

Copyright  
by  
Sarah Elizabeth Harmon  
2007

**The Dissertation Committee for Sarah Elizabeth Harmon Certifies that this  
is the approved version of the following dissertation:**

**Gender in the Romance Languages: An Evolutionary Approach**

**Committee:**

---

Brigitte L.M. Bauer, Supervisor

---

Carlos A. Solé

---

Frederick Hensey

---

Cinzia Russi

---

Qing Zhang

# **Gender in the Romance Languages: An Evolutionary Approach**

**by**

**Sarah Elizabeth Harmon, BA; MA**

## **Dissertation**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**The University of Texas at Austin**

**August 2007**

## **Dedication**

To my parents, Wilmoth C. (Jr.) and Michelle J. Harmon, for their tireless enthusiasm and unwavering love, and my brothers Matthew and Mark for their constant support.

In memory of Professors Stephen LaPointe and Mark R.V. Southern

## Acknowledgements

Language has always fascinated me. Growing up in a partially-multilingual family and in a highly diverse and multilingual area, I have always tried to imitate the sounds, words and phrases around me. Once I started studying Spanish, I was comparing it to English. Once I started learning Italian, I began to compare it to dialectal Italian phrases spoken in my family, and to Spanish and English. Little did I know that I had been essentially performing contrastive analyses that whole time, albeit in a crude fashion. It was not until I took a required 'Introduction to Linguistics' course that I truly found my calling.

The questions posed—and answered—in this dissertation reflect many years of casual and formal research: why do certain aspects of languages change, but not others? Why are there differences among some dialects in a given language? Why are certain changes so similar to one another? I think it is fair to say that we all know that languages change, but few can say *why* they do so. This dissertation, and future works to come, is my way of answering some of my own questions.

My time at the University of Texas has blessed me in countless ways. First, to my dissertation committee: Professors Brigitte Bauer, Carlos Solé, Frederick Hensey, Cinzia Russi, and Qing Zhang. I cannot convey in words the

kindness, generosity, patience, wisdom and knowledge that you have all shown me. Professors Bauer and Solé headed my committee, and I owe them more than my gratitude for their unyielding wisdom and crucial comments. And to the other members of the departments of Spanish and Portuguese, French and Italian, and Linguistics: thank you for your courses, your knowledge, and your advice. To Laura Rodríguez, the Graduate Coordinator for the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, and to Professors Chiyo Nishida and Jean-Pierre Montreuil, the advisors of the Romance Linguistics Program: thank you, *molto grazie*, *merci beaucoup*, *muchísimas gracias*, *muito obrigada*.

My questions about language first developed while performing my bachelors' and masters' work at the University of California at Davis, so it is only right that I acknowledge my professors' contributions there. To Professors Almerindo Ojeda, Máximo Torreblanca and Maria Manea Manoliu, for their wisdom and guidance in my masters' work. In particular to Almerindo, who introduced me to the world of research, teaching, and writing. To the many others who taught me and fueled my fire, including (and perhaps especially) Professor Robert Blake, who opened the door to the world of historical Spanish linguistics and who personally recommended me to the University of Texas and his mentor, Carlos Solé.

While writing my Masters' Thesis, I lost the professor who introduced me to the study of Linguistics: Stephen LaPointe. This time, while writing my dissertation, I lost a professor and committee member: Mark Southern. Mark had a passion for Indo-European linguistics and historical linguistics that was indeed infectious. He was a great linguist, an outstanding teacher, and a wise and good man. He introduced me to several non-central theories of language change, and

even lent me the books on these subjects; William Croft's (2000) work on Evolutionary Theory was one such book. The passion and knowledge for all language-related topics was immeasurably vast...a small amount would last me a lifetime.

To my many friends and colleagues who sat through readings and re-readings of my chapters—thank you for your patience. In particular, to my colleagues at California State University, Chico and California State University, Monterey Bay, who gave me a dry-run at presenting the data from my dissertation, and who helped guide me through some of my questions. Additionally, my thanks to Dr. Joanna Schultz for her editing prowess.

2007 is a landmark year for my family. It is the centennial of the immigration of my maternal great-grandparents from Genoa and Ferno, Italy—3 of them came in 1907, with my grandmother's mother arriving in 1910. They all represent the perseverance of our family—barely-literate immigrant laborers whose children all graduated from high school, and whose great-grandchildren all have college degrees. 2007 also marks 100 years since the birth of my paternal grandmother, and 115 years since that of my paternal grandfather. Both were born in Indian Territory, and were not privy to much education; he was illiterate, and she succeeded to the 8<sup>th</sup> grade, which was the highest level possible in that area and in that era. Of my grandmother's 7 children, only one graduated high school—my father. I reflect upon this aspect of my family history, and am truly humbled not only for my collegiate education, but for the opportunities that have been afforded me in order to complete one of my dreams. I am highly aware of how blessed my life has been thus far.

So, it is with this in mind that I cannot leave this list of acknowledgements without recognizing the massive contribution of my family: my father Wilmoth, my mother Michelle, my brothers Matthew and Mark, and my recently-passed maternal grandmother Josephine Ann George. To say that they have supported me throughout the years is quite an understatement. Often they have given me the energy and the mental fuel to dig deeper than perhaps I normally would have. The competitive nature that runs deep in our family fuels me to reach higher; the inquisitive quiriness that is a hallmark of ours entices me to ask the questions; the passion to follow a dream picks me up when I am down. 'Thank you' is only a starting point.

# **Gender in the Romance Languages: An Evolutionary Approach**

Publication No. \_\_\_\_\_

Sarah Elizabeth Harmon, PhD

The University of Texas at Austin, 2007

Supervisor: Brigitte L.M. Bauer

This investigation tests the validity of three theories of languages applied to data on lexical gender in the Medieval period of the Romance languages. By analyzing and comparing data from the Miracles of Our Lady, in combination with data from various other researchers, certain patterns of regularity and irregularity can be observed. The primary focus addresses the lexical gender assignment of nouns in the various Romance languages, in particular in the merger of the Latin neuter gender with the masculine and feminine genders. The overall changes and stasis of the history of lexical gender in the Romance languages, can be applied to various theories of language change in order to analyze and understand various phenomena. The phenomena examined in this investigation include the topics of lexical gender change and stasis, 'undecided' and ambiguous lexical gender assignment, and mass-gender elements. In addition, the theories of Lightfoot (1979, 1991), Keller (1994) and Croft (1996, 2000) are used to elucidate contemporary theoretical understanding of this topic. Lightfoot and Keller are chosen as representatives of Formalism and Functionalism,

respectively, as they are often used in order to describe and discuss historical language change; the theory of Croft is a new theory which can benefit from further research. It is found that the theory of Croft (2000) best explains the research questions, but more work is recommended in order to fully understand the various phenomena of lexical gender in the history of the Romance languages, and in order to ensure the veracity of the theory, Croft's (2000) Evolutionary Theory must be tested further.

## Table of Contents

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>XI</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE: GENDER, LANGUAGE CHANGE AND THE ROMANCE LANGUAGES—</b>	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE CHAPTER	1
1.1 GENDER	3
1.1.1 Gender in Proto-Indo-European	8
1.1.1.1 Gender in Germanic	12
1.1.2 Gender in Latin	15
1.1.3 Gender in Romance	18
1.1.3.1 Ambiguous and ambigeneric nouns in Romance	23
1.1.3.2 ‘Mass-neuter’ in Romance	26
1.1.3.3 Masculine and feminine minimal pairs	31
1.1.4 Gender change in Romance	32
1.2 THEORIES OF LANGUAGE CHANGE	36
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	38
<b>CHAPTER TWO: GENDER AS REPRESENTED IN THE MIRACLES OF OUR LADY</b>	<b>42</b>
2.0 GENERAL GOALS OF THE CHAPTER	42
2.1 THE MIRACLES OF OUR LADY	42
2.2 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS FOUND IN THE DATA	51
2.3 SPECIFIC QUESTIONS WITHIN THE DATA	62
2.3.1 Masculine-Feminine Switch from Latin to Romance	62
2.3.2 Undecided Gender	70
2.3.3 Comparison of Nouns from the Same Latin Noun	73
2.3.4 Mass and Collective Reference	75
2.4 THE LOSS OF NEUTER GENDER	77
2.5 CONCLUSIONS OF THE CHAPTER	79
<b>CHAPTER THREE: GENDER IN ROMANCE AND THEORIES OF LANGUAGE CHANGE</b>	<b>80</b>
3.0 INTRODUCTION	80
3.1 DISCUSSIONS OF GENDER IN ROMANCE LINGUISTICS	81
3.1.1 The ‘Handbooks’ of Romance Linguistics	81
3.1.2 Discussions on Gender Change from Latin to Romance	83
3.1.3 Discussions on Specific Issues of Romance Gender	87
3.1.4 Discussions on the Romance Mass Gender	91
3.2 MODERN THEORIES OF LANGUAGE CHANGE	93
3.2.1 Formalism and Lightfoot	94
3.2.2 Functionalism and Keller	98
3.2.3 Evolutionary Theory	107
3.2.3.1 Croft’s Evolutionary Theory of Language Change	109
3.3 CONCLUSION FOR THE CHAPTER	117
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF LANGUAGE CHANGE THEORIES</b>	<b>118</b>
4.0 REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS	118
4.1 APPLICATION OF THE AUTHORS’ THEORIES TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS	119
4.1.1 The regularity of gender change from Latin to Romance	120

4.1.2 Differences in gender assignment from Latin to Romance	122
4.1.3 Gender ambiguity from Latin to Romance	123
4.1.4 Lack of mass or collective markers in the Miracles	124
4.1.5 Gender categorization from Latin to Romance	125
4.2 ANALYSIS OF THE AUTHORS	127
4.2.1 A motion against Lightfoot	127
4.2.2 A motion against Keller	132
4.2.3 A motion for Croft	136
4.3 CONCLUSION FOR THE CHAPTER AND THE DISSERTATION	147
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>152</b>
APPENDIX A: CLASSICAL LATIN DECLENSION SYSTEM (BALDI 1999:312, 317, 322, 327, 330, AND 333)	153
APPENDIX B: FRENCH AMBIGENERIC NOUNS (GREVISSE 1986: 760-768)	155
APPENDIX C: MASCULINE AND FEMININE MINIMAL PAIRS IN ROMANCE	157
Portuguese:	157
Spanish:	157
Catalan:	158
Occitan/Provençal:	158
Rhaeto-Romance:	159
APPENDIX D: COMPARISON OF NOUNS OF THE SAME LATIN ETYMON FOUND IN THE MIRACLES OF OUR LADY	160
APPENDIX E: MASS- AND COLLECTIVE-REFERENCE-NOUNS	165
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>169</b>
<b>VITA</b>	<b>186</b>

## List of Tables

TABLE 1: GENDER CATEGORIES IN THE ROMANCE LANGUAGES	21
TABLE 2: MODERN ROMANCE GENDER INFLECTION	22
TABLE 3: ITALIAN AMBIGENERIC 'DOUBLE PLURALS'	24
TABLE 4: RUMANIAN GENDER INFLECTION SYSTEM	24
TABLE 5: ASTURIAN SPANISH EXAMPLES, TAKEN FROM GARCÍA GONZÁLEZ (1979: 52)	28
TABLE 6: SOUTH-CENTRAL ITALIAN MASS-COLLECTIVE NOUNS AND COUNT NOUNS	30
TABLE 7: NUMBER OF NOUNS IN EACH OF THE MIRACLES ANALYZED	52
TABLE 8: NUMBER OF NOUNS AND THEIR ETYMOLOGICAL GENDER CHANGE IN THE MIRACLES ANALYZED	54
TABLE 9: CONDENSED VERSION OF TABLE 8	55
TABLE 10: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF NOMINAL BORROWINGS FOUND IN THE CHRONICLES	56
TABLE 11: BORROWINGS FOUND IN THE MIRACLES AND THEIR ETYMOLOGIES	57
TABLE 12: LATIN MASCULINE TO OLD FRENCH FEMININE NOUNS	62
TABLE 13: LATIN MASCULINE TO OLD CASTILIAN FEMININE NOUNS	62
TABLE 14: LATIN MASCULINE TO OLD GALICIAN PORTUGUESE FEMININE NOUNS	63
TABLE 15: MODERN ROMANCE EQUIVALENTS OF VARIOUS LATIN WORDS IN ELCOCK	66
TABLE 16: LATIN FEMININE TO OLD FRENCH MASCULINE NOUNS	68
TABLE 17: LATIN FEMININE TO OLD CASTILIAN MASCULINE NOUNS	69
TABLE 18: OLD FRENCH MULTIPLE GENDERED NOUNS	70
TABLE 19 OLD CASTILIAN MULTIPLE GENDERED NOUNS	71
TABLE 20: LATIN MASCULINE NOUNS INTO ROMANCE WITH DIFFERING GENDERS	74
TABLE 21: LATIN FEMININE NOUNS INTO ROMANCE WITH DIFFERING GENDERS	74
TABLE 22: LATIN NEUTER NOUNS INTO ROMANCE WITH DIFFERING GENDERS	74
TABLE 23: OLD FRENCH AND OLD CASTILIAN NOUNS WITH MASS OR COLLECTIVE REFERENCE IN THE MIRACLES	76
TABLE 24: STATISTICS LATIN NEUTER > ROMANCE MASCULINE OR FEMININE FROM THE MIRACLES	78
TABLE 25: PARADIGM OF INSTANTIATIONS OF GENERAL THEORY AND SELECTION IN BIOLOGY AND LANGUAGE	113
TABLE 26: LATIN MASCULINE NOUNS INTO ROMANCE	160
TABLE 27: LATIN FEMININE NOUNS INTO ROMANCE	162
TABLE 28: LATIN NEUTER NOUNS INTO ROMANCE	164
TABLE 29: MASS- AND COLLECTIVE-REFERENCE NOUNS FOUND IN THE MIRACLES OF OUR LADY	165

# **Chapter One: Gender, Language Change and the Romance Languages—Introduction**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE CHAPTER**

This dissertation discusses aspects of the history of lexical gender in the Romance languages, with particular reference to the late Middle Ages. To do so, data from the Medieval period of Romance are collected and added to a range of data from previous investigations obtained from the literature, and together analyzed using three language change theories. This dissertation is limited to a small data set, but from this study several avenues of future research can be explored, which are detailed in section 4.3. The research covered in Chapters 1 and 3, in particular the theories discussed in section 3.2, covers a wide range of topics, both within and outside of Romance linguistics. The theories of language change analyzed in section 3.2, including those of Lightfoot (1979, 1991), Keller (1994) and Croft (2000) have been chosen because of their plausible application to lexical gender in Romance. While none of the three authors have directly applied their theories to this topic, others have used their theories, or similar versions, to discuss various topics within Romance linguistics, including gender (e.g. Smith 1996-1997, García 1997). However, these three theories have not been compared and contrasted with regard to lexical gender in a single work and this is one area where this dissertation can be applied to the greater linguistic community. In this way I use a given data set, both from the Miracles and those data from previous researchers outlined in Chapter 1 to test all three theories equally, and further test their ability to describe an area of language change. Chapter 4 demonstrates how all three of these theories explain some aspects of

gender loss and maintenance, but no one theory is complete enough to explain all the elements of the research questions.

The topic of lexical gender in the history of Romance is one which is well documented; the literature discusses the manners in which change and stasis have occurred, yet there is little consensus to why the diachrony of the Romance languages exists as it does. One could look at the history of the language family and note that there is a long stretch—from the fall of the Roman Empire (or earlier, in the case of Rumanian and Sardinian) until approximately the 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> century—in which little documentation exists of the language of the people. It could also be argued that during this time there was little communication between languages. In theory, this could lead to vastly different patterns of lexical gender assignment of Classical Latin and Vulgar Latin. However, as is shown both in this chapter and in Chapter 2, the history of lexical gender for the various Romance languages follows the same lines—albeit with different, language-specific morphological and phonological changes—as well as the category of gender remaining remarkably similar, even identical in many cases. Many in the field have stated that this is due to the Latin gender system changing even as early as Vulgar Latin and would be a necessity for such uniformity across the language family (Cano Aguilar 1992; Herman 2000). However, is this the only possibility? Can this position be demonstrated? In Vulgar Latin there are still vestiges of a tripartite gender system, albeit in a degraded form (Herman 2000:66). In addition, there are phenomena which contradict this transition from a tripartite to a binary gender system; these phenomena are discussed below in sections 1.1.3 and 1.1.4. Research beyond this dissertation is in need to address the history of these questions. Subsequent research may determine if

the change from a tripartite to a binary gender system represents idiosyncratic anomalies of the given language, or if indeed they are phenomena which aid in describing the history of lexical gender in Romance. Furthermore, from roughly 400 CE to approximately 1000 CE there is very little documentation of ‘popular’ language, and only small glimpses of language progression spanning six hundred years of language history. One can observe the ‘before’ and the ‘after’, but there is very little evidence for the intermediary stages.

This dissertation is founded on the above questions. One small segment of language in Northern France, Castile, and Galicia in the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries is analyzed, in order to characterize the language gender system of these geographic areas during this time period. The central goal is to attempt to explain how lexical gender has evolved in the Romance language family; in doing so, we will test three theories of language change. Two are ‘accepted’ by the linguistic community, albeit with controversy. The third, a more contemporary theory, requires additional review and research, but suggest areas of study to describe aspects of morphology and language change.

## **1.1 GENDER**

The term ‘gender’ is an umbrella term encompassing specific kinds of nominal categories, with a complex history paralleling linguistic history. Lexical gender involves both an inherent gender applied to nouns based on a biological distinction as well as assigned gender based on grammatical or semantic distinctions. According to Corbett, who cites Hockett: “Genders are classes of nouns reflected in the behavior of associated words” (1958:231; as cited in Corbett 1991:1), and Corbett further adds that

[the] classification frequently corresponds to a real-world distinction of sex, at least in part, but often too it does not....The word 'gender' is used not just for a group of nouns but also for the whole category; thus we may say that a particular language has, say, three genders, masculine, feminine and neuter, and that the language has the category of gender (1991:1).

Put another way, the term 'gender' characterizes both the lexical item with lexical gender as well as agreement patterns which inflect various modifiers (Zenenko 1983:232). "Gender, in a gender language, is an inherent feature of each noun," although gender agreement between nouns and their modifiers can also be seen as the "semiotic parameter of indexicality" (Dressler and Doleschal 1990-1991:115-116). Additionally, nouns have a deictic characteristic, in that they indicate or refer to objects or ideas. Adjectives and verbs can be seen as anaphoric; they do not refer to anything, but are instead referenced by the nouns in the sentence. They are necessary elements of syntax, but are anaphoric in their nature; this is shown in nominal and verbal inflection (Gruică 1973:279). The nouns control case via the syntax, gender and number on adjectives, and number and person on verbs; agreement is required by the syntax, but the nouns are the central figure in a given sentence (Gruică 1973:282). Pronouns are of an intermediary stage; they must carry the lexical and grammatical attributes of a noun, but because they are essentially placeholders for nouns and have anaphoric reference, they are not fully anaphoric in nature (Gruică 1973:283).

Many languages and language families assign gender based strictly on biological terms: animate nouns are given lexical gender based on their biological gender, and inanimate nouns are treated in different ways according to the language-specific morpho-syntactic rules. Furthermore, this lexical gender assignment is primarily based upon biological elements of the noun; in the case

of the Indo-European languages, this tends to revolve either around animacy, activeness, or gender. For any noun which is assigned lexical gender based on other criteria, it is done through the morphosyntactical rules, or the phonological structure of the noun. For example, if word  $\alpha$  sounds like or is formed in the same manner as word  $\beta$  in the word-final position, then word  $\alpha$  will be assigned the same lexical gender as word  $\beta$  (Zenenko 1983:236). This is generally true for Latin; male and female nouns are assigned lexical gender based on biological gender, while all other nouns “are distributed over the three genders based on their declension class, and thus on morphological factors” (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:361). This same method can be and often is used in assigning lexical gender to borrowings; one can see this in Rumanian, as discussed later in section 1.1.3.1 and data from the Miracles in section 2.1. This is also seen in Latin with respect to Greek anthroponyms (Lazzeroni 1999), as well as in Greek *-ma, matos* nouns which are incorporated into the Latin first declension and assigned feminine gender (Väänänen 1988:172). Overall, the key element to remember is that gender is inherent to the morphosyntactic system, and slower to change in borrowing situations than other grammatical subsystems (Bechert 1982:28). Therefore changes are more likely to be seen as the result of the force of placing the borrowed term into the ‘appropriate category’, whatever that may entail. Creoles, with the characteristic lack of inflection, do not seem to mark any grammatical gender, and often any gender reference is implied; Romance creoles are discussed in section 1.1.3. When discussing Indo-European languages and Romance languages specifically, there is often a maximum of three genders—masculine, feminine, and neuter—which are built from the

original Proto-Indo-European animacy-based gender system. The Proto-Indo-European gender system is further discussed in section 1.1.1

While lexical gender is the focus of this dissertation, it should be noted that the assignment of gender to a given lexicon is conducted under various methods. What is often dubbed as ‘grammatical gender’ is the process of assigning gender according to phonological or morphological similarity based on certain key elements of the lexicon; this is the rule discussed earlier and by Zenenko (1983). It is often through morphological agreement between the noun and its modifiers that the lexical gender of lexical entries can be discerned. Corbett further argues that one cannot discuss gender without it being intricately linked to agreement. “Saying that a language has three genders implies that there are three classes of nouns which can be distinguished syntactically by the agreements they take” (Corbett 1991:4). To use Corbett’s later example, it is not as simple as saying that there is an abstract gender in English containing all nouns in *-tion*; there must be evidence of agreement—Corbett is implying explicit morphological agreement between nouns and other modifiers—between the head and the modifier (1991:31). In fact, one could argue that “[the] principal effect of the inherent gender of Romance lexical items is to trigger agreement in dependent adjectives and determiners” (Posner 1985:439). This agreement is different than anaphoric reference, as anaphors take on the characteristics of their antecedents, including gender.

Lexical gender, while often determined on a grammatical basis, is also determined by other factors. Biological gender is often the benchmark for gender systems. Once the gender patterns are set up based on phonological and morphological elements on a core set of lexical items, much of the rest of the

gender assignment system will follow suit. It is the reason, for example, Latin assigns *mulier* 'woman', *filia* 'daughter' and *mater* 'mother' feminine gender while *vir* 'man', *filius* 'son' and *pater* 'father' are labeled as masculine. Semantic associations are often employed as a way to differentiate animate from inanimate objects, count versus mass and/or collective nouns, or other meaning or elements of the lexical item which lie outside of the morphological or morphosyntactical aspect of the lexicon. The issue of semantic basis for gender is relatively uncontested in some language families. For the most part, the Indo-European languages have long since left the confines of animacy as being the sole or primary motivation in gender assignment; there is more discussion on Proto-Indo-European and gender in section 1.1.1. However, as Corbett points out, "[a] criterion which is the main defining factor for a complete gender in one language may be one contributory factor in another" (1991:31), perhaps opening the door to the possibility of using semantic criteria for assigning gender in various Indo-European languages. What is important to remember in the development and analysis of a lexical gender system is that, as Lehmann stated, "gender is a congruence category. That is to say, it functions in associating other elements with nouns" (1993:152).

Finally, the concept of neuter in the world of Romance has several connotations. Latin has a tripartite gender system: masculine, feminine, and neuter. While there might have originally been an element of animacy implied with these terms, the gender assignment as it is known in Latin is a purely lexical and grammatical feature. That is to say, the three genders are classifications of nouns with biological gender being the basis of human nouns. Most grammarians suggest that in general, the modern Romance languages have only

two genders—masculine and feminine—with Rumanian being the exception. However, it is often stated in the individual grammars that an abstract concept or a sentence is replaced with a ‘neuter’ pronoun or demonstrative; this is particularly common in the Ibero-Romance languages. This then begs the question about whether, in some instances, there might be more than two genders in the Romance languages; this is often mentioned because the ‘neuter’ forms are, for the most part, descendants of the Latin neuter demonstratives and/or pronouns. For this reason, when referring to these pro-forms descended from a Latin neuter grammatical form, they will be referred to as ‘neuter’ in this dissertation. In doing so, this continues to show their relationship to the Latin neuter ancestor, but without implying that they are part of a third gender or constitute a third gender in the given language<sup>1</sup>. The ‘neuter’ demonstratives and pronouns are discussed again in section 1.1.3.

### **1.1.1 Gender in Proto-Indo-European**

“Gender, as a category, is generally preserved.... At least in Indo-European, gender appears to be diachronically more stable than most other nominal categories, such as case or definiteness” (Matasović 2004:72), and in fact, only number is as stable a category. Indeed, gender is a category which does seem to define the various Indo-European language families, both in their inflection patterns as well as their treatment of lexical gender. Later subsections of this work contain discussions on lexical gender systems in Latin and the rest of the Romance-speaking world, but before entering that discussion it is important to note the lexical gender assignment system in Proto-Indo-European.

---

<sup>1</sup> Luján (1972) also discusses this, and confirms that, despite these ‘neuter’ proforms, there are only two genders in Spanish.

Two periods of the language are proposed (Bauer 2000; Beekes 1995; Lehmann 1989, 1993, 1999; Schmidt 1979; Sihler 1995), including an earlier period which is characterized by either an active-inactive or an ergative syntactical structure and an animate-inanimate gender system, followed by a period with a nominative-accusative syntactical structure and a masculine-feminine-neuter gender system. In fact, “[the] Hittite classification of nouns into common and neuter gender still shows a formal and semantic connection to the Proto-Indo-European classification into active and inactive,” thus showing how in general Anatolian, and more specifically in Hittite, is relatively conservative with regard to the development of gender (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995:327). It is in the later period, after Anatolian branched off of the language family, that we find two types of declensions. One is an archaic consonant-stem declension system, a remnant of the previous active or ergative phase which generally does not have any inflection for feminine nouns. This is followed by the two new creations of the o-stem masculine nouns and the (i)eh<sub>2</sub>-stem feminine nouns (Beekes 1995:174-175). The endings more or less broke down as follows: \*-mōn and \*-tēr/\*-tōr are all masculine; \*-eh<sub>2</sub>, \*-yeh<sub>2</sub> (which is a combined form of \*-ih<sub>2</sub> + \*-eh<sub>2</sub>, also used for abstract and collective nouns), and most \*-ih<sub>2</sub>, \*-uh<sub>2</sub>, \*-h<sub>2</sub>, and \*-ti stems are feminine; \*h<sub>2</sub>tēr, \*-ōs. \*-i, and \*-h<sub>2</sub>oy all were common nouns, while \*-r/n, \*-it, \*e/os, \*-tlo (and \*-dhlo), \*-tro (and \*-dhro), and \*-mn are all neuter. \*O-stems are predominantly either masculine or neuter (Matasović 2004:136). Generally speaking, later Proto-Indo-European nouns denoting humans followed the biological gender, while collectives (e.g. \*g’enh<sub>1</sub>os ‘family’) are labeled as neuter; most large, dangerous animals are masculine, while general names for animals are common gender; smaller animals and insects are feminine

(Matasović 2004: 93-97). Names of trees are common gender, but parts of plants, all fruit and cereals and most fluids and substances are neuter; fluids and substances taken as collectives are feminine singular, using the  $*-h_2$  label (Matasović 2004: 126-130).

The evolution of this change from an animacy- or active-based morphosyntactic system to a gender system based on masculine, feminine and neuter genders reflects a series of dramatic changes. Bauer (2000:45), citing from Szemerényi (1990:169), reports that the nominative-accusative endings reflect this ergative or animate inflection. Lehmann (1989:238) proposes four endings for nouns as the Pre-Indo-European inflections:  $-s$  for animate,  $-m$  for inanimate,  $-h$  for collective and  $-\emptyset$  as an extra-syntagmatic inflection for particles or the vocative. Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995) show that in earlier forms of Proto-Indo-European, the inactive group had a subgroup of collective nouns, all with the ending  $-aH$ , and which originally did not have a plural form; furthermore, the inactive neuter nouns generally did not have a plural form, and if there was one, it was associated with this collective meaning. Once the  $-o$ -stems took on a plural form which used  $-s$  instead of ablaut, the same  $-s$  was used for the collective  $-aH$  stems (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995:245-246; also Lehmann 1999:80). Ultimately all collectives—not only  $*-\bar{a}$ -stems but  $*-\bar{i}$ -stems and  $*-\bar{u}$ -stems—“were reinterpreted in the various languages and became markers of the feminine gender independent of a masculine source form” (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995: 327). This is not to say that all feminine nouns, either in later Proto-Indo-European or in the daughter languages, derive from neuter or inactive nouns. Some nouns are substantivized adjective formations, while others are assigned feminine gender based on biological gender (Matasović 2004:167-172).

These criteria directly develop into the Proto-Indo-European inflections discussed by Bauer (2000). Proto-Indo-European evolves into a nominative-accusative language, with masculine-feminine-neuter genders; the ‘active’ is seen to have evolved into the masculine gender with the addition of the *-o* stems, the ‘collective’ into the *-eh<sub>2</sub>* and ultimately feminine (and not necessarily collective) *-ā*-stems, and the ‘inactive’ into the ‘neuter’. This change in phonological system, particularly with the *-eh<sub>2</sub>* > *-ā*-stems, seems to have led to the restructuring of the morpho-syntactical system; “[after] the change there was no longer a parallel *h*-ending with the two endings in *-s* and *-m*. Forms in *-ā* were treated as bases, and endings were added to it rather than replacing a word-final consonant. The contrast led to the grammatical distinction known as gender” (Lehmann 1999:80). It has also been argued that when this shift from animate-inanimate to nominative-accusative happens, and in particular with the addition of a third (feminine) gender, the Proto Indo-European system is out of balance, and needs to ‘re-find’ its equilibrium. It is at this point that Germanic splits off; by that point Anatolian had diverged before the three genders came into existence (Schwink 2004:12-13). In fact, in many cases feminine singulars which originate from a neuter plural *\*-aH/\*-ā* possesses slight meaning differences, e.g. Skt. *tānā*: n.pl. ‘descendants/posterities’ but f.sg. ‘descendant/offspring’ (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995:246).

This subsequent loss of *-h* as a consonant must have occurred before the development of Hittite, although the full development of the masculine-feminine-neuter gender system most likely happened after the separation of the Anatolian languages (Lehmann 1993:152). Therefore, in the later stages of Proto-Indo-European the following inflections can be inferred: *-o*-stem (masculine), *-ā*-stem

(feminine) and the various other archaic consonant-stems—*r/n* stems, *r*-stems, *n*-stems, *s*-stems, *i*-stems, *u*-stems and others—filling in all three genders (Sihler 1995). However, this development of gender is not without irregularities. Some nouns within the *o*-stem declension are marked for feminine gender assignment, and include but are not limited to *\*snusós* ‘daughter-in-law’ and *\*h<sub>1</sub>ek’uos* ‘horse’ and ‘mare’. These anomalies are found only in Greek and Latin and seem to be productive until late in Proto-Indo-European (Matasović 2004:138-139). The former example will continue to be in the Latin masculine-dominated second declension, as is seen in section 1.1.2. There also exist some masculine *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>* stems, which seem to have been maintained into Greek (*neāniās* ‘youth’), Italic (Latin *scrība* ‘scribe’; *agricola* ‘farmer’), and Balto-Slavic (Lith. *ėlgeta* ‘pauper’, OCS *sluga* ‘servant’). In all cases these *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>* stems denote social terms for males (Matasović 2004:142).

#### **1.1.1.1 Gender in Germanic**

The dialogue in this chapter reveals that gender as a category changes regularly in Romance, but this is not necessarily the case in other Indo-European language families. In particular, the Germanic languages demonstrate differences with regard to the treatment of gender as a category. Proto-Germanic language split from the Indo-European family earlier than other language families, seemingly immediately after the tripartite gender system had been established (Schwink 2004:14, 29). As such, the morphological system in Proto-Germanic “is characterized by a multitude of declensional classes and some eight inflectionally marked cases” along with the three genders (Schwink 2004:9). This leads to a starting point which exhibits fluctuation. Indeed, many nouns in Proto-Germanic have not just one lexical gender associated with it, but

pertain to two or all three lexical genders, and often without a semantic difference between the genders (Matasović 2004:59).

From these beginnings, lexical gender seems to proceed in widely divergent paths within the Germanic family, where the following positions are represented: an original tripartite gender distinction based solely on grammatical inflection (e.g. Icelandic, Faroese, Gothic); a tripartite system which utilizes some semantic categorization (e.g. German); a bipartite common-neuter distinction (e.g. Swedish, Danish); the bipartite 'grouping' originally based on a common-neuter distinction (e.g. Dutch, Frisian); and, a morphological system which has no lexical gender at all—Western Jutish has no gender, while English has natural gender only on third-person singular pronouns (Matasović 2004:57-61). Proto-Germanic confusion of lexical gender for some nouns continues in both Old High German and Old English (Matasović 2004:58-59), although there is some contention about Old High German. Since agreement on modifiers is often not present, discerning the lexical gender of a noun in Old High German is often difficult, if not impossible (Schwink 2004:66-67).

Gender as a category has undergone a drastic change in the history of English. Old English has a well-entrenched lexical gender system, with tripartite (masculine, feminine, neuter) genders. Even loanwords into Old English show the strength of the lexical gender system, where the masculine gender seems to be the unmarked gender, closely followed by the feminine (Wetna 1980:400). By Middle English, approximately starting in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, there is no gender inflection on the nouns (Dekeyser 1980:99). The reason for the overhaul of the morpho-semantic system is not agreed upon. Some researchers believe that the change was largely internal, due to “the obscuration and reduction of the vowels

in the inflectional morphemes and the extension of particular forms to other cases and genders” (Dekeyser 1980:99), while others believe in a Creolization hypothesis, involving either Scandinavian (Poussa 1982:70) or French (Bailey and Maroldt 1977:21) conquerors and the pressure of their languages on the ‘native’ population of England. Regardless of the position of the researcher, what is clear is that English changes from a language with grammatical gender (masculine, feminine, neuter) on all nominal forms to one which uses natural gender (male, female, asexual) only on personal pronouns, and this change is complete by the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> century (Dekeyser 1980:100). It seems that this is a slow change, in either a north-to-south direction (Dekeyser 1980:99) or as a Creolization whose standard is centered in the central and eastern Midlands area of England (Poussa 1982:73).

Dutch is another Germanic language which has undergone a substantial change in its gender categorization and inflection patterns, although it is a less drastic change than that of English. Standard Dutch of both the Netherlands and Belgium no longer has a true lexical gender distinction. Instead the languages have two classes of nouns, which are historically descended from the original binary gender distinction: *de*-words (historically masculine and feminine) and *het*-words (historically neuter); *de* and *het* refer to the definite articles that each group requires (Dekeyser 1980:102). This is in contrast to how gender categories are treated in regional dialects, in particular in Belgium, where there is still tripartite grammatical gender systems based upon masculine, feminine and neuter genders. This lexical gender assignment, which is more typical of Middle Dutch and other Germanic languages, is inflected grammatically on the singular definite and indefinite articles and limitedly on the singular adjectives (Dekeyser

1980:107). This waning of gender in (standard) Dutch is further evidence of the erosion of the category of gender in areas of Germanic, especially when one considers the English data in conjunction with this Dutch data. However, it should be noted that these changes in English and Dutch are considered to be atypical for Germanic languages (Dekeyser 1980:97), yet their existence further makes the Romance example a remarkable one.

The comparison of data regarding the history of lexical gender in Germanic to those of the Romance languages singularly reveals a lack of uniformity in the former, and an overall similarity in both form and meaning in the latter. There seems to be a spectrum of possibilities with the archaic (e.g. Icelandic) on the one end and the innovative (e.g. English) on the other. If there is a trend in Germanic, gender weakening is the most likely phenomenon. Subsequent sections will show this is not the case in the Romance family, where the gender category is still alive, and if the 'mass genders' are considered a true gender, reveal continual growth.

### **1.1.2 Gender in Latin**

In discussing gender in Latin, one should primarily focus on Classical Latin and Vulgar Latin. The majority of the Vulgar Latin examples derive from numerous sources, including the works of authors such as Plautus, Petronius and Tacitus; treatises by Columella, Vitruvius, and Megetius among others; 'common' writings and letters from early authors; and graveyard inscriptions and various graffiti, much of which is documented in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (Elcock 1960:21-26). Certain considerations are necessary because these are the only sources available for a language used in spoken register. This spoken register seems to be the link for the vast majority of changes that are

visible between the Romance languages and their Classical ancestor. It is not completely certain if Roman authors who use 'common' speech in their works are actually depicting the Vulgar Latin used at that time, or if the words and sentences are twisted in order to play with the language. However, it can be said that even if they slightly skew the language they try to imitate, there is an element of truth in the imitation. What is found in the literary works for the most part agrees with what has been recovered from inscriptions and graffiti all over the Roman Empire (Herman 2000:17). In addition to these, there is a large body of letters, business texts, school texts, and grammars, which are a more direct representation of the language of the people (Herman 2000:19).

There is little written on the grammatical structure of gender in Old or Early Latin. Therefore, this topic will not be addressed here. As mentioned earlier in section 1.1.1, once Proto-Indo-European arrives to the Italian peninsula, it has three genders (masculine, feminine, and neuter). This is seen not only by Latin data, but other Italic data (Oscan, Umbrian) as well as Celtic and other Indo-European (Venetic, Ligurian) data (Buck 1942:24-25). The inflection of this Italic branch of Proto-Indo-European is nearly identical to that of Classical Latin in terms of the declensions and gender inflections, save for minor phonological changes (e.g. *-os* raising to *-us*), which do not interfere with the morphological marking of gender. Other changes to the declensions were primarily done through the case system. Following this system certain case inflections are dropped in favor of ones more analogous to those in other declensions. This does not apply to gender as a category *per se*, and therefore is not discussed further in this work.

The differences between Classical and Vulgar Latin with regard to gender have been well documented. Cano Aguilar (1992) and Herman (2000) note that there is evidence of the Classical Latin tripartite gender system weakening, with specific reference to the neuter gender, as early as the first century CE. At that time, neuter plurals ending in *-a*, when collective in reference, tend to be used as feminine singular, and the same for abstract neuters that are regularly used in the plural. Herman further notes that there are a few inconsistencies.

