

The syntactic structures of Lingua Franca in the *Dictionnaire de la langue franque*

Natalie Operstein

University of California, USA <natacha@ucla.edu>

Lingua Franca (LF) is a contact vernacular that was used for interethnic communication in the Mediterranean area until the second half of the nineteenth century. The Romance linguistic basis of LF is not disputed, however, the precise nature and extent of the Romance contributions to LF, particularly outside the area of the lexicon, have only recently begun to be assessed. This study aims at providing an exhaustive overview of the syntactic structures of LF as presented in the key documentary source on this language, the anonymous didactic dictionary of 1830 that describes and documents a LF variety spoken in Algiers. The accompanying comparative study shows that the syntactic structures of LF are continuous with, and represent a subset of, those of its Romance lexifiers.*

KEYWORDS: language contact, contact languages, Romance lexifier, Italian, Spanish, Algiers, Mediterranean, Maghreb

1. Introduction

Lingua Franca (LF) is a contact vernacular that was used for interethnic communication in the Mediterranean area until the second half of the nineteenth century (Schuchardt 1909; Swiggers 1991-1993). Although written representations of, and/or extra-linguistic comments on, LF come from more than one period and more than one area of the Mediterranean, the principal documentation of this contact language is circumscribed by the area of the Maghreb in the period between the second half of the sixteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century (Cifoletti 1989, 2004; Camus Bergareche 1993; Arends 1998; Couto 2002). Throughout its entire documented history, LF was transmitted across generations of speakers as a functionally restricted, non-native vernacular (Operstein 1998, 2007; Parkvall & Bakker 2013).

* I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of *Italian Journal of Linguistics* for their valuable comments and suggestions.

Both scholars and lay observers of LF have frequently commented on its Romance linguistic basis, though such observations as are found in the literature are often devoid of discussion of concrete data or of domains other than the lexical. The following observation stands out as representing the earliest statement that articulates the possible taxonomic status of LF as a Romance variety:

D'après quelques érudits, la langue franque et son congénère le sabir ne seraient qu'un dialecte roman, ce que ferait remonter leur origine à la langue des Cicéron, des Virgile, des Jules César (Anonymous 1852; in Cifoletti 1989: 195).

[According to some scholars, *Lingua Franca* and its companion *Sabir* are nothing other than a Romance dialect, which would take their origin back to the language of Ciceros, Virgils, Julius Caesars].

Although the above passage is contained in a pre-scholarly description of LF, with clear humorous overtones, it nevertheless testifies to the fact that at least some mid-nineteenth century scholars regarded LF – which, at the time, was still a living language – as a Romance dialect. A congruent view is discernible in the passage below, in which the present-day commentator points out that the main beneficiaries of LF, in its role as a medium of interethnic communication, must have been primarily those who already spoke one of the Romance languages that have contributed to it:

En premier lieu, son caractère “universel” est à nuancer. En premier lieu, les langues latines semblent avoir occupé une place importante dans la communication globale au sein de la cité algéroise. En second lieu, les captifs provenant de l'Europe du Nord n'ont sans doute pas bénéficié des mêmes facilités de communication que les captifs originaires des territoires méditerranéens, car leurs langues natales, trop éloignées des langues latines méditerranéennes, ne leur permettaient pas d'accéder à une compréhension globale de la *lingua franca* ou de langues latines majoritairement parlées dans les régences. Le système de compréhension par inférences n'est accessible qu'aux locuteurs ayant déjà une certaine connaissance de l'espagnol, de l'italien, du portugais ou du catalan (Planas 2004: 248).

[In the first place, its “universal” character needs to be qualified. First, Romance languages appear to have occupied an important place in the overall communication of the city of Algiers. Second, captives from Northern Europe no doubt did not enjoy the same ease of communication as those from the Mediterranean lands because their native languages, too distant from the Mediterranean Romance languages, did not allow them to attain complete comprehension of *Lingua Franca* or of the

Romance languages predominantly spoken in the regencies. A system of comprehension via inferences is not accessible except to speakers who already have some knowledge of Spanish, Italian, Portuguese or Catalan].

Related observations on the Romance structural basis of LF appear in the works that emphasize its koine-like qualities:

And since Italian and Spanish, the languages that formed the basis for Lingua Franca, were closely related dialects rather than separate languages five centuries ago, it might perhaps more appropriately be categorized as a koiné, i.e. the product of dialect convergence (Arends 2005: 625).

The peculiarity of Lingua Franca is not necessarily due to a simplification of the Romance grammatical structure in contact with Arabic, but rather to the attempt to find a lowest common denominator for Italo-Romance and Ibero-Romance languages (Aslanov 2014: 132).

La neutralització interromànica té lloc, probablement, sobre la base dels rudiments de llatí medieval que eren utilitzats en el conjunt de la Romania, per a fer-se entendre els parlants de les diferents llengües filles del llatí, en llurs contactes mutus (Castellanos 2007: 3).

[Inter-Romance neutralization probably takes place on the basis of the rudiments of Medieval Latin, which speakers of different Romance languages used for making themselves understood in their mutual contacts].

Despite the scholarly consensus regarding the Romance linguistic basis of LF, this language has received remarkably little attention from Romanists, as seen for instance in the surveys of LF bibliography in Cifoletti (1980) and Arends (1998). In this respect, LF's checkered academic history is similar to that of Creole Arabic, an "orphaned language" which "has never been effectively integrated into any single subdiscipline of linguistics and language study" (Owens 2001: 348). Most published studies that have examined the Romance contributions to LF have tended to focus on its lexicon. For example, Cornelissen (1992) estimates that Anonymous (1830), the key documentary source of LF, with about two thousand recorded LF lexical items, contains 58% Italo-Romance words, 27% words that are traceable to more than one Romance language or are inter-Romance hybrids, 6% Spanish words, 4% French words, 3% Arabic words, and 2% Turkish, Portuguese and Catalan words. Coates (1971) makes an etymological investigation of the 169 lexical items in the dialogues of Anonymous (1830), identifying 141 as Italian, 18 as Spanish and 10

as coming from other sources. Operstein (2017a), who focuses on the basic vocabulary of Anonymous (1830), identifies Lat. *cinis* ‘ash’ as the only non-Romance word in both the 100- and 200-word Swadesh lists. For the approximately one hundred LF lexical items in Haedo (1612), the next most important documentary source of LF, Cornelissen (1992) estimates that about 41% derive from Spanish, 17% from Italian, 39% are traceable to more than one Romance language, and 3% derive from Turkish and Arabic.

The Romance morphological contributions to LF are investigated by Operstein (*forthcoming*, b; *forthcoming*, c), who identifies a fair amount of retained Romance inflectional and derivational morphology. In a related study, Operstein (*forthcoming*, d) argues that many of the language-internal developments seen in LF – such as the full grammaticalization of (*e*)*star*, the LF copula deriving from Sp. *estar* / It. *stare* (ultimately from Lat. *stare* ‘stand’) – are continuous with, and proceed in the same direction as, the corresponding developments in LF’s lexifiers. This paper aims to investigate whether similar continuity with the lexifiers exists in the syntactic component of the LF grammar.

Before proceeding, it is necessary first to introduce the variety of LF to be described and the sources of the data. Based on the availability of primary sources, the historical trajectory of LF is divisible into three periods: the formative period, extending from LF’s inception until the sixteenth century; the period of stabilization, between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries; and the period of decline, ushered in by the French military occupation of Algiers in 1830 and completed by the time of the first scholarly description of LF, published in 1909 by Hugo Schuchardt (Schuchardt 1909; Cifoletti 1989; Swiggers 1991-1993; Couto 2002; Castellanos 2007). This periodization is based on written documentation from the Maghreb, and specifically reflects the evolution of Maghrebi LF.

The most important – second – period of LF’s existence is also the best documented. Historically, it coincides with the Ottoman domination of the Maghreb, and is bound up with two important contemporaneous processes in that area: the rise of the pirate cultures and of economies based on the capture and enslavement of large numbers of Europeans, and the rise of Italian to the status of the default language of communication between the Ottoman authorities and Western Europeans, as well as among Europeans from different nations (Cremona 1996, 2002; Baglioni 2010). Guido Cifoletti has argued convincingly that it was only in the linguistic and social ecology of the Maghreb that LF was able to become stabilized, whereas

outside that area it would have lost its bid for a target Romance variety to the more prestigious local Romance languages. Cifoletti's views on the reasons for the stabilization of LF in the Maghreb are articulated, e.g., in the following passage:

Dunque la conoscenza della lingua di prestigio per la maggior parte dei Mediorientali e Magrebini si fermava allo stadio di pidgin: ma nei porti dei pirati barbareschi i Musulmani si trovarono ad avere un enorme prestigio sugli Europei capitati laggiù (che erano per lo più prigionieri o schiavi), per questo motivo poterono imporre anche a questi ultimi la variante pidginizzata che era a loro usuale, e così la lingua franca divenne bilaterale e si stabilizzò. (Cifoletti 2000: 16). [Thus, the knowledge of the language of prestige by most Middle Easterners and Magrebines stopped at the pidgin stage, but in the ports of the Barbary pirates the Muslims had enormous prestige over the Europeans captured there (prisoners and slaves for the most part), and for this reason they could impose even on them the pidginized variety which was usual for them, and thus Lingua Franca became bilateral and was stabilized].

The fact that the bulk of the available documentation of LF comes from the Maghreb converts Maghrebi LF into an object of study in its own right, quite apart from any other variety of LF that could have existed elsewhere (extended discussions of this point are found in Cifoletti 2000 and 2004). In line with this conclusion, the description of LF syntax to be presented in this paper will be based on the key documentary source of Maghrebi LF, Anonymous (1830). This source documents a LF variety spoken in Algiers, corresponds chronologically to the period of stabilization of LF, and stands out in terms of its length and reliability, the latter conferred by the fact of its likely composition by long-term residents of Algiers with in-depth practical knowledge of LF. These attributes of Anonymous (1830) distinguish it both from brief samples of LF supplied by short-term visitors to the area, and from literary pieces in which linguistic accuracy clearly takes second place to comic intent and stereotyping. Structurally, Anonymous (1830) is composed of a brief outline of LF grammar (the pages in this section are unnumbered), a substantial French-LF glossary, eight French-LF dialogues, and a brief French-Maghrebi Arabic glossary. In combination, the dialogues and the occasional illustrative examples in the grammar and French-LF glossary contain a sufficient number of phrases and sentences in LF from which recurrent syntactic constructions can be extracted for a descriptive study.

Whenever necessary, reference will also be made to the second most important documentary source of LF, Haedo (1612). This work is

estimated to have been composed around 1580, toward the beginning of the second period of LF. Haedo (1612) and Anonymous (1830) have long been recognized as the most important documentary sources of LF: “Fuera de estos dos testimonios, los textos en lingua franca son pocos y muy breves [Outside these two sources, the texts in Lingua Franca are few and very short]” (Camus Bergareche 1993: 419). Given the distance of two and a half centuries between these sources, as well as other significant differences between them – such as the different aims of the two publications and the apparently different first languages of their authors – a full-scale comparison between the grammars that emerge from them will not be attempted here, and will be left for a future study.

Finally, an important dimension of LF to be kept in mind is its lexical and structural variation. Some of the variation derives from the regional provenance of LF’s lexifiers: for example, the Venetian variety of LF differs from the Maghrebi variety by the presence of lexical Venetianisms and the imperfective (< Romance infinitive) endings *-ara / -ira* rather than *-ar / -ir* (Cifoletti 2000: 17). The compilers of Anonymous (1830) explicitly note the existence of regional variation in Maghrebi LF:

Cet idiome . . . diffère même sur plusieurs points, suivant les villes où il est parlé, et le petit mauresque en usage à Tunis, n’est pas tout-à-fait le même que celui qu’on emploie à Alger; tirant beaucoup de l’italien dans le première de ces regencies, il se rapproche au contraire de l’espagnol dans celle d’Alger (Anonymous 1830).

[This language ... nonetheless varies in many respects according to the cities it is spoken in, and the Petit Mauresque used in Tunis is not quite the same as the one used in Algiers; while approaching Italian in the first of these regencies, it approaches Spanish in that of Algiers].

