<u>Formalist and functionalist factors in parameter-resetting: a creative compromise:</u>

Syntactic change is formally construed as parameter-resetting in first language acquisition (Roberts (2007), cf Lightfoot (1991, 1999)) and recent analyses of historical syntax apply the formal metric of 'simplicity' in Minimalism, namely Third Factor Principles (Biberauer (2008)), to account for syntactic change (Roberts and Roussou (R&R) (2003), van Gelderen (2011), cf Chomsky (2005, 2007)). Furthermore, the Inertia Principle in historical syntax entails maximum conservativity in parameter-fixing which pre-empts all forms of optionality in formal parametric variation (Longobardi (2001), cf Keenan (1994, 2009)), which is another desideratum for Minimalism (Chomsky (1995)). All this strongly predicts a strict mechanism of parameter-fixing which perfectly aligns with the morphophonological properties of 'cues'/'triggers' in the primary linguistic data (R&R (2003:15, 202-205)), which is subject to scrutiny. This paper examines the diachrony of Latin/Romance prepositions and argues that current Minimalist versions of parameter-resetting are simplistic and in order to capture the formal changes to prepositions, it is necessary to incorporate functionalist factors which attest to the creativity in parameter-fixing in first language acquisition.

It is a common trend for Latin prepositions to be reanalyzed from lexical, spatially-oriented prepositions (Cinque and Rizzi (2010)) to functional markers of nouns and clauses (case-markers (K(case)) and non-finite complementisers (M/Fin) respectively), and this formal reanalysis (PP > KP/MP) conforms to formal 'simplicity' in parametric schemata (Gianollo, Guardiano and Longobardi (2008)) since the morphological agreement between the preposition and its morphologically case-marked nominal complement (P + KP) is lost and the former is reanalyzed as a marker of nouns (K + NP) and infinitives (M + TP), which is structurally parallel to R&R's (2003:85, 96) 'structural simplification' in the formation of complementisers (e.g. Greek *να,* Calabrian *mu* (C > M)). However, Romance prepositional case-markers (K) and complementisers (M) show innovative idiosyncrasies in comparison to Latin which rule out any account of a neat formal transition from Latin to Romance (Ledgeway (2012:21-23)): as Latin does not have prepositional infinitives, Romance prepositional infinitives entail a significant reduction in the original use of the bare prolative infinitive (Vincent (1988:68-70)) which not only show dialectal variations (e.g. Spanish bare infinitive (1a)) vs French/Italian *de/ad*-infinitive (1b-c)) but also diachronic origins in Latin prepositional gerunds/gerundives (Schulte (2007)) which attest to the lexical origins of *de* 'about, regarding' and *ad* 'to, towards' selected accordingly by semantically compatible verbal predicates in expressing 'theme/ content' (2a)) and 'purpose' (2b)) respectively, both of which are stronger than the bare infinitive. Romance case-markers are even more innovative in that they do not merely replace Latin morphological case but also introduce new object alignments, namely the Differential Object-Marking (*ad*) of human/animate and referential/specific direct objects (Nocentini (1985)), which has been shown to derive from verbs of seeing (*verba videndi*) (3a)) (Tse (2013)) and analogized from structurally ambiguous three-place predicates like verbs of serving/shouting/begging (*verba serviendi* (3b)) *et clamandi* (3c)) *et rogandi* (3d-e)) where the human 'beneficiary/recipient/experiencer' is consistently marked by *ad* and can be reanalyzed as a direct object, which creates a synchronic opposition between animacy (*ad*) and inanimacy (ø) where the former is not only semantically but also morphosyntactically differentiated as 'marked', also for reasons of expressivity and clarity (Zamboni (1994)). These Romance innovations show, therefore, that formal syntactic change is not purely determined by formal 'simplicity' but is also influenced by functionalist factors which create new formal categories and new morphosyntactic alignment.

Examples:

Spanish:

1a) non … ensaya-va faz-er con ella nada
    NEG strive-IMPERF.3SG do-INF with her nothing
    'He did not strive to do anything with her.' (*La Primera Crónica General* 626b42)

Italian:

1b) procaccia-ndo **di** riconcili-ar-si co-l Papa
    strive-GERUND DE reconcile-INF-REFL.PRO with-DEF.ART Pope
    'striving to reconcile with the Pope.' (*Cronica fiorentina*, p. 104)

French:

1c) desirroit **a** vivre d-u sien
    want-COND.3SG AD live.INF DE-ART.MASC.SG his.MASC.SG
    '… he would like to live with his.' (*Les miracles de saint Louis de Guillaume de St Pathus* 5554)