[We] can tell that, originally, concord of gender and of number was the explicit bond that united a pronoun to the noun it referred to, particularly in the case of a relative pronoun and its antecedent. This bond seems to have relaxed during the Empire: mistakes in concord became increasingly frequent, and the forms of the relative pronouns, in particular, seem to have become ambiguous as regards gender (Herman 2000:66).

These “mistakes in concord” can be interpreted in many ways, including evidence of multiple variants or as proof of opacity in the speech of the community; this will be relevant in Chapters 3 and 4. Väänänen (1988) also gives a list of neuter nouns that are merged with either the feminine or masculine genders, as well as a few nouns that are marked for both masculine and neuter gender, possibly even as early as Classical Latin.

As for Classical Latin, there is much that can be said on the structure of grammatical gender. A full table of the Classical Latin declension system, taken from Baldi (1999), can be seen in Appendix A. The three genders of Classical Latin (masculine, feminine and neuter) are spread out over five declensions of nouns; adjectives and pronominal forms were the most consistent markers of gender, regardless of the inflection (or lack thereof) on the noun itself. “They determine for us the gender of a noun where this is not known by the form of the noun itself” (Buck 1942:169). The first declension, where the vast majority of

nominatives end in *-a*, is comprised almost exclusively of feminine nouns. The second is split between predominantly masculine nouns (with nominatives endings mostly in *-us*) and a sizeable group of neuter nouns (whose forms of the nominative and accusative ended in *-um*). The other declensions are mixed, particularly the third declension which showcases the more archaic consonant stems. This gender expansion comprising the declension in Latin leads to the various genders. The fourth and fifth declensions, which are of limited size and productivity in the classical language, are predominantly masculine and feminine, respectively. The fourth declension generally continued this inflection of *-us* and is formally similar to the second declension in the nominative singular and accusative singular forms. Largely, gender for human nouns is assigned based on biological gender but is not necessarily true for all other animate nouns. Inanimate nouns seem to be assigned gender via other criteria. Certain semantic groupings are associated with a given lexical gender, specifically rivers and winds being masculine, cities, island countries and trees being feminine, and fruit being neuter (Matasović 2004:49). Otherwise lexical gender is determined according to the outlines mentioned in section 1.1, based on the word-final morphology and/or phonology (Zenenko 1983:236).

### **1.1.3 Gender in Romance**

During the time period after the fall of the Empire and at the beginnings of the early Romance languages, there is little evidence of a third, neuter gender. There are occasional relics of the Latin neuter regardless of the gender of the antecedent. In particular, the relative pronoun *quod* used in reference to abstract things or objects, and based on the evidence at hand, seems to have been in existence as early as the fall of the Roman Empire (Herman 2000:66). Herman

views this break from the Classical Latin declension and gender inflection system, and the confusion of the original gender assignments, as being linked with the restriction of word order. Herman suggests this may have ensured head-modifier relations. This is done in such a way that number and gender are less relevant, “which in any case involved risky inflections that speakers were unsure about” (2000:67). It should be noted that both of the categories of number and gender continue to be important in the morpho-syntax of the Romance languages. Only the classical category of case failed to be carried on by the modern languages, with the exception of Rumanian and to a lesser extent the Rhaeto-Romance languages.

The general consensus is that the early Romance language documents show no evidence of a neuter gender, particularly as it was known in Classical Latin. Rohlfs (1970) reports no vestiges of any kind of the Latin neuter in Old French or any idiosyncrasies in the old language. However, Polinsky and van Everbroek (2003) analyze nouns in Old French texts from the 9<sup>th</sup> century to the 13<sup>th</sup> century, and note the presence of lexical gender nouns based on agreement with modifiers. They present data that contradict Rohlfs’ statement. Specifically, of the nouns they find, approximately 4.6% of the vocabulary in Old French texts is neuter, as compared to 48.3% of the vocabulary being of masculine gender and 47.1% being of feminine gender (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:364). They also site the “uncertainty of gender and/or vacillation of genders” present in areas of the Latin gender system as the reason for some of the uncertainty in their research, noting that some of this uncertainty “was carried over to Late Latin and early Old French” (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:364). Rickard reports that there is evidence in the *Chanson de Roland* of the Latin neuter plural with

plural meaning. Overall, neuter plurals were feminine singular in form and agreement, “but in *la brace* (< *brachia*) ‘both arms’, ‘two arms’, we have a feminine singular, and in *milie* ‘thousands’ (< *milia*), *carre* ‘carts’ (< *carra*), and *deie* ‘fingers’ (< *digita*) we have invariable forms, plural in meaning, and apparently masculine” (1989:32). This is quite interesting for many reasons, not the least of which is the fact that there is a possibility of descendants of Latin neuter plural nouns with plural meaning still in Medieval French. These terms in fact had masculine and/or feminine singular agreement, which signals a fluctuation in gender agreement or instability of the system. Old Spanish, in particular Old Castilian, reveals no vestiges of the Latin neuter; the ‘neuter’ of the demonstrative system, and to a lesser extent the pronominal system exists, “thanks to having developed an ‘abstract’, ‘generic’ or ‘collective’ value” [my translation]<sup>2</sup> (Cano Aguilar 1992:115). The same can most likely be said for Portuguese and Catalan, and probably for the other Romance languages, which show any such vestiges. Old Italian, and in particular Old Tuscan, shows evidence of double plurals, and this and the otherwise two-gender system used in the modern language has already been set (Rohlf 1966). Medieval Occitan seems to have a similar double plural phenomenon, and with many of the same nouns as Italian (Jensen 1986). Rumanian causes more of a problem in this area. No documents before the 16<sup>th</sup> century exist for Rumanian, posing a problem in interpretation. However, by that time the gender inflection system in the language was established (Mallinson 1986).

Table 1 shows a breakdown of the gender categories in the modern Romance languages. As mentioned in section 1.1, ‘neuter’ refers to these

---

<sup>2</sup> “gracias a haber desarrollado un valor ‘abstracto’, ‘genérico’ o ‘colectivo’”

demonstratives and abstract pronouns which are common in the Ibero-Romance branch and are often called ‘neuter’ in various grammars. The last category of “Other” is reserved for those phenomena which are not officially assigned to these genders, and which are explained below.

Table 1: Gender categories in the Romance languages

Language	Masculine	Feminine	‘Neuter’	Other
Portuguese and Galician	x	x	demon.adj.	
Spanish	x	x	demon.adj.; abstract pron. <i>lo</i>	Asturian-mass gender
Catalan	x	x	demon.adj.; obj.pron. <i>ho</i>	‘undecided gender’ nouns in <i>-or</i>
French	x	x	pro-phrase <i>ce</i>	ambigeneric nouns
Occitan and Provençal	x	x	obj.pron. <i>o</i> ; abstract pron. <i>ço</i>	
Italian	x	x		double plurals; S/C mass gender
Sardinian	x	x		
Rhaeto-Romance	x	x	Surselvan ‘predicative adj.’	
Rumanian	x	x		ambigeneric nouns

As one can see, masculine and feminine genders are retained, and the Latin neuter has essentially disappeared from the lexical gender system. As discussed earlier in section 1.1, the sole remnants of the Latin neuter forms in the Iberian languages and the Gallic languages are a ‘neuter’ pro-form. The demonstrative adjective occurs as a pro-phrase or pro-sentence form and the object pronoun which is used for abstract concepts. The abstract ‘neuter’ pronoun is often thought to have originated from the Latin neuter pronoun *illud* (Luján 1972).

Once the neuter gender ceases to exist, and the re-organization of the declension system takes place, the only clear gender inflectional differences in

existence are in the first and second declensions. These two declensions are the dominant declension in the modern Romance languages. For these nouns, the inflection of the modifiers and the anaphors are the only clue to determine the lexical gender of the head noun. This pattern can still be seen in the modern languages. The gender inflections for first and second declension nouns are presented in Table 2 below. Both the singular and plural inflections are shown.

Table 2: Modern Romance gender inflection

Language	masculine inflection	feminine inflection	other inflection
Portuguese and Galician	-o [u]; -os [us]	-a [ə]; -as [əs]	
Spanish	-o [o]; -os [os]	-a [a]; -as [as]	Asturian: masc.obj.pron. <i>lu</i> ; fem.obj.pron. <i>la</i> ; mass obj.pron. <i>lo</i>
Catalan	-Ø; -s [s]	-a [a]/[ə]; -as [as]	
French	-Ø; -s [s]	-e [no phonological representation]; -(e)s, -(au)x [Ø, ez; ø] or [z]	gender inflection on determiners and modifiers phonologically
Occitan/Provençal	-e[e]/-Ø; -es [es]	-a [a]; -as [as]	
Italian	-o [o]; -i [i]	-a [a]; -e [e]	Double plurals: sing. – o; pl. –a. South- Central Italian masc.art. <i>lo, o, lə, rə</i> ; fem.art. <i>la, a</i> ; mass art. <i>ru, lu, u</i>
Sardinian	-u [u]; -us [us]	-a [a]; -as [as]	
Rhaeto-Romance	-Ø; -s [s]/-i [i]	-a [a]; -as [as]	

As one can see, French does not inflect for gender phonologically on the nouns themselves in the singular, but does on the modifiers, including the determiners. In most cases, the French writing system shows the original inflection on the

determiners and, to a lesser extent, on the nouns. The exception to this is the elided /', which does not mark for gender.

Finally, the Romance creoles do not inflect for gender, with the exception of isolated residues that stem from original biological gender differences in the various Romance lexifiers. This is evident in Papiamentu, with the majority of the lexicon coming from Spanish and Portuguese, e.g. *mosa* 'young woman', derived from Portuguese *moça* (Zamora Vicente 1996:444). This lack of gender inflection includes the pronouns and demonstrative system.

### **1.1.3.1 Ambiguous and ambigeneric nouns in Romance**

The 'undecided gendered' nouns in Catalan are a phenomenon which consists of nouns ending in *-or*. The nouns are derived from the Latin third declension, albeit often from different etymological roots, and with no difference in meaning between the masculine and feminine forms, *amor* 'love', *color* 'color', *dolor* 'pain', etc. (Wheeler, Yates and Dols, 1999:25; Badia Margarit 1951:134). These nouns, and those like them, are not considered to be ambigeneric and are termed 'undecided' in this investigation. However, a similar explanation does not exist for the ambigeneric nouns in French, Italian (the so-called 'double plurals') or Rumanian.

The French examples, outlined in Appendix B, are words which have a masculine form and a feminine form, each with its own meaning, and each descended from the same Latin noun but often from different forms of the noun. These French ambigeneric nouns tend to have a collective or abstract meaning associated with the feminine form (Grevisse 1986:760-768). They are no longer productive, but are quite common in the language. Similarly, the Italian 'double plurals' are a group of nouns which have masculine singular inflection but

feminine plural inflection. The feminine plural form tends to have a collective sense, and often the nouns have masculine plural pairs, which denote a plural countable entity. A list of them, taken from Rohlfs (1966: §368, 45-47) can be seen in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Italian ambigeneric ‘double plurals’

<i>l'osso/le ossa</i>	‘bone(s)’	<i>il ciglio/le ciglia</i>	‘eyelash(es)’
<i>l'uovo/le uova</i>	‘egg(s)’	<i>il ginocchio/le ginocchia</i>	‘knee(s)’
<i>il legno/le legna</i>	‘wood(s)’	<i>il labbro/le labbra</i>	‘lip(s)’
<i>il braccio/le braccia</i>	‘arm(s)’	<i>il membro/le membra</i>	‘limb(s)’
<i>il corno/le corna</i>	‘horn(s)’	<i>il miglio/le miglia</i>	‘mile(s)’

As Tekavčić (1980:109) states, this feature is no longer productive not unlike the French examples in Appendix B, and has died out in most northern Italian dialects. However, it is still important in the standard dialect, as well as in the majority of the central and southern dialects.

Rumanian is not listed with the other languages in Table 2 because the traditional grammars describe the gender system differently. A separate table of its inflectional pattern in the nominative-accusative can be seen below in Table 4, taken from Mallinson (1986:244-246).

Table 4: Rumanian gender inflection system

masculine inflection	feminine inflection	ambigeneric inflection
-u [u]; -i [i]	-ă [æ]/-a [a]; -e [e]	-Ø/-u [u]; -uri [uri]/-e [e]

The Rumanian third ‘gender’ is often called neuter in the grammars, however, the preference for this investigation is to use the term ‘ambigeneric’, as Mallinson (1984) does. It accurately conveys the system in terms of inflection, because they lack unique inflections, either on the nouns themselves or on the modifiers. Additionally, this ‘ambigeneric’ label avoids confusions with the Latin neuter. Labeling these nouns as ‘neuter’ leads one to attempt to connect them

grammatically with the Latin neuter. There are historical links between the Rumanian ambigeneric group and the Latin neuter; however, I feel that the term 'ambigeneric' more accurately describes the morphological characteristics of the modern phenomenon. Ambigeneric nouns are those which do not have a single gender, or which have different gender assignments for the singular and plural forms, just as the French and Italian ambigeneric nouns do. Mallinson (1984, 1986) uses this term to describe Rumanian and its third group.

Interestingly, Chitoran (1992) has shown that the ambigeneric group in Rumanian is now the 'loanword' gender, unless the borrowed term shows overt masculine or feminine marking. There does not seem to be much consensus with regard to this issue. Rosetti (1975) also makes a similar claim, but notes that the Rumanian phenomenon is an "inanimate gender," and has no animate nouns (1975:401). The problem is that *animal* 'animal', *dobitoc* 'animal, beast'<sup>3</sup>, *popor* 'nation, people', among others, are all part of this ambigeneric nominal grouping. By most accounts, these groupings are all animate as well the presence of several inanimate nouns within the masculine and feminine categories (Mallinson 1986:246). Rosetti argues that these animate ambigeneric nouns are "marginal," and that they are collectives, thereby making them "less animate" than a count-noun (1975:401). Misterski (1980) holds a similar position. This position is marginal at best, and does not explain how the word for 'people' or 'animal' can be considered marginally animate (Herslund 1976:252), even in their collective or non-count nature<sup>4</sup>. These viewpoints, in combination with those previously

---

<sup>3</sup> Interestingly, *dobitoc* can be either masculine or ambigeneric in Rumanian. Its ambigeneric form is given here; as a masculine noun, it means 'idiot, blockhead'.

<sup>4</sup> The names for individual animals tend to have either masculine or feminine lexical gender: *cal* 'horse' (m); *porc* 'pig' (m); *taur* 'bull' (m); *tigru* 'tiger' (m); *căine* 'dog' (m); *elefant* 'elephant' (m); *leu* 'lion' (m); *pasăre* 'bird' (f); *capră* 'goat' (f).

mentioned of Mallinson (1986) and Chitoran (1992), show the complexity of describing the Rumanian ambigeneric group, and in characterizing the lexical items within this category.

### **1.1.3.2 'Mass-neuter' in Romance**

Asturian Spanish and South-Central Italian seem to have a 'gender of collectivity'. Some literature errs on the side of caution and also terms this lexical group as neuter; indeed, the Asturian Spanish application of gender is often called the 'mass neuter' or "*neutro de materia*" (Neira Martínez 1982, 1983; García González 1979, 1989). However, these unique gender designations are similar to the actual idea of a semantic gender. While it is clear that there is a formal difference between the mass gender and the masculine and feminine genders in these modern languages, both semantically and syntactically, it is the position of this dissertation to not use the term "neuter" for these nouns<sup>5</sup>. The attempt is to keep separate the distinction between the Latin neuter (which was a purely grammatical form) and this modern and dialectal mass-gender (which seems to be a type of semantic basis for gender marking). While it is true that many of the collective nouns in both languages are from the Latin neuter, it is unfounded to state that the Latin neuter was a gender of collectivity. There are many countable nouns that are marked with neuter gender in Latin; many of the plants and fruit were used both as count nouns (neuter singular) and mass nouns (neuter plural), also *armarium* 'cupboard', *filium* 'a thread' (along with the mass

---

<sup>5</sup> Because of the hesitation, they are designated as being of mass- or uncountable-gender; annotating them as 'neuter' with single quotes would cause confusion with the pro-form 'neuter' pronouns and demonstratives. In fact, it is possible that there is a slight connection between these uncountable-marked nouns and the 'neuter' pro-forms, in that there is a notion of non-countability with the abstract, pro-form 'neuters', however this is a topic outside of this investigation.

noun ‘thread’), *muriaticum* ‘a pickled fish’, *et alia*. Several of the nouns in the modern gender designations are descended from the masculine- and feminine-gendered nouns in Latin (cf. Latin *aqua* ‘water’, *fimur* ‘manure’, *oryza* ‘rice’); during the history of the Asturian phenomenon these nouns become marked for their lack of countability, or acquire a collective meaning, thus receiving the appropriate marking. These modern phenomena seem somewhat related to the ambigeneric nouns of French, Italian and Rumanian, yet are out of place with respect to the other dialects in their languages.

Asturian Spanish tripartite gender categorization is based on mass/collective versus count distinctions. As Neira Martínez (1982, 1983) and García González (1979, 1989) have shown, masculine and feminine gender assignment is reserved for count nouns only, while a third group is meant solely for mass nouns, or nouns with collective reference. This third group is reflected primarily in the object pronouns, and additionally in the demonstratives. Examples of this can be seen below in Table 5. The agreement markers labeled MG are of the mass gender.

Table 5: Asturian Spanish examples, taken from García González (1979: 52)

<p>➤ <b>a Bernardo... lleváron lu presu</b> ACC. Bernardo... to-bring.PRET.3.PL ACC.M quickly 'Bernardo...they brought him quickly'</p> <p>➤ <b>el paquete...olvidé lu</b> the.M package...to-forget.PRET.1.SG ACC.M 'the package...I forgot it'</p> <p>➤ <b>otru partíu como esi no lu güelve a jugar</b> other.M party like this.M NEG. ACC.M to-return.PRES.3.SG to to-play.INF 'another party like this one does not play again'</p>
<p>➤ <b>a María...tú no la conoces, pero é muy simpática</b> ACC. María...2.SG NEG ACC.F to-know-PRES.2.SG, but to-be.PRES.3.SG very nice.F 'María...you do not know her, but she is very nice'</p> <p>➤ <b>a la yegua...viémos la en monte</b> acc. the.F mare... to-see.PRET.1.PL ACC.F on mountain 'the mare...we saw her on the mountain',</p> <p>➤ <b>la piedra no la lleva</b> the.F rock NEG ACC.F to-lift.IMP.2.SG 'the rock, do not lift it'</p>
<p>➤ <b>lo que adelantemos primero, ahora atrasámos lo</b> ACC.MG REL to-go-forward.PRET.1.PL first, now to-delay.PRES.1.PL ACC.MG 'that which we moved forward, now we delay it'</p> <p>➤ <b>eso no lo oí nunca</b> DEM.MG NEG ACC.MG to-hear.PRET.1.SG never 'this I never heard of (it)';</p> <p>➤ <b>la mejor oportunidá pa echar el cuchu é en octubre,</b> the.F best opportunity for to-throw-out.INF the.M herd-of-pigs to-be.PRES.3.SG in October,</p> <p><b>porque ya llueve y ya lo recibe</b> because already to-rain.PRES.3.SG and already ACC.MG to-receive.PRES.3.SG</p> <p><b>el campu</b> the.M countryside 'the best opportunity to throw out the herd of pigs is in October, because it has already rains and the countryside receives it'</p> <p>➤ <b>el café... vendía lo en granu</b> the.M coffee...to-sell.IMP.1/3.SG ACC.MG in grain 'the coffee...I/she/he used to sell it by grain/bean'</p>

- **la herba...** primero hay que sega **lo**, después atropa **lo**,  
the.F herb/grass...first there-is REL to-dry.INF ACC.MG, after to-gather.INF. ACC.MG,  
  
marra **lo**...  
to-lay-out.INF ACC.MG  
'the grass/herb...first one has to dry it, later gather it, lay it out'
  
- aquí en pueblu, **la leche** no **lo** vende naide  
here in town, the.F milk NEG ACC.MG to-sell.PRES.3.SG no-one  
'here in town, milk, no one sells it'

It is noteworthy that a similar phenomenon is not recognized in the other Spanish dialects, outside of traces in the dialect spoken in Valladolid, a northern Castilian dialect near Asturias (Klein 1981; Ojeda 1992). These traces are probably due to the influence of the Asturian dialect. While the origins of the uncountable-marked nouns have not yet been traced, work in this area has been initiated. Harmon and Ojeda (1999) find that a version of the same marking of mass-collectible nouns exists in 16<sup>th</sup> century Castilian. Viejo Fernández (2003) looks at Asturian 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century documents with regard to this mass gender. There is more discussion on this in section 3.1.4.

Similarly, South-Central Italian seems to have a semantically-based group of collective and mass nouns. Examples of this, taken from Rohlfs (1966: §419, 108-110) are provided in Table 6.

Table 6: South-Central Italian mass-collective nouns and count nouns

'uncountable' nouns	'countable' nouns
<i>lo vinu, la vinà</i> 'wine'	<i>ru cane</i> 'dog'
<i>lo sale, ra ssalà, la salà</i> 'salt'	<i>ru peffu</i> 'singular fish'
<i>lo melle, o méle, lo méle, u mméla</i> 'honey'	<i>u jóvitu</i> 'elbow'
<i>lo latte, o latte, la lattà</i> 'milk'	<i>u lópe</i> 'wolf'
<i>lo lardà</i> 'bacon fat, lard'	<i>u nàputà</i> 'nephew/niece, grandchild'
<i>ra ppanà, lu ppanà</i> 'bread'	
<i>la casà</i> 'cheese'	
<i>lo pèffo</i> 'fish'	
<i>la sanguà</i> 'blood'	

Like the Asturian Spanish examples, the masculine and feminine gender categories are reserved for count nouns only, while the non-count nouns are given a separate marking. Unlike the previous examples, this inflection is only on the article, and not on pronouns or modifiers.

The Asturian Spanish examples contain an important element: the object pronouns and demonstratives reflect the lexical gender of these mass nouns. This potentially leads to the argument that in Asturian Spanish there are three genders: mass, masculine and feminine. This would be more convincing, however, if the adjectives always showed gender agreement, as well as agreement on the determiners. In the case of the South-Central Italian phenomenon, if one is to argue that these mass nouns constitute a separate gender, the determiner displaying evidence of special marking for the 'mass-gender' is a good start. Typically in Romance the determiner, and in particular the definite article, "is regarded as a gender/number marker" (Posner 1985:440). However, this argument could be strengthened if there were evidence of similar inflection on the adjectives or object pronoun. According to Rohlfs (1966)

supporting evidence does not exist. Certainly more synchronic and diachronic research needs to be performed.

### **1.1.3.3 Masculine and feminine minimal pairs**

Minimal pairs of gender can be observed in the various Romance languages. This phenomenon describes a situation in which two words exist, each with different gender assignment, and both deriving from the same etymon (e.g. French *le cerveau* ‘brain (anatomical, count)’ and *la cervelle* ‘brain (mass/collective)’ < *cerebellum* ‘brain’). In the case of Romance, it is often the case that there is a more abstract or collective reference associated with the feminine word. The French ambigeneric nouns previously mentioned have both masculine and feminine gender assignment, are part of this category, and are not alone in this class. The majority of the other modern Romance languages have sets of minimal pairs, often with distinct morphological inflection on both the noun and the modifiers. Examples of this are provided in Appendix C. In many of the examples, the original etymon in Latin is neuter, and therefore the possibility of having both a masculine (and usually ‘count’) form as well as a feminine (and usually ‘non-count’) form remains. There are other examples of nouns which have been assigned feminine gender because they denote a collective reference, regardless of their etymological root, and include the following:

- Spanish: *hoja* ‘leaf, foliage’; *boda* ‘wedding’ (originally ‘matrimonial vows’); *entraña* ‘entrails, bowels’; *ceja* ‘eyebrow, the part of the forehead where the eyebrow is located’<sup>6</sup>; *fiesta* ‘party, feast-day’ (Menéndez Pidal 1968:217);

---

<sup>6</sup> *Cejo* does exist, but is not related to *ceja* ‘eyebrow’; it refers to the mist over a river or creek in the early morning.

- Occitan/Provençal: *paira* 'pair (of cattle)'; *c(h)jarra* 'cartload'; *semoia* 'demi-muids [grain measure?]'; *clercia/clergia* 'clergy'; *rauba* 'booty, spoils, loot'; any noun ending in *-ada*, particularly those signifying groups of men, soldiers, or people in general; *mura* 'city walls' (rare) (Jensen 1986:1-8)<sup>7</sup>
- Sardinian: *kapita* 'head of livestock'; *ligna* 'firewood' (also *lignu*); *signa* 'sign, mark'; *ossa* 'heap of bones'; *cilia* 'glowering look'; *folia* 'leaf(s)'; *corna* 'pod of legumes'; *iuga* 'many oxen' (Blasco Ferrer 1984:82); Fruit also seems to keep feminine gender in order to show that it has collective sense (Pittau 1972:68-69).

One must again recall that the neuter gender in Latin has no collective reference associated with it as a whole. There are mass or collective-reference nouns which are neuter and often the neuter plural could be used in a collective sense, but there are also masculine and feminine collective nouns. Indeed, not all nouns highlighted in this section derive from a neuter Latin etymon. However, because many Latin neuter plurals retain the *-a* inflection, associated with feminine gender, it seems that many of the languages have kept a 'plural', or perhaps 'non-singular' meaning to these words, via analogy. This does not suggest that all feminine nouns which derive from a Latin neuter noun are non-count, but this is a trend which requires careful attention.

#### 1.1.4 Gender change in Romance

While there are tendencies with regard to gender in each of the declensions, there are abnormalities which Latin speakers are required to

---

<sup>7</sup> Jensen (1986) also includes in this list *pluma* 'plumage of a bird'; however, it should be noted that the etymon for this word, Latin *pluma*, is also feminine, and does not show a change of gender in its history.

navigate. The inconsistency in gender that is most often cited in the linguistic literature is the few masculine, male-referent nouns within the first declension. Some nouns, like *nauta* 'sailor' and *poeta* 'poet', are borrowed from Greek and others are borrowed from Etruscan, such as *verpa* 'male member', *cacula* 'servant', *sculna* 'arbitrator'; still others like *agricola* 'farmer', *conviva* 'guest', and *advena* 'foreigner' are perhaps modeled on the collective *indi-gena* 'native' (Baldi 1999:317-318). These terms are in the minority, since they carry masculine lexical gender yet they decline like any other noun of the declension. This phenomenon is not restricted to a few nouns in the first declension. Nouns such as *nurus* 'daughter-in-law' and *socrus* 'mother-in-law' are feminine in gender (*nurus formosa*), but of the second declension, which is dominated by masculine and neuter nouns. Nominal agreement with these nouns is based on their assigned grammatical gender, which causes confusion for the speakers. These nouns that are marked for one gender but are of declensions dominated by another gender are eventually reassigned and re-inflected in order to reflect their grammatical (and biological) gender.

Despite the few examples mentioned throughout this section, the evolution of the gender system in Romance has a relatively uniform history, especially when compared to a sister Indo-European family, such as Germanic. Overall, the collapse of the neuter gender in Romance is coupled with the collapse of the declension system and the case system, while at the same time there is increased reliance of word order and use of prepositions. It is generally agreed that these changes in word-final phonology, gender, case, word order, and preposition use occur at essentially the same time, such that one change does not directly lead to another. It seems as though many of the changes that can be

observed even in early Romance documents start in the Roman Empire era, as mentioned previously in section 1.1.2. It is important to point out that the categories of gender and nominal inflection undergo a dramatic change even in the 'Classical' period. At the same time, a general pattern of 'regularization' occurs where nouns whose lexical gender does not fit with that of the declension (e.g. *socrus*, *agricola*) undergo a morph-syntactic transformation in order to fit in the proper declension for their gender (e.g. Appendix Probi: *socrus non socra*, *nurus non nura* (da Silva Neto 1952-1957:57)). Third declension masculine and feminine nouns typically keep their morpho-syntactic structure with regard to gender, and do not usually undergo change in order to fit into another declension. Third declension neuter nouns undergo the same gender-switch as other neuter nouns, and for the most part fall into the masculine gender. These specific nouns do not change with regard to the lack of gender inflection on the noun itself (Meyer Lübke 1926:283-284). The rules for assigning lexical gender are similar across the Romance languages. However, these assignment rules are both formal and semantic across the language family which reinforces this uniformity with regard to lexical gender assignment in the Romance family.

It should be noted that, while gender in the Romance languages is generally fixed by the late-Medieval period, it is by no means completely set in all situations (data in Chapter 2 will support this). There is documentation that several words in Old French, including *image* 'image, ghost', *dent* 'tooth', *amor* 'love', fluctuate between masculine and feminine genders, or even switch between the genders at some point in the history of the language (Machonis 1990:195; Chaurand 1999:211). Galician Portuguese shows few examples of gender fluctuation in its history, and most occur with nouns originating from Latin

neuters ending in *-men* (de Azevedo Maia 1986:656). There are few data available outside of this area. Old Castilian shows much of the same patterns. Fluctuation in gender marking and agreement in many words ending in *-or* and *-e* until the 17th century (Penny 2002:111-112) is noticed, but generally gender is stabilized for the vast majority of nouns early on in the language. However, the source of these fluctuating, ‘undecided’ gendered nouns is often Latin third declension nouns. Over time, the vast majority of these nouns have stabilized their lexical gender representation and as a result the number of masculine nouns has risen, “partly by the fixing of fluctuating genders in the patterns of Latin cognates” (Posner 1985:438). In the texts studied for this dissertation, the literature revealed few instances of variation in gender assignment (more will be discussed on this topic in section 2.3). A continued discussion of modern phenomena of gender switching and fluctuation in Spanish and French is found in section 3.1.3. This leads one to question whether there is a pattern to this fluctuation, or if this is a case of random or idiosyncratic phenomena. As we will see in section 4.1.3, this vacillation is explained as variation in a speakers’ utterance selection, which is often resolved on a need basis.

Finally a comment on origins of the various phenomena which have been mentioned in this section. Some explanation for how the idiosyncratic forms of the mass gender evolved has been addressed, but no real discussion of why these forms evolved has been provided. Perhaps the minimal pairs in various languages can be attributed to coincidence, and the fact remains that the vast majority of the Romance languages show some semblance of this pattern and often this occurs with words derived from the same etymon. However, the behavior of the ambigeneric forms in Rumanian and Italian, and the mass

'genders' of Asturian Spanish and South Central Italian require more explanation. This dissertation will not cover this entire history directly, but in section 3.1 data and theory are considered. What can be said is that this subject can be discussed through data collection of early Romance texts and the use of an adequate language change theory. Admittedly, this is a large area for future research, and this dissertation will only cover a small portion of this question.

## **1.2 THEORIES OF LANGUAGE CHANGE**

The focus of theory to be discussed in this dissertation is two linguistic movements which dominate the second half of the twentieth-century and a third, recent theory—Formalism, Functionalism and Evolutionary Theory. These three theories were chosen at various times, and for various reasons. Lightfoot's (1979, 1991) work is incorporated because of its connection with Formalism. It is one of the first Formalist diachronic theories of language change. It is right to include it in any discussion as a possible language change theory when testing theories centered on data. The research and theory development of Keller (1994) and Croft (1996, 2000) are chosen because of their adaptability; they combine concepts of innate grammar and sociolinguistic data and situations. They were chosen early in the discovery process, and in fact were integral components in deciding a dissertation topic. Keller's (1994) Invisible Hand Theory is an explanatory effort to characterize seemingly inexplicable linguistic phenomena. Croft (1996, 2000) proposes a version of Evolutionary Theory different than that of Bichakjian (1988), which centers on the same of application of theory to data. In Bichakjian's theory, the crucial concept is that language is paedomorphic; this biological evolutionary concept describes a process whereby some aspect of a species, which is more prominent in the juvenile stages,

becomes increasingly prevalent in the mature adult (Bichakjian 1988:11). This process occurs over generations; and example could be the increasing plasticity of the human brain, which is associated with children. However, over the history of the human race, our mental plasticity has continued well into adulthood and into older age (Bichakjian 1988:11). Bichakjian applies this to language, and in particular to language acquisition: “By slowing down the rate of language acquisition, the regulatory genes would make languages evolve toward ever more paedomorphic features” (1988:12). From this position Bichakjian posits that language evolves because certain grammatical aspects are acquired and mastered earlier than others; those grammatical elements which are learned later tend to be those which are evolved out of the language (Bichakjian 1988: 159). Learnability and language acquisition as a basis for language change does not always explain the various changes, or the retention of what are deemed ‘complicated’ aspects of grammar. If certain aspects of grammar are ‘complicated’ and ‘difficult to learn’, such as the subjunctive or gender inflection, then why do they continue to exist? Bichakjian’s theory is discussed in further detail in section 3.2.3. On the other hand, the use of an evolutionary theory which focuses on the introduction, maintenance, and loss of variants in a socially motivated theory is more widely applicable. For this reason, Croft’s theory (1996, 2000) is an important choice. Furthermore, Croft’s theory has the advantage of being clearly detailed in its explanation of the evolutionary process of language, one which can be easily applied to a given set of data. Previous attempts to bridge Croft’s ideas to morphology (e.g. Smith 1996-1997) have been published, albeit in a previous version of the theory (Croft 1995)<sup>8</sup>. This fully defined version

---

<sup>8</sup> Croft presented this theory in a 1995 conference; from this, Smith used the theory in his 1996-

of the theory (2000) needs further testing, much in the same manner as the earlier, preliminary version.

In Chapter 3 a detailed description of Lightfoot, Keller and Croft is outlined; in Chapter 4, an analysis of each movement and how it serves to answer the research questions is given (as they pertain to the data collected and presented in this chapter and in Chapter 2); and finally a determination of whether any of the theories can describe the history of gender as a category in the Romance languages. As is detailed in the forthcoming chapters, both the theories of Lightfoot (1979, 1991) and Keller (1994) are satisfactory in describing some elements of lexical gender in Romance, but do not answer many of the existing questions, particularly in discussing inconsistencies in gender representation. This is further discussed in sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2. However, Croft's (2000) theory answers the questions in a more satisfactory manner. This is not to say that Croft's (2000) theory is fool-proof, or that it is not controversial or provocative, but that it is a viable alternative in describing and analyzing the data than the theories of Lightfoot and Keller (covered in section 4.3.3).

### **1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

In order to add to the discussion of lexical gender in Medieval Romance, the text analysis performed in Chapter 2 focuses on documents from the same time period within the Medieval period. This component of the dissertation collects and analyzes data from the "Miracles of Our Lady" religious and popular poetry, written in the late 12<sup>th</sup> and early 13<sup>th</sup> century in French, Castilian Spanish, and Galician Portuguese by three different authors. Religious texts in Medieval

---

1997 article. Croft further refines the theory that he presented in his 1996 article, and in fuller detail in his 2000 book.

times are written for the common people; these texts, written by monks, more closely reflect the language of the people, and often readily available by the clergy. Therefore, religious texts written in the vernacular reflect the speech of the linguistic community, with the result that these texts are valuable in a diachronic analysis. Notary texts and documents often contain more educated speech, and therefore reflect a higher register than do religious texts. However, it should be noted that in order to completely analyze the language of the time, both religious and notary texts should be discussed. This is an area in need of future research; further discussion of the texts used in the dissertation is detailed in section 2.1.

For the purposes of this investigation, Chapter 4 will present the data analysis in relationship to the three theories discussed in detail in section 3.2, and how well each theory answers the research questions, which are outlined below.

1. Regularity of change: Based on the data presented in Chapter 2 and the discussion above in section 1.1.4, there is regularity of change and stasis across the Romance languages. Why does gender change systematically? Why is there a high amount of stasis with masculine and feminine nouns? Why are neuter nouns incorporated into the early Romance languages with such regularity?
2. Differences in gender assignment: Why does the lexical gender of certain words change between masculine and feminine? Here the focus is not on those nouns which change due to formal similarities to other nouns, but on those which seem to change gender spontaneously.

3. Gender ambiguity: Why is there fluctuation of gender assignments for certain nouns and not others?
4. Lack of mass or collective markers: Based on the data gleaned from the Miracles and from this chapter, why is there no evidence of the mass or collective markers in the *Milagros*, yet there seems to be such separate treatment in 16<sup>th</sup> century Castilian, as found in Harmon and Ojeda (1999)?
5. Gender categorization: Why does the category of neuter gender evolve out of the language? Why has no such category been retained in the languages?

These questions are central in understanding why gender as a category and an inflectional system evolves as evidenced in the Romance language family. As seen in both this chapter and Chapter 3, other attempts have been made to explain the mechanisms of how these periods of change and of stasis develop, and they have done well in this regard. However, few have attempted to explain *why* the periods of change and stasis occurred, and *why* it is important to look at change in this context. This dissertation represents an exploration into that area of research, and hopefully it will be a springboard to future research. As a result, while there is one theory that adequately answers these questions, it is felt that a combination of approaches is required to fully answer the question of lexical gender in the Romance languages.

The format of this dissertation is not traditional. I have changed the order of chapters to present the original data first, before discussing theories. This is done in order to maximize a logical flow in the manuscript. In this chapter, data from previous research has been presented, and I feel that the most logical chapter to follow is the one that analyzes and discusses the original data from

the “Miracles of Our Lady.” The chapter discussing and analyzing the various research on lexical gender in Romance and of the three theories of language change follows, and finally the chapter with theory analysis as it pertains to the data, both past and present. In this way, I present previous research, followed by my research and my perspective and analysis. I feel that this represents my investigation most effectively and efficiently.

## **Chapter Two: Gender as Represented in the Miracles of Our Lady**

### **2.0 GENERAL GOALS OF THE CHAPTER**

At the beginning of this dissertation, specifically in section 1.1, a summary of the topic of gender in the Romance language family is presented. What can be noted is an overall uniformity throughout the family both in the category of gender as well as the nominal inflections. However, there is evidence that this general uniformity is not complete. The Catalan ‘undecided gendered’ nouns, the ambigeneric nouns in French, Italian and Rumanian, and the mass genders of Asturian Spanish and South-Central Italian all illustrate a break from uniformity. These are each a small part of the overall gender system for the languages noted above, yet it is curious why they exist in the language, how they developed, and what role they play in the grander scheme of language development. Are they an important aspect, or idiosyncratic entities? For this reason, data from the early history of the Romance languages is necessary to fill in the knowledge gaps inherent in these phenomena, both the regular changes and the oddities.

