The grammaticalization of Latin and Romance KPs: ‘configurationality’ and ‘structural simplification’

Grammaticalization is analysed within Minimalism by Roberts and Roussou (2003) with respect to three functional categories: D(eterminer)P, I(nflectional)P, and C(omplementiser)P. From Latin to Romance, Ledgeway (2011a, 2011b) also deals with these three functional categories within Minimalism. There is another functional category in Latin/Romance: KPs (case-markers) (Vincent and van Kemenade (1997:18-21)), and in this paper I analyse the geneses of Latin/Romance KPs within Minimalism, and not only do I show that Latin/Romance KPs conform to Robert & Roussou’s and Ledgeway’s historical scenarios for Latin/Romance functional categories, I also establish a relationship between Ledgeway’s ‘configurationality’ (Ledgeway (2011a:405:434)) and R & R’s ‘simplification’, namely ‘reduction in feature syncretisms’ (Roberts & Roussou (2003:200-201)).

Traditional syntactic analyses assign abstract case to all arguments that hold thematic relations with the head predicate (Vincent and van Kemenade (1997:14-18)). The geneses of Latin/Romance KPs from PPs(e.g. de marking genitive, ad marking accusative and dative) conform to the geneses of other Latin/Romance functional categories in that they are the results of morphophonological erosion of the Latin case-paradigms, which leads to the rise of configurational syntax in proto-Romance (Ledgeway (2011a:409)). Within configurational syntax, complements are ‘simpler’ than adjuncts since the former require fewer feature place-holders (Robert & Roussou (2003:106)), and so by R & R’s ‘structural simplification’, adjunct PPs are grammaticalized as KP-complements.

The grammaticalization of Latin/Romance KPs conforms to Ledgeway’s ‘configurationality’ and Robert & Roussou’s ‘simplification’, and a causal link is established since configurational syntax is argued to be a prerequisite for adjunct PPs to be re-analysed as KP-complements.
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