Introduction

Dufter, A ; Stark, E

Andreas Dufter and Elisabeth Stark

1 Introduction

Abstract: This chapter seeks to situate the contents of the volume within the larger context of comparative Romance linguistics, and with respect to cross-linguistic and theory-driven investigations into morphosyntax and syntax at large. To this end, the chapter will survey a selection of comparative Romance reference works and venture some remarks about Romance linguistics as a discipline. It will then take stock of some basic notions and widely accepted tenets of syntax and morphosyntax, before providing an overview of the structure and the contents of the volume. Finally, a number of acknowledgements will be made.

Keywords: Romance linguistics, syntax, morphosyntax, syntactic categories, syntactic relations, constituency, dependency, null subject parameter, left periphery, grammaticalization

1 Comparative Romance morphosyntax and syntax: remarks on the development of a discipline

Romance languages and dialects are obviously related, yet differ from each other in a plethora of ways. In the transition from Late Latin to the medieval varieties dubbed *volgari* or *romances*, linguistic change set these emerging Romance vernaculars apart from Latin, and yielded significant diversification within the Romance-speaking territories. This diachronic development has come to be known as *Ausgliederung* 'fragmentation' since Walther von Wartburg's seminal study (Wartburg 1936). It affected not only phonology and the lexicon, but also, and perhaps most interestingly, "core" aspects of grammatical systems, and in particular morphosyntax and syntax. Ever since their earliest attestations, the varieties of Romance have demonstrably continued to evolve, and grammatical change has been ongoing and fostered grammatical variation. Of course, geographical and social differentiation may not come as a surprise in languages boasting large communities of speakers on different continents, such as Spanish, Portuguese and French. However, morphosyntactic and syntactic variation is equally pervasive in Italian and Romanian, and in regional languages such as Catalan and Sardinian, to give but two examples. At the same time, variation has traditionally been frowned upon by prescriptive grammarians and other language observers. At least since the early modern period, and in particular since the invention of the printing press, processes of standardization have been operative. Typically at least, the protagonists of standardization aimed at reducing variability in grammar, prescribing "correct" variants and condemning all

others. Nonetheless, the outcome of standardization has never been complete homogeneity. Rather, the situation of Romance languages in modern times is characterized by a co-existence of standard varieties, local and regional vernaculars, and emergent regional standard varieties, such as Regional Southern French. The implications for comparative Romance linguistics are clear enough: Ideally at least, it needs to investigate both variation between the individual Romance languages, i.e., cross-linguistic or "macro"-variation, and variation within individual Romance languages, i.e., regional ("diatopic") and socio-stylistic ("diastratic" and "diaphasic") "micro"-variation.

Such comprehensive coverage of variation certainly constitutes a daunting task for a handbook on comparative Romance linguistics. Back in the nineteenth century, the founding fathers of the discipline already needed several hundred pages of text for their reference works, at a time when systematic dialectological investigations were in their infancy, and other types of micro-variation barely taken into consideration: Friedrich Diez published his famous *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* (1836–1839) in three volumes, focusing on Italian, Romanian, Spanish, Portuguese, French and Occitan. Some fifty years later, Wilhelm Meyer-Lübke presented another four-volume *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* (1890–1902). Meyer-Lübke's grammar provides an admirably clear and informative account which reflected the theoretical advances of historical and comparative linguistics in the wake of the Neogrammarians (see also Swiggers 2014).

The twentieth century, by contrast, is largely characterized by a relative scarcity of reference works devoted to the Romance language family as a whole. Mention should be made in this context of overviews such as Bourciez's *Éléments de linguistique romane* ([5]1967, [1]1910), Lausberg's *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft* (3 vol., 1956–1962) or Robert A. Hall Jr.'s *Comparative Romance Grammar* (3 vol., 1974–1983). While all these books offer structuralist accounts of phonology and morphology, they fail to describe morphosyntax and syntax in a systematic fashion. Other standard references, such as the widely cited volume *The Romance Languages* (Harris/Vincent 1988), provide a collection of portraits of individual languages rather than a pan-Romance perspective on the similarities and differences in their grammatical organization. To be fair, it must be acknowledged that a significant number of monographs and collected volumes on specific topics of comparative Romance grammar have been published since Lausberg's and Hall's times.[1] All these publications attest to the fertility of investigating close linguistic relatives. Many of them offer fresh data and original analyses, often with important implications for grammatical theory at large.

---

1 See, among others, the monographs by Thun (1986), Wanner (1987), Zanuttini (1997), Squartini (1998), Mensching (2000), Cruschina (2011), and Manzini/Savoia (2011), and volumes edited by Dahmen et al. (1998), Hulk/Pollock (2001), Stark/Wandruszka (2003), Kaiser (2005), Remberger/Mensching (2008), Stark/Schmidt-Riese/Stoll (2008), Dufter/Jacob (2009; 2011), and De Cesare/Garassino (2016).

However, it would probably be misguided to try and consult these volumes as introductory surveys of some subfield of the discipline.

At the same time, grammars of individual Romance languages and language varieties abound (see Dufter 2010 for a short overview of synchronic descriptive grammars in the Romania, and Seilheimer 2014 for historical grammars). As is to be expected, these grammars differ considerably in their theoretical ambition, empirical scope, and target audience. Some of them put a strong focus on syntactic theory, often within the generative framework,[2] whereas other authoritative grammars, albeit theoretically informed, may be more easily accessible to a larger readership.[3]

Against the backdrop of such increasing specialization, and an ever-increasing diversity of theoretical backgrounds and research agendas, an uneasy feeling was gaining ground that Romance linguistics as a discipline might be threatened by fragmentation (see contributions to Dahmen et al. 2006). This is, however, but one of the reasons why the encyclopedic *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* (*LRL*, 8 vol., 1988–2005), edited by Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin and Christian Schmitt, may well be considered a landmark publication: As a timely state-of-the-art reference work, it has offered orientation and guidance to a whole generation of scholars interested in Romance languages and dialects, from both synchronic and diachronic vantage points. As far as comparative Romance morphosyntax and syntax are concerned, the *LRL* boasts two chapters (Oesterreicher 1996a,b), which offer an informed, accessible and admirably comprehensive overview in only 83 pages of text. More generally, the LRL has also served to update the field as a discipline, to reaffirm its aims and scope, and to reinstate the importance of studying "minor" varieties such as Astur-Leonese, Corsican or Friulian. No less than seventeen Romance languages are recognized by the *LRL* and described, albeit with varying degrees of precision, one by one. As a consequence, four of the eight volumes are devoted to the presentation of individual languages (and their dialects), while only three adopt more general linguistic and comparative perspectives (and volume 8 comprises a number of indices). The languages of publication are German and the major Romance languages, a fact which

---

2 See, in particular, the influential monographs by Kayne (1975), Jones (1996) and Rowlett (2007) on French, Rizzi (1982), Burzio (1986), Cinque (1995) and Samek-Lodovici (2015) on Italian, Jones (1993) on Sardinian, Zagona (2002) on Spanish, Gupton (2014) on Galician, Costa (2004) on European Portuguese, and Dobrovie-Sorin (1993) and Dobrovie-Sorin/Giurgea (2013) on Romanian.

3 For academic purposes, key references include Wilmet (^{5}2010), Riegel/Pellat/Rioul (^{5}2014) and Grevisse (^{16}2016) for French, Renzi/Salvi/Cardinaletti (1988–1995) and Serianni (1988) for Italian, Fernández Ramírez (1951; 1985–1987), Bosque/Demonte (1999) and RAE/ASALE (2009) for Spanish, Castilho (2010), Raposo et al. (2013) and Cunha/Cintra (^{6}2014) for Portuguese, Álvarez/Xove (2002) for Galician, Wheeler/Yates/Dols (1999) and Solà Cortassa et al. (2002) for Catalan, and Guţu Romalo (2005) and Pană Dindelegan (2013) for Romanian. In addition, there is a wealth of grammars written to fit the practical needs of language teaching, in particular second language learning. For reasons of space, we will only mention Mosegaard Hansen (2016) for French, Maiden/Robustelli (2000) for Italian, Butt/Benjamin (^{5}2011) for Spanish, and Hutchinson/Lloyd (^{2}2003) for Portuguese.

regrettably might have hindered somewhat the accessibility of the *LRL* in linguistics at large.