### **2.1 THE MIRACLES OF OUR LADY**

The “Miracles of Our Lady” are 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century popular poetry dedicated to the various miracles performed by the Virgin Mary, and is considered to be typical ‘folktales’ of the Middle Ages. Religious in theme but applicable to the common man, these ‘religious tales’ are meant to be examples delivered by the clergy of the Church to the parishioners. The clergy had the desire for the parishioners to understand the teachings of the Bible as well as

continue to praise the Virgin Mary as the Mother of God and as the representative for the Christian people with God (Beretta 1999:viii). The written versions are the 'descendants' of years of oral tradition, which are based on the Marian Chronicles (*Libri miraculorum*) of Gregory of Tours (c. late 6th century). In the 11th century the Cult of the Virgin expands their numbers, and their literature thrives under the Cistercian monastic society. The Cistercians spawn numerous 'chronicles' of the good works of the Virgin Mary and the reasons to praise her goodness, including *De laude Sanctae Mariae* by Guibert de Nogent (1053-1121), *Liber miraculorum Dei genitricis* by Guillaume de Malmesbury (?-1143), and *De miraculis Beatae virginis Mariae* by Gautier de Cluny (?-1155) (Beretta 1999:viii). Perhaps the most important member of this order is Saint Bernard de Clairvaux, as well as his fellow Cistercians at L'Abbaye de Citeaux, whose writings deal with the nature of Mary and the Immaculate Conception (Réau 1955:60). St. Bernard's writings seem to have fueled the Cult of the Virgin, and his works are some of the most well-known from that era, and prove to be integral for Gonzalo de Berceo. All of the above mentioned works and authors are inspirations for later authors. Several local spins and additions are included in the 'chronicles' so the local people could better identify with the stories. All of the above mentioned versions are in Latin, and is not within the scope of this dissertation.

Countless Marian tales of various origins and lengths are available, but three versions are the most known and perhaps analyzed most often.

- *Miracles de Nostre Dame* by Gautier de Coinci (1177/78-1236), a Benedictine monk in the Coigny-l'Abbaye, situated between Soissons and Château-Thierry in northern France; his French-language chronicles are written in the early 13th century (Koenig 1961/1971:xvii);
- *Milagros de Nuestra Señora* by Gonzalo de Berceo (1196?-1264?), a monk and notary for the San Millán de la Cogolla monastery in the Upper Rioja region of Spain, whose stories are in his native Riojan dialect of Castilian Spanish between 1246 and 1252 (Gerli 1985:48-49);
- *As Cantigas de Santa Maria* by King Alfonso X of Castile and Leon, who is credited in writing the songs of Mary in his native Galician-Portuguese from 1270 to 1283 (Mettmann 1986:24).

While it seems that Gautier de Coinci's stories influence those of the other two authors, it is believed that none of the three authors have translated the others' work, and instead have used a combination of the previous Latin versions and popular versions of the tales. This fact is what makes these texts interesting. The authors take the words used in telling the tales, copy them down and subsequently write out the Latin tales and those which are popularly told in their cultures. It is because of this that there are fewer occurrences of 'false cognates' and unnatural word choices and structures, thereby making the language used in the poetry more 'authentic'.

There should be a quick reference made regarding the use of Latin by these authors and any possible Latin influences. Each of the authors uses the Latin texts noted above as reference points or 'guides' in how the stories are told.

To a lesser degree, the Latin tales are used to provide some details of the stories. It does not seem that there is much, if any, Classical Latin influence on the colloquial terminology in the stories. Clerical terminology, particularly the names of prayers or certain rituals, are often given in Latin—*Pater Noster*, *Ave Maria*—but there seems to be little direct Latin influence on the rest of the lexicon. This should not come as a surprise, since the majority of the ‘cultisms’ or Latin-influenced lexical items are re-introduced into the various Romance languages during the Renaissance period or later. This is particularly true for French (Principato 2000:40-41) and Castilian Spanish (Cano Aguilar 1992:177).

Each of the authors wrote their poetry for the general populace, using the vernacular of the people in order to tell the tales of the Virgin Mary (Gerli 1985:32; Mettmann 1986:9; Koenig 1961/1971:xxvi). In the case of Gautier de Coinci, he mimicked the language of the uneducated masses so that those who heard the *Miracles* would be able to recognize the language, and therefore understand the tale (Koenig 1961/1971:xxvi-xxvii). De Coinci wrote two volumes of his *Miracles*, which include the Miracles themselves, songs of praise, poems about the lives of certain saints, and prayers (Koenig 1961/1971:vii). He seems to be from an affluent family that has several representatives in the monastic system, including his uncle Gobert de Coinci, a prior at Vic-sur-Aisne and grand prior at Saint-Médard, where the younger Coinci receives his formative schooling (Koenig 1961/1971:xix). In the *Miracles* themselves, which total 58, he uses a high number of couplets (30,000 in total for all of the miracles in his version), writes his Miracles with both a prologue and epilogue, and is one of the first writers of his time to combine a religious theme (miracles and acts of the Virgin Mary) with ‘profane’ human activities that are often deemed ‘unholy’ and

'unclean' at the time (Beretta 1999:x). He takes inspirations from the popular stories of the day, and writes to the illiterate masses, so that they can partake of the stories through their local, learned clerics. While being poetic in nature, the lexical selection does not seem to be out of the ordinary for the period (Koenig 1961/1971:xxvi). He seems to focus his stories on the villagers whose souls need to be and can be saved, and those who are saved because of their actions and prayers towards the Virgin Mary (Koenig 1961/1971:xxvii).

Gonzalo de Berceo appears to have known about Gautier de Coinci's work, but while the French author includes many miracles, Berceo offers a smaller group of tales—25 in all—and generally has shorter versions of the same tales. Berceo not only uses the vernacular of the general populace of Castile, he does so invoking the mentality of the people (Gerli 1985:32). Like the *Miracles* of Gautier de Coinci, Berceo starts with an introduction to the tale, although he inserts himself as the narrator, and then proceeds to the body, oftentimes finishing with a moral (Beretta 1999:x). Perhaps one of the most important aspects to remember about Berceo is his role in Castilian literature. He is often thought of as the first model of didactic poetry and literature in Castilian, and it is his works which will serve as an example for generations of writers (Gerli 1985:15). It seems to be understood that the *Milagros* specifically are not simply a reflection of

the climate of the popular European devotion [to the Virgin Mary] of the 12th and 13th century, whose most important attraction is the model of Bernardian piety, but that they respond to more practical and perhaps less pious necessities—the desire to attract pilgrims from the Camino [to Santiago de Compostela in Galicia] to the monastery of San Millán.<sup>9</sup> [my translation] (Gerli 1985:23)

---

<sup>9</sup> “...el clima de la devoción popular europea de los siglos XII y XIII, cuyo aliciente más importante es el modelo de la piedad bernardina, sino que responden a necesidades más

In order to create this scenario, Gonzalo de Berceo places himself as the narrator: a poor monk of the San Millán network of monasteries who is similar to those pilgrims crossing the Pyrenees. They are on their way to Santiago de Compostela seeking redemption in the eyes of the Lord and of the Holy Roman Catholic Church (Gerli 1985:23). “What is certain is that the *Milagros*, more than collective anecdotes of European Marian literature, are widely tied to other expressions of faith, like the pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela and to a cult of the Virgin in the Riojan monastery where Berceo grew up”<sup>10</sup> [my translation] (Gerli 1985:23). In creating this collection, Berceo relies mostly on other Marian tales which are written in Latin, but he adds more detail and further develops the stories, including dialogues between characters (Gerli 1985:28). The bulk of his inspiration comes from Saint Bernard of Clairvaux and his *De aquaeductu* (1153), whose discussion of the Virgin Mary as being the ‘aqueduct’ to Christ and to salvation heavily influences Berceo and *Milagros* (Gerli 1985:21). This attention to the Latin texts shows that Berceo is not only capable of understanding the original Latin texts of his predecessors, but is also able to transform the stories into ones of imagination and rustic simplicity which the general population of Castile—and furthermore of the Christian world—could understand (Gerli 1985:32).

The third author, King Alfonso X, is often called ‘Alfonso the Learned’ (*Alfonso el Sabio*) in Spanish literature because of his work to unify and standardize the Castilian language, the writing system, and ultimately the

---

prácticas y quizás menos pías—el deseo de atraer a los peregrinos del Camino al cenobio de San Millán.”

<sup>10</sup> “Lo cierto es que los Milagros, además de recoger anécdotas de la literatura mariana europea, están estrechamente ligados a otras expresiones de fe, como la peregrinación a Santiago de Compostela y a un culto a la Virgen en el monasterio riojano donde se crió Berceo.”

Castilian people (Penny 2002:15). Alfonso's work led him to establish Castilian as the court language, albeit with heavy influences from Latin, Hebrew and Arabic. This is a result of the numerous works that the king had translated, as well as the many courtiers from all over Iberia, including Arabic *mozarabe* leaders and Hebrew-speaking counselors and philosophers from the southern half of the peninsula (Penny 1991:16; Cano Aguilar 1992:196). In fact, he is often thought of as the father of Spanish or Castilian prose (Alatorre 1993:124). Yet despite this, Alfonso decided to use his first language, Galician Portuguese, to write the *cantigas*, as it was deemed a more song-friendly and literary language in Medieval Spain (Beretta 1999:xi). This decision was considered remarkable in the time of King Alfonso X, just as it is now. Alfonso has a wide body of literature on various subjects attributed to his name. While it is uncertain the extent to which the king writes the *Cantigas* himself and how much is done by hired writers, it is clear that he decides to compose songs of praise and devotion to the Virgin Mary. He most definitely oversaw the project, if not also contributing to the body of work. Critics generally agree that "a very important fraction of the work comes from one singular pen, while the rest demonstrates distinctive stylistic traits which lead one to suppose various authors"<sup>11</sup> [my translation] (Mettmann 1986:17), and that the songs which deal with the king himself or his immediate family are likely his own work (Mettmann 1986:18). All of these songs (*cantigas*) sing the praises of the Virgin Mary and the many deeds which she has performed for the king and his family, for the local people, and for other good Catholics around Western Europe (Mettmann 1986:9). The most common underlying themes are her virtuosity and the people imploring the Virgin Mary to

---

<sup>11</sup> "...una fracción muy importante de la obra procede de una misma pluma, mientras que el resto muestra rasgos estilísticos distintivos que hacen suponer varios autores."

help them due to sickness or danger and for the punishment of criminals (Mettmann 1986:13). Mettmann states (1986:13) that Alfonso knew the works of both Gautier de Coinci and Gonzalo de Berceo, and while they might have influenced the choice of stories, it does not seem that Alfonso copied these stories outright. It is noteworthy that Alfonso wrote many more *cantigas*—356 in total—than either the Frenchman or the Riojan. Other notable aspects of the *Cantigas* are the “crafty structure of the work, based on numbers of 5 and 10, and [...] the fact that the poems in their entirety have been put in music and adorned with miniatures”<sup>12</sup> [my translation] (Mettmann 1986:10-11). Each *cantiga* has a refrain, or miniature, which starts and finishes the song, as well as repeated after every stanza, with the primary theme one of praise.

A book with all three Miracles in a single volume exists, complete with translation into modern Italian: Beretta’s (1999) volume. This volume is employed in the data analysis of this research. Beretta includes the complete known *Milagros* of Gonzalo de Berceo, and the vast majority of those by Gautier de Coinci and King Alfonso X. He subdivides his book by author, and gives a full set of notes and bibliography regarding the texts. This book is chosen not only for the convenience of having all three texts in a single volume with modern transcription, but also in order to utilize the extensive preface by Cesare Segre, a noted authority on the three Miracles. Each analysis is checked against individual volumes from each chronicle using the leading conversions and translations available including Koenig (1961-1971) of the *Miracles*, Gerli (1985) of the *Milagros*, and Mettmann (1986) of the *Cantigas*. In comparing Beretta to

---

<sup>12</sup> ...el virtuosismo métrico...la artificiosa estructura de la obra, basada en los números de cinco y diez, y, por fin, el hecho de que los poemas en su totalidad han sido puestos en música y adornados con miniaturas.”

the three individual versions, there are no differences in syntax or morphology, only the occasional difference in punctuation or capitalization is noticed. In total, there are five tales included common to all three authors<sup>13</sup>. The tales are as follows:

**The Jewish Boy Who Was Saved from the Furnace** (*I MIR 12 De l'enfant a un giü qui se crestiëna; El niño judío; Esta é como Santa Maria guardou ao fillo do judeu que non ardesse, que seu padre deitara no forno*);

**The Monk Who Was Delivered from the Devil** (*I MIR 16 De un moigne que Nostre Dame delivra dou Dyable; El sacristán fornicario; Como Santa Maria guardou un monge dos diaboos que o quisieran tentar e se lle mostraron en figures de porcos polo fazer perder*);

**The Saved Castaway** (*II MIR 28 Comment Nostre Dame sauva un home ou fons de la mer; El náufrago salvado; Como Santa Maria guardou hũa nave que ya carregada de triigo que non pereçesse, e sacó-a en salvo ao porto*);

**The Cleric and the Flower** (*I MIR 15 Dou cleric mort en cui boche on trova la flor; El clérigo y la flor, Esta é como Santa Maria fez nacer hũa fror na boca ao creigo, depois que foi morto, e era en semellança de lilio, porque a loava*); and

**The Pregnant Abbess** (*I MIR 20 De l'abeesse que Nostre Dame delivra de grant angoisse; La abadesa preñada; Esta é como Santa Maria livrou a abadessa prene, que adormecera ant' o seu altar chorando*).

---

<sup>13</sup> There is a sixth tale, about Theophilus being saved by the Virgin Mary, which is common in all three authors, but such a huge disparity exists between the length of the texts of the three authors, that I consider it to be too much to use. However, a further project will be devised from this text, as it seems to be rich in possible linguistic analysis.

It should be noted here that the Galician Portuguese *cantigas* of King Alfonso X are short, averaging 645.4 words to Coinci's 1529 words and Berceo's 1108.6 words. In each of these tales, all nouns have been identified. Microsoft Excel spreadsheets have been devised to analyze each noun in its given context, along with the gloss, and subsequently designed to view the etymology of the nouns.

## 2.2 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS FOUND IN THE DATA

In each of the Miracles analyzed, the gender of each noun has been noted. This task is completed by noting any morphological inflection, either on the noun itself, on its modifiers, or on any anaphora present in the data, and noting the gender represented. This method of noting gender through inflection has its limitations, as there are cases, particularly in early Old French, where a lexically feminine noun would be paired with a seemingly masculine anaphor (*la femme...il*). However, if one notices the overall trends of gender marking of the nouns and the modifiers, the lexical gender can be discerned. In the case noted above, *la* of *la femme* is a true marker of gender, whereas the *il* is a default nominative third-person pronoun, used regardless of gender (Elcock 1960:344)<sup>14</sup>. Table 7 shows the delineation of nouns of each tale by each author. The numbers of total words for the Milagros texts are given by the numbers of the Gerli text, while all others are based on the Beretta texts.

---

<sup>14</sup> In the data gleaned from the Miracles, there were no instances where a feminine noun was referenced by a masculine anaphora, including in the *Miracle de Nostre Dame*. This is not surprising; by the 13<sup>th</sup> century the French pronominal system has a feminine counterpart for the personal pronouns (Cohen 1967:110).

Table 7: Number of nouns in each of the Miracles analyzed

Title of tale	Number of Total Words	Number of Total Nouns	Number of Total Singular/ Plural Nouns	Number of Nouns (single occurrence)	Number of Nouns Derived from Latin Nouns
<i>I MIR 12 De l'enfant a un giù qui se crestïena</i>	794	128	112 singular 16 plural	80	59
<i>I MIR 16 De un moigne que Nostre Dame delivra dou Dyable</i>	1,091	175	159 singular 16 plural	99	73
<i>Il MIR 28 Comment Nostre Dame sauva un home ou fons de la mer</i>	2,856	453	404 singular 49 plural	153	110
<i>I MIR 15 Dou clerç mort en cui boche on trova la flor</i>	700	108	95 singular 13 plural	69	47
<i>I MIR 20 De l'abeesse que Nostre Dame delivra de grant angoisse</i>	2,204	377	329 singular 48 plural	123	77
<i>Subtotal for Old French texts</i>	<i>7,645</i>	<i>1,241</i>	<i>1099 singular 142 plural</i>	<i>524</i>	<i>366</i>
Title of tale	Number of Total Words	Number of Total Nouns	Number of Total Singular/ Plural Nouns	Number of Nouns (single occurrence)	Number of Nouns Derived from Latin Nouns
<i>El niño judío</i>	751	178	134 singular 44 plural	122	77
<i>El sacristán fornicario</i>	768	156	132 singular 24 plural	110	56
<i>El náufrago salvado</i>	1,225	252	196 singular 56 plural	152	97
<i>El clérigo y la flor</i>	2,363	78	70 singular 8 plural	66	40
<i>La abadesa preñada</i>	436	514	429 singular 85 plural	269	139
<i>Subtotal for Old Castilian texts</i>	<i>5,543</i>	<i>1,178</i>	<i>961 singular 217 plural</i>	<i>719</i>	<i>409</i>

Title of tale	Number of Total Words	Number of Total Nouns	Number of Total Singular/ Plural Nouns	Number of Nouns (single occurrence)	Number of Nouns Derived from Latin Nouns
<i>Esta é como Santa Maria guardou ao fillo do judeu que non ardesse, que seu padre deitara no forno</i>	1,210	76	67 singular 9 plural	53	34
<i>Como Santa Maria guardou un monge dos diaboos que o quiseran tentar e se lle mostraron en figures de porcos polo fazer perder</i>	1,117	41	36 singular 5 plural	29	23
<i>Como Santa Maria guardou hũa nave que ya carregada de triigo que non perecesse, e sacó-a en salvo ao porto</i>	236	33	32 singular 1 plural	24	15
<i>Esta é como Santa Maria acrecentou o vỹo no tonel, por amor da bõa dona de bretanna</i>	368	50	47 singular 3 plural	33	24
<i>Esta é como Santa Maria livrou a abadessa prene, que adormecera ant' o seu altar chorando</i>	246	32	30 singular 2 plural	23	13
<i>Subtotal for Old Galician Portuguese texts</i>	3,177	232	212 singular 20 plural	162	109
<b>Grand totals for all texts</b>	<b>16,365</b>	<b>2,661</b>	<b>2272 singular 379 plural</b>	<b>1,405</b>	<b>884</b>

Of the nouns directly descended from nouns in Latin, the gender assignments are further detailed as seen in Table 8.

Table 8: Number of nouns and their etymological gender change in the Miracles analyzed

Title of tale	Lat. Masc > Rom. Masc	Lat. Fem > Rom. Fem	Lat. Masc > Rom. Fem	Lat. Fem > Rom. Masc	Lat. Neut > Rom. Masc	Lat. Neut > Rom. Fem
<i>I MIR 12 De l'enfant a un giü qui se crestiëna</i>	14	31	0	1	11	2
<i>I MIR 16 De un moigne que Nostre Dame delivra dou Dyable</i>	21	32	1	1	17	1
<i>II MIR 28 Comment Nostre Dame sauva un home ou fons de la mer</i>	39	50	1	0	17	3
<i>I MIR 15 Dou clerc mort en cui boche on trova la flor</i>	12	20	1	1	12	1
<i>I MIR 20 De l'abeesse que Nostre Dame delivra de grant angoisse</i>	25	34	1	2	13	2
<b>Subtotals for Old French texts:</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>9</b>
<i>El niño judío</i>	26	35	0	0	14	2
<i>El sacristán fornicario</i>	18	26	2	0	8	2
<i>El náufrago salvado</i>	31	45	3	2	14	2
<i>El clérigo y la flor</i>	11	13	4	0	11	1
<i>La abadesa preñada</i>	41	62	4	0	22	10
<b>Subtotals for Old Castilian texts:</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>17</b>
<i>Esta é como Santa Maria guardou ao fillo do judeu que non ardesse, que seu padre deitara no forno</i>	14	15	0	0	5	0
<i>Como Santa maria guardou un monge dos diaboos que o quieran tentar e se lle mostraron en figures de porcos polo fazer perder</i>	14	8	0	0	1	0
<i>Como Santa Maria guardou hũa nave que ya carregada de triigo que non pereçesse e sacó-a en salvo a porto</i>	4	7	0	0	2	2
<i>Esta é como Santa Maria acrecentou o vño no tonel, por amor da bõa dona de bretanna</i>	8	12	1	0	3	0
<i>Esta é como Santa Maria livrou a abadesa prene, que adormecera ant' o seu altar chorando</i>	6	6	0	0	1	0
<b>Subtotals for Old Galician Portuguese texts</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Grand totals:</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>28</b>

A collapsed version of Table 8, which details the percentages of the gender representations in the Miracles, is presented below in Table 9.

Table 9: Condensed Version of Table 8

Language	Lat. Masc > Rom. Masc	Lat. Fem > Rom. Fem	Lat. Masc > Rom. Fem	Lat. Fem > Rom. Masc	Lat. Neut > Rom. Masc	Lat. Neut > Rom. Fem	Total Latin-based Nouns
Old French	111 (30.3%)	167 (45.6%)	4 (1.1%)	5 (1.4%)	70 (19.1%)	9 (2.5%)	366 (100%)
Old Castilian	127 (31.1%)	181 (44.3%)	13 (3.2%)	2 (.5%)	69 (16.9%)	17 (4.2%)	409 (100%)
Old Galician Portuguese	46 (42.2%)	48 (44%)	1 (1%)	0	12 (11%)	2 (1.8%)	109 (100%)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>284 (32.1%)</b>	<b>396 (41.7%)</b>	<b>18 (2%)</b>	<b>7 (.8%)</b>	<b>151 (17.1%)</b>	<b>28 (3.2%)</b>	<b>884 (100%)</b>

In addition, there were two nouns which are considered ambiguous even in Old French, both of which are derived from Latin nouns which only had a single lexical gender; *ordinem* (m) > *ordre* and *germen* (n) > *germe*. In general, Table 9 shows that nouns which are either masculine or feminine in Latin tend to maintain their lexical gender assignment into the three Romance languages studied, and that the Latin neuter merged more often with the Romance masculine than the Romance feminine. This follows much of what is stated in the handbooks, which are discussed in section 3.1.1.

This maintenance of gender even exists with the borrowed terms in the Miracles. Table 10 summarizes a statistical analysis of words found in the Miracles which are borrowings into either Late Latin or early Romance, as well as the language from which they are borrowed.

Table 10: Statistical Analysis of Nominal Borrowings Found in the Chronicles

Language	Intra-Romance	Greek	Arabic	Germanic	Celtic	Total
Old French	0	2	0	8	0	<b>10</b>
Old Castilian	4	1	7	4	1	<b>17</b>
Old Galician Portuguese	5	2	1	(5 via OFr.)	0	<b>8</b>

There are several areas of interest. First, the five borrowings found in Old Galician Portuguese are from Old French, and that all of those terms are themselves borrowed from Germanic, either from Frankish or from Anglo-Saxon. Secondly, there is a relatively high level of Arabic borrowings for Old Castilian, which is to be expected given the geo-political situation of the Middle Ages in the Iberian Peninsula. The last point is the relatively high number of Germanic borrowings into Old French. This is to be expected given the area's geo-political situation during this time period.

The borrowed terms found in the Miracles are analyzed below in Table 11<sup>15</sup>. When possible, the gender of the originating etymon is noted.

---

<sup>15</sup> All Classical Latin forms are given in the accusative singular or plural. If there is a different form as the Classical Latin etymon, then it will be noted. Germanic etymons are taken from Orel (2003) and Lehmann (1986).

Table 11: Borrowings found in the Miracles and their etymologies

Language	Word	Gloss	Origin-Word-Gloss	Gender	Change?
Old French	<i>hermite</i> , <i>'ermite</i>	hermit	EccLat. <i>eremita</i> (m) < Gk. <i>erêmitês</i> (m) 'someone wanting solitude' < <i>erêmos</i> (f) 'desert'	M	M > M
	<i>antecris</i>	anti-Christ	Gk. <i>antikristos</i> (m) 'anti-Christ'	M	M > M
	<i>toaille</i>	napkin	Frk. <i>*thwahlia</i> (f) 'napkin' << Gmc. <i>*thwaxlan</i> (n) 'bath, bathing'	F	F > F
	<i>brese</i> , <i>breise</i>	embers, cimbers	?Gmc. <i>*braise</i> , <i>bras</i>	F	16
	<i>compaignon</i> , <i>compaignons</i>	companion	Merovingian Lat. <i>companiono</i> (m) 'one who eats his bread in company with another person' <sup>17</sup> < Go. <i>gahlaiba</i> (m) < <i>ga-</i> 'with' + <i>hlaifs</i> (m) 'bread'	M	M > M
	<i>honte</i>	shame	Frk. <i>*haunita</i> << Gmc. <i>*haunaz/xaunaz</i> 'low, humble'	F	n/a
	<i>flans</i> , <i>flanz</i>	mold	Frk. <i>*flado</i>	M	16
	<i>biere</i>	coffin	Frk. <i>*bëra</i> (f) 'stretcher' << Gmc. <i>*beranan</i> 'to carry'	F	F > F
	<i>teche</i>	stain	VLat. <i>*tacca</i> (f) (having to do with hides) < Gmc. <i>taikns</i> or <i>*taiknan</i> (n) 'signal'	F	F > F
	<i>estache</i>	stake, post	Gmc. <i>*staka</i> or <i>*stakōn</i> (m) 'stake'	F	F > F

<sup>16</sup> For each of these nouns, the gender for the original etymon is not listed. This is because there was no dictionary found which offered this information.

<sup>17</sup> It does seem that *companiono-* is a calque of the Gothic *gahlaiba* (m) 'one with bread'.

Language	Word	Gloss	Origin-Word-Gloss	Gender	Change?
Old Castilian	<i>pleito</i>	plea	< OFr. <i>plait</i> (m) < CLat. <i>placitum</i> II.m.sg 'liking, will, pleasure; endeavor, scheme, design, decision; leave, consent; engagement, word given'	M	M > M
	<i>solaz</i>	solace	OOc. <i>solatz</i> (m) 'to please, to placate' < CLat. <i>solacium</i> II.n.sg 'consolement' < <i>solari</i> 'to comfort; to console; to alleviate'	M (< N)	M > M
	<i>oraje</i>	wind	Cat. <i>oratge</i> (m) 'breeze' < CLat. <i>auram</i> I.f.sg 'air in gentle motion; light breeze'	M (< F)	M > M
	<i>tacha</i>	stain	Fr. <i>tache</i> (f) 'stain' < VLat. * <i>tacca</i> (f) (having to do with hides) < Gmc. <i>taikn</i> or * <i>taiknan</i> (n) 'signal'	F	F > F
	<i>galea</i>	galley	(Lat. <i>galeam</i> (f) 'soldier's helmet') < Biz.Gr. <i>galéa</i> (m) 'dog shark; Selachian (like a shark or sting ray)' < Gr. <i>galē</i> (m) 'weasel, ferret' (the term for the fish/ship came Greek > Catalan; the ship was compared to the fish because of speed and agility)	F	M > (F >) M
	<i>alcalde</i>	mayor	Ar. <i>qâdi</i> 'judge' (m) < active part. of <i>qâḍâ</i> 'to resolve; to judge'	M	M > M <sup>18</sup>
	<i>rencón</i>	corner	V.Ar. <i>rukún</i> (f.pl.) < Ar. <i>rukn</i> (m.sg.)	M	M/F > M <sup>18</sup>
	<i>mesquinos</i>	mean people	Ar. <i>miskîn</i> 'lacking in goodness, poor, indigent' < <i>sâkan</i> 'to pacify oneself, to humiliate oneself; to be poor'	M	n/a <sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> These gender assignments, or lack thereof, were provided via personal communication by Dr. Georgette Jabbar of the University of Iowa (2006).

Language	Word	Gloss	Origin-Word-Gloss	Gender	Change?
	<i>hazaña</i>	deed, feat	< <i>facere</i> ; ?Ar. <i>ḥásanan</i> (adj.) 'good work' (1st doc. <i>fazaña</i> Berceo 1150)	F	n/a18
	<i>loco</i>	craziness	(unknown): * <i>laucu</i> < ? Ar. <i>láuqa</i> (f), <i>láuq</i> (pl) 'silly, crazy'	M	n/a18
	<i>(de) valde</i>	without cost, poor	Ar. <i>batil</i> 'free'	M	n/a18
	<i>quilma</i>	costal	Ar. <i>qírba</i> (f) 'wineskin; drunkard' (?)	F	F > F18
	<i>varón, barones</i>	barron	Gmc. * <i>baro</i> (m) 'free man, ready for the fight'	M	M > M
	<i>compañía</i>	company	< OCast. <i>compañio</i> < Merovingian Lat. <i>companio</i> , - <i>ōnis</i> (m) < Go. <i>gahlaiba</i> (m) 'one who eats his bread in company with another person' <sup>iii</sup> < <i>ga-</i> 'with' + <i>hlaifs</i> (m) 'bread'	F	M > F
	<i>gana</i>	desire	Go. * <i>ganô</i> (f) 'desire, avarice'	F	F > F
	<i>guisa</i>	manner, way	(unknown): < ? VLat. < Gmc. * <i>wīsa</i> (f) 'visit; face'	F	F > F
	<i>basca</i>	nausea	unknown: prob. Celt. * <i>waskā</i> 'oppression'	F	16

Language	Word	Gloss	Origin-Word-Gloss	Gender	Change?
Old Galician Portuguese	<i>masto</i>	mast	< Fr. <i>mast</i> (m) 'piece of wood' < Frk. <i>mast</i> < Gmc. * <i>mastaz</i> (m) 'mast'	M	M > M
	<i>batel</i>	canoe	< Fr. <i>batel</i> (bateau) (m) 'part of a ship' < Ang.Sax. <i>bāt</i>	M	M > M
	<i>tropel</i>	crowd, group	(< Cast. <i>tropel</i> (m)) < OFr. <i>tropel</i> (m) 'flock, herd' < Frk. * <i>throp</i> 'assembly'	M	M > M
	<i>besonna</i>	(need?)	< OFr. <i>besoigne</i> (f) 'need, poverty' < Frk. * <i>bisunnia</i> (f) 'need'	F	F > F
	<i>fiança</i>	faith, guarantee	< OFr. <i>fiance</i> (f) 'compromise'	F	F > F
	<i>demo</i>	demon	Gr. <i>daimōn</i> (m) 'a god or divinity; destiny, luck'	M	M > M
	<i>eygreja</i>	church	< Gr. <i>ekkyēsia</i> (f) 'assembly'	F	F > F
	<i>garifos</i>	instrument	Ar. <i>garf</i> 'to ladle, to scoop'	M	n/a18

The Old French noun *teche*, and by extension the Old Castilian *tacha*, are interesting cases for borrowing and gender. Of note is the fact that the Germanic *\*taikns/\*taiknan* ‘signal’ is interpreted not as a neuter noun in Vulgar Latin, but as a feminine noun, *\*tacca* ‘having to do with hides’. On the basis of the patterns of borrowed terms seen in the Miracles and in comparison with data from Wehna (1980), I can interpret these data in one of two ways: either that *\*taiknan* is interpreted outright to be an *–a* stem noun regardless of its lexical gender in Germanic, or the Latin neuter category has already merged with the masculine and feminine categories, making the choice of feminine gender probable. The latter argument is more plausible, for if the Latin neuter gender is still in existence and productive, one could argue that this term would be associated with that gender, perhaps appearing as *\*tacce* or *\*taccu*. Since this is not attested, the most likely answer is that the Germanic word is analyzed by the speech community as being more like feminine first-declension nouns, and therefore assigned feminine gender. This is congruent with the gender assignment argument noted in Chapter 1 based on Zenenko (1983:236). There are also two nouns which show a difference in gender between the borrowed term and the Romance equivalent, both of which are borrowings from Catalan or Occitan into Castilian:

- *solaz* (<OOc. *solatz* (m) < CLat. *solacium* II.n.sg); and
- *oraje* (Cat. *oratge* (m) < CLat. *auram* I.f.sg).

Other terms, over time, change gender, but there is an intermediary term in Latin which has the same form and gender as the Romance word, as another example of formal analogy.

- Old Castilian *compañía* (VLat. \**compania* (f) ≈ Merovingian Lat. *companiono*, -*onis* (m) < Go. *gahlaiba* (m) < *ga-* 'with' + *hlaifs* (m))<sup>19</sup>;
- Old Castilian *galea* (< Lat. *galeam* (f) < Biz.Gr. *galéa* (m) < Gr. *galē* (m)); and
- Old French *hermite* (EccLat. *eremita* (m) < Gk. *erêmitês* (m) < *erêmos* (f))

However, these examples show more how Latin incorporated these borrowed terms into its lexicon and assimilated the gender accordingly.

In looking at the entire body of nouns analyzed in this section, there are few changes of grammatical gender outside of the loss of the neuter. The neuter gender tended to pattern more into the masculine nouns in the Romance languages, with some plural neuter nouns merging into the feminine set (sections 1.1.4 and 3.1.1). In the Miracles data, Latin masculine and feminine nouns that have evolved into Galician Portuguese kept their lexical gender, with the exception of one, which will be discussed in section 2.3.1. Latin neuter nouns have patterned mostly to the Galician Portuguese masculine. There are Old French and Old Castilian nouns which have changed gender assignments from their descendants in Latin, and other nouns which show both masculine and feminine gender agreement. The reduction and eventual loss of the Latin neuter is considered in section 2.4.

---

<sup>19</sup> Corominas states that Vulgar Latin \**compania* was “formed at the same time as the Merovingian Latin *companiono*, -*onis*” [“formado al mismo tiempo que el lat. merovingio...” (1954:871 of volume 1)]; the timing does not sound right, as the Merovingian period existed during the time period that most researchers would describe as Late Latin or Early Romance (5<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> century CE).

## 2.3 SPECIFIC QUESTIONS WITHIN THE DATA

### 2.3.1 Masculine-Feminine Switch from Latin to Romance

There is a set of nouns which are masculine in Latin but appeared in the Miracles with feminine gender assignment, shown in Tables 12 (Old French), 13 (Old Castilian), and 14 (Old Galician Portuguese)<sup>20</sup>:

Table 12: Latin Masculine to Old French Feminine Nouns

Word	Modern Word (if different)	Gloss	Etymology, Number	Gender,	Found in the following texts:	Change?
<i>nez</i>		nose	<i>nasum</i> II.m.sg	'nose'	Saved Castaway; Pregnant Abbess	M > F
<i>fleur</i>		flower	<i>florem</i> III.m.sg	'flower, blossom'	Cleric and Flower	M > F
<i>boële</i>	( <i>boyau, entrailles</i> )	gut; entrails, womb	<i>botellum</i> II.m.sg	'small sausage'	Monk Delivered from Devil	M > F

Table 13: Latin Masculine to Old Castilian Feminine Nouns

Word	Modern Word (if different)	Gloss	Etymology, Number	Gender,	Found in the following texts:	Change?
<i>onor, honor</i>	<i>honor</i>	honor	<i>honorem</i> III.m.sg	'honor, respect'	Pregnant Abbess	M > F
<i>pavura</i>	<i>paura</i>	fear	<i>pavorem</i> III.m.sg	'trembling, quaking, produced by fear or excitement'	Pregnant Abbess	M > F
<i>calura</i>	<i>calor</i>	heat	<i>calorem</i> III.m.sg	'warmth, heat, glow'	Saved Castaway	M > F
<i>ardura</i>		anguish, a difficult situation	<i>ardorem</i> III.m.sg	'flame, burning, heat'	Saved Castaway; Pregnant Abbess	M > F
<i>cárcel</i>		jail	<i>carcerem</i> III.m.sg	'prison, jail, cell'	Saved Castaway	M > F
<i>flor</i>		flower	<i>florem</i> III.m.sg	'flower, blossom'	Cleric and Flower	M > F
<i>color</i>		color	<i>colorem</i> III.m.sg	'color, tint, hue'	Cleric and Flower	M > F

<sup>20</sup> As noted in footnote 14 for Table 11, all Latin forms in tables 12-14, 16-17, and 20-22 are the etymons of the Romance terms. Most often they are accusative singular; when otherwise, the case and/or number is noted.

<i>olor</i>		odor	VLat. <i>olor</i> , <i>-oris</i> < CLat. <i>odorem</i> III.m.sg 'smell, odor'	Cleric and Flower	M > F
<i>merediãna</i>	<i>merediana</i>	midday	<i>meridianus</i> (nom.) 'referent to noon or the South' < <i>meridiem</i> 'noon; South' V.m.sg	Cleric and Flower	M > F
<i>lavor</i>	<i>labor</i>	labor, work	<i>laborem</i> III.m.sg 'fatigue; work or task'	Monk Delivered from Devil	M > F
<i>fin mala</i>	<i>fin mala</i>	bad end (cultism)	<i>finem</i> III.m.sg 'limit, end'	Monk Delivered from Devil	M > F
<i>sangre</i>		blood	<i>sanguinem</i> III.m.sg 'blood'	Pregnant Abbess	M > F

Table 14: Latin Masculine to Old Galician Portuguese Feminine Nouns

Word	Modern Word (if different)	Gloss	Etymology, Number	Gender,	Found in the following texts:	Change?
<i>fror</i>	<i>flor</i>	flower	<i>florem</i> III.m.sg 'flower'		Pregnant Abbess	M > F

These data lend themselves to discussion, beginning with the problem of 'flower' and other botanical lexical items. The word for 'flower'—*fleur* in Old French, *flor* in Old Castilian and *fror* in Old Galician-Portuguese—follows a systematic change that occurred in Romance. Trees come to be grammatically marked for the masculine, while flowers and fruit come to be marked for the feminine. The dialogue regarding this change results in conflict and little consensus is reached as to the impetus or direction of the changes. Rohlfs documents that originally in Latin the vast majority of trees have feminine lexical gender—exceptions being *acer* 'maple-tree' and *robur* 'oak' (neuters), and *ulmus* 'elm' and *larix* 'larch' (masculine). The word for 'flower', *flos*, *floris*, has masculine lexical gender (Rohlfs 1966:56). This shows that even in Latin, there is little cohesion in this semantic group, and perhaps this lack of cohesion leads speakers to make changes in order to create transparency or to ease learnability—depending on the theory applied to the phenomenon. There is a change in Vulgar Latin with

*arbor* ‘tree’, “via influence from other nouns in –or, [which] passed into masculine gender; consequently the names of the various trees also changed to, in time, masculine”<sup>21</sup> [my translation] (Rohlf 1966:56; also Elcock 1960:58-59). This treatment of *arbor* can explain why in the Old Castilian data there are examples of words in –or which switched from feminine to masculine gender, such as (*h*)onor, color, olor, lavor.

