

The grammaticalization of (proto-)Romance prepositional infinitives and modal verbs: a typological comparison with English modal verbs and *to*-infinitive:

It is well known that modal verbs in many Romance languages select bare verb forms whereas many lexical verbs select prepositional infinitives headed by *de* and *ad* (see Skydsgaard 1977 for Spanish, Skytte 1984 for Italian, Sandfeld 1965 for French, and Jones (1993) for Sardinian). However, although the geneses of these complementation patterns constitute a long-standing problem in Romance philology (Diez (1876:201), Meyer-Lübke (1906:386), Vincent (1988:68-69), Ledgeway (2011:418-425, 428-432)), good Latin antecedents have not yet been found and no account of their grammaticalization has yet been given, despite the wide and early distributions of prepositional infinitives in Romance (see Beardsley (1921) for Old Spanish, Salvi and Renzi (2010) for Old Italian, and van Reenan and Schøsler (1991) for Old French). This paper seeks to reconstruct proto-Romance complementation patterns by applying the comparative method to three medieval Romance branches, namely Spanish, French and Italian, and to discover the Latin origins for Romance prepositional infinitives and the grammaticalization process that has led to (proto-)Romance modal verbs and prepositional infinitives. These grammaticalization processes are then compared with two very well-known examples of grammaticalization, namely English modal verbs (Warner (1993)) and *to*-infinitive (Los (1999)).

From my corpora of old Romance (Beardsley (1921) for medieval Spanish, Salvi and Renzi (2010) for medieval Italian, and van Reenan and Schøsler (1991) for Old French), proto-Romance is reconstructed with a fairly well-defined and small group of modal verbs which consistently select bare verb forms, and the rest consists of a large number of lexical verbs that are attested with prepositional infinitives headed by *de* and *ad*. In my Latin corpora (Bodelot (2003)), it is clear that while Latin modal verbs are attested only with bare verbal complements throughout the history of the corpora, lexical verbs have a tendency to select prepositional gerunds/gerundives headed by *ad* and *de* towards the later end of Latin. Not all Romance prepositional infinitives can be matched with Latin prepositional gerunds/gerundives, but there are numerous Latin prepositional gerunds/gerundives that bear strong resemblances to Romance prepositional infinitives e.g. *verba cogendi* (Panchón (2003:384)). I propose that Latin prepositional gerunds/gerundives were the putative precursors of Romance prepositional infinitives, and this is empirical confirmation to previous scholarship where it is hypothesised, with no empirical coverage, that the Latin prepositional gerunds/gerundives were replaced by prepositional infinitives in Romance (Diez (1876:201), Meyer-Lübke (1906:386), Harris (1978:199), Schulte (2007:79, 87-90, 106-109)).

The close syntactic affinity between the modal verbs and their bare verbal complements gives rise to a monoclausal analysis and hence the NICE properties in English (Warner (1993)) and clitic-climbing and restructuring in Romance (Ledgeway (2011:418-420)), and the erosion of the nominal morphophonological paradigms of the prepositional complements (in Latin, the demise of the gerund/gerundive, which, unlike the infinitive, is fully inflected for case and number) leads to the re-analysis of adjunct prepositional phrases as complement phrases both in English and Romance (Los (1999)). My analysis of Latin provides empirical support for these cross-linguistic pathways (see Heine (1993) for the geneses of auxiliary verbs and Haspelmath (1989) for those of prepositional infinitives), and I have laid out the Latin background for the grammaticalization processes of two important functional categories in proto-Romance, namely auxiliary verbs (IP) and prepositional complementisers (CP) (Ledgeway (2011:418-432)).

Bibliography:

Beardsley, W. A. (1921): *Infinitive Constructions in Old Spanish*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bodelot, C. (ed.) (2003): *Grammaire fondamentale du Latin Tome X: Les propositions complétives en Latin*. Louvain-Paris-Dudley, MA: Peeters.

Diez, F. C. (1876): *Grammaire des Langues Romanes*. 3rd ed. Paris.

Harris, M. (1978): *The evolution of French syntax: a comparative approach*. London: Longman.

Haspelmath, M. (1989): 'From purposive to infinitive- a universal path of grammaticalization', *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10/1-2:287-310.

Heine, B. (1993): *Auxiliaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, M. (1993): *Sardinian Syntax*. London: Routledge.

Ledgeway, A. (2011): 'Syntactic and morphosyntactic typology and change.' In Maiden, M., Smith, J. C. and Ledgeway, A. (eds) *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*. Vol. I *Structures*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 382-471.

Los, B. (1999): *Infinitival Complementation in Old and Middle English*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Meyer-Lübke, W. (1906): *Grammaire des Langues Romanes*. Vol. III, *Syntaxe*. Paris.

Panchón, F. (2003): 'Les complétives en *ut*'. In Bodelot, C. (ed) *Grammaire Fondamentale du Latin Tome X: Les propositions complétives en latin*. Louvain-Paris-Dudley, MA: Peeters, p. 335-481.

Reenan, P. Van. and Schøsler, L. (1991): 'Les indices d'infinitif complément d'objet en ancien français', *Issue 38 of Working papers in linguistics*, p. 523-545.

Salvi, G. and Renzi, L. (2010): *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*. Vol II. Il Mulino.

Sandfeld, (1965): *Syntaxe du français contemporain: L'infinitif*. Geneva: Droz.

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

Skydsgaard, S. (1977): *La combinatoria sintáctica del infinitivo español*, vol 1-2. Madrid:Castalia.

Skytte, G. (1983): *La sintassi dell'infinito in italiano modern*, vols 1-2. Munksgaard.

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

Warner, A. (1993): *English auxiliaries: structure and history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.