For historical Romance linguistics, the three-volume handbook *Romanische Sprachgeschichte* (*RSG*, Ernst et al. 2003–2008), published by De Gruyter, offers an impressive array of chapters, with a strong focus on external aspects of language use and language standardization in a historical perspective. Several of the chapters are devoted to the Romance language family as a whole, a few in volume 3 also address morphosyntactic and syntactic questions, though never in a comparative perspective. And, again, a majority of articles are written in German, the rest in either French, Italian, or Spanish.

For those who do not read all of these languages, the two volumes of the *Cambridge History of the Romance Languages* (Maiden/Smith/Ledgeway 2011/2013) may come in handy. This reference work adopts a comparative, pan-Romance perspective in all chapters. It thereby succeeds in providing an up-to-date survey of the field, not least so in its chapters on morphosyntactic and syntactic change, and persistence.

Finally, the most recent addition to the list of reference works is the *Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages* (Ledgeway/Maiden 2016). In one single large volume, this handbook contains chapters on individual Romance language varieties as well as comparative overviews, several of them pertaining to the domains of morphosyntax and syntax.

All in all, then, one might very well assume that those seeking an accessible overview of some key topics in Romance morphosyntax and syntax will manage to find something in existing grammars, handbooks and, possibly, other published sources. Why add yet another manual to the set of existing reference works?

To begin with, we strongly believe that Romance morphosyntax and syntax deserve – at the very least – a handbook volume of their own, comprising some 930 pages and 24 chapters, as happens to be the case with the volume at hand. There are probably many arguments to defend this point of view, but one of them is that over the last decades, grammatical descriptions of Romance varieties, including historical stages of the language and historical as well as present-day dialects, have had a significant impact on (morpho)syntactic theory at large. Conversely, theoretical and typological (morpho)syntax has inspired and guided new research into Romance varieties. In-depth investigations of older language stages have deepened our understanding of the mechanisms of grammatical change.[4] On a synchronic level, investigations into the syntax of dialects and other "vernacular" varieties supposedly un-

---

[4] Representative publications include Klausenburger (2000), Salvi (2004) and Ledgeway (2012) for new theoretical perspectives on grammatical change from Latin into Romance, Arteaga (2013) on Old French, Jensen (1986; 1990) on Old Occitan and Old French, Salvi/Renzi (2010), Benincà/Ledgeway/Vincent (2014) and Poletto (2014) on Old Italian, Fischer (2010) on Old Catalan, Kato/Ordóñez (2016) on the evolution of Latin American Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese, and Pană Dindelegan (2016) on Old Romanian.

affected by normative pressure have loomed large over the last few decades. This seems to hold in particular for Italo-Romance, where research activities have been vibrant, typically within the generative approach.[5] In Europe, the *Going Romance* conference series has become a prominent annual venue. In a similar vein, the *Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages* constitutes an established conference series in North American academia in which issues pertaining to Romance morphosyntax and syntax have always enjoyed a prominent place. Such conferences are emblematic of the cross-fertilization of grammatical theory, new descriptive accounts of Romance varieties, and new methods of data collection, including sociolinguistic and experimental ones. Both the *Going Romance* and the *Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages* conferences regularly lead to publications of selected papers in edited volumes, published by John Benjamins. While it is true that a significant number of articles collected in these volumes concentrate on only one variety of Romance, the very fact that the entire family of Romance languages and dialects is accepted as an object of linguistic investigation may be taken as indicative of a shared interest in maintaining Romance linguistics as a discipline. In addition, there are a number of renowned journals such as *Probus* or *Revue Romane* which are exclusively devoted to the linguistic study of all Romance language varieties. Conferences and academic journals such as those mentioned have significantly promoted comparative investigations into Romance grammar, at a time when institutionalized academia would be more likely to encourage compartmentalized research agendas. The time is thus ripe, we would venture to say, to account for the results of this renewed interest, and for the new insights gathered in recent research, in an accessible handbook format.

As linguists working in Romance departments, however, we sometimes feel that there continues to exist something like a "cultural gap" between, on the one side, theoretically minded linguists, of both formalist and functionalist persuasions, and, on the other side, scholars trained in the time-honored philological traditions of research into Romance languages and dialects. It may not be much of an overstatement to say that for each side, there exist separate conferences, networks, book series and journals. Given this, it is perhaps not coincidental that academic publishers such as De Gruyter provide separate catalogs for linguistics and for Romance studies. As editors, it was our ambition to compile a volume that would contribute towards bridging this cultural gap. Therefore, we would be delighted if the volume were of interest for both sides, and possibly for researchers working in neighboring fields. In addition, our contention is that it should be of use not only for established scholars, but also for younger researchers, including graduate and advanced undergraduate students.

---

5 See, in particular, Poletto (1993; 2000) on Northern Italian dialects, Ledgeway (2009) on Old Neapolitan, and Tortora (2003), Manzini/Savoia (2005) and D'Alessandro/Ledgeway/Roberts (2010) on Italian dialects in general.

We endeavor to suggest, then, that this *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax* is timely for a variety of reasons. From Diez' *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* to Ledgeway/Maiden's *Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, reference works need to cover much more than "just" morphosyntax and syntax. To the best of our knowledge, these fields have never received exclusive attention in a single-volume handbook. Even those whose own research interests lie outside the areas of morphosyntax and syntax would probably admit that a total of 83 pages (Oesterreicher 1996a,b) in a volume of several thousands of pages such as the *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* is not a particularly fair share. While the *Romanische Sprachgeschichte* and the *Cambridge History of the Romance Languages* arguably fare somewhat better, they are by design limited to the historical dimension. Similarly, the *Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages* dedicates only about a fourth of its chapters to topics in Romance morphosyntax and syntax. In all likelihood, however, it is limitations of space rather than a presumed scarcity of interesting issues which preclude a more full-fledged presentation of these fields. As we said, those seeking information about individual language varieties of Romance have at their disposal a range of reference grammars, varying in their degree of theoretical sophistication and in the quantity of empirical observations they present. However, for those in search of overviews about cross-linguistic and cross-dialectal differences, and grammatical features characterizing the Romance language family as a whole, the *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax* might be a welcome addition. It seeks to provide both theoretically informed and empirically grounded surveys of topics which have figured prominently in the field (see Sections 2 and 3). In addition to the "big five" in Romance linguistics, Spanish, Portuguese, French, Italian and Romanian, many chapters offer a variety of data from "smaller" languages, and from regional and local dialects. In light of all this, it may not come as a surprise that this handbook is somewhat hefty, probably more so than many other volumes within the *Manuals of Romance Linguistics* book series. In order to be accessible to a wide readership, all chapters are written in English. Furthermore, English glosses and/or translations of examples from Romance language varieties are offered throughout. Albeit with various degrees of detail, glosses generally follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules (www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php). All authors were encouraged to avoid framework-internal discussions, overly technical jargon, and abbreviations which may not be familiar to a non-expert readership. In any event, the reader will find a list of abbreviations used at the beginning of the volume, and an index of linguistic terms, languages and dialects at the end. In the next section, we will introduce some fundamental notions of syntax and morphosyntax, before giving an overview of the structure and the contents of the volume in Section 3.

2 Syntax and morphosyntax: some basic notions

Both syntax and morphosyntax are ambiguous terms, designating, first, components (or "levels" or "modules") of linguistic organization and, second, those subdisciplines of linguistics which investigate these levels. In line with standard assumptions about the organization of language, we take *syntax* to be the component of linguistic systems that defines the set of grammatical arrangements of words, and of certain meaningful subparts of them such as inflectional morphemes. These words and morphemes combine into larger units of grammar such as phrases, up to the level of clauses and sentences. More specifically, syntax as a discipline investigates, first of all, grouping relations (*constituency*) and ordering relations (*linearization*).

