Formal convergence and divergence: creative parametric (re)setting in Latin/Romance syntactic change:

Current Minimalist models of syntax predict strict categorial distinctions in the framework of universal cartography within which parameters are set lexically in accordance with the morphosyntactic properties of functional categories (Biberauer (2008:23ff)). This entails a rigid model of formal syntactic change in which historical processes like grammaticalization are predicted to conform to formal notions of 'simplicity' as well as constitute a form of 'cyclicity' where the same formal change can recur (Roberts and Roussou (R&R) (2003), van Gelderen (2009, 2011)). In the history of Latin/Romance, these predictions have been shown to be simplistic, since there is attested a much more complex picture of synchronic 'layering' between old and innovative linguistic forms which entails a much more gradual evolution from Latin to Romance (Ledgeway (2012:21-23)). In this paper, I propose that in addition to 'layering', there are certain types of syntactic change which, formally construed, involve the creation of new formal features e.g. the formation of Western Romance Differential Object-Marking (DOM) (*ad*). This suggests that not only do parameters converge onto certain parameter-settings in accordance with 'simplicity' (R&R (2003:198-200)), they can also diverge from the pre-established parametric schemata (Gianollo, Guardiano and Longobardi (2008:119)) in ways which attest to the creativity in parametric (re)setting and new types of formal syntactic change.

The use of *ad* as a differential object marker of animate/personal and definite/referential objects is widely attested in Western Romance languages (ex. 1, 2) (Rolhfs (1971)), and proto-Romance/Latin origins have been postulated where it is argued that Latin *ad* is attested not only with certain three-place predicates as markers of indirect objects (De Melo and Adams (2016)) but also with certain two-place predicates with which it can be re-analysed as markers of direct objects e.g. *verba videndi* (ex. 3), which are attested from early Latin to all Western Romance varieties (Tse (2013)):

1) h-o   visto   una   machina   /   **a**   tu-o   babb-o
   have-1SG.PRES see.PERF.PTCP a-FEM.SG car.FEM.SG   AD   your-MASC   dad-MASC
   'I saw a car/your dad.' (Tuscan dialect in Italy) (Zamboni (1993:792))

2) el   director   busc-a   un   empleado   /   **a**   un   empleado
   DET.MASC   director.MASC   search-3SG.PRES   a   employee   AD   a   employee
   'The director is looking for an employee/a particular employee.' (Spanish) (Zamboni (1993:790)

3a) ver   vid-e…
    spring.ACC.SG   see-IMPERATIVE.SG
    'Look at spring…' (Plautus *Truculentus* 353)

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

The differential object-marking pattern can be shown to take shape in Christian and Medieval Latin where *ad* is used with certain three-place verbs which become two-place predicates e.g. *verba clamandi et rogandi*:

5a) 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)

5b) veni-am…   **ad**   Domino   poposce-bat
    mercy-FEM.ACC.SG   AD   Lord   demand-IMPERF.3SG
    'He was begging for mercy from the Lord.' > 'He was begging the Lord for mercy'(*Chronicon Salernitanum* 11)

This creates a synchronic opposition between human/animate direct objects (< indirect object) and other types of

inanimate objects, which constitutes the proto-type of Western Romance DOM (animate vs inanimate). In formal terms, while the categorial reanalysis of *ad* constitutes formal 'simplification' in that it loses its lexical semantics as a lexical preposition denoting direction (P(allative)) and converges onto the 'simpler' setting of being a case-marker (K(case)) (Tse (2013)), the fact that *ad* is only used with certain types of direct objects (animate/referential) shows that the formation of Western Romance DOM is highly sensitive to the inherent properties of nominal arguments ([i-peson/D]). Latin/Romance *ad*, therefore, may be analysed as a marker of inherent Case (cf Chomsky (1981)) as it correlates with 'marked' objects of certain semantic types ([i-person/D]) which need to be marked by *ad* ([u-K]) in order to be differentiated from the canonical 'unmarked' objects (ø), and this constitutes an entirely new opposition in the nominal alignment of direct objects (animate [i-person/D] vs inanimate (ø)) in the evolution from Latin to Romance which shows divergences in the formal parameter setting of syntactic change. Furthermore, it has been argued that there are cases of grammaticalization where new formal features are added from discourse pragmatics which restrict the distribution of the grammatical morpheme (e.g. T elements in 'lateral' grammatialization (Tse (2016)), and in the formation of Western Romance DOM, there is, interestingly, an addition of uninterpretable features in correlation with the inherent semantics/deixis of nominal arguments (i-person/D, u-K) which also restricts the distribution of the grammaticalizing element since *ad* is only used with certain types of direct objects and not otherwise. Western Romance DOM (*ad*), therefore, may be classified as a new type of 'lateral' grammaticalization where uninterpretable, rather than interpretable, features are created as a form of parametric divergence.

References:

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

Chomsky, N. (1981): *Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures.* Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.

De Melo, W. and Adams, J. (2016): '*Ad* versus the dative: from early to late Latin', in Adams, J. and Vincent, N. (eds), *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 87-131.

Gelderen, van. E. (2009): *Cyclical Change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gelderen, van. E. (2011a): *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 (2008), pp. 109-142.

Ledgeway, A. (2012): *From Latin to Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Rolhfs, G. (1971): 'Autour de l'accusatif prépositionnel dans les langues romanes', Revue de Linguistique Romane 35, pp. 312-334.

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

Tse, K. (2016): *Grammatialization and 'lateral' grammatialization: new perspectives on linguistic interfaces and functional categories.* M.Res dissertation, University of York. http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/15691/

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.