Some of the variation takes the shape of Hispano-Italian lexical doublets, such as the aforementioned copula *estar ~ star* (< Sp. *estar* / It. *stare*), which are well represented in Anonymous (1830). The lexical and structural variation becomes even stronger if the different LF texts are treated as a single corpus. To give one example, while Anonymous (1830) attests only periphrastic pronominal possession with *di* ‘of’, with the shapes of the personal pronouns consistent with their derivation from Venetian (e.g. *[la] casa di mi* ‘my house’), the centuries-earlier *Contrasto della Zerbitana* exhibits the enclitic possessives of southern Italo-Romance (e.g. *casama* ‘my house’) (Cifoletti 1989: 59; Minervini 1996: 250).

Another sort of variation is caused by the first languages of LF’s speakers and observers. For example, although Haedo (1612)

and Anonymous (1830) both document Algerine LF, Haedo's is heavily Hispanized and the *Dictionnaire's* heavily Italianized. While historically this may reflect partial relexification of Algerine LF, the influence of the first (or dominant) languages of the observers on the LF idiolect being reported cannot be ruled out as a factor (see related discussion in Dakhliya 2008: 87-88). The issue of variation in LF as related to the first languages of its speakers is taken up in Operstein (*forthcoming*, d), where it is argued that LF is best viewed as located on a pidgin-koine continuum, with the idiolects of non-Romance language speakers typically approximating the basilectal end of this continuum and the idiolects of Romance language speakers typically approximating its acrolectal end.

Variation in the social status of LF is seen particularly clearly in the status differences of its reported speakers before and after the French conquest of Algeria. Prior to the conquest, our documents report LF as being used by such exalted figures as the dey, Turkish dignitaries and corsair captains; subsequently to the conquest, it is typically placed in the mouths of "indigeni tra i più ignoranti [some the most ignorant natives]" (Cifoletti 1994: 146). This sharp descent in the social status of LF is accompanied by its structural impoverishment and a reduced functional and expressive range. The existence of such regional, social and L1-related differences in LF idiolects goes a long way toward explaining the lexical and structural variation observed in the same and across different LF texts.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 looks at the structure of the LF noun phrase, and Sections 3 through 7 examine, respectively, the structure of the copular, verbal, interrogative and imperative clauses and of complex sentences. The orthography and capitalization of the LF examples follow those of the source publications. The French translations of the example sentences represent the French prompts in Anonymous (1830), and are given in that source's orthography. Section 8 concludes the paper by situating the syntactic structures of LF in relation to those of its Romance lexifiers. In most sections, the syntactic structures of LF are compared with the corresponding structures in one or both of its main lexifiers, Italian and Spanish. The purpose of the comparison is not to engage in an in-depth exploration of the relevant aspects of Italian or Spanish syntax, but rather to demonstrate possible parallels or antecedents for the syntactic constructions seen in LF. Most examples are drawn from the normative varieties of each language, and, given the enormous diatopic, diastratic and diachronic variety of inputs to LF, are to be taken merely as convenient reference points for the syntactic structures being illustrated.

2. Noun phrase

2.1. Syntactic agreement

LF has both definite and indefinite articles; these occur before the noun and agree with it in gender. The forms of the articles, with the spelling variation omitted, are as shown in (1).

(1)	MASCULINE		FEMININE	
	oun amigo	‘a friend’	ouna palabra	‘a word’
	il tempo	‘the weather’	la palabra	‘the word’
	l’amigo	‘the friend’	l’eskima	‘the bridle’

Anonymous (1830) records several articulated prepositions, forms in which the article is fused with the preceding preposition into a single word. Only two prepositions, *a* ‘to, at’ and *di* ‘of, from’, are attested in articulated forms. The specific forms recorded are the masculine *al, del* and the feminine *alla, della* (see 2).

(2)	a.	<i>mi andar in casa del Signor.</i>
		1s go.IMPF in house of.the gentleman
		‘Je vais chez Monsieur M.’
		‘I am going to the gentleman’s house’.
	b.	<i>mirar qué ora star al orologio di ti.</i>
		see.IMPF what hour be.IMPF at.the watch of 2s
		‘Voyez quelle heure il est à votre montre’.
		‘See what time is it on your watch’.

Apart from the articles, the LF word classes that express morphological gender differences and/or syntactic agreement with respect to gender include adjectives (e.g. *bonou / bona* ‘good’), demonstratives (*qouesto / qouesta* ‘this’, *qouello / qouella* ‘that’), the third man pronoun (*ello ~ ellou* ‘he’ / *ella* ‘she’) and the perfective form of the verb (e.g. *bachiato -a* ‘kiss’). The examples below illustrate gender agreement between *thé* ‘tea’ and *bonou* (in 3a), between *genti* ‘man’ and *bouona* (in 3b), and between *ellou* (the third person masculine singular pronoun) and its antecedent *thé* ‘tea’ (in 3a). Anonymous (1830) provides the feminine counterpart to the perfective verb forms (etymologically Italian past participles), however, the use of the feminine form is not illustrated (Operstein 2017c).

(3)	a.	<i>mi tenir thé mouchou bon-ou;</i>
		1s have.IMPF tea.M very good-M
		<i>mi quérir ti goustar per ell-ou.</i>
		1s want.IMPF 2s taste.IMPF DOM 3-S.M
		‘J’ai du thé délicieux; je veux que vous en goutiez’.
		‘I’ve got some delicious tea, I want you to try it’.

- b. *star buon-a genti.*
 be.IMPF good-F man.F
 ‘C’est un brave homme’.
 ‘He is a good man’.

Gender agreement is also recorded by Haedo (1612) (see 4), which points to the stability of this feature in LF (Cifoletti 2004; Operstein 2017c).

- (4) a. ...*anchora no estar tempo de parlar quest-a cosa*
 yet NEG be.IMPF time of speak.IMPF this-F thing.F
 ‘It is not yet time to speak of this’.
- b. ...*pillar y meter en aquel forato...*
 take.IMPF and put.IMPF in that.M hole.M
 ‘Take it and put it in that hole’.

Regarding the category of number in LF, the evidence is rather conflicting (Cifoletti 1989, 2004; Operstein 2017c). On the one hand, it is attested in the third person pronoun *ello ~ ellou* ‘he’, *ella* ‘she’ / *elli* ‘they’ and in several nouns recorded in Anonymous (1830) (*orékia*, -e ‘ear’; *volta, volté* ‘time’). One plural noun even shows number agreement with the definite article: compare *mercantzia* ‘merchandise’ with *lé merkantzié di mi* ‘my merchandise’. Nevertheless, the examples below show no plural after a numeral (in 5a) or when the plural reference is clear from the French-language prompt (in 5b). In (5c), the plural reference of *Signor* is inferred from the accompanying demonstrative, similarly to the analytic expression of number (and gender) in Romance indeclinable nouns, compare It. *il re* ‘the king’ with *i re* ‘the kings’ (Patota 2006: 56). Apart from this example, and the pair *mercantzia / lé merkantzié*, there is no evidence of the use of syntactic means to signal number in LF.

- (5) a. *mi pensar non star tré ora.*
 1s think.IMPF NEG be.IMPF three hour
 ‘Je pense qu’il n’est pas trois heures’.
 ‘I think it is not yet three o’clock’.
- b. *sé quérir paché l’Yoldach fazir gribouila.*
 if want.IMPF peace the.janissary make.IMPF fuss
 ‘S’il veut la paix les Turcs feront tapage’.
 ‘If he wants peace, the janissaries will make a fuss.’
- c. *Quest-i Signor star amigo di mi.*
 this-M.PL gentleman.M be.IMPF friend.M of 1s
 ‘Ces Messieurs sont mes amis’.
 ‘These gentlemen are my friends’.

To summarize, LF has inherited from its lexifiers the category of gender which is signaled, at least in part, via syntactic agreement

between the noun and other elements of the noun phrase. The category of number apparently is not used productively in LF.

2.2. Articles

Based on the recorded phrase- and sentence-long examples, the LF of Anonymous (1830) uses determined and determinerless nouns in ways that are similar to its Romance lexifiers. For convenience of presentation, each noun type is discussed below separately.

2.2.1. Count nouns

Common count nouns tend to have the definite article in both subject and object positions. This feature is inherited from LF's Romance lexifiers, in which it reflects the obligatorification of the definite article in these positions; as observed by Wall & Octavio de Toledo (2016: 350), "In Romance, articles before common count nouns occurring as arguments of a verb (usually considered the 'core' domain) became obligatory quite early". The examples in (6) below illustrate this feature with respect to the subject noun *il Bacha* 'the pasha' (in 6a-b) and the object nouns *la porta* 'the door' and *la bentana* 'the window' (in 6c-d). The determined object count nouns contrast with the determinerless object mass noun *café* 'coffee' in (6e) (see also §2.2.3).

- (6)
- a. *dounqué bisogno il Bacha quérir paché.*
so need the pasha want.IMPF peace
'Le Pacha sera donc obligé de demander la paix'.
'So the pasha will need to seek peace'.
 - b. *perqué il Bacha tenir fantétzia.*
because the pasha have.IMPF arrogance
'Parce que le Pacha est entêté'.
'Because the pasha is stubborn'.
 - c. *sarar la porta.*
close.IMPF the door
'Fermez la porte'.
'Close the door'.
 - d. *aprir la bentana.*
open.IMPF the window
'Ouvrez la fenètre'.
'Open the window'.
 - e. *portar café.*
bring.IMPF coffee
'Apportez le café'.
'Bring coffee'.

The use of the definite article before common count nouns in LF is parallel to what we find, for example, in contemporary Spanish (the example in (7) is from Butt & Benjamin 2004: 27).

- (7) *El rey habló con los ministros.*
 the king speak.PRET.3S with the ministers
 'The King spoke with the ministers'.

2.2.2. Generic nouns

Generic nouns tend to be determined when used as subjects and determinerless when used as verb and prepositional objects. This contrast may be observed between the subject *la mangiaria* 'the lunch' in (8a) and the object *mangiaria* in (8a'), and between the subject *il Français* 'the French' in (8b) and the prepositional object *Francis* 'French' in (8b'). Given the absence of a productive nominal plural in LF, the generic nouns are formally / etymologically singular.

- (8) a. *ti venir dgiousto, la mangiaria star pronta.*
 2s come.IMPF just the lunch be.IMPF ready
 'Vous venez à propos, le déjeuner est prêt'.
 'You have come just in time, the lunch is ready'.
- a'. *mi venouto aposto per far mangiaria con ti.*
 1s come.PF Specially for do.IMPF lunch with 2s
 'Je suis venu exprès pour déjeuner avec vous'.
 'I have come especially to have lunch with you'.
- b. *qué poudir counchar il Français contra di Algeri?*
 what be.able.IMPF do.IMPF the French against of Algiers?
 'Que peuvent faire les Français contre Alger?'
 'What can the French do against Algiers?'
- b'. *con Francis.*
 with French
 'Avec les Français'.
 'With the French'.

Similar distinction in article use with generic nouns obtains in Spanish: compare the determined subject *los belgas* 'Belgians' in (9a) with the bare prepositional object *ingleses* 'English people' in (9b) (Butt & Benjamin 2004: 29-32). (9c) and (9d) exemplify bare generic plural verb and prepositional objects in Italian (from Patota 2006: 64-65; see also Benincà 1980; Giorgi 2001: 326; Maiden & Robustelli 2013: 76ff).

- (9) a. *Los belgas beben mucha cerveza.*
 the Belgians drink.PRES.3PL much beer
 'Belgians drink a lot of beer'.

- b. *Le gusta salir con ingleses.*
 3S.OBL please.PRES.3S go.out.INF with English.PL
 ‘S/he likes going out with English people’.
- c. *Ho sentito rumori.*
 have.PRES.1S hear.PPLE rumors
 ‘I have heard rumors’.
- d. *Sono venuto con amici.*
 be.PRES.1S come.PPLE with friends
 ‘I have come with friends’.

The LF example in (10a) is unusual in having a determinerless generic subject *genti* ‘man, people’. (10b) and (10c) exemplify similar usage in Spanish and Italian, though with post- rather than preverbal subjects (see Butt & Benjamin 2004: 31; Renzi 2001: 388–390; Patota 2006: 65; MacKenzie 2003: 7; Maiden & Robustelli 2013: 78). The use of a preverbal bare singular nominal subject with a generic reading is illustrated in (10d) with an example from Brazilian Portuguese (from Schmitt & Munn 1999).