An insight dating back to antiquity is that words may profitably be categorized into a small number of so-called *word classes* (also called "parts of speech", echoing the Latin term *partes orationis*, in much of the older tradition). Linguistic typology has impressively shown that the inventory of word classes differs substantially across languages, and some formal accounts of morphology such as Distributed Morphology (Halle/Marantz 1993) even assume word classes to be syntactic products just like phrases. Yet probably no one would deny that at least on a descriptive level, nouns (N), verbs (V), adjectives (A) and possibly adverbs (Adv) may constitute fundamental lexical categories in Romance and Germanic languages. To these, we may add functional categories such as (at least some) prepositions (P), determiners (D), i.e., articles and their likes, and complementizers (C) such as Fr./Sp./Pt. *que*, It. *che* 'that' heading various types of subordinate clauses. Following Stowell (1981) and Williams (1981), the expression of morphosyntactic features of verbs is categorized as Inflection (I) or Tense (T), respectively. All lexical categories (N, V, A, Adv) and all functional categories (D, P, C, I, T) project, i.e., they can form the nuclei, or *heads*, of larger syntactic units. These larger syntactic units are formed according to a small set of abstract cross-categorial building principles, which became famous under the name of X-bar Theory (see Lasnik/Lohndal 2013, 41–47 for a concise overview). Without entering into details, we will only recall that those larger syntactic units which, intuitively, appear to be relatively complete and autonomous, are referred to as *phrases*. Phrasal categories, and their respective category symbols, are determined by their heads: Nouns head noun phrases (or NPs, for short), verbs head verb phrases (VPs), and so forth. A noun such as Fr. *maison* 'house', for example, can head a complex noun phrase of the type *grande maison de Pierre* 'big house of Pierre', with *grande* and *de Pierre* acting as adjectival and genitival *modifiers* of their head noun (see ↗21 Adjectival and genitival modification). Nominal groups introduced by a determiner, such as *la grande maison de Pierre* 'Pierre's big house', lit. 'the big house of Pierre' are categorized as determiner phrases (DPs) in languages in which the presence of such a determiner before an NP is (near-)categorical in argument position (see ↗20 Determination and quantification). Moving on from NPs, DPs and VPs to the level of (simple) sentences, these have been analyzed as projections of their verbal

inflection or, alternatively, of their tense features (IPs or TPs). Finally, subordinate clauses such as *que Pierre a une grande maison* 'that Pierre has a big house' have been argued to be headed by their subordinating complementizer, thereby forming complementizer phrases (CPs). Taken together, lexical and functional categories and their projections constitute the set of *syntactic categories* of a language.

Many, if not most syntacticians would probably subscribe to the principle according to which syntactic structure is strictly *binary*, i.e., every complex syntactic unit contains exactly two *immediate constituents*. It needs to be acknowledged, though, that binarity is not always self-evident, especially in cases of (symmetric) coordination such as Fr. *Pierre et Marie* 'Pierre and Marie' (see ↗18 Coordination and correlatives).

Besides syntactic categories, traditional as well as many contemporary versions of syntactic theory make reference to a second set of notions, known as *syntactic functions* or, in other work, as *grammatical relations*. Many of these notions are familiar since primary school: *subjects*, *objects*, *predicates* and, possibly, *adverbials* may well seem concepts so obvious to the average language user that, so one might think, little needs to be said about them. On closer scrutiny, however, several issues connected to the exact definition of syntactic functions, as well as to their theoretical status and usefulness for language description, turn out to be anything but trivial (see ↗2 Subjects; ↗3 Objects).

More generally, it can easily be shown that syntactic units which co-occur within a larger syntactic constituent enter into different types of relationships. Perhaps the most conspicuous type is *dependency*, a relation in which one unit renders obligatory the presence of another unit within the larger syntactic context.

Other types may involve morphological categories with syntactic relevance, i.e., so-called morphosyntactic relations. In this volume, *morphosyntax* is understood not as the set union of morphology and syntax, but as the interface of grammar in which the components of morphology and syntax interact. There are reasons to believe that morphology constitutes a component of grammar in its own right, and not just a kind of word-internal syntax, as some researchers have maintained (see Selkirk 1982). Simplifying somewhat, we may say that morphosyntax typically makes reference to categories of inflectional morphology, such as person, number, gender, case, tense, aspect, and mood. The flip side of this conception of morphosyntax is that word formation, including compounding and derivation, does not fall within its purview, even if, at times, the boundaries between compositional, derivational and inflectional morphology may appear to be somewhat blurred (see Scalise 1988; Spencer 2000; Gisborne 2014).

A relationship encompassing the domains of inflectional morphology and syntax is *government*, a concept going back to ancient grammarians and that aims to capture the insight that certain features of grammatical form, such as case features, can be unilaterally "imposed" by a co-constituent which in turn does not possess these features. A related, but distinct, type of relationship is *agreement*. Syntactic units are said to stand in a relationship of agreement when there is a systematic interdepen-

dence with respect to grammatical features shared by both units. The example in (1) may serve as a simple illustration:

(1) Fr. Pierre a   déjà   pardonné à   son   voisin.
    Pierre have.3sɢ already forgiven to   his   neighbor
    'Pierre has already forgiven his neighbor.'

In (1), the presence of *à son voisin* is rendered obligatory by the choice of the verb *pardonner* 'forgive', since *Pierre a déjà pardonné* constitutes an incomplete, ungrammatical sentence. *À son voisin* is therefore dependent upon the verb. More specifically, this verb imposes that the constituent expressing who is being forgiven be introduced by the preposition *à*. In other words, *pardonner* governs *à*-marking (arguably a kind of syntactic dative marking) of the "sinner argument." Finally, the finite auxiliary verb *a* 'has' is marked as third person singular, thereby agreeing in person and number with the "forgiver argument" *Pierre*.[6]

Yet another relationship concept which has become influential, especially for the study of dependency relations between verbs and their complements, is *valency* (Tesnière 1959; ↗4 Argument structure and argument structure alternations). While the exact definition of valency may differ somewhat between different authors, it seems to be commonly accepted that valency is a complex notion, which combines syntactic dependency and government with semantic and pragmatic facets of interrelatedness between a verb (or valency-bearing noun or adjective) and its dependent clause-mates. The notion of valency has occupied center stage in a predominantly European-based tradition of *Dependency Grammar* (see contributions to Ágel et al. 2003/2006; see Perini 2015 for a recent book-length account based on data from Brazilian Portuguese).

By emphasizing the role of lexical information in clause structure, valency-based approaches may also be assimilated to theories advocating a continuum between grammar and the lexicon. This holds true in particular for a family of theories referred to as *Construction Grammar* (see Hoffmann/Trousdale 2013). Here again, the exact definition of what technically constitutes a construction varies between authors. In any event, constructions are "conventionalized pairings between meaning and form" (Goldberg 2006, 3), can be syntactically complex and display formal and/or semantic and pragmatic properties which are not fully predictable on the basis of their component parts alone. The identification of such constructions thus challenges, it has been claimed, the principle of compositionality according to which the meaning of complex

---

6 To be sure, a more comprehensive analysis of (1) would need to recognize additional types of inter-constituent relations, such as the interpretation of the possessive *son* as referring back to *Pierre*. This type of relationships, known as *binding*, will not be addressed in this manual. Many scholars argue that binding is not exclusively syntactic in nature, but an interface phenomenon, extending beyond syntax into discourse semantics and pragmatics in complex ways. The interested reader is referred to Büring (2005) and references cited therein.

linguistic signs, and in particular complex syntactic units, can be systematically computed from the meaning of the word forms it contains. By the same token, constructions have been argued to constitute counter-evidence to any linguistic framework which holds that the lexicon and the grammar of a language can be separated into distinct modules. Instead, proponents of Construction Grammar, in one form or another, maintain that the continuum between the lexicon and grammar in language calls for a non-modular, holistic theory of linguistic systems.

Despite its initial attraction, Construction Grammar has not been exempt from criticism either (see Adger 2013). To begin with, no commonly accepted operational definition seems to exist of what exactly counts as a construction in a given language and what does not. Second, while compositionality may indeed not hold in many cases of complex word formation, the number of demonstrably non-compositional constructions in syntax is perhaps less impressive than one might think. More often than not, proponents of Construction Grammar resort to a modest number of set examples from English, such as the famous case of *let alone* (Fillmore/Kay/O'Connor 1988).[7] Third, even if there are good reasons to attribute the status of construction to a given complex syntactic unit, this should be a starting point rather than an endpoint for linguistic analysis. Adding a complex unit to the list of constructions does not explain *why* this unit features just those idiosyncratic properties it features and not others. Nonetheless, the concept of construction may indeed have diagnostic and descriptive value, especially in cases of complex constructions which do appear to be hard nuts for compositional analyses to crack, such as clefts and pseudo-clefts (see ↗15 Cleft constructions).

