CHAPTER 5

Romance

A typological approach

PAOLO RAMAT AND DAVIDE RICCA

5.1 Typologies of Romance languages

Nowadays there exist many proposals for classifying languages from a typological point of view. In principle all the proposed typological approaches are acceptable. In what follows we shall base our description on the viewpoints of the major contemporary proposals. These in fact complement each other, since they refer to different aspects of language. Thus, word order typology is not in contrast with the actancy-based approach nor head-dependent-marking typology. Since a 'holistic typology', capable of explaining all the facts a language exhibits via a unique principle, does not yet exist, we will choose from time to time the approaches that are the most fitting to describe the various phenomena at issue.

One typological taxonomy is the 'Actancy Typology': Lazard (1991) has sketched a typology according to the behaviour of the semantic roles of Agent and Patient in relation to the verb. He assumes as a basic semantic structure which contains a Predicate, an Agent, and a Patient (or Undergoer, Experiencer) such as (1) which he calls 'phrase d'action' ('process'), 'construction biaxtancielle ma-joue' ('major biaxtancial construction'). The grammatical relations between the predicate and its arguments may be expressed by the order of the sentence, in particular with the prepositional or the arguments or even on the predicate and (parts of) its arguments.

(1) Dominus servum urberat. (Lat.)

master nom servat. acc whispli, [whispli, 23]

'The master whips the servant.'

Lazard makes use of very neutral symbols such as X, Y, and V(erg) and provides these symbols with indices which express their mutual relations. Thus the abstract structure XUV/VUV symbolizes a structure where the Agent and Patient have no marking, but the verb is marked both for the Agent and the Patient; XV/VUV, will, in turn, refer to a structure where the Agent has marking but the Patient does not, while the verb continues to reference both Agent and Patient. It is thus possible to characterize different types of constructions via this symbolism. Example (1) will be represented by

\[
X_U V_{UV} \quad \text{[n = nom, a = acc, ip3sg = present indicative, 3rd person singular]}.
\]

All members of the sentence have morphological marking, and there is no morphological difference between animate and inanimate participants. Compare:

(2) Non omnis arbusta iuasen

not all; ac lan; bushes nom please MBP33, 29

humileque

myricae (Lat., Virg. Ec. IV, 2)

humile; acl; and

tamara; acl

'not everyone likes bushes and humble tamarisks.'

The intransitive sentence (3) will be XV, whereby the Agent of the one-actant verb behaves like that of the two-actant sentence (1).

(3) Dominus semit. (Lat.)

master nom comes[33, 29]

The master is coming.'

This kind of notation enables us to classify different linguistic alignments and constructions (the active, the ergative, the antipassive, the inactive, etc.). What makes the cross-linguistic comparison possible is the invariant semantic content and the functional relations obtaining between the predicate and its two basic arguments, namely Agent and Patient.

Romance languages have predominantly constructions of the types XV/VUV and XV/VUV:

(4) le maître ber.

master neut. [nom, 23, 33]

le serviteur (Fr.)

'The master beats the servant.'

Determiners (Operators). The relation between the two elements is specified on the dependent one (hominis/the man's).

(5) homoinis dominus (Lat.)

man house pl nom, 23, 33 good luck; fortune nom (lit.)

'high mountain.'

b. monte alto fonte (It.)

mountain abl loc high; abl accus, spring nom (lit.)

'fresh spring.'

In (6), nouns with the same phonetic structure (moms-sors and monte-fonte) have no sign of their gender, and only the dependent adjective tells us that mom is masculine while sop is feminine. On the contrary, subject agreement inflection on the verb is a clear head-marking feature both in Latin and in Romance. This is not surprising, since this is probably the most widespread head-marking feature cross-linguistically (Nichols 1986:77). On the whole, Latin and Romance approach more closely the dependent- than the head-marking type, but Romance languages much less so than Latin, as will be seen.

Depending-marking languages seem to disprefer VO order (cf. Nichols 1986:79). However, neither Latin nor much less so—Romance fully comply with this tendency (see §5.3).

In the verb system tense, mood, aspect, and person morphemes, as usual in fusional languages, follow the base (cf. Lat. CANTABRHI, Fr. chantent, Sp. cantan, etc., 'singing, sing, sing'). 4 and determine the verbal nature of the word while the base is not necessarily verbal (cantus, Fr. chant, Sp. canto, mean 'song'). At any rate, in the evolution from Latin to Romance we note a progressive reversal of the directionality

4 There are some cases of prepositionless possessors in Romance (cf. REDERI, LA, 31.2.11, 31.2.14), in modern French remains the Infinitive (in House God, or in southern Italian dialects, e.g., Verbano (a house a person), Inf. the house the person) (Lehmann 1953:169). These obviously qualify as neutral with respect to the head-dependent typology.
5.2 Areal typology: Standard Average European and the Roman languages

