

Adam Ledgeway

## 23 Syntheticty and Analyticty

**Abstract:** The present chapter critically reconsiders the traditional typological distinction between Latin and Romance in terms of a syntheticty-analyticty opposition, according to which core grammatical categories and distinctions are marked morphologically in Latin but syntactically in Romance. After considering a wide selection of the Romance evidence for innovative analytic structures manifested in the emergence of a series of functional categories lexicalizing various functional heads within the nominal, verbal and clausal domains, a number of empirical and theoretical problems and limitations with this superficial dichotomy are reviewed. These highlight how the observed differences between Latin and Romance cannot be simplistically reduced to a synthetic-analytic opposition. Rather, it is argued that the observed rise of Romance analyticty should be considered an epiphenomenal development, ultimately the manifestation of a deeper change, but not, significantly, its cause, related to a change in the head directionality parameter from head-finality to head-initiality.

**Keywords:** syntheticty, analyticty, functional categories, determiners, auxiliaries, complementizers, head parameter, configurationality, grammaticalization, functional structure

### 1 Introduction

It has become commonplace in descriptions of the Latin-Romance transition to highlight a typological shift from the morphologically-oriented structures of Latin to the increasingly syntactically-oriented structures of Romance.<sup>1</sup> By way of illustration, consider Table 1 where we see in accordance with the traditional Latin-Romance synthetic-analytic dichotomy that, in contrast to Romance, Latin lacks functional categories in that none of the core grammatical categories such as subordination, tense, aspect, mood, transitivity or definiteness is expressed analytically. At the same time, we also observe how there is significant variation across Romance in which of the functional categories are realized and the overt distinctions they mark. For instance, only French lexicalizes all functional categories in Table 1, including an overt transitive/causative light *v(erb) fait*, whereas Italian only optionally encodes the partitive distinction through an overt *DET(erminer)* (cf. Stark 2008). By contrast, Romanian fails to overtly mark either of these categories, but uniquely displays robust

---

<sup>1</sup> Meillet ([<sup>1</sup>1937] 1964, 439), Bourciez (<sup>4</sup>1956, 23), Harris (1978, 15–16), Schwegler (1990), Posner (1996, 156–157).

marking on the COMP(lementizer) for the realis/irrealis opposition, otherwise paralleled in the indicative/subjunctive distinction realized on the perfect AUX(iliary), in turn further distinguished by way of the HAVE/BE split in Romanian (Ledgeway 2014a).

**Table 1:** Synthetic vs analytic marking of core grammatical categories in Latin and Romance

	COMP		AUX		V	DET		
Lat.	dico/uolo	Ø	eum	Ø	Ø	coxisse	Ø	panem
Fr.	je dis/veux	qu'	il	a/ait	fait	cuire	du	pain
It.	dico/voglio	che		ha/abbia	Ø	cotto	(del)	pane
Rom.	spun/vreau	că/să		a/fi	Ø	copt	Ø	pâine
	I say/I want	that <sub>(real/irreal)</sub>	him/he	has <sub>IND</sub> /(be) <sub>SBIV</sub>	made	bake(d)	some	bread
	'I say that he has/I want him to have baked some bread.'							

This synthetic-analytic dichotomy, which goes back to the pioneering work of Schlegel (1818),<sup>2</sup> highlights a Sapirian “drift” from the predominantly synthetic structures of Latin towards the characteristically analytic structures of Romance in accordance with a tendency considered by Tekavčić (1980, 15) to be ‘the guiding principle underlying the whole of Romance morphosyntax and undoubtedly its deepest and most important characteristic’.<sup>3</sup> Consequently, there is general recognition among Romanists of all theoretical persuasions that, in the passage from Latin to Romance, the morphosyntax of the emerging languages underwent significant changes in three fundamental areas of the grammar, readily observable in the gradual reduction and/or eventual loss of the Latin morphological case system (1a), synthetic verb forms (2a)

<sup>2</sup> For an historical overview of the use of the terms “synthetic” and “analytic”, see Schwegler (1990, ch. 1).

<sup>3</sup> Coseriu (1987) reinterprets the traditional synthetic-analytic dichotomy as a distinction between “internal” and “external” structures, respectively (cf. Coseriu [1971] 1988, 211, 224). Accordingly, the Romance languages are not characterized by a tendency towards analyticity, but, rather, by a tendency to distinguish between external and internal determination and between relational and non-relational functions. Although it is undoubtedly true that the internal (viz. synthetic) determination of syntactic structures predominates in Latin, Coseriu makes the original observation that this is not the distinctive structural characteristic of Latin; rather what sets Latin apart from Romance is its failure to make any formal distinction between relational and non-relational functions. By contrast, Romance stands out, not by its admittedly steady increase in the number of externally-determined (viz. analytic) structures, but, rather, by its consistent formal distinction between relational and non-relational functions, the former aligned with externally-determined (= analytic) structures and the latter with internally-determined (= synthetic) structures. Thus, the real change in the passage from Latin to Romance is not to be seen as a move from syntheticity to analyticity, but is to be identified with the emergence of a new formative principle of mapping relational and non-relational functions respectively onto externally- and internally-determined structure (see Ledgeway 2012, 26–28).

and implicit subordination (viz. accusative and infinitive (AcI); cf. (3a)) in favour of analytic structures based on functional categories like determiners (viz. articles) and prepositions (1b), auxiliaries (2b) and complementizers (3b):

- (1) a. Lat. **consules**            **senatui**            paruerunt  
           consuls.NOM.PL    senate.DAT        obeyed  
           (Cic. *Red. sen.* 17)
- b. It. **i** consoli furono ossequenti **al**        senato  
           the consuls were        subservient to.the senate  
           ‘The consuls were obedient to the senate.’
- (2) a. Lat. larem corona nostrum decor-ar-i            uolo  
           Lar.ACC crown.ABL OUR.ACC decorate-INF-PASS I.want  
           (Plautus, *Trin.* 39)
- b. Fr. je veux que notre Lare **soit**            honoré  
           I want that our Lar be.SBJV.3SG honoured  
           d’ une couronne  
           of a crown  
           ‘I wish for our Household God Lar to be adorned with a crown.’
- (3) a. Lat. tacitum **te**            dicere        credo...  
           silent.ACC you.ACC say.INF I.believe  
           (Mart. 6.5.3–4)
- b. Cal. criju **ca**        ti            sta            diciennu...  
           I.believe that yourself=PROG.2SG saying  
           ‘I fancy you say to yourself...’

The inescapable conclusion to be drawn from these introductory observations is that marking of definiteness, various verb-related grammatical categories and sentential boundaries in Romance increasingly becomes associated with specific positions, namely the left edge of the nominal, verbal and sentential domains, lexicalized by functional markers belonging to the categories of DET(erminers), AUX(iliaries) and COMP(lementizers). This reflects the traditional intuition popularized within syntheticity-analyticity approaches, which highlights the emergence in Romance of articles and clitics, auxiliaries, and a whole host of finite and non-finite complementizers, all generally absent from Latin. In current theory, grammatical elements of this type are generally considered to head their own functional projections DP, I(nfl)P, and CP which provide the locus of grammatical information for the nominal group, verbal group and the sentence, respectively.

On this view, one of the most significant generalizations of the traditional synthesis-analysis approach can now be insightfully rephrased in terms of the emergence of these functional categories and the grammaticalization of a number of correspond-

ing functional elements that lexicalize these positions (Ledgeway 2011a), a small selection of which we briefly review in Section 2 (for a fuller treatment, see Ledgeway 2012, ch. 4). Following an examination of some of the principle evidence for the emergence of Romance analyticity, we then consider in Section 3 some of the problems and issues surrounding traditional descriptions of the Latin-Romance transition in terms of a simple syntheticity-analyticity dichotomy. This will lead us to exclude the possibility of an independent synthetic-analytic parameter. Finally, we argue in Section 4 that the rise of Romance analyticity should be considered an epiphenomenal development, ultimately the manifestation of a deeper change related to a reversal in the head directionality parameter (Schwegler 1990; Bauer 2006; Ledgeway 2014b; in press a,b).

## 2 Romance analyticity: some examples

### 2.1 Nominal group

Quintilian's (*Inst.* 1.4.19) oft-quoted observation “*noster sermo articulos non desiderat*” (cf. also Donatus' *Ars major* I, 1–3) highlights not only that Latin lacked articles but, more fundamentally, that it lacked a dedicated position for articles and other types of determiner (Lyons 1999, 155). This is further supported by the observation that other determiner-like elements such as demonstratives and possessives, which fill the same syntagmatic slot (or area) as the article (Vincent 1988, 53–54), also come to typically fill the prenominal determiner position in Romance, whereas in Latin – questions of markedness aside – they could occur in pre- or postnominal position just like adjectives. In this light, the emergence of a DP can be seen to provide the relevant (in)definiteness marking of its associated NP, and in some Gallo-Romance varieties like French the accompanying determiner is not simply a spell-out of (in)definiteness, but now also a quasi-obligatory element of the nominal group as the sole exponent, in most cases, of number and gender (Harris 1980, 67).

#### 2.1.1 Articles

The clearest evidence for the rise of analyticity in the Romance nominal domain comes from the appearance in all varieties of indefinite and definite articles (↗20 Determination and quantification). The former continues a weakened form of the Latin numeral for ‘one’ UNUM/-AM (M/F) (> Cat./It./Sp. *un/una*, Fr. *un/une*, Pt. *um/uma*, Rom. *un/o*), and in some varieties formally contrasts with the fuller forms of the numeral (Cal. *unu/una* vs *nu/na* + *figliu/-a* ‘one:M/F’ vs ‘a:M/F’ + ‘son/daughter’). Unlike the earlier emergence and grammaticalization of the definite article from around the eighth century (Lyons 1999, 333; Ledgeway 2012, 96), systematic usage of the indefinite article

does not emerge until around the fourteenth century (Pozas-Loyo 2010, ch. 5; Ledge-way 2012, §4.2.1). Before then the indefinite article is reserved for particularized new referents, presumably a residue of its numeral origin, whereas bare NPs are employed for non-particularized referents (Price 1971, 118–119; Stark 2002; Parry/Lombardi 2007, 91–92; Pozas-Loyo 2010): OTsc. *donami cavallo da cavalcare* ‘give=me (a) horse to ride.INF’; OSp. *como faz buen pastor* ‘as does (a) good shepherd’. Revealing in this respect is the eleventh-century French *Vie de St Alexis* where the article is not employed in the prayer of a childless couple in their request to God, *Enfant nos done* ‘Child us=give.IMP.2SG’, since the meaning of the NP is ‘any child’. When, however, God blesses them with a child, a specific individual, this is reported with the indefinite article: *Un filor donet* ‘A son to.them=he.gives’. In the modern languages, by contrast, indefinite NPs, whether particularized or not, require the article, witness the following Catalan extracts from a not too dissimilar Mallorquin fairy tale: *Bon Jesús! Enviau-mos un infant!* ‘Good Lord! Send.IMP.2SG=us a child!’ [...] *els deixa un infantó ben garrít i condret* ‘to.them=he.leaves a large.child very handsome and healthy’.

Plural forms from the accusative plural UNOS/-AS, best considered indefinite quantifiers rather than plural articles since, unlike the corresponding singular articles, they generally prove optional, are found in Ibero-Romance (Extremaduran *unus pocus de limonis* ‘some few of lemons (= a few lemons)’), Occitan (Langadocian *ausissiái unis gemècs* ‘I.heard some groans’), and, until the sixteenth century, also in French (*avoit unes grandes joes* ‘he.had (some) great cheeks’), where they were principally employed with collective plurals (Woledge 1956). In Romanian, the plural form is most frequently used in the genitive/dative, with a zero form or lexical quantifier being employed in other cases, e.g. (*nişte*) *sfaturi unor colegi* ‘(some) advice some.GEN/DAT colleagues’.

Turning now to the definite article, this continues a weakened form of the Latin distal demonstrative ILLE (> Cat./Sp. *el/la*, Fr./Occ. *le/la*, It. *il/lo/la*, Pt./southern Italo-Romance *o/a*, Rom. *-(u)l/-a*) or, more rarely, the Latin intensifier IPSE ‘self’ (> Balearic/Costa Brava Cat. *es/sa*, Srd. *su/sa*; Aebischer 1948, 193; Ravier 1991, 89).<sup>4</sup> In many late Latin texts both ILLE and IPSE frequently (co-)occur in contexts where their spatial deictic function is considerably weakened, and their principal role is limited to marking anaphoricity and/or definiteness (Väänänen 1987; Nocentini 1990; Vincent 1997b; 1998), a precursor to the modern article famously termed by Aebischer (1948) an “articloid”. Traditionally, then, the principal question has been whether the latter is a demonstrative with a much-increased frequency (Herman 2000, 84–85) or an

<sup>4</sup> Note that in contrast to other Romance varieties where the definite article is prenominal, e.g. Cors. *u vechju portu* ‘the old port’, in Romanian the article apparently shows a greater degree of syntheticity attaching enclitically to the head noun, e.g. *portul vechi* ‘port=the old’, or a prenominal adjective, e.g. *vechiul port* ‘old=the port’ (Dobrovie-Sorin/Giurgea 2006; Nicolae 2015a). The exception is the genitive singular *lui*, which is prenominal with (masculine) personal proper names, e.g. *maşina lui Ion/Alice* ‘car=the the.GEN Ion/Alice’.

article, but with a still-limited range of use (Lyons 1999, 333). Undoubtedly, there are elements of truth in both positions, which can be more appropriately considered as the start and the end points in an unresolved and ongoing process of grammaticalization. In terms of their distribution, Renzi (1976), Selig (1992), and Zamboni (2000, 116) argue that *IPSE* was predominantly used anaphorically in conjunction with second-mention items (cf. (4a)), whereas *ILLE* could be used both anaphorically and cataphorically with first-mention items (cf. (4b)), as illustrated from the following examples taken from the late fourth-century *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*:

## (4) Late Latin

- a. *montes illi... faciebant uallem infinitam...*  
 mountains th(os)e made valley.ACC endless.ACC  
**Uallis** autem **ipsa** ingens est ualde  
 valley.NOM indeed self- huge.NOM is truly  
 ‘th(os)e mountains... formed an endless **valley**... **The**  
 (= aforementioned) **valley** is indeed truly huge’  
 (*Per. Aeth.* 1.1–2.1)
- b. **montes illi,** inter quos ibamus, aperiebant  
 mountains th(os)e between which.ACC we.went opened  
 ‘**the mountains**, between which we were going, opened out’  
 (*Per. Aeth.* 1.1)

To this picture Vincent (1997b) adds that *IPSE*, unlike *ILLE*, performed a topic-marking function, only picking out informationally prominent second-mention items (hence an unsuitable candidate for the object clitic paradigm). However, in his critical review of the late Latin evidence, Adams (2013, 506–527) finds that claims about the “artificial” status of *IPSE* in late Latin, principally based on its presumed innovative anaphoric function, are completely unfounded (cf. also Fruyt 2003, 102; Ledgeway 2012, §4.2.2.1), and that genuine article-like instances of *ILLE* (though not *IPSE*) only occur, and then only occasionally, from the sixth century (cf. (5)). Rather, we have to wait until at least the eighth century (e.g. *The Rule of Chrodegang*) to find a much-weakened, quasi-obligatory use of *ILLE* (Muller 1929, 84; Calboli 2009, 118–119).

- (5) Lat. *nam si in feruenti aqua missa fuerint,*  
 for if in boiling.ABL water.ABL placed.NEUTPL will.have.been  
*albumen coacolat et mediolum illut tarde*  
 egg.white.NOM coagulates and yolk.NOM that.NOM slowly  
*sentit*  
 feels  
 ‘If they [the eggs] are put in boiling water, the white goes hard and  
 the yolk scarcely feels the heat.’  
 (Anthimus 17.5)

Where, however, the definite article does occur in early Romance, it displays considerable attenuation of its original deictic force, increasingly coming to mark shared cognition between speaker(s) and addressee(s). Nonetheless, it still retained considerable identifying force, witness its exclusion in early texts with unique (Old Romanesco *come femina ke non temeia morte* ‘like (a) woman who not feared **death**’), abstract (Old Gascon *leichatz estar yprocesie* ‘let.IMP.2PL be.INF **hypocrisy**’), and generic (OFr. *Païen unt tort e chrestiens unt dreit* ‘**Pagans** are wrong and **christians** are right’) referents which, by definition, cannot be singled out (Parry/Lombardi 2007, 83–84; Renzi 2010, 318–319, 329–330, 332–337), a usage often fossilized in modern proverbs (Fr. *Noblesse oblige* ‘Nobility obliges’) and set expressions (Cat. *parar/desparar taula* ‘to lay/clear (the) **table**’).