In one form or another, however, many of the contributions to this manual are indebted to concepts of *Generative Grammar*. Since Chomsky's seminal earlier publications (see, e.g., Chomsky 1957; 1965) to Government-Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981) and the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995), Generative Grammar has witnessed an astonishing success in linguistics departments all over the globe, but also given rise to much debate, and radical criticism, especially from linguists and psychologists investigating the interplay of language and cognition. This is not the place to engage in theoretical discussion about the architecture of grammar. In our opinion, Generative Grammar has indeed provided a wealth of new insights into the structure of Romance languages and dialects. All we can do here, given space limitations, is to mention a few topics in which research conducted within the generative framework has contributed towards a deeper understanding of syntax, and comparative Romance syntax in particular.

To begin with, much work has been done, before and after the advent of generative syntax, on unexpressed or "null" subjects in finite clauses. Their differential

---

7 Recently, however, Romance languages have gained ground in Construction Grammar; see Bouveret/Legallois (2012), Boas/Gonzálvez-García (2014), and several contributions to Yoon/Gries (2016).

availability in Romance varieties, the interpretational restrictions associated to them, and the division of labor between morphology, syntax, and the lexicon in the expression of subjects have inspired various kinds of cross-linguistic and typological generalizations. While it is true that ambitious earlier claims about a categorical "pro-drop" or "null subject" parameter (Burzio 1986; Rizzi 1986) have not withheld empirical scrutiny, research aimed at refining the notion of null subject languages has considerably fostered our knowledge about the extent, and the limits, of co-variation between inflectional morphology and syntax (see contributions to Biberauer et al. 2010; Zimmermann 2014; ↗2 Subjects).

Second, the identification of unaccusative verbs, dating back to Perlmutter (1978), has become highly influential in coming to grips with the interplay of subject positions, semantic roles of subjects, the availability of passive and other impersonal constructions, auxiliary selection, and past participle agreement (Loporcaro 1998; ↗2 Subjects; ↗6 Voice and voice alternations; ↗7 Auxiliaries).

Moving on from subjects to objects, a third research topic in which Romance languages have played a prominent role is object and adverbial clitics. Their placement, their sequencing and their co-occurrence, in some varieties, with co-indexed non-clitic objects and adverbials, have figured prominently in generative work at least since Kayne (1975) and Rizzi (1982) (↗5 Clitic pronouns). Positions adjacent to the verb are also available for certain other, non-clitic adverbials, and for negating elements. There are, however, certain differences between languages such as English and French, when it comes to the ordering of auxiliaries, preverbal negation, adverbials such as *already* or its French counterpart *déjà*, and non-finite verbal forms such as past participles or infinitives.

Such ordering properties led Pollock (1989) to propose a more articulate structure for the functional category of Inflection. This "Split Inflection Hypothesis" set the scene for a fourth topic of investigation, the relative order of verbs and adjacent syntactic units, in particular object clitics, non-clitic adverbs and negators. Following up on this, Cinque (1999) developed a particularly elaborate syntactic proposal in order to account for the different positions available for different types of adverbs. His analysis is based to a significant extent on data from Italian and French. Very soon, research went beyond clauses with simple finite verbs to investigate linearization with complex verbal predicates and infinitival verbs (↗8 Causative and perception verbs; ↗10 Infinitival clauses).

Fifth, we should mention *wh*-movement, that is, the analysis of clauses which are introduced by a *wh*-element as being derived by long-distance movement. This analysis, originally developed by Ross (1967) and Chomsky (1977), has been instrumental in gaining a better understanding of the regularities, and constraints, observable in Romance *wh*-interrogatives and relative clauses (see ↗16 Interrogatives; ↗22 Relative clauses).

Finally, data from Italian and French have also been adduced as evidence for splitting up the clause-initial complementizer position into what has come to be known as the "fine structure of the left periphery" since Rizzi (1997). By introducing additional

functional structure above IP, the left periphery can accommodate elements related to illocutionary force by virtue of a Force Phrase (ForceP), such as Sp. *ojalá* and Pt. *oxalá* 'hopefully'. More generally, the establishment of a "cartography" of syntactic structure at the left edges of syntactic units such as clauses and sentences has fostered research into the syntax of non-declaratives (see ↗16 Interrogatives; ↗17 Exclamatives, imperatives, optatives). By the same token, syntactic cartography has also invited new reflections on the impact of information structure on syntactic linearization. The provision of recursively available Topic projections (TopP), and of a (non-recursive) Focus projection (FocP), provide new avenues of research into preverbal constituents exhibiting focus or topic properties (see ↗13 Dislocations and framings; ↗14 Focus Fronting). Again, Romance languages and dialects have played a prominent role in cartographic approaches to syntax (see in particular, contributions to Cinque 2002; 2006; Belletti 2004; Rizzi 2004; Benincà/Munaro 2011; Brugé et al. 2012; Shlonsky 2015). At the same time, alternative, less articulate models of syntactic structure have also been proposed on the basis of data from Romance. In particular, it has been argued that prosodic structure needs to be taken into account in order to account for the relationship between information structure and constituent orders in the left periphery of sentences (see, Zubizarreta 1998; 2009 for Spanish, and Costa 2009 for Portuguese).

At least to some extent, the chapters in the present volume bear witness to the diversity of approaches. In the next section, we will outline the overall structure of the volume and briefly introduce the chapters one by one.

3 Structure, contents and leitmotifs of the volume

The volume at hand consists of five parts. Following this introduction (Part I, Chapter 1), it features chapters on topics related to the verbal domain (Part II, Chapters 2–9), the syntax of clauses and sentences (Part III, Chapters 10–18), and the nominal domain (Part IV, Chapters 19–22), before ending with two chapters on more general, typological aspects (Part V, Chapters 23–24).

By verbal domain, we are referring to a syntactic domain that roughly corresponds to the Tense Phrase (TP) in generative approaches, and to the French notion of *proposition* and equivalent notions in other Romance languages. As might be expected, Part II comprises chapters devoted to subjects and object complements of verbs (chapters 2 and 3, respectively). Several formal subtypes of verbal arguments are distinguished. In addition, dependency relations, including valency and government, as well as argument drop, agreement regularities and differential object marking (DOM) are discussed. Argument structures and argument structure alternations, and their semantic effects, are presented in chapter 4. As already mentioned, clitic pronouns have always attracted particular interest among Romance linguists. Their inventories and placement properties form the subject of chapter 5. In chapter 6, the syntactic expression of semantic arguments in passive and related constructions is

investigated, and a number of semantic and information-structural properties of such voice alternations are addressed. Auxiliary verbs, their inventories in Romance languages and dialects, the complex interplay of factors determining the choice of auxiliaries in analytic perfect tenses, and past participle agreement regularities are treated in chapter 7. Chapter 8 then provides information about the syntactic peculiarities of causative and perception verb constructions, which can display both monoclausal and biclausal properties. Part II concludes with chapter 9, on copular and existential constructions, which feature a gamut of different syntactic formats, each of which associated with specific interpretational characteristics.

As already mentioned, Part III scrutinizes the clausal and sentential domains, i.e., issues related to what is called *phrase* in French, or Complementizer Phrase (CP) in generative terms. In particular, several of the chapters in this part zoom in on phenomena related to the left periphery in the sense of Rizzi (1997) and his followers. The part opens with chapter 10 on infinitival clauses, both in syntactically embedded contexts and as independent sentential units. Following up on this, chapter 11 moves on to finite clauses and surveys the morphosyntactic categories of tense, aspect, and mood (TAM). In Romance languages at least, these TAM categories turn out to be intimately related. We chose to discuss these categories in Part III rather than in Part II because at the level of morphosyntax and syntax, TAM features of a clause may entertain a range of grammatical and semantic relations with those of other clauses, thereby interacting at levels higher than their respective proposition or TP. Given that TAM systems in Romance have constituted a hotspot of grammatical research for many decades, the chapter will inevitably not be able to do full justice to all the findings in all varieties of Romance, focusing instead to a large extent on French, Italian, and Spanish. Next, chapter 12 presents basic facts about the expression of negation in Romance languages, surveying the range of negative word items (or "n-words", for short) and Negative Polarity Items ("NPIs"). By NPI, we are referring to linguistic expressions such as English *at all* which, while not carrying negative semantics by themselves, are typically restricted to environments under the scope of negation or other contexts of "scale reversal". The chapter tackles cross-linguistic differences in the expression of negation in Romance from both diachronic and typological angles, by introducing the concept of the Jespersen Cycle, a showcase of grammaticalization theory (see below). Different types of displacements to the left periphery are introduced and analyzed in chapters 13 and 14. Chapter 13 first investigates phenomena known as clitic left dislocations (CLLDs, for short), such as in Fr. *Mon voisin*, *il a toujours été comme ça* (lit. 'My neighbor, he has always been like that'), before examining other types of "displacements" (or External Merge) in which constituents are analyzed as occurring outside the "core clause". Simplifying somewhat, we may say that dislocations and their likes tend to target constituents with topic properties, whereas a different set of rules and constraints applies for the fronting of focused constituents to a left-peripheral position. The distribution of focus fronting, and the interpretational characteristics associated to it, form the subject matter of chapter 14.