Latin:

2a) nos...labor-amus **de** aufere-nd-o mal-o
    we work-PRES.1PL DE eliminate-GERUNDIVE-ABL.SG evil-ABL.SG
    'we strive about removing the evil…' > 'we strive to remove the evil.'
    (Tertullian *Adversus Hermogenem* 11.3)

2b) ego enim te arbitr-or... statim esse
    PRO.1SG for PRO.2SG think-PRES.1SG at.once be.INF
    ad Sicyon-em oppurgn-and-um profe-ct-um
    AD Sicyon-ACC attack-GERUNDIVE-ACC set.out-PERF-ACC.SG
    'for I think that you immediately set off in order to attack Sicyon' > 'for I think that you immediately set off to attack Sicyon' (Cicero *ad Atticum* 1.13)

3a) **ad** er-am revide-bo
    AD mistress-ACC see.again-FUT.1SG
    'I shall see our mistress again…' (Plautus *Truculentus* 320)

3b) **ad** cuius imperi-um cael-um terr-a mari-a servie-bant
    AD REL.PRO.GEN power-ACC.SG heaven-NOM.SG earth-NOM.SG sea-NOM.PL serve-IMPERF
    '… whose power heaven, earth and the seas served.' (Jerome Letter 82.3) (Latin)

3c) proclaim-antes **ad** dominum
    crying.out-PRES.PART.NOM.PL AD Lord
    'crying out (something) to the Lord…' > 'calling the Lord…' (*Actus Petri cum Simone*, 69.3)

3d) Moyses ora-bat **ad** Dominum
    Moses beg-IMPERF.3SG AD Lord
    'Moses was begging the Lord.' (*Libri Maccabaorum* 2.10)

3e) veni-am… **ad** Domino poposce-bat
    mercy-FEM.ACC.SG AD Lord demand-IMPERF.3SG
    'He was begging the Lord for mercy' (*Chronicon Salernitanum* 11)

References:

Biberauer, T. (2008): 'Introduction', in Biberauer, T. (ed), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 1-74.

Chomsky, N. (1995): *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge/Massachussetts: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (2005): 'Three factors in language design'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:1-22.

Chomsky, N. (2007): 'Approaching UG from below', in Sauerland, U. and Gartner, H. M. (eds), *Interfaces + recursion=language? Chomsky's minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1-18.

Cinque, G. and Rizzi, L. (2010): *Mapping Spatial PPs: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, volume 6.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gelderen, van. E. (2011): *The Linguistic Cycle: Language Change and the Language Faculty*. Oxford University Press.

Gianollo, C., Guardiano, C. and Longobardi, G. (2008): 'Three fundamental issues in parametric linguistics', in Biberauer, T. (ed), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation.* Amstrdam: Benjamins, pp. 109-142.

Keenan, E. (1998): 'The historical creation of reflexive pronouns in English'. MS, UCLA.

Keenan, E. (2009): 'Liinguistic theory and the historical creation of English reflexives', in Crisma, P. and Longobardi, G. (eds), *Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 17-39.

Ledgeway, A. (2012a): *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typolog and Change.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lightfoot, D. (1991): *How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lightfoot, D. (1999): *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change, and Evolution.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Longobardi, G. (2001): 'Formal syntax, diachronic minimalism, and etymology: the history of French *chez*'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(2):275-302.

Nocentini, A. (1985): 'Sulla genesi dell'oggetto preposizionale nelle lingue romanze',in *Studi linguistici e filologici per Carlo Alberto Mastrelli,* Pisa, pp. 299-311.

Roberts, I. (2007): *Diachronic Syntax.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, I. and Roussou, A. (2003): *Syntactic Change. A Minimalist approach to grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schulte, K. (2007): *Prepositional infinitives in Romance: a usage-based approach to syntactic change,* Oxford: Peter Lang.

Tse (2013): 'Latin *ad* as a Romance case-marker: differential object marking, Minimalism, formalism/functionalism'. Paper presented at Going Romance, University of Amsterdam, Friday 29th November.

Vincent, N. (1988): 'Latin', in Vincent, N. and Harris, M. (eds), *The Romance Languages*, London, Croom Helm, pp. 26-78.

Zamboni, A. (1993): 'Postille alla discussion sull'accusativo preposizionale', in Ramón Lorenzo (ed), *Actas do XIX Congreso Internacional de Lingüística e Filoloxía Románicas V: Gramática histórica e historia da lingua..*A Coruna: Fundación, pp. 787-808.