THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF THE ROMANCE LANGUAGES

This *Cambridge History* is the most comprehensive survey of the history of the Romance languages ever published in English, offering major and original insights into the subject. Informed by the latest advances in Romance linguistics and general linguistic theory, it engages with new and original topics that reflect wider-ranging comparative concerns, such as the relation between diachrony and synchrony; morphophonological persistence; form–function relationships; morpho-syntactic typology; pragmatic change; the structure of written Romance; and lexical stability.

Volume I is organized around the two key recurrent themes of *persistence* (structural inheritance and continuity from Latin) and *innovation* (structural change and loss in Romance). An important and novel aspect of the volume is that it accords persistence in Romance a focus in its own right rather than treating it simply as the background to the study of change. At the same time, it explores in depth the patterns of innovation (including loss) at all linguistic levels. The result is a rich structural history which marries together data and theory to produce new perspectives on the structural evolution of the Romance languages.

MARTIN MAIDEN is Professor of the Romance Languages and Director of the Research Centre for Romance Linguistics at the University of Oxford. He is also a Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, and a Fellow of the British Academy. His recent publications include *A Reference Grammar of Modern Italian* (with Cecilia Robustelli, 2007).

JOHN CHARLES SMITH is Faculty Lecturer in French Linguistics and Deputy Director of the Research Centre for Romance Linguistics at the University of Oxford and a Fellow of St Catherine's College, Oxford. He has published widely on agreement, refunctionalization, deixis, and the evolution of case and pronoun systems, with particular reference to Romance.

ADAM LEDGEWAY is Head of the Department of Italian and Senior Lecturer in Romance Philology at the University of Cambridge, and a Fellow of Downing College, Cambridge. His recent publications include *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano* (2009).

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF THE ROMANCE LANGUAGES

VOLUME I *Structures*

EDITED BY

MARTIN MAIDEN,
JOHN CHARLES SMITH
and
ADAM LEDGEWAY

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press,
New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521800723

First published 2011

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
The Cambridge history of the Romance languages / edited by Martin Maiden,
John Charles Smith, and Adam Ledgeway.
v. cm.
Contents: v. 1. Structures – v. Context.
ISBN 978-0-521-80072-3 (hardback)
1. Romance languages – History. I. Maiden, Martin, 1957– II. Smith,
John Charles, 1950– III. Ledgeway, Adam. IV. Title.
PC45.C245 2010
440.09–dc22

2010039944

ISBN 978-0-521-80072-3 Hardback

In memoriam
Joseph A. Cremona 1922–2003

CONTENTS

Contents

CONTRIBUTORS

BRIGITTE L. M. BAUER *Associate Professor, The University of Texas at Austin*

STEVEN N. DWORKIN *Professor of Romance Languages and Linguistics, University of Michigan*

ADAM LEDGEWAY *Senior Lecturer in Romance Philology and Head of the Department of Italian, University of Cambridge*

MICHELE LOPORCARO *Professor of Romance Linguistics, Romanisches Seminar, Universität Zürich*

MARTIN MAIDEN *Professor of the Romance Languages and Director of the Research Centre for Romance Linguistics, University of Oxford*

MARIA M. MANOLIU *Professor Emeritus, University of California*

CHRISTOPHER JOHN POUNTAIN *Professor of Spanish Linguistics, Queen Mary, University of London*

GIAMPAOLO SALVI *Professor of Romance Linguistics, Eötvös Loránd University*

JOHN CHARLES SMITH *Faculty Lecturer in French Linguistics, Deputy Director of the Research Centre for Romance Linguistics and Fellow of St Catherine's College, University of Oxford*

ROSANNA SORNICOLA *Professore Ordinario di Linguistica Generale, Università di Napoli Federico II*

ARNULF STEFENELLI†

JOHN TRUMPER *Professor of Linguistics, Università della Calabria*

ABBREVIATIONS

Bibliographical abbreviations will be found under *References*, at the end of this volume.