Information structure has also been argued to motivate the existence of biclausal syntactic formats such as Fr. *C'est mon voisin qui est venu* 'It is my neighbor who came' and *Ce qu'il lui faut*, *c'est de l'argent* 'What he needs is money'. These structures, known as clefts and pseudo-clefts, respectively, and some of their syntactic variants, form the topic of chapter 15. The next two chapters shift the focus from information structure to illocutionary force and its relation to syntax in sentence types such as interrogatives (chapter 16), exclamatives, imperatives, and optatives (chapter 17). Last but not least, chapter 18 studies coordination, distinguishing between copulative, disjunctive, and adversative semantic types, and correlative constructions such as Fr. *Plus on mange*, *plus on a faim* 'The more you eat, the hungrier you get'. Coordinated constituents and correlative clause pairs present interesting theoretical challenges to syntactic theory, many of which are addressed in the course of the chapter.

The four chapters which make up Part IV explore aspects of the nominal domain in Romance, i.e., the morphosyntax and syntax of determiner phrases (DPs) according to the standard generative view. To begin with, chapter 19 describes the categories of gender and number, and the morphosyntactic relations in which they engage. In particular, the chapter details types of nominal plural marking found within the Romance family, and develops a syntactic take on gender and number in DPs. Next, chapter 20 studies different subclasses of determiners and quantifiers, surveying their diachronic sources and their syntagmatic potential in modern Romance languages. The two remaining chapters of Part IV explore various types of adnominal modifiers, from adjectival and genitival ones (chapter 21) to relative clauses (chapter 22). Chapter 21 pays particular attention to issues of linearization, making reference to semantically grounded ordering principles wherever appropriate. Chapter 22, in turn, presents paradigms of relativizing elements found in Romance, and formulates a number of generalizations about categories of relativizers, agreement facts, and the presence or absence of resumptive elements inside the relative clause.

Finally, the two chapters in Part V seek to provide a broader typological perspective on the panoply of observations and findings presented in Parts II, III and IV. Chapter 23 investigates the division of labor between morphology and syntax, in other words, the degrees of analyticity (syntactic coding) or syntheticity (morphological coding) found in Romance languages, and in their common ancestor Latin. Most notably perhaps, this chapter critically assesses standard assumptions of a continuous diachronic evolution towards innovative analytic modes of expressing grammatical categories. The upshot of this discussion is that the changes observed can be more insightfully related to a change in the relative ordering of heads and their modifiers than to some inherent grammatical "drift" away from inflectional markings. To conclude the volume, the relative orderings of major constituents, i.e., subjects, verbs and objects, are discussed in chapter 24. As is well-known, subject–verb–object (SVO) orders constitute the unmarked case in Romance declaratives featuring both a lexical subject and a lexical object. However, other arrangements do occur, albeit with language-specific restrictions. Specifically, the chapter investigates the constraints on

OV and VS orders, capitalizing on information structure and discourse structure as determinants of variation in the linear arrangement of major constituents.

While this *tour d'horizon* may seem ambitious, the volume at hand cannot pretend to offer comprehensive coverage of all topics worthy of a chapter-length treatment.[8] In many ways, both the structure of the volume and the choice of contents reflect our indebtedness to Oesterreicher's (1996a,b) chapters on comparative Romance morphosyntax and syntax in the *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* (see Section 1).

In line with Oesterreicher (1996a), we maintain that any analysis of morphosyntactic categories in Romance languages needs to take into account the following areas of semantics and pragmatics: reference to discourse participants (↗2 Subjects; ↗3 Objects), semantic roles (↗4 Argument structure and argument structure alternations; ↗21 Adjectival and genitival modification), deixis, definiteness, and quantity (↗20 Determination and quantification), temporal reference, aspectual perspectivization, and modality (↗11 Tense, aspect, mood; ↗17 Exclamatives, imperatives, optatives).

The way we conceive of syntax, in turn, is guided by Oesterreicher (1996b). Syntactic encoding implies a selection and combination of lexical and grammatical items. At the clausal and sentential levels, certain linear arrangements of major constituents qualify as unmarked and "basic" (↗24 Basic constituent orders), under a given mapping of semantic arguments onto syntactic roles determined by argument structure and grammatical voice (↗4 Argument structure and argument structure alternations; ↗6 Voice and voice alternations). Additional provisions must be made to account for the syntax of clauses featuring complex, non-finite and/or negated verbal predicates (↗8 Causative and perception verbs; ↗10 Infinitival clauses; ↗12 Negation and polarity), and predicates involving copular verbs (↗9 Copular and existential constructions). The impact of information structure on syntax is particularly evident in "non-basic" sentence variants, e.g. those involving "displacement" outside the core clause, fronting to the left clausal periphery, and splitting up clauses into biclausal cleft structures (↗13 Dislocations and framings; ↗14 Focus Fronting; ↗15 Cleft constructions). Syntactic movement operations are arguably also at play in clauses and sentences headed by interrogative, exclamative or relative items (↗16 Interrogatives; ↗17 Exclamatives, imperatives, optatives; ↗22 Relative clauses).

It follows that issues related to the *interfaces* that syntax entertains with both semantics and information structure recur throughout many chapters. However, the volume cannot attempt systematic descriptions of these interfaces. Instead, we refer the interested reader to the *Manual of Grammatical Interfaces in Romance* (Fischer/ Gabriel 2016), another volume from the *Manuals of Romance Linguistics* series.

---

8 In particular, one may regret the absence of chapters specifically dedicated to adverbs and adverbial modification, both within the verbal and in "higher" clause and sentence level domains. Other lacunae we need to acknowledge include prepositional phrases, finite subordination and non-finite clausal units other than infinitival clauses, such as participial and gerundial constructions, as well as a chapter specifically dedicated to agreement facts.

A second leitmotiv which cross-cuts the volume at hand is *diachrony*. Chapter 6, for example, devotes an entire section to the re-organization of grammatical voice from Latin to Early Romance. In a similar vein, chapter 7 starts out with an outline of the uses of Latin HABERE 'have' and ESSE 'be' and their historical evolution as auxiliaries from Latin to Romance, before taking stock of auxiliary systems found in modern Romance languages and dialects. Auxiliarization is a subcase of grammaticalization, a cover term to designate grammatical changes in which individual linguistic units, and sequences of them, evolve from autonomous lexical and syntactic codings towards less variable, and ultimately rigid grammatical and morphological structures. The literature on grammaticalization is vast (see Narrog/Heine 2011; Detges/Waltereit 2016 for concise overviews). The grammatical changes observed in the evolution from Latin to Romance have always occupied center stage in the field, a fact almost inevitably reflected in this volume. Chapter 12, on negation, likewise insists on long-term diachronic trends, and on cyclical change instantiated by the famous "Jespersen Cycle", going from simple to reinforced and back to simple expressions of negation (for cyclical change in general, see Gelderen 2009; 2011; 2016). Chapter 18, on coordination, traces the historical fate of formal coordinating devices from Latin into Romance, and chapter 19 and 20 do the same for categories and exponents of gender and number, and for Romance determiners and their Latin sources, respectively. Finally, diachrony looms large in chapters 23 and 24. Both chapters offer a survey of changes in inflectional morphology and syntax, and some critical remarks on traditional attempts at explaining *why* these changes occurred. Again, however, we need to emphasize that exhaustive coverage of historical Romance morphosyntax and syntax is beyond the scope of a single-volume handbook which is dedicated to the modern Romance varieties in the first place.