- (10) a. *genti hablar tenir guerra.*
 people say.IMPV have.IMPV war
 ‘On dit que nous avons la guerre’.
 ‘They say we are having a war’.
- b. *Caían bombas por todas partes.*
 fall.IMPV.3PL bombs on all sides
 ‘Bombs were falling everywhere’.
- c. *Arrivava gente da tutte le parti.*
 arrive.IMPV.3S people from all the sides
 ‘People came in from everywhere’.
- d. *Cachorro gosta de gente.*
 dog like.PRES.3S of people
 ‘Dogs like people’.

2.2.3. Count nouns with generic meaning

The example (8b) in the preceding paragraph illustrated the use of a determined count noun, *il Français*, with generic meaning. Further examples of this use include *l’Algérino* in (11a) and *l’Yoldach* in (11b).

- (11) a. *mi pensar l’Algérino non combatir.*
 1S think.IMPV the.Algerian NEG fight.IMPV
 ‘Je pense que les Algériens ne se batront pas’.
 ‘I think Algerians will not fight’.
- b. *sé quérir paché l’Yoldach fazer gribouila.*
 if want.IMPV peace the.janissary make.IMPV fuss
 ‘S’il veut la paix les Turcs feront tapage’.
 ‘If he wants peace, janissaries will make a fuss’.

While the above use may be the simple consequence of the non-productivity of nominal number in LF, the use of singular count nouns with generic meaning also has parallels in LF's Romance lexicifiers. For example, Butt & Benjamin (2004: 30) remark on similar use in Spanish, giving the sentence in (12a) as an example. A corresponding Italian example is provided in (12b) (from Serianni 1989: 208).

- (12) a. *El español, cuando está de vacaciones,*
the Spaniard when be.PRES.3S of vacations
come mucho marisco.
eat.PRES.3S much shellfish
'Spaniards, when they're on holiday, eat a lot of shellfish'.
b. *il tedesco è un gran lavoratore*
the German be.PRES.3S a great worker
'Germans are great workers'.

2.2.4. Mass nouns

The definite article is omitted with partitive mass nouns in verb object position. This includes both nouns referring to substances, such as *agoua* 'water' and *thé* 'tea' in (13a), and the abstract noun *paché* in (13b).

- (13) a. *fazir scaldar agoua; mi quérir counchar thé.*
make.IMPF heat.IMPF water 1S want.IMPF make.IMPF tea
'Faites chauffer de l'eau; je veux faire du thé'.
'Heat (some) water; I want to make tea'.
b. *dounqué bisogno il Bacha quérir paché.*
so need the pasha want.IMPF peace
'Le Pacha sera donc obligé de demander la paix'.
'So the pasha will need to seek peace'.

Similar omission of the definite article before partitive mass nouns is found in Spanish (e.g. 14a-b) and Italian (e.g. 14c-d) (Butt & Benjamin 2004: 30-32; Renzi 2001: 392-394; Patota 2006: 65; Maiden & Robustelli 2013: 76ff; Rohlf's 1968: 118).

- (14) a. *Quiero cerveza.*
want.PRES.1S beer
'I want (some) beer'.
b. *Quieremos paz.*
want.PRES.1PL peace
'We want peace'.
c. *Oggi mangiamo verdura.*
today eat.PRES.1PL vegetables
'Today we eat vegetables'.
d. *Qui vendono birra.*
here sell.PRES.3PL beer
'They sell beer here'.

The examples in (15) show that the mass noun *café* ‘coffee’ is determined in the subject position and determinerless in the verb object position. This indicates that mass nouns behave similarly to generic nouns (§2.2.2) in LF. Plural count nouns and mass nouns have been claimed to have similar semantic and syntactic properties, including in Italian and Spanish (Benincà 1980: 53; Benincà et al. 2001: 185; Benincà 2012; MacKenzie 2003: 8). Butt & Benjamin (2004: 30) point to their overlap in Spanish when they observe that “the difference between generic and partitive mass nouns ... is not always obvious, as in the sentence *como carne* ‘I eat meat’, where *carne* apparently refers to meat in general”. The absence of a productive nominal plural means that mass nouns and generic count nouns are not distinguished morphologically in LF.

- (15) a. *non counchar per mi, il café basta.*
 NEG make.IMPF for 1s the coffee enough
 ‘N’en faites pas pour moi, le café me suffit’.
 ‘Do not make (tea) for me, coffee is enough’.
- b. *portar café.*
 bring.IMPF coffee
 ‘Apportez le café’.
 ‘Bring coffee’.

2.2.5. Generic nouns modified by a qualifier

A generic noun that requires no article when used by itself, such as *mare* ‘sea’ and *terra* ‘land’ in (16a), may take one when modified by a qualifier, which in our data is nearly always a possessive phrase with *di* ‘of’ (see 16b).

- (16) a. *per mare nada, ma per terra il Françis*
 by sea nothing but by land the French
star mouchou forti.
 be.IMPF very strong
 ‘Par mer rien, mais par terre ils sont redoutables’.
 ‘By sea nothing, but by land the French are very strong’.
- b. *per la palabra di mi.*
 by the word of 1s
 ‘Sur ma parole’.
 ‘Upon my word’.

The addition of a modifying phrase or adjective does not automatically convert a generic noun into a specific one. For example, the generic *genti* ‘man, people’ remains generic, and determinerless, in (17a) despite the addition of a modifying adjective. The noun *amigo* ‘friend’ also remains generic and determinerless in (17b) despite the addition of a possessive phrase. The fact that both nouns are in predicative position may be relevant (MacKenzie 2003: 10).

- (17) a. *star buona genti.*
 be.IMPF good man
 ‘C’est un brave homme’.
 ‘He is a good man’.
- b. *Quest-i Signor star amico di mi.*
 this-M.PL gentleman.M be.IMPF friend.M of 1s
 ‘Ces Messieurs sont mes amis’.
 ‘These gentlemen are my friends’.

A similar distinction is observed, e.g., in Spanish: compare *religión* ‘religion’ in (18a) with *la religión* ‘the religion’ in (18b). In (18c), *religión* remains generic and determinerless despite the addition of a qualifying adjective. In (18d), the predicative noun phrase *hombre serio* ‘serious man’ is also generic and determinerless (Butt & Benjamin 2004: 31, 43).

- (18) a. *Estamos hablando de religión.*
 be.PRES.1PL talk.GRD of religion
 ‘We’re talking about religion’.
- b. *Estamos hablando de la religión de los antiguos persas.*
 be.PRES.1PL talk.GRD of the religion of the ancient Persians
 ‘We’re talking about the religion of the ancient Persians’.
- c. *Estamos hablando de religión antigua.*
 be.PRES.1PL talk.GRD of religion ancient
 ‘We’re talking about ancient religion’.
- d. *El doctor Urdino es hombre serio.*
 the doctor Urdino be.PRES.3S man serious
 ‘Doctor Urdino is a serious man’.

In (16) we saw that a noun takes the definite article after *per* when qualified by a possessive phrase. The prepositions *a* ‘to, at’ and *di* ‘of, from’ behave in the same way as *per* with respect to this feature: compare *fora di casa* ‘out of the house’ in (19a) with *della casa di mi* ‘from my house’ in (19b), and see also *al orologio di ti* ‘on your watch’ in (19c).

- (19) a. *andar fora di casa.*
 go.IMPF out of house
 ‘Sortez de la maison’.
 ‘Go out of the house’.
- b. *mi vénir della casa di mi.*
 1s come.IMPF from.the house of 1s
 ‘Je viens de chez moi’.
 ‘I am coming from home’.
- c. *mirar qué ora star al orologio di ti.*
 see.IMPF what hour be.IMPF at.the watch of 2s
 ‘Voyez quelle heure il est à votre montre’.
 ‘See what time it is on your watch’.

The preposition *in* ‘in’ behaves differently in that the addition of a qualifier to its object noun does not cause the noun to become determined (in 20a-c). The example in (20d), though it is the only one of its kind, shows that this feature may not be confined to the noun *casa* ‘house’, which is determinerless in certain common verb-object and preposition-object collocations in both Italian and Spanish (Serianni 1989: 184; Renzi 1997: 168, 2001: 426; Patota 2006: 70; Maiden & Robustelli 2013: 74).

- (20) a. *star in casa?*
 see.IMPF in house
 ‘Est-il à la maison?’
 ‘Is he at home?’
- b. *mi mirato in casa di ti.*
 1s see.PF in house of 2s
 ‘Je l’ai vu chez vous.’
 ‘I saw (him) at your house.’
- c. *mi andar in casa del Signor.*
 1s go.IMPF in house of.the gentleman
 ‘Je vais chez Monsieur M.’
 ‘I am going to the gentleman’s house.’
- d. *in strada grandi.*
 in big street
 ‘Dans la grand’ rue.’
 ‘In the big street.’

2.2.6. Objects of *ténir* ‘have’ and *far/fazir/counchar* ‘do, make’

Objects of *ténir* ‘have’ and *far/fazir/counchar* ‘do, make’ are used without the definite article in the examples assembled in (21). In some cases, the LF examples represent idiomatic verb-object collocations inherited from the lexifiers, such as *fazir frédo* ‘be cold’ < It. *fare freddo* / Sp. *hacer frío*.

- (21) a. *questo umbré ténir cabessa*
 this man have.IMPF head
 ‘Cet homme à de l’esprit’.
 ‘This man is witty’.
- b. *ténir fébra.*
 have.IMPF fever
 ‘Il a la fièvre’.
 ‘He’s got fever’.
- c. *non tenir doubio.*
 NEG have.IMPF doubt
 ‘Il n’y a point de doute’.
 ‘There is no doubt’.
- d. *ti fato colatzione?*
 2s do.PF breakfast
 ‘Avez-vous déjeuné?’
 ‘Have you had breakfast?’

- e. *questo* *fasir* *paoura.*
 NEG make.IMPF doubt
 ‘Cela est effrayant’.
 ‘This is scary’.
- f. *fazir* *vento.*
 make.IMPF wind
 ‘Il fait du vent’.
 ‘It’s windy’.
- g. *counchiar* *favour*
 do.IMPF favor
 ‘favoriser’
 ‘to favor’

Italian and Spanish both use bare nouns in common, idiomatic verb-object collocations, for example *tener coche* ‘have a car’, *buscar casa* ‘look for a house’ in Spanish; *avere paura* ‘be afraid’, *cercare lavoro* ‘look for work’ in Italian (Serianni 1989: 183; Renzi 2001: 427; Butt & Benjamin 2004: 40, 43; Patota 2006: 70; Maiden & Robustelli 2013: 70). MacKenzie (2003) points out that, unlike in *tener un coche* ‘have a car’, the determinerless object in *tener coche* forms an indivisible unit with the verb, with the resulting meaning being something like ‘be a car owner’. Similar close linkage between the verb and its object obtains in Italian, with the resulting idioms often paraphrasable with a single verb (Renzi 2001: 427-429; Maiden & Robustelli 2013: 76ff).

2.2.7. *Definite article after di ‘of’*

When *di* ‘of’ is used as the linking element of a syntagmatic compound, the following noun does not take a determiner (see 22a). When *di* is used as the marker of possession, the possessor noun takes the definite article (see 22c). (This distinction makes the morphological status of *moukera del filio* (in 22b) unclear.)

- (22) a. *cortello di barba* ‘knife of beard = razor’
fazzoletto di collo ‘handkerchief of neck = scarf’
agoua di salé ‘water of salt = brine’
grasso di porco ‘fat of pig = lard’
piato di terra ‘plate of earth = earthenware plate’
- b. *moukera del filio* ‘wife of the son = daughter-in-law’
- c. *mi andar in casa del Signor.*
 1s go.IMPF in house of the gentleman
 ‘Je vais chez Monsieur X.’
 ‘I am going to the gentleman’s house’.

A similar contrast in Spanish is exemplified in (23) (see Butt & Benjamin 2004: 32 and related discussion in MacKenzie 2003: 8-9).