A different approach within the typological perspective deals with the geographical dimension of interlinguistic contact and the possible rise of lingua franca areas. In this domain, a much-discussed topic in the last decade concerns the reshaping of Wheel’s (1934) impressionistic Standard Average European (SAE) into a workable and own measurable/gradable concept to identify a linguistic area embracing the core of western Europe (cf. van der Auwera 1998; Hapelmann 1998; 2001; for a more recent assessment, see van der Auwera 2011; see also 8.4.2). Roman languages all participate, more or less intensively, in the phenomenon, as do Germanic languages, western Slavonic, and Baltic languages; however, the core of the SAE lingua franca area appears to be centred on the felicitously named 'Charlemagne's Spurious Haploglot' (van der Auwera 1998:824), which involves German, Dutch, and, among the Romance languages, just French and northern Italian dialects.

Moreover, the spread and features of SAE appear indeed to have originated in the early Middle Ages (Hapelmann 2001), plausibly in a period of widespread bilingualism, especially between Latinized populations and Germanic newcomers in central Europe. Historically, the progressive emergence of SAE may have had its critical period at the time of the expansion of the Franks in central Europe (Pippin and his son Charlemagne) and the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures as well as of their vulgar translations into Germanic, Romance, and even Slavonic languages.

Several of these features probably spread later and gradually in a wider area in the following centuries, often via the mediation of high-prestige varieties (Latin itself of all, but later some established national languages as well, e.g. German and Spanish, where the grammatical information on 'they have' has been fronted).

5.3 From Latin to Romance: typologically significant category losses and innovations

5.3.1 Determiners

One of the most important innovations characterizing the Romance languages is the absence of definite and indefinite articles that is to be sought in the spoken style of non-literary texts (cf. Patras and Ramat 2004). Latin demonstratives used as deictic reinforcement, mainly at the level of the spoken language; witness in (10) the use of demonstrative eus 'the' Cat./Sp. eus-eu, Fr. le(s)-la, It. lo(la), Anc./Fris./Sc./Pl. and Sbr. a(u)-d(e)-la, Ro. dieu(-la)

As is known, the definite article derives from minimum in French: cf. It. lo comprune (dell' pane e della) cuoare 'he acheit du poit et des ouyane 'i bought (some) bread and (some) oranges'. Finally, for mass nouns a central area within Romance languages—excluding the whole of the Iberian Peninsula, and southern italo-Romance (but for old Neapolitan see Ledgeway 2009a:189-91)—has developed a partitive article (cf. 8.6.2), which is obligatory in French while it may alternate with zero in Italian. In some italo-Romance varieties it may coincide with the simple proposition 'of rather than articulated forms; cf. Tur. [t] I a ha d piu 'I bought some (lit. 'of').

5.3.2 Auxiliaries

Another important change in Romance concerns the emergence of a new system of auxiliaries (cf. 8.4.3.2.1). According to Bernsen (1968) we have here a 'cognitive change', whereas in the previous case of the articles we can speak of an 'innovating change' inasmuch we can observe the emergence of a new category (albeit not completely unknown to the mother language; see (11)). The Romance verb system introduces many periphrastic forms that have roughly the same function as the synthetic forms of the mother language (cf. 8.4.1). The Latin first persons singular perfect (eo corresponds both to it, does) 'said' (simple past, the so-called 'passato remoto') and de moto 'I have said' (the so-called 'passato prossimo'). The same holds for many Romance languages (cf. 8.5.2.3), though the frequency and the functions of the periphrastic vs the simple forms may vary from language to language. The bridging contexts which set the conditions for the change to develop are already found in Latin. Compare (12) with (13), (14):

"neque quis in eo agro aequum habuit et non somne in that field land,acc occupied,acc indicated,acc habito (Lat., C.I. 785, 211 n) have any use 'and nobody must keep occupied the land in that field''

In (12) the 'immediate constituent' analysis [agrum aequum habuit,] = (with OV, but Def*"deit" in the NP). Hence, the meaning of (12) is not that of a periphrastic action in the past ("someone occupied"); rather it refers to a universally valid state of affairs enshrined in the law. On the other hand, in (13) and (14) the past participles exequium and praebuit may, and probably should, be interpreted as belonging not to the NP but to the VP, giving it a perfect tense value (see Ramat 1987:214-7; Ledgeway 2012a:330-33). Note that praebuit does not even agree with hac omnia."
(13) dicam de istori grkeis [...] qv Athenis. Mlllay about these Greeks. what Athenian exquisitum haban (Lut., Cato ad fil. frg. 1) discovered. locus have, sp. fo. loci. (14) I will say about these Greeks [...] what I have found out in Athens (what I hold as discovered in Athens)

(14a) hoc omnim probatum babarun th, alicubi, alicubi, hodie where we have (Crib. Synopsis 7:48, Lat. transl. 6th c.) we have tried all these things

In the course of history of the Romance languages the periphrastic construction became more and more grammaticalized, and in some contemporary varieties it has almost replaced the ancient perfect in all its functions (cf. §4a.3.2). The extreme cases are spoken French, most dialects of northern Italy, Sardinian, and spoken Romanian, where the simple past has disappeared altogether.

