

The rise of C-systems from Latin to Romance: a micro-diachronic analysis

Valentina Colasanti

valentina.colasanti@ubc.ca

University of British Columbia

DiGS 21

Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

4-7 June 2019

1 Introduction

Sentential complementation in Latin represents one of the biggest structural differences with respect to Romance.

Big picture: head directionality (macro)parameter shift
= from Latin head-final > Romance head-initial (Ledgeway 2012, *i.a.*).

Small puzzling picture:

- What happens if we take into consideration Romance microvariation (microparameters)?
- Which is the place of (single, multiple) C(omplementizer)-systems present in Romance?

I argue that the ‘big picture’ (= head-directionality parameter shift) still captures the empirical facts but:

- microparametric evidence is also crucial in outlining the diachronic path *zero > multiple > single* for the rise of finite C-systems (empirical part);
- the rise of C-systems in Romance can be then situated within an acquisition-based approach to diachronic change (theoretical part).

2 Diachronic path: *Zero > multiple > single*

3 stages in the development of C-systems from Latin¹ to Romance:

2.1 *Zero stage*: (PIE /) archaic/early Latin

Accusativus cum Infinitivo (AcI): non-finite head-final CP with null complementizer (cf. Cecchetto & Oniga 2002; Ledgeway 2012):

- (1) *Early Latin* (Plautus, *Bacchidum*, II, 2, 7)
[[Venire tu me _{V-IP}] C_{CP}] gaudes.
come.INF you.NOM me.ACC happy.IND.2SG
‘You’re happy that I’m coming.’

¹ I follow the terminology from Cuzzolin and Haverling (2009, 20) for periods of the Latin language: Archaic Latin (before c. 240 BC), Early Latin (c. 240 BC - c. 90 BC), Classical Latin (c. 90 BC - c. AD 200), and Late Latin (c. 200 - c. 600).

- AcI = unmarked structure: used in every contexts² (e.g. REGRET-verbs (1), SAY-verbs (2), WANT-verbs (3):

(2) *Early Latin* (Plautus, *Mostellaria*, 490)

Ait [[venisse illum in somnis ad se mortuom_{V-IP}] C_{CP}].
 say.3SG come.PRFV.INF that.ACC in sleep to REFL.ACC dead.ACC
 'He said that dead one had come to him in his sleep.'

(3) *Early Latin* (Plautus, *Truculentus*, 922)

[[Gaudere aliqui me_{V-IP}] C_{CP}] volo.
 have.fun.INF somehow me.ACC want.1SG
 'I want to enjoy myself somehow.'

2.2 *Multiple stage*: Classical/late Latin + (early/modern) southern Italo-Romance, Romanian2.2.1 *Classical/late Latin*:

- AcI (cf. 1, 2, 3);
- innovative finite head-initial CPs with overt complementizer:

a) subjunctive complements introduced by UT/NE under WANT-verbs (4):

(4) *Classical Latin* (Cicero, *Epistulae ad Atticum*, IX.18.3)

Tu malim actum [CP ne [V-IP agas]]].
 you.NOM prefer.1SG.SBJV matter.ACC not concern.2SG.SBJV
 'I prefer you didn't concern about matters that are closed.'

b) indicative complements introduced by QUOD under REGRET-verbs (5a), and by QUIA under SAY-verbs (5b):

(5) *Classical Latin*

a. Illud gaudeo, [CP quod [...] [V-IP aequalitas vestra [...] abest...]].
 Of.it happy.IND.1SG that equality.ACC your.ACC exempt.IND.3SG
 'I am happy that the equality of your (age) is exempt...'
 (Caesar, *Brutus*, 41, 156)

b. Dixi [CP quia [V-IP mustella comedit]].
 I.said that weasel.NOM.SG ate.PRFV.3SG
 'I said that the weasel ate them.'
 (Petronius, *Satyricon*, XLVI)

2.2.2 *Early* (6, 7) / *modern* (8) *southern Italo-Romance, Romanian* (9):

- multiple (3-way/2-way) complementizer systems;
- no AcI.

² In describing the distribution of complementizers in Latin and Romance I consider: factive predicates (Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970) such as 'regret', 'know', 'like', etc. (henceforth, REGRET-verbs), verbs of saying/thinking (henceforth SAY-verbs), and verbs of wanting (henceforth, WANT-verbs).