Last not least, the micro- and macro-variation observable within Romance has always been a privileged object of study for morphologists and syntacticians with an interest in linguistic *typology* (see Iliescu 2003; Jacob 2003; Ramat/Ricca 2016). Therefore, typological parameters and classifications constitute a third recurrent theme of this volume. In particular, a number of Romance linguists have argued for systematic correlations between different grammatical properties, with the ultimate aim of establishing more holistic types, and a typologically insightful classification of Romance varieties. Perhaps the most far-reaching claims were formulated by Körner (1987), who postulated the existence of two fundamental syntactic types in Romance, viz., "accusative" or "*de*-languages" such as French, and "ergative" or "*a*-languages" such as Spanish. In order to substantiate his claim, Körner adduces a range of phenomena which, ideally at least, should serve to establish the proposed dichotomy: In contrast to *de*-languages, *a*-languages exhibit differential object marking (DOM; see Bossong 1991; 1998; ↗3 Objects), clitic doubling (↗3 Objects; ↗5 Clitic pronouns), datives as agents of embedded infinitives (↗8 Causative and perception verbs; ↗10 Infinitival clauses), and inflected infinitives (↗10 Infinitival clauses). *De*-languages, in turn, are characterized by "partitive" articles (↗20 Determination and quantification), and past

participle agreement in compound tenses (↗3 Objects; ↗7 Auxiliaries). Proposals such as Körner's are certainly inspiring. Having said that, many chapters in this volume show that the actual range of syntactic variation between Romance varieties is considerably greater, especially when not only standard varieties, but also dialects are taken into account. Over the last decades, a number of more modest, but at the same time more "robust" correlative generalizations have been formulated, and explanatory accounts have been proposed.

On a more general level, the advancement of typological research has also given rise to reflections about whether or not there is such a thing as a global "Romance type". Posner (1996, 35) dismisses phonetic and phonological features as defining "Romanceness" and surmises that the best candidate for identifying a specifically Romance type of languages might be the lexicon. Indeed, a substantial number of lexical items are "shared" by many, or even all Romance languages. At the same time, many of these very same lexical items have also been borrowed into other languages, such as Albanian, Basque, and English. In morphosyntax and syntax, by contrast, a set of features does seem to exist which makes up a "typically Romance" language. This feature set should probably include binary systems of nominal gender (↗19 Gender and number; see Loporcaro forthcoming for a full-fledged account), certain recurring distributions of allomorphs in verb paradigms (cf. the notion of "N-pattern" in Maiden 2016), the grammaticalization of the definite article stemming from a Latin demonstrative (ILLE or IPSE), as well as items of the "functional lexicon", such as other types of determiners, clitics and full pronouns (↗5 Clitic pronouns; ↗20 Determination and quantification; see Posner 1996, 35–96 for a more comprehensive discussion). A number of chapters in this volume offer such global typological perspectives on Romance, by comparing features of Romance morphosyntax and syntax with those found in languages beyond the Romance language family. As we said at the beginning, Romance languages are obviously related – yet pinpointing their grammatical relatedness in typological terms will probably remain an intriguing enterprise for generations of linguists to come.

4 Acknowledgements

Third, we are deeply indebted to all our colleagues who were willing to act as internal or external reviewers of the chapter manuscripts, the latter group including Aria Adli, Nicholas Catasso, Georg A. Kaiser, Álvaro S. Octavio de Toledo, Javier Rodríguez Molina, Malte Rosemeyer and Armin Schwegler. Their constructive criticism has been instrumental in eliminating mistakes, clarifying many points, and optimizing the structure of the chapters and the presentation of contents.

Fourth, the revised versions of the chapter manuscripts had to be proofread and prepared for submission to the publisher. Elizabeth Rowley-Jolivet deserves special mention for her excellent proofreading as a native speaker of English and linguist. Benjamin Meisnitzer, as well as Dumitru Chihaï and Aurelia Merlan were of great help with some of the Portuguese and Romanian examples, respectively. In addition, literally thousands of linguistic examples and references had to be checked, and the formatting of examples, glosses and bibliographical entries had to be harmonized according to stylesheet guidelines. All this would have been simply impossible without the unconditional help of our teams in Zurich and Munich over the past two and a half years. We feel privileged in being able to rely on such great young linguists. Thank you so much, Mathieu Avanzi, Lena Baunaz, Larissa Binder, Jan Davatz, Daniela Gabler, Isabel Geiger, David Gerards, Teresa Gruber, Klaus Grübl, Benjamin Massot, Joan Miralles, Aurélia Robert-Tissot and Thomas Scharinger.

Fifth, several of the contributors to this volume wish to acknowledge help from colleagues and/or financial support. We reproduce these acknowledgements here following the ordering of chapters in the volume:

Chapter 8 (Marie Labelle): We thank Aroldo Leal de Andrade, Maria Teresa Espinal, Paul Hirschbühler, Anne Rochette, and the reviewers for their comments on previous versions of this paper.

Chapter 12 (Pierre Larrivée): I am grateful to the editors of this volume, who kindly forced me to think about the issue in a pan-Romance way. This could not have been done without the input of Elena Albu, Carmen Avram, Montse Batllori and Benjamin Fagard, and that of the anonymous reviewers, who I warmly thank without however forgetting to evoke the usual disclaimers.

Chapter 14 (Silvio Cruschina & Eva-Maria Remberger): We would like to thank two anonymous reviewers and the editors of this volume for valuable comments and remarks.

Chapter 17 (Xavier Villalba): This work has been supported by grants FFI2014-52015 and 2014SGR1013, awarded to the Centre de Lingüística Teòrica of the UAB.

Chapter 20 (Nigel Vincent): I am grateful to Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden as well as to the editors of this volume and to Aurelia Merlan for their comments on an earlier draft of this chapter. Needless to say responsibility for any remaining errors of fact or interpretation is mine alone.

Chapter 21 (Antonio Fábregas): We are grateful to Elisabeth Stark, João Costa, Sandra Ronai, Ana Maria Brito, Francesca Masini, Tammer Castro, Marie Laurence Knittel, Edwige Dugas, Maria Pilar Colomina, Peter Svenonius and one anonymous

reviewer for comments and suggestions on previous versions of this chapter. All disclaimers apply.

Chapter 22 (Cecilia Poletto & Emanuela Sanfelici): We thank Elisabeth Stark and the audience of the Relativsätze Forschergruppe Linguistik Kolloquium at Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, for their helpful feedback. For the concerns of the Italian academy, Emanuela Sanfelici takes responsibility for Sections 2, 3, and 4, whereas Cecilia Poletto takes responsibility for Sections 1 and 5.

Chapter 24 (Manuel Leonetti): The investigation presented in this chapter corresponds to two research projects funded by the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad ("Semántica procedimental y contenido explícito III" – SPYCE III, FFI2012-31785; "La interfaz Semántica / Pragmática y la resolución de conflictos interpretativos" – SPIRIM, FFI2015-63497-P). I am grateful to Elisabeth Stark, Andreas Dufter and an anonymous reviewer for their useful comments and suggestions. Thanks are due also to Vicky Escandell-Vidal for her help with Catalan data and to João Costa for providing me with published materials on Portuguese word order.

Last but not least, our heartfelt gratitude goes to our much regretted academic *maestro*, Wulf Oesterreicher. Without his dedication to his students, research assistants and colleagues, without the unfailing support we received over many years, and without his enthusiasm for, and encyclopedic familiarity with Romance linguistics we would probably not have had the chance to end up as editors of a *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*. It is to him that this volume is dedicated.

5 References

Adger, David (2013), *Constructions and grammatical explanation: comments on Goldberg*, Mind and Language 28, 466–478.

Ágel, Vilmos, et al. (edd.) (2003/2006), *Dependency and Valency. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, 2 vol., Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.

Álvarez, Rosario/Xove, Xosé (2002), *Gramática da lingua galega*, Vigo, Galaxia.

Arteaga, Deborah L. (ed.) (2013), *Research on Old French: The State of the Art*, Dordrecht, Springer.

