

CHAPTER 4

Prepositional “*where*” in Southern Italian Dialects

NICOLA MUNARO AND CECILIA POLETTO

4.1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter we intend to investigate a curious phenomenon found in some Southern Italian dialects in the area including Basilicata, Calabria, Campania, part of Sicily, and part of Apulia. In these varieties it is possible to use a form identical to the *wh*-item meaning “where” as a preposition, which translates some of the usages of standard Italian *da* “by, at, to.” So, for instance a form like “at/to the doctor’s” is translated as something like “where the doctor,” as shown in (1a):

- (1) a. Pier iè sciut ndo u mirc. Rionero in Vulture (Pz)
 Piero has gone where the doctor
 ‘Peter went to the doctor’s’
- b. Ndo iè u giardin?
 where is the garden
 ‘Where is the garden?’
- c. Lu paes ndo sti iè bellesm
 the village where lives is very.beautiful
 ‘The village where he lives is very beautiful’

The form of the preposition meaning “to” in (1a) is identical to the *wh*-item “where” used in interrogative (1b) and relative clauses (1c).

This phenomenon might look *prima facie* like a case of homophony, or at best as a case of grammaticalization of a *wh*-pronoun into a preposition; however, it can be shown that the only way to capture the distribution of “prepositional *where*” (from now on P-*where*) is that the contexts where it can occur can be defined on the basis of the formal features of the noun with which the P element is associated. If P-*where* were a case of homophony, we would have the additional burden of explaining why the element *where* does not substitute for the preposition *da* “by/at/to” in all the possible usages of the preposition; moreover, we could expect other *wh*-items to have undergone the same path, which is not the case, and we would have to admit that there are two lexical entries for “*where*” in the lexicon, which is not an elegant solution. Interestingly, the phenomenon of P-*where* displays a progressive enlargement from a set of core contexts that are found in most dialects of the geographical area mentioned earlier to additional contexts, found in a subset of dialects, while it never targets other usages of the preposition in any of the dialects of the ASIt database.¹ For instance, temporal usages of the preposition *da*, which in general are parasitic on locative usages in most languages, are never expressed by P-*where*. This is even more striking if we notice that the element *dove* (“*where*” in Italian) can indeed have temporal usages when it introduces an embedded clause with temporal value. We will show that there exists an implicational scale in terms of contexts in which P-*where* can occur that depends on the properties of the noun with which P-*where* is associated. This will lead us to propose an internal structure of the lowest portion of locative PPs that partially reformulates Cinque’s (2010) and Terzi’s (2010) proposals on the internal structure of PPs. We will argue that the predicate position of the small clause containing in its subject position the null PLACE postulated by Terzi is occupied by another small clause containing the actual locative noun and its possessor (and not by a simple DP).

More generally, we believe that our case study can shed light on the nature of the diachronic process of reanalysis. Since the work by Roberts and Roussou (2003), processes of linguistic change like grammaticalization and reanalysis have become central issues in formal diachronic syntax. It is now widely assumed that both grammaticalization and reanalysis are two instances of the same process, according to which an element originally located lower in the structure is reinterpreted as a higher element realizing a higher functional projection, in general as a head. Another type of process related to grammaticalization/reanalysis is the change of a complex element into a head, as discussed

1. We have not undertaken a mathematical investigation of our contexts, but their distribution can probably be captured by a gauss function in a way similar to the one described by Sorace (2004) for the phenomenon of auxiliary selection with unaccusative verbs.

at length by van Gelderen (2011). We do not think that the phenomenon we observe in the Southern Italian dialects can be described by assuming either that the *wh*-item moves higher in the structural tree or that a specifier is reanalyzed as a head. The process we observe is of a completely different type, as we will see.

