

A study of the historical and linguistic factors that shaped Modern Spanish

Candidate: Emma Bentley (BNTEMM001)

A minor dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of a
Master of Arts specialising in Linguistics

Supervisor: Rajend Mesthrie

Linguistics Section
School of African and Gender Studies, Anthropology and Linguistics (AXL)
Faculty of Humanities
University of Cape Town
2021

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree.
It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in this dissertation from the
work, or works, of other people has been attributed to, cited and referenced.

Signature: Signed by candidate

Date: 15 September 2021

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

Abstract

Based on the perspectives and findings of descriptive linguists and typologists, this thesis presents a largely discursive qualitative analysis of how the morphosyntactic changes in Spanish, since its emergence as a separate code from Latin, are linked to both external and internal systems. The morphosyntactic changes follow the course of the three distinct phases of Spanish: Medieval Spanish, Early Modern Spanish and Modern Spanish. Medieval Spanish (*español medieval* or *romance castellano*) was used from the 9th to the start of the 15th century. Early Modern Spanish (*español medio* or *áureo*) was used from the 15th to the 17th centuries. Modern Spanish (*español moderno*) has been used since the 17th century. The external systems are understood as the political, historical, societal, and individual elements at play, whereas the internal system refers to systematic linguistic changes.

This perspective of the analysis is concerned with how exposure to other language communities, including those speaking substrate languages of former times, as well as other social contexts including ruling social communities has influenced the changes which emerged in the shape of present-day Spanish. However, the findings in this analysis also show that the reasons for the acceptance of many of the structural changes have been due to their frequent use in the spoken form. The analysis investigates the sociolinguistic context for these morphosyntactic developments, supported by existing research on language contact, historical linguistics, including grammaticalisation and sound change regularity. In doing so, this study considers how the past has influenced the present shape of Spanish and considers which sociolinguistic and contact factors were involved.

The main findings are that, however great the exposure of Spanish to other language communities has been, the changes to its morphosyntactic system have been subjected to a number of internal grammatical and sociolinguistic conditions. Grammatical conditions may include its typological profile, grammaticalisation, and phonological changes. Sociolinguistic conditions include the speaker's choice, linguistic adaptation and receptiveness to change. The role the *Real Academia Española* (RAE) has played since the 18th century in promulgating linguistic uniformity in the grammar, orthography and lexicon of the Spanish language has been pivotal for the standard written form of the language. Whilst bringing

about uniformity in the written language, it has still allowed for linguistic variation in the vernacular, both within Spain and beyond its borders. This is in line with its role as the umbrella academy to the *Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española* (ASALE). This would suggest that the uniformity in the written language has managed to bolster effective communication amongst the different Spanish speaking nations.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been feasible were it not for the tireless support and guidance that my good friend, Dr Ailsa Smith bestowed on me. Her role as an invisible secondary guide to the general formatting of my study has been pivotal to my having realised it as a dissertation. She has been crucial in helping me fine tune the register, format, coherence, style and argument, not to mention reminding me to account for each pronoun used.

I would especially like to show my gratitude to Professor Rajend Mesthrie, who has seen my work through to its final stages. Without his input, I would not have been able to pursue it till the very end and deliver a research dissertation with an outcome I was confident with. I appreciate his managerial guidance, expertise and constant support. I would also like to acknowledge the SARChI chair in Migration, Language and Social Change (grant no. 64805) for the SARChI bursary, which has enabled Rajend to act as my Supervisor to bring my thesis to completion.

I would especially like to thank my mother, Elspeth, who gently pressurised me to persevere and hold a submission date in mind. She provided me with support right until the very end, by taking an interest in, enquiring about and encouraging me to complete this dissertation. Thank you to my brother Alexander who incentivised me into finishing it. He relentlessly checked in with me on the progress of my dissertation and supported me through each phase.

Most importantly, I would like to dedicate this research endeavour to Carlota, my daughter, whose bilingualism in Spanish and English and continued emotional support have made this project both intriguing and possible.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Acknowledgements	3
Table of Contents	4
List of Abbreviations	6
CHAPTER ONE: Introduction	
1. Background.....	8
1.1 Research Area.....	12
1.2 Rationale and Significance of the research.....	14
1.3 Limitations of the Research.....	18
1.4 Research Methodology.....	19
1.4.1 Research Approach.....	19
1.4.2 Research Questions.....	20
CHAPTER TWO: Literature Review of the Historical Background to the Emergence of Modern Spanish	
2.1 The Historical Background to the Emergence of Modern Spanish.....	21
2.2. Conclusion.....	35
CHAPTER THREE: Analysis of the Changes in the Tense and Aspectual Categories of Modern Spanish	
3.1 Introduction.....	37
3.2 The gradual population of the verbal paradigms by periphrastic perfective tenses.....	41
3.3 The regularisation of the passive voice in Spanish.....	45
3.4 The changing and levelling of verb conjugation groups.....	46
3.5 The enclitic pronoun <i>se</i> , an added passive marker other than <i>ser</i> + past participle.....	48