Belletti, Adriana (ed.) (2004), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Volume 3*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Benincà, Paola/Ledgeway, Adam/Vincent, Nigel (edd.) (2014), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Benincà, Paola/Munaro, Nicola (edd.) (2011), *Mapping the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Volume 5*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Biberauer, Theresa, et al. (edd.) (2010), *Parametric Variation. Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Boas, Hans C./Gonzálvez-García, Francisco (edd.) (2014), *Romance Perspectives on Construction Grammar*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Bosque, Ignacio/Demonte, Violeta (edd.) (1999), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 3 vol., Madrid, Espasa Calpe.

Bossong, Georg (1991), *Differential object marking in Romance and beyond*, in: Douglas Kibbee/
    Dieter Wanner (edd.), *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benja-
    mins, 143–170.

Bossong, Georg (1998), *Le marquage différentiel de l'objet dans les langues de l'Europe*, in: Jack
    Feuillet (ed.), *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de
    Gruyter, 193–258.

Bourciez, Édouard (⁵1967, ¹1910), *Éléments de linguistique romane*, Paris, Klincksieck.

Bouveret, Myriam/Legallois, Dominique (edd.) (2012), *Constructions in French*, Amsterdam/Phila-
    delphia, Benjamins.

Brugé, Laura, et al. (edd.) (2012), *Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Volume 7*,
    Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Büring, Daniel (2005), *Binding Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Burzio, Luigi (1986), *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach*, Dordrecht, Reidel.

Butt, John B./Benjamin, Carmen (⁵2011, ¹1988), *A New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish*,
    London, Arnold.

Castilho, Ataliba Teixeira de (2010), *Nova gramática do português brasileiro*, São Paulo,
    Contexto.

Chomsky, Noam (1957), *Syntactic Structures*, The Hague, Mouton.

Chomsky, Noam (1965), *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1977), *On "wh"-movement*, in: Peter W. Culicover/Thomas Wasow/Adrian Akmajian
    (edd.), *Formal Syntax*, New York, Academic Press, 71–132.

Chomsky, Noam (1981), *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht, Foris.

Chomsky, Noam (1995), *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo (1995), *Italian Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge, Cambridge University
    Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo (1999), *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-linguistic Perspective*, Oxford,
    Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo (ed.) (2002), *Functional Structure in DP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic
    Structures Volume 1*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo (ed.) (2006), *Restructuring and Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic
    Structures Volume 4*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Costa, João (2004), *Subject Positions and Interfaces. The Case of European Portuguese*, Berlin/New
    York, Mouton de Gruyter.

Costa, João (2009), *A focus-binding conspiracy. Left-to-right merge, scrambling and binary structure
    in European Portuguese*, in: Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (ed.), *Alternatives to Cartography*, Berlin/
    New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 87–108.

Cruschina, Silvio (2011), *Discourse-related Features and Functional Projections*, Oxford, Oxford Uni-
    versity Press.

Cunha, Celso/Cintra, Luís F. L. (⁶2014), *Nova gramática do português contemporâneo*, Rio de Janeiro,
    Lexikon.

Dahmen, Wolfgang, et al. (edd.) (1998), *Neuere Beschreibungsmethoden der Syntax romanischer
    Sprachen*, Tübingen, Narr.

Dahmen, Wolfgang, et al. (edd.) (2006), *Was kann eine vergleichende romanische Sprachwissenschaft
    heute (noch) leisten? Romanistisches Kolloquium XX*, Tübingen, Narr.

D'Alessandro, Roberta/Ledgeway, Adam/Roberts, Ian (edd.) (2010), *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects
    of Italy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

De Cesare, Anna-Maria/Garassino, Davide (edd.) (2016), *Current Issues in Italian, Romance and
    Germanic Non-canonical Word Orders. Syntax – Information Structure – Discourse Organization*,
    Frankfurt etc., Lang.

Detges, Ulrich/Waltereit, Richard (2016), *Grammaticalization and pragmaticalization*, in: Susann Fischer/Christoph Gabriel (edd.), *Manual of Grammatical Interfaces in Romance* (Manuals of Romance Linguistics 10), Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 635–657.

Diez, Friedrich (1836–1839), *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 3 vol., Bonn, Weber.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1993), *The Syntax of Romanian. Comparative Studies in Romance*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen/Giurgea, Ion (2013), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*, vol. 1: *The Noun Phrase*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Dufter, Andreas (2010), *Grammatik und Grammatikographie in der Romania*, in: Dudenredaktion/Gesellschaft für deutsche Sprache/Mechthild Habermann (edd.), *Grammatik wozu? Vom Nutzen des Grammatikwissens in Alltag und Schule*, Mannheim, Bibliographisches Institut, 390–404.

Dufter, Andreas/Jacob, Daniel (edd.) (2009), *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Dufter, Andreas/Jacob, Daniel (edd.) (2011), *Syntaxe, structure informationnelle et organisation du discours dans les langues romanes*, Frankfurt etc., Lang.

Ernst, Gerhard, et al. (edd.) (2003–2008), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und ihrer Erforschung*, 3 vol., Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.

Fernández Ramírez, Salvador (1951), *Gramática española. Los sonidos, el nombre y el pronombre*, Madrid, Revista de Occidente.

Fernández Ramírez, Salvador (1985–1987), *Gramática española*, 5 vol., Madrid, Arco Libros.

Fillmore, Charles J./Kay, Paul/O'Connor, Mary Catherine (1988), *Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: the case of "let alone"*, Language 64, 501–538.

Fischer, Susann (2010), *Word-Order Change as a Source of Grammaticalisation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Fischer, Susann/Gabriel, Christoph (edd.) (2016), *Manual of Grammatical Interfaces in Romance* (Manuals of Romance Linguistics 10), Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter.

Gelderen, Elly van (ed.) (2009), *Cyclical Change*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Gelderen, Elly van (2011), *The Linguistic Cycle. Language Change and the Language Faculty*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Gelderen, Elly van (ed.) (2016), *Cyclical Change Continued*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Gisborne, Nikolas (2014), *The word and syntax*, in: John R. Taylor (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Word*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 196–220.

Goldberg, Adele (2006), *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Grevisse, Maurice ([16]2016, [1]1936), *Le bon usage: grammaire française*, refondue par André Goosse, Paris, Duculot.

Gupton, Timothy (2014), *The Syntax–Information Structure Interface. Clausal Word Order and the Left Periphery in Galician*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter.

Guṭu Romalo, Valeria (ed.) (2005), *Gramatica limbii române*, 2 vol., Bucureşti, Ed. Academiei Române.

Hall Jr., Robert A. (1974–1983), *Comparative Romance Grammar*, 3 vol., New York, Elsevier.

Halle, Morris/Marantz, Alex (1993), *Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection*, in: Kenneth Hale/Samuel J. Keyser (edd.), *The View from Building 20. Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 111–176.

Harris, Martin/Vincent, Nigel (edd.) (1988), *The Romance Languages*, London/New York, Routledge.

Hoffmann, Thomas/Trousdale, Graeme (edd.) (2013), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Holtus, Günter/Metzeltin, Michael/Schmitt, Christian (edd.) (1988–2005), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, 8 vol., Tübingen, Niemeyer.

Hulk, Aafke C. J./Pollock, Jean-Yves (edd.) (2001), *Subject Inversion and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hutchinson, Amélia P./Lloyd, Janet (²2003, ¹1996), *Portuguese. An Essential Grammar*, London/New York, Routledge.

Iliescu, Maria (2003), *La typologie des langues romanes. État de la question*, in: Fernando Sánchez Miret (ed.), *Actas del XXIII Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y Filología Románica*, vol. 1, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 61–81.

Jacob, Daniel (2003), *Prinzipien der Typologie und der sprachinternen Klassifikation der romanischen Sprachen*, in: Gerhard Ernst et al. (edd.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und ihrer Erforschung*, vol. 1, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 137–155.

Jensen, Frede (1986), *The Syntax of Medieval Occitan*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.

Jensen, Frede (1990), *Old French and Comparative Gallo-Romance Syntax*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.

Jones, Michael Allan (1993), *Sardinian Syntax*, London/New York, Routledge.

Jones, Michael Allan (1996), *Foundations of French Syntax*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kaiser, Georg A. (ed.) (2005), *Deutsche Romanistik – generativ*, Tübingen, Narr.

