

The grammaticalization of Latin *ad* as a Romance case-marker: differential object marking, Minimalism, formalism/functionalism:

The grammaticalization of Latin/Romance *ad* as a marker of indirect objects is pan-Romance and its grammaticalization in proto-Romance/Latin has been extensively dealt with (e.g. Adams (2013:278-294)). The grammaticalization of *ad* as a marker of direct objects, however, has received relatively less attention, despite strong evidence that it is related to the grammaticalization of *ad* as a dative case-marker (Nocentini (1985), Sornicola (1997, 1998)). In this paper, I trace the grammaticalization of *ad* as a case-marker of both direct and indirect objects in proto-Romance/Latin, which is important not only for Romance linguistics, since this accounts for the origins of differential object marking in Romance, but also for Latin philology, as it is an expansion of the traditional analysis of Latin *ad*. Furthermore, I test the Minimalist framework of grammaticalization (Roberts and Roussou (R & R) (2003), Tse (2013a, b)), *ad* as a case-marker (K(case)) is a new functional category for R & R (2003) and its dual grammaticalization poses important methodological questions regarding the relationship between formalism and functionalism.

ad functions as a case-marker of direct objects in many Romance languages (Rohlf's (1971)), and while its use as a case-marker of indirect objects is held to be pan-Romance (Adams (2013:278ff)), its use as a case-marker of direct objects displays dialectal differences: in certain varieties, it is only used vestigially in order to avoid ambiguity between the subject and object (Zamboni (1993:789)):

- 1) o ama-va como a proprio filho
 he.PRO.ACC love-3SG.IMPERF as AD own son
 'He loved him as a son' i.e. 'like a parent who loved his son', rather than 'like a son who loved his parent.' (Portuguese)

In other varieties, it is used as a case-marker of human/animate direct objects (Zamboni (1993:792)):

- 2a) h-o visto una machina
 have-1SG.PRES see.PERF.PTCP a-FEM.SG car.FEM.SG
 'I saw a car.'
- 2b) h-o visto a tu-o babb-o
 have-1SG.PRES see.PERF.PTCP AD your-MASC dad-MASC
 'I saw your dad.' (Tuscan dialect in Italy)

In some varieties, it is also used as a case-marker of specific/referential direct objects e.g. Spanish (Zamboni (1993:790)):

- 3a) el director busc-a un empleado
 DET.MASC director.MASC search-3SG.PRES a employee
 'The director searches an employee.' (anyone would do)
- 3b) el director busc-a a un empleado
 DET.MASC director.MASC search-3SG.PRES AD a employee
 'The director searches a particular employee.' (Spanish)

These patterns constitute differential object marking not only in terms of distinguishing between subject and object (1) but also between different types of direct objects (animate/inanimate (2a-b), specific/generic (3a-b)). These uses of *ad* are attested in many branches of old Romance (Sornicola (1998:422)) where *ad* marks animate and singular direct objects (Zorraquino (1976:563), Nocentini (1985:304)). There is another factor, namely the fact that there is comparative evidence for *ad* being obligatory with tonic personal pronouns and proper names (Sornicola (1997:77, 1998:422)). Such a wide geographical and historical distribution suggests that *ad* is grammaticalized in proto-Romance/Latin. Furthermore, there is evidence that the grammaticalization of *ad* as a marker of direct object is related to its grammaticalization as a marker of indirect object. First of all, there are numerous Romance verbs which select *ad* (4b-d) that corresponds to the Latin morphological dative in the direct object relation, given that it is the second argument of a two-place predicate (4a) e.g. Latin/Romance *servire* 'to serve':