In the modern languages, by contrast, shared cognition between speaker(s) and addressee(s) assumes increasing importance, such that the article is now generally required with unique, abstract, and generic referents (Rom. *Injustiția este regula vieții creștinului* ‘injustice=**the.NOM.FSG** is rule=**the.NOM.FSG** life=**the.GEN.FSG** christian=**the.GEN.MSG**’), as well as with inalienable possessa (Ast. *Tien el pelo roxo* ‘he.has **the** hair red’). Catalan varieties have moved the furthest in this direction (Wheeler/Yates/Dols 1999, 67–68), developing a specialized paradigm for proper names which, in the standard language, blends ILLE-derived forms (female names, vowel-initial male names, e.g. *la Mònica, l’Òscar*) with a reflex of DOMINUS ‘master’ > *en* (consonant-initial male names, e.g. *en Pere*), whereas the colloquial language, especially in the north-western dialects, often extends ILLE forms to the whole masculine paradigm, e.g. *el Pere* (Badia Margarit 1962, I, 158; 1995, 446–447; Veny 1982, 36, 95). In Balearic varieties, by contrast, forms derived from DOMINUS/DOMINA ‘master/mistress’ are extended to the whole paradigm, e.g. *en Pere, n’Òscar, na Mònica, n’Alba* (Veny 1982, 67).

Catalan is also of interest for those varieties spoken in the Balearics and some areas of the coastal mainland which contrast reflexes of both IPSE, the so-called *article salat*, and ILLE (Moll 1993, 40–41, 69–71; Badia i Magarit 1995, 444–446; Perea 2005, 69–73; Busquet Isart 2010; Ledgeway 2012, §4.2.2.2.1). While both forms have definite reference, only the *article salat* has truly deictic force and is able to identify both anaphorically and cataphorically definite referents ([+definite, +particularized, ±given]): Maj. Cat. *se bevia tota s’aigo que duia es torrent* ‘he drank all **the** water which **the** river brought’. By contrast, the ILLE-derived forms are confined to marking fully-identifiable unique referents ([+definite, -particularized, +given]), e.g., *el Bon Jesús* ‘**the** Christ child’, *la casa* ‘**the** home, house’, *l’Universitat* ‘**the** University (of Palma)’, occurring precisely in those contexts in which, we saw above, the definite article is typically absent in early Romance, namely in conjunction with unique, abstract and generic referents (cf. *una fia blanca com la neu i garrida com el sol* ‘a daughter as white as (**the**) snow and as attractive as **the** sun’). In a number of contexts, minimal pairs based around this [±deictic] contrast can be constructed: Maj.Cat. *Jo m’en vaig a córrer el món* ‘I’m off to go around **the** world’ vs *es meu món és la música* ‘(**the**) my world is music’.



tion to another (Pottier 1961; Jones 1988; Alboiu/Motapanyane 2000, 14–20; Monachesi 2005).

### 2.2.1 Romance auxiliaries

Despite difficulties in identifying a discrete class of Romance auxiliaries (≈7 Auxiliaries), it is possible to recognize some general crosslinguistic parameters of auxiliatation (see Heine 1993), which variously characterize those Romance verbs that realize verb-related categories such as tense, aspect, mood and voice. For example, semantically it is not difficult to recognize a number of verbs that have undergone various degrees of semantic impoverishment, including such cases as Srd. *torrare* ‘return’ and Ibero-Romance *acabar* ‘finish, complete’, whose original lexical meanings are still transparent, though weakened, in their respective iterative and retrospective aspectual periphrases with a following infinitive (e.g., Srd. *lu torro a fakere* ‘it= I.return to do.INF (= I’ll do it again)’; Ast. *acabé xintar* ‘I.finished lunch.INF (= I had just had lunch)’), and Rtr. *gnir* ‘come’, which has been completely desemantized in its passive auxiliary function with the participle (Gardenese [la bef iə u'nida la'veda] ‘the washing is **come** (= has been) washed’; cf. Salvi 2016, §11.5.3).

In accordance with well-attested crosslinguistic pathways of auxiliatation (see Heine 1993, 45–48), the core Romance verb-related grammatical categories are thus derived from original lexical predicates variously indicating location (e.g. stative/dynamic passive STARE ‘stand’/ESSE ‘be’: Pt. *a porta estava/era pintada de branco* ‘the door **was/was being** painted white’; Pountain 1982; Ledgeway 2008a, 298–299), motion (e.g. conative \*AD-RIPARE ‘arrive’: Occ. *soi arribat a emplenar aquel botelhon* ‘I am **arrived** (= managed) to fill.INF that bottle’), possession (e.g. iterative TENERE ‘hold, have’: Pie. [i 'tenu bra'ja] ‘they **hold** shouted (= keep shouting)’; cf. Ricca 1998), volition (e.g. future \*VOLERE ‘want’: Friul. *voj parti* ‘I.**want** (= will) leave.INF’; Vegliote *ju blaï inplenúr la kikza* ‘I **want** (= will) fill the marrow’; cf. Bartoli 1906, II, 423–424), and obligation (e.g. future HABERE DE ‘have of’: Catanzarese *ha de nivicara* ‘it.**has of** (= will) snow.INF’).

In the area of morphosyntax, Romance auxiliatation is clearly visible in the process of decategorialization, whereby the emergent auxiliary progressively jettisons the typical morphosyntactic properties of its erstwhile lexical status such as the ability to select its own arguments (cf. Harris/Campbell’s 1995, 193 *Heir-Apparent Principle*). Other reflexes include:

a) the emergence of gaps in the verb paradigm, including the lack of compound forms with the Italian dynamic passive auxiliary *venire* ‘come’ (It. *vengono puniti* ‘**they.come** (= are (being)) punished’ vs \**sono venuti puniti* ‘they.are **come** punished’), the incompatibility of French retrospective *venir de* ‘come of/from’ + infinitive with the preterite in contrast to its Ibero-Romance equivalent *acabar de* ‘finish from’ (e.g. Fr. *il vient/\*vint d’accuser son compagnon* ‘he.comes/came from accuse.INF (= has just/had just accused) his companion’ vs Sp. *acaba/acabó de acusar a su compa-*

*ñero*), and the lack of an infinitival form for the reflex of perfective HABERE ‘have’ in Romanian (e.g. **am** *râs* ‘I.have laughed’ vs *înainte de a fi/\*avea* *râs* ‘before of to be.INF/have.INF laughed’);

b) the inability to form passives, witness the infelicity of It. progressive aspectual periphrasis *stare* ‘stand’ + gerund in the passive *\*la tenda sta essendo montata* ‘the tent **stands** (= is) being pitched’;

c) the conservation of verb-subject inversion (namely, V-to-C movement) in Gallo-Romance which otherwise proves increasingly infelicitous and/or ungrammatical with lexical verbs (cf. Ledgeway 2015, §3.2), e.g. Fr. *je suis* ‘I am’ (from *être* ‘be’) or ‘I follow’ (< *suivre* ‘follow’) → **Suis-je?** ‘Am I/\*Follow I?’;

d) the inability to take a nominal complement, as exemplified by Cat. perfective *haver* ‘have’, now replaced by a reflex of TENERE ‘hold’, e.g. *\*havia/tenia els cabells curts* ‘he.had the hair short’;

e) the reduction and loss of verb inflection, as exemplified by the Salentino progressive aspectual marker *sta* (< *stare* ‘stand’) now used in all six grammatical persons (Leccese *sta bbegnu/bbieni* ‘PROG I.come/you.sg.come’; Ledgeway 2016b), the Italian deontic modal of necessity *bisognare* ‘need’ today characterized by severe inflectional restrictions which limit it to occurring in the 3sg of a handful of synthetic forms (e.g. *bisogna(va) agire* ‘it.is(was).necessary act.INF’; cf. Benincà/Poletto 1997), and the fossilization of *\*volet* ‘wants’ > *o* in the Romanian colloquial future construction *o + să* (COMP.SBJV) + subjunctive, e.g. *o să mergem* ‘FUT COMP.SBJV we.go (= we’ll go)’.

The increased semantic integration between auxiliary and verbal complement produces an extreme case of interlacing (Lehmann 1988) between matrix and dependent clauses, effacing surface clausal boundaries ([VP]+[VP] → [AUX+VP]) and licensing a range of local phenomena assumed to hold exclusively of monoclausal structures (Cinque 2006), including:

a) climbing of negators and clitic pronouns (≥5 Clitic pronouns) to the auxiliary (e.g. Nap. *nu t’aggiu (\*nun) vasato (\*te)* ‘not you= I.have (not) kissed (=you)’ and, in Ibero-Romance and Romanian, the impossibility of intervening adverbs between perfective auxiliary and participle (Sp. *todavía no ha (\*todavía) llegado* ‘still not he.has (still) arrived’) (≥7 Auxiliaries);

b) the impossibility of cleft sentence formation (e.g. Fr. *\*c’est tout expliquer que je pourrai* ‘it is everything explain.INF that I will.be.able’), since the non-finite lexical verb forms a constituent with the auxiliary;

c) transparency of perfective auxiliary selection according to the transitivity of the dependent infinitive in modal and aspectual periphrases, e.g. Gsc. *qu’as anàt cuélhe aigo* ‘(that) you.sg.have gone fetch.INF water’ vs *que soun poucuts càye* ‘(that) they.are been.able fall.INF’;

d) long object preposing in passive *se/si* constructions, e.g. Sp. *los documentos no se pueden/?puede cargar* ‘the documents not self=can.3PL/3SG upload.INF (= the documents cannot be uploaded)’.

In an apparently paradoxical fashion, then, we witness in an original analytic development unmistakable signs of growing syntheticity as the auxiliary and dependent non-finite verb form progressively coalesce in accordance with the cyclical nature of the syntheticity-analyticity continuum (cf. Section 3.2).

Frequently, this increased semantic and structural integration is manifested morphophonologically in the emergence of specialized (and often synchronically irregular) auxiliary paradigms displaying phonologically reduced (typically clitic) forms, which, in certain cases, contrast with morphophonologically regular and full paradigms preserved for the original lexical meaning of the same verb (cf. *sto* ‘I.stay’ > Cal. *ste* (+ *penzannu*) ‘I’m (thinking)’ vs *staju* (+ *a ra scola*) ‘I stay (at the school)’). Illustrative in this respect are Rom./Gsc./Cors. (*a*) *avea/aver/avè* ‘have’ which in their grammatical uses as perfective auxiliaries have developed specialized, reduced forms in a number of persons (e.g. Cors. ***avete camere*** ‘you.PL.have bedrooms’ vs ***ate capitu*** ‘you.PL.have understood’), as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2:** Morphophonological distinctions in lexical/auxiliary uses of HABERE

Rom. <i>avea</i>		Gsc. <i>aver</i>		Cors. <i>avè</i>	
Lexical	Auxiliary	Lexical	Auxiliary	Lexical	Auxiliary
<i>am</i>	<i>am</i>	<i>èi</i>	<i>èi</i>	<i>aghju</i>	<i>aghju</i>
<i>ai</i>	<i>ai</i>	<i>as</i>	<i>as</i>	<i>ai</i>	<i>ai</i>
<i>are</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>hà</i>	<i>hà</i>
<i>avem</i>	<i>am</i>	<i>avem</i>	<i>am</i>	<i>avemu</i>	<i>emu</i>
<i>aveji</i>	<i>aʃi</i>	<i>avetz</i>	<i>atz</i>	<i>avete</i>	<i>ate</i>
<i>au</i>	<i>au</i>	<i>ann</i>	<i>ann</i>	<i>anu</i>	<i>anu</i>

Similarly, Sardinian (Jones 1988), Romanian (Monachesi 2005, 133–134) and Catalan (Pérez Saldanya/Hualde 2003; Juge 2006) contrast a lexical paradigm, respectively, for ‘owe’ (*dévere*) and ‘want’ (*a vrea*), and ‘go’ (*anar*) with a morphophonologically specialized paradigm of the same now employed as future and preterite auxiliaries, respectively: Srd. *mi devet meta vinu* ‘me= **he.owes** much wine’ vs ***det próere*** ‘**must.3sg** (= it will) rain.INF’; Cat. *dilluns van al teatre* ‘Monday **they.go** to.the theatre’ vs *dilluns và(re)n anar al teatre* ‘Monday **they.go** go.INF (= they went) to.the theatre’; Rom. ***vrem o schimbare*** ‘**we.want** a change’ vs ***vom vrea o schimbare*** ‘**we’ll** want a change’. The paradigms of all three verbs are given in Table 3:

**Table 3:** Lexical/Auxiliary paradigms of DEBERE, \*VOLERE and \*ANDARE

Srd. <i>dévere</i>		Rom. <i>vrea</i>		Cat. <i>anar</i>	
Lexical	Auxiliary	Lexical	Auxiliary	Lexical	Auxiliary
<i>devo</i>	<i>de(v)o</i>	<i>vreau</i>	<i>(v)oi</i>	<i>vaig</i>	<i>và(re)ig</i>
<i>deves</i>	<i>des</i>	<i>vrei</i>	<i>(v)ei, ài, îi</i>	<i>vas</i>	<i>và(re)s</i>
<i>devet</i>	<i>det</i>	<i>vrea</i>	<i>(v)a, o</i>	<i>va</i>	<i>va</i>
<i>devimus</i>	<i>demus</i>	<i>vrem</i>	<i>(v)om</i>	<i>anem</i>	<i>và(re)m</i>
<i>devites</i>	<i>dedzis</i>	<i>vreți</i>	<i>(v)eți, àți, țți, oți</i>	<i>aneu</i>	<i>và(re)u</i>
<i>deven</i>	<i>den</i>	<i>vor</i>	<i>(v)or</i>	<i>van</i>	<i>va(re)n</i>

### 2.2.2 Romance synthetic future(-in-the-past)

With the exception of Old French and, perhaps, ModSp. *eres* ‘you.sg.are’ (< ERIS ‘you.sg.will.be’), both synthetic paradigms of the Latin future (AMA-BO ‘love-FUT.1SG’, LEG-AM ‘read-FUT.1SG’), as well as the ESSE ‘be’ + future active participle periphrasis, left no trace in Romance. With the exception of Sardinian, Romanian, Dalmatian and possibly some Gascon varieties (Rohlf’s 1970, 220), in their place we find, alongside the present and various grammaticalized periphrases involving auxiliaries like those seen in Table 2, a newly synthesized future derived from an erstwhile periphrasis consisting of the present infinitive followed by a weakened form of HABERE ‘have’ (e.g., UIUERE ‘live.INF’ + \*aio/as/a(t)/Vmo(s)/ete(s)/Vn(t) > Gal. *vivir-ei/-às/-â/-emos/-edes/-ân* ‘I/you/(s)he/we/you/they will live’), forms which have now been largely jettisoned in the modern dialects of southern Italy (Loporcaro 1999).<sup>5</sup>

Similarly, the Romance synthetic future-in-the-past derived from the infinitive followed by a past tense form of HABERE, the perfect HABUI (> \*HEBUI ‘I.had’) in northern and central Italo-Romance (e.g., It. *viv(e)r-ebbi* > *vivrei* ‘I would live’) and the imperfect HABEBAM ‘I.had’ elsewhere (e.g., Gal. *vivir-ía*), has traditionally been considered a development parasitic on that of the future, such that once infinitive + HABEO had come to mark the future, this opened the way for infinitive + HABUI/HABEBAM to mark future-in-the-past. However, Benveniste (1968, 89–90) and Coleman (1971, 224) convincingly argue that the documentary evidence shows the HABERE periphrasis to have

<sup>5</sup> For further discussion of the development of the Romance future(-in-the-past) and conditional, see Thielmann (1885), Valesio (1968; 1969), Coleman (1971), Harris (1978, ch. 6), Fleischman (1982), Pinkster (1987; 1989), Adams (1991), Roberts (1993), Maiden (1996), Bentley (2000a,b), Nocentini (2001), D’hulst (2004), Bourova (2005; 2007), La Fauci (2006), Bourova/Tasmowski (2007), Slobbe (2008), Parkinson (2009), Ledgeway (2012, 134–140).

first emerged as a future-in-the-past, with the future construction following later. There is, however, greater consensus among scholars that the irrealis conditional meaning represents a secondary development from an original future-in-the-past value in accordance with the crosslinguistic tendency for future forms to develop irrealis modal functions (Coleman 1971, 217; Fleischman 1982, 64).