We will show that our case of reanalysis has to be seen as a change in the environment of the reanalyzed element, hence as a purely structural change. In section 4.2 we report previous work of ours on the internal structure of the *wh*-item *where* in Italian dialects, which is instrumental in understanding the details of the analysis of P-*where*. In section 4.3, we provide an overview of the distribution of P-*where* in various dialects we have investigated. Section 4.4 contains a detailed discussion of our idea: we propose that P-*where* actually exploits a sort of reduced relative structure in which the null classifier-like element PLACE² located in the internal structure of the *wh*-item is raised to the top of the structure and enters a small clause structure with the actual lexical noun present. Since, as we will see, most dialects only use P-*where* in cases of quasi-inalienable locative possession (like “someone’s home”), we will adopt the recent proposal by den Dikken (2003, 2013), also adopted by Terzi (2010), that inalienable possession is actually to be interpreted as a small clause whose predicative head functions as the relator between the possessor (located in the specifier position of RelatorP) and the possessee (located in the complement position of RelatorP). Only the further extension found in a small number of dialects to non-quasi inalienable locatives (like “the street”) is a real case of change of category in which the *wh*-item becomes a real preposition. Finally, section 4.5 contains some concluding remarks.

4.2. THE STATE OF THE ART ON THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF “WHERE”

This section contains a summary of the proposal we argued for in Munaro and Poletto (2014), in which we examined the internal formatives of the interrogative and relative *wh*-item “where” in the Northern Italian domain. On this basis we showed that part of the functional projections active inside a locative PP as proposed by Cinque (2010) and Terzi (2010) are also found in its corresponding *wh*-form.³ In that work, we followed the method of

2. An anonymous reviewer points out that in Italian the null PLACE can be realized as *parte*, originally meaning “part,” and not as *luogo*. Notice, however, that *luogo* in Italian belongs to the highest stylistic register. Furthermore, we think that Terzi’s original insight in assuming that there is a null locative classifier-like noun as PLACE is precisely that this is a locative concept, not the real lexical counterpart of “place.”

3. For a complex internal structure of the *wh*-*where* and the idea that a null PLACE is present in *where/there*, see also Kayne (2004, 2007). See also Noonan (2017) for an analysis of the internal structure of these elements in French and German.

microcomparative variation discussed in Poletto (2012), according to which the elements that have more lexical variation inside a dialectal area are those that contain in their internal structure more functional projections, and each dialect lexically realizes only a part of them. Functional items that have a poorer internal structure are more stable from the lexical point of view and display the same root in all dialects.

The decomposition of the various formatives of the *wh*-item “where” has revealed that it is made up by three types of elements: a prepositional formative, which can correspond to the prepositions *in* “in,” *di* “of,” or *da* “from,” or a combination of them; a vocalic formative *o/u*; a deictic locative element derived from various sources *-nd*, *-v*, or *-la*.⁴ In a form like *indulà*, attested in the variety of Grado, all the formatives are overtly represented.

The internal structure of *wh*-items is generally assumed to at least partially reflect the structure of the corresponding element they question: hence something like “who” or “what” will have a nominal structure underneath the operator layer (as already proposed by Katz and Postal 1964). Given that “where” expresses a locative *wh*-item, this has to be compared with the structure of locative PPs in order to establish which projections the two categories share. We adopt Cinque’s (2010) and Terzi’s (2010) proposal for the internal structure of locative PPs (but see also a very similar proposal by Svenonius 2010):

- (2) [PPDirSource *from* [PPDirGoal *to* [PPDirPath *across* [PPStat *AT* [DegreeP *two miles*
 [ModeDir *diagonally* [AbsViewP *north* [RelViewP *in* [DeicticP *here*
 [AxPartP *under* [PP [P_] [NPplace *the mountain* [NP PLACE]]]]]]]]]]]]]

If this general view of *wh*-items is correct, then the null hypothesis is that the locative *wh*-item realizes at least some of the syntactic projections internal to a PP, and hence there should be a partial correspondence between (2) and the internal structure of “where.”

An independent difference between complex locative PPs and the *wh*-item is the fact that it is possible to sub-extract the internal projections in a PP, but the formatives in the *wh*-item always come in the same order; this amounts to saying that while it is possible to move in the syntax, the morphological component admits no movements of any sort. In other words, the line we take is the same as that usually adopted in the Minimalist Program, where complex morphological forms are not created in the syntax but are already present in the lexicon, and each internal morpheme checks the features of a functional projection. Although the various morphemes correspond each

4. For a table containing all the morphological formatives attested in the Northern Italian dialects, the reader is referred to Munaro and Poletto (2014).

Comparing (6) to the structure of a regular PP (see (2) in the preceding), we see that only four of the potential functional positions are relevant for the *wh*-item: the two highest PPs expressing Source and Goal, the DisjunctiveP (typical only of *wh*-items and not of the corresponding PP) and the DeicticP/ExistentialP, in addition to the lexical projection hosting the restrictor.

