Formalist and functionalist factors in parameter-resetting: a creative compromise:

Syntactic change is formally construed as parameter-resetting in first language acquisition (Roberts (2007), cf Lightfoot (1991, 1999)) and recent analyses of historical syntax apply the formal metric of ‘simplicity’ in Minimalism, namely Third Factor Principles (Biberauer (2008)), to account for syntactic change (Roberts and Roussou (R&R) (2003), van Gelderen (2011), cf Chomsky (2005, 2007)). Furthermore, the Inertia Principle in historical syntax entails maximum conservativity in parameter-fixing which pre-empts all forms of optionality in formal parametric variation (Longobardi (2001), cf Keenan (1994, 2009)), which is another desideratum for Minimalism (Chomsky (1995)). All this strongly predicts a strict mechanism of parameter-fixing which perfectly aligns with the morphophonological properties of ‘cues’/‘triggers’ in the primary linguistic data (R&R (2003:15, 202-205)), which is subject to scrutiny. This paper examines the diachrony of Latin/Romance prepositions and argues that current Minimalist versions of parameter-resetting are simplistic and in order to capture the formal changes to prepositions, it is necessary to incorporate functionalist factors which attest to the creativity in parameter-fixing in first language acquisition.

It is a common trend for Latin prepositions to be reanalyzed from lexical, spatially-oriented prepositions (Cinque and Rizzi (2010)) to functional markers of nouns and clauses (case-markers (K(case)) and non-finite complementisers (M/Fin) respectively), and this formal reanalysis (PP > KP/MP) conforms to formal ‘simplicity’ in parametric schemata (Gianollo, Guardiano and Longobardi (2008)) since the morphological agreement between the preposition and its morphologically case-marked nominal complement (P + KP) is lost and the former is reanalyzed as a marker of nouns (K + NP) and infinitives (M + TP), which is structurally parallel to R&R’s (2003:85, 96) ‘structural simplification’ in the formation of complementisers (e.g. Greek va, Calabrian mu (C > M)). However, Romance prepositional case-markers (K) and complementisers (M) show innovative idiosyncracies in comparison to Latin which rule out any account of a neat formal transition from Latin to Romance (Ledgeway (2012:21-23)): as Latin does not have prepositional infinitives, Romance prepositional infinitives entail a significant reduction in the original use of the bare prolative infinitive (Vincent (1988:68-70)) which not only show dialectal variations (e.g. Spanish bare infinitive (1a)) vs French/Italian de/ad-infinitive (1b-c)) but also diachronic origins in Latin prepositional gerunds/gerundives (Schulte (2007)) which attest to the lexical origins of de ‘about, regarding’ and ad ‘to, towards’ selected accordingly by semantically compatible verbal predicates in expressing ‘theme/content’ (2a)) and ‘purpose’ (2b)) respectively, both of which are stronger than the bare infinitive. Romance case-markers are even more innovative in that they do not merely replace Latin morphological case but also introduce new object alignments, namely the Differential Object-Marking (ad) of human/animate and referential-specific direct objects (Nocentini (1985)), which has been shown to derive from verbs of seeing (verba videndi) (3a)) (Tse (2013)) and analogized from structurally ambiguous three-place predicates like verbs of serving/shouting/begging (verba serviendi (3b)) et clamandi (3c)) et rogandi (3d-e)) where the human ‘beneficiary/recipient/experiencer’ is consistently marked by ad and can be reanalyzed as a direct object, which creates a synchronic opposition between animacy (ad) and inanimacy (ø) where the former is not only semantically but also morphosyntactically differentiated as ‘marked’, also for reasons of expressivity and clarity (Zamboni (1994)). These Romance innovations show, therefore, that formal syntactic change is not purely determined by formal ‘simplicity’ but is also influenced by functionalist factors which create new formal categories and new morphosyntactic alignment.
Examples:

Spanish:

1a) non … ensaya-va fazar con ella nada

   NEG strive-IMPERF.3SG do-INF with her nothing

   ‘He did not strive to do anything with her.’ (La Primera Crónica General 626b42)

Italian:

1b) procaccia-nndo di riconcili-ar-si co-l Papa

   strive-GERUND DE reconcile-INF-REFL.PRO with-DEF.ART Pope

   ‘striving to reconcile with the Pope.’ (Cronica fiorentina, p. 104)

French:

1c) desirroit a vivre d-u sien

   want-COND.3SG AD live.INF DE-ART.MASC.SG his.MASC.SG

   ‘… he would like to live with his.’ (Les miracles de saint Louis de Guillaume de St Pathus 5554)

Latin:

2a) nos…labor-amus de aufere-nd-o mal-o

   we work-PRES.1PL DE eliminate-GERUNDIVE-ABL.SG evil-ABL.SG

   ‘we strive about removing the evil…’ > ‘we strive to remove the evil.’

   (Tertullian Adversus Hermogenem 11.3)

2b) ego enim te arbitror… statim esse

   PRO.1SG for PRO.2SG think-PRES.1SG at.once be.INF

   AD Sicyon-ACC oppurgn-and-um profe-ct-um

   ‘for I think that you immediately set off in order to attack Sicyon’ > ‘for I think that you immediately set off to attack Sicyon’ (Cicero ad Atticum 1.13)

3a) ad er-am revide-bo

   AD mistress-ACC see.again-FUT.1SG

   ‘I shall see our mistress again…’ (Plautus Truculentus 320)

3b) ad cuius imperi-um cael-um terr-a mari-a servie-bant

   AD REL.PRO.GEN power-ACC.SG heaven-NOM.SG earth-NOM.SG sea-NOM.PL serve-IMPERF

   ‘… whose power heaven, earth and the seas served.’ (Jerome Letter 82.3) (Latin)

3c) proclaim-antes ad dominum

   crying.out-PRES.PART.NOM.PL AD Lord

   ‘crying out (something) to the Lord…’ > ‘calling the Lord…’ (Actus Petri cum Simone, 69.3)

3d) Moyses ora-bat ad Dominum

   Moses beg-IMPERF.3SG AD Lord

   ‘Moses was begging the Lord.’ (Libri Maccabaorum 2.10)

3e) veni-am… ad Domino poposce-bat

   mercy-FEM.ACC.SG AD Lord demand-IMPERF.3SG

   ‘He was begging the Lord for mercy’ (Chronicon Salernitanum 11)
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