(6) *Early Salentino* (southern Italo-Romance; Ledgeway 2005, 368-369)

- a. Penza **ca** illu non è solo al mundo.
He.thinks that he not is alone in.the world
'He thinks that he is not alone in the world.'
- b. Fa parere **che** lo sole et la luna et le altre pianete et le stelle
It.makes to.seem that the sun and the moon and the other planets and the stars
girano.
revolve.IND
'It seems that the sun and the moon and the other planets and the stars revolve.'
- c. Illu volce **cu** nuy sappessemu...
He wanted that we should.know.SBJV.3PL
'He wanted that we should know.'

(7) *Early Ferentinese* (southern Italo-Romance; Colasanti 2016)

- a. Paro **ca** tuneva gli mazzosalato.
It.seems that hold.IMP.3SG the salt
'It seems that he held the salt.'
- b. Po' dici **che** ci batte 'n pett.
Then you.say that CL beat.IND.1PL in chest
'Then you say that it beats in our chest.'
- c. Uria **cu** nun fussi mai unuta.
I.want.COND that not be.SBJV.2SG never come
'I would like it if you would have never come.'

(8) *Modern Secinarese* (southern Italo-Romance; Manzini and Savoia 2005: I,457)

- a. 'M annə 'dittə **ka** v'vè du'manə.
CL they.have said that he.comes tomorrow
'The have said that he comes tomorrow.'
- b. 'Vujjə **kə** v'vi.
I.want that you.come
'I want that you come.'

(9) *Modern Romanian*

- a. Mă tem / cred **că** te iubesc.
to.me I.am.afraid I.believe that you.CL I.love.IND
'I'm afraid/I believe that I love you.'
- b. Vreau maîne **să** meargă.
I.want tomorrow that s/he.should.go.SBJV
'I want him/her to go tomorrow.'

2.3 *Single stage*: majority of Romance + many modern southern Italo-Romance varieties2.3.1 *Majority of Romance*: 1 finite complementizer (< QUID) all contexts:

(10) *Modern Spanish*

- a. María dice **que** la fiesta se ha acabado.
 Maria says that the party CL has.IND finished
 'Maria says that the party has finished.'
- b. María quiere **que** la fiesta se acabe.
 Maria wants that the party CL finish.SBJV
 'Maria wants that the party would finish.'

(11) *Modern French*

- a. Jean m' a dit **que** il viendrait plus tard.
 Jean CL has said that he would.come more late
- b. Je veux **que** cela soit vrai.
 I want that that be.SBJV correct

(12) *Modern Catalan*

- a. Han confirmat **que** arribaran demà.
 they.have confirmed that they.will.arrive tomorrow
- b. Volem **que** te 'n vagis.
 we.want that CL CL you.go.SBJV

(13) *Modern Portuguese*

- a. Clara diz **que** tu ouves música clássica todos os dias.
 Clara says that you listen music classical all the days
- b. Clara quere **que** tu ouves música clássica todos os dias.
 Clara wants that you listen music classical all the days

(14) *Terranovese* (southern Italo-Romance; Manzini and Savoia: I,460)

- a. M anə dittə **ka** viənədə krajə.
 To.me they.have said.IND that they.come.IND tomorrow
 'They have said that they come tomorrow.'
- b. Péndzə **ka** viənə krajə.
 I.think that s/he.comes.IND tomorrow
 'I think that s/he comes tomorrow.'

2.3.2 *Many modern southern Italian varieties*: subsequent generalisation of just 1 finite complementizer (Colasanti 2016):(15) *Early Cosentino* (southern Italo-Romance; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2014, 40)

- a. Un pienzu **ca** vi canuscia bonu.
 Not I.think that CL he.knows good
 'I don't think that he knows better.'
- b. Vulìa **chi** m' accumpagnassa a ra casa.
 I.wanted that CL he.would.accompany.SBJV to the house
 'I wanted that he would accompany me home.'

(16) *Modern Cosentino* (southern Italo-Romance; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2014, 40)

- a. A dittu **ca** sgarrati.
He.has said that you.are.mistaken
'He has said that you are mistaken.'
- b. Idda vo **ca** ci fazzu na picca 'i spisa.
She wants that CL I.do a bit of shopping
'She wants that I do a bit of shopping.'