As discussed earlier, we assume that the whole extended projection in (6) is activated even when a single lexically realized morpheme is present, irrespective of whether it occupies a high or low position. Capitalizing on the present analysis of the internal structure of the *wh*-item “where,” we now turn to the internal structure of “where” when it is used as a preposition. We will propose that the structure of P-where is actually a free relative clause whose null head noun is the element PLACE extracted out of a small clause encoding inalienable possession.

4.3. THE DISTRIBUTION OF “P-WHERE” ACROSS DIALECTS

Rohlf's (1969) already noticed the following cases of a prepositional usage of *dove* in Old Tuscan and modern Southern Italian dialects like Calabrian, Sicilian, Neapolitan, and Apulian. He provides for Old Tuscan the following examples:

- (7) a. non mai tornare dove lui (Benvenuto Cellini, *La vita*, Rohlf's 259)
not never return where him
'never to go back to him'
- b. vieni a dove me (Tuscan Vernacular, Rohlf's 259)⁵
come to where me
'come to me'

For modern Southern Italian dialects, Rohlf's (1969) provides, among others, the following examples:

- (8) a. vaju duve pàtremma Calabrian
go where father-my
'I go to my father'
- b. undi a mamma Southern Calabrian
where the mother
'at the mother's place'

5. This is a particularly interesting example because P-where co-occurs with the preposition *a* “to,” showing that they are not the same. However, we have not found cases of this type in the modern dialects investigated.

- | | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| c. | vaju unni to soru
go where your sister
'I go to your sister' | Sicilian |
| d. | si nni va nni so mughieri
cl-cl-goes where his wife
'he goes to his wife' | Sicilian |
| e. | è agghiuto addó la sorə
is gone where the sister
'he went to his sister' | Neapolitan |
| f. | mandó un zitellu duve a surella
sent a boy where the sister
'he sent a boy to the sister' | Corsican |
| g. | addó nuja
where us
'at our place' | Campanian |
| h. | ndi mia
where me
'at my place' | Southern Calabrian |
| i. | dunde nnó
where us
'at our place' | Corsican |
| j. | manghjò duve u prete
ate where the priest
'he ate by the priest' | Corsican |
| k. | jamu duve u medicu
go where the doctor
'we go to the doctor' | Calabrian |

AQ: Perhaps align these elements? (either right or left)

The cases exemplified in (8) can be grouped into three categories: P-where is attested either with personal pronouns, or with kinship nouns (like “sister,” “mother,” “wife”), or with nouns indicating a profession (like “priest,” “doctor”). They all have in common that the usage is similar to French “chez,” as Rohlf’s notices, in the sense that the meaning is the one of a location prototypically associated with a person (like his own home or the place associated with his job). Therefore, all these constructions have an implicit locative in their interpretation; the fact that kinship terms are more frequently used with P-where is due to their intrinsically relational nature.

Rohlf's provides only one example of a locative that is not associated with a person, and it is the following one:

- (9) *vaju duve u cummientu* Calabrian
 go where the monastery
 'I go to the monastery'

One might wonder whether this is just a coincidence, or whether examples with a locative that is not related to a person are rare for some linguistically interesting reason. Therefore, we have carried out an investigation in the ASIt database,⁶ including some additional locations, in order to better understand the distribution of the phenomenon. In our research we have found that a certain degree of variation exists concerning the contexts in which P-where is attested.

The majority of the dialects investigated use P-where only when the referent is human and if a conventional relation exists between the profession and the place where it is performed. So we find cases like “where the doctor” meaning “in the practice of the doctor” or “where the director” meaning “in the office of the director.”

- (10) a. *Andù lu miericu ti portu dumani* Ariano Irpino (Av)
 Where the doctor you take tomorrow
 'To the doctor I will take you tomorrow'
- b. *Adduv'u medicu ti cci portu dumani* Crotona
 Where the doctor you there take tomorrow
 'To the doctor I will take you tomorrow'
- c. *Unni uđutturi, ti pottu dumani* Messina
 Where the doctor, you take tomorrow
 'I will take you to the doctor tomorrow'

We also found dialects in which the referent does not need to be human, but inalienable possession is still implied,⁷ so in addition to using P-where in cases

6. The ASIt project is a database including about 300 Italian dialects, which can be freely consulted at the following website: <http://asit.maldura.unipd.it/>.