Typologically, the use of a 'have + perfect participle' construction to form a perfect tense (whether or not it further grammaticalizes into a general perfective past) is another strong diagnostic of SAE, according to Hagothman (2001:1495). Together with Romance, it is found in all Germanic and some Balkan languages: Greek, Albanian, and Macedonian. On the other hand, it is practically unknown outside Europe (Dahl 1995; note, however, that a transitive possessive verb 'have' is by itself relatively uncommon across the world). The parallel constructions in the different branches of European languages, arising roughly in the same period, point to a complex contact picture (cf. Giacalone Ramat 2006:135-43). The case seems to exemplify well the situation of 'contact-induced' replica grammaticalization or even a 'grammaticalization area', in the words of Heine and Kuteva (2000:52-4, 182-5).

Alongside the perfect periphrastic constructions with have there also exist those with auxiliary be, the distribution of which is discussed in detail in §45.

Other verbs, too, progressively assumed the role of auxiliary, and the Romance languages offer a large palette of different functions for the new auxiliaries. For example, Spanish distinguishes between a dynamic passive auxiliary ser and a stative passive auxiliary estar.

(15) El coche era pintaio (Ser.), vs the car. was painted 'The car was being painted'

El coche estaba pinto (Sp.), the car za. was painted 'The car was painted.'

Reflexives of state 'to stand' are the most widespread auxiliary for expressing the progressive when followed by the grund: Sp. estar trabajando, It. stare lavorando 'I was working', although other strategies may occur. Many of them are based on a location schema (cf. Heine 1993:32). Gen. sup. de're: a 'skrive/du/su ke 'skrivu 'ma letra' (Tosa 1997:217) 'I'm writing a letter.' (lit. 'I'm behind to write' I'm here that I write a letter'). It. andare 'to go' may be considered a passive auxiliary in sentences where the main verb has a meaning such as 'tense, destroy' (see Giacalone Ramat 2000:126f).

(16) La memoria di questi fatti va ' a andata the memory of these facts goes is gone perdotta. (It.) lost 'The memory of these things is being/has been lost.'

In non-perfective tenses, andare may freely combine with the passive past participle of all transitive verbs; however, it involves a deontic meaning with the past, as in (17):

(17) La memoria di questi fatti va'andata/andrà the memory of these facts going/it will go/may go mantenuta/salvata. (It.) maintained/saved 'The memory of these things must be/had to be/will have to be maintained/saved.'

In several Romance languages, the same movement verb has been grammaticalized as a future auxiliary, in an allative construction quite parallel to Eng. going to. In instances such as (18), there can still be ambiguity with the original meaning as a verb of motion:

(18) Las señoras van a dormir. (Sp.) the ladies go to sleep 'The ladies go to sleep/will (soon) sleep.'

Similarly, Fr. aller and Pr. (especially Brazilian) ir 'go' are used as auxiliaries for expressing future, especially if established as certain:

(19) Je vais [*]* lui téléphoner. (Fr.) I 1sg. will call him 'I'm going to call him.'

(20) Vous [*]* allez un film no cinema. (Pr.) 2sg. go, will see a film in the cinema 'I'm going to see a film at the cinema.'

Catalan also has the construction anar o 'to go* to* infinitive. However, its meaning is not future proper, but rather imminential: it's limited uses as a future proper are mostly considered as due to Catalan interference (cf. Fabra 1998:288, Badia i Margarit 1962, 1994, n. 12; Gavarró and Laca 2002:2693). On the other hand, in Catalan a very similar construction can 'to go* to* infinitive, without a 'to* has the opposite meaning: it is the current punctual past tense in the contemporary language. On the discourse-based motivate, see Santos and Montemol (2004). Example (21) shows both periphrases in the same sentence (Gavarró and Laca 2002:2693):

(21) El fiscal anava a estrenar, però va el prosecutor go, it will go, to see new but va com' the public prosecutor was about to sneeze, but he restrained himself:

In a few Gallo-Romance varieties the verb 'come' may be used as an auxiliary for the immediate past, but in this case the construction involves, much less unexpectedly, an ablative instead of an allative preposition:

(22) Elle vient de le voir. (Fr.) she comes from she's seen 'She has just seen him.'

(23) Venir de me lavar. (It.g.) Come from me to wash 'I have just washed.' (Giacalone Ramat 2002:123).