- 4a) e-ius studi-o serv-ire addecet
 him-GEN.SG zeal serve-INF be.proper
 'It is proper to serve his zeal.' (Plautus *Amphitruo* 1004) (Latin)
- 4b) perché non poss-o ad tal signor serv-ire
 because NEG can-1SG.PRES AD such lord serve-INF
 '... because I cannot serve such a lord.' (Medieval Neapolitan)
- 4c) serv-ir a-l Campeador
 serve-INF AD-DEF.ART Campeador
 'to serve the Campeador.' (*El Cantar del mio Cid* 1369) (Medieval Spanish)
- 4d) ...para serv-ir a tão ilustres senhor-es
 in.order serve-INF AD so distinguished.PL sir-PL
 '... in order to serve such distinguished guests.' (*Ciganita* 35) (Medieval Portuguese)

This proto-Romance *ad* must have been concurrent with the morphological dative in the direct object relation, which is empirically supported (4e)) (cf *credere* + dative/*ad*-PP, *obtemperare* + dative/*ad*-PP (Adams (2013:292)):

4e) **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)

Furthermore, there are certain predicates that are ambiguous between trivalency and bivalency from Latin to Romance e.g. Latin/Romance *clamare* (Sornicola (1997:72-73)):

5a) clam-o mihi ipse:
 shout-PRES.1SG me.DAT myself
 numer-a ann-os tu-os
 count-IMPERATIVE.2SG year-ACC.PL your-ACC.PL
 ‘I shout to myself: count your years!’
 (Seneca, *Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium* 27) (Latin)

5b) **ad** me omn-es clam-ant
 AD me.ACC all-NOM.PL shout-PRES.3PL
 Ianua culp-a tu-a est
 Ianua fault.FEM.NOM.SG your.FEM.NOM.SG be.PRES.3SG
 ‘Everyone shouts at me: Door, it is your fault!’ (Catullus 67:14) (Latin)

Latin *clamare* ‘to shout’ is a three-place predicate, as it is attested with three arguments: an agent (<*ego*> ‘I’ (5a), *omnes* (5b)), an experiencer (*mihi* (5a), *ad me* (5b)), and a theme/proposition (*numera annos tuos* (5a), *Ianua culpa tua est* (5b)). In (proto-)Romance, **clamare* ‘to call’ is a two-place predicate and is only attested with two arguments in Romance (agent, experiencer) (Meier (1948:123)):

5c) **a** Minaya Albar Fáneez e **a** Per Vermudoz
 AD Minaya Albar Fáneez and AD Per Vermudoz
 los llam-ó
 them call-PRET.3SG
 ‘He called them... Minaya Albar Fáneez and Per Vermudoz.’ (*El Cid*, 1894-1895) (Medieval Spanish)

5d) allora Elia chiamoe **a** Dio
 then Elia call-PRET.3SG AD God
 ‘Then Elia called God.’ (Fra Giordano) (Medieval Italian)

5e) appressu clam-au **a** lu primu vinchituri
 then call-PRET.3SG AD DEF.ART first wave
 ‘Then he called the first wave.’ (*La istoria di Eneas* 91, 46) (Medieval Sicilian)

Latin *ad*-PP, which is functionally equivalent to the third argument in Latin *clamare* (5a)-b)), is re-analysed as the second argument in proto-Romance **clamare* (5c-e)) i.e. direct object.¹

I have therefore utilised the Latin corpora for the grammaticalization of *ad* as a dative case-marker (Pinkster (1990), Adams (2011, 2013)), which constitute a chronological spectrum of Latin texts (Plautus, Cicero, Ovid and Christian Latin, Medieval Latin). *ad*-PPs are attested with trivalent verbs (*ad patrem* (6a)) and are concurrent with the morphological dative marking (e.g. *patri* (6b)) the third argument from as early as Plautus e.g.

