Reflexives and voice-related phenomena: the role of text-type, language contact and null-subjects in some Medieval Romance varieties.

Anne Wolfsgruber (University of Salzburg)

Introduction: As is well known, the evolution of the reflexive is closely intertwined with constructions that are connected to voice-related phenomena. Therefore, it is not surprising that we should find Romance *se* to be involved in a number of different constructions that are known to adhere (more or less clearly) to this category. Starting out as an unaccusativity/unergativity marker in (Late) Latin, SE/SIBI conquered new realms that had majorly been the domain of the R-morpheme. This spread of use eventually lead to reflexively marked anticausatives, passive *se* and in a last step to impersonal active constructions with *se* widely found in the Romance languages (cf. i.a. Cennamo 1999, Sansò 2011). However, this evolution is subject to variation among the Medieval Romance varieties (as is today).

In medieval times, we find a more exhaustive use of *se* with change of state verbs, state verbs or verbs that denote mental activity, such as fr. *aler* 'to go', *apareistre* 'to appear', *être* 'to be', *purpenser* 'to think' etc. some of which we still encounter as verbs lexicalized with *se* as in sp. *irse*, fr. *s'en aller*, cat. *anar-se'n*, etc. today. While this use (which most probably reflects the (Late) Latin SE/SIBI spread) is very common in the *langue d'oïl* varieties, the use of passive *se*-constructions is rare (cf. Jensen 1990) and impersonal active constructions divide the scholars' judgements. Some attribute them to be possible; others classify them as passives (cf. Gamillscheg 1957, Moignet 1973 among others).

As part of our project, we conducted extensive corpus studies to determine the evolutionary path(s) of the reflexive in Medieval French (BFM), Medieval Spanish (CORDE)[1], Medieval Catalan (CICA) and Medieval Occitan (COM1+2 and RIALTO) in order to get more detailed information on the reflexive's path(s) not only diachronically (1100 (where texts were available) to 1451) but also gaining new insights from the spatial dimension. The data indicate that factors like the availability of null-subjects, indefinite pronouns and their functional range, word order patterns like VS and text-type as well as discursive traditions seem to play crucial roles.

New data: The corpus analyses reveal that while Medieval Spanish, Catalan and Occitan behave largely similarly, Medieval French seems to exhibit a different evolutionary path of the reflexive. The Medieval *langue d'oïl* varieties show a high number of reflexively marked change of state/state/mental activity verbs with animate subjects (henceforth *old middles*) and periphrases where *se* is most probably lexicalized with the verb. This constitutes the pan-textual result. As for anticausatives, passives and those constructions that show signs of reanalysis towards impersonal active *se*, the frequencies are vanishingly low except for two treatises that are translations from Latin originals: *De l'invention* and *De la érudition*. The later treatise (1360) is particularly interesting because its translator Jean Daudin was known for his translations of Petrarch which indicates that we are already entering the beginning era of Humanism and Renaissance thinking which lead to an abundant adaptation of Italianisms and Latinisms (cf. Gamillscheg 1957). The data suggest that the role of the genesis of a text as well as its text-type seem to be important details which have only received attention more recently (cf. Balon/Larrivée 2016). Another striking result is that we find the indefinite pronoun *on* < lat. HOMO in contexts where the other varieties would rather use *se*.

While French seems particularly constrained in its use of passive-*se* and signs that indicate an on-going reanalysis towards an impersonal active reinterpretation of the passive *se*-construction, the Medieval Spanish, Catalan and Occitan varieties we have examined show greater consistence. The percentages for old middles are lower and passive *se* as well as early signs of a reanalysis towards impersonal active constructions are present (the latter especially from the 2nd half of the 13th century onwards) in nearly every text regardless the text-type. Anticausatives are more text-type constrained as they appear only more frequently in texts that we labeled *scientific prose texts*

---

[1] For Spanish and French we analyzed 13 texts (about 475,000 words each) per language quantitatively another 60 texts were analyzed qualitatively, for Catalan 9 texts were analyzed quantitatively and 18 qualitatively; Occitan was only analyzed qualitatively due to corpus-related peculiarities.