Coming back to future periphrases, Romance displays a host of different patterns. Typologically, they match almost perfectly the main lexical resources for future 'grammatical' attested worldwide (cf. Bybee et al. 1994:251-71; Dahl 2008b), which comprise verbs of motion (see above) and modal verbs expressing volition (It. volere, Fr. vouloir, It. volere to originally mean 'I want* to* infinitive and obligation (Sp. querer, Cpl. depu 'I must* to* infinitive, Jones 1993:90, and the many reflexes of the type haber de 'to have or do'). Perhaps the only major type lacking is change-of-state futures (as in Ger. ich werde 'I become* to* infinitive). However, the Romance vestige futures (Dahl 2008b:321; Legedza 2012a:123) might fill the gap, given the very close semantic connection between 'come* and 'become', and the fact that Romance reflexes of venir 'to come* is often used to express just change of state, with no movement involved, e.g. It. vino brutto, lit. 'the weather is coming bad'.

The change-of-state meaning is indeed the most plausible starting point for a third pattern of grammaticalization of 'come* namely, its use as a passive auxiliary with the passive past participle in Italian and various other Romance languages (and, because of language contact, in some Alpine Germanic dialects such as Cimbrian and Bavarian; Ramat 1998:227), Heine and Kuteva 2005:181; for non-IE parallels see Giacalone Ramat and Sannò 2014). Note the imminential meaning in (22):

(24) Et il e vegliato catilina. (It.g.) he is come found 'He has been found.'

(25) Manso vine pudi de ei in col, (reg. Ro.) table-the comes put, by them in corner 'The table is going to be put by them in the corner.'

It is impossible to describe here all the verbs which function as auxiliaries in the Romance languages (cf. §6.3.2.1 and the list in Legedza 2012a:122-4). What matters is that the periphrastic forms have the auxiliary ('det') first and the main verb ('det') following it. This is consistent with the general trend we observed in §5.1: the transition from Latin to Romance languages involves a tendential drift from Det-"det" to the reverse order. However, inversion is possible in the Romanian future and conditional, in archaizing usage (cf. §6) where the auxiliary is an eroded form of the verb a vra* want'.

(26) Adormirse. (Ro.) fall,asleep be-det,asleep,be 'We shall fall asleep.'

This inversion reminds one of the western Romance future grammaticalization pattern curreo esto novo e* 'have' with Ov order. Traces of the periphrastics that gave rise very early in the history of the Romance languages to the new synthetic forms are still found in the (literary) Portuguese type lavar-me-e-lhe 'wash-as-me-have (I shall wash myself, alongside lavare-me-lhe.' "wash,me," where the clitic pronoun is inserted between the basic verb and the ending that derives from Lat. unus 'to have'. Similarly, the conditional may be lavar-se-e-lhe 'wash,as-me-they had (they would wash themselves).

5.3.3 Word order change

Although Legedza (2012a:201, n. 29) observes that it is difficult to provide a consistent definition of the term 'have' as used by Nichols (1986:61f) and others, there is a general agreement that the change from Ov (i.e. Det-"det") to VO (i.e. Det-"det") is one of the main features characterizing the shift from Latin to the Romance languages. However, it has to be noted that Latin was not a rigid OV language with obligatory final position of the verb, like Turkish or Japanese. As a basically inflectional language, its word order was rather free. For instance, in
Most variation within Romance does not involve the basic orders, but rather their rigidity, both diachronically and synchronically. While the unmarked order is SVO everywhere, marked sentence orders reflecting differences in informational structure are marginal in French, but quite common, for example, in Italian and Spanish. In Italian VOS and OVS are possible, and Spanish, besides VOS order pragmatically similar to Italian, has also VSO for all-rhematic sentences (Zabarella 1999:635-4). Historically, both old Italian and old French displayed less rigidity in many constructions than their contemporary descendants (cf. §511.33.2, 625).1

The increasing rigidity which developed from Latin to Romance languages has been traditionally connected with the loss of case endings. However, reduction of case endings is attested already in ancient Latin: the famous funerary inscription of Lucius Cornelius Scipio Cl. (L. 1), second half of the third century bc (illustrated in 33) would be as in (33) in Classical Latin.

(32) Hunc oino ploraturne coniugat
Hunc oino ploraturne coniugat
Romanae / duovorm optio se fortis
Romanorum, pro. good cum bel, acc. cum bel, acc. pro. fortis
ultra (OLat.)

maxim. 'the majority of Romans agree that this one has been the best of the good men'

(33) hunc unus plurimi consentur romanorum optimumuisse sibiercin (CLat.)