However, it should also be noted that this masculine gender assignment for trees does not hold true for all dialects of Italian. Rohlf also states (1966:56-57) that in several areas of Italy certain species of trees are still marked for feminine, including ‘poplar’ (Emilia: *piopa*; Romagna: *piopa*, *fiopa*; Milan: *pioba*; Corsica: *piopa*; Sambuca: *fioppa*, Campori: *piopa*), ‘willow’ (southern Piedmont: *la salsa*; Abruzzo: *la saucia*; Lazio: *sarcia*, *saucia*) among others. There are similar breaks in Iberian Romance; Zenenko (1983:240) notes that some fruit trees in Catalan are either masculine (*el cirerer* ‘cherry tree’), feminine (*la pomera* ‘apple tree’), or both (*la perera*, *el perer* ‘pear tree’). With the switch of trees from feminine to masculine, the word for the products of trees, much like the word FRUCTUS, often changes to feminine: FRUCTUS > *fruta*, PIRUM ‘pear’ > Spanish *la pera*, Italian *la pera* and so forth. This also holds for the nuts of trees, with the Latin neuter NUX ‘nut’ having evolved into Spanish *la nuece* ‘nut’, and Italian *la noce* ‘the nut that is edible’—in contrast to *il noce* ‘the plant that produces the nut’ (Rohlf 1966:57).

It is also been suggested that this association of ‘fruit’ with the feminine gender is due to possible collective nature of the neuter plural. There have been other examples of the neuter plural being used as a collective, and then later

---

<sup>21</sup> “...per influsso di altre parole in –or, passò al genere maschile; di conseguenza anche i nomi dei diversi alberi divennero, col tempo, maschili:...”

being reinterpreted as a feminine singular; this has been discussed earlier in section 1.1.2. It has been posited by other researchers that the semantic group of 'fruit' is part of this, and is the reason behind the lexical grammar re-assignment of 'fruit' from neuter to feminine (Zenenko 1983:240). The general pattern seems to change so that the producer ('tree') is assigned masculine gender, while the collective product ('fruit', 'nut') is marked for the feminine, and that was done as a result of analogy and re-analysis of the *-u/-a* inflections, respectively. Väänänen (1988:171) notes that even in the *Appendix Probi* there is evidence of this change for the word for fruit-trees to masculine gender and the fruit itself to feminine gender. Da Silva Neto (1956:95-98) discusses similar changes found in various Vulgar Latin sources. However, the overall pattern of gender change in Romance seems to have its roots in the collapse of the neuter into the masculine gender, along with the apparent re-assignment of all nouns ending in *-a* to the feminine gender. As mentioned earlier, this seems to have happened very early in the history of the Romance languages, or perhaps as early as Vulgar Latin. During the same period, flowers, as products of trees, are marked for feminine gender, including the word *flos, floris* changing from masculine to feminine gender. 'Flower' is generally feminine in the Romance languages, with the key exception of Italian (*il fiore*) and Sardinian (*su fiore*).

This begs the question, why did Italian and Sardinian words for 'flower' retain the original Latin gender assignment, while all other Romance languages shift to the feminine? Elcock states that Italian tends to pattern its lexical gender assignment to that of Latin, "presumably on account of the ever-present influence of Classical Latin in the development of literary Italian," and that the gender assignment in the other languages must pattern after the "hesitations of popular

speech” (1960:59-60). One could reason that Sardinian followed this same ‘pattern’. Perhaps analogy did play a role in Italian and Sardinian’s retaining of the masculine gender for these words, but this answer is not satisfactory. It seems unlikely that a common word such as ‘flower’ would follow literary influence. Elcock further states that the same process happened with Classical Latin nouns *callem* ‘narrow track, foot path’, *canalem* ‘water pipe, channel, canal’, *carcerem* ‘prison, jail, cell’, *cinerem* ‘ash’, *finem* ‘limit, border’, *par(i)etem* ‘parent’, *pontem* ‘bridge’, *pulicem* ‘flea’, *pulverem* ‘dust, powder’, *rumicem* ‘sorrel’ and *sanguinem* ‘blood’—all of these words being of mostly masculine Latin gender, with *parietem* being of common gender and *rumicem* of feminine gender. Table 15, shows that the ‘unity’ among the non-Italian languages is in fact quite fractured.

Table 15: Modern Romance equivalents of various Latin words in Elcock

	<i>callem</i> (m)	<i>canalem</i> (m)	<i>carcerem</i> (m)	<i>cinerem</i> (m)	<i>finem</i> (m)
Portuguese	--	<i>canal</i> (m)	<i>cácere</i> (m)	<i>cinza</i> (f)	<i>fim</i> (m)
Spanish	<i>calle</i> (f)	<i>canal</i> (m)	<i>cárcel</i> (f)	<i>ceniza</i> (f)	<i>fin</i> (m)
Catalan	<i>carrem</i> (m)	<i>canal</i> (m)	<i>càrcer</i> (m)	<i>cendra</i> (f)	<i>fi</i> (m)
Occitan	--	<i>canal</i> (m)	<i>carce</i> (f)	<i>cen(d)re</i> (m/f; f.pl. religious)	<i>fin</i> (f)
French	--	<i>canal</i> (m)	[ <i>carcéral</i> (adj)]	<i>cendre</i> (f)	<i>fin</i> (f)
Provençal	--	<i>canal, canau</i> (f)	<i>carce, charce</i> (f)	<i>cendre, cèndre, cene, cènre, icèndre</i> (m/f)	<i>fi, fin</i> (f)
Sardinian	--	<i>canale, canabi</i> ‘channel’ (m)	--	<i>chigina, chinisa/u, chinixu/a</i> (f/m)	<i>fine</i> (f: Logudorese; m: Campidanese)
Italian	<i>calle</i> (f. Venice ‘alley’; m. Std. ‘path’)	<i>canale</i> (m)	<i>carcere</i> (m)	<i>cenere</i> (f)	<i>fine</i> (f) ‘end’; (m) ‘goal’
Rhaeto Romance	--	<i>chanal</i> (m)	--	<i>tschendra</i> (f)	<i>fin</i> (f)
Rumanian	--	<i>canal</i> (m)	--	<i>cenușă</i> (f)	[ <i>final</i> (adj)]

	<i>parientem</i> (c)	<i>pontem</i> (m)	<i>pulicem</i> (m)	<i>pulverem</i> (m)	<i>rumicem</i> (f)	<i>sanguinem</i> (m)
Portuguese	<i>parente</i> (m) [> <i>parenta</i> (f)]	<i>ponte</i> (f)	<i>pulga</i> (f)	> <i>polvilho</i> (m)	--	<i>sangue</i> (m)
Spanish	<i>pariente</i> (m)	<i>puente</i> (m)	<i>pulga</i> (f)	<i>polvo</i> (m)	--	<i>sangre</i> (f)
Catalan	<i>parent</i> (m) [> <i>parenta</i> (f)]	<i>pont</i> (m)	<i>puça</i> (f)	<i>pols</i> (m)	--	<i>sang</i> (f)
Occitan	<i>parent</i> (m)	<i>pont</i> (m)	<i>piussa,</i> <i>pouluc,</i> <i>poulutx, pus</i> (f)	<i>pols</i> (m)	--	<i>sana</i> (f/m)
French	<i>parent</i> (m)	<i>pont</i> (m)	<i>puce</i> (f)	<i>poudre</i> (f)	--	<i>sang</i> (m)
Provençal	<i>parènt</i> (m)	<i>pont,</i> <i>pouont,</i> <i>pouent,</i> <i>pouant,</i> <i>pount</i> (m)	--	<i>poudro,</i> <i>pouvero,</i> <i>pouvuro</i> (f)	--	<i>sang, sanc</i> (m/f)
Sardinian	<i>parente</i> (m)	<i>ponte</i> (m)	<i>puighi,</i> <i>puliche</i> (m/f)	<i>peuere,</i> <i>piubaru,</i> <i>piubere</i> (m)	--	<i>sambani,</i> <i>sangui,</i> <i>sanguini,</i> <i>sanguni</i> (m)
Italian	<i>parente</i> (m)	<i>ponte</i> (m)	<i>pulce</i> (f)	<i>polvere</i> (f)	--	<i>sangue</i> (m)
Rhaeto Romance	<i>parent</i> (m) [> <i>parenta</i> (f)]	<i>punt</i> (f)	<i>pulesc</i> (m— Ladin- Fassano)	<i>pulvra</i> (f)	--	<i>sang</i> (m)
Rumanian	<i>parinte</i> (m)	<i>punte</i> (f)	<i>purice</i> (m)	--	[ <i>rumen</i> (adj)]	<i>sînge</i> (n)

As one can see, there is variation of gender assignment on most of the listed nouns. Therefore, one wonders if the ‘speaker hesitations’ mentioned by Elcock are in fact different morphological recognitions and assignments of certain inflections. Note, too, that Italian and Sardinian do not always continue with the original Latin gender assignment, *callem* > It. *calle* (f); *cinerem* > It. *cenere* (f); *finem* > It. *fine* (f ‘end’), Sard. *fine* (f, Logudorese); *pulicem* > It. *pulce* (f), Sard. *puighi, puliche* (f/m); *pulvere* > It. *polvere* (f). In the same vein, not all dialects of Italian show ‘flower’ as masculine. Central and southern Italian dialects tend to conserve the masculine gender, but the Gallo-Italian dialects behave much as the rest of the Romance-speaking world in marking ‘flower’ as feminine, including evidence of *la flor* in the oldest Genovese, Lombard, Veronese and Venetian dialects. It is still feminine in Piedmont (*na fiúr*), Liguria (*a šúa*), in parts of Lombardy (*la fiur* ‘flower of flour’) and in Istria. Similar evidence can also be

found in literary Old Italian examples from all parts of Italy, including central and southern dialects (Rohlf 1966:67-68). However, according to Elcock, “[from] the present sporadic distribution of these words, as between masculine and feminine, one can draw no general influence concerning linguistic zones within the wide frontiers of Vulgar Latin; one can only observe its uncertainties” (1960:60). This answer is not a satisfactory, and allows the possibility of better explanations to this question via more modern theories.

Returning to the data found in the Miracles, there is evidence of Latin feminine nouns having changed their gender to masculine in Romance, as seen in Tables 16 (Old French) and 17 (Old Castilian).

Table 16: Latin Feminine to Old French Masculine Nouns

Word	Modern Word (if different)	Gloss	Etymology, Gender, Number	Found in the following texts:	Change?
<i>fossé</i>		ditch	<i>fossam</i> I.f.sg 'ditch, trench, channel' < pp.(f) <i>fodere</i> 'to dig, to burrow'	Cleric and Flower	F > M
<i>front</i>		forehead	<i>frontem</i> III.f.sg 'forehead, brow'	Jewish Boy Burning	F > M
<i>torel, tor</i>	<i>tour</i>	tower	<i>turrem</i> III.f.sg 'tower' (+ diminutive)	Monk Delivered from Devil; Pregnant Abbess	F > M
<i>infame</i>	<i>infamie</i>	infamy, dishonor	<i>infamiam</i> I.f.sg 'dishonor' < <i>infamis</i>	Pregnant Abbess	F > M

Table 17: Latin Feminine to Old Castilian Masculine Nouns

Word	Modern Word (if different)	Gloss	Etymology, Gender, Number	Found in the following texts	Change?
<i>valles</i>		valley	<i>vallem</i> III.f.sg, <i>valles</i> III.f.pl 'valley, vale'	Saved Castaway	F > M
* <i>cuitados</i>		worried ones, troubled ones	<i>cogitatum</i> III.f.sg 'thought, reflection' < past part. of <i>cogitare</i> 'to turn over in the mind, to think, reflect, consider'	Saved Castaway	F > M

Like their previously mentioned masculine-to-feminine counterparts, there does not seem to be a true reason for these grammatical gender switches. The case of the Old French *tor*, *torel* will be discussed below in section 2.3.2, but otherwise the question stands, why is there a shift in grammatical gender for these nouns?

The answer may partially lie in the fall of the declension system of Classical Latin, which is concurrent with the restructuring of the lexical gender system and its inflections. With the loss of final consonants, many of the above-mentioned words would formally seem to be either first or second declension. This is certainly true for *cuitados/cogitatum*, and one can posit that the third declension nouns *vallem*, *turrem* and *frontem*, once their final *-m* is deleted, likely entered a period of time when they were marked either with masculine or feminine gender. While there is no evidence to support this phenomenon in the data from the Miracles, this behavior would follow from the given events of the language. *Fossam/Fossé* and *infamiam/infamie* require further explanation, however, as there is nothing either in their form or their meaning, which would necessitate a change in gender.

### 2.3.2 Undecided Gender

Some nouns showed both masculine and feminine agreement observed in multiple contexts. In this dissertation these nouns are labeled ‘undecided’ in their gender, as they are not associated with one single grammatical gender, but rather are represented with two different genders. They are similar to the Catalan *-or* ‘undecided gendered’ nouns, including having the same *-or* terminations. For this reason, the same term of ‘undecided gender’ is used for the data found in the Miracles, which can be seen in Table 18 (Old French) and 19 (Old Spanish)<sup>22</sup>.

Table 18: Old French Multiple Gendered Nouns

Word	Modern Word (if different)	Gloss	Etymology, Gender, Number	Found in the following texts:	Change?
tor	<i>tour</i>	tower	<i>turrem</i> III.f.sg 'tower'	Monk Delivered from Devil	F > F
torel, tor	<i>tour</i>	tower (+ diminutive?)	<i>turrem</i> III.f.sg 'tower'	Monk Delivered from Devil; Pregnant Abbess	F > M

<sup>22</sup> Interestingly, in the modern Romance languages, none of the descendants are of ‘undecided’ gender; all language show either one or two descendants with fixed gender. The descendants of *turrem* are feminine in all languages, save for Rumanian (*turn*, ambigeneric); the other nouns show both masculine and feminine descendants in the various languages.

Table 19 Old Castilian Multiple Gendered Nouns

Word	Modern Word (if different)	Gloss	Etymology, Number	Gender,	Found in the following texts:	Change?	
onor, honor	<i>honor</i>	honor	<i>honorem</i>	III.m.sg	'honor, respect'	Monk Delivered from Devil	M > M
onor, honor	<i>honor</i>	honor	<i>honorem</i>	III.m.sg	'honor, respect'	Pregnant Abbess	M > F
pavor	<i>paura</i>	fear	<i>pavorem</i>	III.m.sg	'trembling, quaking, produced by fear or excitement'	Jewish Boy Burning	M > M
pavura	<i>paura</i>	fear	<i>pavorem</i>	III.m.sg	'trembling, quaking, produced by fear or excitement'	Pregnant Abbess	M > F
calor		heat	<i>calōrem</i>	III.m.sg	'warmth, heat, glow'	Jewish Boy Burning	M > M
calura	<i>calor</i>	heat	<i>calōrem</i>	III.m.sg	'warmth, heat, glow'	Saved Castaway	M > F

The analysis reveals all of the Castilian nouns are derived from Latin *-orem*. This is the same group which make up the Catalan undecided nouns, so this result is somewhat expected. Secondly, the diminutive on *tural* is most likely contributing to the masculine gender of the noun, which follows what was discussed in section 3.1.3 and the discussions of Spanish *-ón/-ona* (Wandersleben 1981:10). Added to the data in Table 19 should be the previously mentioned nouns of Old French, which were undecided in grammatical gender, *ordre* (descended from Classical Latin masculine *ordinem*) and *germe* (descended from Classical Latin neuter *germen*). In the Miracles, there is evidence of the masculine form of both nouns, but none of any vacillation of gender in the texts analyzed.

Old Castilian has an additional example of 'undecided' gender, *mar* 'sea', which is shown in the Milagros as being marked for both the masculine and the

feminine. From the Latin third declension neuter *mare* ‘sea’, it appears as *el mar* or *los mares* in *El náufrago salvado*, but as *la mar* in both *El náufrago salvado* and *La abadesa preñada*. Neither Galician Portuguese nor French show this same vacillation of gender—Old Galician Portuguese *mar* is masculine, while Old French *mer* is feminine. However, this vacillation with Castilian *mar* should not be completely surprising to Spanish speakers. According to the 22nd edition of the *Diccionario de la lengua española* (2001) from the Real Academia Española, the word *mar* is still of “ambiguous gender”, meaning that it can take either masculine or feminine agreement. The default gender is often labeled as masculine, for example in Spanish instructional texts. However, in the maritime community the feminine form is often used, as well as in certain expressions, including but not limited to *la alta mar* ‘high seas, open sea’, *mar gruesa* ‘heavy sea’, ‘rough sea’, *mar larga* ‘high sea’, *mar rizada* ‘choppy sea’. Corominas (1954:254 of vol. 3) mentions that the term is feminine in Rumanian and French, but masculine in Italian, Sardinian, and Portuguese. In Occitan *mare* is feminine but has evidence of extensive masculine marking and agreement in the Middle Ages. Catalan and Castilian, according to Corominas, have consistently fluctuated between the two genders, and in the case of Castilian, this phenomenon has occurred in this manner even in the Middle Ages, including passages from *El Cantar de Mio Cid* (11<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> century), Berceo, and others (Corominas 1954:254). In the evolutionary process between Latin and Romance, particularly Latin neuter nouns which are of the third declension, there is fluctuation of lexical gender in certain terms (see section 2.3.1). We can recall Penny’s (2002:12) statement from section 1.1.3, that many nouns ending in *-or* or *-e* display fluctuation of gender marking and agreement in Old Castilian into

the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Perhaps, then, the Castilian Spanish examples from the *Milagros* should not be surprising. Yet it is still puzzling why this was not true for all nouns in the *Milagros* ending in *-or* or *-e*, let alone in Old French or Old Galician Portuguese. Furthermore, is the fluctuation of lexical gender in general an indication of another process in the Romance Languages? This last question will be addressed later in section 4.1.3.

### **2.3.3 Comparison of Nouns from the Same Latin Noun**

Overall, the three Latin gender descendants studied here show high correspondences with regard to lexical gender. The genders for a given noun are relatively consistent. In fact, very few examples are found in these data in which the lexical gender differs across the languages. The full statistical tables are shown in Appendix D. When analyzing the 122 Latin nouns with descendants in at least two of the Miracles studied in this chapter, only seven nouns (5.7%) are found to have differing gender assignment. In other words, 43 of 47 Latin masculine nouns (91.5%) have a masculine descendant in the Miracles studied here and 54 of 55 Latin feminine nouns (98.1%) have a feminine descendant. There are 20 noun glosses that ultimately derive from a Latin neuter noun, and of them 18 (90%) merge into the same gender category in the Romance descendants. This reveals high similarity, and shows even higher percentages than the findings in Polinsky and van Everboek (2003) on Old French, but albeit with a much smaller corpus than that of Polinsky and Everboek. A larger corpus must be analyzed in order to compare the number equally. The nouns that have differing genders among the languages can be seen in Tables 20 (Latin masculine), 21 (Latin feminine) and 22 (Latin neuter).

Table 20: Latin masculine nouns into Romance with differing genders

Number	(Classical) Latin - Gender	Old Castilian - Gender	Old Galician Portuguese - Gender	Old French - Gender
17	<i>honorem</i> - M	<i>(h)onor</i> – M/F		<i>honeur</i> - M
29	<i>pavorem</i> - M	<i>pavor</i> - M, <i>pavura</i> – F	<i>pavor</i> - M	<i>paour</i> , <i>peür</i> - M
40	<i>florem</i> - M	<i>flor</i> – F	<i>flor</i> -F	<i>fleur</i> - F
41	<i>colorem</i> - M	<i>color</i> – F	<i>coor</i> - M	

Table 21: Latin feminine nouns into Romance with differing genders

Number	(Classical) Latin - Gender	Old Castilian - Gender	Old Galician Portuguese - Gender	Old French - Gender
47	<i>turrem</i> - F	<i>torre</i> - F		<i>tor</i> – F/M; <i>turel</i> - M

Table 22: Latin neuter nouns into Romance with differing genders

Number	(Classical) Latin - Gender	Old Castilian - Gender	Old Galician Portuguese - Gender	Old French - Gender
1	<i>gaudium, gaudia</i> - N	<i>gozo</i> - M		<i>joie</i> - F
8	<i>marem, maria</i> - N	<i>mar, mares</i> M/F	<i>mar</i> - M	<i>mer, mers</i> - F

The most remarkable aspect of these data surrounds the two neuter etymons. First, with regard to ‘joy’ there are two etymons in Latin, which have been borne out in each of the examples found in the Miracles, singular *gaudium* > Old Castilian *gozo*, while plural *gaudia* > Old French *joie*. This is an example of the pattern of evolution of Latin neuter nouns, with the singular form merging with the masculine set (as in *gaudium* > *gozo*) and the plural form merging with the feminine set (*gaudia* > *joie*). The actual question of the loss of the Latin neuter is specifically taken up in section 2.4, but it seems clear from the data presented here that the way in which these neuter nouns pattern overall into Romance is similar. These few examples show that speakers exhibited low levels of ambiguity, which in some cases are rectified but not in others. Indeed Latin *mare* has already been discussed with regard to Spanish *mar*, as seen in

section 2.3.2 and 1.1.3.1. Those Romance nouns which have changed lexical gender from their Latin etymon have been discussed in sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. Additionally, *color* in modern Spanish is masculine, which hints at possible inconsistencies of gender assignment for this word for Medieval Castilian. No evidence of *color* with feminine gender was found in the Miracles studied, but further research on the other *Milagros*, in addition to other period texts may provide insights into the variability in gender assignment. At this point, the question to be asked is as follows: Can the maintenance of lexical gender assignment be explained by the same theories used to explain the change in the other areas?

#### **2.3.4 Mass and Collective Reference**

It should be noted that there is no evidence for ‘mass/collective’ markings, such as those found in section 1.1.3.1 in discussing Asturian Spanish and South-Central Italian, nor any evidence of ambigeneric nouns or ‘double plurals’ as in French and Italian, respectively. Overall, the only possible evidence of a mass versus count distinction is in the number inflection of a small set of these nouns, which shows ambiguity regarding their collectivity in the data. Theoretically, a mass noun should always be represented either in the singular or the plural, but not with both number inflections. Table 23 shows a list of the mass- or collective-reference nouns in Old French and Old Castilian which were found in the data with both a singular and a plural form (a table of all mass nouns is located in Appendix E):

Table 23: Old French and Old Castilian Nouns with Mass or Collective Reference in the Miracles

	Word	Gloss	only sing.	only plural	SG and PL	Other	Gender change
Old French	<i>chevolz, chavel</i>	hair			X		M > M
	<i>feu, feus</i>	fire				nom vs. acc, likely	M > M
	<i>genz, gens, gent</i>	people			X		F > F
	<i>merci, mercis</i>	mercy, grace			X		F > F
	<i>grace, graces</i>	grace			X		F > F
	<i>pitiez, pieté</i>	piety			X?		F > F
Old Castilian	<i>fuego, fuegos</i>	fire			X		M > M
	<i>yent, yentes</i>	people			X		F > F
	<i>gracia/gratia, gracias</i>	thanks			X		F > F
	<i>tierra, tierras</i>	land			X		F > F
	<i>cardat, cardades</i>	care, tenderness			X		F > F
	<i>merced/mercet, mercedes</i>	mercy, grace			X		F > F
	<i>salud/salut, saludes</i>	heathy, greetings			X		F > F
	<i>tiempo, tiempos</i>	time			X		N > M
	<i>cielo, cielos</i>	sky, heaven			X		N > M

There are 116 nouns with mass or collective reference in the Miracles studied, but only 15 of them have both singular and plural forms. The inflection is shown either on the noun or the modifier(s), or both in some cases. This shows some ambiguity with respect to these 15 nouns. However, when one reflects upon the entire set of mass and collective nouns (in Appendix E), what stands out is that the overall picture demonstrates how collectivity was typically not inflectionally marked.

Where there is some ‘differential treatment’ in the Miracles is in Old French and Old Castilian. This small reflection of inconsistency in these languages should not be surprising. Chapter 1 discusses how both modern

French and modern Asturian Spanish show a possibility of mass nouns being treated differently. Old Galician Portuguese does not show any such vacillation that seems appropriate, since at no time in the history of Portuguese is there a separate treatment of mass or collective-reference nouns depicted in a different manner (Mattoso Camara 1972:62). While the Asturian and the Riojan/Castilian dialects are geographically close, evidence for differences is not expected. However, Harmon and Ojeda's work (1999) discusses a 16th century Castilian agricultural treatise which shows definite signs of a mass/collective marking at a later point from the same dialect. More attention should be paid to this matter in future research. Viejo Fernández (2003) has shown there is some evidence of this mass gender in 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century Asturian documents, but a more extensive analysis needs to be performed on the history of Asturian and, perhaps more importantly, northern Castilian Spanish. In comparing what Harmon and Ojeda present from current data, there is one noun in common, *agua* 'water' seen in *Obra de Agricultura*, the work studied by Harmon and Ojeda (1999). The noun is shown with a different adjectival marking in 16<sup>th</sup> century Castilian, but this study of *Milagros* reveals no distinct marking. In addition to the information from Table 23, there are three nouns—*yerba* 'herb, grass', *flor* 'flower', and *fruta* 'fruit'—which for Harmon and Ojeda have possible mass reference, but in the *Milagros* are with count connotation, therefore no comparisons can be made.

#### **2.4 THE LOSS OF NEUTER GENDER**

The loss of the Latin neuter gender is one last area which should be discussed. Much attention has been devoted to this topic, both in various handbooks and in subsequent articles. The literature is in agreement that the loss of this specific gender coincides with the loss of the case marking system

and most of the final consonants in the phonological system (Elcock 1960:24-27; Menéndez Pidal 1968:205-206; Herman 2000:42). It should be noted, however, that in the texts analyzed in this study, there are no remnants of any neuter gender marking. This follows the evidence in Vulgar Latin texts of the lexical gender category of neuter weakening and eroding, even as early as the first century AD. However, some texts seem to show that neuter nouns exist even in the earliest of the Romance texts (Herman 2000:65-66). The evidence shown earlier in section 2.1 with the borrowing of Germanic neuter *\*taikns/\*taikan* to Vulgar Latin as feminine *\*tacca* further bolsters the claim by Herman that Vulgar Latin was by-and-large the last true documentation of the neuter gender in Latin, and even at that period its existence is waning. An analysis of the Latin neuter nouns and their descendants found in the Miracles can be seen in Table 24:

Table 24: Statistics Latin Neuter > Romance Masculine or Feminine from the Miracles

Latin Neuter	To Old French Masculine	39	89%
	To Old French Feminine	5	11%
	To Old Castilian Masculine	46	79%
	To Old Castilian Feminine	12	21%
	To Old Galician Portuguese Masculine	9	82%
	To Old Galician Portuguese Feminine	2	18%

As expected, the vast majority of Latin neuter nouns are reassigned to the masculine gender, which is the conventional explanation discussed in section 3.1. There seems to be no justification for why nouns in this corpus tend to go to one gender category or the other, based on the data accumulated from the Miracles. In fact, of all the Latin neuter nouns, only one has descendants with differing grammatical gender in Romance, the problematic *mare* (Old French *la mer*, *mers*; Old Castilian *el mar*, *los mares*, *la mar*, Old Galician Portuguese *o*

*mar*). As we have seen previously in section 2.3.2, this word is already in a state of flux in the language.

## **2.5 CONCLUSIONS OF THE CHAPTER**

There are two basic topics regarding the data presented in this chapter. First, the overall maintenance of gender patterning from Latin to early Romance is discussed, including the few breaks from this regularity. The data given in this chapter are not numerous, but they are a glimpse into the Romance languages with regard to lexical gender assignment. Additionally they help to support some of the claims made by more modern researchers which are discussed in the first and third chapters. One could therefore surmise that the loss of the Latin neuter gender and the stabilization of the masculine and feminine genders perhaps occur in an earlier stage of Latin, while there is still much communication between the Roman provinces...or perhaps that the lexical gender assignments in these three Romance languages pattern along the same rules, which perhaps stemmed from one of the registers of Latin. In Chapter 4, the linguistic theories of language change discussed in Chapter 3 will be used in combination with the data given in this chapter and in section 1.1, so that there is a more accurate description of why the lexical gender systems of Romance evolve as they do.

## **Chapter Three: Gender in Romance and Theories of Language Change**

### **3.0 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first is an analysis of gender in the Romance languages, with specific reference to change where possible, and the second is a discussion of the theories of language change which will be discussed with reference to the data from Chapter 2. The focus of section 3.1 is the research on gender in Romance linguistics. This will be a broad discussion, detailing investigations covering many areas in this topic. It is an extension of the discussions raised in section 1.1. Section 3.2 will look at three theories of language change which have been often used: Lightfoot's Transparency Principle, Keller's Invisible Hand Theory, and Croft's Evolutionary Theory.

In the history of linguistics, there have been several movements which have changed the way researchers regard and analyze language. The 'linguistic revolution' of Noam Chomsky resulted in Formalism, which looks at the structure of language at the surface and in underlying forms, and how this influenced the different components of the language. Chomsky focused solely on syntax, but his theories of language and Universal Grammar have been expanded to all areas of language. Numerous Formalist theories of language change have occurred in each of the genres, as well as those which describe language change in a broad sense. This is not to say that Formalism has been the only important or prominent theoretical movement in modern linguistics. Certainly, when discussing the theories of language change from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Structuralist movement must be included. Structuralists are

influenced by the theories and writings of Ferdinand de Saussure. The writings of Saussure require reflection on the history of the Neo-Grammarians, and so on. Indeed, theories about language and how it changes have their modern roots in the comparative historical linguists in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, but they continue through the writings of Saussure, the Structuralists and throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and continuing into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **3.1 DISCUSSIONS OF GENDER IN ROMANCE LINGUISTICS**

#### **3.1.1 The 'Handbooks' of Romance Linguistics**

The 'handbooks' of the various Romance languages—principally the works of Meyer Lübke (1926), Badia Margarit (1951, 1962), da Silva Neto (1952), Elcock (1960), Williams (1962), Rohlf (1966, 1970), Jordan (1967), Menéndez Pidal (1968, 1986), Mattoso Camara (1972), Pittau (1972) and Tekavčić (1972)—are often the point of departure for many researchers, and therefore it is the starting point for this section. These linguists re-examine the various Romance languages and create highly detailed grammars, which are full of both historical and sociolinguistic data. It should be noted that analogy as a tool of language change features prominently in the handbooks. Meyer Lübke (1926) analyzes the Romance family as a whole, noting that with the collapse of word-final consonantal distinctions, the second declension and fourth declension are all but indistinguishable. Speakers employ analogy in order to merge the fourth declension nouns into the second, so that there is more of a correlation between morphological inflection on the one hand and declension and gender on the other (Meyer Lübke 1926:273). Around the same time, semantic analogy is used in the merge between the fifth declension forms, which are predominantly feminine,

and the first declension, which is primarily comprised of feminine nouns. The first declension is less marked than the fifth, and leads to the folding of the fifth declension into the first. Neuter plural nouns also merged with the first declension via formal analogy (Meyer Lübke 1926:278). The same analogy-based rationales, with Meyer Lübke's work often being cited, are also found in Ernout (1927:3-5), Elcock (1960:56-68), Menéndez Pidal (1968:213-217), and Rohlfs (1966:16-17, 59)<sup>23</sup>. Analogy is a useful tool in explaining the steps of morphological change in a given language; this can be seen with the nominal morphological changes in Romance discussed above. But it does not accurately explain how to predict when analogy will be employed, nor does it allow for members of a given speech community to have multiple variants available. Furthermore, it does not explain why there are 'irregularities' in the pattern, and is often employed when a given linguist cannot find any other rationale for a given linguistic change (Vincent 1974:428). It is not a complete theory, as it only explains how, not why, a language has changed. Therefore, these handbooks of the various Romance languages, both of the individual languages and of the language family as a whole, are excellent resources for describing the variation and change that have existed and still exist in all aspects of linguistics, but do not lend themselves well to theories of language change.

---

<sup>23</sup> Another author frequently discussed is Robert Hall, Jr., whose works primarily on his version of 'Proto-Romance' and how gender changed from Latin to 'Proto-Romance' and ultimately into the modern Romance languages, is often cited. However, since there is much criticism of his creation of a 'Proto-Romance' stage, it will not be included in the main body of this chapter. Should one wish to read further into this area on Hall, please see the references which are listed in the bibliography.

### 3.1.2 Discussions on Gender Change from Latin to Romance

There have been various discussions on the history of lexical gender assignment in the Romance languages, and in doing so, many have attempted to discuss reasons for the changes or maintenance that can be observed. Discussions from the various handbooks in Vincent (1974) revisits the discussion on analogy through the lens of generative grammar, and in doing so puts a new spin on an older explanation. His treatment of the topic revolves around Bloomfield's (1934) definition of analogy: "A grammatical pattern (sentence-type, construction, or substitution) is often called an *analogy*. A regular analogy permits a speaker to utter speech-forms which he has not heard; we say that he utters them *on the analogy* of similar forms which he has heard" [emphasis original] (Bloomfield 1934:275). According to Vincent, if positions such as those of Bloomfield (1934), Kuryłowicz (1945-1949), Mańczak (1958), and Vennemann (1972) are employed, one can use analogy with respect to the various morpho-syntactic changes that have taken place in the various Romance languages and accurately discuss these changes. With specific reference to the loss of the neuter gender, Vincent states that the use of both 'Humboldt's Universal' ("Suppletion is undesirable, uniformity of linguistic symbolization is desirable: Both roots and grammatical markers should be unique and constant" (Vennemann 1972:184)) as well as analogy to explain how and why the Latin neuter merged into the masculine and feminine genders. For Vincent, it is the combination of the desire for grammatical simplification, as well as the confusion and similarity between the grammatical markings of the neuter on the one hand and the masculine and feminine on the other, that leads to the decline and eventual disappearance of the Latin neuter (1974:433-434). However, in his

explanation Vincent cites Elcock's (1960:56) statement that those neuters which have a collective reference in the plural are the ones which comprise the group of neuter nouns merging with the feminine first declension (Vincent 1974:433). This is plausible, in that those neuter plurals which have a collective sense often become associated as feminine singular nouns purely on formal analogy (e.g. Spanish feminine singular *hoja* 'leaf', which is derived from the Latin neuter plural *folia* 'leaves'), but it is questionable to say that all neuter-to-feminine changes in Romance are because all the nouns are collective in some sense. The remainder of Vincent's article discusses the mechanisms of Humboldt's Universal and analogy with regard to Generative Grammar, and is mirrored by Lightfoot (1979), discussed below in section 3.2.1.

A key study in the history of gender change in the Romance languages is presented in Polinsky and van Everbroek (2003). Focusing on the change from a tripartite in Latin to a binary gender system in Old French, Polinsky and van Everbroek posit that learnability on the part of the language learners alter major grammatical systems. This is done as a means of ironing out irregularity and eases in a general transparency in the grammar (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:358-359). Specifically, they believe that "the Latin system became increasingly complicated, to the point that reanalysis into the simpler system of Old French was easier than learning and maintaining the old system" (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:359). By complicated, Polinsky and van Everbroek refer to the lack of correlation between inflection and meaning, thus interfering with child language acquisition (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:359). This reanalysis of the gender system, from a tripartite to a binary system, leads to a "*significantly* different gender assignment system" [emphasis original] (Polinsky

and van Everbroek 2003:359). This is due to a combination of the reduction of complexity of the system, a more balanced type-token frequency, and the reduction of complexity in the inflectional system (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:359). The authors do admit that this is difficult to prove, given the paucity of the Gaulish data available, particularly in the Gaulish lexicon (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:366). Furthermore, their analysis shows that over the course of nine generations 85% of Latin masculine nouns continue their masculine gender in Old French, more than 85% of Latin feminine nouns continue their feminine gender in Old French, 65% of Latin neuters are marked for masculine gender in Old French while the other 35% of these neuters are marked for feminine in Old French (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:376-378). The data are collected in the same manner as those of the Miracles in Chapter 2, and analyzed for their gender using the same methods as is done in this dissertation. This roughly mirrors the Miracles data discussed in section 2.3.3, and it is this aspect of the article which is strong. In addition, those Latin masculine nouns which appear with feminine gender in Old French are predominantly from the third declension, which is heavy on hesitation (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:376), in particular nouns ending in *-orem*, and points to learnability and analogy as a source for these changes in gender (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:377). This analysis is similar to those of the handbooks, with the emphasis on analogy. However, there are grave issues with the other elements of the analysis. As mentioned earlier, arguments based on 'complexity' can be suspect, and this is an issue. However, a significant issue with this analysis is the authors' claim that the substrate grammars, particularly that of Gaulish, have a possible role, and that

the bilingual speakers find the binary gender system easier to learn (Polinsky and van Everbroek 2003:366).

There have been other somewhat controversial positions which discuss specific areas of gender change in Romance. Rohlfs (1979) states that with the weakening of certain aspects of Vulgar Latin grammar, certain constructions or lexical items are retained over others. As such, there is often vacillation of terms or constructions, as speakers are attempting to maneuver the language as best as they can; this can be seen in the third declension masculine and feminine nouns, where there is vacillation of lexical gender assignment as well as for various other nouns in the fourth and fifth declensions (1979:9). There is an element to this that seems plausible, and indeed is the aspect of speaker and utterance variation discussed in Croft (2000), and analyzed in section 3.2.3. However, Rohlfs also mentions the possible role of the sub-strata, in particular Greek (1979:11), in this vacillation, which is a point that is not commonly held and which is controversial at best. It is contrary to earlier and later positions—even by Rohlfs himself (1966)—that these changes are internal within Romance. Lazzeroni (2000) suggests the possibility that the fourth declension masculine nouns merged into the second declension, while the second declension feminine nouns (*sucrus*, *nurus*, *quercus*) merged into the fourth declension (2000:234). In doing so, Lazzeroni states that “the flexional class of nouns in *-us* was lexicalized: for some lexical items, the speaker should have memorized it by choosing the declension; and [the speaker] should have memorized also the gender in order to choose the agreement”<sup>24</sup> [my translation] (2000:234).

---

<sup>24</sup> “...la classe flessionale di un nome in *-us* era lessicalizzata: per ciascun lessema, il parlante doveva averla memorizzata per selezionare la declinazione; e doveva avere memorizzato anche il genere per selezionare l'accordo.”