7. By inalienable possession we mean all those constructions in which there is an intrinsic relation between the possessum and the possessee. In fact, there are various types of inalienable possession, including body parts, kinship terms, and cases of inalienable possession of a place. We investigate here only the second and the third type, although there might be structural similarities with the case of body parts; nevertheless, we are not aware of any of these phenomena extending productively to body parts.

like (10), they also use it in cases like “in the garden” or “in the orchard” when there is a well-defined owner of the place:

- (11) Tin nu martidd *ndo la cas?* Rionero in Vulture (Pz)
 have a hammer where the house
 ‘Do you have a hammer here at home?’

There are also dialects that, in addition to using P-where in cases like (10), see (12b), also use it for a simple locative that is neither human nor requires inalienable possession, like “in the street” (12a):

AQ: Please verify/clarify.

- (12) a. N’ ng’èia n ‘sciun’ *ndo la strata* Calitri (Av)
 Not there.was no one where the street
 ‘No one was in the street’
 b. Crai ti port’ *ndo lu mier’ch*
 Tomorrow you.take where the doctor
 ‘I will take you to the doctor tomorrow morning’

Some other dialects, in addition to using P-where in the contexts exemplified in (10), (see (13b)) also use this construction with human referents where no place is implied (as in (13a)):

- (13) a. Av’ *raccumandat’ a figl’m’ ndò lu pruf’ssor’* Treviso (Av)
 have recommended to son.my where the professor
 ‘I have recommended my son to the professor’
 b. *Ndò lu mier’ch’ t’ port’ cramatina*
 where the doctor you.take tomorrow morning
 ‘I will take you to the doctor tomorrow morning’

However, this usage has not extended to figurative locatives, as the following case attests:

- (14) Aggi’ *raccumannat’ figliam’ a lu pr’fessor’*
 have recommended daughter.my to the professor
 ‘I have recommended my daughter to the professor’

P-where seems thus to have its core distribution in cases like (10), where the referent is human and there is inalienable possession. All the other cases imply the usage of P-where in (10), but there does not seem to be a reciprocal implicational relation.

The following table (15) shows the distribution of P-where in the dialects we have investigated across Campania, Basilicata, Calabria, and Sicily:⁸

(15)⁹

	Ariano Irpino	Crotone	Messina	Calitri	Palermo	Trevico	Carife	Monte calvo	Scampi tella
Locative possessor	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Common locative without possessor	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Locative possessee	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
Dative locative	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-

We can summarize as follows the various types of P-where found in the Southern Italian dialects:

- (a) the first type is the one including the inalienable possession of a location that belongs to a human being, i.e., the place where a person lives or the place where someone practices his or her profession, as in (10);
- (b) the second type is the exact counterpart of the first one, i.e., the case in which it is not the possessor that is realized but the possessee, i.e., cases like ‘where the house’ or ‘where the garden’ (see (11) and third row in (15));
- (c) the third type is the one found with no inalienable possession, i.e., where the structure has extended to cover cases where the internal structure of the PP is the regular one with a locative noun and no possessor at all, as in (12a);
- (d) the fourth type is the one in which ‘P-where’ seems to be equivalent to the preposition ‘to’ and is used to introduce the indirect object of the predicate, as in (13a).

8. In the same contexts, some Sicilian dialects do not use “where,” but another element, namely *intu* “inside.” We leave this aside and concentrate on P-where, though the two phenomena are clearly related.

9. In the following table the 0 corresponds to the cases that are not attested in the sample, while – corresponds to the ungrammaticality of the construction.

[124] (Micro)variation in PPs

4.4. ON THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF INALIENABLE POSSESSION

The phenomenon we are dealing with is thus restricted (at least in most dialects) to what we can call inalienable possession of a place. As generally assumed, inalienable possession is different from alienable possession in the sense that the two related elements (possessor and possessee) are defined on the basis of the other element of the pair: for instance, you cannot be a mother if there is no son/daughter. As noticed by several authors who worked on the structural encoding of inalienable possession, the syntax of the phenomenon is partially independent from its semantics, i.e., as Alexiadou (2003) points out, there is a core of intrinsically relational nouns which have special properties (for instance, kinship nouns) and then there are others which in some languages can share the properties of kinship nouns, though they are not (for example, a noun like “friend” behaves in some languages as a kinship noun, while in others it does not). Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992) notice furthermore that also relational nouns can be treated as having the typical properties of inalienable but also alienable possession. Hence, inalienable possession is syntactically partially independent from the lexical semantics of noun classes, and can be syntactically defined as a special class of nouns that display a different structural configuration from usual possessor/possessee relations.