*	unattested form or usage
**	ungrammatical form or usage
%	marginal form or usage
?	dubious form or usage; when used alone, form uncertain or unknown
??	highly dubious form or usage
=	cliticized to
$	syllable boundary
Ø	null argument (subject or object)
1	first person
1CONJ	first conjugation
1SW	one-syllable window
2	second person
2CONJ	second conjugation
2SW	two-syllable window
3	third person
3CONJ	third conjugation
3SW	three-syllable window
4CONJ	fourth conjugation
A	(i) adjective position (head of AP); (ii) subject of a transitive clause
ABL	ablative
Abr.	Abruzzese
Aca.	Acadian (French)
ACC	accusative

List of abbreviations

ACT	active
ADJ	adjective (category)
ADV	adverb position (head of ADVP)
ADVP	adverb phrase
Agr(S/O)	(subject/object) agreement
Agr(S/O)P	(subject/object) agreement phrase
Alb.	Albanian
Alg.	Algherese (Alguerès)
AP	adjective phrase
ARo.	Aromanian
Ast.	Asturian
AUG	augmentative
AUX	auxiliary
AUXP	auxiliary phrase
Bal.	Balearic (Catalan)
Bel.	Bellunese
Bol.	Bolognese
BrPt.	Brazilian Portuguese
C	(i) central; (ii) complementizer position (head of CP); (iii) consonant
Cal.	Calabrian
Cat.	Catalan
CLat.	Classical Latin
Cmp.	Campanian
coll.	colloquial
COMP	complementizer (category)
COND	conditional
ConF	contrastive focus
ContRo.	contemporary Romanian
Cor.	Corsican
Cos.	Cosentino
CP	complementizer phrase
Cpc.	Capcinese
Cst.	Castilian
CuSp.	Cuban Spanish
D	determiner position (head of DP)
DAT	dative
DEC	declension
DEF	definite

DEM	demonstrative
DET	determiner (category)
dial.	dialectal
DIM	diminutive
DO	direct-object
DoSp.	Dominican Republic Spanish
DP	determiner phrase
E	east(ern)
Egd.	Engadinish
Eml.	Emilian
Eng.	English
EuPt.	European Portuguese
Ext.	Extremaduran (Extremeño)
F	feminine
Fin	finiteness position (head of FinP)
FinP	finiteness phrase
Foc	focus
FocP	focus phrase
ForceP	(illocutionary) force phrase
Fr.	French
Frk.	Frankish
Frl.	Friulian
FUT	future
Gen.	Genoese
GEN	genitive
Ger.	German
Glc.	Galician
GR	grammatical relation
Grk.	Greek
Gsc.	Gascon
Hai.	Haitian
HPC	heavy penult constraint
HTop	hanging topic
IbR.	Ibero-Romance
IE	Indo-European
IMP	imperative
IND	indicative
IndefQ	indefinite quantifier
INDF	indefinite

INF	infinitive
InfF	informational focus
I(nfl)	(verb) inflection (head of IP)
INT	interrogative
IO	indirect object
IP	inflection phrase
IPF	imperfect
IPFV	imperfective
IRo.	Istro-Romanian
Ist.	Istrian
It.	Italian
Lad.	Ladin (ladino dolomitico)
Lat.	Latin
LD-Top	left-dislocated topic
Lec.	Leccese
Lig.	Ligurian
lit.	literally
Lmb.	Lombard (Italo-Romance)
Loc	Locative
Log.	Logudorese
Lvl.	Livinallonghese
Maj.	Majorcan
M	masculine
Mdv.	Moldovan
Mid.	middle
Mil.	Milanese
Mod., mod.	modern
ModFr.	modern French
ModOcc.	modern Occitan
ModPt.	modern Portuguese
ModSp.	modern Spanish
MRo.	Megleno-Romanian
Mtv.	Mantuan
MxSp.	Mexican Spanish
N	(i) north(ern); (ii) noun position (head of NP); (iii) noun
Nap.	Neapolitan
Neg	negator
NegP	negator phrase
NEUT	neuter