Syntagmatic compounds of the type seen in (23a) are a productive word-formation device in the Romance lexifiers of LF, cf. *luna di miele* ‘honeymoon’, *carte da gioco* ‘playing cards’ in Italian; *ojo de buey* ‘sky-light’, *caballito de batalla* ‘hobbyhorse’ in Spanish; and *dent de lion* ‘dandelion’, *prise de courant* ‘power socket’ in French (Serianni 1989: 183; Voghera 2004; Real Academia Española 2010; Forza & Scalise 2016: 530-531).

- (23) a. *la carne de vaca*
 ‘beef’
 b. *la carne de la vaca*
 ‘the meat of the cow’

2.2.8. Definite article with personal titles

The only personal title recorded in Anonymous (1830) is *Signor*, and it is determinerless when used as a vocative and determined otherwise.

- (24) a. *bon dgiorno Signor.*
 good day sir
 ‘Bon jour, Monsier’.
 ‘Good day, sir’.
 b. *ti dar una cadeira al Signor.*
 2S give.IMPF a chair to.the gentleman
 ‘Donnez une chaise à Monsieur’.
 ‘Give a chair to the gentleman.’

This difference is observed in both Spanish and Italian (Serianni 1989: 172, 185; Butt & Benjamin 2004: 37).

- (25) a. *El señor Moreira*
 ‘Mr. Moreira’.
 a’. *Pase usted, señor Moreira.*
 ‘Come in, Mr. Moreira’.
 b. *Il signor Bruschino*
 ‘Mr. Bruschino’.
 b’. *[D]ottor Lombardo, senta una cosa!*
 ‘Listen, doctor Lombardo!’

2.2.9. Indication of time

The LF construction in (26a) appears to be a calque of the corresponding construction in French, down to the lack of the definite article before the numeral. The corresponding Italian / Spanish construction is given in (26b).

- (26) a. *poco poco star quatr'ora.*
 little little be.IMPF four'hour
 'Il est bientôt quatre heures'.
 'It is nearly four o'clock'.
- b. *Sono le quattro.*
Son las cuatro.
 be.PRES.3PL the.F.PL four
 'It is four o'clock'.

2.3. Other determiners

Other LF determiners include the indefinite article, cardinal and ordinal numerals, quantifiers, and demonstrative, interrogative and indefinite adjectives. As in the lexifiers, these are prenominal (Serianni 1989; Renzi 1997).

The use of the indefinite article in LF parallels its use in the lexifiers (see 27a-c). In (27d), the part of speech status of the predicate nominal *francis* is unclear.

- (27) a. *mi andar mirar oun amigo.*
 1S go.IMPF see.IMPF a friend
 'Je vais voir un ami'.
 'I am going to see a friend'.
- b. *ti dar una cadiéra al Signor.*
 2S give.IMPF a chair to.the gentleman
 'Donnez une chaise à Monsieur'.
 'Give a chair to the gentleman'.
- c. *mi non crédir ouna palabra.*
 1S NEG believe.IMPF a word
 'Je n'en crois pas une parole'.
 'I don't believe a word'.
- d. *star francis...*
 be.IMPF French
 'Il est français...'
 'He is French / a Frenchman'.

The sentences in (28) illustrate gender agreement between the noun and demonstrative adjective.

- (28) a. *quest-o umbré ténir cabessa*
 this-M man.M have.IMPF head
 'Cet homme à de l'esprit'.
 'This man is witty'.
- b. *ti goustar qouest-a cosa?*
 2S like.IMPF this-F thing.F
 'Approuvez-vous cette chose?'
 'Do you like this?'

The sentences in (29) illustrate the prenominal position of inter-

rogative adjectives (in 29a), indefinite adjectives (in 29b), quantifiers (in 29c-d) and numerals (in 29e-f).

- (29) a. *Gouerra, con qué natzion?*
 war with which nation
 'La guerre, avec quelle nation?'
 'A war, with which nation?'
- b. *mi poudir servir per ti*
 1s be.able.IMPF serve.IMPF DOM 2s
per qoualké cosa?
 for some thing
 'Puis-je vous servir en quelque chose?'
 'Can I do anything for you?'
- c. *molto tempo ti non mirato Signor M.?*
 much time 2s NEG see.PF sir M.
 'Y a-t-il long-tem[p]s que vous n'avez vu Monsieur M.?'
 'Has it been long since you have seen Mr. M.?''
- d. *ti métir oun poco piou zoukro.*
 2s put.IMPF a little more sugar
 'Mettez-y un peu plus de sucre.'
 'Put a little more sugar'.
- e. *mi pensar non star tré ora.*
 1s think.IMPF NEG be.IMPF three hour
 'Je pense qu'il n'est pas trois heures.'
 'I think it is not three o'clock yet'.
- f. *primo piano*
 first floor
 '1^{er} étage.'
 'First floor'.

2.4. Adjectives

Anonymous (1830) records few examples of noun phrases with attributive adjectives. The adjectives can both precede the noun (in 30a, 30d) and follow it (in 30b-c). The position of a degree word, and of an attributive adjective modified by one, is illustrated in (30b). The examples in (30d) are periphrastic lexical entries translating the French-language prompts in the parentheses.

- (30) a. *star buona genti.*
 be.IMPF good man
 'C'est un brave homme.'
 'He is a good man'.
- b. *mi tenir thé mouchou bonou...*
 1s have.IMPF tea very good
 'J'ai du thé délicieux...'
 'I've got some delicious tea...'
- c. *in strada grandi.*
 in big street
 'Dans la grand' rue.'
 'In the big street'.

- d. *picola cassa* ‘case’ (Fr. *caisson*)
picolo camino ‘path’ (Fr. *sentier*)
picolo bastone ‘stick’ (Fr. *baguette*)

In Romance languages, the position of the attributive adjective can be both pre- and postnominal and is subject to many factors including syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, lexical and phonological (Nespor 2001; Butt & Benjamin 2004: 60-66; Patota 2006: 78-80; Bernardini 2011). The postnominal position generally elicits the literal meaning of an adjective and is considered unmarked; a postposed adjective supplies objective descriptive information about the noun and is semantically autonomous with respect to it. The prenominal position is marked, implies close linkage between the adjective and noun, refers to an inherent and known property of the noun, and may be utilized for non-literal, subjective or metaphorical uses. In the literature, the order adjective-noun has been likened to a nominal compound, and the order noun-adjective to modification by a relative clause (Maiden 1995: 114-115; Vincent 2007: 58-60; Cornilescu & Dinu 2013: 456). In Italian, preposed adjectives can be modified by *più* ‘more’ and *meno* ‘less’ but not, for example, by *molto* ‘very’ (Giorgi 2001: 317). Spoken and written modalities of contemporary Italian differ in their use of the prenominal position: while in the former it is mostly used in fixed expressions, in the latter it constitutes a stylistic choice (Scarano 2000, as summarized by Bernardini 2011). For some attributive adjectives, differences in placement may result in significant semantic differences: compare, for example, It. *certe idee* ‘certain ideas’ with *idee certe* ‘ideas which are certain’ (Maiden 1995: 114), and Sp. *un buen amigo* ‘good as a friend’ with *un amigo bueno* ‘a good friend and a good person’ (Butt & Benjamin 2004: 65).

The small number of examples in our data precludes an in-depth study of attributive adjective placement in LF, however, these examples suffice to provide evidence of continuity with the syntax of attributive adjectives in the lexifiers. For example, *bonou* ‘good’ clearly has the meaning of subjective evaluation when preposed (in 30a); when postposed (in 30b), it “predicates some property of the noun which is not inherent in the noun’s meaning” (Maiden 1995: 114). The postposed position of *bonou* is also apparently correlated with its being modified by *mouchou* ‘very’: as observed by Coates (1971: 28), “*mouchou* derives morphemically from Spanish, but syntactically from Italian”. The prenominal position of *picolo* ‘small, little’ in (30d) reflects the formation of new, compound-like lexemes to express new concepts. The function of *picolo* in these items is comparable to that of a diminutive suffix; compare Serrianni’s (1989: 204) observations on the semantic equivalence of *un piccolo discorso amichevole* and *un discorsetto amichevole* ‘a little

friendly speech'. In summary, the syntax of attributive adjectives in LF, with some evidence of functional differentiation between the pre- and postnominal position of adjectives in at least some of the lects, is clearly continuous with the state of affairs in the lexifiers.

2.5. Possession

Attributive possession in LF is indicated by the preposition *di* 'of' placed between the possessee and possessor. The possessor may be a noun, as in (31a), or a personal pronoun, as in (31b).

- (31) a. *mi andar in casa del Signor.*
1s go.IMPf in house of.the gentleman
'Je vais chez Monsieur M.'
'I am going to the gentleman's house'.
- b. *commé star il fratello di ti?*
how be.IMPf the brother of 2s
'Comment se porte votre frère?'
'How is your brother?'

The above construction represents the end point in the grammaticalization of the lexifiers' periphrastic possessive construction initially used with nominal possessors, as in Sp. *la casa de Juan* 'Juan's house', It. *la casa di Gianni* 'Gianni's house'. With pronominal possessors, the lexifiers have both a dedicated set of possessive adjectives and the ability to use the periphrastic construction, e.g., for disambiguation, contrast or emphasis (Cordin 2001: 620-621; Maiden & Robustelli 2013: 158ff). For example, the gender of the possessor in It. *la sua casa* 'his/her house' may be disambiguated by using the periphrastic *la casa di lui* 'his house' or *la casa di lei* 'her house'. In Spanish, *su casa* is ambiguous with respect to the gender, person and number of the possessor; these can be made explicit by the use of the periphrases *la casa de él* 'his house', *la casa de ella* 'her house', *la casa de ellos* 'their (m.) house', *la casa de ellas* 'their (f.) house', *la casa de Usted* 'your (sg.) house' or *la casa de Ustedes* 'your (pl.) house' (Orozco 2012: 219). Elimination of the category of possessives in LF has paved the way for complete grammaticalization of the periphrastic possessive construction; in the lexifiers, this construction is either stylistically marked or distributionally constrained (see also Operstein forthcoming,d).

3. Copular clauses

Copular clauses are formed with LF's only copula, (*e*)*star* (< Sp.

estar / It. *stare*). The examples in (32) illustrate copular clauses with nominal, adjectival, adverbial and prepositional (locational and possessor) predicates. (32b) shows that the predicative adjective agrees with the subject noun in gender. (32c) illustrates the adverbial use of a masculine (etymologically masculine singular) adjective. (32c) and (32d) both show that the subject of a copular clause may be left unexpressed.

- (32) a. *Questi Signor star amigo di mi.*
 these gentleman be.IMPF friend of 1s
 ‘Ces Messieurs sont mes amis’.
 ‘These gentlemen are my friends’.
- b. *il tempo star bell-o.*
 the weather.M be.IMPF beautiful-M
 ‘Il fait beau temps’.
 ‘The weather is nice’.
- c. *star mouchou bon-ou.*
 be.IMPF very good-M
 ‘Il se porte fort bien’.
 ‘He is very well’.
- d. *star in casa? – no, star forà.*
 be.IMPF in house NEG be.IMPF outside
 ‘Est-il à la maison?’ – ‘Non, il est sorti’.
 ‘Is he at home?’ – ‘No, he is out’.
- e. *questo libro star di mi.*
 this book be.IMPF of 1s
 ‘Ce livre est à moi’.
 ‘This book is mine’.

The negative morpheme precedes the copula.

- (33) a. *questo non star vero.*
 this NEG be.IMPF true
 ‘Cela n’est pas vrai’.
 ‘This is not true’.
- b. *non star bouonou.*
 NEG be.IMPF well
 ‘Il n’est pas bien’.
 ‘He is not well’.

The use of (*e*)*star* as the only copula is related to non-retention in LF of the Romance copula deriving from Lat. *esse(re)* ‘be’. The complete grammaticalization of LF (*e*)*star* represents the end point in the grammaticalization of Lat. *stare* ‘stand’, its ultimate etymological source (Operstein *forthcoming*, d). One of its syntactic effects in LF is non-distinction between nominal and locational predicates, something that distinguishes LF from some of its Romance lexifiers.

In the following example, Anonymous (1830) records the interchangeability of (*e*)*star* ‘be’ with *andar* ‘go’:

- (34) *mi andar bonou, comme ti star?*
 1s go.IMPF well how 2s be.IMPF
 'je me porte bien, comment vuos (sic) portez-vous'
 'I am well, how are you?'