Furthermore, it is clear that there are various types of inalienable possession; the most typical one concerning body parts entails a different semantic relation with respect to the one of kinship nouns, and in some languages only one of the two classes has special properties. In the Southern Italian dialects we examine here, for instance, enclitic possessives are only possible with kinship nouns but not with body parts (or alienable possession of the more common type). So, in this geographical area (the phenomenon is widespread in all Southern Italian dialects except in extreme Southern ones like Sicilian, Southern Calabrian, and Salentino) you can say *mamməta* with the enclitic possessive *-ta* to mean “your mother,” but you cannot say *manəta* meaning “your hand.” The phenomenon of P-where is restricted to locatives that have an intrinsic relation to the possessor, though it might not be inalienable in a proper sense: although you can sell a house or an office, P-where manifests itself with nouns like *home* meaning the place where a person lives, or like *practice* meaning the place where a doctor practices his or her profession.

Since the context of inalienable possession between a place and a human referent seems to be the core one in which the phenomenon of P-where is attested, we start by providing a structure for this case. Looking at the internal structure of locatives, we notice that Cinque (2010) does not define precisely the structural relation between the element PLACE and the NP indicating a location that constitutes its associate. Terzi proposes that they

are in a possessive relation, a solution which is partly similar to the one we will take, with the difference that we interpret it as an inalienable possession relation (cf. den Dikken 1999; Alexiadou 2003). More recently, Lam (2013) has proposed that the element PLACE is actually a classifier of the NP specifying the location and, as such, it is part of its extended projection. We hypothesize that our cases of inalienable possession are different from the usual locative ones where there is a single locative NP and its classifier PLACE on top, and propose that the relation between the null PLACE and the animate N “the doctor” is actually more complex than meets the eye. Since the element *where* is a *wh*-item, we have to assume that the null PLACE is associated with a null variable, as is the case for all *wh*-items. This null variable occupies precisely the position of the associate of PLACE.

On the other hand, the animate DP *the doctor* is the owner of a locative NP; since this is a case of inalienable possession, we will assume, following den Dikken (2013),¹⁰ that inalienable possession is expressed through a maximal projection where the possessor occupies the specifier position and the possessee the complement position.

Den Dikken (2013) proposes that the structure of inalienable possession can be syntactically represented as a functional projection, more precisely as a small clause whose head is actually an element establishing a predicative relation between the two constituents occupying the specifier and the complement position; we follow him here in assuming that the small clause is actually a RelatorPhrase. The fact that P-*where* occurs more frequently with kinship nouns is straightforwardly derived from this assumption, since kinship nouns are intrinsically relational.¹¹ The internal structure associated with the noun “doctor” is then the following:

(16) [_{RP} [_{SPECRP} [_{DP} the [_{NP} doctor]] [_{R'}]] [_{DP} the [_{NP} practice]]]

The small clause then enters a relation with *where*, which is the relative pronoun of a free relative clause and null PLACE, which is raised to be the head of the free relative clause. However, since PLACE cannot directly relate to a predicative structure as the small clause as such, because it is a nominal element,

10. Alexiadou (2003) proposes that the structure of inalienable possession is similar to the one of alienable possession, with the difference that in alienable possession relations the Possessor is the Specifier of a PossessorP located in the functional spine of the DP, while in the cases of inalienable possession the possessor is the complement of the possessee heading the nominal expression. We do not have strong arguments against this analysis, but rather adopt den Dikken’s approach since it better fits the variation found in the dialects we consider.

11. As for the reason why P-*where* also occurs with pronouns, we surmise that this has to do with the fact that pronouns are also intrinsically relational with respect to the speaker. We do not pursue this any further here, as it would lead us too far afield.