NOM	nominative
NP	noun phrase
Nrm.	Norman
O	(i) old; (ii) object
Ø	null argument (subject or object)
OBL	oblique (case)
OCat.	old Catalan
Occ.	Occitan
OFlo.	old Florentine
OFr.	old French
OIt.	old Italian
ONap.	old Neapolitan
OOcc.	old Occitan
OPrv.	old Provençal
OPt.	old Portuguese
ORo.	old Romanian
OSL	open syllable lengthening
OSp.	old Spanish
OSrd.	old Sardinian
OT	Optimality Theory
OTsc.	old Tuscan
PASS	passive
PAV	palatalization and affrication of velar consonants
PF	perfect
PFV	perfective
Pic.	Picard
Pie.	Piedmontese
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
PL	plural
PLPF	pluperfect
PP	(i) past participle; (ii) prepositional phrase
PRET	preterite
PRS	present
Prv.	Provençal
PST	past
Pt.	Portuguese
PW	phonological word
PYTA	*perfecto y tiempos afines*
Q	quantifier position (head of QP)

QP	quantifier phrase
QUANT	quantifier
Qué.	Québécois (French)
RæR.	Ræto-Romance
REFL	reflexive
Rmc	Romanesco
Ro.	Romanian
Ros.	Roussillonnais (Rossellonès)
Rov.	Rovignese
S	(i) south(ern); (ii) subject
$S_{A/O}$	intransitive subject of an unergative/unaccusative clause
Sal.	Salentino
SBJV	subjunctive
Sc-set	scene-setting adverb(ial)
Sen.	Sienese
SG	singular
Sic.	Sicilian
SIt.	southern Italian
Sp.	Spanish
Spec	specifier position
Srd.	Sardinian
Srs.	Surselvan
Srv.	Servigliano
t	trace of moved element
Tar.	Tarantino
TOP, Top	Topic
Tor	Turinese
Trn.	Trentino
Tsc.	Tuscan
UEgd.	Upper Engadinish
Umb.	Umbrian
V	(i) verb; (ii) vowel
Vgl.	Vegliote
Vnz.	Venetian
VOC	vocative
VP	verb phrase
VQ	vowel quality
VR	vowel reduction
Vto.	Veneto

V2	Verb Second (syntax)
W	west(ern)
Wln.	Wallon
WRæR.	western Ræto-Romance
X	unspecified element
YE	yod-effect

List of authors

Caes.	Caesar
Cat.	Catullus
Cic.	Cicero
Cor. Nep.	Cornelius Nepos
Enn.	Ennius
Hor.	Horace
Liv.	Livy
Naev.	Naevius
Oribas.	Oribasius
Ov.	Ovid
Petr.	Petronius
Pl.	Plautus
Sall.	Sallust
Ter.	Terence
Val. Max.	Valerius Maximus
Verg.	Vergil

INTRODUCTION

This *Cambridge History of the Romance Languages* stands on the shoulders of giants. A glance at the list of bibliographical references in this work should suffice to give some idea of the enormous body of descriptive and interpretative literature on the history of the Romance languages, both from the point of view of their structural evolution (the main focus of this volume) and with regard to the contexts in which they have emerged as distinct 'languages', and gained or lost speakers and territory, and come into contact with other languages (the focus of the second volume). This profusion of scholarship, adopting a multiplicity of approaches (synchronic, diachronic, microscopic, macroscopic) has more than once provided material for major, indeed monumental, comparative-historical synopses (e.g., Meyer-Lübke (1890–1902), Lausberg (1956–62), or the massively detailed and indispensable encyclopaedic works such as Holtus, Metzeltin and Schmitt (1988–96) and Ernst, Glessgen, Schmitt and Schweickard (2003–9)).