The above interchangeability is parallel to the use of movement verbs in copular and auxiliary functions in Romance languages, including Hispano- and Italo-Romance. For example, in Spanish *andar* can replace *estar* in some contexts, e.g. *qué andas haciendo?* for *qué estás haciendo?* 'what are you doing?', *cómo andas?* for *cómo estás?* 'how are you doing?' (Butt & Benjamin 2004: 244, 425; for Italian, see Maiden 1995: 157-158).

The only example of what may be viewed as quasi-auxiliary use of (*e*)*star* is given in (35a), where the element in the predicative position derives from a **lexifier past participle**. The only other auxiliary-like verbs in LF are found in the analytic inchoatives listed in (35b). Both these construction types have parallels in the Romance lexifiers of LF, as illustrated by the Spanish examples in (35c) and (35d) (Butt & Benjamins 2004: 395-399).

- (35) a. *sé il Françis sbarcar, Algéri star perso.*
 if the French disembark.IMPF Algiers be.IMPF lost
 'Si les Français débarquent Alger est perdu'.
 'If the French land, Algiers is lost'.
- b. *tornar rosso* 'blush' (*rosso* 'red')
tornar / vernir bello 'grow lovelier' (*bello* 'beautiful')
- c. *ponerse / quedarse triste* 'become sad' (*triste* 'sad')
- d. *La ciudad estaba destruida.*
 the city be.IMPF.3S destroyed
 'The city was in ruins'.

4. Verbal clauses

The basic constituent order in the example sentences and dialogues supplied in Anonymous (1830) is SVO (see 36a). The subject (in 36b) and direct object (in 36c) may be left unexpressed. Adverbs and prepositional phrases follow the verb (in 36d-e), whereas the negative morpheme precedes it (in 36f-g). A sentence may begin with a subordinating conjunction (in 36h). The examples in (36a) and (36h), additionally, illustrate LF's predicative possessive construction with *ténir* 'have', whereas (36b) and (36g) illustrate the use of *ténir* as an impersonal existential verb. The example in (36f) shows double negation, and the example in (36d) illustrates the adverbial use of a masculine (etymologically masculine singular) adjective.

- (36) a. *questo umbré tenir cabessa*
 this man have.IMPF head
 'Cet homme à de l'esprit'.
 'This man is witty'.
- b. *tenir poco tempo.*
 have.IMPF little time
 'Il y a peu de temps'.
 'There is little time'.
- c. *mi mirato in casa di ti.*
 1s see.PF in house of 2s
 'Je l'ai vu chez vous'.
 'I saw (him) at your house'.
- d. *mi ablar dgiousto.*
 1s speak.IMPF just
 'Je dis la vérité'.
 'I speak justly'.
- e. *mi vénir della casa di mi.*
 1s come.IMPF from.the house of 1s
 'Je viens de chez moi'.
 'I am coming from home'.
- f. *mi non sentito nada.*
 1s NEG hear.PF nothing
 'Je n'ai rien entendu'.
 'I haven't heard anything'.
- g. *non tenir doubio.*
 NEG have.IMPF doubt
 'Il n'y a point de doute'.
 'There is no doubt'.
- h. *perqué il Bacha tenir fantétzia.*
 because the pasha have.IMPF arrogance
 'Parce que le Pacha est entêté'.
 'Because the pasha is stubborn'.

The direct object of *dar* 'give' precedes the indirect object (in 37a). The direct object precedes the prepositional phrase (in 37a-b). This order in LF reflects the unmarked order in its Romance lexicifiers (Benincà et al. 2001: 135; Ledgeway 2011: 408; Dryer & Gensler 2013).

- (37) a. *ti dar una cadiéra al Signor.*
 2s give.IMPF a chair to.the gentleman
 'Donnez une chaise à Monsieur'.
 'Give a chair to the gentleman'.
- b. *mi poudir servir per ti*
 1s be.able.IMPF serve.IMPF DOM 2s
per quoualké cosa?
 for some thing
 'Puis-je vous servir en quelque chose?'
 'Can I do anything for you?'

Several LF verbs, including *pouidir* ‘be able’, *quérir* ‘want’, *volir* ‘want’, *andar* ‘go’, *fazir* ‘do, make’ and *laschiar* ‘let’, can take a verb complement, invariably in the imperfective form. The negative morpheme is placed before the first of the two verbs (see 38c).

- (38) a. *mi andar spasségjar.*
 1s go.IMPF walk.IMPF
 ‘Je vais me promener’.
 ‘I am going for a walk’.
- b. *cosà volir scométir?*
 thing want.IMPF bet.IMPF
 ‘Que voulez-vous parier?’
 ‘What would you like to bet?’
- c. *mi non pouidir crédir.*
 1s NEG be.able.IMPF believe.IMPF
 ‘Je ne saurais croire’.
 ‘I cannot believe (it)’.

Combinations with *fazir* ‘do, make’ and *laschiar* ‘let’ have the effect of causativizing the second verb (in 39).

- (39) a. *fazir scaldar agoua; mi quérir counchar thé.*
 make.IMPF heat.IMPF water 1s want.IMPF make.IMPF tea
 ‘Faites chauffer de l’eau; je veux faire du thé’.
 ‘Heat (some) water; I want to make tea’.
- b. *ti laschiar counchar per mi.*
 1s let.IMPF do.IMPF DOM 1s
 ‘Laissez-moi faire’.
 ‘Let me do (it)’.

The above two-verb constructions are modeled after Romance infinitival constructions with modal, causative and perception verbs (Maiden 1995: 160-163; Vincent 1997a: 173). LF’s analytic causatives in (39) represent the continuation of Romance periphrastic causatives, illustrated below with examples from Italian (Patota 2006: 143).

- (40) a. *La mamma fa preparare il pranzo a Carla.*
 the mom make.PRES.3S prepare.INF the lunch to Carla
 ‘Mom makes Carla prepare lunch’.
- b. *La mamma lascia preparare le valigie a Carla.*
 the mom let.PRES.3S prepare.INF the bags to Carla
 ‘Mom lets Carla pack the bags’.

The future / irrealis marker *bisogno/a*, grammaticalized in this function from It. *bisogno* ‘need’ and/or *bisogna* ‘it is needed’, is placed before the subject (in 41a); in the absence of an overt subject, it is placed before the verb (in 41b-c).

- (41) a. *bisogno mi andar.*
 FUT 1s go.IMPF
 'J'irai' / 'Que j'aïlle'.
 'I will go' / 'That I go'.
- b. *bisogno andar domani.*
 FUT go.IMPF tomorrow
 'Nous irons demain'.
 'We will go tomorrow'.
- c. *bisogno andar mirar per ellou siémé siémé.*
 FUT go.IMPF see.IMPF DOM 3s.M together
 'Nous irons le voir ensemble'.
 'We will go see him together'.

Several verbs, including *fazir* 'do, make', *ténir* 'have', *(e)star* 'be', *piacher* 'please' and *dispiacher* 'displease', are or may be used impersonally.

- (42) a. *fazir caldo.*
 make.IMPF hot
 'Il fait chaud'.
 'It is hot'.
- b. *non tenir doubio.*
 NEG have.IMPF doubt
 'Il n'y a point de doute'.
 'There is no doubt'.
- c. *non star tardi.*
 NEG be.IMPF late
 'Il n'est pas tard'.
 'It is not late'.
- d. *quouando piacher per ti.*
 when please.IMPF DOM 2s
 'Quand il vous plaira'.
 'Whenever you like'.
- e. *dispiacher mouchou per mi.*
 displease.IMPF very DOM 2s
 'J'en suis bien fâché'.
 'I am very sorry'.

The following pair of sentences is interesting in that the impersonal and non-impersonal uses of *cascar* 'flow' are differentiated exclusively via word order:

- (43) a. *cascar agoua.*
 flow.IMPF water
 'Il pleut'.
 'It is raining'.
- b. *agoua cascar*
 water flow.IMPF
 'L'eau coule'.
 'The water is flowing'.

The LF of Anonymous (1830) has grammaticalized the preposition *per* ‘for, by’ into a marker of pronominal objects. LF pronouns do not distinguish between subject and oblique forms, which may explain the need for a syntactic marking of grammatical relations. Cifoletti (2004: 47) observes that with the first and second person pronouns, *per* marks both direct and indirect objects, whereas with the third person pronouns only direct objects are so marked.

- (44) a. *ti conoschir per ellou?*
 2S know.IMPV DOM 3S.M
 ‘Le connaissez vous?’
 ‘Do you know him?’
- b. *ti fato vergogna per mi.*
 2S do.PF shame DOM 1S
 ‘Vous m’avez fait un affront’.
 ‘You have insulted me’.

Both main lexifiers of LF display the phenomenon of differential object marking (DOM). The difference between them and LF consists in the preposition selected as the DOM marker, the types of arguments selected for the marking, and the degree of grammaticalization of the phenomenon. The examples below illustrate DOM in Spanish (in 45a), Italian (in 45b), and *cocoliche*, a contact variety of Italian heavily influenced by Spanish (in 45c) (from Butt & Benjamin 2004, Berretta 1991 and Berruto 2012, respectively).

- (45) a. *No conozco a Feliciano.*
 NEG know.PRES.1S DOM Feliciano
 ‘I don’t know Feliciano’.
- b. *A Giorgio questi argomenti non l’hanno convinto.*
 DOM Giorgio these arguments NEG 3S.M.have.PRES.3PL convince.PPLE
 ‘These arguments haven’t convinced Giorgio’.
- c. *vedo a mio fratello.*
 see.PRES.1S DOM my brother
 ‘I see my brother’.

The development of DOM in LF may be related, at least in part, to the functional extension of *per* in the context of naturalistic acquisition of Italian as a second language (Operstein 2007, *forthcoming*, d). Alternatively, or in addition, DOM could have been replicated from languages with which LF was in contact, a number of which possess this feature: as argued by Heine & Kuteva (2003), language-internal and contact-induced grammaticalization often act together to effect a structural change. In the specific context of contact languages, language-internal grammaticalization and copying from other languages in contact have

both been identified as potential sources of inflectional material (Bruyn 2008; Roberts & Bresnan 2008). With reference to DOM, replication from other languages in contact has been proposed, e.g., by Döhla (2016), who argues that the development of DOM in Andalusian Arabic and in Maltese was induced by contact with the Romance languages that are assumed to have developed this feature internally, medieval Iberian vernaculars and Old Sicilian, respectively.

The examples below illustrate the fact that the LF of Anonymous (1830) captures DOM at an incipient stage of evolution. They show that DOM is confined to the marking of objects expressed by personal pronouns, which occupy the highest slots in the animacy and definiteness hierarchies (Rohlf's 1971; Berretta 1991; Döhla 2016); as seen in (46a-c), direct nominal objects are not so marked.

- (46) a. *molto tempo ti non mirato Signor M.?*
 much time 2S NEG see.PF sir M.
 'Y a-t-il long-tem[pl]s que vous n'avez vu Monsieur M.?'
 'Has it been long since you have seen Mr. M.?'
 b. *aprir la bentana.*
 open.IMPF the window
 'Ouvrez la fenètre'.
 'Open the window'.
 c. *ti dar una cadiéra al Signor.*
 2S give.IMPF a chair to.the gentleman
 'Donnez une chaise à Monsieur'.
 'Give a chair to the gentleman'.

Related to the phenomenon of DOM is the issue of the distinction, or lack thereof, between direct and indirect objects. Both Spanish and Italian display the tendency toward formal syncretism between direct and indirect object pronouns, which is more pronounced in some varieties than in others (cf. the phenomena of *leísmo* and *loísmo* in Spanish) (Kabatek & Pusch 2011: 85; Vázquez & Miglio 2016: 70-71). For indirect nominal objects, Romance languages generally use the preposition *a* 'to', however, as noted above, both Spanish and Italian also use this preposition for introducing some direct nominal objects as part of DOM (Vincent 1997b: 209). In LF personal pronouns, both direct and indirect objects are marked by *per*, whereas in LF nouns indirect objects are distinguished from direct objects by the preposition *a* 'to', compare *ti non mirato Signor M.?* 'you didn't see Mr. M.?' with *ti dar una cadiéra al Signor* 'give a chair to the gentleman'. Based on these facts, the *Dictionnaire's* LF is typologically similar to its lexifiers in the tendency toward non-distinction between direct and indirect objects, and also in that this tendency is carried through only partially (with pronominal but not with nominal objects).