3.6 The eventual regularisation of word order.....	50
3.7 The restructuring and gradual normalisation of <i>haber, ser</i> and <i>estar</i> as auxiliary verbs.....	53
3.8 The restructuring of aspect as a grammatical category.....	57
3.9 The enhancement of the subjunctive mood and the standardisation of periphrastic tenses.....	60
3.10 The levelling of the first- and third person inflectional morpheme markers.....	65
3.11 The morphosyntactic restructuring of the Spanish verbal paradigms (5th to 15th centuries)	67
3.12 The impact of sound change regularity	73
3.13 The involvement of sociolinguistic and contact factors in the dominance of Castilian Spanish.....	76
 CHAPTER FOUR: Conclusion	 79
 REFERENCE LIST	 85

List of Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
AP	adjective phrase
adv	adverb
aux	auxiliary verb
CL	Classical Latin
ENCL	enclitic passive voice pronoun
cond	conditional mood
def	definite article
dop	direct object pronoun
E. Med SP	<i>español medieval</i> (Medieval Spanish)
E. Áureo SP	<i>español áureo</i> or <i>español medio</i> (Early Modern Spanish)
E. Mod SP	<i>español moderno</i> (Modern Spanish)
fem	feminine gender (pertaining to pronouns, articles, nouns, and adjectives)
fut	future tense
ger	gerund
imperf	imperfect tense
indic	indicative mood
indef	indefinite article
inf	verb infinitive
interj	interjection
masc	masculine gender (pertaining to pronouns, articles, nouns, and adjectives)
n	noun
NGLEM	Manual of New Grammar for the Spanish Language

NP	noun phrase
PP	past participle
periphr	periphrastic
pret	past simple tense
PL	plural
pluperf	pluperfect (past perfect) tense
poss	possessive pronoun
pres	present
perf	perfect
RAE	<i>Real Academia Española</i> (The Royal Academy of Spanish)
ref	reflexive verb
rel	relative pronoun
SG	singular
subj	subjunctive mood
SVO	subject-verb-object (word order)
v	verb
VL	Vulgar Latin
VSO	verb – subject – object (word order)
∅	zero expression/empty position

CHAPTER ONE – Introduction

1. Background

The linguistic profile of Modern Spanish has been impacted by a range of morphological and syntactical changes. Lapesa (1984), Moreno Fernandez (2005), Ostler (2006), Penny (1991, 1995) and Pawlik (2016) share detailed accounts of the trajectory of the changes in Spanish. This trajectory involves the process of both the reduction and addition of linguistic features. All of the academics cited above suggest that Spanish has departed significantly from its Latin origins. In addition, stating that a regularisation of its distinctive linguistic structure has materialised. For this reason, linguists, scholars and typologists all concur that there has been typological change in the language. Their deduction is that the Pre-Romanesque variants, concentrated around the Iberian Peninsula (Portugal, Spain, a portion of France, Andorra and Gibraltar), largely influenced systematic changes in the Spanish linguistic system.

In addition to this, the substrate Celtic Continental languages have had an influence on the development of the Spanish lexicon, and this has been a topic of debate amongst linguists. These languages were also used along the Iberian Peninsula and towards the Balkans and Anatolia (the western most area of the Asian continent), according to research conducted by Ball and Fife (1993). Their grouping is said to be geographic as opposed to linguistic. The group includes Hispano-Celtic (Celtiberian and Gallaecian) Galatian, Gaulish (Cisalpine Gaulish) and Lepontic. Lepontic, was spoken in parts of Cisalpine Gaul (today Northern Italy) between 550 and 100 BC (Eskola, 1998). While Ball and Fife (1993) anticipate that additional uncorroborated languages might also have been used in the same region around the 3rd to the 6th century BC, the languages in this group are the only corroborated ones. More importantly, Ball and Fife (1993) distinguished this group from the Insular Celtic languages of the British Isles, Ireland, and Brittany, languages which are considered to be in a linguistic rather than in a geographic group.