Traditional accounts trace the Romance synthetic future(-in-the-past) back to a substandard spoken Latin innovation (cf. Varvaro 2013, 32–36) which was severely repressed and hence barely attested in the written language (Haverling 2010, 397–398), a view which finds some initial support in the characteristically Latinate postposition of the auxiliary typical of OV languages (Fleischman 1982, 119, 121). Consequently, the future(-in-the-past) construction represents the gradual grammaticalization and desemanticization of *HABERE* from a full verb of possession (Slobbe 2008, 109–112), where it could often imply unrealized actions in conjunction with a transitive infinitive (7a), towards a deontic modal of obligation from the first century AD (7b), before emerging from around the third century AD (though see Pinkster 1987, 206), and now also in conjunction with intransitive and passive infinitives, as a simple future auxiliary (7c) and ultimately as a future inflectional ending. This latter stage is famously represented in the late seventh-century *Fredegar's Chronicle* from Gaul (7d), where the Classical Latin future *dabo* 'give.FUT.1SG' is juxtaposed with the now synthesized *HABERE* periphrasis *daras* (< *DAR(E)* 'give.INF' + cliticized \**as* 'you.have'; Fleischman 1982, 68; Haverling 2010, 398). However, the apparently more emphatic reading of the latter ('you WILL (give me them)') might indicate an early functional specialization of the two paradigms (Adams 1991, 160–161; ↗11 Tense, aspect, mood).

(7) Latin

- a. nihil **habeo** ad te **scribere**  
 nothing I.have to you write.INF  
 'I have nothing to write to you'  
 (Cic. *Att.* 2.22.6)
- b. quid **habui** **facere**?  
 what I.had do.INF  
 'what was I supposed to do?'  
 (Sen. *Controv.* 1.1.19)
- c. tempestas illa **tollere** **habet** totam paleam de area  
 storm that remove.INF has all chaff from threshing.floor  
 'that storm will carry off all the chaff from the threshing floor'  
 (Aug., *Evang. Iohan* 4.12)
- d. ille respondebat: non dabo. Iustinianus dicebat:  
 he replied not I.give.FUT Justinian.NOM said  
**daras**  
 you.give.FUT

‘and he replied: I will not give [them to you]. And Justinian replied: but you will give [them to me]’  
(*Fred. Chron.* 2.62)

Already in the earliest Romance texts the component parts appear firmly fused together, witness forms such as *prindrai* ‘I shall take’ and *salvarai* ‘I shall save’ (alongside older *ert* < ERIT ‘will be’) in the Strasbourg Oaths, *jrás* ‘you will go’, *farás* ‘you will do’, and *tornarás* ‘you will return’ in the Emilian Glosses (Menéndez Pidal 1956, 361), *farai* ‘you will do’ in the Umbrian Confession Formula, and *monstero-* ‘I will show’ in the *Ritmo Laurenziano* (Varvaro 2013, §7). Despite such evidence, it is not at all certain that the periphrasis had fully grammaticalized by the early Romance period, inasmuch as the constituent parts still preserve a certain degree of autonomy in early Ibero-Romance, Occitan, and northern Italian dialects (e.g., Old Gascon *diser t’an* ‘say. INF you=they.have (= they will tell you)’, Old Lombard *turbar se n’a lo sol* ‘disturb. INF self= thereof= has (= will be blurred) the sun’), as well as in literary registers of Modern European Portuguese where the reflex of HABERE can be separated from its infinitive by an intervening mesoclitic, e.g. *garanti-los-ia* ‘guarantee. INF=them=had. 1SG (= I would guarantee them)’.<sup>6</sup>

### 2.2.3 Clitic pronouns

On a par with the development of the article in the nominal group (cf. Section 2.1.1), the verbal group witnesses a related development with the emergence of another DET(erminer) category in the form of object clitic pronouns (Wanner 1987, 75 Clitic pronouns), which in the third person are often formally identical with the article (e.g., Fr. *le maire, je le connais bien* ‘the.msc mayor, him= I.know well’). Following Vincent (1997b; 1998), we can thus talk of the emergence of a “D-system” in Romance which in the nominal domain gives rise to articles (reflexes of ILLE, IPSE), initially limited to subject nominals and constituents fronted to the pre-verbal topic/focus field, and to object clitics (restricted to reflexes of ILLE in the third person) in the verbal domain (cf. late eighth-century Latin clitic left-dislocation *ipsa cuppa frangentla tota* ‘the.fsg drinking.cup.fsg they.break.SBJV=it.fsg all (= let them break the whole drinking cup)’). Consequently, Vincent (1997b, 149) argues that “the different patterns of morphological realization of the third-person clitics [...] and the articles [...] reflect two independent and convergent developments, one involving the verb-object relation and one the clause-subject relation”, ultimately giving rise to a subject-object asymmetry in line with the emerging pattern of configurationality.

<sup>6</sup> Menéndez Pidal (1956, 358 and 377), Rohlfs (1968, 334–335), Roberts (1994), Luís/Spencer (2005), Monachesi (2005, 152–158).

In Gallo- and Rhaeto-Romance varieties, as well as northern Tuscan, the object clitic referencing system observed above is extended over time to the subject relation, such that between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there emerges a series of subject clitics derived from weakened nominative subject pronouns (cf. Vanelli/Renzi/Beninca 1985; Poletto 1995), as exemplified by the representative present tense paradigms in Table 4 where the distribution of subject clitics can be observed to affect different persons in different varieties.<sup>7</sup>

**Table 4:** Some Romance subject clitic paradigms

spoken Fr. 'speak'	Occ. (Eymoutiers) 'be'	Comasco 'sleep'	Florentine 'speak'
ʃ pəʁl	jo se	'dɔrmi	(e) parlo
ty pəʁl	te se	ta 'dɔrmat	tu parli
i/ɛl pəʁl	ej	al/la 'dɔrmi	e/la parla
ʃ pəʁl	nu sū	dɔr'mum	si parla
vu pəʁle	vu se	dɔr'muf	vu parlate
i pəʁl	sū	'dɔrmaŋ	e/le parlano

These former dependents have migrated towards the verbal head Infl where they analytically spell-out the features of the finite verb (8a). In some varieties, the clitics have become obligatory even in the presence of a preverbal lexical subject (8b), or even in conjunction with an indefinite quantifier (8c), such that today they must be considered agreement markers ultimately representing an ongoing synthetic development of person-marking on the verb (see further Poletto 2000).

- (8) a. Genoese     [<sub>IP</sub> [<sub>pro<sub>i</sub></sub>] [<sub>Infl'</sub> a<sub>i</sub>       vegne]]  
                   pro                   SCL.FSG comes  
                   'She's coming.'
- b. Pie.       [<sub>IP</sub> [**Cec**<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>Infl'</sub> u<sub>i</sub>       travaja]]  
                   Cec                   SCL.MSG works  
                   'Francesco is working.'
- c. Milanese   [<sub>IP</sub> [**Un quidun**<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>Infl'</sub> el<sub>i</sub>       riverà     in ritart]]  
                   a somebody                   SCL.MSG will.arrive in late  
                   'Somebody will arrive late.'

<sup>7</sup> Kayne (1975), Renzi/Vanelli (1983), Vanelli (1987), Roberge (1990), Poletto (1993; 1995; 2000), Cardinaletti (1997; 2004), Heap (2000), Olivieri (2004; 2010; 2011), Manzini/Savoia (2005, I, ch. 2), Sauzet (2007), Poletto/Tortora (2016).

## 2.3 The clause

In the same way that DET and Infl constitute the spell-out of grammaticalized categories related to their associated NP and VP complements, the sentential core too, formally represented by IP, is embedded within a further layer of functional structure CP. In the passage from Latin to Romance, exploitation of this COMP(lementizer) position most noticeably surfaces in the grammaticalization of verb fronting in declarative root clauses as part of the late Latin/early Romance V2 syntax (Benincà 1994; 2013; Salvi 2004),<sup>8</sup> which imposes generalized V-to-C movement on the finite verb and, in accordance with individual Romance variation (cf. Wolfe 2015a,b,c,d), optional fronting of one or more constituents to the Topic-Focus field:

- (9) Opt. [<sub>FocP</sub> Com tanta paceença [<sub>C-FinP</sub> **sofria**  
 with so.much patience suffered  
 [<sub>TP</sub> ela ~~sofria~~ esta enfermidade ~~com tanta paceença~~]]  
 she this illness  
 ‘She demonstrated enormous patience suffering from this illness.’

However, this traditional interpretation of satisfying the V2 requirement in terms of V-to-C movement represents just one of two possible licensing mechanisms made available by the grammar: alongside the more marked Move option, the system also makes available the less costly Merge option whereby the V2 requirement on C can be satisfied analytically by direct lexical insertion of a suitable head. Ledgeway (2008b) shows that in medieval Romance this latter option is realized by insertion of the analytic marker *si/si* (< sic ‘thus’), as illustrated by the Old Neapolitan near minimal pair in (10a,b) exemplifying the competing Move and Merge options, respectively:

- (10) ONap.  
 a. [<sub>FocP</sub> *sì* fuorti cuolpi [<sub>C-FinP</sub> **li donava**  
 such strong blows him=he.gave  
 [<sub>IP</sub> ~~li donava sì f. cuolpi~~]]  
 b. [<sub>FocP</sub> *spissi cuolpi mortali* [<sub>C-FinP</sub> **sì** [<sub>IP</sub> *le dava spissi e m.*]]  
 many blows mortal sì him=he.gave

<sup>8</sup> However, it also surfaces indirectly in the loss of the accusative and infinitive construction (cf. (3a)), one of the most notable causalities of the widespread development of CP structure, which increasingly in the postclassical period was replaced by a finite complement clause introduced by the complementizers *quod* and *quia* (cf. (3b)), a usage finally consolidated as the core complementation pattern in vulgar texts after the fall of the empire (Väänänen 1982, 273; Herman 1989; 2000, 88–89; Zamboni 2000, 119–120; cf. also Ledgeway 2016a, §63.2.3).

Arguably, the Merge option also characterizes many modern Gascon varieties which, despite not displaying the Move option (namely, generalized V-to-C movement), obligatorily lexicalize [+declarative] root C with *que* ‘that’:<sup>9</sup>

- (11) Gsc. [<sub>TopP</sub> ta pay [<sub>C-FinP</sub> **qu**] [<sub>TP</sub> èy arribat]]  
           your father       **that** is arrived  
           ‘Your father has arrived.’

Although Gascon is unique in its systematic overt analytical marking of declarative force, it is not uncommon across Romance to find various analytic markers of more marked illocutionary force types, variously lexicalized by a series of different C-related particles and complementizers which explicitly encode different clause types (Cruschina/Ledgeway 2016, §31.3.2; Giurgea/Remberger 2016; Corr 2017). Among numerous examples, here we can recall optatives (12a,b), interrogatives (12c,d), exclamatives (12e) and imperatives (12f).

- (12) a. Cat. **Que** la preparin                   ells!  
           that it= prepare.PRS.SBJV.3PL they  
           ‘Let them prepare it!’  
       b. Pt. **Oxalá** não venha! (*oxalá* < Arabic *ua šā Allāh* ‘if God wanted!’)  
           hopefully not he.come.PRS.SBJV  
           ‘Would that he not come tomorrow!’  
       c. Srd. **A** kerres       vennere   a domo   mea? (*a* < AUT ‘or’)  
           Q you.want   come.INF a house my  
           ‘Do you want to come to my house?’  
       d. Gsc. **E** l’ as audit? (*e* < ET ‘and’)  
           Q him= you.sg.have heard  
           ‘Have you heard him?’  
       e. Sp. ¡Cuán rápido **que** habla Bruno!  
           how quick that speaks Bruno  
           ‘How quick **that** speaks Bruno!’  
       f. NESic. **Mi**           trasi!       (mi < (QUO)MODO ‘how’)  
           that.IRREALIS enter.3SG  
           ‘Please do come in!’

<sup>9</sup> For discussion and relevant bibliography, see Ledgeway (2012, 173–175; 2015, §3.2).

### 2.3.1 Complementizers

A further area highlighting the consolidation of analytic marking within the C(omplementizer)-domain is evidenced by the emergence in Romance of non-finite complementizers derived from the prepositions DE ‘of’ and AD ‘to’ introducing infinitival clauses (13a), which to all intents and purposes parallel the use of finite complementizers derived from QUOD(/QUID) and QUIA ‘that’ ((13b); cf. Ledgeway 2016a, §63.1, §63.2.1).

- (13) Cat. a. Digues-li **de** venir!  
 tell=him of.COMP come.INF  
 b. Digues-li **que** vingui!  
 tell=him that he.come.SBJV  
 ‘Tell him to come!’

Although such pairs reveal strong structural parallels in the distribution and behaviour of finite and non-finite complementizers, the similarity is spurious inasmuch as different clausal introducers may occupy distinct positions. For instance, whereas Italian finite *che* precedes topics and foci (so ***che la data l’ho sbagliata*** ‘I.know **that the date**.TOP it=I.have mistaken’) occupying the leftmost position within the left periphery, non-finite *di* follows them (so *la data **di** averla sbagliata* ‘I.know **the date**.TOP **of** have.INF=it mistaken’), occurring in the right margin of the left periphery. Evidence like this has led many researchers investigating the structure of the left periphery in Romance to propose a split C-domain (Rizzi 1997; Benincà/Poletto 2004; Dufter/Octavio de Toledo 2014), hierarchically articulated into several functional fields whose simplified linearization can be summarized as C<sub>Force</sub> > Top > Foc > C<sub>Fin</sub>.

**Table 5:** Romance dual complementizer systems

	‘I think that he’s coming’	‘I want that he should eat’
Romania	<i>cred cǎ vine</i>	<i>vreau să mănânce</i>
Sicily	<i>pensu ca vèni</i>	<i>vògghiu chi mmanciassi</i>
Sicily (Messina)	<i>critu ca vèni</i>	<i>ògghiu mi mancia</i>
Southern Calabria	<i>pensu ca vèni</i>	<i>vogghiu mu (mi) mangia</i>
Northern Calabria	<i>criju ca vèni</i>	<i>vuogliu chi mmangia</i>
Salento	<i>crisciu ca vène</i>	<i>ogghiu cu mmancia</i>
Naples	<i>pènsa ca vènə</i>	<i>vògliə chə mmangə</i>
Northern Apulia	<i>pènsə ca vènə</i>	<i>vògghia chə mmangə</i>
Abruzzo	<i>pènsə ca vènə</i>	<i>vòjja chə mmangə</i>

Indeed, some Romance varieties such as Romanian (Alboiu/Motapanyane 2000, §4.2) and many southern Italian dialects (Calabrese 1993; Ledgeway 2004; 2005) present dual finite complementizer systems (cf. Table 5), distinguishing between a complementizer derived from *QUIA* (> *ca*, *că*) specialized in introducing realis (indicative) complements and a complementizer derived from *QUID* (> upper southern Italian dialects *che* [ke/kə], *chi*), (*QUO*)*MODO* (> SCal., NESic. *mu/ma/mi*), or *QUOD* (> Salentino *cu*) heading irrealis (subjunctive) complements.

These dual complementizer systems appear to exploit both the higher and lower complementizer positions within the left periphery just outlined, inasmuch as the realis complementizer lexicalizes the higher  $C_{\text{Force}}$  position, and therefore precedes topics/foci, and the irrealis lexicalizes the lower  $C_{\text{Fin}}$  position from where it follows topics/foci:

- (14) Salentino
- a. *ticu ca lu libbru lu kkattu*  
 I.say that<sub>REALIS</sub> the book.TOP it=I.buy  
 ‘The book, I say that I buy it.’
- b. *ojju lu libbru cu lu kkattu*  
 I.want the book.TOP that<sub>IRREALIS</sub> it=I.buy  
 ‘The book, I want to buy it.’

Indeed, in Romanian in the presence of a fronted topic or focus both complementizer positions can be simultaneously realized in irrealis complement clauses (15a). Such recomplementation structures are also frequent in many early Romance varieties (Wanner 1998; Paoli 2005; Ledgeway 2004, §4.3.2.2; 2005, 380–381; Vincent 2006) as well as many other modern varieties (Ledgeway 2012, §4.4.2.2) where they are equally found in realis (indicative) complement clauses (15b,c).