Somehow the speakers would then have to re-introduce all of the fourth declension nouns into the appropriate gender and declension—either first/feminine or second/masculine—but Lazzeroni does not detail how that is done, or why this intermediary step would be taken in the first place.

### **3.1.3 Discussions on Specific Issues of Romance Gender**

Specific issues of Romance gender contain several topics that are important for this dissertation. One is the role of gender inflexion, particularly with the loss of the neuter gender and its eventual merger with the remaining genders of the Romance-speaking world. Mignot (1978) points to the role of grammatical gender inflexion, and its place in identifying lexical gender. His central topic is that the changing of lexical gender, unlike case and number, is more “involved” and requires a change in the lexicon of the language. Therefore, it is a more dramatic change than that of case or number, both of which are more syntactic in nature (1978:50). A further argument for the internal nature of the gender is further strengthened by Bechert (1982), who states that gender “affects the morphological subsystem of grammar which changes under the influence of non-cognate (or remotely related) neighboring languages more slowly than other grammatical subsystems” (Bechert 1982:28). In doing so, Bechert discusses ambigeneric gender in Rumanian and argues against a borrowing of Slavic neuter gender into Rumanian, and instead opting for its roots in the tripartite gender system of Latin (Bechert 1982:28). This is further reinforced by Mallinson (1986). Lazzeroni (1999), in looking at Greek anthropomorphisms into Latin, suggests that speaker confusion and a lack of communicative function lead to “incorrect” assumptions on the part of the speakers regarding the “identities” of the declensions, and therefore the gender inflexions. This leads speakers to a

new assignment of lexical gender (1999:211). However, Lazzeroni links this to a lack of education of the speakers in the etymologies of the borrowed terms, thus suggesting that had the speakers of Latin been fully educated in Greek, they would not have made such 'errors' (1999:212). This position implies that speakers, in order to have correct intuitions of their native language, must be literate and know the history of their language. It is an argument which has many flaws, starting with the view that education is linked with fluency in a native language. While it can be stated that formal education enhances the knowledge of prescriptive grammar and the standard variety of a given language, one cannot make the connection between the amount of education of a given speaker and that speaker's innate knowledge of his native tongue.

Research has been conducted on the derivational properties of certain morphemes, which will cause changes or perhaps hesitation in lexical gender assignment. A study by Wandersleben (1981) looks at Spanish and the assignment of lexical gender with the morpheme *-ón* and its feminine counterpart *-ona*. Wandersleben cites research regarding the feminine gender, which is often thought of as a 'augmentative' alternative to the masculine—one thinks of *hueco* and *hueca*, both meaning 'hole' but the feminine lexicon refers to a larger, deeper hole than the masculine form. Wandersleben suggests that modern native Spanish speakers do not exhibit any cognitive connection between the feminine gender in Spanish and an augmented or 'plural' nature of the noun, and this could possibly be true for all of Romance (1981:10). Therefore, Wandersleben also finds that Spanish *-ona* is truly a feminine alternative to *-ón*, based on the fact that *-ón* is principally used with feminine primaries, while *-ona* is used with mostly masculine primaries (1981:14). This is

interesting not only as a way to counter earlier remarks about the collective, 'plural' aspect of the feminine (Elcock 1960:56), but to also show that if this aspect did exist, it has now been eliminated from the conscience of speakers. Fleischmann (1976) discusses the diachronic characteristics of the French morpheme *-age*, the primary morpheme derived from the Latin *-aticu* 'characteristic of, pertaining to,' in Vulgar Latin this suffix marks lexical items pertaining to taxes, offices, collectives, and abstracts (1976:42). In Old French, according to Fleischmann, this inflection takes on the role as of collective- or mass-noun marker, but in Modern French the collective/mass aspect of the morpheme is no longer in use; rather, it is now a deverbal formative (1976:42). Fleischmann notes that the vast majority of the Old French *-age* collectives are denominal and "true collectives," and the few that are deverbal "are in fact abstracts or action nouns expressing a 'collective result' or an analogous type of extended collected meaning which abstracts often acquire" (1976:44). Examples include: *brigandage* 'highway robbery'; *colombage* 'frame wall, stud work'; *cubage* 'cubic content'; *enfantillage* 'childishness, *entourage* 'surroundings'; *feuillage* 'foliage'; *fromage* 'cheese'; *hivrage* 'rainy season'; *lainage* 'fleece (of sheep), wollen goods'; *language* 'speech'; *maquillage* 'make-up'; *nappage* 'table linen'; *ombrage* 'shade'; *ouvrage* 'work, production'; *pacage* 'pasture ground'; *plumage* 'plumage, feathers'; *ramage* 'floral design; song (of birds)'; *témoignage* 'testimony, evidence' (Fleischmann 1976:43-44). While most *-age* nouns are masculine, there are two groups which are feminine, neither of which can be traced to the Latin *-aticu* suffix (1976:45). Furthermore, Fleischmann states that there has been a swapping of lexical gender, with some originally masculine *-age* nouns becoming feminine "on the subliterate level" (*âge*, *gage*, *orage*

'storm') while others undergo the reverse process and change from feminine to masculine (*le cartilage, le putrilage, image*) (1976:46); these changes were all part of Old French, with the suffix *-age* ceasing to be actively used as a collective marker by the sixteenth century (Fleischmann 1976:44). These studies show that lexical gender has changed in the history of certain Romance languages in order to create more symmetry in the system. They also demonstrate that a 'plural' sense of certain lexical classes has disappeared for the most part in much of modern Romance. This is important relative to some of the data discussed in section 2.3.

Among the oft-discussed topics with regard to gender development in Romance is the issue of disagreement or non-agreement between lexical gender and its manifestations in the modifiers. Plank (1984) discusses the issue in response to Zwicky (1969), Pullum and Zwicky (1975) and Zwicky and Pullum (1983). The dialogue is based on the possibility of rule-specific conditions on the applicability of syntactic rules in any given language and the affect of phonological features. Plank is looking for a better way to generalize the discussion in various Indo-European languages, and attempts to do so (1984:331). In his article he discusses French nasal 'insertion' on possessive adjectives (*mon frère* vs. *ma sœur* vs. *mon amie*) (1984:335-336) and the so-called Spanish 'feminine *el*' (*el castillo frío* vs. *la mesa fría* vs. *el agua fría*) (1984:337-338), among other cases of lexical or deictic disagreement. His conclusion is that both phenomena are combinations of the morphology and the phonology mixing with the syntax in order to create these apparent mismatches of agreement that it is done on a language-specific basis (1984:341-342). Posner (1985) answers Plank with corrections as well as with further insight.

First, according to Posner, the “principle effect of the inherent gender of Romance lexical items is to trigger agreement in dependent adjectives and determiners” (1985:439), so that while there seems to be ‘disagreement’, as in the French and Spanish cases noted above, they actually represent phonological conflicts. Furthermore, Posner notes that the French and Spanish examples are different. The Spanish phenomenon, the *Real Academia Española* has noted that there is complete agreement (e.g. *la agua fría*) in Leonese, Aragonese, Navarrese, the Río Platense of South America, Chilean, Mexican and New Mexican varieties of Spanish (Posner 1985:441). Indeed, states Posner, it was not until Andrés Bello created his volumes on the grammar of the Castilian Spanish language that there was a true stabilization of the normative rules on the subject (1985:442), and that there has always been vacillation in this area (1985:446). As for the French examples that Plank gave, Posner replies that there is a phonological difference between the *mon* in *mon* [mõ] *frère* and in *mon* [mõn/mõn] *amie* (1985:447), and that this is truly a case of non-agreement which is phonologically determined in French (1985:449).

### **3.1.4 Discussions on the Romance Mass Gender**

Ample literature exists on the phenomena of Romance mass nouns and their treatment in the various Romance languages. Lüdtke (2003) attempts to discuss the history of the mass gender (“mass neuter”) in Asturian, northern Castilian and south-central Italian, even attempting to relate it to the loss of the Latin neuter. Indeed, since the marking is primarily on the determiners and anaphoric elements, one could understand how the *-d* in Latin *illud* (neuter) would affect the vowel differently than the *-m* in Latin *illum* (masculine), thereby leading to a different pronunciation. Torreblanca (1990, 1992) uses a similar

phonological explanation but in both cases there is still no explanation why these phenomena do not exist on other anaphoric elements which did not have such inflection word-finally in Latin. The other question is why they exist in these dialects but not in other areas of the Romance-speaking world, including geographically-contiguous dialects. Lüdtke fails to account for that, as does Torreblanca. Equally important is Lüdtke's relating the mass gender nouns to Latin neuter nouns. Indeed, many of these nouns are neuter in Latin, but certainly not all, and we do not have enough diachronic data to support this claim. Fleischmann (1976), as mentioned above in section 3.1.3, discusses the previously collective nature of the French morpheme *-age*, but that this has diminished since the 16<sup>th</sup> century (1976:47).

In discussing the history of the Asturian mass gender, Viejo Fernández (2003) looks at the history of this phenomenon in Medieval Asturian Spanish, principally analyzing the language in documents from the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century. He notes that the mass-gender is extrasyntagmatic, or goes beyond the given phrase, and is formed with nouns which are originally thought to be masculine. The feminine-based mass-gendered nouns (e.g. *la leche no lo vende nadie*) are a more modern inclusion into the phenomenon (Viejo Fernández 2003:10-11). This is different than the modern phenomena, as detailed in section 1.1.3.2, which fully includes otherwise-feminine mass nouns in this mass gender. Furthermore, there seems to be some vacillation of pronominal gender assignments with respect to this mass gender as far back as the 12<sup>th</sup> century (Viejo Fernández 2003:10). He further refutes the notion that the mass gender is based on external pressures, and clearly states that this is an internal phenomenon, one that is based in texts and does not seem to possess a base in

the languages surrounding Asturias (Viejo Fernández 2003:12). As noted earlier in section 1.1.3.2, this is an area which warrants further research, both in text analysis and in the theoretical realm.

### **3.2 MODERN THEORIES OF LANGUAGE CHANGE**

After extracting data from various other researchers and combining it with the original data from the Miracles, the focus is shifted to the three theories which will be used to analyze the data. First, a definition of a ‘theory of language change’ is required before examining the three theories. In its simplest form, it explains why a change in a given language happens, or perhaps why a change happens in one area but not in another. In essence, such a theory looks at both change and stasis of a phenomenon, a dialect, or a language, and often analyzes the issue both synchronically and diachronically. It not only looks at *how* the language changed, but *why* it originally changed in a given manner. It is this latter part that most ‘theories’ fail to satisfy. I recognize that there might be some areas of language which cannot be formalized into a theory of language change, but often the failure comes not from the topic being analyzed, rather in the incongruency in what is promised by the given researcher—in this case, an explanation of some type—and what is actually offered. Teleological discussions should be avoided when possible, as it puts undue pressure on the speaker, which does not seem to be warranted. Lass (1980) centers his argument on this position. In this section, the focus will be on three theories of language change, those of Lightfoot (1979, 1991), Keller (1994) and Croft (2000).

It should be noted that all three theories have been previously applied to various aspects of morphology and morpho-syntax, and for this reason they are chosen for this investigation. Lightfoot’s (1979) handling of Chomskyan

Generative Grammar was revolutionary for his time, and his continued work on parameters and child language acquisition (1991) have shaped how Formalist theory handles language change. With Keller's Invisible Hand Theory, a serious attempt is put forth to explain the seemingly random aspects of language change, both on a smaller scale (loss of a certain set of vowels) and on a grander scale (loss of a grammatical category). Keller's theory has been used often, as well having been the representative of modern Functionalist theory. As for Croft, as mentioned in section 1.3, his theory represents a departure from Functionalist theories, and is one which affects not only linguistic change, but that of human interaction and other biological processes, an evolutionary change from A to B. While Croft's theory could benefit from further research, it is highly detailed and ready to be implemented for any set of data; a version of his theory has been used to analyze morpho-syntactical change in Romance (Smith 1996-1997). As we shall see in Chapter 4, it can also be used to effectively explain the changes and stasis of lexical gender in Romance.

### **3.2.1 Formalism and Lightfoot**

Stemming from Saussure and the Structuralists, Noam Chomsky took linguistics one step further in analyzing syntax, both as it is manifested and how it is generated. His Generative Grammar emphasizes the seemingly innate ability of humans for language, and theorizes that humans must be born with a Universal Grammar which holds the basic foundations of language. Several linguists have used his Generative Grammar theories to create theories of language change, describing derivations of syntax, morphology and phonology in order to accommodate the changes taking place over the evolution of language, as outlined below and in other areas of linguistic research. On the whole,

Formalism is not centered on diachronic studies. The bulk of the movement is centered on possible representations and manifestations of Universal Grammar, preferring synchronic analyses. Taken collectively, the Formalist camp is more interested in how a language works, rather than why things are represented in a certain way, let alone why a language, or an aspect of the grammar, changes over time.

It must be said that these ‘characterizations of grammar’ are highly useful to the diachronic analyst. Indeed, one can take the various descriptions of a given language’s grammar, compare it with similar analyses of different ‘eras’ of the language’s grammar, and from there compose a diachronic analysis. In this dissertation, Luján (1972), Ojeda (1992) and others have been useful in their description of gender, syntax, and the nominal phrase in Spanish and Italian, respectively. However, they lack the insight into any theory of language change. They simply describe the problem and the grammar. Formalists who are ‘strictly Chomskyan’ in their approach describe the ‘unconscious’ aspect of language, how we as humans are born with a faculty for (verbal) communication, how language is processed and composed on a relatively non-conscious level, and how humans possess an innate Universal Grammar. As Miglio describes it, Formalism is “mechanistic, in the sense that [language] is explained in terms of architecture of the machine—a task not to be underestimated, considering that the machine in question is the human brain—rather than in teleological terms, as being determined by the speaker’s intentions” (Miglio 1999:225).

While the vast majority of Formalist theories are profoundly synchronic, Lightfoot has written extensively on diachronic issues while being firmly entrenched in the Formalist theory of language—chiefly his *Principles of*

*Diachronic Syntax* (1979), and to a lesser extent *How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change* (1991). For Lightfoot, it is re-analysis which takes center stage. There is a reason for speakers re-analyzing a given aspect of the grammar in that the grammar has a principle which requires transparency at all times.

The Transparency Principle requires derivations to be minimally complex and initial, underlying structures to be 'close' to their respective surface structures, and it must be conceived as part of the theory of grammar, and not as a component of a theory of (syntactic) change; it helps to define what constitutes a possible grammar of a particular natural language. (1979:121).

As for what is considered "minimally complex," Lightfoot gives no hint. What is clear for Lightfoot is that this Transparency Principle will guide the grammar in changes. For example, if two genders are formally indistinguishable in their inflection, the Transparency Principle will require that the grammar either differentiate them, or eradicate one of the gender inflections. Vincent (1974:435-436) states something similar to this, albeit in his case it is a combination of analogy and generative grammar which performs the same function. This line of argument is somewhat teleological in its own right, however it is not as teleological in nature as Keller (1994), as outlined in section 3.2.2. Lightfoot develops his position in discussing English modal verbs, and this approach is applicable to other areas of syntax and morpho-syntax. The Transparency Principle and re-analysis are used in order to characterize the way the grammar has changed diachronically (Lightfoot 1979:123). Therapeutic re-structuring is key to Lightfoot and many other Formalists. These types of changes improve the correlation between the surface structure and the deep structure, and are done "only when necessary and not randomly" (Lightfoot 1979:124). In other words, if

the Transparency Principle is violated, only at that point will the grammar change in order to eradicate the 'offending' aspect of the grammar.

From here, Lightfoot discusses the essential elements of a theory of change. There is one element in particular, that "less highly valued grammars are liable to re-analysis" (Lightfoot 1979:149-150), which leads to further complications, "[the] particular therapy may cause markedness elsewhere in the grammar, but this will not inhibit the change, because it seems to be the case [...] that grammars do not practice prophylaxis" (Lightfoot 1979:150). This therefore would enable a constant cycle of re-analysis. If one aspect of the grammar violates the Transparency Principle, it leads the speaker to re-analyze that aspect of the grammar and make subsequent changes in order to comply with the Transparency Principle. The resulting change affects the markedness of another aspect of the grammar, which in turn violates the Transparency Principle, leading to yet another re-analysis of the grammar, *ad infinitum*. It should be pointed out that "language learners do not re-design their entire grammar or practice sufficient prudence to check all the implications of a given change for all other areas of the grammar" (Lightfoot 1979:378), and so re-analysis is continued between the generations, *ad infinitum*. However, there is yet another constraint that limits certain therapies to certain languages, since some therapies will be more valued or more likely than others in a given language. Lightfoot, however, questions whether this process can be done independent of the grammar (1979:151). From this premise, Lightfoot argues that historical linguists must focus more on a theory of change rather than a theory of grammar.

Lightfoot later discusses what he sees as the causes of re-analysis. His view is based in discrepancies between surface structures and underlying

grammars, and how these discrepancies violate principles in the grammar. “[In] many instances the therapy takes the form of extending some already occurring surface pattern, i.e. such that the relevant forms can be construed as being base-generated without the mediation of several movement rules” (Lightfoot 1979:358). For Lightfoot, no principle can dictate how the re-analysis is to take place. The important aspect is that there must be re-analysis in order to simplify the rules or parameters involved in the grammar (Lightfoot 1979:359). As is discussed in Chapter 4, this does not answer any questions regarding which change is implemented, rather it only ‘explains’ that there is an impetus behind the change. Grammar rules must be re-analyzed in order to clear up any possible markedness or opaqueness. While Lightfoot states that he is against the use of analogy in language change, proof for him can be seen in the spreading of the Latin genitive marker *-i* to only fifth declension nouns and not third declension nouns (Lightfoot 1979:360), as well as child language patterns where they consistently produce analogical, but incorrect, forms such as *feets*, *mices*, and *mens* (Lightfoot 1979:361). However, he does state that analogy can be used as a tool in re-analysis (Lightfoot 1979:373).

### **3.2.2 Functionalism and Keller**

There are various definitions and explanations of Functionalism that have been published, which often include descriptions of speakers responding to changes in their speech community and altering aspects of a language in order to maintain communicativity (Aitchison 2001; Payne 1999; Newmeyer 1991; Keller 1997; Nettle 1999; Lass 1997). For the purposes of this dissertation, Functionalism is defined as follows: it is a theory of language change in which the focus is on the communicative aspects of language—how speakers truly

communicate with each other, the motivations behind change, and the reasons why aspects of language remain at stasis. As the name implies, it explains the goals and functions of a speaker (or a speech community), a change and a language. It is a teleological theory whose roots are in Martinet's work, particularly his theories of language change revolving around the Principle of Least Effort and the issue of communicativity. For Martinet, speakers may not always use language as a means of inter-personal communication; they could in theory be speaking just to speak, but there is still the structure of language (Martinet 1974:139). Both the structure and the context in which the given construction is used are important in the analysis of a language. Therefore, a change in the language, and not merely the ideal settings in which it can be used, is the focus of this theory (Martinet 1974:160). This combination of pragmatics, discourse analysis, morphology, phonology, syntax and semantics is the core of Functionalism. It is this core which Martinet establishes and the Functionalists use in order to create a school of linguistic theory which is different than that of the Formalists.

While there are many names associated with the Functionalist theory of language change, one that is often followed is Keller, who defines language as a "phenomenon of a third kind" (Keller 1997:15). This metaphor is an adaptation of a similar theory of economic tendencies by Adam Smith, and Keller's is but one application of Smith's original theory related to other realms (Keller 1994:68). For Keller, a "phenomenon of a third kind" represents something that is neither a natural phenomenon ("those phenomena which are made by God") nor an artifact ("those [phenomena] which are made by people") (Keller 1994:61). These phenomena of the third kind are unintended themselves, yet are the result

of an (intended) human action (1994:63). Keller states that these last types of phenomena, and in particular language, change via the Invisible Hand Theory. The theory contends that speakers do not intend to change an aspect of a language, but intend to communicate, and an invisible hand 'guides' them in this. It is not so much a tool as it is a characterization of a process, a combination of Martinet's Principle of Least Effort, and the additional twist suggesting that language is a 'phenomenon of the third kind'. Therefore, these changes are made by the speaker without the intention of making a change. According to Keller, the Invisible Hand Theory should have three steps:

1. The depiction of the motives, intentions, goals, convictions (and such like) on which the actions of the individuals who participate in the generation of the phenomenon in question are based, including the general conditions of their actions;
2. The depiction of the process that explains the generation of structure by the multitude of individual actions;
3. The depiction of the structure generated by these actions. (Keller 1994:70).

This entire process is still a functional one, says Keller. The choices that are made by the speaker are in the realm of possible choices for the given context, the given dialect, and the given language. They are done in the name of continued communicativity (Keller 1997:17). Furthermore, these explanations do not predict what will happen in the future. This is a theory based on observation only, and does not discuss hypothetical outcomes—a straight-forward contrast to Formalism and the generated grammars which are deemed 'plausible' for a given language (Keller 1994:71-72). This is another crucial aspect of Functionalism: the observation of language as it is used, characterizing both the language and the changes that have occurred over time as observed in their contexts. As

such, Keller believes that researchers should leave predicting future changes alone, and states that social and historical facts can be included to describe past and diachronic changes. It is these facts, along with linguistic facts, that are combined to make the 'motivation' for speaker change in the first place. For Keller, language is a cultural phenomenon, and as such "the explanation must always be based on individual actions. There is no direct route from historical facts which could claim to be an explanation" (Keller 1994:83-84). Functionalist linguistic explanations provide a means to understand "why [a construction exists], why it still exists, or why it no longer exists" (Keller 1994:85). It is clear that Keller places more emphasis on maintenance and stasis than Lightfoot.

The study of cultural and social motivations—community or collective goals—is important, although it must be noted that they start at the individual level (Keller 1994:87). Because language use is an individual creation, but one that is done within a community, Keller posits that the motivation is communication itself, and communication is influencing the change or phenomenon. If language use and change within the language itself is kept on the community level, it becomes a circular argument. Keller argues that by bringing the impetus back down to the individual level, the circularity is avoided. The communicative motivation is principally led by the individual striving for social status. Keller defines status as "striving for everything concerning our social co-existence, the important and the unimportant, the enduring and the ephemeral. Included here are goals like influence, affection, food, power, attention, being understood, being read, being accepted, having a mate, and such like" (Keller 1994:87-88). Most importantly, this 'social success' cannot be defined outside of abstracts concepts, because for each 'community' what is

successful is represented through different means. However, achieving social success is a 'universal' concept. The Invisible Hand can help us explain the "special function" that triggered the change, or even the need for a change, in the first place (Keller 1994:89). While some, such as Lass (1980) are against this teleological style of explanation. Lass explains that the speaker has an internal motivation for the change. Keller believes that the question of

most of the instruments of our language are functional is not due to the fact that we as speakers produce all sorts of useful instruments, but because we avoid the ones which are not useful over and over again in favour of those which seem more useful to us. This process of selection and filtering creates teleonomy without finality: unplanned functionality. (Keller 1994:89-90)

This is similar to Milroy (1992), who argues for network bonds and the manner in which speakers use those bonds to filter through language changes. The difference with Keller is his belief that the Invisible Hand explains how and why the changes are made. Yet it is clear that there is a conflict between the notions of language as a 'phenomenon of the third kind' on the one hand, and the concept of the individual changing language based on social motivation on the other, and it is a conflict which strikes at the core of Keller's theory.

As for stasis, Keller believes that this phenomenon is also derived from a maxim of action, but it is a maxim of homogeneity. This is opposed to heterogeneity, which brings change to language. While it may seem that a language is in a period of stasis, he believes that it is never quite the case. The language may seem to be functioning well, but it is dynamic and changing. This is where language would differ from other systems. In most systems, when they reach stasis, they are maintained as long as they function (Keller 1994:95). Regardless, there are various functions in a language, and Keller looks to Grice

and pragmatics to support his claim. The important aspect here is the relationship between the notion of communication and the speaker's pragmatic intention. For both Keller and Grice, "communicating means 'saying something and meaning something by it'" (Keller 1994:96-97). There is simply not a certain force behind the statement a person utters, but it is the passing of certain information or the withholding of other information that is what the speaker is communicating. What is more, it is not enough to say that a speaker intends to say something, or intends to communicate certain information, because the speaker possesses a certain logic in what he is communicating. Keller adds another important maxim: "Talk in a way in which you would believe the other would talk if he or she were in your place" (Keller 1994:99). It is analogous to the proverbial Golden Rule, but on a linguistic level, and follows Gricean approaches to language. The speaker talks in such a way so as the interlocutor understands and in doing so, the speaker may change his or her language, or perhaps conform to certain norms of speech. Naturally, this is influenced by how the speaker perceives the interlocutor's language, which the latter modified so that the former could understand him, and so on. This cyclical nature helps to maintain a semblance of stasis (Keller 1994:99). Additionally, the speaker models his speech according to the speech which surrounds him, an element to Keller's theory which is reminiscent of Lightfoot's argument. Unlike Lightfoot, Keller argues that this is done through a series of maxims, which all refer to the speaker trying to blend in with the other speakers around him. The speaker communicates in such a way as to not annoy the others in the target community, and to do all of this in a way that is of minimal effort or energy to the speaker himself (Keller 1994:100). All of these maxims will culminate in one final super

maxim: “Talk in such a way that you are socially successful” or “that you are most likely to reach the goals that you set for yourself in your communicative enterprise,” all of which is done “at the lowest possible cost” (Keller 1994:105-107). The teleological nature of this theory of language change is again clear.

Keller also looks at other tools for linguistic change and discusses their role with regard to the Invisible Hand. Specifically, he dismisses the notions of drift (Keller 1994:113-114) as well as markedness or ‘naturalness’ theories (Keller 1994:115-117), noting that both theories fail to recognize the role of stasis in diachronic linguistics. Keller, in agreement with Lass (1980), continues, “an established tendency is not the cause or the trigger of change; it is, rather, a descriptive generalisation of established phenomena of change” (Keller 1994:117). In this view, naturalness can have a place as an explanation-theory as long as the theory explains a *trend*, and not an individual case of a phenomenon. It cannot necessarily predict a trend will happen in the future, since this cannot be achieved in adherence to the Invisible Hand Theory (Keller 1994:120).

From here, Keller critiques both Formalism and Darwinian evolutionary theory. He summarizes that generativists believe that children often know the general environment of their language, but this is not done via conventions, which are “necessarily arbitrary,” rather via the grammar, which is innate (Keller 1994:129-130). All of this is contrary to his position. Keller’s main issue with the Formalists is their lack of observation of what is actually produced, and the contexts in which they are produced (Keller 1994:133). In fact, this echoes what was said in the concluding remarks of section 3.2.1. As for Darwinian evolutionary theory and its application to linguistic theory, it is a link that makes

Keller uncomfortable. He envisions a version of the theory of evolution that is beneficial to the study of cultural and social phenomena, and in particular to language. This can be done, he says, as long as the following conditions are met:

1. "The process should *not* be a teleological one; that is to say, we should not be dealing with a process which is carried out in a controlled fashion to achieve a preset goal" [emphasis original]. There can be a direction, but stating that a 'goal' is implied is not even true for biological evolution, so it should not be used for language or socio-cultural evolution.
2. "It must be a cumulative process." This is a process that is done by "populations."
3. "The dynamics of the process must be based on the interplay between variation and selection." (Keller 1994:144-145)

Once these conditions are met, it can be determined if 'phenomena of the third kind', and in particular, language can follow these conditions. Keller further notes that it "is definitely not a cumulative process" (1994:145-146), but he is less clear as to whether the dynamics are based on variation or selection. Croft (2000) will have this same discussion, which we will see in section 3.2.3. Regardless, Keller does try to apply the evolutionary model, using a 'meme' as the most basic linguistic unit, but does not provide a satisfactory answer to what this 'meme' could be, other than saying that "good linguistic memes are those whose use contributes to the success" to successfully achieve the speakers goal in communication (1994:147-148).

To show how Keller's theory can be used in the analysis of gender, García (1997) uses the Invisible Hand Theory to discuss the loss of the Spanish reflexive prepositional pronoun *sí* and the rise of the use of the third-person pronoun (*él, ella, ellos, ellas*) in its place. In comparing contexts for each of these pronouns over the history of Castilian Spanish, García posits that the

situation becomes one of weakening and bleaching. There is a recessive variant which is semantically bleached, such that speakers opt for an innovation as an alternative; the Invisible Hand guides speakers to this variant (García 1997:26). Once the innovation is entrenched in the grammar, its role expands, and eventually becomes the recessive variant and is bleached; thus repeats the cycle, allowing for changes in the grammar (García 1997:26). With respect to these reflexive and personal pronouns in Castilian, García shows that the role of *sí* started in specific “Intermediate” contexts, involving phrases that have an obvious antecedent. The use of this pronoun is expanded into those “Mediate” contexts that include referents, which are “accessible only via a different referent” (García 1997:30-32). As the Mediate contexts show increased use of *él*, *sí* is becoming bleached (García 1997:33); at the same time *sí mismo* is used in the Intermediate contexts (García 1997:35). As a result, the Invisible Hand is guiding speakers toward constructions which specify gender and number—which both *sí mismo* and the personal pronoun version *él mismo* do—thus strengthening the position of *él mismo* in particular, leaving *sí* to fall out of favor with speakers (García 1997:36). This theory seems to explain the switch from *sí*, a reflexive non-gender-inflected pronoun, to *él (mismo)*, a pronoun construction which incorporates inflection agreement; it also demonstrates how integral gender and number are in the grammar of Spanish. However, there is still an element of speaker awareness of change, albeit less so than Keller’s original theory. There arises another issue with García’s application of the Invisible Hand: the cyclical nature of the recessive variant and innovation. It seems similar to our objection to Lightfoot’s opacity and re-analysis process in language change, and leaves us asking the same question: what is the original impetus for change?

### 3.2.3 Evolutionary Theory

As a movement branching from Functionalism, some linguists intend to use biological evolutionary theory in order to create a linguistic theory that incorporates the same assumptions. Linguists supporting other theories such as Formalism, Functionalism, even Structuralism and earlier movements of the 19<sup>th</sup> century state that languages evolve, and several researchers have attempted to formalize that statement into a theory of language change. The connection between Functionalist and biological evolutionary theories has long existed, even in Martinet's writings. Indeed, linguists of all genres have been discussing the 'evolution of language' for almost as long as there have been researchers who study the components of language and its development. Once Darwin's theories and observations on biological evolution were published and widely read, social scientists have applied extrapolations of biological evolution in their work, to varying degrees and with varying success. The same can be said for linguistics. This includes taking names for biological evolution processes, such as exaptation, and applying them to linguistics (Lass 1990). Slight differences in approaches and in their scope exist, because there are obvious differences between organisms and language: language is a tool used by certain organisms to communicate. Later linguists such as Bichakjian (1988) and Croft (1996, 2000) define a true 'evolution of linguistic change' combining modern biological-evolutionary theory with how language is acquired and how it is developed in diachronic studies.

There seems to be two current branches of modern linguistic evolutionary theory, one defined by Bichakjian (1988), and the other by Croft (2000). Bichakjian discusses how aspects of Proto-Indo-European evolved over time

based on ease of learnability, while Croft employs theory in describing why change happens based on social dimensions. As discussed in section 1.2, Bichakjian's main argument revolves around the fact that there is a paedomorphic nature to both biological and linguistic evolution; for example, more abstract oblique cases such as the instrumental and ablative are often not learned until much later (ages 8-9) than are prepositional phrases (age 3) (Bichakjian 1988:93). Children use the mechanisms at their disposal, those variants that they have already acquired, in order to communicate. The earlier-acquired mechanisms (prepositional phrases) are then carried into the adult language at the expense of the other mechanism (instrumental/ablative cases); the adults in the speech community opt for the variant that they acquired earlier, thus showing the paedomorphic nature of language change (Bichakjian 1988:93). Bichakjian uses this rationale to discuss various inherent changes in Indo-European (1988:3). However, if the scenario that Bichakjian depicts for language change is true, if those elements learned later are replaced with those learned earlier, how is it that these elements are later replaced? If we say that Latin ablative was learned later than accusative and dative, and this along with the increased use of prepositional phrases led to the loss of the ablative, how do we explain the loss of the Latin accusative and dative? Did they become more difficult to learn than a system based on fixed word order? This area of language acquisition still needs to benefit from further research, and so a theory based on language acquisition and learnability is one which cannot be fully employed at this time. Therefore, Bichakjian's theory is not suitable for this investigation. What is more, because of Croft's ties to Functionalism and his adaptable theory

of language change, it is his work which will be used in this chapter and in this dissertation.

### **3.2.3.1 Croft's *Evolutionary Theory of Language Change***

Croft first came out of the Functionalist camp, and this is evident in his writings. He combines the social aspects of language, the force of the speech community, and the pragmatic and contextual considerations in language change with the functional load of the change in question. In his article "Linguistic Selection: An Utterance-based Evolutionary Theory of Language Change" (1996) and his further elaboration of the theory in *Explaining Language Change: An Evolutionary Approach* (2000), Croft formally enters the realm of evolutionary theory, taking his cue from writings in conceptual evolutionary theory and applying them to language change specifically, and linguistics in general.

For Croft, there are four instrumental concepts to this particular theory of language change: utterance, language, grammar and environment. They will set the stage for his theory and its link to biological evolutionary theory. For Croft, an utterance is a "particular, actual occurrence of the product of human behavior in communicative interaction (i.e. as a string of sounds), as it is pronounced, grammatically structured, and semantically and pragmatically interpreted in its context" (Croft 2000:26). A language is then defined by Croft as being "the population of utterances in a speech community" (Croft 2000:26), and is comprised only of those utterances which are actually produced and comprehended, not 'all possible utterances' or 'all utterances which can be generated'. This is a direct attack on Formalism and Generative Grammar, and shows the link to Functionalism, with its emphasis on observation of actual speech instead of abstract concepts of grammar. The definition of a grammar is

essentially the same, with the added element of its being comprised of structures based on utterances heard in the speech community (Croft 2000:26). Since language is based on actual utterances produced by speakers, grammar cannot be generated via Formalism but can be done informally. Therefore, Croft states that language use is generated by using the rules of grammar and actually producing an utterance. It is this combination of an abstract grammar and actual production of language which is going to be at the core of Evolutionary Theory. Finally, an environment is “the other members of the speech community, the social context of the speech event, and the goals of the speech event itself” (Croft 2000:27).

It is with this backdrop that Croft launches into linguistic Evolutionary Theory, using similar concepts to what is used in conceptual biological evolutionary theory. An utterance is analogous to a gene, the backbone of language. The replicating of these genes is seen in linguistic structures, both in formal or syntactic as well as semantic and discourse structures. “They exist in nested systems of more inclusive units, and with further complications (overlapping, discontinuity, intersection, etc.) that are well-known to students of linguistic structure” (Croft 2000:28). Much like language itself, these replicators/linguistic structures are spatiotemporally bounded and are specific to a given space and time. Croft creates a new word for these (formal) linguistic structures, ‘lingueme’, which stems from the concepts of ‘phoneme’ and ‘morpheme’. These linguemes have variants, and only one variant can occur in the appropriate structural position in any given utterance, much like phonemes and morphemes. The grammar is then acquired through hearing other utterances embodying these linguemes. “Knowledge of language is basically the

ability to replicate linguemes in the appropriate social-communicative contexts” (Croft 2000:29). These linguemes, and the utterances in which they occur, are the backbone for any grammar, as well as the elements which are to be analyzed when discussing both change and stasis in a given language.

Croft then turns to how utterances are ‘selected’ to continue on in the language. His Theory of Utterance Selection consists of three observations:

1. The theory does not “preclude the existence of selection processes in language change at other levels of the language, the individual and society,” but it assumes that “utterance selection is the primary locus of language change, and hence that most language changes can be accounted for in terms of utterance selection.”
2. The theory does not “entail a particular set of causal mechanisms for replication or selection of linguemes in utterances.”
3. The theory “puts linguistic convention at center stage. Normal (i.e. identical) replication of linguemes in utterances is conforming to the linguistic conventions of the speech community. Altered replication of linguemes in utterances—the creation of variants—is a causal consequence of not conforming to the linguistic conventions of the speech community.” (Croft 2000:30)

Since there is an emphasis on linguistic convention, changes are made only to enhance communicativity. There is a true motivation for the changes in language, something which is often missing from much of Functionalist theory. Croft’s theory shows that the selection of a variant, the change in the language is social, not functional; functional for Croft has a sense of external function which he uses to characterize innovation (Croft 2000:32).

The variants in a linguistic variation have social values associated with them. Speakers select variants to use—that is, to replace in particular utterances on the basis of the social values: overt or covert prestige, the social relation of the speaker to the interlocutor, etc. (...) This causes the differential perpetuation of the relevant replicators, that is, the differential survival/extinction of linguistic structures in utterances. In other words, it

is social factors, not functional factors, that play the same role in selection that ecological factors do in biology. (Croft 2000:32)

From this, one can see that language change is a result of a change in the social value of the lingueme in question. The speech community either no longer recognizes the lingueme or does not find it acceptable, and so another variant is selected. The value placed on the lingueme by the speech community is that of acceptance or recognition. This is similar to what Milroy (1992) proposes for a social or speech-community-driven impetus for change. Croft places emphasis on the pragmatic situation, rather than merely accounting for the social prestige or networking element of a given change in a given speech community. This means that, at any one time, any lingueme can have multiple variants or only one variant; there is no exclusion of multiple possibilities. This also gives Croft's Evolutionary Theory flexibility, something which both Lightfoot and Keller's theories lack. This 'battle for social acceptance' is the linguistic equivalent of 'the survival of the fittest'. The 'fittest' linguemes continue, and those which are not 'fit' will be dropped in favor of another variant. Therefore, this model allows for multiple variants to be in the language at any given time and affords the possibility of not only the use of multiple variants, but their 'competition' for continued use in the speech community. Over time, some variants will drop out of the language, others will continue, and still others will be created. This occurs on a constant basis by the speakers, as they re-interpret the introduction of new language. It is this replication of utterances, or the discarding of other utterances, which represents change or stasis in the given language. In order to demonstrate this link between his Evolutionary Theory of language change and that of Darwinian evolutionary change, Croft creates a table of terminology which

makes parallels between biological and linguistic evolutionary theories (2000:38) (Table 25).