6a) numquid aliu-d v-is patr-i nunti-ar-i
 whether another-N.SG.ACC want-PRES.2SG father-DAT.SG report-INF-PASS
 ‘whether you want another thing to be reported to your father.’ (Plautus, *Captivi* 400)

6b) qu-ae **ad** patr-em v-is nunti-ar-i
 which-N.PL.ACC to father-ACC.SG want-PRES.2SG report-INF-PASS
 ‘the things which you want to be reported towards your father’ (Plautus, *Captivi* 360)

Similar *ad*-PPs (e.g. *ad eram* (7a)) are attested with bivalent verbs (cf *servire* (4e)) and are concurrent with the morphological accusative marking direct object (*ver* (7b)) e.g. *verba videndi*:

7a) **ad** er-am revide-bo
 AD mistress-ACC see.again-FUT.1SG
 ‘I shall see our mistress again...’ (Plautus *Truculentus* 320)

¹ The bivalency of (proto-)Romance **clamare* is anticipated in Latin examples where the direct object is omitted e.g.

1) ego autem **ad** Deum clama-vi
 PRO.1SGbut AD God-ACC.SG shout-PERF.1SG
 ‘But I shouted (something) to God.’
 OR ‘But I called God.’ (Latin Vulgate Bible, *Exodus* 14.15)

- 7b) ver vid-e...
 spring.ACC.SG see-IMPERATIVE.SG
 ‘Look at spring...’ (Plautus *Truculentus* 353)

This construction occurs throughout the history of Latin² and is attested in all the branches of Romance which have prepositional objects marked by *ad*:

- 8a) guard-a a me
 watch-IMPERATIVE AD me
 ‘Look at me...’ (*Vita e favole di Esopo* 19, 18) (Medieval Neapolitan)
- 8b) vid-i a Dido
 see-PRET.1SG AD Dido
 ‘... I saw Dido.’ (*La istoria di Eneas*) (Medieval Sicilian)
- 8b) ver-é a la mugier...
 see-FUT.1SG AD DEF.ART woman
 ‘I shall see the woman...’ (*El Cid* 228b) (Medieval Spanish)
- 8c) ve-r a Rainha da Grã-Bretanha
 see-INF AD Queen of Great-Britain
 ‘to see the Queen of Great Britain.’ (*Prosa do Padre Antonio Vieira* 289) (Medieval Portuguese)
- 8d) yo veh-ia a Jesuchrist...
 PRO.1SG see-IMPERF.1SG AD Jesus.Christ
 ‘I saw Jesus Christ...’ (The Sermons of Saint Vicent Ferrer 60) (Medieval Catalan)

Verba videndi may well have played a major role in the grammaticalization of *ad* as a direct object case-marker.

Both Pinkster (1990:201-202) and Adams (2011:266, 2013:279) point out that the *ad*-PP in 6a) (*ad patrem*) is not synonymous with the morphological dative (*patri*) in (6b), since the former is semantically stronger in denoting spatial motion of transportation, given that the recipient (*patrem*) is not immediately present in the scene and the message has to be transported to him abroad.³ The Latin *ad*-PP in 7a) (*ad eram*) is also semantically stronger than the morphological accusative (*ver*) in 7b), since it denotes ‘visiting one’s house’ which implies travelling and hence spatial direction. These nuances are retained throughout the history of Latin.⁴ There is therefore a synchronic distribution of morphological dative/accusative case and *ad*-PPs in Latin, which, as Ledgeway (2012:21-23) argues, creates a ‘layered’ distribution of synthetic (morphological case) and analytic (*ad*-PPs) forms, the former unmarked while the latter marked.

As *ad* is the marked option, all such *ad*-PPs are re-analysable as specific/referential objects, and in later Latin, the spatial meaning of *ad* is weakened to the point that it comes to mark titles and proper names (Adams (2011:267, 2013:282-286), Vielliard (1927:200)) e.g.