- (15) a. Rom. *Vreau ca MÂINE să meargă.*  
 I.want that<sub>REALIS</sub> tomorrow.FOC that<sub>IRREALIS</sub> he.go.SBJV  
 ‘I want him to go tomorrow.’
- b. OFr. *Je te adjure par le vray Dieu*  
 I you=beseech by the true God  
*que ta fille Tarsienne, que tu ne la*  
 that your daughter Tarsienne that you not her  
*donnes a mariage a autre que a moy.*  
 give to marriage to other that to me  
 ‘I beseech you before God that your daughter Tarsienne you may give her to me alone in marriage.’
- c. Gal. *Dixéronme que a ese rapaz que*  
 they.told=me that to that boy that  
*o coñecemos na festa.*  
 him=we.knew in.the party  
 ‘They told me that that guy we met him at the party.’

Unlike in Latin where the clausal boundary was not overtly signalled in the accusative with infinitive construction (cf. (3a)), we thus see that in Romance not only is the clausal boundary overtly marked by an overt complementizer, but that even the lower and higher confines of the entire left periphery may be analytically spelt out.

### 3 Problems

Although we have seen above that, superficially at least, there is unmistakable evidence in certain areas for the greater analyticity of Romance in contrast to the typical synthetic tendencies of Latin, this traditional divide between Latin and Romance in terms of a synthetic-analytic split proves problematic on several accounts, as does the fundamental typological distinction on which it rests (cf. Schwegler 1990, 4–5; Bauer 1995, 10–11, 138, 166; Vincent 1997a, 99–100, 105). Indeed, Humboldt (1836) considered contrasts between Latin and Romance such as those exemplified in Section 2 as purely superficial, external differences since, at a deeper, internal level, the Romance languages are of the same inflectional type as the ancestor language, and hence ultimately constructed according to the same structural principles. Consequently, Humboldt concludes (pp. 288–289) that, although individual inflectional forms were lost, inflection as a whole was not lost ('Es sanken Formen, nicht aber die Form'). Though this idea might be difficult to maintain in its strongest form, it does underline how the Latin-Romance transition cannot be characterized *tout court* in terms of a shift from synthetic to analytic structures as long as Romance continues to display extensive syntheticity involving nominal and verbal inflections. Furthermore, as Coseriu (1987, 58) observes, there is little justification for lumping all presumed Romance analytic developments into a single all-encompassing principle, since they represent a collection of extremely heterogeneous changes, the diatopic distribution, individual chronologies and details of which vary enormously from one construction to another.

#### 3.1 Languages or constructions?

Among various difficulties associated with the traditional synthesis-analysis dichotomy, one observes above all an erroneous tendency to define Latin and Romance in absolute terms as synthetic and analytic languages, respectively, for both languages clearly also display, even if in smaller measure, tendencies in the opposite direction (Coseriu [1971] 1988, 210; 1987, 56; Schwegler 1990, 28; Vincent 1997a, 99). For example, among other things Latin boasts within the nominal group numerous prepositions (including *A(B)* '(away) from, by', *CUM* 'with', *DE* '(down) from', *AD* 'to(wards)', *EX* 'out of', *IN* 'in, on'; see Hewson/Bubenik 2006, 248–255), and within the verbal group a perfective middle periphrasis consisting of *ESSE* 'be' + PFV.PTCP (e.g.

*arma sunt humi inuenta* ‘weapons.NOM.NEUTPL are ground.LOC found.NOM.NEUTPL (= the weapons have been found on the ground)’ and independent markers of sentential negation (*quem non amat, non amat* ‘whom not she.loves not she.loves’).<sup>10</sup> Equally at the level of the clause Latin shows analyticity in a number of overt markers of subordination, including the subjunctive complementizers *UT/NE* ‘that/that...not’ (e.g. *Pompeius suis paredixerat ut Caesaris impetum exciperent* ‘Pompey.NOM his.men.DAT.PL had.fortold that Caesar.GEN charge.ACC they.received.SBJV’), and a series of question markers such as *ne* ‘is it the case that...?’, *nonne* ‘is it not the case that...?’, *num* or *an* ‘surely it is not the case that...?’ (e.g. *Num negare audes?* (Cic., *Cat.* 1.8) ‘Q deny.INF you.dare (= you surely don’t dare to deny it)?’).

Conversely, in Romance number and gender marking on nouns and adjectives is still typically suffixal (16a),<sup>11</sup> as are person/number (16b) and temporal, aspectual and modal categories (16c) on finite verbs.

- (16) a. Sp. est-**e(-os)/-a(s)**      niñ-**o(s)/-a(s)**      travies-**o(s)/-a(s)**  
           this-MSG(MPL)/-F(PL)    child-M(PL)/-F(PL)    naughty-M(PL)/-F(PL)
- b. Rom. alerg-**am/-ai/-a/-am/ați/-au**  
           run-IND.PST.IPFV.1SG/2SG/3SG/1PL/2PL/3PL
- c. Gsc. cant-**i/-èvi/-èi/-erèi/-erí/-èssi**  
           sing-1SG.PRS.IND~SBJV/PST.IPFV.IND/PST.PFV.IND/FUT/COND/PST.SBJV

To these we can add the widespread use of evaluative suffixes (e.g. It. *cas-etta* ‘house-DIM’, Gsc. *hemna-assa* ‘woman-PEJ (= spiteful woman)’, Pt. *ric-aço* ‘rich-AUG’, Rom. *frumuș-el* ‘beautiful-DIM’, Extremaduran *pelot-açu* ‘ball-AUG’),<sup>12</sup> superlative and residual comparative forms (e.g. Ast. *munch-isimu* ‘much-SUPERL.MSG’, Cat. *fred-íssim* ‘cold-SUPERL.MSG’, *mill-or* ‘good-COMPR.SG’, *pitj-or* ‘bad-COMPR.SG’, It. *noios-issimo* ‘boring-SUPERL.MSG’, *super-iore* ‘high-COMPR.SG’, *infer-iore* ‘low-COMPR.SG’, Pt. *felic-íssimo* ‘happy-SUPERL’, *mai-or* ‘big-COMPR.SG’, *men-or* ‘small-COMPR.SG’), and the frequent retention of case distinctions in pronouns (e.g. Basilicatense (Muro Lucano) *ià* ‘1SG.NOM’, (*a*) *mì* ‘(P.ACC-DAT.MRK) 1SG.ACC-DAT’, (*pə*) *mévə* ‘(for) 1SG.OBL’, (*cu*) *michə* ‘(with) 1SG.COM’; Ro. *eu* ‘1SG.NOM’, (*pe*) *mine* ‘(P.ACC.MRK) 1SG.ACC’, *mie* ‘1SG.DAT’, *meu* ‘1SG.GEN’; cf. Loporcaro 2008). Furthermore, we should recall that Romance languages also display a whole host of innovative synthetic structures (Coseriu 1987, 59), notably

<sup>10</sup> Highly exceptional are lexicalized cases of univerbation of the negator *NE(c)* ‘not’ in such cases as *NOLO* ‘I do not want’ and *NESCIO* ‘I do not know’ (cf. *UOLO* ‘I.want’, *SCIO* ‘I.know’; cf. Ernout/Thomas [1953] 1993, 149–150).

<sup>11</sup> In many Occitan varieties the original synthetic marking of plural number has optionally been reinforced with the creation of doubly marked inflectional plurals (Wheeler 1988, 256) such as *pial* ‘hair’/*pial-s* ‘hair-PL’ (> *pials-es* ‘hair.PL-PL’), *amì* ‘friend’/*amì-s* ‘friend-PL’ (> *amiss-es* ‘friend.PL-PL’).

<sup>12</sup> In Modern French these are generally no longer productive, e.g. *fill-ette* ‘girl-DIM’, but not \**chaussur(e)-ette* ‘shoe-DIM’, which has to be expressed by the analytic *petite chaussure* ‘little shoe’.

the future and conditional derived from an erstwhile infinitival periphrasis in conjunction with HABERE ‘have’ (cf. Section 2.2.2), sentence and manner adverbs in *-men(t(e))* (17a),<sup>13</sup> internal morphophonological alternations such as metaphony and related types of stressed vowel alternation to mark number and/or gender in nominal categories (17b,c,d), and inflected non-finite verb forms such as the infinitive (Table 6) and gerunds and participles (Table 7).<sup>14</sup> In this light, the presumed inexorable driving force underlying Romance analyticity appears seriously undermined.

- (17) a. DISTRACTA + **MENTE** > Cat. distreta-**ment**  
           divided.ABL mind.ABL           distracted-**ly**  
           ‘with (an) absent mind’ >       ‘absent-mindedly’
- b. eastern Abruzzese    **faksə** / **fiksə**  
                                   fax\SG    fax\PL
- c. Pt.    p[**o**]rc-o / p[**ɔ**]rc-a(s)/-os  
           dirty\MSG-MSG   dirty\-F(PL)/-MPL
- d. Rom. **boal-ă**       /   **bol-i**  
           illness\FSG-FSG   illness\-FPL

**Table 6:** Romance inflected infinitives (*cant-* ‘sing’)

	Infinitive	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
Gal.	<i>cantar+</i>	-∅	-es	-∅	-mos	-des	-en
OLeo.	<i>cantar+</i>	-∅	-es	-∅	-mos	-des	-en
ONap.	<i>cantar(e)+</i>	-∅	-∅	-∅	-mo	-vo (-ve)	-no
(E)Pt.	<i>cantar+</i>	-∅	-es	-∅	-mos	-des	-em
Srd.	<i>cantare+</i>	-po	-s	-t	-mus	-dzis	-n

<sup>13</sup> See the discussion in §3.2, as well as Karlsson (1981), Bauer (2001; 2003; 2006), Ricca (2010, 181–185), Hummel (2011; 2014; in press).

<sup>14</sup> For discussion and relevant bibliography, see Ledgeway (2012, 293–295).

**Table 7:** Romance inflected gerunds and participles (*cant-* ‘sing’)

	Gerund		Present/Past Participles		
	Gal.	Pt. (Póvoa de Atalaia)	ONap.		
	<i>cantando+</i>	<i>cantand(o)+</i>	<i>cantanno+</i>	<i>cantante+</i>	<i>cantato+</i>
1SG	-∅	-∅	-∅	-∅	-∅
2SG	-∅	-s	-∅	-∅	-∅
3SG	-∅	-∅	-∅	-∅	-∅
1PL	-mos	-mos	-mo	-	-
2PL	-des	-eis	-vo (-ve)	-	-
3PL	-∅	-em	-no (-ne)	-no	-no

In short, considerations such as these reveal that, if they are to be employed at all, the terms *synthetic* and *analytic* should not be predicated of languages but, at best, of individual constructions (cf. also Schwegler 1990; Vincent 1997a). Thus, to the extent that any generalizations can usefully be made in relation to the synthetic and analytic typology, they must be made in relation to specific construction types, rather than individual languages. Exemplary in this respect is the often overlooked observation (though see Meyer-Lübke 1894, 2–3; Coseriu 1987, 58; La Fauci 1998, 524–525) that the fate of Latin inflection is different in the nominal and verbal domains: whereas all but a few isolated residues of the rich Latin nominal declension – early Gallo-Romance, Rhaeto-Romance, and Romanian aside (cf. Dragomirescu/Nicolae 2016) – have survived into Romance, the Latin verbal conjugation formally continues largely intact, even accommodating, in some cases, several new additions such as the future and the conditional (Section 2.2.2; see Maiden 2011a,b). This observation apparently explains why analytic developments occurring within the nominal domain typically assume a substitutive function replacing earlier synthetic structures (e.g. ANN-AE ‘Anna-GEN’ vs Fr. *d’Anne* ‘of Anne’, DUR-**IOR** ‘hard-COMPR’ vs Pt. *mais dur* ‘more hard (= harder)’), unlike in the verbal domain where, rather than replacing earlier synthetic structures, they usually come to mark new functions that complement those already marked synthetically within the system. For instance, Romance reflexes of FACTUM HABEO (‘do.PFV.PTCP I.have’) do not replace, at least not initially, the synthetic perfect Feci (‘I did, I have done’), but variously come to assume novel ancillary functions of the perfect (Harris 1982; Squartini/Bertinetto 2000), ranging from a present resultative ((18a); Alfonzetti 1998) to a present perfect with marked iterative function ((18b); Leal Cruz 2003, 132), before ultimately encroaching upon (some of) the functions proper of the original perfect, witness its canonical present perfective reading in standard peninsular Spanish ((18c); Penny 2000, 159) and its full-fledged punctual perfective value in modern spoken French ((18d); Harris 1970, 79–83).

## (18) a. Acireale, Sicily

N'**haiu** **vivutu** nenti.  
 not I.have drunk nothing  
 'I'm sober (because I haven't been drinking).'

## b. Spanish of La Palma

No **ha** **llovido** nada.  
 not it.has rained nothing  
 'We continue not to have had any rain whatsoever.'

c. ES<sub>p</sub>. ¿Quién **ha** **roto** esta ventana?

who has broken this window  
 'Who has broken the window?'

d. Fr. Elle **est morte** au début du 17<sup>ème</sup> siècle.

she is died at.the beginning of.the 17th century  
 'She died at the start of the seventeenth century.'

### 3.2 Absolute vs relative interpretations

Even assuming that the synthetic-analytic parameter is to be interpreted in relation to specific constructions, we have to recognize that it is often erroneously applied in absolute terms, whereas individual constructions can display varying degrees of syntheticity and analyticity (Vincent 1997a, 100). A case in point concerns what is called “mesoclisis” in the future and conditional (cf. Section 2.2.2) of numerous early Romance varieties and today still attested in literary European Portuguese (e.g. OGsc. *Poder l'i tornar* ‘I could turn it’), where the possibility of separating the person/number inflection (e.g. -i ‘1sg’) from the future/conditional stem (e.g. *poder* ‘be.able.INF’) with an intervening object clitic (e.g. *l’* ‘it’) casts some doubt on the simple suffixal nature of the former. Similar problems arise for diminutive forms like Pt. *pãozinho* ‘roll’ (< *pão* ‘bread’ + DIM -*zinho*), which in the plural are marked not only in the desinence of the diminutive, but also in the nasal vowel alternation on the nominal stem (namely, *pãe-zinho-s* ‘bread\PL-DIM.M-PL’).

Another important case is constituted by the Romance *FACERE* ‘make’ causative construction, which, although clearly analytic inasmuch as it involves two separate lexemes (viz. reflex of *FACERE* + infinitive), mimics the syntax of a morphological causative with both verbs behaving as a single verbal complex (see Sheehan 2016; Vincent 2016, §4.2.5), licensing monoclausal properties such as clitic climbing, e.g. Cat. *No em facis plorar(\*-me)!* ‘not **me**= make.2SG.PRS.SBJV cry.INF(=**me**) (= Don’t make me cry)!', and a single case frame with transitive infinitival subjects occurring in the dative, e.g. Cal. *cci fazzu cunzà a machina a Ciccü 'to.him=* I.make repair.INF the car **to Ciccü** (= I’ll make Ciccü repair the car)’.

Similarly, an often-cited case of greater Romance analyticity concerns the marking of sentential negation in Gallo-Romance, northern Catalan dialects, and Arago-

nese,<sup>15</sup> which is frequently expressed discontinuously by a reflex of the original preverbal negator *NON* ‘not’ and a postverbal grammaticalized minimizer (e.g. *PASSUM* ‘step’, *RES/REM* ‘thing’, *MICAM* ‘crumb’, *PUNCTUM* ‘point; stitch’), in some cases leading to the loss of the preverbal negator (Stage II > Stage III in terms of Jespersen’s (1917) cycle; cf. Dufter/Stark 2007), e.g. Aragonese *no faré yo pas* ‘NEG I.will.do I NEG’, Pie. *capissu nenj* ‘I.understand NEG’. The greater autonomy of such negative structures is, however, only apparent. For instance, confining ourselves just to French, with finite verbs *pas* is always immediately postverbal and can never, for example, be separated from the finite verb by a nominal, participial or infinitival complement, e.g. *je (n’)ai pas vu (\*pas) la maison (\*pas)* ‘I (NEG) have NEG seen (NEG) the house (NEG)’. This lack of autonomy manifested in the rigidly fixed positioning of *pas* is hardly what would be expected *a priori* of a supposedly analytic structure; on the contrary, *pas* and similar postverbal negators display a high degree of bonding with respect to their associated verb.