3 Directionality: zero > multiple > single

- *Zero*: oldest stage of the path
 - AcI (§2.1): archaic Indo-European strategy of subordination in archaic/early Latin (Cristofaro 2003).
- *Multiple*: intermediate stage of the path
 - Coexistence of AcI and finite CPs headed by overt Comp in classical/late Latin (§2.2.1);
 - Multiple (3-way/2-way) complementizer systems in early/modern southern Italo-Romance and Romanian (cf. §2.2.2).
- *Single*: final stage of the path
 - Modern standard Romance (except Ro.): 1 finite complementizer. (§2.3.1);
 - Southern Italo-Romance: generalisation of 1 complementizer (cf. early vs modern Cosentino; §2.3.2).

Table 1: *Zero > multiple > single* from Latin to Romance

Zero	Multiple		Single	
AcI	QUOD/QUIA/UT subordinate clauses	<i>ca/cu/che</i> multiple complementizer systems	single complementizer systems (<multiple complementizer systems)	single complementizer systems
archaic/early Latin	classical/late Latin early Romance	early S. Italo-Rom. modern S. Italo-Rom. Romanian	modern S. Italo-Rom.	modern standard Romance (ex. Romanian)

4 *Zero > multiple > single*: a micro-diachronic analysis

4.1 *Modality marking in Romance*

▷ **Claim:** presence of finite complementizer systems akin to modality marking.

- **Q1:** What do we mean by 'modality'?
 - Modality adds meaning in addition to the neutral meaning of the proposition or an utterance (Bybee & Fleischman 1995; Bybee et al. 1994);
 - 'Subordinating modality' (Bybee et al. 1994): can be expressed in natural languages in different ways (e.g. morphological, lexical, syntactic, and via intonation). These are not mutually exclusive.

- **Q2:** How is modality marked/expressed in Romance?
 - Shared between *complementizer*, together with *matrix* and *embedded* predicates (i.e. shared among domains; not only true for Romance);
 - C hosts *modality features*;
 - Comp forms imply the presence of *modality features*.
- **Q3:** How many modality types in Romance?
 - 3: realis, irrealis and factive.

(17) *Early Ferentinense* (Colasanti 2016)

- a. Sacci **ca** tu nun si 'na bbona pezza.
I.know.IND that you not are a good patch
'I know that you are not a good person.'
- b. Curi mu dissu, dacciforte, **che** tu si magnatu lu pane.
Curi to.me he.say.IND.PST with.power that you are eaten.PTP the bread
'Curi said to me, of course, that you have eaten the bread.'
- c. Vurià **cu** gli vento m' annariàsse.
I.want.COND that the wind to.me aerate.SBJV.IMP.3SG
'I would like it if the wind would aerate me.'

▷ C head hosts realis, irrealis and/or factive modality features: C_[realis, irrealis, factive]

N.B. For the mechanisms involved in modality marking see Colasanti (2018, ch. 3). But this is another talk!

4.2 Zero > multiple > single: *modality features*

Zero > multiple > single diachronic path describes change in modality marking/encoding

4.2.1 *Zero*: no Comp form no *modality features* on C

- early/classical/late Latin head-final AcI construction (cf. Cecchetto & Oniga 2002; Ledgeway 2012):

(18) *Early Latin* (Plautus, *Bacchidum*, II, 2, 7)

- a. Venire tu me gaudes.
come.INF you.NOM me.ACC happy.IND.2SG
'You're happy that I'm coming.'
- b. [[venire tu me _{IP}] C_∅ _{CP}] gaudes

- AcI:

- with volitive (3) and factive (1) predicate types as well.

4.2.2 *Multiple*: maximal marking of modality in multiple Comp systems with multiple Comp forms

(a) innovative finite head-initial CPs introduced by finite complementizer (i.e. QUOD/QUIA/UT) in classical/late Latin:

(19) $C_{[factive]} = \text{QUOD}$ (20) vs $C_{[realis]} = \text{QUIA}$ (cf. 5b) vs $C_{[irrealis]} = \text{UT/NE}$ (cf. 4)

(20) *Classical Latin* (Petronius, *Satyricon* 71.9)

Scis enim [_{CP} **quod**_[factive] [_{V-IP} epulum dedi]].
 you.know for that feast.ACC I.gave
 'For you remember that I gave a public banquet once'

(b) early/modern southern Italo-Romance, Romanian: multiple complementizer systems

3-way: realis, factive and irrealis modality marked with 3 different Comps

▷ early southern Italo-Romance (6, 7)

