

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 very widespread in 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 (1985:300)). 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)) with my analysis of Latin/Romance *ad*, since it poses important methodological questions about the relationship between formalism and functionalism.

ad functions as a case-marker of direct objects in many modern Romance languages (Rolhfs (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 some other varieties, it is used as a case-marker of human/animate direct objects (Zamboni (1993:792)):

- 2) h-o visto a tu-o babb-o
have.1SG.PRES see.PERF.PART 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 (2), specific/generic (3a-b)).

Furthermore, the use of *ad* as a marker of direct objects is attested in many branches of old Romance (Sornicola (1998:422)) where animacy and specificity are important factors in conditioning this use of *ad*, given that *ad* only marks animate objects, within which it is rarely used with plural, mass, generic ones i.e. it is mainly used with specific and referential direct objects (Zorraquino (1976:563), Nocentini (1985:304)). There is another factor, namely the fact that there is comparative evidence that *ad* is obligatory with tonic personal pronouns and highly preponderant with proper names (Sornicola (1997:77, 1998:422)). Such a wide geographical and historical distribution of this use of *ad* suggests that it is grammaticalized in proto-Romance/Latin. Furthermore, there is evidence that its grammaticalization as a marker of direct object is related to its grammaticalization as a marker of indirect object since in the history from Latin to Romance, there are certain predicates that are ambiguous between trivalency and bivalency. On the one hand, there are predicates that have undergone semantic change and have changed from being three-place predicates to two-place predicates e.g. Latin *clamare* (Sornicola (1997:72-73)):

- 4a) clam-o mihi ipse: numer-a ann-os tu-os
shout-PRES.1SG me.DAT myself count-IMPERATIVE.2SG year-ACC.PL your-ACC.PL
'I shout to myself: count your years!' (Seneca, *Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium* 27, 4 BC –65 AD)
- 4b) ad me omn-es clam-ant
to 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 poem 67, line14, 84-54 BC)

In Latin, *clamare* 'to shout' is clearly a three-place predicate, as it is attested with three arguments, namely an agent (<ego> 'I' (4a), *omnes* (4b)), an experiencer/recipient (*mihi* (4a), *ad me* (4b)), and a theme/proposition (*numera annos tuos* (4a), *Ianua culpa tua est* (4b)). In Romance, however, **clamare* has undergone semantic change (> 'to call') and is a two-place predicate, since it only selects two arguments (agent, experiencer/recipient):

- 5a) a Minaya Albar Fáneez e a Per Vermudoz los llam-ó
AD Minaya Albar Fáneez and to Per Vermudoz them call-PRET.3SG
'He called them... Minaya Albar Fáneez and Per Vermudoz.' (*El Cantar del mio Cid*, 1894-1895) (Medieval Spanish)
- 5b) allora Elia chiamoe a Dio
then Elia call-PRET.3SG AD God
'Then Elia called God.' (Fra Giordano) (Medieval Italian)
- 5c) 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 with Latin *clamare* (4a-b)), is re-analysed as the second argument in proto-Romance **clamare* i.e. the direct object. On the other hand, there are Latin predicates which select the morphological dative that corresponds to the direct object in terms of grammatical relations, given that it is the second argument of a two-place predicate e.g. *servire* 'to serve':

- 6a) e-ius studi-o serv-ire addeceat
him-GEN.SG zeal serve-INF be.proper
'It is proper to serve his zeal.' (Plautus *Amphitruo* 1004)
- 6b) 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)
- 6c) serv-ir a-l Campeador
serve-INF AD-DEF.ART Campeador
'to serve the Campeador.' (*El Cantar del mio Cid* 1369) (Medieval Spanish)

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

- 7a) 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)
- 7b) 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)

However, both Pinkster (1990:201-202) and Adams (2011:266, 2013:279) have pointed out that these *ad-PPs* (7a) are not synonymous with the morphological dative (7b), since the former are semantically stronger in denoting spatial motion 'towards', since in 7a) the *ad-PP* (*ad patrem*) implies that the message has to be transported to the recipient (*patrem*) and therefore retains its spatial meaning (cf *ad-PPs* in Cicero's letters, which also denote spatial direction in terms of dispatchment of letters (Adams (2013:279))), whereas the morphological dative does not have such spatial connotations. Such *ad-PPs* occur with bivalent verbs:

- 8a) respic-e ad me...
look.back-IMPERATIVE AD me.ACC
'Look back towards me...' (*Stilus* 331)
- 8b) d-i homin-es respici-unt
God-NOM.PL men-ACC.PL look.back-3PL.PRES
'The gods look back at me.' (*Rudens* 1316)

9a)	cred-o trust-1SG.PRES	ad AD	uxor-em wife-ACC.SG.FEM	me-am my-ACC.SG.FEM
	'I believe my wife.'			
9b)	ego-met I-EMPH	mihi me-DAT.SG.NEG	non trust-1SG.PRES	cred-o
	'I myself do not trust myself...'			

ad-PPs are also semantically stronger than the morphological accusative/dative with bivalent verbs, since in 8a), the *ad*-PP retains its spatial meaning in marking the 'direction' of gaze (cf Ovid's *Metamorphosis* 1.628 (*spectare ad*), 11.546 (*respicere ad*)) whereas in 9a) *ad* is more emphatic than the dative (*mihi* in 9b)). There is therefore a synchronic distribution of morphological dative/accusative case and *ad*-PPs already in (pre-)classical 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.