Analogous issues arise from a consideration of the Romance sentential and manner adverbs in *-men(t(e))* and the Romance compound perfect discussed in (6a) and (7a–d) above, respectively. Beginning with the former, on the one hand, the evidence of coordination from modern varieties such as French, Italian, and Occitan points to the synthesized suffixal nature of the original ablative nominal *MENTE* ‘with (a) mind’ (e.g. ModFr. *humblement et doucement* ‘humbly and sweetly’, ModIt. *villanamente e aspramente* ‘cruelly and bitterly’, Langadocian *doçament e simplament* ‘quietly and simply’), whereas the same coordination facts in Modern Ibero-Romance, on the other hand, reveal how *-ment(e)* retains a greater degree of analyticity (e.g. Cat. *dolçament i suau* ‘sweetly and soft(ly)’, Pt. *intensa e constantemente* ‘intense(ly) and constantly’, Sp. *impensada pero providencialmente* ‘unexpected(ly) but providentially’), parallel to Old French and Old Tuscan (OFr./OTsc. *humeles e dulcement/umile e dolcemente* (CDR 1163/Nov. 4) ‘humbly (lit. ‘humble’) and gently’). Even greater autonomy can be seen in Old Occitan where not only is the reflex of *MENTE* (variously *-men(s)*, *-menz*, *-ment*) usually attached to just one of the adjectives in coordinated structures (usually the first, e.g. *cruelmen et amara* ‘cruelly and bitter (ly)’, but also *suau e bellament* ‘soft(ly) and beautifully’; Diez 1874, 429), but the two constituent parts of the adverbial structure can be also separated by intervening material (e.g. *epsa...ment* ‘identical...ly’; Grandgent <sup>2</sup>1909, §105).

Turning now to the analytic perfect, this is characterized by converse patterns of syntheticity and analyticity: whereas in modern French, Italian, and Occitan varieties the component parts continue to display considerable autonomy, witness the interpolation of such elements as adverbs of varying sizes (e.g. It. *abbiamo fortunata-*

<sup>15</sup> See, among others, Price (1962; 1986), Posner (1984; 1985a,b), Zanuttini (1997, ch. 3), Parry (2013), Poletto (2016).

*mente già pagato* ‘we.have **fortunately already** paid’; Monachesi 2005, 134), in Modern Ibero-Romance auxiliary and participle, despite continuing to be written as separate words, never allow interpolation of any sort (e.g. Pt. *não tinha* (**\*nunca**) *falado nunca comigo* ‘not he.had (**never**) spoken **never** with.me’).

Examples like these, coupled with the problem of how one is to correctly measure the autonomy of linguistic units (Schwegler 1990, ch. 2), frequently obscured by conventional, yet non-systematic, orthographic representations of the “word” (cf. Sp. *tal vez* ‘such time’ vs Fr. *peut-être* ‘can-be’ vs Pt. *talvez* ‘such.time’, It. *chissà* ‘who.knows’, all meaning ‘perhaps’), lead Schwegler (1990, 193) to conclude that the labels synthetic and analytic can, at best, be understood as nothing more than “the rough measure of the morphemic interdependence of speech units” [italics A.L.].

Yet even adopting a relativized interpretation of the traditional usage still fails to make any intuitive sense of many developments. For example, in the wake of Schwegler (1990, xv), Vincent (1997a, 99–100) proposes a scalar definition of the synthetic-analytic distinction in terms of the degree of phonological and morphosyntactic autonomy borne by the constituent grammatical properties of a given construction. On this view, however, one of the most important consequences of the presumed synthetic to analytic drift, manifested in the gradual replacement of an original “free” word order with a “fixed” (S)V O order, must now, despite the obvious contradiction, be treated as a synthetic development. In particular, the remarkable syntactic autonomy and independence of the core constituents of the Latin sentence which could, in accordance with pragmatic principles, not only occur in all possible permutations (see Ledgeway 2012, chs 3, 5), but whose internal structure, when complex, could, in certain cases and in specific registers, be scattered discontinuously across the sentence (cf. Section 4 below), must be taken as an indication of greater analyticity. By the same token, the greatly reduced positional autonomy, coupled with the increased semantico-syntactic interdependence, of the core constituents of the Romance sentence which can now only be interpreted relative to each other, and whose constituent parts are cohesively bound together, are to be understood within the current approach as a synthetic development.

### 3.3 Morphophonological erosion and its effects

It has often been claimed that there is a strict correlation between the rise and fall of analyticity and syntheticity, respectively, with processes of morphophonological weakening and erosion. A prime example concerns the phonetic erosion of the case system which has frequently been considered the trigger for an increased use of prepositions (Väänänen <sup>3</sup>1966, 115–119; 1982, 157–195; Bauer 1995, 137–139; Molinelli 1998, 147). By the same line of argument, the weakening of the Latin case system is also believed to produce an increasingly rigidified word order able to unambiguously distinguish between subject and object (Vennemann 1974; 1975; Bichakjian 1987, 89;

Bauer 1995, 5–6), a development which, in turn, correspondingly renders the original case system increasingly redundant (Bourciez <sup>4</sup>1956; Zamboni 2000, 102).

Yet, claims that such grammatical changes do not happen unless they are rendered necessary by concomitant changes in the phonology are simply not borne out by the Latin or Romance evidence. Beginning with the increased use of prepositions, on the basis of late Latin evidence Adams (2011, 264) questions whether it is “convincing to see the change as having a neat single cause, such as attrition of case endings determined by phonetic developments” since a “switch to prepositions is attested long before the phonetic changes usually cited in this connection (loss of final *-m* and *-s*, shortening of long vowels in final syllables) took place.” Indeed, on this point Pinkster (1990, 195–196) observes that as early as the archaic period Latin prepositions had already developed very specific uses and characteristics of their own and were not simply analytic alternatives to the morphological case system, despite the documentation of the loss of final consonants in nominal forms from the early inscriptions onwards, including nominative *MSG -s* from around 250 BC (e.g. *Cornelio* (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup>.8) for classical *CORNELIUS*), though restored by the classical period and generally retained even in late non-literary texts, and the somewhat later *ACC.SG -m*.

Although a trace of final *-m* continues to surface in the form of nasalization and lengthening of the preceding vowel in the classical period, from around 150 AD (Beckmann 1963, 180–182) the presence of *-m* in texts represents nothing more than a conservative spelling convention (Pinkster 1990, 199; 1993, 240; Adams 2013, 128–132). Thus, the loss of final consonants, even from an early period, apparently had no repercussions on the case system, which continued unscathed and unchanged for centuries (Pinkster 1990, 200). Indeed, even when in later texts we apparently come across neologistic uses of prepositions in place of traditional case forms, the complements of such prepositions always occur in a particular case form, often an indiscriminate ablative or accusative employed as a generalized prepositional case as in *in eadem diem* (*A.Vales.* 56) ‘in same.ACC day.ACC’ (‘on that same day’; cf. Classical Lat. *IN EO DIE* ‘on that.ABL day.ABL’), an observation which incontrovertibly demonstrates that neologistic prepositional uses cannot be determined by phonetic erosion (Pinkster 1993, 243).

Rather, the growing use of prepositions cannot be considered a single unified development, but instead covers a variety of heterogeneous cases differentiated by chronology and register (Adams 2013, ch. XIII). Whereas it is commonplace to retrace the Romance prepositional dative and genitive to early Latin uses (e.g. Plautus) of the prepositions *AD* ‘to(wards)’ and *DE* ‘(down/away) from’, respectively, Adams’ examination of such cases in early, Classical, and late Latin reveals that the resemblance between Latin and Romance is misleading and merely superficial. In particular, the evidence he adduces highlights how there was no abrupt move from syntheticity to analyticity, inasmuch as the Romance prepositional types emerged slowly over centuries from the gradual broadening of classical uses long before processes of phonetic erosion could have played a role in any such developments.

Not dissimilar considerations apply to the presumed effects of phonetic erosion on the verbal paradigm, where the weakening and/or loss of inflectional marking of person and number on the verb have often simplistically been identified as the cause of the progressive establishment of subject clitics in Gallo-Romance. This erroneous correlation is, however, immediately dispelled by varieties such as the dialect of Vicenza where all synthetic marking for person and number on the finite verb remains intact, yet the verb paradigm shows subject clitics for all six grammatical persons. Even in varieties like French where the present indicative of regular first-conjugation verbs notoriously displays considerable syncretism in all persons apart from the first and second persons plural, distinctive synthetic marking of person and number continues in other paradigms such as the future. In short, the rise of analytic marking of person and number in conjunction with the Romance verb through subject clitics cannot be associated *tout court* with inflectional weakening, as the relevant facts in Table 8 demonstrate (↗2 Subjects).

**Table 8:** Romance synthetic and analytic marking for person and number

Vicentino	French	
present tense <i>vendere</i> 'sell'	present tense <i>pousser</i> 'push'	future tense <i>pousser</i> 'push'
a 'vendo	ʒ(ə) pus	ʒ(ə) pus(ə)ʒe
te a 'vendi	ty pus	ty pus(ə)ʒa
el/a 'vende	i(l)/ɛl pus	i(l)/ɛl pus(ə)ʒa
a ven'demo	nu pusɔ̃	nu pus(ə)ʒɔ̃
a ven'di	vu puse	vu pus(ə)ʒe
i 'vende	i(l)/ɛl pus	i(l)/ɛl pus(ə)ʒɔ̃

### 3.4 Change and competition

The wide-spread survival in Romance of synthetic forms, particularly in the verbal domain, observed above in Section 3.1, also poses a serious challenge to traditional accounts which identify phonetic erosion with the rise of analyticity (Wüest 1998, 94). Indeed, the survival of such forms highlights the fact that the emergence of analyticity in Romance does not involve a wholesale unitary move away from synthetic to analytic structures, but involves gradual changes and extensive periods of complementarity between competing synthetic and analytic structures (Bauer 2006). Latin comparative constructions, for instance, have since the earliest times displayed variation in the encoding of the standard of comparison, which could be marked synthetically through the ablative (e.g. **SOLE CLARIOR** 'SUN.ABL clear.COMPR' (= 'brighter than the sun')) or analytically through the particle construction introduced by the complemen-

tizer *QUAM* ‘than’ (e.g. *CLARIOR QUAM SOL* ‘clear.COMPR.NOM than sun.NOM’). However, as has long been recognized (cf. Bennett 1914, 292–297; Adams 1976, 83–86), in most cases the two were not simple free variants but were generally in complementary distribution, the ablative construction typically occurring, for example, in proverbial expressions, negative structures, and rhetorical questions. Remaining with the comparative, we may also note that alongside the synthetic formation in *-IOR* (as well as the superlative in *-ISSIMUS*) analytic formations with *PLUS* and *MAGIS* ‘more’ (and *MAXIME* or *PLURIMUM* ‘most’ in the case of the superlative) are also attested since the earliest period (e.g. *CLARIOR VS MAGIS/PLUS CLARUS*, *CLARISSIMUS VS MAXIME/PLURIMUM CLARUS*; Lindsay 1907, 38; Wüest 1998, 92), and indeed were obligatory with those adjectives ending in *-VUS* (e.g. *PLUS/MAXIME IDONEUS* ‘fitter/fittest’). In both cases, we know that it is the analytic variant that wins through in Romance, but this was not an immediate or foregone conclusion in the Latin period.

Similar early synthetic-analytic variations are found in other areas, including the expression of the future and the present perfect, where from an early date the synthetic forms were, to some extent, in competition with periphrastic *HABERE* formations (Pinkster 1987; Bauer 2006, 289). In the case of the future it is the analytic structure (itself eventually synthesizing) which ultimately triumphs (Section 2.2.2), but in the case of the perfect the original synthetic construction lives on and the competition between the two forms is far from over (Harris 1982), with the division of labour between the two available paradigms resolved differently across the *Romània* (cf. discussion of examples (7a–d) above). The case of the future considered here also raises the related issue of competing analytic structures: assuming that there was a general drift towards analyticity, how are we then to explain the fact that the already existing periphrastic future forms of the classical period (cf. *SUM* ‘I am’ + future active and passive participle) were themselves replaced by the new *HABERE* future periphrasis (Pinkster 1987, 221)?

In short, it is demonstrably false to portray the passage from Latin to Romance in terms of a simple and unified linear development from the synthetic to the analytic. In many cases, synthetic and analytic developments occurred in parallel and co-existed over long periods of time as contrasting and/or stylistic variants, in some cases up until the present-day. Where analytic structures have won through, these typically show a gradual development rather than a saltational change and co-exist alongside many original synthetic structures that have survived into Romance from the ancestral language. Furthermore, in some cases these same analytic innovations have ousted earlier classical periphrases and/or have gone on themselves to become synthetic, developments which are patently incompatible with the traditional thesis of an inexorable shift away from syntheticity towards ever-greater analyticity.

### 3.5 Explanatory power: conclusive remarks

By way of conclusion, we note that the postulation of an independent synthetic-analytic parameter is undermined by the general observation that all presumed cases of analytic development can otherwise be independently subsumed within the general theory of grammaticalization (Hopper/Traugott 1993, 17), integrating synthetic forms as those having achieved the highest degree of grammaticalization (Klausenburger 2000, 105, 152; Bauer 2006, 288). In particular, the analytic developments witnessed in the history of Romance are clearly not in any way exclusive to the Romance family, but simply exemplify a crosslinguistic tendency for synthetic structures, once weakened through phonetic erosion or other forces within the system, to be progressively replaced by new competing structures which “given the nature of syntactic change, cannot help but be analytic” (Vincent 1997a, 101). Analyticity therefore turns out to be a secondary development, ultimately the manifestation of a deeper change, but not, significantly, its cause (cf. also Schwegler 1990).

By way of illustration, one only has to consider the parallel analytic developments in the nominal and verbal domains such as the use of prepositions and auxiliaries replacing earlier inflections: here the chief issue is not the replacement of synthetic forms with analytic ones, but, rather, a structural change in linearization involving the head parameter that affects both inflectional morphology and syntax alike (Harris 1978, 6; Bauer 1995, 10, 24, 166; Oniga 2004, 52, 75). Accordingly, the principal innovation in inflectional morphology has been the move away from structures in which grammatical modification (head; henceforth in bold) follows the lexical element (dependent/modifier; henceforth underlined) to structures in which the relevant grammatical modification (head) precedes the lexical element (dependent/modifier), e.g. PAUL-o ‘Paul-DAT’ vs Fr. à Paul ‘to Paul’, COGITA-UERAT ‘think-**PFV.PST.3SG**’ vs Cat. *havia pensat* ‘**he**.had thought’.

In syntax too, verbal and nominal heads, once frequently preceded by such modifiers as direct objects/genitives and manner adverbs/adjectives, come instead to precede all such modifiers, witness the following Latin vs Italian contrasts: AMOREM UULT ‘love.ACC **he**.desires’ vs *desidera l’amore* ‘**he**.desires the love’, AMORIS UOLUNTAS ‘love.GEN **desire**.NOM’ vs *il desiderio dell’amore* ‘**the desire** of the love’, FORTITER PUGNAT ‘bravely **he**.fights’ vs *combatte coraggiosamente* ‘**he**.fights fiercely’, FORTIS MILES ‘brave **soldier**’ vs *soldato coraggioso* ‘**man** brave’. These latter examples, which clearly do not involve analyticity, therefore highlight that the relevant change in linear order in syntax is consistent with that observed in inflectional morphology, ultimately both derivable from a single integrated and comprehensive structural change involving a reversal in the head parameter, the significance of which we explore in the following section (cf. also Baldinger 1968).

## 4 Head parameter: deriving analyticity and configurationality

Without doubt the biggest problem for the traditional synthetic-analytic interpretation of the Latin–Romance transition is that it offers no explanation whatsoever for the observed changes. At bottom, the predominant analytic patterns noted in Romance are nothing more than the partial surface reflex of a more deep-rooted structural change, interpreted here as the result of a change in the head directionality parameter (cf. Tesnière 1959; Chomsky 1981; Hawkins 1983; Travis 1984). At least in its earliest attestations, Latin was predominantly head-final (19a) whereas Modern Romance is head-initial (19b), with Classical Latin representing a transitional stage in which both conservative head-final (20a) and innovative head-initial (20b) orders are found (Adams 1976; Ledgeway 2012, ch. 5).