We can see that final -is is regularly omitted in one, duovorm, optio, and uter. This may involve neutralization with the nominative singular, because also the nominative ending -is is not fully stable for instance, it does not appear in formas, from the inscription from Tusculum (CL. L. 49, century third ac)

(34) M. Furius
M. Furius
C. F. tribunus militare de
C. F. tribunus militare de
M. Furius
M. Furius
Iulio
Iulio
Iulii
Iulii
tribunum militare
tribunum militare
Praetor
Praetor
Iulius
Iulius
Marcellus
Marcellus
Marcelli
Marcelli
gave
give
give
give (this object)

'The tribune M. Furius, son of Calius, gave (this object) to Mars from a military plunder'

Consequently, it cannot be said that the loss of final comitatives automatically generated the use of prepositions, nor vice versa. In 34 we see that an ablative (praditus) is preceded by a preposition (de): case marking and prepositions are often used simultaneously. There has been a sparsity between the two factors and the process leading from Platonis libri 'Plato's books' to i libri di Plato 'the books of Plato' developed along a continuum lasting centuries. In (34) formi coincides with nominative case-marked tribunus (CLat. tribunus).

Note that in some Romance varieties, after the loss of the distinction between nominative and accusative (tribunus - nominative and accusative), a new direct object marker was developed much later via the prepositions a 'to' or (in Romanian) pe 'on'.

(35) Chisamou a Michelli (Scat)
Chisamou a Michelli (Scat)
he called a Michele

he called Michele

(36) Ana a vezut-o pe Maria (Ita)
Ana a vezut-o pe Maria (Ita)
Ana has seen-her pr Maria

'Ana has seen Maria.'

At this stage, the object relation is marked similarly to the other non-subject roles in the sentence. However, the introduction of a direct object marker makes invention easier: A Mikhail chisamou (though with Mikhail now focalized), since the object is clearly marked. In no Romance language, however, has this prepositional marking of the object been generalized: it is limited to a subset of NPs, whose extension varies, but is generally identifiable as an upper segment of the well-known typological hierarchies of animacy and or definiteness (cf. Rousong 1998:218-20). For instance, in (37) we have both the direct object with a and without a, depending on the different status of the two NPs along the hierarchy (a pronoun vs. a N) with a lower degree of referentiality:

(37) Più nobili cosa esti vinciti a se
Più nobili cosa esti vinciti a se
more noble thing is
more noble thing is
vinciti a se
vinciti a se

'more noble than to overcome the enemies'

As for the other features related to the OV or VD order (Greenberg's 'universalism'), we may observe, again, a freedom which progressively diminished in the Romance languages. Latin, especially old Latin, could have the relative clause proposed to its referent head, thus with Det "Det:"

(38) mandatque quee sunt velo deferre epistulam
mandatque quee sunt velo deferre epistulam
which are I want deliver

letters

(39) posterulam a me
(34) postulam a me
'I want to deliver the letters that were given to me.'

However, the most frequent order was already N + relative clause (i.e. Det"Det:""). In French, as well as in the other Romance languages, it would be impossible to have 'quee sunt velo deferre epistulam' which (too, me) have been given I want to deliver the letters'. What is possible is que eis hominum quee sunt velo deferre epistulam the letters which were given to me I want to deliver the letters', with a proverbial aphoristic reversion of 'letters' in the main clause.

The same holds for comparative constructions: Latin had both comparative + standard and standard + comparative, whereas Romance languages have just comparative + standard. Car. Antone he più velcha odi/Filippo 'Antone is older than Filippo.'

Finally, in Latin adjectives may precede (39) or follow (40) their heads.

(40) lex est ratio
law/proportion is
decisive (Lat., Cic. Leg. Man. 1, 20)

'sum is the right way to rule'

(41) in senatus populus
in senate/people
Romani
Romanians

under control of the Roman Senate and people'

The traditional view is that the adjective is proposed when it is strictly connected to the noun as an epithet, as in (19) and (20), and postponed if it delimits a particular subclass, as in (40) (cf. Errnout and Thomas 1989:162). Urbanus 'an urban prator' (epithet) vs prator urbanus 'prator of the town' (classifying). However, there are many counterexamples, such as nasibus [...] eternus vs eternus naves (Caes. B.G. 4.2.1, 22.4) 'transport ships'. Other authors claim that the N-adjective order was already the unmarked one in Classical Latin (see Ledygawy 2012a:210-13). In Romance languages we have instances of clear semantic oppositions: Fr. un pavon causé 'a poor speaker' is a person who is not gifted for speeches, whereas an uncausé pavon is a speaker who is poor ('not rich'); it number of families means 'many families but families number 'large families'; Sp. un pobre bonito is a 'poor fellow' whereas un pobre nobio is a 'poor man'. Apart from such cases of strong
5.3.4 Sentence negation