- 9) ips-e farinarius ad ipso Vern-o nonquam aspe-xissit
 self-MASC.SG baker-NOM.SG AD self-ACC Vernus-ACC never look-3SG.PERF
 ‘The baker never looked at the Vernus’ (Merovingian documents, XXXII) (Vielliard (1927:200))

Furthermore, in late Latin there is fluctuation between trivalency and bivalency with certain verbs e.g. Latin *clamare* (cf ex. 5) and footnote 1):

- 10) proclaim-antes ad dominum
 crying.out-PRES.PART.NOM.PL AD Lord
 ‘crying out (something) to the Lord...’ (10a)
 OR ‘calling the Lord...’ (10b) (*Actus Petri cum Simone*, 69.3)

² E.g.

1) ... vereor, ne... nunc ad Caecilianam fabulam spectet
 fear-PRES.1SG COMPnow AD Caecilian-FEM.ACC.SG play-FEM.ACC.SG watch-PRES.SUBJ.3SG
 ‘I fear that... he may now watch the play of Caecilius.’ (Cicero *ad Atticum* 1.16.6)

2) patriae quoque vellet ad oras respicere
 fatherland-GEN.SG also want-IMPERF.SUBJ.3SG AD shore-ACC.PL look.back-INF
 ‘... he also wanted to look back at the shores of her homeland...’ (Ovid’s *Metamorphosis* 11.546)

(cf Gregorius Magnus *Epistulae* 3.39-40)

³ This is most evident in this example from the same passage:

1) qu-ae nunti-are hinc te vol-o
 REL.PRO-N.PL.ACC announce-INF from.herePRO.2SG.ACC want-PRES.1SG
 in patri-am ad patr-em
 into homeland-ACC.SG AD father-ACC.SG

‘the things which I want to you bring from here to your homeland to your father.’ (*Captivi* 383)

The spatial force of delivering the message to the recipient (*ad patrem*) is evident in *hinc* ‘from here’ and *in patriam* ‘to your homeland’. (cf *Captivi* 365)

⁴ In Cicero’s letters, *ad*-PPs denote dispatchment of letters (Adams (2013:279)), and footnote 2, ex. 1), the *ad*-PP (*ad Caecilianam fabulam*) denotes travelling to the theatre in order to watch the play.

The omission of the direct object in 10a) leads to the re-analysis of *clamare* as a bivalent verb (10b)) cf footnote 1) (cf Spanish *llamar a* (5a), Italian *chiamare ad* (5b), *clamari ad* (5c) ‘to call’). As the third argument of Latin trivalent verbs are preponderantly animate (Pinkster (1985:170ff)), when the third argument of Latin *clamare* is re-analysed as the second argument of (proto-)Romance **clamare*, [+human/animate] is taken over. This is especially apparent, given that synchronically there are still attestation of *clamare* functioning as a trivalent verb e.g.

- 11) adversus nos fact-a su-a clam-ant
towards PRO.1PL.ACC deed-N.PL.ACC POSS.ADJ-N.PL.ACC shout-PRES.3PL
‘They shout their own deeds at us...’ (Aurelius Augustinus, *Contra Epistulam Parmeniani* 2.1.2)

Synchronically, therefore, there is a systematic alternation between inanimate objects (*facta sua* (11)) and animate objects marked by *ad* (*ad dominum* (10)). Similar patterns can be found with *verba petendi* e.g.

- 12a) Moyses ora-bat ad Dominum
Moses beg-IMPERF.3SG AD Lord
‘Moses was begging the Lord.’ (*Libri Maccabaorum* 2.10)
- 12b) 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)

Although *verba petendi* are trivalent (12b)), it can also be used bivalently by omitting the theme (12a)). There is therefore a synchronic alternation between inanimate direct objects (*veniam* (12b)) and animate direct object marked by *ad* (*ad Dominum* (12a)),⁵ which foreshadows Romance *verba petendi* which take inanimate objects (13a-b)) and animate objects (marked with *ad*) (13c-e):