(19) a. Archaic Lat.

quouis forma uirtutei **parisuma** fuit  
 whose beauty.NOM valour.DAT most.equal.NOM was  
 (*CIL* 1<sup>2</sup>.7)

b. Rom. a cărui frumusețe fuse  
 GEN.FSG whose beauty.F was  
**egală** cu vitejia sa  
 equal.FSG with valour his  
 ‘whose beauty was fully equal to his valour’

(20) Lat. a. constantibus hominibus **par** erat  
 resolute.ABL.PL men.ABL equal.NOM it.was  
 ‘[our apprehension] was equal to that of men of strong character’  
 (*Cic. Diu.* 2.113)

b. libertate esse **parem** ceteris  
 freedom.ABL be.INF equal.ACC rest.DAT.PL  
 ‘the being equal to the rest of the citizens in freedom’  
 (*Cic. Phil.* 1.34)

In terms of structural organization, Latin has also been argued to exhibit a non-configurational syntax in which relationships between individual linguistic items are signalled lexocentrically through the forms of the items themselves (case inflections, agreement), whereas in Romance relationships between related linguistic items are encoded by their fixed positions relative to each other (Vincent 1988, 53–54, 62–63; 1997b, 149, 163; 1998, 423–424; Ledgeway 2011b, §3; 2012, ch. 3). Consequently, in Latin not only is it difficult to establish fixed orders for individual heads and their associated complements or modifiers within their given phrase (21a,b), even adja-

gency between semantically-related items is not a requirement (Marouzeau 1949, 42; 1953, 62; Ernout/Thomas <sup>1</sup>1953, 162; Oniga 2004, 101–102; Powell 2010), witness frequent discontinuous structures such as (22a) where, for example, noun and modifier are separated by an intervening nominal. In Romance, by contrast, all elements appear to have pre-established positions (21c) and the languages do not readily license hyperbaton (22b).

- (21) a. Lat. Caesar suas copias in proximum  
 Caesar.NOM his.ACC troops.ACC in next.ACC  
 collem subducit  
 hill.ACC withdraws  
 ‘Caesar leads off his forces to the next hill.’  
 (Caes. *B.G.* 1.22.3)
- b. Lat. copias suas Caesar in proximum  
 troops.ACC his.ACC Caesar.NOM in next.ACC  
 collem subduxit  
 hill.ACC withdrew  
 ‘Caesar drew off his forces to the next hill.’  
 (Caes. *B.G.* 1.24.1)
- c. Fr. César retire ses troupes (\*ses) (\*César)  
 Caesar withdraws his troops his Caesar
- (22) a. Lat. legio pompeiana, celeris spe  
 legion.NOM Pompeian.NOM quick.GEN hope.ABL  
 subsidii confirmata  
 help.GEN assured  
 (Caes. *B.C.* 3.69.2)
- b. Rom. legiunea pompeiană, întărită de (\*rapid)  
 legion=the Pompeian strengthened by quick  
 nădejdea unui ajutor rapid  
 hope=the of.a help quick  
 ‘the Pompeian legion, encouraged by the hope of speedy assistance’

At the macroparametric level, the passage from Latin to Romance is therefore arguably marked by a reversal in the head (cf. (19)–(20)) and configurationality (cf. (21)–(22)) macroparameters. However, following Ledgeway (2012, ch. 5; in press a,b), both perceived changes can be reduced to a single macroparametric change, with the effects of configurationality derived from the reversal in the head parameter. In essence, the perceived non-configurationality of Latin can be broken down into two main ingredients: (i) grammatically-free word order which *a priori* allows complements to occur on either side of their head; and (ii) pragmatically-driven word order, often producing discontinuous structures resulting from the greater accessibility of

topic- and focus-fronting to positions situated in the left edge of individual functional projections.

#### 4.1 Grammatically-free word order

The gradual rigidification of word order in the passage from Latin to Romance is to be understood as the surface effect of a progressive reversal of the directionality parameter (for in-depth qualitative and quantitative analyses, see Ledgeway 2012, 202–235). Assuming the ordering of heads and complements in the development from archaic Latin to Romance to have undergone a shift from head-last (cf. (19a)) to head-first (cf. (19b)), the greater freedom of word order traditionally recognized for Classical Latin can be seen as a result of its occupying an (artificially sustained) intermediate position in this change, resulting in mixed (dis)harmonic linearizations like (20a,b).<sup>16</sup> Formally, this linear variation can be captured in terms of the application or otherwise of a L(inearization)-movement termed roll-up (cf. Ledgeway 2012, ch. 5; Biberauer/Holmberg/Roberts 2014). Thus, assuming the Universal Base Hypothesis (Kayne 1994), when a complement surfaces to the left of its head, it must have moved leftwards, i.e. rolled up, across the latter from its base-generated position to a derived (inner) specifier. Both options from the verbal and nominal domains are exemplified with the following (near-)minimal pairs:

- (23) a. [<sub>v-VP</sub> **instruit** [<sub>DP</sub> aciem]]  
           drew.up.3SG    battle.line.ACC  
           (Liv. 33.15.19)
- b. [<sub>v-VP</sub> [<sub>Spec</sub> aciem] **instruit** [<sub>DP</sub> ~~aciem~~]]  
           battle.line.ACC    drew.up.3SG  
           (Liv. 7.37.7)  
           ‘(he/the Samnite army) drew up battle line’

- (24) a. [<sub>DP</sub> **metum** [<sub>DP</sub> rerum nouarum]]  
           fear.ACC            things.GEN    new.GEN

---

**16** In particular, this oscillation between head-last and head-first structures in the history of Latin can be captured along two axes of variation (cf. Ledgeway 2012, 236), the first in terms of diachronic variation (head-last (archaic Latin) → head-initial (early/late Latin)) and the second in terms of diaphasic (and no doubt diastatic and diamesic) variation (head-final (formal, literary) vs head-initial (subliterary, colloquial)). The facts can therefore be interpreted in terms of a progressive reversal of the head parameter from a regular head-final setting towards a head-initial setting, with Classical Latin displaying an ambivalent behaviour on account of its non-uniform characterization in relation to these two dimensions of variation (cf. 20a–b), namely, non-archaic (predominantly head-first), but formal and literary (predominantly head-final).

‘fear of revolution’

(Cic. *Att.* 5.21.3)

- b. [DP [Spec urbanarum rerum] **metum** [DP ~~urbanarum r.~~]]  
 urban.GEN things.GEN fear.ACC

‘because of concern about the situation in the city’

(Cic. *Att.* 5.18.1)

In this light, the distinct grammatical organization of Romance and, in particular, its rigid head-complement order, now finds a straightforward explanation in terms of the loss of roll-up from the grammar, as exemplified in the corresponding French structures:

- (25) Fr. a. ils (\*en ligne) se **rangèrent** en ligne  
 they in line self=arranged in line  
 b. la (\*des choses) **crainte** des choses  
 the of.the things fear of.the things

## 4.2 Pragmatically-driven word order

Besides fluctuation at the syntactic level between a conservative head-final and an innovative head-initial order, pragmatics is also recognized to play a significant role in determining Latin word order. This aspect of Latin sentential organization, largely absent in Romance (≥14 Focus Fronting), can be captured by assuming the greater accessibility of topic- and focus-fronting to left-peripheral positions situated in the left edge of individual functional projections in apparent violation of the Left Branch Condition (LBC; Ross 1967). In Romance, we have seen (cf. Section 2) that functional structure is readily made visible through the lexicalization of head positions with functional categories such as determiners, auxiliaries and complementizers. By contrast, Latin lacks such functional categories, but displays ubiquitous evidence for the presence of functional structure through its extensive exploitation of topic- and focus-fronting to the left-edge specifier positions of these same functional projections. By way of illustration, consider the examples in (26), where SpecDP is overtly signalled by the discontinuous focused adjective *summo* in the Latin example (26a), whereas in its Spanish translation (26b) it is the head of DP that is overtly spelt out by the presence of the indefinite article *un* while the adjectival modifier *del más alto* remains *in situ*.

- (26) a. [DP [Spec **summo**] [D' Ø [NP homo [~~summo~~ ingenio]]]]  
 highest.ABL man.NOM talent.ABL  
 (Cic. *De or.* 1.104)  
 b. [DP [Spec Ø] [D' **un** [NP hombre [del más alto talento]]]]  
 a man of.the more high talent

- c. \*<sub>[DP [Spec del más alto] [D' un [NP hombre[del más alto talento]]]]</sub>  
           of.the more high a man talent  
           ‘a man of the highest ability’

However, the availability of edge-fronting cannot be reduced to the absence/presence of articles and concomitant availability of functional categories like determiners in the two languages (for detailed discussion, see Ledgeway 2014b; in press a), but follows from the head parameter, the setting of which directly determines the application or otherwise of antilocality in constraining movement.<sup>17</sup> In particular, we propose that antilocality is not a blanket constraint on all instances of local movement, but should be parametrized across languages, a conclusion already independently forced upon us by our analysis of grammatically free word order in Latin where head-finality was interpreted as the output of a roll-up operation that raises the complement to the specifier to the left of its selecting head. Antilocality, however, predicts that roll-up should be excluded as a movement which is *a priori* too local/short. The suspension of antilocality therefore appears to constitute a *sine qua non* for languages like Latin which exhibit head-final orders derived through roll-up movement in accordance with the proposals in Kayne (1994, 47–48, 52–53) and recent work on the Final-Over-Final-Constraint (cf. Biberauer/Holmberg/Roberts 2008; 2009; 2014; Biberauer/Newton/Sheehan 2009; Biberauer/Sheehan 2012). In Romance, by contrast, the head parameter is consistently aligned with the head-initial setting such that roll-up, and hence antilocal movement, never arises in the grammars of these varieties. We thus naturally derive from the different settings of the head parameter a concomitant parametrization in the role of antilocality in constraining movement. In short, the application or otherwise of antilocality is predicted to be parasitic on the head-initial vs head-final parametric distinction: once its potential effects are quashed by the positive evidence of head-finality required to motivate roll-up, it fails to apply across the board licensing other short/local movements such as edge-fronting in apparent violation of the LBC.

### 4.3 Head parameter and syntheticity-analyticity distinction

We have observed how perceived changes in configurationality in the Latin-Romance transition, reducible to the progressive loss of roll-up and left edge-fronting, can ultimately be derived from a gradual reversal in the head directionality parameter. This is a significant result as it allows us to explain a series of significant changes

<sup>17</sup> In very basic terms, antilocality is a principle which rules out uneconomical movements considered “too” local/short, forcing movement to involve at least raising outside of the immediate minimal domain or phase thereby crossing at least one (phasal) XP boundary (cf. Grohmann 2000; 2003; Abels 2003; Bošković 2005).

between Latin and Romance in terms of a single macroparametric change, doing away with the need for a somewhat dubious independent configurationality macroparameter, the relevant effects of which now fall out for free as part of the head parameter. In addition to deriving the superficial effects of (non-)configurationality, the reversal in the head parameter also allows us to understand the observed changes in syntheticity and analyticity in the Latin–Romance transition. In particular, we take Romance analyticity to follow from a rigidification of the head parameter and its consequences for antilocality leading to the loss of edge-fronting to the DP left periphery. In this regard, we have seen that whereas Latin typically spells out left-peripheral specifier positions through roll-up and edge-fronting (cf. (24a)), Romance typically spells out the corresponding head positions with functional categories (cf. (24b)), giving rise to an important typological difference in the syntax of Latin and Romance which privilege an XP-type and X-type syntax, respectively (cf. Koopman’s (1996) *Principle of Projection Activation*, and the discussion of the head-/dependent-marking distinction in Ledgeway 2012, ch. 6). We thus conclude that the shift from syntheticity to analyticity represents a reflex of the change from head-finality to head-initiality, signalling a move away from a Latin dependent-marking syntax, in which various dependents are raised to lexical and functional left-peripheral specifier positions in apparent violation of antilocality, towards a Romance head-marking syntax in which functional head positions are increasingly spelt out under direct lexicalization or movement (for a theoretical implementation of this generalization, see Ledgeway 2014b; in press a).

There thus emerges a correlation between head-finality and syntheticity on the one hand, and between head-initiality and analyticity on the other (Bauer 1995, 166; Dryer 2009; Ledgeway 2011b, 440–442), inasmuch as “left-branching morphological structures tend to become synthetic forms, whereas right-branching elements remain separate” (Bauer 1995, 125–126). Significant in this regard is Ledgeway’s (2012, §5.4.2) observation that Latin displays a degree of competition across different areas of the grammar between inherited head-final structures and innovative head-initial structures, where the relevant functional head is systematically phonologically null and overt, respectively. This can be seen in the following examples which contrast the AcI (27a), a head-final construction introduced by a null head-final complementizer (cf. Cecchetto/Oniga 2002), with a finite complementation structure introduced by an overt head-initial complementizer *quod* (27b), and bare case-marked nominals (28a), here analyzed as silent postpositional phrases headed by a head-final null adposition (cf. also Emonds 1985, 224), with head-initial prepositional structures (28b):

- (27) a.  $[[\text{tacitum} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{dicere}]_{V-TP}] \emptyset_{CP}$  credo  
           silent.ACC   you.ACC say.INF                   I.believe  
           ‘I fancy you say to yourself’  
           (Mart. 6.5.3)

b. scis            enim [CP **quod** [V-TP epulum dedi]]  
 you.know for            that            feast.ACC I.gave  
 ‘for you remember that I gave a public banquet once’  
 (Petr. *Sat.* 71.9)

(28) a. Pompeius [...] proficiscitur [[Canusium] Ø<sub>PP</sub>]  
 Pompey.NOM sets.out Canusium.ACC  
 ‘Pompey...sets out for Canusium’  
 (Caes. *B.C.* 1.24.1)

b. miles [PP **ad** [Capuam]] profectus sum  
 soldier.NOM to Capua.ACC set.out I.am  
 ‘I set out as a soldier for Capua’  
 (Cic. *Sen.* 10)

We thus witness a parallel development in the sentential and nominal domains where an archaic head-final structure headed by a null complementizer (Acl) or null adposition (bare case-marked nominal) is progressively rivalled, and eventually replaced in Romance, by an innovative head-initial structure headed by an overt complementizer and preposition, respectively. This is also what we see in the development of the DP, which passes from an original head-final arrangement with a null D head (Latin, without articles) to a head-initial arrangement with an overt D head (Romance, with articles). Remarkably, then, many further well-known changes in the passage from Latin to Romance traditionally classified as part of the drift from syntheticity to analyticity, including the replacement of the Acl with finite complementation and the loss of the case system in favour of prepositions and the emergence of articles, can also be shown to follow from the progressive reversal in the head parameter (for further discussion, see Ledgeway 2014b; in press a).

## 5 References

- Abels, Klaus (2003), *Successive Cyclicity, Anti-locality, and Adposition Stranding*, University of Connecticut, Storrs, unpublished thesis.
- Adams, James (1976), *A typological approach to Latin word order*, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81, 70–99.
- Adams, James (1991), *Some neglected evidence for Latin HABEO with infinitive: the order of the constituents*, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 89, 131–196.
- Adams, James (2011), *Late Latin*, in: James Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, 257–283.
- Adams, James (2013), *Social Variation and the Latin Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Aebischer, Paul (1948), *Contribution à la protohistoire des articles “ille” et “ipse” dans les langues romanes*, *Cultura neolatina* 8, 181–203.

- Alboiu, Gabriela/Motapanyane, Virginia (2000), *The generative approach to Romanian grammar: an overview*, in: Virginia Motapanyane (ed.), *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*, Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1–48.
- Alfonzetti, Giovanna (1998), *Passato prossimo e passato remoto: dimensioni di variazione*, in: Giovanni Ruffino (ed.), *Atti del XXI congresso internazionale di linguistica e filologia romanza. Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, Università di Palermo 18–24 settembre 1995*, vol. 2, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 27–37.
- Badia Margarit, Antonio (1962), *Gramàtica catalana*, 2 vol., Madrid, Gredos.
- Badia i Margarit, Antoni M. (1995), *Gramàtica de la llengua catalana. Descriptiva, normativa, diatòpica, diastràtica*, Barcelona, Proa.
- Baldinger, Kurt (1968), *Post- und Prädeterminierung im Französischen*, in: Kurt Baldinger (ed.), *Festschrift Walther von Wartburg zum 80. Geburtstag. 18. Mai 1968*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 87–106.
- Bartoli, Matteo (1906), *Das Dalmatische. Altromanische Sprachreste von Veglia bis Ragusa und ihre Stellung in der Apennino-balkanischen Romania I, II*, Vienna, Hölder.
- Bauer, Brigitte (1995), *The Emergence and Development of SVO Patterning in Latin and French*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Bauer, Brigitte (2001), *Syntactic innovation in Latin poetry? The origins of the Romance adverbial formation in “-ment(e)”*, in: Arpád Orbán/Marc van der Poel (edd.), *Ad Litteras. Latin Studies in Honour of J. H. Brouwers*, Nijmegen, Nijmegen University Press, 29–43.
- Bauer, Brigitte (2003), *The adverbial formation in “mente” in Vulgar and Late Latin. A problem in grammaticalization*, in: Heikki Solin/Martti Leiwo/Hilla Halla-aho (edd.), *Latin vulgaire et latin tardif VI. Actes du VI<sup>ème</sup> colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, 29 août–2 septembre 2000*, Helsinki, Hildesheim, Olms, 439–457.
- Bauer, Brigitte (2006), *“Synthetic” vs “analytic” in Romance. The importance of varieties*, in: Randall Gess/Deborah Arteaga (edd.), *Historical Romance Linguistics. Retrospective and Perspectives*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 287–304.
- Beckmann, Gustav (1963), *Die Nachfolgekonstruktionen des instrumentalen Ablativs im Spätlatein und im Französischen* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 106), Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Benincà, Paola (1994), *Un’ipotesi sulla sintassi delle lingue romanze medievali*, in: Paola Benincà (ed.), *La variazione sintattica. Studi di dialettologia romanza*, Bologna, il Mulino, 177–194.
- Benincà, Paola (2013), *Caratteristiche del V2 romanzo. Lingue romanze antiche, ladino dolomitico e portoghese*, in: Federica Cognola/Ermengildo Bidese (edd.), *Introduzione alla linguistica del mòcheno*, Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier, 65–84.
- Benincà, Paola/Poletto, Cecilia (1997), *The diachronic development of a modal verb of necessity*, in: Ans van Kemenade/Nigel Vincent (edd.), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 94–118.
- Benincà, Paola/Poletto, Cecilia (2004), *Topic, focus, and V2. Defining the CP sublayers*, in: Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Volume 2*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 52–75.
- Bennett, Charles (1914), *Syntax of Early Latin. II. The Cases*, Boston, Allyn and Bacon.
- Bentley, Delia (2000a), *I costrutti condizionali in siciliano: Un’analisi diacronica*, *Revue romane* 35, 3–20.
- Bentley, Delia (2000b), *Semantica e sintassi nello sviluppo dei costrutti condizionali: il caso del siciliano*, *Revue romane* 35, 163–176.
- Benveniste, Émile (1968), *Mutations of linguistic categories*, in: Winfred P. Lehmann/Yakov Malkiel (edd.), *Directions for Historical Linguistics. A Symposium*, Austin, TX, University of Texas, 83–94.