Table 25: Paradigm of instantiations of general theory and selection in biology and language

General Theory of Selection	Paradigm Instantiations of Selection in Biology	Paradigm Instantiations of Selection in Language
replicator	gene	lingueme
replicator in a population	gene pool	lingueme pool
structure set of replicator	string of DNA	utterance
normal replication	reproduction by e.g. interbreeding	utterance production in communication
altered replication	recombination, mutation of genes	mechanisms for innovation
alternate replicators	alleles	variants
locus for alternative replicators	gene locus	linguistic variable
interactor	organism	speaker (including grammar)
environment	ecological environment	social-communicative context
selection	survival and reproduction of organisms	entrenchment of convention by speakers and its propagation in communication

While Table 25 shows strong parallels between biological and linguistic evolutionary theories, Croft is quick to point out that there are disanalogies between linguistics and biology. First is the role of functionalism. While functionalism is acceptable in biology, it is not in linguistics, because linguistic change is via social forces “that have little or nothing to do with functional adaptiveness for communication” (Croft 2000:39). Second, the relationship between the replicator and the interactor are different in biology and language. In biology, the genotype (replicator) produces the phenotype (interactor), but in linguistics it is the reverse: the grammar (interactor) produces the utterance (replicator). “This disanalogy has probably contributed to the notion that language change occurs through speakers’ grammars (child language acquisition) rather than through language use” (Croft 2000:39). Croft therefore

implies that it is not solely the listener changing his or her grammar in order to better accommodate or imitate the language which is spoken around him or her. Rather, it is a synthesis of this acquisition and constantly changing grammar on the one hand and the language spoken around the listener on the other, which can account for the changes that we see in a given language or the marrying of acquisition and use of language by a given speech community. However, for Croft, this disanalogy is not necessarily bad, nor does it weaken the argument for evolutionary attitudes towards language change. Because selection might occur at other levels of linguistic structures, “the specific relationship between grammar and utterance is not necessarily part of the evolutionary mechanisms of language change” (Croft 2000:40). Furthermore, the theory of biological evolution which he follows (Hull 1988) does not specify “what kind of causal mechanisms are involved, nor does it specify other sorts of causal relationships that may hold between [the replicator, the interactor and the environment]” (Croft 2000:40). There is room for maneuvering in these cross-disciplinary instantiations of the theory.

Under Croft’s theory, linguistic change centers around innovations that speakers create. Like Lightfoot, Croft believes that speakers and listeners take the language spoken around them and then analyze it subconsciously. This “abstraction and analysis” form the basis for change: speakers “produce new utterances based on abstraction and analysis that they have done on previous utterances. We are presented with grammatical wholes and must analyze them into their component units, syntactic and semantic, in the process of learnability and (re)using language” (Croft 2000:118). The way that speakers create the innovations, in Croft’s vernacular, is through Form-Function Reanalysis. This

method is non-intentional, meaning that speakers do not intend to make the changes (Croft 2000:118). The remapping of variants is the focus; speakers (re-)associate form-function relations in such a way that involves both the syntactical form and the semantic component, and can be extracted to the entire paradigm (Croft 2000:120). It is a more specific linguistic phenomenon than the re-analysis employed by Lightfoot, and has four processes associated with it: hyperanalysis, hypoanalysis, metanalysis, and cryptanalysis. Hyperanalysis is a process which leads to semantic bleaching and/or loss; the listener overanalyzes a particular syntactic construction and overextends the semantic content (Croft 2000:121). Hypoanalysis is the opposite; a syntactic construction is underanalyzed, and the listener ends up performing what Lass calls exaptation, or recycling (Croft 2000:126). Metanalysis is when both hyperanalysis and hypoanalysis are performed by the listener simultaneously (Croft 2000:130). Finally, cryptanalysis is when the listener reinforces a “covert” semantic or functional property of a syntactic construction, clitic doubling and negation reinforcement are examples here (Croft 2000:134). These are important language-internal processes performed by the listener (and the speaker), and are important tools in language change.

Smith (1996-1997) shows how this theory can be installed, in particular with reference to gender in Romance; what Smith finds demonstrates that Croft’s Evolutionary Theory has potential. The theory is used to analyze gender and number agreement between direct object (pronouns) and past participles in past tense constructions using ‘to have’: *passé composé* in French (*Il/elle l’a pris(e)*) and *pasatto prossimo* in Italian (*Lo/La ha preso/a; L’ha preso/a*), versus Spanish non-agreement in similar *presente perfecto* (*Lo/La ha tomado; \*La ha tomada*).

The questions for Smith are: 1) why is there such agreement in French and Italian (and some non-finite constructions in Catalan), but not in Spanish; and 2) if there is no ambiguity—if the direct object is known in the context, therefore the gender is known, why does there need to be any agreement between the direct object (pronoun) and the past participle (1996-1997:115)? One explanation is that there is liaison which causes ambiguity; there is ‘functional overkill’ built in (Smith 1996-1997:116). Smith uses Croft’s concepts of hypoanalysis and hyperanalysis, in particular to show that what listeners do is believe that the agreement, which is an essential/contextual trait dependent on its antecedent, is undergoing hyperanalysis, becoming a contingent/inherent trait (1996-1997:118). “In other words, the listener makes the abstraction not of the *form* of the agreement (the divided traits for two elements), but rather of [the] *act* of the agreement (the existence of the connection between the two elements)”<sup>25</sup> [my translation; emphasis original] (Smith 1996-1997:118). Therefore, one could say that this trait is evolving from a contextual/essential trait to one which is inherent/contingent, and it is done through the tool of hyperanalysis. Furthermore, there is evidence of ‘errors’—non-compliance of agreement between the direct object pronoun and the past participle—in Old French (Cohen 1963), which is mostly in *avoir* constructions; this can also be found in 13<sup>th</sup> century Italian and in some modern Italian and Catalan dialects (Smith 1996-1997:119). This is evidence of variation in speaker utterances, further showing that Croft’s Evolutionary Theory can be used to analyze morphosyntactical elements, specifically aspects of gender agreement.

---

<sup>25</sup> “En d’autres mots, l’auditeur fait abstraction non pas de la *forme* de l’accord (les traits partagés par les deux éléments), mais plutôt du *fait* de l’accord (l’existence du lien entre les deux éléments).”

### **3.3 CONCLUSION FOR THE CHAPTER**

In this chapter we have discussed various aspects of gender in Romance, delving deeper into the topics brought to light in Chapter 1. We have also expounded upon the three theories to be used in the data analysis: Lightfoot (1979, 1991), Keller (1994) and Croft (1996, 2000). After reviewing the literature, it becomes clear that although much has been written about gender as a category and as a phenomenon in Romance, there are still questions which have not been satisfactorily answered. In Chapter 4, we will see how the various questions posited in Chapters 1 and 2 are handled using the three language change theories which have been outlined in section 3.2. We have seen that these theories can be used to discuss aspects of gender agreement (Smith 1996-1997) and gender and pronoun selection (García 1997). We will now see that aspects of these theories can explain the research questions of this dissertation, and at the same time that there are still some questions yet to be addressed.

## Chapter Four: Data Analysis and Discussion of Language Change Theories

### 4.0 REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In the introductory chapter, a presentation of analyses in lexical gender assignment in Romance is discussed. The data obtained from the Miracles in Chapter 2 not only mirror previously reported data, but also continue to lead us to the same questions. In fact, with specific reference to the data in this dissertation, the research questions from Chapter 1 can be elaborated and the inconsistencies and trends which demand review can be discussed, as updated below:

1. Regularity of change: Based on the data in sections 1.1, 2. 3 and 2.4, there is regularity of change and stasis across the Romance languages. Why does gender change systematically? Why is there a high amount of stasis with masculine and feminine nouns? Why are neuter nouns incorporated into the early Romance languages with such regularity?
2. Differences in gender assignment: Why does the gender of certain words change between masculine and feminine? Here the focus is not on those nouns which change due to formal similarities to other nouns, but on those which seem to change gender spontaneously. In this discussion are the data in Tables 12-14, 16-17 and 22, all of which were part of section 2.3.1.

3. Gender ambiguity: Why is there fluctuation of gender assignments for certain nouns and not others? This is seen in section 2.3.2, as well as the Catalan *-or* nouns noted in section 1.1.3.1.
4. Lack of mass or collective markers: There is no evidence for a mass-gender in the Castilian data of the Miracles in section 2.3.4; why is there no such evidence, yet there seems to be such separate treatment in 16<sup>th</sup> century Castilian, as found in Harmon and Ojeda 1999?
5. Gender categorization: Why does the category of neuter gender evolve out of the language? Why has no such category been retained in the languages?

#### **4.1 APPLICATION OF THE AUTHORS' THEORIES TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Among the Formalists, it is with Lightfoot (1979, 1991) and not his predecessors that a satisfactory response can be found to the questions surrounding language change. This theory centers on the Transparency Principle and re-analysis. A level of opacity between the surface structure and the underlying grammar must be cleared up, and this is done via re-analysis of the grammar. Transparency is at the crux of Lightfoot's work, and in an effort to restore transparency, the re-analyzed grammar might, and oftentimes does, create more opacity in other areas. It is a cyclical process, one which has no end, and seemingly does not have an impetus.

Functionalism focuses not only on the grammatical constructions involved, but also on the context in which they are constructed or uttered. It is a fusion of modern linguistics theory with pragmatics and sociolinguistics, such that the historical and sociological ramifications are taken into account when

documenting and explaining language change. More specifically, Keller's approach revolves around the notion that language is a 'phenomenon of the third kind'. The Invisible Hand Theory is used to describe how changes occur and the changes the result of speaker motivations. However, the changes are not accomplished in ways obvious to speakers. It is as if an invisible hand is guiding the speakers to certain changes and away from constructions, sounds, and/or inflections which are no longer functional within the speech community. There are many linguistic tools used in this process including re-analysis, exaptation, perhaps even drift, but they are only tools, and do not explain why the language changes in the first place; the Invisible Hand provides this answer.

Croft's Evolutionary Theory (2000) is similar to Functionalism. Croft often blends Functionalism with sociolinguistic and pragmatic perspectives, and in many ways his evolutionary theory is a repackaging of those two genres. However, there is a substantially different component which is based in the biological evolutionary writings of Hull (1988). For Croft, language change is motivated by more than communicativity; there is a true adaptiveness which is placed on a particular construction, inflection, or phonological variant; either it is effective in its communicativeness, or it simply opted out for an alternative variant. Often there are multiple variants which are competing for supremacy at any one time, but the variant which best functions in the speech community is the one which will be maintained.

#### **4.1.1 The regularity of gender change from Latin to Romance**

Lightfoot's theory would view the system of grammar as changing in its entirety. There is a lack of transparency in the surface structures with the gender inflections in all declensions, both formal and semantic. Therefore, the

underlying grammar of Latin, which consists of three genders, has to be re-analyzed in order to fit with the groupings that are evident in the surface structure, thus resulting in the systematic handling of the category of gender in general. This combined with the collapse of the declension system and the case system result in a re-analyzed nominal inflection system, which subsequently consist of only two (nominal) gender categories.

If one applies Keller's theory to the question, it would lead to a social or pragmatic motivation for the systematic changes utilized throughout the Romance-speaking world. The lack of distinction between many of the word-final inflections in Latin is a source for confusion, which would cause speakers to communicate ineffectively. One could argue that because of the phonological and morphological confusion word-finally, speakers would need to maintain communicativity. This is where the Invisible Hand would nudge speakers toward a solution that continues to utilize the category of gender, yet maintains an acceptable level of communicativity. Therefore, under this theory, a move toward a binary gender system is the solution. Because certain forms are more unmarked—masculine of the second declension being perhaps the most unmarked—the speakers would have re-assigned neuter nouns to the gender which is the most unmarked and the most similar formally: the second declension masculine nouns. In this way, the tools of re-analysis and analogy are used by speakers in order to manipulate the grammar. The primary motivation is to successfully speak in a way that clears up any confusion that would have impeded communicativity in the language. Because of the clear inflectional and phonological distinction between first declension feminine nouns and second declension masculine nouns, there would have been clear communicativity and

therefore no motivation for change between the two options. The only area of confusion here is with the neuter nouns, and this where the Invisible Hand moves in and waves its magic.

Croft's theory would have a similar argument to that of Keller's. Due to the changes in inflection and phonology at the word-final position, there is confusion which blocks communicativity system-wide, hence the seemingly pan-Romance solution. Where Croft's theory would differ is in how the changes take place. The argument would be focused on the similarity between the second-declension masculine nouns and many of the neuters, along with the similarity between the first declension feminine nouns and plural neuter nouns, thereby allowing the speakers to choose an alternate variant which would minimize confusion. The speech community performs hyperanalysis and therefore changes the gender assignment from neuter to either masculine or feminine. Third declension nouns, which are not formed like their counterparts in the first and second declensions, would not be analyzed in a similar fashion with respect to inflection. The majority of nouns are feminine or masculine, so the speakers would have analyzed the gender assignment for the third declension nouns in the same manner as the first and second declensions. In other words, the masculine and feminine genders are more adaptive with their gender assignments, whereas the neuter nouns are less adaptive and ultimately are unadaptive in the Romance lexical gender system. The 'fittest' genders continue, while the one which was less fit evolved out of the system.

#### **4.1.2 Differences in gender assignment from Latin to Romance**

If employing Lightfoot's theory, it can be argued that there must have been a linguistic element which blocks the transparency between the surface structure

and the underlying grammar. This element would then cause the nouns to change gender category. In doing so, transparency would be restored, and there would be harmony in the system again. However, that element would be unclear, and probably would be language specific. Furthermore, because there is no such element documented in the Miracles, it is difficult to use this theory to accurately describe the situation in the languages.

Applying Keller's theory, it can be argued that there must have been an aspect of these nouns which blocks communicativity, and speakers implement more functional solutions which cause their gender assignment to switch. This is plausible, particularly when one looks at future attempts at standardization based on inflection and gender assignment. It is also reminiscent of the application of Lightfoot's theory above, but for different reasons.

Again, an analysis using Croft's theory would be similar to one using Keller's theory. There must be some element in the gender assignment of the words which blocks communicativity. Already having a two-gender system in place, the speakers must have opted for the variant which best suited communicativity, both in terms of adaptability as well as communicativity.

#### **4.1.3 Gender ambiguity from Latin to Romance**

The system is in transition due to all of the changes in the nominal inflection and categorization rules. This state-of-flux is proof under Lightfoot's theory that the grammar is in the process of being re-analyzed, with the ultimate proof being the subsequent stabilization in later stages of the languages.

An analysis using Keller's theory would turn to the role of the speech community. There is not one solution, innovation, or variant which is accepted

yet by the entire community, and therefore fluctuation in the system remains. Once one solution is accepted, the grammar will become more fixed and stable.

Croft's theory would point to the vacillation as proof that evolutionary practices were in play, much like Lightfoot's theory would point to this as proof that re-analysis is in full swing. However, the difference is that re-analysis is a tool, and the motivation behind using the tool is to maintain communicativity. Much like an analysis using Keller's theory, there are active variations but the speakers individually, as well as the speech community as a whole, still allow more than one variation to remain in their repertoire of linguemes without affecting communicativity. The argument is that the adaptive process is in working order, and that a selection would eventually be made in most cases. Furthermore, the push for standardization in later years would strengthen the selection process where necessary. With regard to those lexical items which still fluctuate, the theory would hold that both masculine and feminine variants continue to be viable options, since there are specific uses for each variant.

#### **4.1.4 Lack of mass or collective markers in the Miracles**

Lightfoot's theory would not provide an answer to this question. According to this theory, the Old Castilian grammar at the time of the *Milagros* must not have displayed opacity, and therefore must have needed to distinguish the mass and collective-reference nouns from the countable nouns, and subsequently not built into the underlying grammar.

It is unclear whether Keller's theory would be able to answer this question any better, other than to say that speakers at the time of the *Milagros* (1246-1252) have no need to separately mark mass or collective-reference nouns, but by the time of *Obra de Agricultura* (1516) such a necessity exists. This may be

the only explanation we can entertain, given the paucity of early data. There is no motivation in earlier Castilian, but perhaps the context of the language is the missing explanation. Folktales in the earlier work, agricultural and botanical topics in the later work and perhaps the social contexts of the two works together forces the writers/speakers to create alternative solutions in order to successfully communicate to their target audience. However, this explanation is flimsy at best.

Croft's theory would yield a slightly more satisfying analysis, which is similar to an analysis using Lightfoot's theory and would also point to a need which has not evolved in the language at the earlier date of the *Milagros*. If speakers at the 13<sup>th</sup> century in Castile have not yet made a separate inflection or assignment for mass or collective nouns, then it must not have been a barrier to communication at that time. Clearly some form of barrier is present in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and the variant available is one that was suitable for the environment. Croft's Evolutionary Theory might lead one to argue that hypoanalysis of a 'third gender' came into play, but given the time which elapsed between Latin and the *Milagros* data, approximately 800 years, this is difficult to accept. The fact that this separate semantic gender category subsequently evolved out of the standard Castilian dialect shows that the distinction is no longer necessary for the majority of Castilian speakers, and so is rotated out of the speech community. This is not true for northern Castilian or Asturian dialects, since it is maintained there.

#### **4.1.5 Gender categorization from Latin to Romance**

Much like the answer to the first question, an application of Lightfoot's theory would argue for a re-analysis of the entire category of gender. Since the

nominal morphology has been re-analyzed, leading to the nouns themselves being inflected with either masculine or feminine markers, the surface structure does not need a separate neuter category. Therefore, the underlying grammar is changed such that the entire category of neuter gender is eradicated from the grammar and the transparency between the underlying grammar and the surface structure is restored.

Applying Keller's theory, once the confusion between the neuter nouns and the others is resolved, there is no longer any motivation on the part of the speech community to continue with a neuter category. It is not until the later 'idiosyncrasies' from the mass gender of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Castilian, modern Asturian Spanish and modern South-Central Italian; the Italian double plurals and the Rumanian ambigeneric nouns; and the ambigeneric remnants in French, Occitan/Provençal and Rhaeto-Romance that a need for a separate treatment of a group of nouns based on lexical gender was demanded. Once confronted with this need, speakers resort to a system that is well-entrenched and fully detailed in the language, namely gender, as a means for describing the differences which they wished to communicate in the language. This reasoning results in many leaps. Latin never shows evidence of a separate marking for mass nouns, nor anything else based on semantic gender, therefore this use of Keller's theory would not be logical.

If one utilizes Croft's theory, the argument again centers on hyperanalysis. Once the non-neuter variation in the gender system is selected, there is no longer any use for a separate category for neuter. At that time, there is no need for a separate category for anything—mass nouns had not received their own inflection at that time, nor any other semantic or grammatical category, so it could

not be reused in any other way. Since adaptiveness is absent, the neuter gender is rotated out of the language. The speakers have no use for it anymore, and it cannot be recycled. The 'neuter' demonstratives and pro-phrase anaphora are the only remnant once the hyperanalysis is complete.

## **4.2 ANALYSIS OF THE AUTHORS**

### **4.2.1 A motion against Lightfoot**

Lightfoot's theory is good start, but there are issues which must be addressed. Re-analysis can be envisioned as playing a peripheral role in the change of gender category. The Romance gender inflection and assignment system as a whole is re-analyzed due to confusion or opacity between the various neuter forms and the masculine and feminine forms of the first two declensions, and perhaps these changes are done at a very early stage. It can also be argued that, from the behavior of the first two declensions, the third declension followed a type of structural analogy with regard to gender assignment but this analogical analysis is not usually the main tool for Lightfoot's theory. Furthermore, this theory would imply that the phonological erosion of consonants in word-final position is the impetus for this re-analysis. As noted in section 1.1.3, most linguists cannot distinguish whether the phonological changes, the changes in gender, the dismantling of the declension system, or the erosion of the case system are 'first', and indeed argue that they are relatively simultaneous, thus putting a large pock-mark on Lightfoot's theory. The required 'gradual change' in the style of a domino effect is not there.

Indeed, this is an aspect of Lightfoot's theory which needs to be addressed. Lightfoot's description of re-analysis, sounding much like analogy,

requires a series of changes to happen in a given order, much like the proverbial domino chain. But a domino chain has one lead domino which falls first and knocks over the next domino in line, thus creating a chain reaction. There is no impetus for this version of re-analysis, nor is there a specific starting point to the issue of gender category in early Romance. If, for the sake of argument, the phonological erosion of consonants in word-final position causes the opacity among the gender inflections in three of five declensions, then what causes the phonological erosion? Perhaps this is a process that exists in the early history of Latin. But one would be hard pressed to find such a beginning domino in that change which would lead to such changes. Furthermore, to compare such a late phenomenon to developments hundreds of years later is not logical according to this theory. Language change is gradual according to Lightfoot (1979:377), but there is too much of a leap from one period to another.

As for the discussion of the other research questions, there seems to be a missing element. We can accept the evidence of fluctuations of gender as proof that the grammar was still undergoing re-analysis, although certainly examples such as Castilian *mar*, which is still of 'ambiguous' or 'undecided' gender in modern times, and the various ambiguous reflections in tables 18-19 in section 2.3.2, seem to show a 'constant' re-analysis. The question still remains, why would these nouns be 'ambiguous' in their gender category? Other third declension nouns, those which do not have clear masculine or feminine inflections on the nouns themselves or those third-declension neuter nouns are almost without exception in a single gender category. Additionally, what is unique about *mar* in Castilian or the *-or* nouns in Catalan but not in the other Romance languages observed in this dissertation?

As for the lack of mass and collective-reference evidence in the Old Castilian data from the *Milagros*, Lightfoot's theory cannot answer this question. Admittedly, this is an area worthy of additional research. However, it should be noted that because Latin, in its various registers and stages, does not have a clear-cut inflection or categorization for mass and collective-reference nouns which is separate from those of countable nouns, it is perhaps not surprising that no data are found in the Miracles, and that no clear answer can be derived using the Lightfoot theory.

Another critical issue against Lightfoot is his discussion of the gradual nature of change, and how it manifests itself among generations. According to the author's earlier work (Lightfoot 1979), change is gradual, as the next generation learns imperfectly from the previous that language learners pick up language-specific parameters from the variations in the output they hear around them. This allows the language learner to modify his own internal grammar, thereby resulting in a different internal grammar than that of the models' (Lightfoot 1979:377). The question then remains, if children develop and fine-tune their grammars based on the output and surface structures of their models (their parents), then how can there be "large differences" in the underlying grammars between the generations, particularly if the surface structures are minimally, if at all, different? Further following his logic, if there is hardly any difference between the surface structures, then there is no opacity, which would require the cycle of re-analysis to slow down, if not stop all together, until the opacity would be such that re-analysis is required. Is this Lightfoot's way of introducing the concept of stasis, or is this a hole in his theory? In his later work on parameters, Lightfoot (1991) defines this relationship between the grammars

of the different generations, stating that there are new parameters that “may spread gradually though some speech community. That is, there may be a discrete change in the grammars of some individuals before the new parameter setting affects the grammars of others” (Lightfoot 1991:162). The basis for this line of thinking is in child language acquisition. The child’s triggering experience is based on the parent’s output, which gets interpreted into the child’s grammar in a slightly different fashion than that of the parent, and it is from this interpretation that the changes begin. Therefore, for Lightfoot, in a given speech community, similar changes can be happening, and there is a chain reaction formed. In Lightfoot’s view, grammars are individualistic. There is no one grammar for, say, Old English (to use Lightfoot’s example), rather there is a set of grammars, one for each speaker, which as a whole characterize the grammar of a given language (Lightfoot 1991:162). Despite the existence of these ‘individual grammars’, Lightfoot reports that “[if] one aggregates across dialects, genres, and time periods, one can study the global changes in much the same way that population geneticists study variations in the populations of species under various conditions” (Lightfoot 1991:163). However, it seems that in one breath Lightfoot advocates a language-specific set of parameters, with individual humans developing individual grammars, yet he is a strong advocate of Universal Grammar and the general universal principles of underlying grammars. Is it possible for one argument to exist with the other? Even if one is to assume that there is a difference between the internal grammar of a language which every speaker possesses on the one hand, and the overall general characteristics of the ‘grammar’ of the language, the inner workings of the language are actually evaluated and analyzed, rather than focus being placed solely on what has

changed. Furthermore, equal weight should be given to what has been (relatively) maintained. Yet, according to what Lightfoot has claimed, stasis is not given the same weight as change. Overall, there is much in these lines of inquiry that seems at odds with each other.

If re-analysis is the cause of further markedness and opacity, and more cases are identified where the speaker must perform a re-analysis of some aspect of the grammar, can the initial impetus for change be determined? Lightfoot does not give that answer, but does refute the possibility that external elements play a role, and in doing so does not discount the possibility of borrowing situations (Lightfoot 1979:382-383). Essentially, Lightfoot does not successfully address his own question, instead opting to critique borrowing, and later drift, as non-viable options. He does not himself state what starts the chain of re-analysis, which is truly unsatisfying. One is left asking which came first, the proverbial chicken or the equally proverbial egg.

A major area of critique of Lightfoot's approach is his theory tends to be "unnecessarily complicated" and "not always in accordance with existing data" (Fischer and Van der Leek 1981:301), and conflicting statements and unclear approaches to language change are evident. With Lightfoot's discussion on re-analysis and the Transparency Principle, it seems as though he is arguing that language must be constantly repairing opacity, but this seems counter-intuitive. First, maintenance or stasis does not seem to hold a place in Lightfoot's theory as many other theories, including Keller (1994) and Croft (2000). It is well known that languages do enter into periods of maintenance and stasis; they do not constantly change in every aspect of their grammar, or at the very least they do not do so at the surface level. Second, "[one] should, however, recognize that

there are also changes which are neither arbitrary nor necessary....Such changes do not have the effect of reducing opacity; on the contrary, it can be said that in this manner optimal advantage is taken of the possibilities provided by the (theory of) grammar” (Fischer and Van der Leek 1981:340). Some changes occur seemingly at the whim of the speech community, the addition of a mass gender, such as the one in Asturian Spanish, could be included in this. We have no explanation why this mass gender was created although it likely had utility. As such, Lightfoot’s theory is indeed a start and at that time it was one of the few theories of language change that revolved around syntactic change but yet it is not a satisfactory theory.

#### **4.2.2 A motion against Keller**

It seems that, overall, Keller’s theory does provide more answers in comparison to Lightfoot’s theory. As discussed in section 3.2.2, Functionalism is more in the realm of explaining why changes happen, whereas Formalism is better suited for explaining how a language changes. Generally speaking, Keller’s theory provides better answers for the research questions than does Lightfoot’s theory, but there are still areas requiring investigation. The answer for the fluctuating gender is fine in explaining those nouns which fluctuated gender assignment in the Miracles and later stabilized, but proves unsatisfactory for the modern examples: Spanish *el/la mar* is still not explained, nor the continued ‘undecided’ Catalan *-or* nouns. It is not likely this continued variation is a sign that the linguistic communities in Spain and Cataluña still have not ‘decided’ on a single gender assignment for these lexical items. As for the lack of a solid conclusion on the mass gender question, once again there needs to be more

research in the histories of these phenomena before a better answer can be reached.

While Keller's theory is truly explanatory, there are faults. Many researchers in Functionalism, Keller included, repeatedly argue that speakers are not aware of the changes that they make. Language is a 'phenomenon of the third kind'. The changes are made unintentionally by the speakers while being guided by the Invisible Hand, so that a certain level of communicativity is maintained by the speech community. However, much of the analysis using Keller's theory still exhibits some active intention of 'choosing' one variation over another. It is rather implausible that a speaker does not realize they are communicating in an inaccurate manner. In the situation described by Functionalists, it is through the reactions of the target audience, the speech community, that the speaker perceives the lack of communicativity, and from there the speaker (usually) shifts and maneuvers his language use in a way that will be accepted in that given context and in the given speech community. It would be ideal to go back in time and record Romance speakers, particularly in the later days of the Roman Empire; any attempts by Romance speakers to change strategies and retain the neuter, once they realize their intended meaning is not communicated, would be observed. With specific regard to this dissertation, if we had speaker (or writer) accounts that discuss the lack of communicativity between speakers, that speakers had to actively change their language in order to maintain communicativity, then we would be able to fully utilize Keller's theory, and do so in such a way that would be uncontroversial. This is impossible, of course, but it would be truly necessary in order to fully test Keller's theory. This is the trouble with diachronic studies and language theory,

that the only available sources in many cases are the texts and other written evidence that have survived. In this case, what are lacking are the mistake-ridden drafts of the authors of the Miracles, assuming they ever existed.

Lass (1997:336) accurately points to another, though related, flaw. Explanations of language change that are based in explaining human action do not function well, as they rely too much on inside knowledge of a given speaker that the linguist simply does not have—one cannot analyze the inner workings of the speaker's brain. Perhaps Keller's theory can produce a rebuttal such that one can observe speaker intentions through the actions of the speech community. Milroy (1992) identifies specific ways that one can gauge not only the introduction and acceptance of innovations into a speech community, but how these innovations are diffused into a group. Weak bonds, according to Milroy (1992) are formed between members of the speech community, in particular those who are members of many speech communities. These weak bonds to many communities are how innovations are introduced into a given speech community, and are either accepted or rejected by the other members. These weak bonds help to diffuse changes as well as maintain a type of equilibrium on other structures. This opposes previous research, including Weinrich, Labov and Herzog (1968), stating that prestige alone is the motivating factor for adopting certain constructions and innovations. Communication is always paramount, say the Functionalists, while the position of Lass, and my own would not necessarily disagree, one still has to question if it is always communicativity that is 'on the mind' of the speaker. Lass' main issue with any theory which uses human action in its explanation is its teleological nature. This is something that, as mentioned before, the linguist does not have and cannot

have, not only in the processing of grammar in general, but especially for specific changes in the speech of a given speaker (Lass 1997:336).

How can one 'understand' or get at 'the intention behind' or discover the 'meaning' of a shift from SOV to SVO, or a monophthongization, or a vowel-shift, etc., in any 'cognitive' or empathetic way, or 're-enact' them, or attribute them to 'reasons' or 'beliefs'? Especially as linguistic changes...typically unfold over very long periods of time, most often beyond the lifetime of any human 'actor'. (Lass 1997:339)

These theories therefore become irrefutable because of the fact that we cannot directly chronicle and analyze the thought processes, even the unintended ones, of the speakers, let alone those of the speech community. This is a valid point, although this is probably true for any theory of human behavior, including psychology, linguistics, and sociology, among others and therefore may not be a truly substantial counter-argument.

Another criticism of Functionalism from Lass, perhaps directed specifically at Keller and Milroy (1992) is their claim that language change must initially reside with the individual speaker, and from there it propagates out to the rest of the speech community. Lass' argument is one worth mentioning. If an individual initializes the change, how is it that the entire speech community eventually adopts only one variation? Change, he says, is not propagated on the individual level, regardless of it being linguistic, social or otherwise; "*certain particular individuals* may be crucially implicated in the diffusion of change through a community" [emphasis original] (Lass 1997:363), and one person or two people may initiate a change, but it must be accepted throughout the entire speech community. This is not always the case, and it seems to be too complicated a process for Lass. Croft (2000) has the same argument. It does not seem that there is a puppeteer pulling the strings on certain changes and holding back

others, yet this is what many Functionalists seem to purport, in a non-direct way (Lass 1997:364). Lass cites studies by Macaulay and Trevelyan (1973) that have shown that speakers within observed social classes produce approximately the same variables at a consistent rate, which results in one question, how did speakers 'know' what the other members of the study and those in their social class were going to produce? Since they cannot know this, it shows that the diffusion of individual changes into the speech community is suspect (Lass 1997:367). Finally, regarding 'functional motivation' and the role that pragmatics plays in language change, Lass does admit that there is some 'speaker manipulation' of the language, so that the intended utterance is in compliance with discourse and pragmatic situations. However, that is different than implying that language change over time, particularly in a non-pragmatic sense, is manipulated by the speaker so as to make the language 'function' better. Therefore, the distinction must be made with regard to time between utterances (which develop and unfold over "human, experimental time") on the one hand and change on the other. The latter occurs over "geological" time, meaning that humans are not usually aware of such change happening in their language and cannot usually act upon any change as it is happening. Therefore, one way to phrase it is that "a speaker engaged in a change is not an actor, but a victim" (Lass 1997:367-368). They are often unaware of any changes that occur, instead of being conscious of the changes and actively implementing them.

#### **4.2.3 A motion for Croft**

As one can see in section 4.1, Croft's Evolutionary Theory answers most of the questions satisfactorily; indeed, the only one left unanswerable regards the mass gender. Acknowledging that the paucity of early data hinders most any

diachronic analysis of the phenomenon, not only is this not surprising, but it is nearly expected. Regardless, an analysis which utilizes Croft's Evolutionary Theory can yield acceptable results, which is the primary goal of this dissertation.

In its application to the research questions, Croft's Evolutionary Theory is not much different than Keller's version of Functionalism. In many ways, Croft has taken Keller's Invisible Hand explanation and has given it a more obvious and concrete metaphor, an evolution of variants or linguemes in the language as governed by form-function re-analysis. However, there are some key differences, primarily with why the changes take place. Croft has a more detailed and more concrete metaphor which one can grasp. If humans, like all other living creatures, have evolved through the ages, so should the other aspects of our lives, with language perhaps being chief among them. One can see how adaptiveness and selection are used in language change, which leads to a more stable argument. Furthermore, Croft often seems to be taking the best elements of Keller's Invisible Hand (social movement of change, language of a third kind) and Lightfoot's Transparency Principle (an element keeps communication from flowing), and adds his own twist. Not only does language evolve in an unintentional manner, it does so through the four specific types of Form-Function Re-analysis: hyperanalysis, hypoanalysis, metanalysis, and cryptanalysis. Croft's theory can be used to explain both internal changes and those changes that stem from language contact situations; in both cases, there is interference, from which a series of innovations are created subconsciously by the speakers, which in turn provides the multiple variants needed for the evolutionary cycle. Some innovations will be permanent; some will be trends, only having a short lifespan; some will never be accepted by the speech community and become

extinct. This ability of being applicable to various linguistic scenarios is highly appealing, and lends itself to be included in multiple linguistic analyses. With specific application to this dissertation, it is Croft's theory which answers the research questions best. Not only are four of the five questions answered, the one question which is not well-answered, that of the lack of mass-neuter data in Old Spanish, can be analyzed in such a way which begins to shed light on the situations: perhaps at the time of Berceo speakers did not need to have a mass-neuter, but by the time Gonzalo de Alonzo writes in 1516 (as documented by Harmon and Ojeda 1999), there is such a need. While this area needs further research, if one applies Croft's theory for language change to a data set, one can derive an answer.

There are issues with Croft's analysis of language change. Principally, there are times when the links between biology and language are meant to be obvious, but the reader is lost in what is being said. Other critiques (Lightfoot 2002, Carstairs-McCarthy 2003) have noted the same issue. Croft does further clarify this idea in his critique of Kirby, Smith and Brighton (2004), stating that the focus is not solely on the linguistic conventions, but how speakers, as interactors, work within the environment. It is how they communicate and with whom they are speaking which "causes selection of linguistic structures in utterances. Both speakers and utterances play essential roles in an evolutionary model of change" (Croft 2000:610). Secondly, Croft's language does not always make clear his hesitation about the differences between biology and language with regard to the analogies he makes. Additionally, the reliance on utterances makes diachronic change difficult to characterize and document, unless the term 'utterance' is applied loosely and includes all written examples as examples of utterances.

While Croft does not explicitly state that this can be done, I feel that it is the necessary step to take in order to truly employ this theory. Without taking such a step, we have no way of recording and collecting true utterances in previous periods of time and for the purposes of this dissertation, any text is seen as a collection of utterances, ones which were uttered by a member of a given speech community, albeit in its written form. Lastly but quite importantly, there are no discussions of linguistic phenomena in the entire book. Therefore, Croft does not apply data to the theory that he details in the early chapters and in his 1996 article. He borrows data from other publications of language theory in order to prove his point, but does not center large portions of his book, let alone the entire theory, on original data or analysis of a linguistic phenomenon, language, or even language family. It is a significant flaw, and one which will hopefully be remedied in further publications. Indeed, Smith (1996-1997) and this dissertation are two tests for the theory, in order to see if the theory is pliable and maneuverable enough to be applied to actual data. That question has been demonstrated true, however, the data in this dissertation are limited, so this is only a small test; Smith (1996-1997) is also a test of an earlier, not fully developed version of the theory. More tests must be performed on the theory, utilizing larger sets of data, in order to fully capture the scope of the theory and its capabilities.

However, there is one glaring and unanswered issue which is at the forefront, the listener's and the speaker's awareness of change. While there are similar issues with Keller, there is at least some semblance of a concession, that he and the other Functionalists are aware that this is an issue with their theories. Keller attempts to divorce himself from that issue with his staunch admissions that speakers are not aware of, and do not intend to make changes in their

language use. It is not always believable or probable, but at least the effort is made. Croft does not attempt an explanation. He does mention that Form-Function Re-analysis is a non-intentional mechanism for innovation (2000:118), but this is the only mention of speaker (non-)awareness in the entire book. It does not seem to be a point that Croft wishes to make clear in the mind of the reader. Perhaps it is meant to be understood that any phenomenon or any organism which undergoes evolution is never aware of the process. Yet this does not seem to be intuitively correct. Again, how can a speaker make changes in his speech, opt for one variant over another in order to maintain clarity and communicativity, and at the same time not be aware of these changes? There is no attempt to discuss why speakers are not aware of these changes, or even an admission that they are possibly aware of changes in their language use. Additionally, Lass' argument against theories based on human action and thought processes applies here, although it seems to be less-glaring an issue.

On the other hand, one could use the lack of discussion of speaker- and hearer-awareness as a tool within this theory. In Hull's (1988) writing and in others in the biological evolution arena, there is no mention of an organism's awareness of the changes that have (or have not) taken place. It is assumed that the organism and others in its 'community' or 'species' accept any change that lies before them, they either adapt, or become extinct. One can say the same process exists for language. When there is an issue with the communicativity among the speech community, a given linguistic variant, element, or problem will be adapted, will be recycled or exapted, or will cease to be used. Lass has a similar argument, "a speaker engaged in change is not an actor, but a victim" (1997:367-368). If this logic is applied to Croft's theory, one is

led to the view that speakers must therefore be somewhat aware that there is a change needed in a given linguistic convention, albeit on a discourse level. It is because speakers are aware that they are not communicating effectively with the 'conventional' means that they create with, and often within, the language until they find the option or variant that works best. If they cannot reuse the previous linguistic element, or perform an exaptation, then it will cease to be used and will therefore die out of the language. This is different than the Functionalist view, in that the creative aspect of language is what is being changed, not specific elements of the grammar. Another variant is used, or another manner of constructing the intended idea, not necessarily a targeted elimination. It works for plants, animals, and aspects of human life and human behavior, much like Hull (1988) proposes.