(21) $C_{[realis]} = \text{che}$ (7b) vs $C_{[factive]} = \text{ca}$ (7a) vs $C_{[irrealis]} = \text{cu}$ (7c)

2-way: realis, factive and irrealis modality marked by 2 different Comps

▷ early (15) / modern southern Italo-Romance (23) and Romanian (9)

(22) $C_{[realis/factive]} = \text{ca}$ (23a-b) vs $C_{[irrealis]} = \text{che}$ (23c)

(23) *Arpinate* (southern Italo-Romance)

- a. I dichə **ca** stə cinema nə gliə vuógliə vedè chiù.
 I say that this movie not CL want see anymore
 'I say that I don't want to see this movie anymore.'
- b. A Maria gliə dispiàcə **ca** Giuanna sta a chiàgnə.
 to Mary CL regret that Giovanna stays to cry
 'Mary regrets that Giovanna is crying.'
- c. Mariə ularrià **chə** Peppe beuəssə sulə vinə bbuonə.
 Mario want.COND that Peter drink.SBJV only wine good
 'Mario would like it if Peter only drank good wine.'

4.2.3 *Single*: realis, irrealis and factive modality undifferentiated single Comp

(a) majority of standard Romance languages: never had dual complementizer system

(24) *Italian*

- a. Dico **che** Maria è una brava donna.
 I.say that Maria is.IND a good woman
 'I say that Maria is a good woman.'
- b. So **che** Maria è una brava donna.
 I.know that Maria is.IND a good women
 'I know that Maria is a good woman.'
- c. Vorrei **che** Maria fosse una brava donna.
 I.would.like that Maria was.SBJV a good woman
 'I would like that Maria would be a good woman.'

(b) many modern southern Italian dialects: loss of previous dual Comp system

(25) $C_{[realis, irrealis, factive]} = \text{ca}_{[realis, irrealis, factive]}$ (15 vs 16)

5 *Minimax* acquisition-based diachronic approach to zero > multiple > single

General assumptions:

- 1) in acquisitional terms, language change comes from 'inside', namely the child (re)analyses lexical items or structure (Gibson & Wexler 1994; Evers & Van Kampen 2008; Lightfoot & Westergaard 2007; *i.a.*);
- 2) emergentist view of parametric variation (Biberauer & Roberts 2017): parameters are not built into UG (Factor 1; Chomsky 2005) but emerge via interaction of all three factors (Factor 2: PLD 'acquisitionally significant input'; Factor 3: MMM 'maximise minimal means').

5.1 *Maximise Minimal Means* (Biberauer 2017)

Maximise Minimal Means (MMM; Biberauer 2017; Humboldt 1836 'infinite use of finite means') = general cognitive economy principle with 2 linguistic manifestations:

- *Feature Economy* (FE): postulate as few formal features as possible (viz. 'minimise'; Roberts & Roussou 2003)
- *Input Generalisation* (IG): maximise available features (Roberts 2007)

The learner makes *maximal* use of *minimal* means.

Interaction between FE-IG = for a formal feature [F]: NONE > ALL > SOME learning pattern

- NONE: default choice as acquirer experiences non-existence of [F] [minimisation]
- ALL: generalisation of [F] following acquirer's initial 'ignorance' [maximisation]
- SOME: [F] is present in some domains and absent in others [linguistically governed selection]

5.2 NONE > ALL > SOME *modality features*

Zero > multiple > single path precisely reflects diachronically NONE>ALL>SOME acquisitional pattern:

- (i) *Zero* (NONE): no modality [F] on C in AcI archaic construction
 - ▷ archaic/early/classical Latin
- (ii) *Multiple* (ALL): three different modality [F] (i.e. realis, factive, irrealis) in multiple Comp systems with multiple (two/three) Comp forms
 - ▷ classical/late Latin, early/modern southern Italo-Romance, Romanian
- (iii) *Single* (SOME): some modality [F] on C in single complementizer systems with single Comp form
 - ▷ majority modern Romance, modern southern Italo-Romance

6 Conclusions

- New microparametric evidence from Italo-Romance:

- help us to highlight the diachronic path zero > multiple > single for finite complementation from Latin to Romance;
- give a more detailed understanding on the nature of parametric change through micro-diachronic analyses.