Analysis: Medieval French diverges from the other Medieval languages not only in the use of *se*-constructions but also in its rather unclear status concerning null-subjects (cf. Roberts 1993, Vance 1997, Meisel/Rinke 2009 and many others) and in the frequency of VS patterns with *se* (Spanish 16-26%; French: around 8%). The data suggest that there is a connection between the evolution of *se* as a passive marker/as a marker for impersonal active constructions and the availability of null-subjects. Medieval French clearly shows a tendency of using *se* in constructions where it is most probably lexicalized with the verb (old middles, reflexives/reciprocals). Uses that suggest a syntactically active status and one that has probably evolved away from the status of a clitic towards one that exhibits more affix-like qualities (cf. i.a. Mutz 2012) seem to be less available to French, the only exception being the examples we found in texts that constitute Latin translations and probably mark the beginning of Italian as a model language.

By assuming Speas (1995) we can relate these differences to the availability of null-subjects. In her theory of *pro*-drop she assumes that in languages with strong agreement, affixes can head their own projections and have their own lexical entries, while in languages with weak agreement, the affixes are stored in the lexicon already attached to the verb. This could explain, why we find *se* being syntactically active in passives and impersonals in null-subject languages like Medieval Catalan, Spanish and Occitan where it can head little *v* (cf. Torrego 2013, Roberts 2010) or where it can act as the morphological exponent of absorbing the D feature on finite T (cf. Otero 1986, Bamba 2015). In this vein, it seems logical that a language that is about to lose its null-subject status or at least does not show all of the characteristics that well-behaved null-subject languages normally show and where the independent entry of affixes is already endangered, learners would go for other and more unambiguous solutions such as periphrastic passives or the indefinite pronoun *on.*

Bibliography (selection):

BFM (*Base de français médiéval*): http://txm.bfm-corpus.org/ (08/12/2016). ‖ CICA (Corpus informatitzat del Català antic): http://cica.cat/ (15/02/17) ‖ COM1+2 (*Concordance de l'Occitan Médiéval*, Brepols) ‖ CORDE (Corpus diacrónico del español)*:* http://www.rae.es (01/10/2016). RIALTO : http://rialto.unina.it/ (27/02/17) ‖ ‖ Cennamo, M. (1999). Late Latin pleonastic reflexives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 97(1), 103-150.‖ Balon, L. & Larrivée, P. (2016). L'ancien français n'est déjà plus une langue à sujet nul–nouveau témoignage des textes légaux. *Journal of French Languages Studies, 26*, 221-237. ‖ Bamba, K. (2015). D feature and impersonal SE: A new perspective on Romance impersonal constructions. http://cla-acl.ca/wp-content/uploads/Bamba.pdf (05/01/17) ‖ Gamillscheg, E. (1957). *Historische französische Syntax*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. ‖ Jensen, F. (1990). *Old French and comparative Gallo-Romance syntax*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. ‖ Moignet, G. (1973). *Grammaire de l'ancien français*. Paris: Klincksieck ‖ Mutz, K. (2012). SE-Verbs, SE-Forms, or SE-Constructions? SE and its Transitional Stages between Morphology and Syntax. In S. Gaglia & M.-O. Hinzelin (Eds.), *Inflection and Word Formation in Romance Languages*, 319-346. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. ‖ Otero, C. P. (1986). Arbitrary Subjects in Finite Clauses. In I. Bordelois, H. Contreras & K. Zagona (Eds.), *Generative Studies in Spanish Syntax*, 81-110. Dordrecht: Foris. ‖ Rinke, E. & Meisel, J. M. (2009). Subject-Inversion in Old French: Syntax and Information Structure. In G. A. Kaiser & E.-M. Remberger (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Workshop "Null Subjects, Expletives, and Locatives in Romance"*, 93-130. Konstanz: Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Konstanz, Arbeitspapier 123. ‖ Roberts, I. G. (1993). *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax. A Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.‖ Roberts, I. (2010): *Agreement and Head Movement. Clitic, Incorporation, and Defective Goals.* Cambridge: MIT Press. ‖ Sansò, A. (2011). Grammaticalization Paths and Prototype Effects. A History of the Agentive Reflexive. *Folia Linguistica Historica, 32*, 1-34. ‖ Speas, M. (1995). Economy, Agreement and the Representation of Null Arguments. http://people.umass.edu/pspeas/prodrop.pdf (15/03/2016). ‖Torrego, E. (2013). Revisiting Romance SE. http://www.ehu.eus/ojs/index.php/ASJU/article/view/9849/9277 (15/04/2016). ‖ Vance, B. S. (1997). *Syntactic Change in Medieval French. Verb-Second and Null Subjects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.