ARCHAISM AND INNOVATION WITHOUT HISTORY?
THE TYPOLOGY OF GERMANIC AND ROMANCE
Paper presented at the 50th Poznań Linguistic Meeting

John Charles Smith   **University of Oxford (St Catherine's College)**

Lass (2000) radically re-assesses the labels 'Old', 'Middle', and 'Modern' as applied to Germanic. Each of the notions in question 'is a well-formed typological category; but it is not temporal. It rather indicates an ontogenetic position on a cline of morphological and prosodic change.' He demonstrates this hypothesis by analysing the way in which certain linguistic features have or have not changed between Proto-Germanic and modern Germanic, and showing that, from a typological perspective, using these features, *contemporary* Germanic languages may appropriately be labelled 'Old', 'Middle', 'Early Modern', and 'Modern'.

Lass's analysis challenges us to think about what the terms used in language periodization really mean and implicitly invites us to apply his methods to other language families. In this paper, I tentatively apply them to Romance. Most of Lass's features involve the inflectional system, where there is some continuity of a Germanic 'type' of language from Proto-Germanic to at least some of the modern languages. However, there is a major typological shift between Latin and Romance, such that *no* Romance language exhibits — for example — the six cases or the three distinct genders of Latin, whereas all of them have created functional categories absent from the parent language. So, rather than inflectional categories *per se*, I use the morphosyntactic analysis of Coşeriu (1971; 1988), in which Romance is distinguished from Latin by an iconic typology, whereby relational concepts or meanings receive relational, 'syntagmatic' (analytic) exponence and non-relational concepts or meanings receive non-relational, 'paradigmatic' (synthetic) exponence.

With these features as input, Lass's methods yield a typology of Romance which takes account of diachronic data but is conceptually independent of notions such as temporality and periodization. It is scalar: most Romance languages can be ranked along a cline from 'old' to 'modern', with Portuguese the 'oldest' and French the most 'modern'. But there are problems. Romanian cannot be situated anywhere on the cline. And, surprisingly, Modern Portuguese is typologically 'older' than Old Portuguese, and Modern Spanish is 'older' than Old Spanish.

These anomalies can be explained, but only if we examine how the languages get to be the way they are. Romanian is out on a limb because of a number of features linked to its membership of the Balkan *Sprachbund* (Sandfeld 1930), whilst Portuguese and Spanish have, since the Middle Ages, reintroduced a number of morphosyntactic features under the learned influence of Latin. Trudgill's typology of contact (Trudgill 2010; 2011a; 2011b) is relevant here: it seems that (at least as far as the features under discussion are concerned) Lass's methods can 'detemporalize' the results of non-contact-induced change and simplification due to short-term contact (koinéization, etc.), but not the complexification through additive borrowing that results from stable contact. So, however well Lass's method works for Germanic, its application to Romance must be augmented by a study of the types of change which have led to the present state of the languages being described. The claim that labels such as 'Old', 'Middle', and 'Modern' are strictly non-temporal cannot therefore be universal.

REFERENCES

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1971. *Essai d'une nouvelle typologie des langues romanes*. Sinaia: Universitatea din Bucureşti.

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1988. Der romanische Sprachtypus: Versuch einer neuen Typologisierung der romanischen Sprachen. *Energeia und Ergon: Sprachliche Variation, Sprachgeschichte, Sprachtypologie. Band I, Schriften von Eugenio Coseriu. (1965-1987)*, edited by Jörn Albrecht, 207-224. Tübingen: Narr.

Lass, Roger. 2000. Language periodization and the concept 'middle'. *Placing Middle English in Context*, edited by Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Pävi Pahta & Matti Rissanen, 7-42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sandfeld, Kristian. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique : problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Champion.

Trudgill, Peter. 2010. Contact and sociolinguistic typology. *The Handbook of Language Contact*, edited by Raymond Hickey, 299-319. Chichester & Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell.

Trudgill, Peter. 2011a. *Sociolinguistic Typology: social determinants of linguistic complexity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trudgill, Peter. 2011b. Social structure, language contact and language change. *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, edited by Ruth Wodak, Barbara Johnstone & Paul Kerswill, 236-248. Los Angeles, etc.: SAGE.