Much of the finest scholarship in Romance linguistics has, naturally enough, been conducted in Romance languages, or in German (the native language of some of the major founding figures of the discipline). One of our aims is to reach out to linguists who are not Romance specialists, and who may not know these languages. While the histories of some of the better-known major Romance languages (Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese) have been treated in English, this work is certainly the first detailed comparative history of the Romance languages to appear in English.[1]

The aim of *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages* is not to compete with or supersede the works mentioned above, but to complement them, by presenting both to Romanists and to historical linguists at large the major and most exciting insights to emerge from the comparative-historical

study of Romance. With this in mind, we have deliberately attempted in the presentation and discussion of the material of the two volumes to adopt a more inclusive approach which, while not alienating the traditional Romanist, bears in mind the practical limitations and needs of an interested non-specialist Romance readership (witness, for instance, the extensive translation of Romance and Latin examples), though in no case is this done at the expense of empirical and analytic detail.

It is our firm belief that the richly documented diachronic, diatopic, diastratic, diamesic and diaphasic variation exhibited by the Romance family offers an unparalleled wealth of linguistic data of interest not just to Romanists, but also to non-Romance specialists. This perennially fertile and still under-utilized testing ground, we believe, has a central role to play in challenging linguistic orthodoxies and shaping and informing new ideas and perspectives about language change, structure and variation, and should therefore be at the forefront of linguistic research and accessible to the wider linguistic community.

The present work is not a 'history' of Romance languages in the traditional sense of a 'standard' reference manual ('vademecum') providing a comprehensive structural overview of individual 'languages' and/or traditional themes (e.g., 'Lexis', 'Vowels', 'Nominal Group', 'Tense, Aspect and Mood', 'Subordination', 'Substrate', 'Prehistory', etc.) on a chapter by chapter basis (cf., among others, Tagliavini (1972), Harris and Vincent (1988), Holtus, Metzeltin and Schmitt (1988–96)), but, rather, is a collection of fresh and original reflections on what we deem to be the principal questions and issues in the comparative internal (volume 1: Structures) and external (volume 2: Contexts) histories of the Romance languages, informed by contemporary thinking in both Romance linguistics and general linguistic theory and organized according to novel chapter divisions which reflect broader, overriding comparative concerns and themes (generally neglected or left untackled in standard works), rather than those which are narrowly focused on individual languages or developments. This is not to say that readers wanting to learn something about a classic topic of Romance linguistics such as the survival of the nominative vs. oblique case distinction in old French, for example, will not find the relevant information simply because there is no individual chapter on 'French' or 'The Nominal Group'. On the contrary, they will find, throughout, rich and diverse comparative discussions of this topic in relation to other Gallo-Romance varieties (not to mention non-Gallo-Romance varieties which preserve, to varying degrees, traces of case distinctions) from the perspective of: (i) the issues and questions it raises for the

relationship between diachronic and synchronic analyses (see Sornicola, chapter 1: §3.1); (ii) its impact on the morphophonological exponence of nominal categories (see Maiden, chapter 4: §2) and the restructuring of the nominal paradigm (see Maiden, chapter 4: §§3–3.1); (iii) its refunctionalization as an agency opposition (see Smith, chapter 6: §2.2); (iv) its differential development and distribution in nominal and pronominal paradigms (see Salvi, chapter 7: §§2.1–2); and (v) its integration into an early Romance active vs. stative syntactic alignment (see Ledgeway, chapter 8: §6.2.2.2). Inevitably, this will mean that certain aspects of the history of the Romance languages or individual members thereof – though admittedly very few, as a thorough reading of the following pages reveals – may not be exhaustively covered. A case in point is the development of the Romance future and conditional paradigms derived from the infinitive and a weakened present/past form of HABERE 'have' (e.g., CANTARE + *-a/*-ia > Sp. *cantará/cantaría* 's/he will/would sing'), which although discussed in relation to other developments, such as the distribution of root-allomorphy (cf. Maiden, chapter 5: §6) or the directionality of the head parameter (cf. Ledgeway, chapter 8: §5), does not form the subject of a separate study in its own right. Nevertheless, we are convinced that the merits of the individual chapter divisions adopted here far outweigh any potential lacunae (for which, in any event, there exist in virtually all cases other reliable treatments; for the Romance future and conditional paradigms, see, among others: Valesio 1968; Coleman 1971; Harris 1978: ch. 6; Fleischman 1982; Green 1987; Pinkster 1987; Vincent 1987; Maiden 1996c; Loporcaro 1999; Nocentini 2001; La Fauci 2006).