In several examples, the preposition *di* ‘of’ also functions as a marker of verbal and prepositional objects (see 47). This use is continuous with similar uses of this multifunctional preposition in the lexifiers (see, e.g., Vincent 1997b: 209-210 for Italian).

- (47) a. *mi doubtar di questo.*
 1S doubt.IMPF of this
 ‘J’en doute’.
 ‘I doubt this’.
- b. *andar fora di casa.*
 go.IMPF out of house
 ‘Sortez de la maison’.
 ‘Get out of the house’.
- c. *qué poudir counchar il Français contra di Algeri?*
 what be.able.IMPF do.IMPF the French against of Algiers
 ‘Que peuvent faire les Français contre Alger?’
 ‘What can the French do against Algiers?’

5. Interrogative clauses

In the LF of Anonymous (1830), polar questions are structurally indistinguishable from declarative clauses. The authors indicate explicitly that they are marked by intonation:

Rien dans la forme du langage ne marque l’interrogation, qui ne se fait sentir que par l’inflexion interrogative de la voix (Anonymous 1830).

[Nothing in the form of the language marks questions, which are conveyed only by the interrogative inflection of the voice].

The use of intonation for signaling polar questions, without any syntactic marking, has parallels in both main lexifiers of LF (see, e.g., Maiden & Robustelli 2013: 147 and Rossano 2010: 2759 for Italian; Butt & Benjamin 2004: 540 for Spanish). The dialogues supply examples of polar questions both with (in 48a-b) and without (in 48c-d) an overt subject.

- (48) a. *ti quérir café?*
 2S want.IMPF coffee
 ‘Voulez-vous du café?’
 ‘Would you like (some) coffee?’
- b. *ti conoschir per ellou?*
 2S know.IMPF DOM 3S.M
 ‘Le connaissez vous?’
 ‘Do you know him?’

- c. *sentir per mi?*
 hear.IMPF DOM 1S
 'M'entendez-vous?'
 'Do you hear me?'
- d. *capir?*
 understand.IMPF
 'Comprenez-vous?'
 'Do you understand?'

In content questions, the question word or interrogative phrase is placed at the beginning of the clause. The question words recorded in Anonymous (1830) include *qui* 'who', *qué* 'what, which', *cosa* 'what', *commé* 'how', *ové* 'where', *oundé* 'where from', *qouanto* 'how many, how much' and *perqué* 'why'. If the subject is expressed by a personal pronoun, the order of the subject and verb is not inverted (see 49a), whereas if it is expressed by a noun, their order is inverted (see 49b-c).

- (49) a. *commé ti star?*
 how 2S be.IMPF
 'Comment vous portez-vous?'
 'How are you?'
- b. *commé star il fratello di ti?*
 how be.IMPF the brother of 2S
 'Comment se porte votre frère?'
 'How is your brother?'
- c. *Comé star il tempo?*
 how be.IMPF the weather
 'Quel temps fait-il?'
 'How is the weather?'

The examples below provide further illustration of the word order difference in content questions deriving from the nominal versus pronominal nature of the subject.

- (50) a. *cosa ti quérir counchar?*
 what 2S want.IMPF do.IMPF
 'Que voudriez-vous faire?'
 'What would you like to do?'
- a'. *qué poudir counchar il Français
 contra di Algeri?*
 what be.able.IMPF do.IMPF the French
 against of Algiers
 'Que peuvent faire les Français contre Alger?'
 'What can the French do against Algiers?'
- b. *cosa ti ablar?*
 what 2S say.IMPF
 'Que dites-vous?'
 'What are you saying?'

- b'. *qué servir touto questo?*
 what serve.IMPF all this
 'A quoi servira tout cela?'
 'What will all this accomplish?'

The subject of a content question can be left unexpressed (see 51). The example in (51b) illustrates an interrogative governed by a preposition (Maiden & Robustelli 2013: 143).

- (51) a. *qué pensar?*
 what think.IMPF
 'Qu'en pensez-vous?'
 'What do you think?'
 b. *di qué paísé star?*
 from what country be.IMPF
 'De quel pays est-il?'
 'What country is he from?'
 c. *cosà volir scommétir?*
 what want.IMPF bet.IMPF
 'Que voulez-vous parier?'
 'What would you like to bet?'

Both Italian and Spanish require inversion of the subject and verb in most types of content questions (Butt & Benjamin 2004: 539-540; Maiden & Robustelli 2013: 147-148). The Italian examples below are from Rossano (2010: 2764).

- (52) a. *Cosa sottolinei tu?*
 what underline.PRES.2S 2S
 'What do you underline?'
 b. *Quanto costa un casco?*
 how.much cost.PRES.3S a helmet
 'How much does a helmet cost?'

Optional non-inversion of subjects in content questions has been described, e.g., for Caribbean Spanish, where it has been connected with an increase in the overall frequency of overt pronominal subjects and analyzed as part of a larger shift toward a rigid SVO order (Brown & Rivas 2011). An example of such non-inversion is *qué tú piensas?* for the normative *qué piensas tú?* 'what do you think?'. Though the details of non-inversion in Caribbean Spanish do not match those of LF in every respect – for example, Brown and Rivas note that it is attested not only with pronominal subjects but also with subjects expressed by proper nouns and “noun phrases lacking quantifiers and modifiers” – the Caribbean Spanish facts provide a plausible explanatory model for the non-inversion of pronominal subjects in LF, namely their shared tendency toward a fixed, SVO word

order. The fixed preverbal position of pronominal subjects in LF may also be connected with their use as functional equivalents of person inflection, paralleled by the obligatorification of preverbal subject pronouns in French and some other Romance varieties (Benincà 1997: 123; Kabatek & Pusch 2011: 83-84).

The LF example in (53a) illustrates the use of the preverbal position for topicalization, with the subject moved before the question word. The structurally matching Italian example in (53b), from Rossano (2010: 2765), shows that this topicalization strategy is inherited from LF's lexifiers.

- (53) a. *E il padré di ti commé star?*
 and the father of 2S how be.IMPF
 'Et Monsieur votre père comment est il?'
 'And your father how is he?'
 b. *Ma tu che ruolo avrai?*
 but 2S what role have.FUT.2S
 'But you which role will you have?'

6. Imperative clauses

LF imperatives are structurally indistinguishable from declaratives and polar questions. They employ the imperfective form of the verb, with or without the subject pronoun; examples of the latter type are more numerous. Both types of LF imperatives have functional equivalents in Romance languages, where both uninflected infinitives and verb forms that are inflected for person may be used as imperatives (Lipski n.d.).

- (54) a. *intrar.*
 come.in.IMPF
 'Entrez'.
 'Come in'.
 b. *spétar oun poco.*
 wait.IMPF a little
 'Attendez un peu'.
 'Wait a little'.
 c. *ti sentar.*
 2S sit.down.IMPF
 'Asseyez-vous'.
 'Sit down'.
 d. *ti métir oun poco piou zoukro.*
 2S put.IMPF a little more sugar
 'Mettez-y un peu plus de sucre'.
 'Put a little more sugar'.

7. Complex sentences

The dialogues in Anonymous (1830) contain examples of sentences consisting of more than one clause. The coordinate clauses are joined *asyndetically*.

- (55) a. *ti venir dgiousto,*
 2s come.IMPF just
la mangiaria star pronta.
 1s lunch be.IMPF ready
 ‘Vous venez à propos, le déjeuner est prêt’.
 ‘You have come just in time, the lunch is ready’.
- b. *mi tenir thé mouchou bonou;*
 1s have.IMPF tea very good
mi quérir ti goustar per ellou.
 1s want.IMPF 2s taste.IMPF DOM 3s.M
 ‘J’ai du thé délicieux; je veux que vous en goutiez’.
 ‘I’ve got some delicious tea, I want you to try it’.

The same is true of object complement clauses (see also 55b above).

- (56) a. *genti hablar tenir gouerra.*
 people say.IMPF have.IMPF war
 ‘On dit que nous avons la guerre’.
 ‘They say we are having a war’.
- b. *ti quérir mi andar con ti?*
 2s want.IMPF 1s go.IMPF with 2s
 ‘Voulez-vous que j’aïlle avec vous?’
 ‘Do you want me to come with you?’
- c. *mi pensar star meïo.*
 1s think.IMPF be.IMPF better
 ‘Il me semble qu’il vaudrait mieux’.
 ‘I think this would be better’.
- d. *mi pensar l’Algérino non combatir.*
 1s think.IMPF the²Algerian NEG fight.IMPF
 ‘Je pense que les Algériens ne se batront pas’.
 ‘I think Algerians will not fight’.

Several of the examples contain clause-combining morphemes. These include *per* ‘for’ in the same-subject purpose clause (in 57a), *qué* ‘that’ in the relative clause (in 57b), *sé* ‘if’ in the conditional clause (in 57c) and *quando* ‘when’ in the temporal clause (in 57d).

- (57) a. *mi venouto aposto per far mangiaria con ti.*
 1s come.PF specially for do.IMPF lunch with 2s
 ‘Je suis venu exprès pour déjeuner avec vous’.
 ‘I have come especially to have lunch with you’.
- b. *qui star questo signor qué poco poco ablar per ti.*
 who be.IMPF this gentleman that little little speak.IMPF DOM 2s

'Qui est-ce Monsieur qui vous parlait tantôt'.

'Who is the gentleman that spoke with you just now?'

- c. *sé quérir paché l'Yoldach fazir gribouila.*
 if want.IMPF peace the.janissary make.IMPF fuss
 'S'il veut la paix les Turcs feront tapage'.
 'If he wants peace, the janissaries will make a fuss'.
- d. *quando ti mirar per ellou*
 when 2S see.IMPF DOM 3S.M
saloutar mouchou per la parte di mi.
 greet.IMPF much by the part of 1s
 'Quand vous le verrez faites lui mes compliments'.
 'When you see him, pay him my respects'.

Although the above inventory of complex sentences is limited, each of the recorded sentence types and clause-combining morphemes is inherited from LF's Romance lexifiers. The complementizer-like use of *di* 'of', seen in (58), also has parallels in Romance languages (e.g. Maiden 1995: 207; Vincent 1997a: 171-172; Camus Bergareche 2013).

- (58) *mouchou tempou di conoschir per ellou?*
 much time of know.IMPF DOM 3S.M
 'Y a-t-il long temps que vous le connaissez?'
 'Have you known him for a long time?'

8. Summary and conclusion

The descriptive and comparative study in the preceding sections indicates that, from the perspective of their origin, the syntactic structures of LF may be divided into three broad types. The first type are constructions that LF has inherited intact from its Romance lexifiers. These include the static word order features summarized in Table 1. As seen in the table, LF has inherited from the lexifiers the orders determiner-noun, numeral-noun, preposition-noun, possessed-possessor, noun-relative clause, degree word-adjective, negative morpheme-verb, verb-adverb, the relative order of the direct and indirect objects of 'give', the basic subject-verb-object order with nominal objects, and both the noun-adjective and adjective-noun orders. Also inherited are periphrastic causatives with the verbs *make* and *let*, predicative possession with *have*, double negation, adverbial use of adjectives (Maiden 1995: 263, 267), obligatory fronting of the interrogative phrase in content questions, subject-verb inversion in content questions with nominal subjects, the use of fronting for topicalization, the ability to begin a clause with a subordinating conjunction, and functional differentiation between the preposed and postposed order of attributive adjectives. Similarly inherited are the gender agreement in the noun phrase and between the noun and predicative adjective, the unmarked status of the mas-

culine gender in nouns and adjectives (Serianni 1989: 121; Maiden 1994: 107), principled ways of using determined and determinerless nouns, and the overall ability to make functional use of variations in the constituent order. These inherited syntactic properties align LF typologically with its Romance lexifiers while at the same time distancing it from pidgins, the language type with which LF has traditionally been identified. The latter, according to a recent cross-linguistic survey, lack such features as adjectival agreement, definite and indefinite articles, clause-combining morphemes, and the ability to make functional use of word order variation (Parkvall & Bakker 2013: 46).

