The rise and fall of alignments in Romance *vs* Daco-Romance

Ștefania Costea (University of Oxford)

The presentation investigates the main causes responsible for different evolutions in the verbal domain across Daco-Romance, i.e. Daco-Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, Aromanian, and Istro-Romanian, comparing them, in turn, to the rest of Romance. In particular, we will focus on the alignments present in Latin and (early) Romance, on one hand, and across the Balkans, on the other. Deliberately oversimplifying, the former witnessed a shift from a nominative/accusative alignment, whereby all subjects (e.g., AGENT, PATIENT/UNDERGOER) are marked the same, to an active/stative alignment, whereby PATIENT/UNDERGOER subjects are marked differently from AGENT subjects. To take but one example, the fact that the active/stative alignment in auxiliary selection was generalised in the passage from Latin to early Romance (cf. Ledgeway 2012:319) can be easily seen in the Gallo-Romance examples below, dating from the eleventh and twelfth centuries, respectively. Verbs that took AGENT subjects align with reflexes of HABERE (cf. *avez* […] *toluz* 'you have captured' in (1)), while verbs whose subjects were PATIENTS select for reflexes of ESSE (cf. *soi aprochatz* 'I have come' under (2)).

(1) *Vos   li   avez   tuz ses   castelz   toluz*
    you   CL.DAT.3SG.M have.IND.PRS.2PL all his.PL castle.PL   capture.PART.MPL
    'You have captured all his castles' (old French, *Chanson de Roland* 236)

(2) *tant   soi   aprochatz   de   la   fi*
    so   be.IND.PRS.1SG come.PART.MSG   of   the   end
    'so I have come to an end' (old Occitan, *Pos de chanter m'es pres talenz*)

Somewhat differently from the evolutions seen in Latin and Romance, Balkan varieties consistently displayed a nominative/accusative alignment. By means of illustration, Hellenistic Greek auxiliary εἰμί 'be' indiscriminately combines with both AGENT and PATIENT/UNDERGOER subjects, witness its co-occurrence with the direct object τὸν Κώνωπα 'Conops' in (3) below.

(3) *ᾧ   τὸν   Κώνωπα   ἦν   κατακοιμίσας*
    which.DAT the.ACC   Conops.ACC   be.IND.IMPF.3SG put.to.sleep.PART.AOR.MSG
    '[the drug] with which he had put Conops to sleep'

                                          (Hellenistic Greek, Ach.*Tat.Leuc.Clit.*2.31.1)

(4) *ἐπυνθάνετο   τίς   εἴη   καὶ   τί   ἐστιν   πεποιηκώς*
    ask.IND.IMPF.3SG who be.OPT.3SG and   what be.IND.PRS.3SG do.PART.PRF.MSG
    '(the commanding officer) inquired who he was and what he had done'

                                          (Hellenistic Greek, *Acts*.21.33)

It is highly probable that when Latin was acquired by Balkan populations it was influenced by the nominative/accusative alignment of the substrate. Thus, the result would be a generalised nominative/accusative syntax from the earliest stages of Daco-Romance, i.e., deriving from the variety of Latin spoken in Dacia. Now, although the earliest written attestations of a Daco-Romance variety date from the sixteenth century, the current comparative method allows us to reconstruct the unattested stages. In this respect, it is essential to note that despite the fact that Daco-Romance varieties, i.e. Daco-Romanian, Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian, and Istro-Romanian, split around the tenth century, they remarkably pattern alike as far as the (nominative/accusative) alignment is concerned, viz. the auxiliary HAVE is indiscriminately used alongside both AGENT and PATIENT/UNDERGOER subjects (cf. (5)-(8) below). Thus, it can be assumed that the auxiliary HAVE had already generalised by the time the Daco-Romance unity was interrupted.

(5) *am*   *cântat* / *am*   *vinit*
 have.IND.PRS.1SG read.PART   have.IND.PRS.1SG come.PART
 'I (have) read' / 'I have come' (Megleno-Romanian)

(6) *am*   *vidzută* / *me-am dusă*
 have.IND.PRS.1SG see.PART(.FEM) CL.ACC.1SG=have.IND.PRS.1SG go.PART(.FEM)
 'I saw' / 'I (have) been' (Aromanian)

(7) *a*   *dat*   / *av*   *verit*
 have.IND.PRS.3SG give.PART   have.IND.PRS.3SG come.PART
 'he gave' / 'he came' (Istro-Romanian)

(8) *am*   *știut* / *au*   *plecat*
 have.IND.PRS.1SG know.PART   have.IND.PRS.3PL leave.PART
 'I knew' / 'they went' (Daco-Romanian)

All in all, our current analysis, which takes into account the Balkan nature of the Daco-Romance family, explains why Daco-Romance does not display any traces of an erstwhile active/stative alignment, otherwise present, albeit to different degrees, across Romance varieties.

(SELECTED) BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J.N. (2013). *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bentein, K. (2016). *Verbal Periphrasis in Ancient Greek: Have- and Be- Constructions.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Capidan, Th. (1925). *Meglenoromânii. Istoria și graiul lor (I)*. Bucharest: Cultura Națională.

Capidan, Th. (1932). *Aromânii. Dialectul aromân. Studiu lingvistic*. Bucharest: Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului (Imprimeria Națională).

Kovačec, A. (1971). *Descrierea istroromânei actuale.* Bucharest: Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Ledgeway, A. (2012). *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.