It is conceivable that the spatial meaning of *ad* would be grammaticalized as marking animate and specific objects in Romance (2), 3a)-b)), since the third argument of Latin trivalent verbs are preponderantly animate (Pinkster (1985:170ff)) and the spatial meaning of *ad* creates emphasis for its complement and is hence re-analyzable as a marker of object specificity/referentiality. This is the case in post-classical Latin (Adams (2011:267, 2013:282)) e.g.

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

verba videndi (verbs of seeing) are used bivalently with *ad*-PPs from Plautus (8) to Medieval Latin (10) and can therefore be argued to play a crucial role in the grammaticalization of *ad* as a case-marker of direct objects, as such verbs recur throughout all the major branches of Romance where this use of *ad* is attested (*aguardar* 'to look at' and *ver* 'to see' in Medieval Spanish (Zorraquino (1976:561), *guardare* 'to watch' in Medieval Neapolitan (Sornicola (1997:74), *vidiri* 'to see' in Medieval Sicilian (Sornicola (1997:71)). By this stage, the spatial meaning of *ad* has become weakened as the use of *ad* with *aspicere* 'to look at' is almost interchangeable with the morphological accusative (Vielliard (1927:200)), except that the four examples of *aspicere* ad mark specific objects rather than generic ones. Furthermore, there is increasing evidence of *ad*-PPs displacing the morphological dative in direct object function in post-classical Latin: *servire ad* (cf 6a)-c)), *obtemperare ad*, *credere ad* (cf 9a)-b)) (Adams (2013:292)), as well as fluctuation between trivalency and bivalency e.g:

11)	proclamantes crying.out-PRES.PART.NOM.PL	ad AD	dominum Lord
	'crying out (something) to the Lord...' (<i>Actus Petri cum Simone</i> , 69.3)		

Such examples (*proclamare* 'to proclaim' > Spanish *llamar* (5a), Italian *chiamare* (5b), *clamari* (5c) 'to call') lead to the re-analysis of *ad*-PPs as direct objects, which, given the trivalent origins of *clamare*, are preponderantly animate/human. Even when direct and indirect objects co-occur with trivalent verbs, there is a juxtaposition between the inanimate (direct) object and the animate (indirect) object, which further highlights the differences between the two objects e.g.

12)	veni-am... mercy-FEM.ACC.SG	ad AD	Domino Lord	popose-bat demand-IMPERF.3SG
	'He was begging the Lord for mercy' (<i>Chronicon Salernitanum</i> 11)			

As *poposcere* selects an animate/human object (*ad Domino*) and an inanimate object (*veniam*), *ad* is strongly associated with animate/human objects, which are indeed the Romance outcomes: *rogar* 'to beg' (Medieval Spanish) (Zorraquino (1976:561), *pregari* 'to beg' (Medieval Sicilian) (Sornicola (1997:71), *supplicare* 'to beg' (Medieval Neapolitan) (Sornicola (1997:75)). The association of *ad* with human/animate and specific/referential objects is therefore attested in Latin, and Adams (2013:286) shows that by the time of the *Actus Petri cum Simone* (6th century AD), *ad* shows preponderance as a marker of names, titles and tonic personal pronouns, whereas atonic pronouns continue to be inflected and used without *ad*, which anticipates the patterns of medieval Romance outlined above (Sornicola (1997:77)). By this stage of Latin, *ad* is marking both indirect objects and certain types of direct objects (animate/human, specific/referential), as in Romance (2), 3a)-b)). The differential marking between subject and object (1) is unattested in Latin and can be analysed as a secondary Romance development, which is conceivable given that it is attributable to the need for resolving the ambiguity between subjects and objects.

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, 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:section 4) argument that formalism and functionalism are not only not mutually exclusive in grammaticalization, they are also mutually complementary, since 1) formalist and functionalist factors co-exist in cross-linguistic examples of grammaticalization 2) functionalist factors have to be considered in order to account for sub-types of functional 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 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.
- Bossong, 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.
- 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 Ileme Congrès 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.
- Rolhfs, 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', *Italianische 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.
- Zamboni, A. (1993): 'Postille alla discussione sull'accusativo preposizionale', in Ramón Lorenzo (ed), *Actas do XIX Congreso Internacional de Linguística e Filología Románicas V: Gramática histórica e historia da lingua*. A Coruña: Fundación, pp. 787-808.
- Zorraquino, M. A. (1976): 'A + objeto directo en el *Cantar del Mio Cid*', in Colón, G. and Kopp, R. (eds), *Mélanges offerts à C. Th. Gossen*, Bern-Liège, Francke, pp. 554-566.