Despite this omission of discussion regarding the awareness of the language users, Croft's theory does indeed do the best job in answering the research questions outlined above. The answers to each question correctly take into account the variability of language, and because of this, come closest in accurately describing both change and stasis given in this data. We could see in the Miracles data the various possibilities for the undecided-gendered nouns, the evidence for earlier variability and change, and the overall stability or stasis in the category of gender in the Romance languages. Croft's Evolutionary Theory can account for what we see in the Miracles data, as well as the data presented here by other researchers. Furthermore, it is because of the adaptability of the theory, and that of the language users, that this theory makes a good argument for the evolution of language. Many researchers have noted that language evolves, but with Croft's work, one can actually show how human language evolves over time,

between speech communities and diachronically within the language. It is through the tracking of variants and this acceptability that one can see change and stasis, and ultimately evolution.

One key distinction between Keller's theory and that of Croft is the latter's lack of preemptive change. In many Functionalist writings, including Keller, there seems to be a description of language change performed in order to avoid possible breaks in communicativity. It is something which Lass (1980:78-80) critiques, adding that one cannot 'anticipate' what will be the stumbling blocks of communication and change for the language. This line of logic often leads to the *ad hoc* nature of Keller's and the other theories of Functionalism. Croft's theory is set up differently, noting that there must be these errors or 'stumbling blocks' of communication already in existence; they would have to exist for the language users to act on. Perhaps these linguistic issues never make it to the written language, but they must have been in the everyday speech of the linguistic community, or these changes would never have evolved. Furthermore, this 'speed bump' must be common to the entire linguistic community under study, but not necessarily to other communities. If it is a common area of incommunicativity, then it will be globally addressed. If not, it will only be an issue in those speech communities which deem it so. This leads well to the seeming pan-Romance regularity with regard to both change and stasis in lexical gender. It is because of this individualization of the speech community, its relative independence and its distinction, that results in the adaptations that are performed. Speakers and hearers must be able to communicate within their own community first, and then with those who have weaker ties to the community or those weak-tied members who have links to other speech communities who will

introduce possible adaptations to other groups. If they are deemed 'acceptable' and 'useful' in the other speech communities, then the adaptations will persist across the speech communities. If not, and cannot be recycled or exapted, they will cease to exist. The criteria to make these choices are vague and indeed, Croft does not truly address this issue. If, however, this is a social-pragmatic theory, and communicativity is the central goal, this means that the criteria are to be determined by either pragmatic- or social-acceptability; this in turn implies that each speech community will have an 'acceptable' speech pattern or grammar. If communicativity is to be maintained, then one must speak in such a way that is acceptable. Even change must be done in accordance with the given speech community. This is not a new idea, and we saw this in particular with Keller (1994, 1997) and various sociolinguists. What makes Croft's theory stand apart is the concept that not only are there multiple variants of a given phenomenon, but that these multiple variants are accepted by a given speech community, and that this is done arbitrarily. Generally speaking, it will take time for these changes to cycle, with considerations for exceptions of immediate linguistic contact with another group, bilingual situations, and the like.

Upon analyzing the data in Chapters 1 and 2 again, there are various levels of 'abnormalities' with regard to gender. Portuguese and Sardinian seem to have few, if any, of these gender system anomalies, and this is seen in sections 1.1 and 2.3.4. French, Catalan, Occitan, Provençal, and Rhaeto-Romance have more of these gender anomalies, albeit in either fossilized forms or in reduced forms. Rumanian has conflicting issues with its ambigeneric nouns, and the Italian double plurals also exist. By far the most abnormal are Asturian Spanish and South Central Italian. These gradations of abnormalities

are similar, yet there are clear lines drawn between the types of anomalies. Those phenomena which are conflicting reassignments of the original loss of the Latin neuter, which is the vast majority, can be seen as alternate variants which show that members of the speech community are retaining the gender systems of their languages. These phenomena are not the dominant variant and many of these modern phenomena have been reported as being non-productive or have been eliminated from many dialects. It is only when we analyze the mass genders that we must take a different approach, as they have no real connection with any Latin construction and use a different criterion for marking gender, from a grammatical gender to a semantic one. Additionally, this phenomenon has not yet been linked to any change in the system of gender in the history of Romance. This mass group is created to fill a need in categorization, and because gender is such a strong category in Romance, it seems that the solution is to create a mass gender. Based on the information available, one cannot make much more than an educated guess, such as this one.

Is there a danger in describing language change in terms of communicativity and adaptiveness of linguistic tools? Lass (1980, 1997) would seem to think so, in that it is difficult to find evidence, one presumes written evidence, of said periods of incommunicativity. It is certainly dangerous to explain a language change in such a way that does not include 'communicativity' and 'adaptation' of speakers and their language use, or is this impossible to do? Indeed Lass, particularly in his 1980 work, does not provide details of how else to describe language change, short of describing how *not* to describe it. It is my belief that it is possible to describe the evolution of human language, both as a macro-concept as well as the individual speech communities and linguistic

entities, in these terms, but with the provision that the teleological aspect is not at the forefront of the theory. There is always an implied goal in human communication, to communicate our ideas, emotions, wishes and desires, and to do so in such a way as to be understood. In their native language, speakers do not consciously think of what structures are possible, at least not until their audience fails to understand what is being communicated, and only at that point does a given speaker consciously think of how to rephrase the utterance. But even at that level, one does not think in terms of 'gender' or 'number' within a given phrase. It is usually done through further description of the entity or more effective enunciation of the lexical item. This is different than in bilingual situations where a speaker has learned a second language later in life. Under these circumstances, more attention is paid to such grammatical entities as 'gender', 'number' and other inflectional categories. Regardless, Lass worries that by using a communicativity-based approach to language change a possible 'realm' where there is "massive 'communicative failure', gross enough to require action" (1980:85) is still unfathomable. But from one generation to the next, there is not usually such 'massive communicative failure', but perhaps 'stumbling blocks' which are removed over generations of speech. This seems to be born out by Croft's theory, which requires these stumbling blocks to be in place in the language before any change can occur.

To counter this issue, the approach advocated by Croft's Evolutionary Theory allows speakers to utter various alternatives in order to resolve a communicativity issue; just as an organism may have the potential to adapt to a change in the environment via various processes, language users do the same thing, allowing for multiple variants to exist in a given speech community at any

given time. Over time one adaptation generally 'wins out', although there can be others which are also used for a period of time. The same is true with language. Various methods exist to resolve, say, the changes in the gender system in early Romance exist, and indeed there seemed to be a few variations in the history of the language family. For the most part, a binary approach is better suited for the speakers, for whatever reason, and one must recognize there may not be a way to describe or document these reasons, since one cannot look inside the human brain as of yet and determine this—with some exceptions. Additionally, from the data in Chapter 2, there are examples of gender assignment changes and fluctuations in gender assignment, showing that the system is flexible for a period of time before the gender assignment system becomes more fixed. During this time, there are multiple options for the lexical items in question, and the speakers show their capability to adapt to a given system, work it into something which enhanced communicativity, and do it in such a way as to communicate within their community.

What is more, this approach to describing language change does not put strict timelines on the changes, and Lass (1997:305-307) is in agreement with this position. In fact, Croft's theory allows for there to be periods of stasis in the given speech community. Clearly, if there are no barriers to communicativity, the language will not change much, if at all. Speakers will continue to play with the language, as this is part of the creative aspect of the human mind, but will not gravely alter the language. Additionally, the adaptations are often internal structures and modifications which are based on the linguistic systems and tools already in place. There is no absolute new revelation in the data with regard to

gender; rather there was a paring down of the system as it is, with some reassignment of lexical items.

#### **4.3 CONCLUSION FOR THE CHAPTER AND THE DISSERTATION**

The goal of this dissertation is to analyze three different theories of language change with respect to a small set of data from the late Medieval period of French, Castilian Spanish, and Galician Portuguese. More specifically, this has been a test of Croft's Evolutionary Theory (1996, 2000), to discern if it is a viable theory. What has been shown is that while this Evolutionary Theory does indeed answer the research questions in an effective manner, and does so more effectively than do more accepted theories such as Lightfoot's Formalist diachronic-based approach (1979, 1991) and Keller's Functionalist Invisible Hand Theory (1994), there are still unanswered questions.

What Croft's Evolutionary Theory has answered, and I believe that it has done so well, is the question of the various 'idiosyncrasies', changes of gender, and multiple gender anomalies that many linguists have not been able to fully explain. In these cases, one can view the anomalies as examples of variants in the given speech communities, and that the variants at a given time are accepted. Where a gender change is evident it is often a case of hypoanalysis being performed on the grammar (or aspect of grammar). Where there is maintenance, which, when discussing the history of lexical gender as a category, is the bulk of the story, Croft's Evolutionary Theory allows for this. Clearly minute changes are evident due to slightly imperfect replications of the utterances heard by the speech community but overall there is great uniformity with regard to gender in Romance. Croft's theory allows for this, and even welcomes it.

Maintenance is reflective of successful communication like successful reproduction and propagation in biological theory.

It is in these questions where the application of both Lightfoot (1979, 1991) and Keller (1994) falter. Lightfoot's Theory (1979, 1991) can be used to describe some of the changes where Croft discussed the use of hyper- and hypo-analysis to the grammar; Lightfoot used the idea of opacity. The grammar in some aspect becomes suspect, thus 're-analysis' (or analogy) is employed to clarify. This explanation is highly cyclical, as each change-and-correction leads to yet another opaque element, thus requiring more 're-analysis'. Opacity and re-analysis might help to explain the changes in lexical gender or the loss of the neuter, but because no subsequent wholesale changes in the gender system following these changes are evident, this leaves one to wonder where the subsequent changes and opacity reside. Furthermore, such a theory does not allow for maintenance and stasis, and this is clearly needed in order to explain lexical gender in Romance.

The opposite is true for Keller's Invisible Hand Theory (1994) and its application to the research questions. Keller's theory adequately allows for stasis, and indeed can answer why there are changes in lexical gender and the loss of the neuter. However, in order to do so the theory implies that speakers make decisions about the functionality of the element of grammar in question, and then consciously decide to change the grammar. This is counter to what is commonly held by most linguists. Furthermore, this theory does not allow for multiple variants to co-exist in a speech community. Clearly this is needed in order to account for elements of the grammar, which seem to 'allow' multiple

variants. A teleological theory, which cannot be flexible or adaptable, is not suitable for this type of inquiry.

Therefore, Croft's Evolutionary Theory does indeed answer the research questions satisfactorily. However, there are grave issues with this theory, starting with the fact that this is a relatively untested concept. Outside of one study (Smith 1996-1997), there are few if any instantiations of applying this theory to a set of data. An additional issue with Croft's Evolutionary Theory is the lack of discussion of speaker awareness (or lack thereof). It is my belief that since organisms are not necessarily cognizant of changes that they undergo in biological evolutionary theory, such is also the case that speakers are unaware of changes to the grammar they use. This leaves the door open to the possibility of speakers observing changes in the past, but also means they cannot discern the changes as they happen in the speech community. Regardless, it is clear through the analysis performed in this investigation that this theory is viable, and that it is worthy of further investigation. Further applications of this theory, not only with respect to gender but case and other areas of morphology, should be conducted to further test Croft's theory.

The one area where none of the theories could adequately answer the research questions regards the mass gender, and the lack of evidence from the Miracles. It is not surprising that there is no conclusive answer; there is so little data regarding its history in Asturian Spanish and South-Central Italian, therefore there is little to analyze. As more data become available, this question can be re-evaluated.

Several limitations are inherent in this dissertation. First, the data analyzed for this topic, the five Miracles of Our Lady, came from a small sample,

not only of what Gautier de Coinci, Gonzalo de Berceo and King Alfonso X wrote, but of all 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century texts from France, Castile and Galicia. Further investigations must be completed on the other Miracle poetry, as well as other texts from that epoch. Additional analyses should be performed on similar texts from elsewhere in the Romance-speaking world in the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, and comparative studies to show similarities and differences to the data presented here. In particular, 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century South-Central Italian poetry, predominantly from the provinces of Le Marche and Umbria<sup>26</sup> are available which are comparable in time frame and would have great utility in an analysis similar to this one.

Further research, beyond what has been mentioned above, also includes analyses of the mass gender, in particular in Castilian and other northern Spanish dialects. It is clear no evidence of such a phenomenon comparable to the *Milagros de Nuestra Señora* studied here is known, therefore further analyses need to be performed on the other *Milagros*, as well as on other texts from the same epoch. More investigation must also be performed on Medieval Asturian Spanish texts, as Viejo Fernández (2003) recognizes. This must be completed to fully understand the history of the phenomenon. Until this happens, it is not possible to accurately describe and analyze the evolution of the mass-neuter phenomenon in Romance. Continued work on South-Central Italian from Medieval texts should also be considered, to better understand the history of the phenomenon in that speech community. Additionally, an update to the linguistic

---

<sup>26</sup> These are poems predominantly written by St. Francis of Assisi and fellow members of the Catholic religious orders of the area; many of the poems are written anonymously. Volumes of this poetry can be found in von Wartburg (1946), Monaci (1912/1955) and Ugolini (1959), among others.

situation in both Asturias and South-Central Italy is needed, so that one can analyze the current usage, if any, of the mass gender.

There are problematic sets of data which have troubled researchers in the Romance languages, two of which are discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, including Spanish 'undecided' *mar*, and the terms for flowers, fruit and trees. Further research both within the frameworks applied in Chapter 4 as well as in the history of the Romance languages is required in order to better characterize the lexical gender of these nouns. Further research on gender loss in other Indo-European languages should be performed, so that lexical gender in all of Indo-European can be better understood.

## **Appendices**

- A: Latin Nominal Declensions
- B: French Ambigeneric Nouns
- C: Romance Masculine and Feminine Minimal Pairs
- D: Latin-to-Romance Noun Comparisons
- E: Mass- and Collective-Reference Nouns in the Miracles Data

**APPENDIX A: CLASSICAL LATIN DECLENSION SYSTEM (BALDI 1999:312, 317, 322, 327, 330, AND 333)**

	o-stem 2 <sup>nd</sup>				a-stem 1 <sup>st</sup>	c-stem 3 <sup>rd</sup>		
Singular								
	'garden'	'master'	'man'	'war'	'gate'	'chief' m	'voice' f	'stone' m
nom	hortus	magister	vir	bellum	porta	princeps	vox	lapis
voc	horte	magister	vir	bellum	porta	princeps	vox	lapis
acc	hortum	magistrum	virum	bellum	portam	principem	vocem	lapidem
gen	horti	magistri	virī	belli	portae	principis	vocis	lapidis
dat	horto	magistro	viro	bello	portae	principi	voci	lapidi
abl	horto	magistro	viro	bello	porta	principe	voce	lapide
loc	domi 'at home'			belli 'in the time of war'	Romae 'at Rome'			
Plural								
nom	horti	magistri	virī	bella	portae	principes	voces	lapides
voc	horti	magistri	virī	bella	portae	principes	voces	lapides
acc	hortos	magistros	viros	bella	portas	principes	voces	lapides
gen	hortorum, hortum	magistrorum, magistrum	virorum, virum	bellorum, bellum	portarum	principum	vocum	lapidum
dat	hortis	magistris	virīs	bellis	portis	principibus	vocibus	lapidibus
abl	hortis	magistris	virīs	bellis	portis	principibus	vocibus	lapidibus

							i-stem 3 <sup>rd</sup>	
Singular								
	'merit' f	'conqueror' m	'sea' n	'likeness' f	'custom' m	'race' n	'cough' f	'fire' m
nom	virtus	victor	aequor	imago	mos	genus	tussis	ignis
voc	virtus	victor	aequor	imago	mos	genus	tussis	ignis
acc	virtutem	victorem	aequor	imaginem	morem	genus	tussim, tussem	ignem
gen	virtutis	victoris	aequoris	imaginis	moris	generis	tussis	ignis
dat	virtuti	victori	aequori	imagini	mori	generi	tussi	igni
abl	virtute	victore	aequore	imagine	more	genere	tussi	igni, igne
Plural								
nom	virtutes	victores	aequora	imagines	mores	genera	tusses	ignes
voc	virtutes	victores	aequora	imagines	mores	genera	tusses	ignes
acc	virtutes	victores	aequora	imaginem	mores	genera	tussis, tusses	ignis, ignes
gen	virtutum	victorum	aequorum	imaginum	morum	generum	tussium	ignium
dat	virtutibus	victoribus	aequoribus	imaginibus	moribus	generibus	tussibus	ignibus
abl	virtutibus	victoribus	aequoribus	imaginibus	moribus	generibus	tussibus	ignibus

		u-stem 4 <sup>th</sup>			5 <sup>th</sup>	
Singular						
	'animal' n	'fruit' m	'hand' f	'horn' n	'day' m	'thing' f
nom	animal	fructus	manus	cornu	dies	res
voc	animal	fructus	manus	cornu	dies	res
acc	animal	fructum	manum	cornu	diem	rem
gen	animalis	fructus	manus	cornu (-s)	diei	rei
dat	animali	fructui	manui	cornu (-ui)	diei	rei
abl	animali	fructu	manu	cornu	die	re
Plural						
nom	animalia	fructus	manus	cornua	dies	res
voc	animalia	fructus	manus	cornua	dies	res
acc	animalia	fructus	manus	cornua	dies	res
gen	animalium	fructuum	manuum	cornuum	dierum	rerum
dat	animalibus	fructibus	manibus	cornibus	diebus	rebus
abl	animalibus	fructibus	manibus	cornibus	diebus	rebus

**APPENDIX B: FRENCH AMBIGENERIC NOUNS (GREVISSE 1986: 760-768)**

Noun	Meaning in Masculine	Meaning in Feminine
<i>aigle</i> (< <i>aquila</i> (?> OProv. <i>aigla</i> ))	➤ male eagle	➤ female eagle
<i>amour</i> (< <i>amor</i> )	normal lexical gender assignment ➤ 'love'; 'Cupid/Love/Eros' ➤ m.pl. 'mating'	➤ feminine plural 'sexuality'; 'mating'
<i>chose</i> (<Jurid.Lat. <i>causa</i> )	➤ substitutes for a noun that one cannot remember, or which one wants to avoid using	normal lexical gender assignment 'thing'
<i>délice</i> (< <i>delicium/deliciae</i> )	➤ delight, pleasure (count)	➤ delights, pleasures (collective)
<i>foudre</i> (< Pop.Lat. * <i>fulgura</i> < CLat. <i>fulgur</i> 'lightning' < <i>fulgere</i> 'to shine')	➤ 'cask'; 'true warrior ( <i>foudre de guerre</i> )'	➤ 'lightning' ➤ f.pl. 'wrath'
<i>gens</i> (< <i>gens</i> )	➤ 'people' ('indeterminate' gender)	➤ 'people', 'group of people' ➤ (from the Latin) 'gens'
<i>hymne</i> (< <i>hymnes</i> < Gk. <i>hymnos</i> )	➤ 'chant, poem'; 'ode' ➤ 'Christian song'	➤ 'Christian song'
<i>merci</i> (< <i>merces/ mercedem</i> 'salary, price' (> LLat. 'favor, grace'))	➤ 'thank you'	➤ 'mercy'
<i>œuvre</i> (< <i>opera</i> < n.pl of <i>opus</i> )	➤ ensemble of work	normal lexical gender assignment ➤ 'activity, work, human action'
<i>orge</i> (< OProv. <i>ordi</i> < <i>hordeum</i> )	➤ 'barley' the plant	➤ 'barley' the culinary dish
<i>orgue</i> (< Ecc.Lat. <i>organum</i> < Gk. <i>organon</i> )	➤ 'organ', musical instrument	➤ f.pl. 'one or many instruments'; emphatic use <i>grandes orgues</i>
<i>pâque</i> (< Pop.Lat * <i>pascua</i> < Lat. <i>pascua</i> 'food' < <i>pascha</i> < Gk. <i>paskha</i> < Heb. <i>pesah</i> 'passage')	➤ m.sg. 'Easter day' (the date)	➤ f.sg. 'celebration of Jewish Passover' ➤ f.pl. 'celebration of Christian Easter'; Easter Communion

<p><i>période</i> (&lt; <i>periodus</i> 'period' &lt; Gk. <i>periodos</i>)</p>	<p>➤ 'Age or degree of evolution of a thing, moment in the life of a person, the highest degree that a person or a thing can obtain'</p>	<p>normal lexical gender assignment, 'period of time, space'</p>
<p><i>personne</i> (&lt; <i>persona</i> 'personage, person' &lt; Etrus. 'theater mask')</p>	<p>indeterminate gender—general, non-specific (not common)</p>	<p>normal lexical gender assignment, 'person'</p>

## APPENDIX C: MASCULINE AND FEMININE MINIMAL PAIRS IN ROMANCE

### Portuguese<sup>27</sup>:

Masculine	Gloss	Feminine	Gloss
<i>lenho</i>	'trunk of a tree'	<i>lenha</i>	'wood for burning'
<i>braço</i>	'arm'	<i>braça</i>	'brace [unit of measurement based on the length of an arm]'
<i>fruto</i>	'fruit, offspring, product'	<i>fruta</i>	'fruit [botanical]'
<i>madeiro</i>	'beam, girder'	<i>madeira</i>	'wood' [general term]
<i>ôvo</i>	'egg'	<i>ova</i>	'fish eggs'
<i>ramo</i>	'branch, bough'	<i>rama</i>	'branches, foliage'
<i>bicho</i>	'general animal, vermin'	<i>bicha</i>	'collective term for worms, leeches'
<i>bico</i>	'beak of a bird'	<i>bica</i>	'fountain, pipe, conduit'
<i>cesto</i>	'basket, scuttle'	<i>cesta</i>	'basket, coop'
<i>dobro</i>	'double, doubleness'	<i>dobra</i>	'fold'
<i>lagarto</i>	'lizard'	<i>lagarta</i>	'caterpillar'
<i>poço</i>	'well, shaft'	<i>poça</i>	'splash, puddle, pool'
<i>o corte</i>	'cut, incision'	<i>a corte</i>	'court'
<i>o grama</i>	'gram [weight measurement]'	<i>a grama</i>	'grass, grama-grass'
<i>banho</i>	'bath, bathroom'	<i>banha</i>	'lard, fat, drippings'
<i>cabeço</i>	'hill, mound'	<i>cabeça</i>	'head'
<i>cortiço</i>	'hive, beehive'	<i>cortiça</i>	'cork, bark, crust'
<i>candeio</i>	'flame for nighttime fishing'	<i>candeia</i>	'lamp, light, candle'
<i>veio</i>	'vein in wood or stone'	<i>veia</i>	'vein in general'

### Spanish<sup>28</sup>:

Masculine	Gloss	Feminine	Gloss
<i>brazo</i>	'arm'	<i>braza</i>	'brace, unit of measurement'
<i>huevo</i>	'egg'	<i>hueva</i>	'roe'
<i>velo</i>	'veil, bridal veil'	<i>vela</i>	'veil, sail' <sup>29</sup>
<i>gesto</i>	'facial expression'	<i>gesta</i>	'deeds of a hero'
<i>leño</i>	'log, wood'	<i>leña</i>	'firewood'

<sup>27</sup> All data taken from: Tessier 1989:74; Vazquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz, 1971:370.

<sup>28</sup> All data taken from Menéndez Pidal 1968:217.

<sup>29</sup> *vela* also means 'candle', but the etymology is unrelated to *vela* 'veil, sail'.

**Catalan<sup>30</sup>:**

Noun	Masculine Gloss	Feminine Gloss
<i>art</i>	'fishing net'	'art'
<i>mar</i>	'sea'	'the state of the waves or tide'
<i>vessant</i>	'valley side'	'slope'
<i>son</i>	'sleep, the act of sleeping'	'sleep, the want to go to sleep'
<i>llum</i>	'lamp'	'light'
<i>fi</i>	'objective, ending'	'terminus, end'
<i>còlera</i>	'cholera, sickness'	'anger, irritation'
<i>salut</i>	'salute'	'health'

**Occitan/Provençal<sup>31</sup>:**

Masculine	Gloss	Feminine	Gloss
<i>folh</i>	'leaf'	<i>folha</i>	'leaf'
<i>os</i> (pl. <i>osses</i> )	'individual bones'	<i>la ossa</i>	'all the bones, skeleton'
<i>vestimen</i>	'garment, piece of clothing'	<i>vestimenta</i>	'the clothes that one is wearing'
<i>braz</i> > <i>bras/brasses</i>	'arm'	<i>bras(s)a</i> > <i>brassas</i> pl.	'arms as a set, fathom'
<i>ram</i>	'tree branch'	<i>rama</i>	'tree branch' (via analogy from <i>folha</i> )
<i>fruch</i>	'fruit' (also often used as a mass noun, with <i>frug</i> )	<i>frucha</i>	'fruit'
<i>prat</i>	'meadow'	<i>prada</i>	'meadow'
<i>cilh</i>	'eyelash'	<i>cilha</i>	'eyelash'
<i>crit</i>	'shout'	<i>crida</i>	'cries, shouting' (collective words)
<i>gra(n)</i>	'grain'	<i>grana</i>	'seed'
<i>fau, fag</i>	'beech-tree'	<i>faia</i>	'beech-wood' (wood coming from the beech tree)
<i>bestial</i>	'cattle, animals'	<i>bestia</i>	'cattle'—only found in a poem, could be poetic license

<sup>30</sup> All data taken from Wheeler, Yates and Dols, 1999:27 and Badia Margarit 1951:133.

<sup>31</sup> All data taken from Jensen 1986:1-8.

**Rhaeto-Romance<sup>32</sup>:**

Dialect	Masculine	Gloss	Feminine	Gloss
Friulian	/il rover/	'oak tree'	/il rovere:t/	'oak grove'
Puter	/il penam/	'plumage'	/la pena/	'feather'
	/il boʃc/	'tree'	/la boʃca/	'trees'
Romansh	/krap/	'rock'	/krapa/	'rocks (f.)'
Sumeiran	/iʎ mejl/	'the apple'	/la mejla/	'apples'
Vallader	/il dajnt/	'finger'	/la dajnta/	'fingers'

---

32 All data taken from Haiman and Benincà 1992:121-122.

**APPENDIX D: COMPARISON OF NOUNS OF THE SAME LATIN ETYMON FOUND IN THE MIRACLES OF OUR LADY**

Table 26: Latin masculine nouns into Romance

Number	(Classical) Latin—Gender	Old Castilian—Gender	Old Galician Portuguese—Gender	Old French—Gender
1	<i>hominem, homines</i> - M	<i>omne, omnes</i> - M	<i>ome</i> - M	<i>hom, home, homme</i> - M
2	<i>filium, filios</i> - M	<i>fijo, fijos, fijuelo</i> - M	<i>fill(o)</i> - M	<i>fix, fiex, fil, fiels</i> - M
3	<i>saporem</i> - M	<i>savor, sabor</i> - M	<i>sabor</i> - M	
4	<i>alterum, alteros</i> - M	<i>otro, otros</i> - M	<i>outros</i> - M	
5	<i>patrem</i> - M	<i>padre</i> - M	<i>padr(e)</i> - M	<i>pere</i> - M
6	<i>focum, focos</i> - M	<i>fuego, fuegos</i> - M	<i>fogo</i> - M	<i>feu, feus</i> - M
7	<i>unus, unos</i> - M	<i>uno, unos</i> - M		<i>uns</i> - M
8	<i>diem, dies</i> - M	<i>día, días</i> - M	<i>dia</i> - M	<i>jor, jors</i> - M
9	<i>regem, reges</i> - M	<i>reï, rey reïes</i> - M	<i>rei, rey</i> - M	<i>roi, roy, rois, roys</i> - M
10	<i>monicum, monicos</i> - M	<i>monge</i> - M	<i>monge</i> - M	<i>moigne, moignes</i> - M
11	<i>abbatem, abbates</i> - M	<i>abad, abades</i> - M	<i>abad'</i> - M	
12	<i>inimicum, inimicos</i> - M	<i>enemigo, enemigos</i> - M		<i>anemi, anemis</i> - M
13	<i>fratrem, fratres</i> - M	<i>fraire</i> - M	<i>frad(e)</i> - M	<i>frere</i> - M
14	<i>diabolum, diabolos</i> - M	<i>d'ablo, d'ablos</i> - M	<i>diabo, diablo, diabres</i> - M	<i>dyable, deable</i> - M
15	<i>angelos</i> - M	<i>ángeles</i> - M		<i>angeles, angele</i> - M
16	<i>seniorem</i> - M	<i>señor</i> - M		<i>seignor, sire, seignor</i> - M
17	<i>honorem</i> - M	<i>(h)onor</i> - M and F (PregAb)		<i>honeur</i> - M
18	<i>episcopum, episcopos</i> - M	<i>obispo, bispo, obispos</i> - M	<i>bispo</i> - M	<i>evesque, evesques, vesques</i> - M
19	<i>oculos, oculum</i> - M	<i>ojo, ojos</i> - M		<i>iex, ielz</i> - M
20	<i>paradisum</i>	<i>paraíso</i> - M		<i>paradys, paradis</i> - M

Number	(Classical) Latin - Gender	Old Castilian - Gender	Old Galician Portuguese - Gender	Old French - Gender
21	<i>magistrum, magister, magistros</i> - M	<i>maestro</i> - M		<i>maistre, maistres</i> - M
22	<i>christianum, christianos</i> - M	<i>cristiano, christiano, christianiello</i> s - M	<i>cristãos</i> - M	<i>cretiens</i> - M
23	<i>peregrinum, peregrinos</i> - M	<i>peregrino, peregrinos</i> - M		<i>pelerins</i> - M
24	<i>duellum</i> - M	<i>duelo</i> - M		<i>duel</i> - M
25	<i>mundum</i> - M	<i>mun</i> do - M		<i>monde</i> - M
26	<i>amicum, amicos</i> - M	<i>amigo, amigos</i> - M		<i>ami, amis</i> - M
27	<i>ventrem</i> - M	<i>vientre</i> - M		<i>ventre</i> - M
28	<i>amorem</i> - M	<i>amor</i> - M	<i>amor</i> - M	<i>amor</i> - M
29	<i>pavorem</i> - M	<i>pavor</i> - M, <i>pavura</i> - F	<i>pavor</i> - M	<i>paour, peür</i> - M
30	<i>cancellarium</i> - M	<i>cancellario</i> - M		<i>chancelier</i> - M
31	<i>pedem, pedes</i> - M	<i>pies</i> - M		<i>piez, pié</i> - M
32	<i>clericum</i> - M	<i>clérigo, clérigos</i> - M		<i>clerçon, clerçons, cleric, clers</i> - M
33	<i>liber, librum, libros</i> - M	<i>libros</i> - M		<i>livre, livres</i> - M
34	<i>furnum</i> - M	<i>forno</i> - M	<i>forn(o)</i> - M	<i>fornel</i> - M
35	<i>metum</i> - M	<i>miedo</i> - M	<i>medo</i> - M	
36	<i>dolorem</i> - M	<i>dolor</i> - M	<i>doo</i> - M	<i>diex</i> - M
37	<i>latronem</i> - M	<i>ladrón</i> - M		<i>larron</i> - M
38	<i>leonem, leones</i> - M		<i>leões</i> - M	<i>lion, lyon, lyons</i> - M
39	<i>lectum</i> - M		<i>leito</i> - M	<i>lit</i> - M
40	<i>florem</i> - M	<i>flor</i> - F	<i>fror</i> - M	<i>fleur</i> - F
41	<i>colorem</i> - M	<i>color</i> - F [ModSp M]	<i>coor</i> - M	
42	<i>ordinem</i> - M		<i>ordin, orden</i> - M	<i>ordre</i> - M
43	<i>annum</i> - M	<i>año, años</i> - M		<i>ans</i> - M

Table 27: Latin feminine nouns into Romance

	(Classical) Latin - Gender	Old Castilian - Gender	Old Galician Portuguese - Gender	Old French - Gender
1	<i>villam</i>	<i>villa</i> - F		<i>vile</i> - F
2	<i>gentem, gentes</i> - F	<i>yent, yentes</i> - F	<i>gente</i> - F	<i>genz, gens, gent</i> - F
3	<i>dominam, dominas</i> - F	<i>dueña, dueñas</i> - F	<i>dona, donas, donzel</i> - F	<i>dame, damoiselle</i> - F
4	<i>matrem</i> - F	<i>madre</i> - F	<i>madre</i> - F	<i>mere</i> - F
5	<i>pacem</i> - F	<i>paz</i> - F	<i>paz</i> - F	<i>pais, país</i> - F
6	<i>manus, manum, manum</i> - F	<i>mano, manos</i> - F	<i>mão</i> - F	<i>main, mains</i> - F
7	<i>gratiam, gratias</i> - F	<i>gracia, gracias, gratia</i> - F	<i>graça</i> - F	<i>grace, graces</i> - F
8	<i>civitatem</i> - F	<i>cibdat</i> - F		<i>cité</i> - F
9	<i>ecclesiam</i> - F	<i>eglesia</i> - F	<i>eygreja</i> - F	<i>eglise</i> - F
10	<i>iram</i> - F	<i>ira</i> - F		<i>ire</i> - F
11	<i>parabolam</i> - F	<i>palavra, palabra</i> - F		<i>parole</i> - F
12	<i>animam, animas</i> - F	<i>alma, almas</i> - F		<i>ame, ames</i> - F
13	<i>horam</i> - F	<i>ora</i> - F		<i>eure</i> - F
14	<i>causam, causas</i> - F	<i>cosa, cosas, cosiella, cosiellas</i> - F	<i>cousa</i> - F	<i>chose</i> - F
15	<i>buccam</i> - F	<i>boca</i> - F	<i>boca</i> - F	<i>bouche</i> - F
16	<i>casam</i> - F	<i>casa</i> - F	<i>cas(a)</i> - F	
17	<i>noctem</i> - F	<i>noche</i> - F	<i>noit'</i> - F	<i>nuit</i> - F
18	<i>rationem, rationes</i> - F	<i>razón</i> - F	<i>razon</i> - F	<i>raison, raisons</i> - F
19	<i>bestiam, bestias</i> - F	<i>bestia, bestias</i> - F		<i>beste</i> - F
20	<i>paenitentiam</i> - F	<i>penitencia, penitencia</i> - F		<i>penitance</i> - F
21	<i>linguam</i> - F	<i>lengua</i> - F		<i>langue</i> - F
22	<i>reginam</i> - F	<i>reína, reína</i> - F		<i>roïne</i> - F
23	<i>terram, terras</i> - F	<i>tierra, tierras</i> - F		<i>terre</i> - F
24	<i>veritatem, veritates</i> - F	<i>verdat, verdad</i> - F		<i>verité, veritez</i> - F
25	<i>navem, naves</i> - F	<i>nave, naves</i> - F		<i>nef</i> - F
26	<i>vitam</i> - F	<i>vida</i> - F	<i>vida</i> - F	<i>vie</i> - F
27	<i>mortem</i> - F	<i>muert, muerte</i> - F	<i>morte</i> - F	<i>mort</i> - F
28	<i>operam, operas</i> - F	<i>obra</i> - F		<i>werves</i> - F
29	<i>virgo, virginem, virgines</i> - F	<i>virgo, vírgenes</i> - F	<i>virgen, virgem</i> - F	<i>virge, verge</i> - F
30	<i>gloriam</i> - F	<i>gloria</i> - F		<i>gloyre</i> - F
31	<i>mercedem, mercedes</i> - F	<i>merced, mercet, mercedes</i> - F		<i>merci, mercis</i> - F

	(Classical) Latin - Gender	Old Castilian - Gender	Old Galician Portuguese - Gender	Old French - Gender
32	<i>stellam, stellas</i> - F	<i>estrella</i> - F	<i>estrela</i> - F	<i>estoyles</i> - F
33	<i>imaginem</i> - F	<i>imagen</i> - F		<i>image, ymage</i> - F
34	<i>pietatem</i> - F	<i>pïadat</i> - F		<i>pitiez</i> - F
35	<i>visionem</i> - F	<i>visiön, vissiön</i> - F	<i>vison</i> - F	
36	<i>litteram, litteras</i> - F	<i>letras</i> - F		<i>letre</i> - F
37	<i>pars, partim/partem</i> - F	<i>part</i> - F		<i>part, pars</i> - F
38	<i>barcam</i> - F	<i>barca</i> - F		<i>barge</i> - F
39	<i>palmam, palmas</i> - F	<i>palma</i> - F		<i>Paumes</i> - F
40	<i>ripam</i> - F	<i>ribera</i> - F		<i>rive</i> - F
41	<i>devotionem</i> - F	<i>devociön</i> - F		<i>devotiön</i> - F
42	<i>famam</i> - F	<i>fama</i> - F		<i>fame</i> - F
43	<i>scholam</i> - F	<i>escuela</i> - F	<i>escol(a)</i> - F	<i>escole</i> - F
44	<i>hostiam, hostias</i> - F	<i>ostia</i> - F	<i>ostias</i> - F	
45	<i>poenam</i> - F	<i>pena</i> - F	<i>pëa</i> - F	<i>painne</i> - F
46	<i>legem</i> - F	<i>lege</i> - F		<i>loi</i> - F
47	<i>turrem</i> - F	<i>torre</i> - F		<i>tor</i> - F; <i>turel</i> - M
48	<i>rugam</i> - F		<i>rua</i> - F	<i>rue</i> - F
49	<i>rem</i> - F		<i>ren</i> - F	<i>rien</i> - F
50	<i>aquam</i> - F	<i>agua</i> - F	<i>agua</i> - F	
51	<i>vox, vocem, voces</i> - F		<i>vozes</i> - F	<i>vois</i> - F
52	<i>faciem</i> - F		<i>ffaz</i> - F	<i>face</i> - F
53	<i>fornacem</i> - F	<i>fornaz</i> - F		<i>fornaise</i> - F
54	<i>voluntatem</i> - F	<i>voluntad, boluntat</i> - F		<i>volenté</i> - F