This work is organized around four key recurrent themes: *persistence*, *innovation*, *influences* and *institutions*. Thus, much of the first volume dedicated to the linguistic 'Structures' of Romance juxtaposes chapters or chapter sections dealing with issues of persistence on the one hand and innovation on the other in relation to the macroareas of phonology, morphology, morphosyntax, lexis, semantics and discourse-pragmatics. It goes without saying that the Romance languages are the modern continuers of Latin and therefore many aspects of structure persist from that language into Romance. It is not usual, however, for works on the Romance languages to concentrate on these factors of inheritance and continuity, since they – understandably – prefer to comment on what is new and different in Romance by comparison with Latin. By contrast, we believe that it is an important and original aspect of the present work that it accords persistence in Romance (and hence inheritance from Latin) a focus in its own right rather than treating it simply as the background to the study of the changes.

At the same time, we devote considerable space to the patterns of innovation (including loss) at all linguistic levels that have taken place in the evolution of Romance. Thus, the chapters of the present volume equally address many of the most important changes in the history of the Romance languages, profitably marrying data and theory to create new perspectives on their structural evolution.

Structural persistence and innovation within Romance cannot, of course, be studied in isolation from the influences and institutions with which the Romance languages and their speakers have variously come into contact at different periods in their history. For this reason, the authors of individual chapters have been encouraged to consider, as far as possible, structural persistence and innovation in relation to these influences and institutions and the extent to which they may have helped in arresting or delaying them on the one hand and shaping or accelerating them on the other. It is, however, in the second volume dedicated to the 'Contexts' in which the Romance languages have evolved that the central role assumed by *influences* and *institutions* is investigated, as well as their bearing on questions of persistence and innovation (cf. the discussion of the Romance creoles). It is well known that the Romance languages have been subject in varying degrees to the effects of outside influences. In addition to contact and borrowing (e.g., from Germanic, Arabic, Slavic) and substrate effects (e.g., from Celtic), there is also the all-important role of Latin as a learnèd language of culture and education existing side by side and interacting with the evolving languages, as well as the role of contact and borrowing between Romance languages. When speaking of institutions, we have in mind both the role of institutions in the sense of specific organizations (the Church, academies, governments, etc.) in the creation of 'standard' languages and the prescription of norms of correctness, and also the language as an institution in society involved in, among other things, education, government policy, and cultural and literary movements.

Consequently, the focus throughout both volumes is on an integration of the internal and external perspectives on the history of the Romance languages, in part achieved through a multiauthor format which brings together the best of recent scholarship in the two traditions, and in part through careful editorial intervention and cross-referencing across chapters and volumes.[2] However, as editors we have been keen to impose as few constraints on our contributors as possible in order to create an opportunity for international scholars of stature and intellectual vision to reflect on the principles and areas that have been influential in a particular subarea, and to reassess the situation.