Kato, Mary A./Ordóñez, Francisco (edd.) (2016), *The Morphosyntax of Portuguese and Spanish in Latin America*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Kayne, Richard (1975), *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Klausenburger, Jürgen (2000), *Grammaticalization. Studies in Latin and Romance Morphosyntax*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Körner, Karl-Hermann (1987), *Korrelative Sprachtypologie. Die zwei Typen romanischer Syntax*, Stuttgart, Steiner.

Lasnik, Howard/Lohndal, Terje (2013), *Brief overview of the history of generative syntax*, in: Marcel den Dikken (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 26–60.

Lausberg, Heinrich (1956–1962), *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*, 3 vol., Berlin, De Gruyter.

Ledgeway, Adam (2009), *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.

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

Ledgeway, Adam/Maiden, Martin (edd.) (2016), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Loporcaro, Michele (1998), *Sintassi comparata dell'accordo participiale romanzo*, Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier.

Loporcaro, Michele (forthcoming), *Gender from Latin to Romance: History*, *Geography*, *Typology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Maiden, Martin (2016), *Morphomes*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 708–721.

Maiden, Martin/Robustelli, Cecilia (2000), *A Reference Grammar of Modern Italian*, London, Arnold.

Maiden, Martin/Smith, John Charles/Ledgeway, Adam (edd.) (2011/2013), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, 2 vol., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Manzini, M. Rita/Savoia, Leonardo M. (2005), *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*, 3 vol., Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini, M. Rita/Savoia, Leonardo M. (2011), *Grammatical Categories: Variation in Romance*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mensching, Guido (2000), *Infinitive Constructions with Specified Subjects: A Syntactic Analysis of the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm (1890–1902), *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 4 vol., Leipzig, Reisland.

Mosegaard Hansen, Maj-Britt (2016), *The Structure of Modern Standard French. A Student Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Narrog, Heike/Heine, Bernd (edd.) (2011), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Oesterreicher, Wulf (1996a), *Gemeinromanische Tendenzen V. Morphosyntax*, in: Günter Holtus/ Michael Metzeltin/Christian Schmitt (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. 2.1, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 273–309.

Oesterreicher, Wulf (1996b), *Gemeinromanische Tendenzen VI. Syntax*, in: Günter Holtus/Michael Metzeltin/Christian Schmitt (edd.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. 2.1, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 309–355.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (ed.) (2013), *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (ed.) (2016), *Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Perini, Mário A. (2015), *Describing Verb Valency. Practical and Theoretical Issues*, Cham etc., Springer.

Perlmutter, David M. (1978), *Impersonal passives and the unaccusativity hypothesis*, in: *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, CA, Berkeley Linguistics Society, 157–189.

Poletto, Cecilia (1993), *La sintassi dei pronomi soggetto nei dialetti settentrionali*, Padova, Unipress.

Poletto, Cecilia (2000), *The Higher Functional Field. Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Poletto, Cecilia (2014), *Word Order in Old Italian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989), *Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP*, Linguistic Inquiry 20, 365–424.

Posner, Rebecca (1996), *The Romance Languages*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

RAE/ASALE = Real Academia Española/Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2009), *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*, 3 vol., Madrid, Espasa Calpe.

Ramat, Paolo/Ricca, Davide (2016), *Romance: A typological approach*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 50–62.

Raposo, Eduardo, et al. (edd.) (2013), *Gramática do português*, 2 vol., Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Remberger, Eva-Maria/Mensching, Guido (edd.) (2008), *Romanistische Syntax – minimalistisch*, Tübingen, Narr.

Renzi, Lorenzo/Salvi, Giampaolo/Cardinaletti, Anna (edd.) (1988–1995), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, 3 vol., Bologna, il Mulino.

Riegel, Martin/Pellat, Jean-Christophe/Rioul, René ([5]2014, [1]1994), *Grammaire méthodique du français*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.

Rizzi, Luigi (1982), *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris.

Rizzi, Luigi (1986), *Null objects in Italian and the theory of "pro"*, Linguistic Inquiry 17, 501–557.

Rizzi, Luigi (1997), *The fine structure of the left periphery*, in: Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar. A Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 281–337.

Rizzi, Luigi (ed.) (2004), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Volume 2*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Ross, John Robert (1967), *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, MIT, Cambridge, MA, Ph.D. dissertation.

Rowlett, Paul (2007), *The Syntax of French*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Salvi, Giampaolo (2004), *La formazione della struttura di frase romanza. Ordine delle parole e clitici dal latino alle lingue romanze antiche*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.

Salvi, Giampaolo/Renzi, Lorenzo (edd.) (2010), *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*, Bologna, il Mulino.

Samek-Lodovici, Vieri (2015), *The Interaction of Focus, Givenness, and Prosody: A Study of Italian Clause Structure*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Scalise, Sergio (1988), *Inflection and derivation*, Linguistics 26, 560–581.

Seilheimer, Andrea (2014), *Les grammaires historiques des langues romanes*, in: Andre Klump/
Johannes Kramer/Aline Willems (edd.), *Manuel des langues romanes* (Manuals of Romance
Linguistics 1), Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 118–145.

Selkirk, Elisabeth O. (1982), *The Syntax of Words*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Serianni, Luca (1988), *Grammatica italiana. Italiano comune e lingua letteraria*, con la collab. di
Alberto Castelvecchi, Torino, UTET.

Shlonsky, Ur (ed.) (2015), *Beyond Functional Sequence. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures
Volume 10*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Solà Cortassa, Joan, et al. (2002), *Gramàtica del català contemporani*, 3 vol., Barcelona, Empúries.

Spencer, Andrew (2000), *Morphology and syntax*, in: Geert E. Booij/Christian Lehmann/Joachim
Mugdan (edd.), *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, vol. 1,
Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 312–334.

Squartini, Mario (1998), *Verbal Periphrases in Romance. Aspect*, *Actionality*, *and Grammaticalization*,
Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

Stark, Elisabeth/Schmidt-Riese, Roland/Stoll, Eva (edd.) (2008), *Romanische Syntax im Wandel*,
Tübingen, Narr.

Stark, Elisabeth/Wandruszka, Ulrich (edd.) (2003), *Syntaxtheorien: Modelle*, *Methoden*, *Motive*,
Tübingen, Narr.

Stowell, Timothy A. (1981), *Origins of Phrase Structure*, MIT, Cambridge, MA, Ph.D. dissertation.

Swiggers, Pierre (2014), *La linguistique romane*, *de Friedrich Diez à l'aube du XXe siècle*, in: Andre
Klump/Johannes Kramer/Aline Willems (edd.), *Manuel des langues romanes* (Manuals of Ro-
mance Linguistics 1), Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 43–64.

Tesnière, Lucien (1959), *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*, Paris, Klincksieck.

Thun, Harald (1986), *Personalpronomina für Sachen. Ein Beitrag zur romanischen Textlinguistik*,
Tübingen, Narr.

Tortora, Christina (ed.) (2003), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Wanner, Dieter (1987), *The Development of Romance Clitic Pronouns. From Latin to Old Romance*,
Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

Wartburg, Walther von (1936), *Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume*, Halle an der Saale,
Niemeyer.

Wheeler, Max/Yates, Alan/Dols, Nicolau (1999), *Catalan. A Comprehensive Grammar*, London/New
York, Routledge.

Williams, Edwin (1981), *On the notions "lexically related" and "head of a word"*, Linguistic Inquiry 12,
245–274.

Wilmet, Marc ([5]2010, [1]1997), *Grammaire critique du français*, Bruxelles, De Boeck/Duculot.

Yoon, Jiyoung/Gries, Stefan Th. (edd.) (2016), *Corpus-based Approaches to Construction Grammar*,
Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.

Zagona, Karen T. (2002), *The Syntax of Spanish*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Zanuttini, Raffaella (1997), *Negation and Clausal Structure. A Comparative Study of Romance Lan-
guages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Zimmermann, Michael (2014), *Expletive and Referential Subject Pronouns in Medieval French*, Berlin/
Boston, De Gruyter.

Zubizarreta, María Luisa (1998), *Prosody*, *Focus*, *and Word Order*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Zubizarreta, María Luisa (2009), *The left edge in the Spanish clausal structure*, in: Pascual José
Masullo/Erin O'Rourke/Chia-Hui Huang (edd.), *Romance Linguistics 2007. Selected Papers from
the 37th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, *Pittsburgh*, *15–18 March 2007*,
Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 339–357.