- 13a) supplic-arono ad Giove che lor de-sse un re
beg-PRET.3PL AD Jove COMP PRO.3PL give-IMPERF.SUBJ a king
‘They were begging him to give them a king.’ (Medieval Neapolitan)
- 13b) a vui preg-u ki...
AD PRO.2PL beg-PRES.1SG COMP
‘I beg you to...’ (*La istoria di Eneas* 80, 86) (Medieval Sicilian)
- 13c) yo rueg-o a Dios e a-l Padre Spiritual
PRO.1SG beg-PRES.1SG AD God and AD-DEF.ART Father Spiritual
‘I beg God and the Spiritual Father.’ (*El Cid* 300) (Medieval Spanish)
- 13d) preg-à a Déus
Pray-PRES.3SG AD God
‘She prays to God...’ (The Sermons of Saint Vicent Ferrer 104) (Medieval Catalan)
- 13e) preg-amò a te
Beg-PRES.1PL AD PRO.2SG
‘We beg you...’ (*Galeota, Lettere* LXXX 40) (Medieval Neapolitan)

Finally, the grammaticalization of *ad* provides new evidence for the Minimalism framework of grammaticalization, as R & R (2003) only analyse auxiliary verbs (T), complementisers (C) and determiners (D) when case-markers constitute another important functional category, namely K(case) (van Kemenade and Vincent (1997:19-21)). Generative models of language acquisition predict that language evolution should be in the form of ‘random walks’, since Lightfoot (1999:180-204, 264-266) asserts that the primary linguistic data which shapes language acquisition is entirely contingent, yet given that the grammaticalization of object case-markers occurs cross-linguistically (Heine and Kuteva (2002:37-38), Bossong (1991)), R & R (2003) argue that grammaticalization involves ‘structural simplification’, which is defined as the ‘reduction of ‘feature syncretisms’’, and since ‘simpler’ structures are argued to be preferred in language acquisition,

⁵ The use of *ad* with *verba petendi* corresponds to *ab* in classical Latin, as they were confused due to sound change (Westerbergh (1956:255)):

- 1) ... ab ips-a eius-que prol-em veni-am poposce-bat
AB PRO-FEM.ABL.SG PRO.GEN.SG-and son-ACC.SG mercy-ACC.SG demand-IMPERF.3SG
‘... she was begging for her son and mercy from the church’ > ‘she was begging the church for her son and mercy.’

In (pre-)classical Latin, *verba petendi* can take *ab*-PPs with or without the direct object (cf Meier (1948:122)):

- 2) numquam abs te petam
never AB PRO.2SG beg-FUT.1SG
‘I shall never beg (anything from) you.’ (Plautus *Bacchides* 1144)

Furthermore, the person being begged can be passivized, which indicates that it occupies the direct object relation:

- 3) Agryripp-us exorar-i... poterit ut sinat sese
Agryrippus-NOM.SG beg-INF.PASS can-FUT.3SG COMP allow-PRES.SUBJ.3SG REFL.PRO
alternas cum ill-o noctes h-ac fru-i
alternate-FEM.PL with DEM.PRO-ABL.SG night-FEM.PL DEM.PRO-FEM.ABL.SG enjoy-INF
‘Agryrippus can be induced into allowing himself to share her with him on alternate nights...’
(Plautus *Asinaria* 916)

grammaticalization can occur cross-linguistically (R & R (2003:2-7)). The grammaticalization of *ad* as a case-marker conforms to their analysis, since when *ad*-PPs are re-analysed as KPs, the *Agree* relation between *ad* and its case-marked complement is lost, which leads to the re-analysis of *ad*-PPs as KPs. Furthermore, the dual case-function of *ad* supports Tse's (2013a) argument that formalism and functionalism are not only not mutually exclusive in grammaticalization but also mutually complementary, since Tse (2013a:section 4) argues that 1) formalist and functionalist factors co-exist in cross-linguistic examples of grammaticalization 2) functionalist factors account for sub-types of grammatical elements. 1) has been dealt with in Tse (2013b) who compares the grammaticalization of Latin/Romance *ad* as a dative case-marker to English *to* and shows that there are remarkable similarities, namely the fact that they are both spatial prepositions denoting direction 'towards' and their complement is re-analyzable as the 'beneficiary/recipient/experiencer' of the main verb (Tse (2013b:section 3)). The grammaticalization of Latin/Romance *ad* as a marker of differential objects requires two case functions for *ad*, namely K(accusative) and K(dative) as posited by Caha (2009), and in order to account for the geneses of these two types of K, functionalist factors, like the semantic and pragmatic usages outlined above, have to be considered in order to determine whether *ad* represents K(dative) or K(accusative).