- Biberauer, Theresa/Holmberg, Anders/Roberts, Ian (2008), *Structure and linearization in disharmonic word orders*, in: Charles Chang/Hannah Haynie (edd.), *Proceedings of the 26<sup>th</sup> West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Somerville, MA, Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 96–104.
- Biberauer, Theresa/Holmberg, Anders/Roberts, Ian (2009), *Linearization and the architecture of grammar: a view from the Final-Over-Final Constraint*, in: Vincenzo Moscati/Emilio Servidio (edd.), *StiL - Studies in Linguistics (Proceedings of XXXV Incontro di Grammatica Generativa)* 3, 78–91.
- Biberauer, Theresa/Holmberg, Anders/Roberts, Ian (2014), *A syntactic universal and its consequences*, *Linguistic Inquiry* 45, 169–225.
- Biberauer, Theresa/Newton, Glenda/Sheehan, Michelle (2009), *Limiting synchronic and diachronic variation and change: the Final-over-Final Constraint*, *Language and Linguistics* 10, 701–743.
- Biberauer, Theresa/Sheehan, Michelle (2012), *Disharmony, antisymmetry, and the Final-over-Final Constraint*, in: Myriam Extebarria/Vidal Valmala (edd.), *Ways of Structure Building*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 206–244.
- Bichakjian, Bernard (1987), *The evolution of word order: a paedomorphic explanation*, in: Anna Giacalone Ramat/Anna Onofrio Carruba/Giuliano Bernini (edd.), *Papers from the 7<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 87–107.
- Bošković, Željko (2005), *On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP*, *Studia Linguistica* 59, 1–45.
- Bourciez, Édouard (<sup>4</sup>1956), *Éléments de linguistique romane*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Bourova, Vaira (2005), *À la recherche du “conditionnel latin”: les constructions “infinitif + forme de ‘habere’” examinées à partir d’un corpus électronique*, in: Claus Pusch/Johannes Kabatek/Wolfgang Raible (edd.), *Romanistische Korpuslinguistik II. Korpora und diachrone Sprachwissenschaft*, Tübingen, Narr, 303–316.
- Bourova, Vaira (2007), *Les constructions latines infinitif + “habebam” vs infinitif + “habui” et le développement du conditionnel roman*, in: David Trotter (ed.), *Actes du XXIV<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes, Aberystwyth 2004*, vol. 2, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 461–474.
- Bourova, Vaira/Tasmowski, Liliane (2007), *La préhistoire des futurs romans – ordre de constituants et sémantique*, *Cahiers Chronos* 19, 25–41.
- Busquet Isart, Núria (2010), *El parlar salat: Descripció, àmbit geogràfic i ús*, Universitat de Barcelona, unpublished thesis.
- Calabrese, Andrea (1993), *The sentential complementation of Salentino: a study of a language without infinitival clauses*, in: Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier, 28–98.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (2009), *Latin syntax and Greek*, in: Philip Baldi/Pierluigi Cuzzolin (edd.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 1: *Syntax of the Sentence*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 65–193.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (1997), *Subjects and clause structure*, in: Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *The New Comparative Syntax*, London, Longman, 33–63.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (2004), *Toward a cartography of subject positions*, in: Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Volume 2*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 115–165.
- Cecchetto, Carlo/Oniga, Renato (2002), *Consequences of the analysis of Latin infinitival clauses for the theory of case and control*, *Lingue e linguaggio* 1, 151–189.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981), *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2006), *Restructuring and Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Volume 4*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Coleman, Robert (1971), *The origin and development of Latin "habeo" + infinitive*, *Classical Quarterly* 21, 215–232.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra (1992), *Remarks on the determiner system of Rumanian*, *Probus* 4, 189–260.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra (1995), *Romanian genitive constructions*, in: Guglielmo Cinque/Giuliana Giusti (edd.), *Advances in Roumanian Linguistics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 1–54.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra/Nicolae, Alexandru (2009), *Evoluția articolului hotărât și genitivul în româna veche*, in: Rodica Zafiu/Gabriela Stoica/Mihaela Constantinescu (edd.), *Limba română: teme actuale*, București, Editura Universității din București, 647–667.
- Corr, Alice (2017), *Ibero-Romance and the Syntax of the Utterance*, University of Cambridge, Ph.D. dissertation.
- Coseriu, Eugenio (1987), *Le latin vulgaire et le type linguistique roman (À propos de la thèse de Humboldt: "Es sanken Formen, nicht aber die Form")*, in: József Herman (ed.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif. Actes du 1<sup>er</sup> colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Pécs, 2–5 septembre 1985)*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 53–64.
- Coseriu, Eugenio ([1971] 1988), *Der romanische Sprachtypus. Versuch einer neuen Typologisierung der romanischen Sprachen*, in: Jörn Albrecht (ed.), *Energie und Ergon. Sprachliche Variation – Sprachgeschichte – Sprachtypologie. Band I. Schriften von Eugenio Coseriu (1965–1987)*, Tübingen, Narr, 207–224.
- Cruschina, Silvio/Ledgeway, Adam (2016), *Structure of the clause*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 556–574.
- D'hulst, Yves (2004), *French and Italian conditionals: from etymology to representation*, in: Jacqueline Guéron/Jacqueline Lecarme (edd.), *The Syntax of Tense and Aspect: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Expression of Tense and Aspect*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 181–201.
- Diez, Friedrich (1874), *Grammaire des langues romanes. Livre II: Flexion*, Paris, Franck.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen/Giurgea, Ion (2006), *The suffixation of definite articles in Balkan languages*, *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 51, 73–104.
- Dragomirescu, Adina/Nicolae, Alexandru (2016), *Case*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 911–923.
- Dryer, Matthew (2009), *The branching direction theory of word order correlations revisited*, in: Sergio Scalise/Elisabetta Magni/Antonietta Bisetto (edd.), *Universals of Language Today*, Berlin, Springer, 185–207.
- Dufter, Andreas/Octavio de Toledo, Álvaro S. (2014), *Introduction*, in: Andreas Dufter/Álvaro S. Octavio de Toledo (edd.), *Left Sentence Peripheries in Spanish. Diachronic, Variationist and Comparative Perspectives*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 1–20.
- Dufter, Andreas/Stark, Elisabeth (2007), *La linguistique variationnelle et les changements linguistiques "mal compris": le cas du "ne" de négation*, in: Bernard Combettes/Christiane Marchello-Nizia (edd.), *Études sur le changement linguistique en français*, Nancy, Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 115–128.
- Emonds, Joseph (1985), *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Ernout, Alfred/Thomas, François (1993, <sup>1</sup>1953), *Syntaxe latine*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Fleischman, Suzanne (1982), *The Future in Thought and Language. Diachronic Evidence from Romance*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Fruyt, Michèle (2003), *Anaphore, cataphore et déixis dans l'Itinerarium d'Égérie*, in: Heikki Solin/Martti Leiwo/Hilla Halla-aho (edd.), *Latin vulgaire et latin tardif VI. Actes du VI<sup>ème</sup> colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, 29 août – 2 septembre 2000, Helsinki*, Hildesheim, Olms, 99–119.
- Giurgea, Ion (2012), *The origin of the Romanian "possessive-genitival" article "al" and the development of the demonstrative system*, *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 57, 35–65.

- Giurgea, Ion/Remberger, Eva-Maria (2016), *Illocutionary force*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 863–878.
- Grandgent, Charles (<sup>2</sup>1909), *An Outline of the Phonology and Morphology of Old Provençal*, Boston, MA, Heath.
- Green, John (1987), *The evolution of Romance auxiliaries: criteria and chronology*, in: Martin Harris/ Paolo Ramat (edd.), *The Historical Development of Auxiliaries*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 255–267.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes (2000), *Prolific Peripheries: A Radical View from the Left*, University of Maryland, College Park, unpublished thesis.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes (2003), *Prolific Domains: On the Anti-locality of Movement Dependencies*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Harris, Alice/Campbell, Lyle (1995), *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, Martin (1970), *The verbal systems of Latin and French*, Transactions of the Philological Society 69, 62–90.
- Harris, Martin (1978), *The Evolution of French Syntax: A Comparative Approach*, London, Longman.
- Harris, Martin (1980), *Noun phrases and verb phrases in Romance*, Transactions of the Philological Society 78, 62–80.
- Harris, Martin (1982), *The “past simple” and the “present perfect” in Romance*, in: Nigel Vincent/ Martin Harris (edd.), *Studies in the Romance Verb*, London, Croom Helm, 42–70.
- Haverling, Gerd (2010), *Actionality, tense, and viewpoint*, in: Philip Baldi/Pierluigi Cuzzolin (edd.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 2: *Constituent Syntax: Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 277–523.
- Hawkins, John (1983), *Word Order Universals*, New York, Academic Press.
- Heap, David (2000), *La variation grammaticale en géolinguistique: les pronoms sujet en roman central*, Munich, Lincom Europa.
- Heine, Bernd (1993), *Auxiliaries*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Herman, József (1989), *Accusativus cum infinitivo et subordonné à “quod”, “quia” en latin tardif – nouvelles remarques sur un vieux problème*, in: Gualtiero Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin. Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna, 1–5 April 1985*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 133–152.
- Herman, József (2000), *Vulgar Latin*, Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Hewson, John/Bubenik, Vit (2006), *From Case to Adposition. The Development of Configurational Syntax in Indo-European Languages*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul/Traugott, Elizabeth (1993), *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von (1836), *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluß auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*, Berlin, Druckerei der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hummel, Martin (2011), *The interfaces of adjective and adverb in Romance. Facts and arguments for discussion*. <http://sites.google.com/site/rsgadjadv/>
- Hummel, Martin (2014), *The adjective-adverb interface in Romance and English*, in: Petra Sleeman/ Freek Van de Velde/Harry Perridon (edd.), *Adjectives in Germanic and Romance*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, Benjamins, 35–71.
- Hummel, Martin (in press), *Sincronía y diacronía de los llamados adjetivos adverbializados y de los adverbios en “-mente”*, Anuario de Letras, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Jespersen, Otto (1917), *Negation in English and Other Languages*, Copenhagen, Host.
- Jones, Michael Allan (1988), *Auxiliary verbs in Sardinian*, Transactions of the Philological Society 86, 173–203.

- Juge, Matthew (2006), *Morphological factors in the grammaticalization of the Catalan “go” past*, *Diachronica* 23, 313–339.
- Karlssoon, Keith (1981), *Syntax and Affixation. The Evolution of “mente” in Latin and Romance*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Kayne, Richard (1975), *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard (1994), *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Klausenburger, Jurgen (2000), *Grammaticalization. Studies in Latin and Romance Morphosyntax*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Koopman, Hilda (1996), *The Spec Head Configuration*, in: Edward Garrett/Felicia Lee (edd.), *Syntax at Sunset*, *UCLA Working Papers in Syntax and Semantics* 1, 37–64.
- La Fauci, Nunzio (1998), *Riflettendo sul mutamento morfosintattico. Nel latino, verso il romanzo*, in: Paolo Ramat/Elisa Roma (edd.), *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX Congresso Internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana, Pavia, 26–28 settembre 1996*, Roma, Bulzoni, 519–545.
- La Fauci, Nunzio (2006), *Dinamiche sistematiche. Perifrasi perfettive e futuro sintetico. Dal latino al romanzo*, in: Renato Oniga/Luigi Zennaro (edd.), *Atti della Giornata di linguistica latina, Venezia, 7 maggio 2004*, Venezia, Cafoscarina, 101–131.
- Leal Cruz, Pedro (2003), *El español tradicional de La Palma*, La Laguna, Centro de la cultura popular canaria.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2004), *Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali. La doppia serie di complementatori*, *Rivista italiana di dialettologia* 27, 89–147.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2005), *Moving through the Left Periphery. The dual complementiser system in the dialects of Southern Italy*, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103, 336–396.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2008a), *Sulla storia dei verbi copulari dei dialetti dell’alto Meridione. Il caso del napoletano*, *The Italianist* 28, 281–301.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2008b), *Satisfying V2 in early Romance: Merge vs Move*, *Journal of Linguistics* 44, 437–440.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2011a), *Grammaticalization from Latin to Romance*, in: Bernd Heine/Heiko Narrog (edd.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 719–728.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2011b), *Syntactic and morphosyntactic typology and change*, in: Martin Maiden/John Charles Smith/Adam Ledgeway (edd.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, vol. 1: *Structures*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 382–471.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2012), *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2014a), *Romance auxiliary selection in light of Romanian evidence*, in: Gabriela Pană Dindelegan et al. (edd.), *Diachronic Variation in Romanian*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 3–35.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2014b), *Parametrul lui poziției centrului și efectele sale pragmatice în trecerea de la latină la limbile române*, in: Rodica Zafiu/Adina Dragomirescu/Alexandru Nicolae (edd.), *Diacronie și sincronie în studiul limbii române*, București, Editura Universității din București, 11–26.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2015), *Parallels in Romance nominal and clausal microvariation*, *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 60, 105–127.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2016a), *Clausal complementation*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1013–1028.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2016b), *From coordination to subordination: the grammaticalisation of progressive and andative aspect in the dialects of Salento*, in: Adriana Cardoso et al. (edd.), *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 157–184.