- Morphosyntactic micro-diachronic analyses provide:

- interesting insight on the nature of parametric variation;
- predictions on language acquisition: follow learnability pathway (i.e. MMM model).

References

- Baños Baños, J. M. (2009). 'Subordinación completiva'. In J. M. Baños Baños (Ed.), *Sintaxis del latín clásico* (pp. 523–562). Madrid: Liceus.
- Bauer, B. (2009). 'Word order'. In P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax* (pp. 241–316). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Biberauer, T. (2017). 'Factors 2 and 3: A principled approach'. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, 10, 38–65.
- Biberauer, T. & Roberts, I. (2017). 'Parameter setting'. In A. Ledgeway & I. Roberts (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax* (pp. 113–133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolkestein, M. (1989). 'Parameters in the Expression of Embedded Predications in Latin'. In G. Calboli (Ed.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin* (pp. 3–35). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bybee, J. L. & Fleischman, S. (1995). *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bybee, J. L., Perkins, R. D., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*, volume 196. University of Chicago Press Chicago.
- Calboli, G. (1978). 'Die Entwicklung der klassischen Sprachen und die Beziehung zwischen Satzbau, Wortstellung und Artikel'. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 83, 197–216.
- Calboli, G. (1983). 'The Development of Latin (Cases and Infinitive)'. In H. Pinkster (Ed.), *Latin Linguistics and Linguistic Theory. Proceedings of the 1st International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics Amsterdam* (pp. 41–54). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cecchetto, C. & Oniga, R. (2002). Consequences of the analysis of Latin infinitival clauses for the theory of Case and control. *Lingue e linguaggio*, 1, 151–189.
- Chomsky, N. (2005). 'Three Factors in Language Design'. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36(1), 1–22.
- Colasanti, V. (2016). 'What has and hasn't changed? Parametric change and morphosyntactic exaptation in Romance'. Paper presented at Formal Approaches to Romance Microvariation Workshop (FARM), University of Bucharest, Romania, 25–26 November 2016.
- Colasanti, V. (2018). *A Comparative Approach to Morphosyntactic Microvariation. The Dialects of Southern Lazio*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Cristofaro, S. (2003). *Subordination Strategies: A Typological study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cuzzolin, P. (1994). 'On Sentential Complementation after Verba Affectuum'. In Herman, J. (Ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin: Selected papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Budapest, 23–27 March 1991)*, (pp. 201–210)., Amsterdam. Benjamins.
- Cuzzolin, P. & Haverling, G. (2009). 'Syntax, sociolinguistics, and literary genres'. In P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 1: Syntax of the sentence*. (pp. 19–64). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Devine, A. & Stephens, L. (2006). *Latin Word Order: Structured Meaning and Information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evers, A. & Van Kampen, J. (2008). 'Parameter Setting and Input Reduction'. In T. Biberauer (Ed.), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation* (pp. 483–515). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gibson, E. & Wexler, K. (1994). 'Triggers'. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 25(3), 407–454.
- Greco, P. (2008). *Accusativus cum Infinitivo e subordinate completive con quod, quia e quoniam in alcune cronache latine dell'Italia centro-meridionale (secoli X–XII)*. PhD thesis, Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II.
- Herman, J. (1989). *Accusativus cum infinitivo et subordonnée à quod, quia en latin tardif - Nouvelles remarques sur un vieux problème*. In G. Calboli (Ed.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin: Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna, 1–5 April 1985* (pp. 133–152). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Herman, J. (2010). *Vulgar Latin*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Humboldt, W. (1836). *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistigen Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*. Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kiparsky, P. & Kiparsky, C. (1970). 'Fact'. In Bierwisch, M. & Heidolph, K. E. (Eds.), *Progress in Linguistics*, (pp. 143–147)., The Hague. Mouton.
- Ledgeway, A. (2012). *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ledgeway, A. & Lombardi, A. (2014). 'The Development of the southern Subjunctive. Morphological Loss and Syntactic Gain'. In P. Benincà, A. Ledgeway, & N. Vincent (Eds.), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy* (pp. 25–47). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lightfoot, D. & Westergaard, M. (2007). 'Language Acquisition and Language Change: Inter-relationships'. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1, 396–415.
- Manzini, M. R. & Savoia, L. (2005). *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa. 3 voll.* Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso.
- Roberts, I. (2007). *Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, I. & Roussou, A. (2003). *Syntactic change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.