Bibliography:

- Adams, J. N. (2011): 'Late Latin', in Clackson, J. (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 257-283.
- Adams, J. N. (2013): *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bosson, G. (1991): 'Differential object marking in Romance and beyond', in *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp. 143-171.
- Caha, P. (2009): *The nanosyntax of case*. Doctoral thesis, University of Tromsø.
- Heine, H. and Kuteva, T. (2002): *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ledgeway, A. (2012): *From Latin to Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lightfoot, D. (1999): *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change, and Evolution*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Meier, H. (1948): '*Sobre as origens do acusativo preposicional nas linguas românicas*', in Meier, H. (ed), *Ensaio de Filologia Românica*, Lisboa, pp. 115—164.
- Nocentini, A. (1985): 'Sulla genesi dell'oggetto preposizionale nelle lingue romanze', in *Studi linguistici e filologici per Carlo Alberto Mastrelli*, Pisa, pp. 299-311.
- Pinkster, H. (1985): 'Latin cases and valency grammar', in Touratier, C. (ed), *Syntaxe et Latin, Actes du IIeme Congres International de Linguistique Latine. Aix-en Provence, 28th-31st Mars 1983*, pp. 163-186.
- Pinkster, H. (1990): 'The development of cases and adpositions in Latin', in Pinkster, H. and Genee, I. (eds), *Unity in Diversity: Papers Presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50th Birthday*. Dordrecht: 195-209.
- Roberts, I. and Roussou, A. (2003): *Syntactic change. A Minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rohlf, G. (1971): 'Autour de l'accusatif prépositionnel dans les langues romanes', *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 35, pp. 312-334.
- Sornicola, R. (1997): 'L'oggetto preposizionale in siciliano antico e in napoletano antico: considerazioni su un problema di tipologia diacronica', *Italienische Studien* 18-66-80.
- Sornicola, R. (1998): 'Processi di convergenza nella formazione di un tipo sintattico: la genesi ibrida dell'oggetto preposizionale', in *Les nouvelles ambitions de la linguistique diachronique, Actes du XXIIe Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes (Bruxelles 23-29 Juillet 1998)*, Bruxelles, Max Niemeyer Verlag, II: 419-427.
- Tse (2013a): 'Grammaticalization and 'lateral' grammaticalization, formalism and functionalism', in *Working papers of the University of Geneva, GG@G, SWIGG 12*.
http://www.unige.ch/lettres/linge/syntaxe/journal/volume_huit_2012.html
- Tse (2013b): 'The grammaticalization of KPs within Minimalism: formalism vs functionalism, synchrony vs diachrony', in *Bohemica Olomucensia*.
- Vincent, N. and Kemenade, A. van (1997): 'Introduction: parameters and morphosyntactic change', in Vincent, N. and Kemenade, A. van (eds) *Parameters of morphosyntactic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 1-25.
- Westerbergh, U. (1956): *Chronicon Salernitanum: A Critical Edition with Studies on Literary and Historical Sources and on Language*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- 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.
- Zorraquino, M. A. (1976): 'A + objeto directo en el *Cantar del Mio Cid*', in Colòn, G. and Kopp, R. (eds), *Mélanges offerts à C. Th. Gossen*, Bern-Liège, Francke, pp. 554-566.