A significant instance of differentiation in word order among the Romance languages is offered by sentence negation, reflecting the different stages of the well-known Jespersen's Cycle (Jespersen 1917:4; see e.g. Schweger 1990:153-74; Benmim and Ramat 1996; van der Auwera and Neukomm 2004:58f; cf. also §5.3.2.2.1). The inherited order, with the Latin sentence negator ne 'not' preceding the finite verb in main declarative sentences, has been maintained, together with the marker itself, in the lateral areas (Iberian Peninsula, central and southern Italy, and Romania). Central regions—apart from Liguria and Veneto in northern Italy—have seen a host of basically parallel, but independent, processes of renewal, by which a multitude of different items (chiefly: (i) the negative quantifier nothing; (ii) lexical items originally denoting minimal quantities, such as step', crumb', drop', etc., so-called 'negative polarity items'; and (iii) expressions of holophrastic negation originally occurring sentence-finally) have grammaticalized sentence negation.

Most of the above processes give rise to a new V-ne order, although many varieties (standard Fr. ne...pas is obviously the most familiar) display the intermediate stage of discontinuous negation. However, the new postverbal negators, due to their different historical origins, cannot be subsumed under a single syntactic perspective: for a detailed analysis, see Perry (1996) for Italo-Romance, and §6.1.2.2.

At any rate, the resulting V-ne order taken as a whole is clearly marked from a general typological perspective: in Dryer's (2011) sample of 1,326 languages, the V-ne type (including both word-like and affixal negators, and even negative verbs, which do not have much in common with the process outlined above) is by far the most common worldwide, with about 52% of the total, while V-ne types amount to about 28%, and the discontinuous 'double negator' type to about 16% (with several minor or hybrid types accounting for the remaining 8%). As a matter of fact, French-based creoles in Louisiana and Guadeloupe have restored the typologically unmarked pre- verbal position of negation, thus completing Jespersen's Cycle (Ramat 2006).

(41) Mo pa koup. (Lou.)
   Ne pa vie. (Gar.)
   "I don't cut"
   "We don't want."

A different typological perspective on sentence negation is taken in Mietoani (2003), whose main defining parameter is the dichotomy between 'symmetric' and 'asymmetric' negation. The negative construction is labelled symmetric if it does not derive from the corresponding affirmative in any other meaningful way than by the presence of negative markers (Mietoani 2005:63).

In particular, asymmetry may involve: (i) neutralizations in the negative paradigm (e.g. fewer tense-mood distinctions, or no person inflection in the negative constructions); (ii) the occurrence of a dedicated 'negative verb' which carries inflection; (iii) some sort of specialized tense-aspect-modal marking for negative constructions.

On the whole, despite the relevant functional motivations for the different kinds of asymmetric negation, symmetric negation turns out to be the most widespread type in Mietoani's balanced language sample, which deals with main declarative sentences only. Romance languages all display the symmetric type in such sentences, although they often show (as Latin did) asymmetry in imperatives (especially in the second person singular), a favourite locus for asymmetry crossing (van der Auwera and Lejeune 2011). Negative imperatives may require a different verb form as in (42) and (43), or the use of a dedicated auxiliary, as [sta] stay' in (44):

(42) Cantal
   sing.aw.2sg Don't sing'
   sing
   "Don't sing!"

(43) [cantan]
   sing.aw.2sg Don't sing'
   sing
   "Don't sing!"

(44) [kanta]
   nu sta a kanta [gen]
   stay.aw.2sg to sing' Don't sing!'
   "Don't sing!" (Toso 1997:214).

5.3.5 The clitic pronoun system and its grammaticalization potential

Another major innovation in the Romance system with respect to Latin is undoubtedly the development of clitic pronouns. These are found in all Romance varieties for the object and the dative function, and less extensively for oblique functions.

A series of clitic subject pronouns is also found in a central area of the Romance domain, comprising Friuli, northern Occitan, Francoprovençal, Romansh except Sursee, Ladin, Friulian, and northern Italo-Romance, including Florentine. This latter series is often not complete for all persons, depending on the variety. The literature on both subject and non-subject clitics in huge (see Cis 45, 47, 48). We limit ourselves to a brief considerations about the typological significance of this innovation.

Cross-linguistically, Romance non-subject pronominal clitics have rather close parallels in other Indo-European languages of Europe, especially Slavonic (cf. Dimotika-Volchnovanova 1999) and Greek (cf. Aragontopoulou 1999). They do not fit particularly well into the picture of Standard Average European, however, and they have never been proposed as an identifying and typical feature for this linguistic area, although they were the object of a dedicated volume within the "European" project (van Riemsdijk 1999). For all three families, perhaps the most significant typological issue is the extent to which they can be considered an instance of a head-marking strategy for non-subject roles in the sentence. This would mean in the case of Romance a significant change with respect to Latin, which is usually characterized as overwhelmingly dependent-marking, as seen in §5.3. (cf. Nicholls 1986:89). Related to this issue, and applicable to subject clitics as well, is the question of the level of grammaticalization of clitics along the syntax-morphology continuum. A strictly head-marking interpretation of clitics would imply their turning into obligatory agreement markers on the verb, fully entering the domain of inflectional morphology.