If free relatives are to be interpreted as canonical restrictive relative clauses with a light head (as proposed by a whole line of research that has been applied to Italian by Benincà 2012), then we can analyze these structures as reduced free relatives headed by the null PLACE.¹² This would explain why a *wh*-item (otherwise used only in relative, interrogative, and exclamative clauses) seems to have taken up the value of a locative preposition, but crucially only in cases of inalienable possession. At this stage, the reanalysis process is only apparent, since “where” preserves the same internal structure that it has in free relative clauses. The point is that here the structure is more complex than meets the eye.

This structural analysis also allows us to capture the extension to cases of inalienable possession like the ones found in Rionero in Vulture, such as (11), where the noun occurring with P-where is not the possessor, but the place the possessor owns: cases like “where the garden” or “where the house” actually entail the realization of the NP that is the complement of the internal small clause RelatorP to which PLACE is associated, as shown in (18).

Up to now, we have seen that the structure of P-where is always the same modulo the realization of null or lexical elements, i.e., a double small clause where the highest specifier containing PLACE is actually a free relative clause headed by PLACE and in which “where” is the relative pronoun. The lower small clause is a standard Relator phrase with the possessor in the Spec and the possessee in the complement position. Essentially, what we are saying is that combining Cinque’s analysis of PPs with den Dikken’s proposal on relational small clauses, we can explain the distribution of P-where without any further assumptions.¹³

The last step of extension of “where” to normal DPs like *street*, exemplified by (12), which do not include any sort of inalienable possession, is mediated through a structure like (20), where there is actually no variable related to PLACE, which is inserted into a SC relation with RP. The difference between (17)/(18) and (20) is that in (17)/(18) we still have a RelP, as in inalienable possession. In (20), there is no RelP small clause any longer, but just a canonical PP structure:

- (20) [_{SCP} [_{SpecSCP} [PLACE [_{PPdirsource} . . . [_{AxPartP} [_{PP} [_{P*}] [[CPrel [Where]] . . .] PLACE]]]]]]]]]
 [_{SC} copula] [_{DP} **the street**]

Notice that (20) is still a free relative clause headed by PLACE, but in this case, the lowest part of the structure has been simplified from a small clause into the one of a normal DP.

12. We adopt the view that free relatives are identical to headed restrictive relative clauses with a null head noun, which in our case is PLACE.

13. For a similar proposal on Greek, see Terzi (2010).

If we are correct, then the reason why P-where exists is that some locative PPs actually have a free relative clause structure where the phonetically null light noun heading the relative clause is originally merged inside an inalienable possessive structure (as the Saxon genitive in English clearly shows), which then extends in other varieties from inalienable possession (where either the possessor or the possessee are realized) to normal stative locatives without inalienable possession. Therefore, cases like (12), (13), and (14) are similar in that they do not have a RelP, but they still have the higher small clause with the free relative in its specifier.

4.5. SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this chapter we have analyzed an interesting phenomenon attested in some Southern Italian dialects, namely the prepositional usage of the *wh*-item “where,” whereby P-where is used to introduce locative PPs expressing different degrees of inalienable possession. In trying to account for a process that might look at first sight like a lexical re-categorization of a *wh*-element into a preposition, we have argued for a structural analysis that sheds new light on the way we structurally interpret the process of reanalysis. We do not claim that the process of reanalysis as it has been conceived of in recent generative literature does not exist, but simply point out that some cases that look like reanalysis might actually be neither an instance of a lexical element turning into a functional one, nor an instance of a specifier becoming a head.

We think that the one we have investigated here is structurally a different phenomenon. We have observed that the process that changes the category of a *wh*-item and turns it into a preposition runs through the association of the element “where” with different lexically realized and null items.

Our analysis concerns only the most embedded structure of a locative PP: while the functional projections contained in any PP are the ones identified by Cinque (2010), we have proposed that the reason why it is possible to use “where” as a preposition can be derived by the structural possibility to realize a small clause whose subject is a relative clause headed by the null PLACE postulated by Terzi (2010), and whose predicate is not a DP, but another small clause containing the relation between the locative noun and its possessor. The only reanalysis consists in the loss of the lower RelatorP, which is turned into a regular nominal expression.

