Not so nano.
Reducing the order of modifiers to Lexical Items

Francesco Pinzin (Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main) Pinzin@em.uni-frankfurt.de
Tommaso Mattiuzzi (Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main) Mattiuzzi@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Nanosyntax (Starke 2009, 2014) has been successful in modelling the patterns of co-occurrence of roots and suffixal Lexical Items (LIs) as a function of the syntactic constituents with which such LIs are stored in the lexicon of each language. Such syntactic constituents can be seen as the 'lexicalisation potential' of each LI in terms of syntactic-semantic features. By this, Nanosyntax achieves in this domain the desideratum of the Borer-Chomsky conjecture (Borer 1984): to reduce crosslinguistic variation to the featural composition of the language-specific LIs. As a relatively recent development (Starke 2018), Nanosyntax integrated cases in which the lexicalisation of a given syntactic-semantic feature does not involve either a suffixal or root LI, but a modifier/auxiliary XP (a Complex Left Branch, CLB). Standard cases are the merge of a (non-suffixal) determiner, an adjective, an auxiliary verb, or an adverb. Integrating a CLB with the main functional sequence (*fseq*) to satisfy a given feature {f} is a two-step operation: first, the CLB is derived in an 'auxiliary workspace', second, the CLB is merged with the main *fseq*, with the former linearly preceding the latter. Among other open issues, this poses the question of how to derive orders in which the CLB instead follows the constituent it combines with (e.g., N-Adj, as It. *giardino inglese* 'English garden'). In this presentation, we explore how to model such "reversed" orders in terms of what is standardly known within Nanosyntax as *Lexicalisation Driven Movements*. The core of the proposal is the idea that the XP resulting from merging a CLB with the main fseq is itself in need of a lexicalisation. This departure from current models follows from a more general requirement: all labelled nodes must be matched by a LI. This straightforwardly covers all configurations in which the label is provided by an atomic {f}, as well as structures where the projected label is instead provided by a CLB. Lexicalising an XP of the latter type requires a special kind of LI, which we model in term of idioms with no externalisation form (Starke 2011). Such LIs encode the surface orders between the CLB and the rest of the functional sequence. We then explore the limits of this system by looking at how it fairs in deriving the 'Universal 20' orders between Demonstratives, Numerals, Adjectives and Nouns (Greenberg 1967, Cinque 2005).

Borer, Hagit. 1984. *Parametric syntax: Case studies in semitic and Romance languages*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2005. Deriving Greenberg's universal 20 and its exceptions. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36(3). 315–332.

Greenberg, Joseph. 1963. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In Joseph Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of language*, 73–113. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Starke, Michal. 2009. Nanosyntax: A short primer to a new approach to language, *Nordlyd* 36. 1–6.

Starke, Michal. 2011. *Class notes, course on nanosyntax given at Ghent University*. November 7–10.

Starke, Michal. 2014. Cleaning up the lexicon. *Linguistic Analysis*, 39(1). 245–256.

Starke, Michal. 2018. "Complex left branches, spellout, and prefixes". In Lena Baunaz, Karen De Clercq, Liliane Haegeman & Eric Lander (eds.), *Exploring nanosyntax*, 239–249. Oxford, Oxford University Press.