From this perspective the relevant data involve so-called left- and right-dislocations (we use the term simply as a useful label, without implying that they are the result of any kind of movement rule), in which the full NP and its clitic resumption (or anticipation) co-occur in the same utterance, as in the following Italian examples where the object clitic le co-occurs with the full NP object:

(45) Le chiavi le prendo in (It.)
   The keys them- Take I
   'I'll take the keys myself.'

(46) a. Le ho preso le chiavi, (It.)
   have taken.le.chiavi
   'I've taken the keys.'
   b. Le ho preso io, le chiavi, (It.)
   have taken.le.chiavi
   'It's me that took the keys.'

Sentences (45) and (46) are not pragmatically equivalent to those without a clitic such as (47) because (simplifying considerably) they tend to imply topicalization of the object NP, which in the unmarked sentence (47) is normally part of the rheme.

(47) Preso ho preso le chiavi, (It.)
   have taken.le.chiavi
   'I'll take/Have taken.me the keys'

As a matter of fact, and despite complications in the range of their pragmatic value(s) (Berruto 1985; Frasaccelli 2003), dislocation constructions are never obligatorily Italian in a strictly syntactic point of view. This means that the clitics cannot be considered (necessarily) as agreement markers. Right dislocations are probably a better starting point than left dislocations for a full grammaticalization of the construction, because the transition to an obligatory 'subjective conjugation', which is the agreement marker (cf. Berrutto 1989), would be unproblematic in terms of the word order of the 'major' constituents.

The grammaticalization process of the clitic towards an agreement marker is more advanced in Spanish, where constructions displaying clitic obligatoriness do exist, and therefore cannot be dealt with in terms of some marked pragmatic value (cf. Lehmann 1982:238). For instance, there is no alternative in Spanish if the object is a full personal pronoun, as in (48), or the quantifier toda 'everything', as in (49):

(48) Yo lo le vi a él, él, la, él, (Sp.)
   I him= saw to him I saw to him
   'I saw him.'
disputed for a different approach, which postulates just two genders but assigns independent controller capability to the single nominal inflectional markers, see Maiden (2011:201, n. 346:2013). The Italian case for a distinct alternating gender is less clear. Nouns like *luvo ‘the egg’, plural *luvi, which select masculine targets in the singular and feminine ones in the plural, as in Romanian, do exist, but they are very limited in number (twenty or so), are not productive, and represent a residual class. For them, Acquaviva (2002; 2006:123-61) proposes a different description. Relying on the fact that several of such nouns admit both plural forms, an -e feminine and an -i masculine, often with different in meaning (e.g. *mac bracio ‘arm’, *mac bracia ‘arms’ [of persons, e.g. bracia di un fiante ‘arms of a river’], and relying further on a synthetic argument about gender resolution in coordinate phrases, Acquaviva suggests that the relationship between il bracio and le bracia is not inflectional, but derivational: according to him, bracio/-i is a regular masculine noun and le bracia is a different lexeme, a feminine plural noun related to the former by a conversion process. Clearly, if bracio no longer belongs to the same inflectional paradigm of braccio, there is no need for an alternating gender at all. But see further discussion in §424.2. This argument cannot, however, be automatically extended to older phases of Italian; nor to several Italo-Romance varieties in central and southern Italy, where the type is much more widespread and the agreement patterns in coordination may work like in Romanian, as shown by Loporcaro and Paciaroni (2001:100-09).

Typologically, many of the Italo-Romance varieties mentioned above are more interesting than Romanian, because, besides a still vital alternating gender, they also display a different phenomenon, also a remnant of the Latin neuter, but kept fully separate synchronically: the so-called ‘Latin neuter’ or in these varieties ‘roman’ neuter (not only original Latin neuters) require a set of agreement targets different from masculine, i.e. they belong to a different agreement class and therefore to a different gender. The opposition is reflected generally in the determiners (e.g. Mac [lo pu] ‘bread’, mass neuter, vs [la ku] ‘the dog’) and may extend to other targets like adjectives (Paciaroni and Loporcaro 2010). A similar, though not identical, phenomenon is present in Asturian and Leonese (Ojeda 1992). Leaving the details to the discussion in §5133.2 and §574, it is important to stress that this ‘Roman neuter’ is productive (it is assigned to borrowings like ‘sport’, and applies e.g. to nominalized infinitives), and, unlike the alternating gender discussed above, it is also a target gender. As discussed in Loporcaro and Paciaroni (2011), such systems are a rarity in Indo-European, where the dominant tendency has been replacing the original three-value system or at most keeping it intact.4

It is fair to say that the very nature of ‘mass neuter’ as a phenomenon pertaining to gender does not meet universal consensus. For instance, Corbett (2000:127) considers the Asturian data as an instance of ‘mass number’ andledgeay (2009a:150) speaks of a third independent inflectional category [finmu] for Neapolitan.