REFERENCES

- Alexiadou, Artemis. 2003. Some notes on the structure of alienable and inalienable possessors. In *From NP to DP: The Expression of Possession in Noun Phrases*, edited by Martine Coene and Yves D’hulst, pp. 167–188. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Benincà, Paola 2012. Lexical complementisers and headless relatives. In: *Functional Heads: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 7, edited by Laura Brugé, Anna Cardinaletti, Giuliana Giusti, Nicola Munaro, and Cecilia Poletto, pp. 29–41. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2010. Mapping spatial PPs: an introduction. In *Mapping Spatial PPs: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 6, edited by Guglielmo Cinque and Luigi Rizzi, pp. 3–25. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cole, Peter, David Gil, Gabriella Hermon, and Uri Tadmor. 2001. The acquisition of in-situ WH-questions and WH-indefinites in Jakarta Indonesian. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, pp. 169–179. Somerville MA: Cascadilla Press.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 1999. On the structural representation of possession and agreement: the case of (anti-)agreement in Hungarian possessed nominal phrases. In *Crossing Boundaries: Advances in the Theory of Central and Eastern European Languages*, edited by Istvá Kenesei, pp. 137–178. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 2013. On the morphosyntax of (in)alienably possessed noun phrases. *GLOW Newsletter*.
- Katz, Jerrold, and Paul Postal. 1964. *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 1993. Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection. *Studia Linguistica* 47: 3–31.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2004. Here and there. In *Syntax, Lexis and Lexicon-Grammar: Papers in Honour of Maurice Gross*, edited by Christian Leclère, Éric Laporte, Mireille Piot, and Max Silberstein, pp. 253–273. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2007. A short note on where vs. place. In *Miscellanea di Studi Linguistici offerti a Laura Vanelli da amici e allievi padovani*, edited by Roberta Maschi, Nicoletta Penello, and Piera Rizzolatti, pp. 245–257. Udine: Forum.
- Lam, Chi Fung. 2013. *The Cartography of Spatial Adpositional Phrases in Mandarin and Cantonese*. PhD thesis, Università Ca' Foscari-Venice.
- Munaro, Nicola, and Cecilia Poletto. 2014. Synchronic and diachronic clues on the internal structure of 'where' in Italo-Romance. In *Diachrony and Dialects*, edited by Paola Benincà, Adam Ledgeway, and Nigel Vincent, pp. 279–300. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Noonan, Máire. 2017. Dutch and German R-pronouns: R you sure it's a pronoun? In *The Structure of Words at the Interfaces*, edited by Heather Newell, Máire Noonan, Glyne Piggott, and Lisa deMena Travis, pp. 209–239. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1930. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Poletto, Cecilia. 2012. Comparative linguistics and microvariation: the role of dialectology. *Language in Context* 12.1: 47–68.
- Poletto, Cecilia, and Jean-Yves Pollock. 2009. Another look at *wh*-questions in Romance: the case of Mendrisiotto and its consequences for the analysis of French *wh*-in-situ and embedded interrogatives. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2006. Selected Papers from 'Going Romance', Amsterdam, 7–9 December 2006*, edited by Danièle Torck and W. Leo Wetzels, pp. 199–258. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Roberts, Ian, and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

AQ: Please provide name of editor(s).

AQ: Per text citations, OK?

AQ: Please add page numbers (and volume number if applicable).

- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol. 3. Torino: Einaudi.
- Sorace, Antonella. 2004. Gradience at the lexicon-syntax interface: evidence from auxiliary selection. In *The Unaccusativity Puzzle: Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*, edited by Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Martin Everaert, pp. 243–268. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Starke, Michal. 2009. Nano-syntax: a short primer to a new approach to language. *Nordlyd* 36.1, special issue on Nano-syntax, edited by Peter Svenonius, Gillian Ramchand, Michal Starke, and Knut Tarald Taraldsen, pp. 1–6.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2010. Spatial P in English. In *Mapping Spatial PPs: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 6, edited by Guglielmo Cinque and Luigi Rizzi, pp. 127–160. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Terzi, Arhonto. 2010. Locative prepositions and place. In *Mapping Spatial PPs: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 6, edited by Guglielmo Cinque and Luigi Rizzi, pp. 196–224. New York: Oxford University Press.
- van Gelderen, Elly. 2011. *The Linguistic Cycle: Language Change and the Language Faculty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta. 1992. The definite determiner and the inalienable constructions in French and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 595–652.