- Ledgeway, Adam (in press a), *From Latin to Romance: the decline of edge-fronting*, in: Adriana Cardosa/Ana Maria Martins (edd.), *Word Order Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam (in press b), *From Latin to Romance syntax: the great leap*, in: Paola Crisma/Giuseppe Longobardi (edd.), *The Oxford Handbook of Diachronic and Historical Linguistics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Lehmann, Christian (1988), *Towards a typology of clause linkage*, in: John Haiman/Sandra Thompson (edd.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 181–225.
- Lindsay, Wallace (1907), *Syntax of Plautus*, Oxford, James Parker & Co.
- Loporcaro Michele (1999), *Il futuro CANTARE-HABEO nell'Italia meridionale*, *Archivio glottologico italiano* 84, 67–114.
- Loporcaro, Michele (2008), *Opposizioni di caso nel pronome personale: i dialetti del Mezzogiorno in prospettiva romanza*, in: Alessandro De Angelis (ed.), *I dialetti meridionali tra arcaismo e interferenza*, Palermo, Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani, 207–235.
- Luís, Ana/Spencer, Andrew (2005), *A paradigm function account of “mesocclisis” in European Portuguese*, in: Geert Booij/Jaap van Marle (edd.), *Yearbook of Morphology 2004*, Dordrecht, Springer, 177–228.
- Lyons, Christopher (1999), *Definiteness*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Maiden, Martin (1996), *Ipotesi sulle origini del condizionale analitico come “futuro del passato” in italiano*, in: Paola Benincà et al. (edd.), *Italiano e dialetto nel tempo. Saggi di grammatica per Giulio C. Lepschy*, Roma, Bulzoni, 149–173.
- Maiden, Martin (2011a), *Morphological persistence*, in: Martin Maiden/John Charles Smith/Adam Ledgeway (edd.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, vol. 1: *Structures*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 155–215 and 699–706.
- Maiden, Martin (2011b), *Morphophonological innovation*, in: Martin Maiden/John Charles Smith/Adam Ledgeway (edd.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, vol. 1: *Structures*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 216–267 and 706–713.
- Manzini, M. Rita/Savoia, Leonardo M. (2005), *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*, 3 vol., Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Marouzeau, Jules (1949), *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine. III. Les articulations de l'énoncé*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Marouzeau, Jules (1953), *L'ordre des mots en latin. Volume complémentaire*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- Meillet, Antoine (1964, <sup>1</sup>1937), *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, Paris, Champion.
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón (<sup>4</sup>1956), *Orígenes del español. Estado lingüístico de la península ibérica hasta el siglo XI*, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm (1894), *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen. II. Formenlehre*, Leipzig, Reisland.
- Molinelli, Piera (1998), *Dai casi alle preposizioni in latino: analisi sociolinguistica e spiegazione tipologica*, in: Paolo Ramat/Elisa Roma (edd.), *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX Congresso Internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana, Pavia, 26–28 settembre 1996*, Roma, Bulzoni, 147–166.
- Moll, Francesc de B. (1993), *El parlar de Mallorca*, Mallorca, Moll.
- Monachesi, Paola (2005), *The Verbal Complex in Romance. A Case Study in Grammatical Interfaces*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Muller, Henri (1929), *A Chronology of Vulgar Latin*, Halle, Niemeyer.
- Nicolae, Alexandru (2015a), *The parameter of definiteness: diachronic and synchronic evidence*, in: Virginia Hill (ed.), *Formal Approaches to DPs in Old Romanian*, Boston/Leiden, Brill, 17–61.

- Nicolae, Alexandru (2015b), *On the syntactic specialization of the Romanian demonstratives and the grammaticalization of the article "cel"*, *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 60, 47–70.
- Nocentini, Alberto (1990), *L'uso dei dimostrativi nella Peregrinatio Egeriae e la genesi dell'articolo romanzo*, in: Alberto Fatucchi (ed.), *Atti del convegno internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae*, Arezzo, Accademia Petrarca di lettere e arti e scienze, 137–158.
- Nocentini, Alberto (2001), *La genesi del futuro e del condizionale sintetico romanzo*, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 117, 367–401.
- Olivieri, Michèle (2004), *Paramètre du sujet nul et inversion du sujet dans les dialectes italiens et occitans*, *Cahiers de grammaire: Questions de linguistique et de dialectologie romanes* 29, 105–120.
- Olivieri, Michèle (2010), *Syntax and corpora*, *Corpus* 9, 7–19.
- Olivieri, Michèle (2011), *Typology or reconstruction: the benefits of dialectology for diachronic analysis*, in: Janine Berns/Heike Jacobs/Tobias Scheer (edd.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2009. Selected Papers from "Going Romance" Nice 2009*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 239–253.
- Oniga, Renato (2004), *Il latino. Breve introduzione linguistica*, Milano, Angeli.
- Paoli, Sandra (2005), *COMP: a multi-talented category. Evidence from Romance*, in: Laura Brugè et al. (edd.), *Contributions to the XXX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, Venezia, Cafoscarina, 185–202.
- Parkinson, Jennie (2009), *A Diachronic Study into the Distribution of Two Italo-Romance Synthetic Conditional Forms*, University of St Andrews, unpublished thesis.
- Parry, Mair (2013), *Negation in the history of Italo-Romance*, in: David Willis/Christopher Lucas/Anne Breitbarth (edd.), *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 77–118.
- Parry, Mair/Lombardi, Alessandra (2007), *The interaction of semantics, pragmatics and syntax in the spread of the articles in the early vernaculars of Italy*, in: Anna Laura Lepschy/Arturo Tosi (edd.), *Histories and Dictionaries of the Languages of Italy*, Ravenna, Longo, 77–97.
- Penny, Ralph (2000), *Variation and Change in Spanish*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Perea, Maria Pilar (2005), *El parlar salat*, in: Antoni M. Alcover. *Dialectòleg, gramàtic i polemista*, Barcelona, Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 69–83.
- Pérez Saldanya, Manuel/Hualde, José Ignacio (2003), *On the origin and evolution of the Catalan periphrastic preterit*, in: Claus Pusch/Andreas Wesch (edd.), *Verbalperiphrasen in den (ibero-) romanischen Sprachen*, Hamburg, Buske, 47–60.
- Pinkster, Harm (1987), *The strategy and chronology of the development of future and perfect tense auxiliaries in Latin*, in: Martin Harris/Paolo Ramat (edd.), *The Historical Development of Auxiliaries*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 193–223.
- Pinkster, Harm (1989), *Some methodological remarks on research on future tense auxiliaries in Latin*, in: Gualtiero Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin. Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna, 1–5 April 1985*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 311–326.
- Pinkster, Harm (1990), *The development of cases and adpositions in Latin*, in: Harm Pinkster/Inge Genee (edd.), *Unity in Diversity: Papers Presented to Simon C. Dik on his 50<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, Dordrecht, Foris, 195–209.
- Pinkster, Harm (1993), *Chronologie et cohérence de quelques évolutions latines et romanes*, in: Gerold Hilty (ed.), *Actes du XX<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, vol. 3, Tübingen, Narr, 239–250.
- Poletto, Cecilia (1993), *La sintassi dei pronomi soggetto nei dialetti settentrionali*, Padova, Unipress.

- Poletto, Cecilia (1995), *The diachronic development of subject clitics in North eastern Italian dialects*, in: Adrian Battye/Ian Roberts (edd.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 295–324.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2000), *The Higher Functional Field. Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2016), *Negation*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 833–846.
- Poletto, Cecilia/Tortora, Christina (2016), *Subject clitics: syntax*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 772–785.
- Posner, Rebecca (1984), *Double negatives, negative polarity, and negative incorporation in Romance: a historical and comparative view*, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 82, 1–26.
- Posner, Rebecca (1985a), *Post-verbal negation in non-standard French: a historical and comparative view*, *Romance Philology* 39, 170–197.
- Posner, Rebecca (1985b), *L'histoire de la négation et la typologie romane*, in: *Actes du XVII<sup>ème</sup> Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, vol. 2, Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, 265–271.
- Posner, Rebecca (1996), *The Romance Languages*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Pottier, Bernard (1961), *Sobre el concepto de “verbo auxiliar”*, *Nueva revista de filología hispánica* 15, 325–331.
- Pountain, Christopher (1982), *\*ESSERE/STARE as a Romance phenomenon*, in: Nigel Vincent/Martin Harris (edd.), *Studies in the Romance Verb*, London, Croom Helm, 139–160.
- Powell, Jonathan (2010), *Hyperbaton and register in Cicero*, in: Eleanor Dickey/Anna Chahoud (edd.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 163–185.
- Pozas-Loyo, Julia (2010), *The Development of the Indefinite Article in Medieval and Golden-Age Spanish*, Queen Mary University of London, unpublished doctoral thesis.
- Price, Glanville (1962), *The negative particles “pas”, “mie”, and “point” in French*, *Archivum Linguisticum* 14, 14–34.
- Price, Glanville (1971), *The French Language: Present and Past*, London, Arnold.
- Price, Glanville (1986), *Aspects de l'histoire de la négation en français*, in: *Actes du XVII<sup>ème</sup> Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, vol. 2, Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, 569–575.
- Ravier, Xavier (1991), *L'occitan. Les aires linguistiques*, in: Günter Holtus/Michael Metzeltin/Christian Schmitt (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik. Band V,2: Okzitanisch, Katalanisch*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 80–105.
- Remberger, Eva-Maria (2006), *Hilfsverben. Eine minimalistische Analyse am Beispiel des Italienischen und Sardischen*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Renzi, Lorenzo (1976), *Grammatica e storia dell'articolo italiano*, *Studi di grammatica italiana* 5, 5–42.
- Renzi, Lorenzo (2010), *L'articolo*, in: Giampaolo Salvi/Lorenzo Renzi (edd.), *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*, Bologna, il Mulino, 297–347.
- Renzi, Lorenzo/Vanelli, Laura (1983), *I pronomi soggetto in alcune varietà romanze*, in: Paola Benincà et al. (edd.), *Studi in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*, Pisa, Pacini, 121–145.
- Ricca, Davide (1998), *Una perifrasi continua-iterativa nei testi piemontesi dal Cinquecento all'Ottocento: TENERE + participio passato*, in: Paolo Ramat/Elisa Roma (edd.), *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX Congresso Internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana, Pavia, 26–28 settembre 1996*, Roma, Bulzoni, 345–368.
- Ricca, Davide (2010), *Adverbs*, in: Philip Baldi/Pierluigi Cuzzolin (edd.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 2: *Constituent Syntax: Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 109–191.

- Rizzi, Luigi (1997), *The fine structure of the left periphery*, in: Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar. A Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 281–337.
- Roberge, Yves (1990), *The Syntactic Recoverability of Null Arguments*, Montreal/London, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Roberts, Ian (1993), *A formal account of grammaticalisation in the history of Romance futures*, *Folia Linguistica Historica* 13, 219–258.
- Roberts, Ian (1994), *Two types of head movement in Romance*, in: David Lightfoot/Norbert Hornstein (edd.), *Verb Movement*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 207–242.
- Rohlf, Gerhard (1968), *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia*, Torino, Einaudi.
- Rohlf, Gerhard (1970), *Le gascon: Étude de philologie pyrénéenne*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Ross, John R. (1967), *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, MIT, unpublished thesis.
- Salvi, Giampaolo (2004), *La formazione della struttura di frase romanza. Ordine delle parole e clitics dal latino alle lingue romanze antiche*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Salvi, Giampaolo (2016), *Ladin*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 154–168.
- Sauzet, Patric (2007), *L'emplec dels pronoms subjèctes e la lenga d'Augièr Galhard*, *Lengas* 62, 77–114.
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm (von) (1818), *Observations sur la langue et la littérature provençales*, Paris, Librairie grecque-latine-allemande.
- Schwegler, Armin (1990), *Analyticity and Syntheticity. A Diachronic Perspective with Special Reference to Romance Languages*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
- Selig, Maria (1992), *Die Entwicklung der Nominaldeterminanten im Spätlatein*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Sheehan, Michelle (2016), *Complex Predicates*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 981–993.
- Slobbe, Bianca (2008), *Restructuring and the development of the Romance conditional verb forms*, in: Sylvia Blaho/Luis Vicente/Mark de Vos (edd.), *Proceedings of ConSole XII*, University of Leiden, 107–123.
- Squartini, Mario/Bertinetto, Pier Marco (2000), *The simple and compound past in Romance languages*, in: Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 385–402.
- Stark, Elisabeth (2002), *Indefinites and specificity in Old Italian texts*, *Journal of Semantics* 19, 315–332.
- Stark, Elisabeth (2008), *Typological correlations in nominal determination in Romance*, in: Henrik Høeg Müller/Alex Klinge (edd.), *Essays on Nominal Determination. From Morphology to Discourse Management*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 45–61.
- Tekavčić, Pavao (1980), *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana*, vol. 2: *Morfosintassi*, Bologna, il Mulino.
- Tesnière, Lucien (1959), *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Thielmann, Philipp (1885), *HABERE mit dem Infinitiv und die Entstehung des romanischen Futurums*, *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie* 2, 157–202.
- Travis, Lisa (1984), *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*, MIT, unpublished doctoral thesis.
- Väänänen, Veikko (1966), *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag.
- Väänänen, Veikko (1982), *Introduzione al latino volgare*, Bologna, Pàtron.
- Väänänen, Veikko (1987), *Le journal-épître d'Égérie. Étude linguistique*, Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Valesio, Paolo (1968), *The Romance synthetic future pattern and its first attestations*, *Lingua* 20, 113–161.
- Valesio, Paolo (1969), *The synthetic future again: phonology and morphosyntax*, *Lingua* 24, 181–193.

- Vanelli, Laura (1987), *I pronomi soggetto nei dialetti italiani settentrionali dal Medio Evo a oggi*, Medioevo romanzo 12, 173–211.
- Vanelli, Laura/Renzi, Lorenzo/Benincà, Paola (1985), *Typologie des pronoms sujets dans les langues romanes*, in: *Actes du XVII<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, vol. 3, Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, 163–176.
- Varvaro, Alberto (2013), *Latin and the making of the Romance languages*, in: Martin Maiden/John Charles Smith/Adam Ledgeway (edd.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, vol. 2: *Contexts*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 6–56.
- Vennemann, Theo (1974), *Topics, subjects, and word order: from SXV to SVX via TVX*, in: John Anderson/Charles Jones (edd.), *Historical Linguistics*, Amsterdam, North Holland, 339–376.
- Vennemann, Theo (1975), *An explanation of drift*, in: Charles Li (ed.), *Word Order and Word Order Change*, Austin, TX, University of Texas Press, 269–305.
- Veny, Joan (1982), *Els parlars catalans (Síntesi de dialectologia)*, Mallorca, Moll.
- Vincent, Nigel (1987), *The interaction of periphrasis and inflection: some Romance examples*, in: Martin Harris/Paolo Ramat (edd.), *The Historical Development of Auxiliaries*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 237–256.
- Vincent, Nigel (1988), *Latin*, in: Martin Harris/Nigel Vincent (edd.), *The Romance Languages*, London/New York, Routledge, 26–78.
- Vincent, Nigel (1997a), *Synthetic and analytic structures*, in: Martin Maiden/Mair Parry (edd.), *The Dialects of Italy*, London/New York, Routledge, 99–105.
- Vincent, Nigel (1997b), *The emergence of the D-system in Romance*, in: Ans van Kemenade/Nigel Vincent (edd.), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 149–169.
- Vincent, Nigel (1998), *Tra grammatica e grammaticalizzazione: Articoli e clitici nelle lingue (italo)-romanze*, in: Paolo Ramat/Elisa Roma (edd.), *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX Congresso Internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana, Pavia, 26–28 settembre 1996*, Roma, Bulzoni, 411–440.
- Vincent, Nigel (2006), *Il problema del doppio complementatore nei primi volgari d'Italia*, in: Alvisè Andreose/Nicoletta Penello (edd.), *Laboratorio sulle varietà romanze antiche. Giornata di lavoro sulle varietà romanze antiche*, Padova, Università degli Studi di Padova, 27–42.
- Vincent, Nigel (2014), *Similarity and diversity in the evolution of Italo-Romance morphosyntax*, in: Paola Benincà/Adam Ledgeway/Nigel Vincent (edd.), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1–21.
- Vincent, Nigel (2016), *A structural comparison of Latin and Romance*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 37–49.
- Wanner, Dieter (1987), *The Development of Romance Clitic Pronouns. From Latin to Old Romance*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- Wanner, Dieter (1998), *Les subordonnées à double complémentateur en roman médiéval*, in: Giovanni Ruffino (ed.), *Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza. Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, Università di Palermo 18–24 settembre 1995*, vol. 1, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 421–433.
- Wheeler, Max (1988), *Occitan*, in: Martin Harris/Nigel Vincent (edd.), *The Romance Languages*, London/New York, Routledge, 246–278.
- Wheeler, Max/Yates, Alan/Dols, Nicolau (1999), *Catalan. A Comprehensive Grammar*, London/New York, Routledge.
- Wolledge, Brian (1956), *The plural of the indefinite article in Old French*, *The Modern Language Review* 51, 17–32.
- Wolfe, Sam (2015a), *Microvariation in Old Italo-Romance syntax: evidence from Old Sardinian and Old Sicilian*, *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 100, 3–36.

- Wolfe, Sam (2015b), *Verb initial orders in Medieval Romance. A comparative perspective*, *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 60, 147–172.
- Wolfe, Sam (2015c), *The nature of Old Spanish verb second reconsidered*, *Lingua* 164, 132–155.
- Wolfe, Sam (2015d), *The Old Sardinian Condaghes: a syntactic study*, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 133, 137–205.
- Wüest, Jakob (1998), *Pour une linguistique historique non linéaire: Les formes analytiques du latin*, in: József Herman (ed.), *La transizione dal latino alle lingue romanze. Atti della tavola rotonda di linguistica storica, Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia, 14–15 giugno 1996*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 87–98.
- Zamboni, Alberto (2000), *Alle origini dell'italiano. Dinamiche e tipologie della transizione dal latino*, Roma, Carocci.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella (1997), *Negation and Clausal Structure. A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.