Table 28: Latin neuter nouns into Romance

Number	(Classical) Latin - Gender	Old Castilian - Gender	Old Galician Portuguese - Gender	Old French - Gender
1	<i>tempus</i> - N	<i>tiempo, tiempos</i> - M		<i>tanz</i> - M
2	<i>miraculum, miracula</i> - N	<i>miraclo, miraclos, miráculos</i> - M	<i>miragr(e)</i> - M	<i>myracle, miracle, myracles</i> - M
3	<i>altare</i> - N	<i>altar</i> - M	<i>altar</i> - M	<i>autel</i> - M
4	<i>bracchia</i> - N	<i>brazos</i> - M	<i>braços</i> - M	
5	<i>cor, cordem</i> - N	<i>corazón</i> - M	<i>coraçon</i> - M	<i>cuers, cors, corage</i> - M
6	<i>caelum, caela</i> - N	<i>cielo, cielos</i> - M		<i>cielz, ciel, celz</i> - M
7	<i>servitium</i> - N	<i>servicio</i> - M		<i>service, servise</i> - M
8	<i>marem, maria</i> - N	<i>mar, mares</i> (SC both genders; pl = masc; PregAb fem only)	<i>mar</i> - M	<i>mer, mers</i> - F
9	<i>consilium, consilia</i> - N	<i>consejo, concejo</i> - M		<i>consilliez</i> - M
10	<i>solum, sola</i> - N	<i>solares, suelo</i> - M		<i>seul</i> - M
11	<i>saeculum</i> - N	<i>sieglu</i> - M		<i>siecle</i> - M
12	<i>caput</i> - N	<i>cabo, cabillo</i> - M ('tail')	<i>chapel</i> (<Fr) - M	<i>chief, chapitre</i> - M
13	<i>nomem</i> - N	<i>nomne</i> - M		<i>non, nons</i> - M
14	<i>caementum</i> OR <i>coemeterium</i> - N	<i>cimiterio</i> - M		<i>cymetere, cymentere</i> - M
15	<i>sepulcrum</i> - N	<i>sepulcro</i> - M		<i>sepucre</i> - M
16	<i>ministerium</i> - N	<i>ministerio, menester</i> - M		<i>menestrelz</i> - M
17	<i>canem</i> - C	<i>can</i> - M		<i>chien, chiens</i> - M
18	<i>talentum</i> - N	<i>talent</i> - M		<i>talent, mautalent</i> - M
19	<i>gaudium</i> - N	<i>gozo</i> - M		<i>joie</i> - F
20	<i>festu</i> - N	<i>feita</i> - F		<i>feste</i> - F

## APPENDIX E: MASS- AND COLLECTIVE-REFERENCE-NOUNS

Table 29: Mass- and collective-reference nouns found in the Miracles of Our Lady

	Word	Gloss	only singular	only plural	SG and PL	Other	Gender change
Old French	<i>chevolz, chavel</i>	hair			X		M > M
	<i>feu, feus</i>	fire				nom vs. acc, likely	M > M
	<i>amor</i>	love	X				M > M
	<i>honeur</i>	honor	X				M > M
	<i>diex</i>	pain	X				M > M
	<i>ventre</i>	guts, entrails	X				M > M
	<i>voirre</i>	glass	X				M > M
	<i>terre</i>	land	X				F > F
	<i>ire</i>	ire	X				F > F
	<i>char</i>	flesh	X				F > F
	<i>genz, gens, gent</i>	people			X		F > F
	<i>merci, mercis</i>	mercy, grace			X		F > F
	<i>grace, graces</i>	grace			X		F > F
	<i>mort</i>	death	X				F > F
	<i>gravele</i>	gravel, sand	X				F > F
	<i>fain</i>	hunger	X				F > F
	<i>glory</i>	glory	X				F > F
	<i>volonté</i>	will, wish	X				F > F
	<i>misericorde</i>	misery	X				F > F
	<i>fame</i>	renown, reputation	X				F > F
	<i>pitiez, pieté</i>	piety			X?		F > F
	<i>bonté</i>	kindness	X				F > F
	<i>vergoigne</i>	shame	X				F > F
	<i>leece</i>	heavenly happiness	X				F > F
	<i>boële</i>	intestines	X				M > F
	<i>infame</i>	dishonor	X				M > F
	<i>sanc</i>	blood	X				N > M
	<i>genolz, genoillons</i>	knees		X			N > M
	<i>tanz</i>	time		X?			N > M
	<i>cornes</i>	horns		X			N > M
	<i>joie</i>	joy	X				N > F
<i>Subtotals</i>	31		22	3	5	1	

	Word	Gloss	only singular	only plural	SG and PL	Other	Gender change
Old Castilian	<i>sabor/ savor</i>	desire, want	X				M > M
	<i>fuego, fuegos</i>	fire			X		M > M
	<i>h/onor</i>	honor	X				M > M, M > F
	<i>pañó</i>	wool, woolen cloth	X				M > M
	<i>vientre</i>	guts, entrails	X				M > M
	<i>amor</i>	love	X				M > M
	<i>pavor</i>	fear	X				M > M
	<i>pavura</i>	fear	X				M > F
	<i>seso</i>	discretion, sense, wits	X				M > M
	<i>pudor</i>	modesty, shame	X				M > M
	<i>calor</i>	heat	X				M > M
	<i>calura</i>	heat	X				M > M
	<i>miedo</i>	fear	X				M > M
	<i>dolor</i>	pain	X				M > M
	<i>dineros</i>	money		X			M > M
	<i>yent, yentes</i>	people			X		F > F
	<i>paz</i>	peace	X				F > F
	<i>gracia/gratia, gracias</i>	thanks			X		F > F
	<i>ira</i>	ire	X				F > F
	<i>voluntad/ boluntat</i>	will, desire	X				F > F
	<i>tierra, tierras</i>	land			X		F > F
	<i>verdat/verdad</i>	truth	X				F > F
	<i>agua</i>	water	X				F > F
	<i>vida</i>	life	X				F > F
	<i>muert/muerte</i>	death	X				F > F
	<i>gloria</i>	glory	X				F > F
	<i>cardat, cardades</i>	care, tenderness			X		F > F
	<i>merced/ mercet, mercedes</i>	mercy, grace			X		F > F
	<i>salud/salut, saludes</i>	heathy, greetings			X		F > F
	<i>piadat</i>	pity; piety	X				F > F
	<i>farina</i>	flour	X				F > F
	<i>nieves</i>	snow(s)		X			F > F
	<i>devoción</i>	devotion	X				F > F
	<i>fama</i>	fame	X				F > F
	<i>passión</i>	passion	X				F > F

	Word	Gloss	only singular	only plural	SG and PL	Other	Gender change
Old Castilian	<i>lana</i>	wool	X				F > F
	<i>presura</i>	swiftness, agility	X				F > F
	<i>foguera</i>	large bonfire	X				F > F
	<i>cenisa</i>	ash	X				F > F
	<i>pena</i>	pain, pity	X				F > F
	<i>potencia</i>	power	X				F > F
	<i>yerva</i>	grass, herb	X				F > F
	<i>fianza</i>	loyalty	X				F > F
	<i>pereza</i>	laziness	X				F > F
	<i>infamia</i>	infamy	X				F > F
	<i>massa</i>	dough	X				F > F
	<i>justicia</i>	justice	X				F > F
	<i>culpa</i>	blame	X				F > F
	<i>dissensión</i>	dissension	X				F > F
	<i>ardura</i>	anguish	X				M > F
	<i>lavor</i>	labor, work	X				M > F
	<i>sangre</i>	blood	X				N > M
	<i>cuitados</i>	the worried ones		X			N > M
	<i>tiempo, tiempos</i>	time			X		N > M
	<i>brazos</i>	arms		X			N > M
	<i>corazón</i>	heart, courage	X				N > M
	<i>cielo, cielos</i>	sky, heaven			X		N > M
	<i>daño</i>	damage	X				N > M
	<i>ijares</i>	flank, loin		X			N > M
	<i>ijadas</i>	flank, loin		X			N > F
	<i>gozo</i>	joy	X				N > M
	<i>odio</i>	hate	X				N > M
	<i>leche</i>	milk	X				N > F
	<i>misericordia</i>	misery	X				N > F
<b>Subtotals</b>	<b>63</b>		<b>48</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	

	Word	Gloss	only singular	only plural	SG and PL	Other	Gender change
Old Galician Portuguese	<i>amor</i>	love	X				M > M
	<i>pavor</i>	fear	X				M > M
	<i>medo</i>	fear	X				M > M
	<i>pan</i>	bread	X				M > M
	<i>fogo</i>	fire, kiln	X				M > M
	<i>sabor</i>	desire	X				M > M
	<i>do</i>	pain	X				M > M
	<i>grado</i>	will, volition	X				M > M
	<i>fumo</i>	smoke	X				M > M
	<i>gente</i>	people	X				F > F
	<i>morte</i>	death	X				F > F
	<i>paz</i>	peace	X				F > F
	<i>vida</i>	life	X				F > F
	<i>agua</i>	water	X				F > F
	<i>arêa</i>	sand	X				F > F
	<i>graça</i>	grace	X				F > F
	<i>vergonna</i>	shame	X				F > F
	<i>devoçon</i>	devotion	X				M > M
	<i>trigo</i>	wheat	X				N > M
	<i>braços</i>	arms		X			N > M
	<i>mel</i>	honey	X				N > M
	<i>coraçõ</i>	heart, courage	X				N > M
<i>Subtotals</i>	<i>22</i>		<i>21</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>116</b>		<b>91</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	

## References

- Aitchison, Jean. 2001. *Language Change: Progress or Decay?* 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alatorre, Antonio. 1993. *Los 1,001 años de la lengua española*. 2nd edition. Mexico City: Tezontle.
- Alvar, Manuel ed. 1996. *Manual de dialectología hispánica*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Ansaldo, Umberto. 2003. "Explaining Language Change (Review)." *Functions of Language* 10:122-128.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1989. *Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. 2nd edition. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Arias Cabal, Álvaro. 1998. "Diacronía del incontable o 'neutro de materia' en asturiano." In Giovanni Ruffino (Ed.), *Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza*. Tübingen: Neimeyer. 35-49.
- Azevedo, Milton M. 1984. "Loss of Agreement in Caipira Portuguese." *Hispania* 67:403-409.
- Baciu, Ioan. 1989. "Encore et toujours le neutre roumain." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 34:315-318.
- Badia Margarit, Antonio. 1951. *Gramática histórica catalana*. Barcelona: Noguer.
- Badia Margarit, Antonio. 1962. *Gramática catalana*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Baldi, Philip. 1999. *The Foundations of Latin*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bailey, Charles-James N. and Karl Maroldt. 1977. "The French Lineage of English." In J. Meisel, *Langues en contact—Pidgins—Creoles—Languages in Contact*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 21-53.
- Bauer, Brigitte. 2000. *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European: The Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bechert, Johannes. 1982. "Grammatical Gender in Europe: An Areal Study of a Linguistic Category." *Papiere zur Linguistik* 26:23-34.

- Beekes, Robert S.P. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Translated by UvA Vertalers/Paul Gabriner: *Vergelijkende taalwetenschap. Een inleiding in de vergelijkende Indo-europese taalwetenschap* (1990).
- Bello, Andrés and Rufino J. Cuervo. 1970. *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. Buenos Aires: Sopena.
- Bello, Andrés. 1988. *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. Madrid: Arcos.
- Benediktsson, Hreinn. 1986. "Olcel. *oxe, uxe*: Morphology and phonology." *NOWELE* 7:29-97.
- Beretta, Carlo. 1999. *Miracoli della Vergine: Testi volgari medievali*. Turin: Giulio Einaudi.
- Bichakjian, Bernard H. 1988. *Evolution in Language*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Publishers.
- Blasco Ferrer, Eduardo. 1984. *Storia linguistica della Sardegna*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1934. *Language*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Bossier, Willem. 1986. "O sufixo léxico -ão, ajuntado a bases livres, do ponto de vista sincrónico." *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 20:7-33.
- Bryant, William H. 1984. "Demythifying French Grammar." *The French Review* 58:19-25.
- Buck, Carl Darling. 1942. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. 3rd impression of 1933 edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, Lyle. 1993. "The Explanation of Syntactic Change: A Historical Perspective." In Jaap Van Marle (Ed.), *Historical Linguistics 1991: Papers from the 10th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Amsterdam, 12-16 August 1991*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 49-69.
- Cano Aguilar, Rafael. 1992. *El español a través de los tiempos*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.

- Carballo Calero, Ricardo. 1968. *Gramática elemental del gallego común*. 2nd edition. Vigo: Galaxia.
- Carstairs-McCarthy, Andrew. 2003. "Explaining Language Change (Review)." *Diachronica* 20:203-206.
- Cassirer, Ernst A. 1971. "Structural Analysis of Language." In Bertil Malmberg (Ed.), *Readings in Modern Linguistics: An Anthology*. Stockholm: Lärmedelsförlagen. 79-96.
- Chaurand, Jacques. 1999. *Nouvelle histoire de la langue française*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Chitoran, Ioana. 1992. "The Romanian Gender System in the Framework of Markedness Theory." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 37:177-190.
- Clivio, Gianrenzo. 1976. *Storia Linguistica e Dialettologia Piemontese*. Turin: Centro Studi Piemontesi.
- Cohen, Marcel. 1963/1966/1970. *Nouveaux regards sur la langue française*. Paris: Éditions sociales.
- Cohen, Marcel. 1967. *Histoire d'une langue: Le français (des lointaines origines à nos jours)*. 3rd edition. Paris: Éditions Sociales.
- Corbett, Greville G. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Corominas, Joan. 1954. *Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Croft, William. 1990. *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, William. 1995. Bringing Chaos into Order: Mechanisms for the Actuation of Language Change. Paper presented at *The International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, University of Manchester.
- Croft, William. 1996. "Linguistic Selection: An Utterance-based Evolutionary Theory of Language Change." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 19:99-139.
- Croft, William. 1997. "On Language Change." *Journal of Pragmatics* 27:393-402.

- Croft, William. 1999. "What (Some) Functionalists Can Learn from (Some) Formalists." In Michael Darnell et. al. (Eds.), *Functionalism and Formalism in Linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 87-110.
- Croft, William. 2000. *Explaining Language Change: An Evolutionary Approach*. New York: Longman.
- Crowley, Terry. 1999. "The Rise and Fall of Languages (Review)." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 19:109-115.
- da Silva Neto, Serafim. 1952-1957. *História da Língua Portuguesa*. Rio de Janeiro: Livros de Portugal.
- da Silva Neto, Serafim. 1956. *Fontes do Latim Vulgar: O Appendix Probi*. 3rd edition. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria Acadêmica.
- da Silveira Bueno, Francisco. 1967. *Grande dicionário etimológico-prosódico da língua portuguesa*. São Paulo: Edição Saraiva.
- de Azevedo Maia, Clarinda. 1986. *História do Galego-Português: Estado linguístico da Galiza e do Noroeste de Portugal desde o século XIII ao século XVI*. Coimbra: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica.
- de Beaugrande, Robert. 1997. "On History and Historicity in Modern Linguistics: Formalism Versus Functionalism Revisited." *Functions of Language* 4:169-213.
- de Saussure, Ferdinand. 1994/1916. *Curso de lingüística general*. Madrid: Alianza. Translated by Amado Alonso.
- Dekeyser, Xavier. 1980. "The Diachrony of the Gender System in English and Dutch." In Jacek Fisiak (Ed.), *Historical Morphology*. Berlin and New York: Mouton Publishers. 97-111.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2000. *The Rise and Fall of Languages*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. and Ursula Doleschal. 1990-1991. "Gender Agreement via Derivational Morphology." *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 40:115-137.
- Duarte i Montserrat, Carles and Àlex Alsina i Keith. 1984. *Gramàtica històrica del Català*. Barcelona: Curial.

- Elcock, W. D. 1960. *The Romance Languages*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Ernout, Alfred. 1909. *Les éléments dialectaux du vocabulaire latin*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honor Champion.
- Ernout, Alfred. 1927. *Morphologie historique du latin*. nouv.ed. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Ernout, Alfred. 1954. *Aspects du vocabulaire latin*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Ferreira de Carvalho, Nildemir. 1989. "A naturalieza do gênero em português." *Alfa* 33:55-88.
- Fischer, O.C.M. and F.C. Van der Leek. 1981. "Optional vs. Radical Re-analysis: Mechanisms of Syntactic Change (Review of David W. Lightfoot, *Principles of diachronic syntax*)." *Lingua* 55:301-350.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1976. "The Suffix -age in Modern French." *Romance Philology* 30:42-58.
- Gamkrelidze, Thomas V. and Vjačeslav V. Ivanov. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture*.vol. 1. New York and Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Translated by Johanna Nichols.
- García, Érica. 1997. "Grasping the Invisible Hand." In Jadranka Gvozdanović (Ed.), *Language Change and Functional Explanations*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 21-52.
- García González, Francisco. 1979. "Los pronombres personales en el oriente de Asturias." *Estudios y trabajos del seminariu de llingua asturiana II*. Oviedo, Asturias: Universida d'Uvieu Serviciu Publicaciones. 47-56.
- García González, Francisco. 1989. "El neutro de materia." *Homenaje a Alonso Zamora Vicente II*. Madrid: Castalia. 91-105.
- Gasperini, Lucia. 1999. "Diachrony and Synchrony of the Latin Ablative: Concerning Certain Semantic Roles." *Diachronica* 26:37-66.
- Gerli, E. Michael. 1985. *Milagros de Nuestra Señora*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Gifford, D. J. and F.W. Hodcroft. 1967. *Textos lingüísticos del medioevo español*. 2nd edition. Oxford: The Dolphin Book Company, Ltd.

- Grandgent, C. H. 1905. *An Outline of the Phonology and Morphology of Old Provençal*. Revised 1st edition. Chicago: D.C. Heath & Company.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien. 1992. *Dictionnaire de l'ancien français*. Paris: Larousse.
- Grevisse, Maurice. 1986. *Le Bon Usage: Grammaire Française*. 12th edition. Paris: Duculot.
- Gruîță, Gligor. 1973. "A propos de la notion d'accord." *Cercetari de Lingvistica* 18:279-295.
- Haiman, John and Paola Benincà. 1992. *The Rhaeto-Romance Languages*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hall, Robert A, Jr. 1950. "The reconstruction of Proto-Romance." *Language* 26:6-27.
- Hall, Robert A, Jr. 1965. "The 'neuter' in Romance: a pseudo-problem." *Word* 21:421-427.
- Hall, Robert A, Jr. 1968. "'Neuters', Mass-nouns, and the Ablative in Romance." *Language* 44:480-486.
- Hall, Robert A, Jr. 1974. *External History of the Romance Languages*. New York: American Elsevier. Translated by.
- Harmon, Sarah and Almerindo Ojeda. 1999. "Mass reference in 16th century Castilian: Gabriel Alonso de Herrera's *Obra de agricultura*." In Fernando Martínez-Gil and Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach, *Advances in Hispanic Linguistics: Proceedings from the Second Hispanic Linguistic Symposium*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. 364-377.
- Haudricourt, Andre-George and A.G. Juillard. 1949. *Essai pour une histoire structurale du phonétisme français*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Herman, József. 2000. *Vulgar Latin*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press. Translated by Roger Wright.
- Herslund, Michael. 1976. "Encore le 'neutre' en roumain." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 13:251-254.

- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1971. "Structural Analysis of Language." In Bertil Malmberg (Ed.), *Readings in Modern Linguistics: An Anthology*. Stockholm: Läromedelsförlagen. 97-105.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1991. *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. 2nd edition. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hualde, José Ignacio. 1992. "Metaphony and Count/Mass Morphology in Asturian and Cantabrian Dialects." In Christiane Laeufer and Terrell A. Morgan (Eds.), *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 99-114.
- Hull, David. 1988. *Science as a Process: An Evolutionary Account of the Social and Conceptual Development of Science*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ionescu Ruxandoiu, Liliana. 1977. "Remarks on the Latin type of Romanian." *Analele Universitatii Bucuresti Limba si Literatura Romana* 26:129-135.
- Iordan, Iorgu. 1967. *Lingüística Románica*. Madrid: Alcalá.
- Jensen, Frede. 1972. *From Vulgar Latin to Old Provençal*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Jensen, Frede. 1986. *The Syntax of Medieval Occitan*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Jensen, Frede. 1987. "Stray Thoughts on Gallo-Romance Collectives, Mass Nouns and Generic Representations." *Selecta: Journal of Pacific NorthWest* 8:11-16.
- Jones, Michael Allan. 1993. *Sardinian Syntax*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2001. "The Rise and Fall of Languages (Review)." *Journal of Linguistics* 37:180-186.
- Jungemann, Frederick H. 1955. *La teoría del sustrato y los dialectos hispano-romances y gascones*. Madrid: Gredos. Translated by Emilio Alarcos Llorach.
- Kastovsky, Dieter and Christiane Dalton Puffer. 2002. "Sexist German--Non-sexist English or Non-sexist German--Sexist English? Historical Observations on a Pragmatic Question." *Language Sciences* 24:285-296.

- Katz Levy, Anita. 1973. "Plural Form Versus Singular Meaning in Hispano-Romance Nouns." *Romance Philology* 27:13-25.
- Kaye, Alan S. 1999. "The Rise and Fall of Languages (Review)." *Language* 75:400-401.
- Keller, Rudi. 1994. *On Language Change: The Invisible Hand in Language*. London: Routledge. Translated by Brigitte Nerlich.
- Keller, Rudi. 1997. "In What Sense Can Explanations of Language Change Be Functional?" In Jadranka Gvozdanović (Ed.), *Language Change and Functional Explanations*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 9-20.
- Keonig, Frederic. 1961-1971. *Les Miracles de Nostre Dame par Gautier de Coinci*. 2nd edition. Geneva: Droz.
- Kirby, Simon. 1999. *Function, Selection and Innateness: The Emergence of Language Universals*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kirby, Simon, Kenny Smith, and Henry Brighton. 2004. "From UG to Universals: Linguistic Adaptation through Iterated Learning." *Studies in Language* 28:587-607.
- Klein, Flora. 1981. "Neutrality, or the semantics of gender in a dialect of Castilla." In W Cressey and D J Napoli (Eds.), *Linguistics Symposium on Romance Linguistics 9*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. 164-176.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1945-1949. "'La nature des proces dit 'analogiques'." In E.P. Hamp, Jr. Robert A Hall and R. Austerlitz (Eds.), *Readings in Linguistics II*. Chicago: Chicago University Press. 158-174.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1964. *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag.
- Kurzová, Helena. 1993. *From Indo-European to Latin: The Evolution of a Morphosyntactic Type*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Laeuffer, Christiane and Terrel A. Morgan (eds.). 1992. *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the Nineteenth Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL XIX), The Ohio State University, 21-23 April 1989*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Lanchetas, Rufino. 1900/1903. *Gramática y vocabulario de las obras de Gonzalo Berceo: Obra premiada en público certamen por la Real academia española é impresa á sus expensas*. Madrid.
- Lass, Roger. 1980. *On Explaining Language Change*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lass, Roger. 1990. "How to Do Things with Junk: Exaptation in Language Evolution." *Journal of Linguistics* 26:79-102.
- Lass, Roger. 1997. *Historical Linguistics and Language Change*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lazzeroni, Romano. 1999. "Dall'antroponimo al paradigma: Storia di una declinazione latina." *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 84:207-214.
- Lazzeroni, Romano. 2000. "Genere grammaticale e riorganizzazione dei paradigmi: Il caso della IV declinazione latina." *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 85:232-237.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1989. "Problems in Proto-Indo-European grammar: Residues from Pre-Indo-European active structure." *General Linguistics* 29:228-246.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1993. *Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1999. "Towards a history of early Indo-European." *Diachronica* 16:67-95.
- Lightfoot, David. 1979. *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. Berlin and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightfoot, David. 1991. *How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change*. Cambridge, MA: Bradford/MIT.
- Lightfoot, David. 2002. "Explaining Language Change (Review)." *Journal of Linguistics* 38:410-414.

- Ludtke, Helmut. 2003. "El neutro romántico: su origen antiguo y sus avatares posteriores en asutriano, castellano norteño, romanche, e italiano dialectal." *Lletres asturianas: Boletín oficial de l'Academia de la Llingua Asturiana* 82:7-14.
- Luján, Marta. 1972. "On the So-called Neuter Article in Spanish." In Jean Casagrande and Bohdan Saciuk (Eds.), *Generative Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. 162-175.
- Machado, José Pedro. 1977. *Dicionário etimológico da língua portuguesa*. 3rd edition. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.
- Machonis, Peter. 1990. *Histoire de la langue: De latin à l'ancien français*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Mallinson, Graham. 1984. "Problems, Pseudo-problems and Hard Evidence--Another Look at the Rumanian Neuter." *Folia Linguistica* 18:439-451.
- Mallinson, Graham. 1986. *Rumanian*. Dover, NH: Croom Helm.
- Mańczak, Witold. 1958. "Tendances générales des changements analogiques." *Lingua* 7:298-325; 387-420.
- Mańczak, Witold. 1974. "Métaphonie devant u dans les langues romances." *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 21:343-353.
- Martin Baldonado, Joanne. 1981. "Affixation and Gender Desinence in the Old Spanish Postverbal Nouns." *Romance Philology* 35:64-79.
- Martinet, André. 1962. *A Functional View of Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Martinet, André. 1974. *Economía de los cambios fonéticos: Tratado de fonología diacrónica*. Madrid: Gredos. Translated by Alfredo de la Fuente Arranz.
- Matasović, Ranko. 2004. *Gender in Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Mattoso Camara, Jr., Joaquim. 1972. *The Portuguese Language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Translated by Anthony J. Naro.
- Meillet, Antoine and J. Vendryes. 1979. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. 5th. Paris: Honoré Champion.

- Menéndez Pidal, Ramon. 1968. *Manual de gramática histórica española*. 13th edition. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramon. 1986. *Orígenes del español*. 10th edition. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Mettmann, Walter. 1986. *Cantigas de Santa Maria*. Madrid: Castalia.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1926. *Introducción a la lingüística románica*. Madrid: Impresario de la Librería y Casa Editorial Hernando. Translated by Américo Castro.
- Michaux, Christine. 1992. "The Collectives in French: A Linguistic Investigation." *Linguisticæ Investigationes* 16:99-124.
- Miglio, Viola G. 1999. "Explanatory Power of Functional and Formal Approaches to Language Change." In Michael Darnell et. al. (Eds.), *Functionalism and Formalism in Linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 221-251.
- Mignot, Xavier. 1978. "Homonymies entre les désinences casuelles du latin." *Langages* 12:45-50.
- Milroy, James. 1992. "Speaker-innovation and Linguistic Change." In James Milroy (Ed.), *Linguistic Variation and Change: On the Historical Sociolinguistics of English*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. 164-205.
- Misterski, Henryk. 1980. "Le genre neutre en roumain." *Studia Romanica Posnaniensia* 6:37-41.
- Monaci, Ernesto. 1912/1954. *Crestomazia italaiana dei primi secoli con prospetto grammaticale e glossario*. Città di Castello: S. Lapi.
- Neira Martínez, Jesús. 1982. "La situación lingüística de Asturias." *Revista de Occidente* 10-11:111-125.
- Neira Martínez, Jesús. 1983. "De dialectología asturiana." *Philologica Hispaniensia in Honorem Manuel Alvar, I: Dialectología*. Madrid: Gredos. 485-497.
- Nettle, David. 1999. "Functionalism and its Difficulties in Biology in Linguistics." In Simon Dik (Ed.), *Functional Grammar*. New York: North-Holland. 445-467.

- Newmeyer, Frederick. 1991. "Functional Explanation in Linguistics and the Origins of Language." *Language and Communication* 11:3-28.
- Niermeyer, Jan Frederik and C. van de Kieft. 2002. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*.vol. 1 and 2. 2nd edition. Boston and Leiden: Brill.
- Ojeda, Almerindo. 1992. "The 'Mass-neuter' in Hispano-Romance Dialects." *Hispanic Linguistics* 5:245-277.
- Ojeda, Almerindo. 1995. "The Semantics of the Italian Double Plural." *Journal of Semantics* 12:213-237.
- Orel, Vladimir. 2003. *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Boston: Brill.
- Palmer, Leonard Robert. 1988. *The Latin Language*. Reprint of 1954 London:Faber & Faber. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Payne, Doris. 1999. "What Counts as Explanation?: A Functionalist Approach to Word Order." In Michael Darnell et. al. (Eds.), *Functionalism and Formalism in Linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 137-165.
- Penny, Ralph. 2002. *A History of the Spanish Language*. 2nd edition. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pettit, Philip. 1975. *The Concept of Structuralism: A Critical Analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pittau, Massimo. 1972. *Grammatica del sardo-nuorese*. 2nd edition. Bologna: Prof. Riccardo Patron.
- Plank, Frans. 1984. "Romance Disagreements: Phonology Interfering with Syntax." *Journal of Linguistics* 20:329-349.
- Polinsky, Maria and Ezra Van Everbroeck. 2003. "Development of Gender Classifications: Modeling the Historical Change from Latin to French." *Language* 79:356-390.
- Polomé, Edgar C. 1992. "Germanic, Northwest-Indo-European and Pre-Indo-European Substrates." In Rosina L. Lippi-Green (Ed.), *Recent Developments in Germanic Linguistics*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 47-55.

- Posner, Rebecca. 1966. *The Romance Languages*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Posner, Rebecca. 1985. "Non-agreement on Romance Disagreements." *Journal of Linguistics* 21:437-451.
- Posner, Rebecca. 1993. "Latin to Romance (Again?): Change or Genesis?" In Jaap Van Marle (Ed.), *Historical Linguistics 1991: Papers from the 10th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Amsterdam, 12-16 August 1991*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 265-279.
- Posner, Rebecca. 1997. *Linguistic Change in French*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pountain, Christopher J. 2001. *A History of the Spanish Language through Texts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Poussa, Patricia. 1982. "The Evolution of Early Standard English: The Creolization Hypothesis." *Studia Anglica Posnanensia* 14:69-85.
- Prado, Marcial. 1982. "El genero en español y la teoría de la marcadez." *Hispania* 65:258-266.
- Principato, Aurelio. 2000. *Breve storia della lingua francese: dal Cinquecento ai giorni nostri*. Rome: Carocci.
- Prokosch, Eduard. 1933. *An Outline of German Historical Grammar*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pullum, GK and AM Zwicky. 1975. "Sections from 'The Principle of Phonology-free Syntax'." *Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 18:172-183.
- Raidt, Edith H. 1998. "Language change in progress: Morphological erosion in present-day 'South African Dutch' and 18th century 'Cape Dutch'." In Richard Hogg and Linda van Bergen (Eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1995, II: Germanic Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 269-284.
- Réau, Louis. 1955. *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*. 1st edition. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Regan, Brian T. 1974. *Dictionary of the Biblical Gothic Language*. Phoenix, AZ: Wellspring Books.

- Repina, Tamara. 1980. "L'autonomie syntaxique des moyens d'expression grammaticale et la typologie des langues." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 25:385-389.
- Rickard, Peter. 1989. *A History of the French Language*. 2nd edition. London and Boston: Uniwin Hyman.
- Robert, Paul and Alain Rey. 2001. *Le Grand Robert de la langue française*. 9th edition. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1966. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Turin: Giulio Einaudi.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1970. *From Vulgar Latin to Old French*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. Translated by Vincent Almazom and Lillian McCarthy.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1979. "Aspects du latin vulgaire examinés à travers la géographie linguistique." *Travaux de Linguistique et de Litterature* 17:7-25.
- Ronjat, Jules. 1937. *Grammaire istorique des parlers provençaux modernes*. Montpellier: Société des Langues Romanes.
- Rosetti, A. 1975. "Pour le 'neutre' en roumain." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 20:401-402.
- Salmons, Joe. 1992. "The Evolution of Gender Assignment from OHG to NHG." In Rosina L. Lippi-Green (Ed.), *Recent Developments in Germanic Linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 81-95.
- Sampson, Rodney. 1980. *Early Romance Texts: An Anthology*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Samuels, Michael Louis. 1972. *Linguistic Evolution: With Special Reference to English*. Oxford: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1979. "Reconstructing Active and Ergative Stages of Pre-Indo-European." In Frans Plank (Ed.), *Ergativity: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations*. San Francisco: Academic Press. 333-345.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst. 2004. "Pre-Indo-European grammar." *General Linguistics* 42:89-109.

- Schwink, Frederick W. 1994. *Linguistic Typology, Universality and the Realism of Reconstruction*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Schwink, Frederick W. 2004. *The Third Gender: Studies in the Origin and History of Germanic Grammatical Gender*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Sensò, Andrea. 2004. "Explaining Language Change (Review)." *Linguistics* 42:867-871.
- Sihler, Andrew. 1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Latin and Greek*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sluiter, Ineke. 2000. "Seven Grammarians on the Ablative Absolute." *Historiographia Linguistica* 27:379-414.
- Smith, John Charles. 1996-1997. "Surfonctionnalité et hyperanalyse: L'accord du participe passé dans les langues romanes à la lumière de deux théories récentes." *Faits de Langues* 8:113-120.
- Smith, John Charles. 2001. "Markedness, Functionality, and Perversion in the Actualization of a Morphosyntactic Change." In Henning Anderson, *Actualization: Linguistic Change in Progress*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 203-223.
- Spencer, Andrew and Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.). 2001. *The Handbook of Morphology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Steinmetz, Donald. 2001. "The Great Gender Shift and the attrition of neuter nouns in West Germanic: The example of German." In Irmengard Raugh and Gerald F. Carr (Eds.), *New Insights in Germanic Linguistics II*. New York: Peter Lang. 201-224.
- Szemerényi, Oswald J. L. 1990. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. 4th edition. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Tekavčić, Pavao. 1972. *Grammatica storica dell'italiano*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Teschner, Richard V. 1986. "The Genders of French and Spanish Noun Cognates: Some Statistics and a List." *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 43:256-266.
- Teyssier, Paul. 1989. *Manual de língua portuguesa*. Coimbra: Coimbra Editora. Translated by Margarida Chorão de Carvalho.

- Torreblanca, Máximo. 1990. "Sobre la evolución /u/ latina > en español: *junco, surco, ducho*." *Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 14:247-276.
- Torreblanca, Máximo. 1992. "Sobre la palatalización de consonantes latinas en español e hispanorromance." *Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 16:281-327.
- Ugolini, Francesco A. 1959. *Testi volgari abruzzesi del duecento*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1963. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1988. *Introducción al latín vulgar*. 2nd edition, 3rd reprint. Madrid: Gredos. Translated by Manuel Carrión of the 1967 edition.
- Valdman, Albert. 1977. "Creolization: Elaboration in the Development of Creole French Dialects." In Albert Valdman (Ed.), *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 155-189.
- Vazquez Cuesta, Pilar and Maria Albertina Mendes da Luz. 1971. *Gramática da língua português*.
- Vennemann, Theo. 1972. "Phonetic Analogy and Conceptual Analogy." In Theo Vennemann and T.H. Wilbur (Eds.), *Schuchardt, the Neogrammarians, and the Transformational Theory of Phonological Change*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum-Verlag. 181-204.
- Viejo Fernández, Xulio. 2003. "Nuevos datos antiguos y modernos sobre'l neutru continuu asutrianuu." *Lletres asturianas: Boletín oficial de l'Academia de la Llingua Asturiana* 84:7-14.
- Vincent, Nigel. 1974. "Analogy Reconsidered." In J. M. Anderson and C. Jones (Eds.), *Historical Linguistics: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Edinburgh 2nd-7th September 1973*. New York: American Elsevier. 427-445.
- von Wartburg, Walther. 1946. *Raccolta di testi antichi italiani*. Berne: A Francke.
- Voyles, Joseph B. 1992. *Early Germanic Grammar: Pre-, Proto- and Post-Germanic Languages*. New York: Academic Press.
- Vrabie, Emil. 1989. "On the Distribution of the Neuter Plural Endings in Modern Standard Romanian." *Slavic and East European Journal* 33:400-410.

- Wandersleben, Werner. 1981. "Sobre el femenino aumentativo." *Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 19:9-18.
- Weinreich, Uriel, William Labov, and Marvin I. Herzog. 1968. "Empirical foundations for a theory of language change." In Winnifred Lehmann and Y. Malkiel, *Directions for Historical Linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press. 95-188.
- Wełna, Jerzy. 1975. "Gender Determiners in American English: A Study in the Grammar of Loanwords." *Studia Anglica Posnamensia* 7:95-108.
- Wełna, Jerzy. 1980. "On Gender Change in Linguistic Borrowing (Old English)." In Jacek Fisiak (Ed.), *Historical Morphology*. New York: Mouton Publishers. 399-420.
- Wheeler, Max W., Alan Yates, and Nicolau Dols. 1999. *Catalan: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Williams, Edwin B. 1962. *From Latin to Portuguese*. 2nd edition. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Zamora Vicente, Alfonso. 1996. *Dialectología española*. 2nd edition, 6th reprint. Madrid: Gredos.
- Zenenko, G.P. 1983. "Acerca de la manifestación del género de los sustantivos y adjetivos como categoría gramatical en las lenguas romances ibéricas." *Verba* 10:231-247.
- Zwicky, AM. 1969. "Phonological Constraints in Syntactic Description." *Papers in Linguistics* 1:411-463.
- Zwicky, AM. 1983. "Phonology in Syntax: The Somali Optional Agreement Rule." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1:385-402.

## Vita

Born in San Mateo, California, on 31 December 1974, Sarah Elizabeth Harmon is the only daughter and eldest of three children of Michelle and Wilmoth Harmon, Jr. A 1993 graduate of Aragon High School in San Mateo, California, Sarah entered her Bachelors studies at the University of California at Davis, and graduated in 1997 with honors as a Spanish major and Linguistics minor. She continued at the University of California at Davis, co-presenting and co-authoring a paper with Prof. Almerindo Ojeda in 1999, and finishing her Masters in Linguistics in 1999; her Masters' Thesis discusses the mass-neuter article in 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century South-Central Italian poetry. From there she entered her doctoral studies in Romance Linguistics at the University of Texas, and taught Spanish in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the same institution. She co-organized the Twelfth Colloquium on Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Literature and Romance Linguistics, held at the University of Texas in April of 2002. Since 2005, while finishing her dissertation, she has been teaching Spanish at Skyline College in San Bruno, California, Cañada College in Redwood City, California, and De Anza College in Cupertino, California. This dissertation is, to date, her most treasured and honored achievement.

Permanent address: PO Box 28004, San José, CA 95159-8004

This dissertation was typed by the author.