Coming now to number distinctions proper, the apparent typological uniformity of Romance data needs some qualification. Certainly all Romance varieties distinguish just two values for this category, singular and plural, as did Latin; but the expression of the category is not that uniform (for further discussion of the typological issues from a Romance-internal perspective, see also §423.1). A significant dimension of variation regards the form—or the bare existence—of morphological marking on the noun. Despite the overwhelming cross-linguistic prevalence for suffixation, for several Romance varieties suffixation turns out to be only a recessive feature. In French, nouns are basically uninflected for number (despite orthography and liaison phenomena in very limited contexts, e.g. le jeux olympiques [le jeu olympique]; only a small minority of nouns keep the number distinction in all contexts essentially some words ending in -al, with plural-[e], such as chenal—chaux ‘horse(s)’). In many colloquial varieties of Spanish, as in Andalusia and many areas of Latin America, the plural suffix -s is being lost, leaving—in the extreme case of full disappearance—most nouns uninflected for number (Peppi 2000:122:5, 148-50). But probably the greatest wealth of cross-linguistically marked solutions is found in northern Italy, invariability tends to be the rule—apart from a small, phonologically conditioned classes and remnants of metaplectic stem alternants—for all masculine, i.e. for the majority of nouns in Piedmontese, Lombar and Friulian varieties, while in Lombardy the dominant strategy appears to be the typologically marked stem change process, due to the relevance of morphologized metaphonic processes. See, for instance, the examples—both with nouns and adjectives—from Lugo (Pellicceri 1979, quoted in Maiden 1979:211):

4 However, wider surveys would be needed here, especially concerning the possible emergence of alternating genders in languages which also keep the original Indo-European triplicate masculine/feminine/neuter distinction (cf. Loporcaro and Paciaroni 2011:1003).
However, the most 'exotic' instance is found in western Lombard and Emilian varieties which couple the invariable or metaphonetic masculines with a subtractive (or at least anti-iconic) process for the -e feminines: MIL/BR. [It 'scarpa'], nl ['skarp'] 'the shoes' (a very rare phenomenon cross-linguistically).

Although these data are basically the consequence of 'blind' phonetic changes, they led to a recurrent evolutionary tendency concerning the marking site(s) of plural information. Unlike Latin, number in Romance can be viewed as a stable inflectional category only if we look beyond the noun. Clearly, number is always a property of the NP (or DP) as a whole, but the dominant strategy in Latin, a typical fusional language, was the redundant marking of the feature on both the noun and its agreement targets (determiners, quantifiers, possessives, adjectives, and anaphoric pronouns). In the Romance varieties in which many or most nouns are invariable, very little has changed at the level of the phrase; nearly all phrases still carry unambiguous number information, due to the fact that number inflection has been generally preserved in determiners, quantifiers, and other grammatical items (and also verbs).

For instance, in Andalusian Spanish we have (53a,b) and in Torinese (54):

(53) a. El [fr] el perro peligroso e[li]n
    the/this.male dog dangerous is
    desencaden. (And.)
    chained.
    'The/this dangerous dog is chained up.'

b. Lo/T[fr]lo perro peligroso e[li]n
    the/this.male dog dangerous are
    desencaden. (And.)
    chained.
    'The/these dangerous dogs are chained up.'

(54) a. [el/la/lui/la 'libro'] (Tur.)
    'the/this/that book,'

b. [i/ei/costi/i [k] [i] 'libro'] (Tur.)
    'the/some/these/those books.'

Some instances of preservation of inflectional marking cannot be easily accounted for on purely phonetic grounds, and may be restorations/corrections reflecting a morphosyntactic principle of generalizing the preferential locus for number marking outside the noun. In Torinese, this is the case for the masculine plural ending -i in the demonstrative 'questi/these' above, and in quantifiers: 'tant/più 'libro' 'many/few books.'

Similar instances of selective marking of plural on determiners only are reported for several other Romance varieties (e.g. Auvergnat and Breton/Portuguese) by Ledgeway (1962:24,205), who takes them as reflecting a more general tendency towards increase of head-marking strategies in the transition from Latin to Romance. This is certainly possible, but ultimately depends on the still problematic definition of head articles are clearly heads with respect to N in the current DP approach of generative models, but would be considered as modifiers in other models, including that adopted by Nichols (1980) in her original proposal of the head-dependent typology.