It is necessary here to mention, albeit briefly, the rationale behind a number of our decisions in representing, and referring to, Latin. It is customary (though in no way a universally accepted practice) in many works on Latin and Romance to cite Latin forms in small capitals. Although we recognize that there are, of course, no linguistic grounds for this choice of typographic representation, inasmuch as Latin forms could just as legitimately appear in lower-case italics on a par with any other language, we have chosen to follow here the (more or less) established convention of employing small capitals for cited examples. While it is true that the ancient Romans did not use small capitals to represent their language, it is equally true that they did not use lower-case italics either. However, we believe that the conventional practice of placing Latin forms in small capitals has the typographical advantage, especially in a work like ours, where reference to Latin forms is legion, of allowing immediate and efficient recognition of the two diachronic poles of our investigation, Latin (small capitals) and Romance (lower-case italics). Where we do depart, however, from current conventional practice is in our representation of the classical Latin high back vowel/glide [w], which is today usually represented as 'V' in syllable onsets (e.g., **V**IVO 'I live') and U in all other positions (e.g., HABUIT 'he had') or, according to another school of thought, as '*V*' when it appears in upper case and '*u*' when in lower case (e.g., ***Viuo*** 'I live'). By contrast, we have preferred to adopt U (lower case) / U (upper case) in all positions (hence, **U**IUO and HABUIT), which not only reflects the original practice of ancient Romans, but also makes the value of the grapheme more transparent in the discussion of Latin (morpho)phonology. One further departure from current typographical conventions concerns our decision to cite all non-attested forms, whether reconstructed for Latin or any other language (but in all cases preceded by a single asterisk) in phonetic transcription (e.g., *voˈlere 'to want' replacing classical UELLE), and not in small capitals (e.g., *UOLERE) as is frequently the case in other works.

Finally, although we do not wish to enter here into a discussion of the value or the appropriateness of such labels as 'vulgar', 'late', 'spoken', 'literary' and many others in relation to Latin (for which we refer the reader to the chapters in Volume II by Banniard, Varvaro and Wright), we are keen to point out that we do not consider Latin a monolithic variety, uniquely to be identified with the prescriptive norm passed down to us in the high literary and rhetorical models of the classical era. Rather, like any other natural language that has existed, we take Latin to be a rich and varied polymorphous linguistic system which was subject, both on the diachronic and synchronic axes, to the same kinds of diatopic, diastratic, diamesic and

diaphasic variation as its modern Romance descendants. We therefore deliberately avoid capitalized epithets in such syntagms as 'Vulgar Latin' or 'Late Latin', which unreasonably suggest an ill-founded linguistic and psychological demarcation between one supposed language, Classical Latin on the one hand, and an autonomous derivative, 'Vulgar Latin' or 'Late Latin' on the other. Rather, in the same way that linguists regularly append descriptive labels like 'modern', 'spoken', 'popular', 'dialectal', 'journalistic', 'literary', 'Latin-American' and such like to the modern Romance languages to refer to a particular 'variety' of that language (e.g., '(spoken) Barcelona Catalan', 'popular French', 'journalistic Italian', 'literary Romanian', 'Latin-American Spanish'; see Wright, Volume II, for further discussion), we have left it to the discretion of individual authors to indicate and identify, where necessary, the particular register, style or variety of Latin intended by means of an appropriate non-capitalized epithet or periphrasis, be it 'vulgar Latin', 'spoken Latin' or 'the Latin of North-West Africa'.

To conclude, we should like to remember here Joseph Cremona, who died on 19 March 2003, and to whom the present volume of *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages* is dedicated – fittingly so since Joe was the first to hold the post of Lecturer in Romance Philology (1955–89) in the University of Cambridge. During his long and eminent career, Joe firmly established, and when necessary, defended, the study of Romance linguistics in Cambridge, and inspired and encouraged successive generations of students to become specialists in Romance and/or general linguistics. Indeed, it stands as a testimony to his continuing legacy that a great many of those currently teaching the history and structure of Romance languages in British universities have been his students (or, latterly, have been taught by his students). Amongst them are two of the present editors and several of the contributors to the two volumes. The subject is buoyant and flourishing in Britain today, and a very large share of the credit goes to him. What he created was not so much a 'Cremona school' as a 'Cremona style': he argued that fruitful study of the structure and evolution of the Romance languages requires a thorough acquaintance with linguistic theory, and at the same time that the study of linguistics, and especially historical linguistics, needs mastery of the kind of comparative and historical data which can be gleaned abundantly from Romance languages. It is these same issues and principles which have guided and shaped *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, a fitting tribute, we believe, to his memory.