Table 1. Word order features of Lingua Franca

FEATURE	SPANISH AND ITALIAN	LINGUA FRANCA
article, noun	<i>un amigo</i> <i>un amico</i> 'a friend'	<i>oun amigo</i> 'a friend'
demonstrative, noun	<i>este señor</i> <i>questo signore</i> 'this gentleman'	<i>qouesto signor</i> 'this gentleman'
numeral, noun	<i>tres horas</i> <i>tre ore</i> 'three hours'	<i>tré ora</i> 'three hours'
preposition, noun	<i>en casa</i> <i>in casa</i> 'at home'	<i>in casa</i> 'at home'
possessed, possessor (possessor = noun)	<i>la casa del señor</i> <i>la casa del signore</i> 'the gentleman's house'	<i>[la] casa del Signor</i> 'the gentleman's house'
possessed, possessor (possessor = personal pronoun)	<i>la casa di noi</i> <i>la casa de nosotros</i> 'our house'	<i>[la] casa di mi</i> 'my house'
adjective, noun	<i>buena gente</i> <i>buona gente</i> 'good people'	<i>bouona genti</i> 'good man'
noun, adjective	<i>[la] calle grande</i> <i>[la] strada grande</i> 'big street'	<i>strada grandi</i> 'big street'
noun, relative clause	<i>el señor que hablaba contigo</i> <i>il signore che parlava con te</i> 'the gentleman that spoke with you'	<i>qouesto signor qué ... ablar per ti</i> 'the gentleman that spoke with you'
degree word, adjective	<i>muy fuerte</i> <i>molto forte</i> 'very strong'	<i>mouchou forti</i> 'very strong'
verb, adverb	<i>hablar alto</i> <i>parlare forte</i> 'speak loudly'	<i>ablar dgiousto</i> 'speak justly'
negator, verb	<i>no saber</i> <i>non sapere</i> 'not to know'	<i>non sabir</i> 'not to know'
subject, verb, object (object = noun)	<i>esto da miedo</i> <i>questo fa paura</i> 'this is scary'	<i>qouesto fasir paoura</i> 'this is scary'
verb, direct object, indirect object	<i>da una silla al señor</i> <i>dai una sedia al signore</i> 'give a chair to the gentleman'	<i>ti dar una cadiéra al Signor</i> 'give a chair to the gentleman'

The second type of LF syntactic structures comprises language-internal developments prompted by contact-induced reductions in structural categories or their exponence (Maiden 1995: 236). These include non-inheritance of the Romance clitic pronouns, possessive adjectives, morphological person marking on the verb, and a copula deriving from Lat. *esse(re)*. These structural losses have led either to (compensatory) expansion of functionally related lexifier constructions, or to complete elimination of the affected construction types. Specifically, non-retention in LF of a copula deriving from Lat. *esse(re)* has brought about complete grammaticalization of (*e*)*star* (< Lat. *stare*) whose effect upon syntax includes identical encoding of nominal and locational predicates. In the lexifiers, the descendants of Lat. *stare* are only partially grammaticalized, and are used alongside those of *esse(re)*. Non-retention in LF of the Romance possessive adjectives has brought about complete grammaticalization of the periphrastic pronominal possessive construction with *di* 'of'. Compared to its lexifiers, this construction has lost its marked character and expanded its functional domain: in Italian, periphrastic pronominal possessives are stylistically marked (Cordin 2001: 620), while in Spanish their use is constrained by such factors as the person of the possessor, the nature of the possessed noun, and the syntactic position of the possessive phrase (Orozco 2012). Non-retention of the Romance clitic pronouns has brought about the fixing of the basic SVO order in LF. The basic SOV order of the lexifiers, obligatory when the object is expressed by a clitic pronoun, was consequently eliminated; compare, for example, the SVO order of LF *mi credere per ti* 'I believe you' with the SOV order of Sp. *yo te creo* and It. *io ti credo*. Elimination of morphological person marking on the verb is partially compensated by the use of overt pronominal subjects, though in the LF of Anonymous (1830) their use is far from obligatory.

The third and final type of syntactic constructions consists of LF innovations. Although these may not have immediately identifiable antecedents in the lexifiers, they nevertheless have ample developmental parallels in the Romance domain. For example, the aforementioned tendency toward the fixing of the SVO order is also discernible in the absence of subject-verb inversion in content questions when the subject is expressed by a personal pronoun; a similar development has been described for Caribbean Spanish (Brown & Rivas 2011). The use of free personal pronouns to mark subjects is parallel to the obligatorification of subject clitics in several Romance languages (Kabatek & Pusch 2011: 83-84). Typological congruence with Romance languages and their developmental tendencies is also seen in the devel-

opment of DOM, in which feature the differences between LF and its lexifiers are not greater than between different Romance languages (Kabatek & Pusch 2011: 84-85). LF is also typologically similar to its lexifiers in the tendency toward partial non-distinction between direct and indirect objects, copular use of motion verbs, and grammaticalization of prepositions into object markers and complementizers.

In summary, the syntactic constructions in the LF of Anonymous (1830) are clearly continuous with those of LF's Romance lexifiers. The inherited syntactic constructions are more reduced by comparison: among other structural losses, LF lacks auxiliaries, reflexives, possessives, passive, and number agreement, and has a reduced inventory of subordinating conjunctions. The syntactic innovations of LF either result from functional expansion of related lexifier constructions or have close developmental parallels in the lexifiers. The structural continuity between LF and its lexifiers in the domain of syntax, demonstrated in this paper, fully bears out Whinnom's (1965: 524) earlier assessment that "the syntax of Sabir, however simplified, is beyond question Romance: the word-order is a Romance word-order".

Notes

¹ The following abbreviations are used in this paper: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, DOM = differential object marking, dom = differential object marker, f. ~ F = feminine, fut = future, grd = gerund, impf = imperfective, inf = infinitive, It. = Italian, Lat. = Latin, L1 = first (source) language, L2 = second (target) language, LF = Lingua Franca, m. ~ M = masculine, neg = negative morpheme, obl = oblique, pf = perfective, pl. ~ pl = plural, pple = participle, pres = present, pret = preterit, refl = reflexive, sg. ~ s = singular, Sp. = Spanish.

² There is a lack of agreement about whether pre-sixteenth century texts are to be included in the LF textual corpus. While this is done by some researchers (see Arends 1998), Cifoletti (1978), for example, views the late thirteenth- / early fourteenth-century poem from Djerba, *Contrasto della Zerbitana* (Grion 1890-1892), as L2 Italian rather than LF ("qualche varietà più o meno scorretta di italiano", 209), and considers the earliest LF text to be Juan del Encina's villancico dating from about 1520 (Cifoletti 1989: 220). Whinnom (1965: 523) characterizes the language of the *Contrasto* as "an inconsistently pidginized Italian". Minervini (1996) believes that the *Contrasto* represents merely "una varietà ritenuta affine alla lingua franca" (250), and considers the first documentation of LF to be Haedo (1612) (see Minervini 2010). Opinions also vary with respect to some LF samples from outside the Maghreb, such as the putative LF samples in the plays of Carlo Goldoni (see Camus Bergareche 1993).

³ An alternative label for LF during the last period of its existence (Cifoletti 1978, 2004).

⁴ Whinnom (1965: 525) summarizes this issue as follows (with respect to Encina's

villancico): “the linguistic facts of both grammar and lexicon are misted over by Encina’s limited knowledge and lack of serious philological purpose”.

⁵ Camamis (1977: 124-150) attributes the work published as Haedo (1612) to the priest Antonio de Sosa, who spent the years 1577-1581 as a captive in Algiers.

⁶ See below regarding the feminine plural *lé*.

⁷ A reviewer points to the occasional lapses in gender agreement in Haedo (1612), Anonymous (1830) and, to a greater extent, in Encina’s villancico, which is thought to represent LF from Eastern Mediterranean (Harvey et al. 1967). The absence of gender agreement in these examples is not incompatible with the view that syntactic gender is stably present in Maghrebi LF, but is analyzable as an example of the aforementioned continuum of regional, social and L1-triggered variation in LF.

⁸ Note that *mangiaria* ‘lunch’ also lacks an article as the object of *far* ‘do, make’, with which it seems to form a lexical unit (see §2.2.6).

⁹ Renzi (2001: 389) notes that, in Italian, (unqualified) bare plural subjects are found preverbally in bureaucratic prose and in elevated literary styles. In both Italian and Spanish, bare preverbal subjects may appear in proverbs and if qualified, e.g. *bambini di tutte le età arrivavano da ogni parte* ‘children of all ages were arriving from everywhere’ in Italian and *cosas como esas solo te pasan a ti* ‘things like that only happen to you’ in Spanish (Benincà et al. 2001: 186; Butt & Benjamin 2004: 31).

¹⁰ “... il plurale senza articolo sembra ... equivalere semanticamente a una quantificazione indefinita ... [an article-less plural appears to be semantically equivalent to an undetermined quantity]” (Benincà 1980: 53).

¹¹ A reviewer points to the possibility that *strada grandi* may be used here as the name of a street (see Serianni 1989: 177 on the use of articles with street names in Italian).

¹² Cf. Vincent (2007: 59) with respect to the preposed adjective in *un vecchio amico* ‘an old friend’, as opposed to *un amico vecchio*: “Because noun and [pre-posed] adjective unite to form a complex concept in this way, they are equivalent to what might in another language be a single word such as *buddy* or a compound like *soulmate*”.

¹³ This interchangeability is even clearer in the context of the complete glossary entry, which reads as follows (Anonymous 1830: 61):

Porter (Se), je me porte bien, star ou andar, mi andar bonou,
comment vuos portez-vous, etc. comme ti star?

¹⁴ Regarding DOM in Italian, see also Serianni (1989: 95) and Maiden (1995: 264).

¹⁵ Based on Greenberg (1963), Sörös (1995) and Dryer & Haspelmath (2013).

Bibliographical References

Anonymous 1830. *Dictionnaire de la langue franque ou petit mauresque, suivi de quelques dialogues familiers et d’un vocabulaire des mots arabes les plus usuels, à l’usage des Français en Afrique*. Marseille: Tipographie de Feissat aîné et Demonchy, Imprimeurs.

Anonymous 1852. *La langue sabir. L’Algérien* 11 May 1852.

Arends, Jacques 1998. A bibliography of Lingua Franca. *The Carrier Pidgin* 26. 4-5, 33-35.

Arends, Jacques 2005. Lingua Franca. In Strazny, Philipp (ed.), *Encyclopedia of linguistics. Vol. 1*. New York: Fitzroy Dearborn. 625-626.

Aslanov, Cyril 2014. Lingua Franca in the Western Mediterranean: between myth and reality. In Besters-Dilger, Juliane; Dermakar, Cynthia;

- Pfänder, Stefan & Rabus, Achim (eds.), *Congruence in contact-induced language change: language families, typological resemblance, and perceived similarity*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter. 122-136.
- Baglioni, Daniele 2010. *L'italiano delle cancellerie tunisine (1590-1703): edizione e commento linguistico delle "Carte Cremona"*. Roma: Scienze e Lettere.
- Benincà, Paola 1980. Nomi senza articolo. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 5. 51-62.
- Benincà, Paola 1997. Sentence word order. In Maiden, Martin & Parry, Mair (eds.), *The dialects of Italy*. London / New York: Routledge. 123-130.
- Benincà, Paola 2012. Determiners and relative clauses. *Iberia* 4. 92-109.
- Benincà, Paola; Salvi, Giampaolo & Frison, Lorenza 2001. L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate. In Renzi, Lorenzo; Salvi, Giampaolo & Cardinaletti, Anna (eds.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*. New ed. Bologna: il Mulino. 129-239.
- Bernardini, Pietra 2011. Qualificativi, aggettivi. *Enciclopedia dell'italiano*. [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/aggettivi-qualificativi_\(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/aggettivi-qualificativi_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano)/)
- Berretta, Monica 1991. Note sulla sintassi dell'accusativo preposizionale in italiano. *Linguistica* 31. 211-232.
- Berruto, Gaetano 2012. *Sociolinguistica dell'italiano contemporaneo*. 2nd ed. Roma: Carocci Editore.
- Brown, Esther L. & Rivas, Javier 2011. Subject-verb word-order in Spanish interrogatives: a quantitative analysis of Puerto Rican Spanish. *Spanish in Context* 8. 23-49.
- Butt, John & Benjamin, Carmen 2004. *A new reference grammar of Modern Spanish*. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bruyn, Adrienne 2008. Grammaticalization in pidgins and creoles. In Kouwenberg, Silvia & Singler, John Victor (eds.), *The handbook of pidgin and creole studies*. Wiley-Blackwell. 385-410.
- Camamis, George 1977. *Estudios sobre el cautiverio en el Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Camus Bergareche, Bruno 1993. Lingua franca y lengua de moros. *Revista de Filología Española* 73. 417-426.
- Camus Bergareche, Bruno 2013. On *deísmo*. Another case of variation in Spanish complementation. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 12. 13-39.
- Castellanos, Carles 2007. La lingua franca, una revolució lingüística mediterrània amb empremta catalana. Paper presented at the XII International Colloquium of the North American Catalan Society, Halifax, Canada, May 2007. http://www.uab.cat/Document/439/403/castellanos_linguafranca2007.pdf (14 February 2017.)
- Cifoletti, Guido 1978. *Lingua franca e sabir*: considerazioni storiche e terminologiche. *Intontri Linguistici* 4. 205-212.
- Cifoletti, Guido 1980. *Il vocabolario della lingua franca*. Padova: CLESP.
- Cifoletti, Guido 1989. *La lingua franca mediterranea*. Padova: Unipress.
- Cifoletti, Guido 1994. Aggiornamenti sulla lingua franca mediterranea. In Brincat, Joseph M. (ed.), *Languages of the Mediterranean: substrata – the islands – Malta*. The Institute of Linguistics, University of Malta. 143-149.
- Cifoletti, Guido 2000. La lingua franca a Venezia nel settecento. In Orioles,

- Vincenzo (ed.), *Documenti letterari del plurilinguismo*. Roma: Il Calamo. 9-18.
- Cifoletti, Guido 2004. *La lingua franca barbaresca*. Roma: Il Calamo.
- Coates, William A. 1971. The Lingua Franca. In Ingemann, Frances (ed.), *Papers from the Fifth Annual Kansas Linguistics Conference*. Lawrence, Kansas: The Linguistics Department, University of Kansas. 25-34.
- Cordin, Patrizia 2001. I possessivi: pronomi e aggettivi. In Renzi, Lorenzo; Salvi, Giampaolo & Cardinaletti, Anna (eds.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*. New ed. Bologna: il Mulino. 619-630.
- Cornelissen, Ralf 1992. Zur Lingua Franca des Mittelmeers. In Birken-Silverman, Gabriele & Rössler, Gerda (eds.), *Beiträge zur sprachlichen, literarischen und kulturellen Vielfalt in der Philologien*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. 217-228.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra & Dinu, Anca 2013. Adjectives and specificity. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 58. 455-480.
- Couto, Hildo Honório do 2002. *A língua franca mediterrânea: histórico, textos e interpretação*. Brasília: Editora Plano.
- Cremona, Joseph 1996. L'italiano in Tunisi. La lingua di alcuni testi del tardo 500 e del 600. In Benincà, Paola; Cinque, Guglielmo; de Mauro, Tullio & Vincent, Nigel (eds.), *Italiano e dialetti nel tempo: saggi di grammatica per Giulio C. Lepschy*. Rome: Bulzoni. 85-97.
- Cremona, Joseph 2002. Italian-based Lingua Francas around the Mediterranean. In Lepschy, Anna Laura & Tosi, Arturo (eds.), *Multilingualism in Italy: past and present*. Oxford: Legenda. 24-30.
- Dakhliya, Jocelyne 2008. *Lingua Franca: histoire d'une langue métisse en Méditerranée*. Arles: Actes Sud.
- Döhla, Hans-Jörg 2016. The origin of differential object marking in Maltese. In Puech, Gilbert & Saade, Benjamin (eds.), *Shifts and patterns in Maltese*. Berlin / Boston: DeGruyter Mouton. 149-172.
- Dryer, Matthew S. & Gensler, Orin D. 2013. Order of object, oblique and verb. In Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/1>, Accessed on 2017-07-02)
- Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin, eds., 2013. *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at <http://wals.info>, Accessed on 2017-07-02)
- Forza, Francesca & Scalise, Sergio 2016. Compounding. In Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 524-537.
- Giorgi, Alessandra 2001. La struttura interna dei sintagmi nominali. In Renzi, Lorenzo; Salvi, Giampaolo & Cardinaletti, Anna (eds.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*. New ed. Bologna: il Mulino. 287-328.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1963. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.), *Universals of language*. London: MIT Press. 58-90.
- Grion, Giusto 1890-1892. Farmacopea e lingua franca del dugento. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 12. 181-186.

- Haedo, Fray Diego de 1612. *Topographia e historia general de Argel*. Valladolid.
- Harvey, L.P.; Jones R.O. & Whinnom, Keith 1967. Lingua Franca in a *villanico* by Encina. *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 41. 572-579.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania 2003. On contact-induced grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 27. 529-572.
- Kabatek, Johannes & Pusch, Claus D. 2011. The Romance languages. In Kortmann, Bernd & van der Auwera, Johan (eds.), *The languages and linguistics of Europe: a comprehensive guide*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 69-96
- Ledgeway, Adam 2011. Syntactic and morphosyntactic typology and change. In Maiden, Martin; Smith, John Charles & Ledgeway, Adam (eds.), *The Cambridge history of the Romance languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 382-471
- Lipski, John M. n.d. On the source of the infinitive in Romance-derived pidgins and creoles. Manuscript. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0cde/f7f7daf6b5253b8fa7f756dcdcf881f00f35f.pdf>. (Accessed 21 June 2017)
- MacKenzie, Ian 2003. Bare nouns in Spanish. *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 80. 1-12.
- Maiden, Martin 1995. *A linguistic history of Italian*. London/New York: Longman.
- Maiden, Martin & Robustelli, Cecilia 2013. *A reference grammar of Modern Italian*. 2nd ed. London / New York: Routledge.
- Minervini, Laura 1996. La lingua franca mediterranea: plurilinguismo, mistilinguismo, pidginizzazione sulle coste del mediterraneo tra tardo medioevo e prima età moderna. *Medioevo Romano* 20. 231-301.
- Minervini, Laura 2010. Lingua franca, italiano come. In *Enciclopedia dell'italiano*. [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lingua-franca-italiano-come_\(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lingua-franca-italiano-come_(Enciclopedia-dell'Italiano)/)
- Munn, Allan & Schmitt, Cristina 1999. Against the Nominal Mapping Parameter: bare nouns in Brazilian Portuguese. In Tamanji, Pius; Hirotani, Masako & Hall, Nancy (eds.), *Proceedings of North East Linguistic Society* 29. Amherst, MA: GLSA. 339-353.
- Nespor, Marina 2001. Il sintagma aggettivale. In Renzi, Lorenzo; Salvi, Giampaolo & Cardinaletti, Anna (eds.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*. New ed. Bologna: il Mulino. 439-455.
- Operstein, Natalie 1998. Was Lingua Franca ever creolized? *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 13. 377-380.
- Operstein, Natalie 2007. On the status and transmission of Lingua Franca. In Hock, Wolfgang & Meier-Brügger, Michael (eds.), *Darъ slovesъny: Festschrift für Christoph Koch zum 65. Geburtstag*. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner. 235-249.
- Operstein, Natalie *forthcoming*, a. The Spanish component in Lingua Franca. *Language Ecology*.
- Operstein, Natalie *forthcoming*, b. Toward a typological profile of Lingua Franca: a view from the lexicon and word formation.
- Operstein, Natalie *forthcoming*, c. Inflection in Lingua Franca: from Haedo's *Topographia* (1612) to the *Dictionnaire de la lanque franque* (1830).

- Operstein, Natalie *forthcoming*, d. Lingua Franca between pidginization and koineization. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*.
- Operstein, Natalie *forthcoming*, e. The orthography of the *Dictionnaire de la langue franque*. *Mediterranean Language Review*.
- Orozco, Rafael 2012. The expression of nominal possession in the Spanish of Colombians in New York City. In File-Muriel, Richard J. & Orozco, Rafael (eds.), *Colombian varieties of Spanish*. Madrid: Iberoamericana / Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert. 205-233.
- Owens, Jonathan 2001. Creole Arabic: an orphan of all orphans. *Anthropological Linguistics* 43. 348-378.
- Parkvall, Mikael & Bakker, Peter 2013. Pidgins. In Bakker, Peter & Matras, Yaron (eds.), *Contact languages: a comprehensive guide*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 15-64.
- Patota, Giuseppe 2006. *Grammatica di riferimento dell'italiano contemporaneo*. Novara: Garzanti Linguistica.
- Planas, Natividad 2004. L'usage des langues en Méditerranée occidentale à l'époque moderne. In Dakhliya, Jocelyne (ed.), *Trames de langues: usages et mélanges linguistiques dans l'histoire du Maghreb*. Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose. 241-257.
- Real Academia Española & Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. 2010. *Nueva gramática de la lengua española. Manual*. Madrid: Espasa.
- Renzi, Lorenzo 1997. The structure of the noun phrase. In Maiden, Martin & Parry, Mair (eds.), *The dialects of Italy*. London/New York: Routledge. 162-170.
- Renzi, Lorenzo 2001. L'articolo. In Renzi, Lorenzo; Salvi, Giampaolo & Cardinaletti, Anna (eds.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*. New ed. Bologna: il Mulino. 371-437
- Roberts, Sarah J. & Bresnan, Joan 2008. Retained inflectional morphology in pidgins: a typological study. *Linguistic Typology* 12. 269-302.
- Rohlf, Gerhard 1968. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia*. Turin: Giulio Einaudi.
- Rohlf, Gerhard 1971. Autour de l'accusatif prépositionnel dans les langues romanes. *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 35. 312-334.
- Rossano, Federico 2010. Questioning and responding in Italian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42. 2756-2771.
- Scarano, Antonietta 2000. *Aggettivi qualificativi, italiano parlato e articolazione dell'informazione*. Preprint LABLITA 5.
- Schuchardt, Hugo 1909. Die Lingua franca. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 33. 441-461.
- Serianni, Luca 1989. *Grammatica italiana. Italiano comune e lingua letteraria*. Turin: Utet Libreria.
- Sörös, Anna 1995. Rapports génétiques et typologiques dans l'étude synchronique des langues romanes. *Revue Romane* 30. 41-79.
- Swiggers, Pierre 1991-1993. Autour de la 'lingua franca': une lettre de Marcel Cohen à Hugo Schuchardt à propos de la situation linguistique à Alger. *Orbis* 36. 271-280.
- Vázquez Rozas, Victoria & Miglio, Viola G. 2016. Constructions with subject

- vs. object experiencers in Spanish and Italian: a corpus-based approach. In Yoon, Jiyoung & Gries, Stefan Th. (eds.), *Corpus-based approaches to Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 65-102.
- Vincent, Nigel 1997a. Complementation. In Maiden, Martin & Parry, Mair (eds.), *The dialects of Italy*. London / New York: Routledge. 171-178.
- Vincent, Nigel 1997b. Prepositions. In Maiden, Martin & Parry, Mair (eds.), *The dialects of Italy*. London / New York: Routledge. 208-213.
- Vincent, Nigel 2007. Learned vs popular syntax: adjective placement in early Italian vernaculars. In Lepschy, Anna Laura & Tosi, Arturo (eds.), *Languages of Italy: histories and dictionaries*. Ravenna: Longo. 55-75.
- Voghera, Miriam. 2004. Polirematiche. In Grossmann, Maria & Rainer, Franz (eds.), *La formazione delle parole in italiano*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. 56-68.
- Wall, Albert & Octavio de Toledo y Huerta, Álvaro Sebastián 2016. Exploring and recycling: topichood and the evolution of Ibero-Romance articles. In Norde, Muriel & Van de Velde, Freek (eds.), *Exaptation and language change*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 341-375.
- Whinnom, Keith 1965. The origin of the European-based creoles and pidgins. *Orbis* 14. 509-527.