Nonetheless, Cowgill (1975), McCone (1991, 1992) and Schrijver (1995) caution that written evidence of these Continental Celtic languages has been insubstantial. Therefore, researchers

have not been able to apply the comparative method which, they argue, would closely determine the developmental outcome of these languages. Lehmann (1993) explains that the comparative method is a process by which each characteristic feature of a language is compared to one or more language(s) which share the same language descent.

Linguists, including Diez (1863), often describe Spanish as a vernacularised version of Latin. This approach has been applied to this study, which takes into account both a language's typological classification and the sociolinguistic factors surrounding its development. While a typological lens has been used to classify Spanish's linguistic features, as exemplified in the study, existing research in sociolinguistics has been applied to complement the theory presented.

First, it is essential to pinpoint the variety of Spanish that is under consideration in this study, due to the vast number of variants that have emerged and are currently in use. There are 10 principal dialects of Spanish, as reported by the *Real Academia Española* (1973). These dialects include Castilian (*castellano*), Andalusian (*andaluz*), Canarian Spanish (*canario*) and Equatorial Guinean Spanish (*ecuatoguineano*). Added to the list are Spanish of the Philippines (*filipino y chabacano*), Caribbean Spanish, (*caribeño*), Mexican Spanish (*mexicano*), Central American Spanish (*centroamericano*), the Language of the Andes (*hablas de las sierras altas*), Chilean Spanish (*chileno*) and Rioplatense Spanish or the Spanish of *Río de la Plata* (spoken in the Argentinian basin). Vidal de Battini (1966) cites 8 spoken varieties of Spanish in Argentina alone. Fernández (2009) attests to another 10 spoken varieties in Mexico and 5 in Peru.

This study will focus on the Castilian variety (*castellano*). Castilian is also referred to as European Spanish or Peninsula Spanish. 'Peninsula' here refers to the Iberian Peninsula where the Spanish language first took form. Castilian itself has both Northern and Southern variants. According to Alfonso (1951), the distinction of the variants lies in the way the phonemes /c/, /s/ and /z/ are pronounced before an /i/ or an /e/, and the fricative [θ] in *ce* and *ci*. The zeta [θ] can be dental or interdental, and is more frequently used by speakers in the south of Spain, and in particular towards the south of Andalusia. The bilingual regions are

concentrated in the north of Spain but while Castilian is a dialect of Spanish, Andalusian is a dialect of Castilian and is spoken in the south of Spain and in the Canary Islands.

Presently, Spanish is cited as the official language of Spain, of 19 countries in the Americas and of Equatorial Guinea. Equatorial Guinea is the only African country with Spanish as its official language. Spanish has been one of the official languages of Equatorial Guinea since 1844. The written and spoken form are considered to be European Spanish and it is spoken by 67.6% of the population. It is a national language and is used in administration and educational settings. Two other African territories colonised by Spain between the 18th and 19th century, were Western Sahara and the northern strip of Morocco, Cape Juby (Lipski 2021). However, the use of Spanish was replaced by Arabic and French respectively as official languages. Later, the government in exile of the Western Sahara reintroduced Spanish to their publications in 2001 (Sahara Press Service (SPS) 2006). In the United States, based on the 2017 American Community Survey, there are 41 million people above the age of 5 who speak Spanish as a home language. The importance of the language to the United States is illustrated by the fact that it has its own Academy of the Spanish Language called *Academia Norteamericana de la Lengua Española* (2021).

In tracing Spanish's linguistic history, its various phases of existence need to be identified and discerned. Lapesa (1981) has developed a trajectory of the history of the Spanish language and has classified it as a Romance language. Spanish is derived from Vulgar Latin (6th to the 9th centuries), of the Italic subfamily branch in the Indo-European Languages group. The three distinct phases of Spanish from the earliest to the most recent are referred to as Medieval Spanish, Early Modern Spanish and Modern Spanish. Medieval Spanish (*español medieval* or *romance castellano*) is the variant that was spoken from the 9th to the start of the 15th century. For this reason, this era is also named the Middle Ages variant of Spanish. Early Modern Spanish (*español medio* or *áureo*) was believed to have been used by close to 80% of the Spanish population. *Español medio* was documented in its written form by the late 15th and up to the late 17th centuries. Thereafter, Modern Spanish (*español moderno*) came into being and its norms were regularised towards the end of the 17th century. However, it is significant that salient changes to the Spanish verbal system had occurred even prior to the commencement of the Medieval Spanish phase. In other words, these changes

took place around the time of the transition from Vulgar or Late Latin to Medieval Spanish. These earlier linguistic changes are specifically alluded to and demonstrated in the data analysis section of this study.

Modern Spanish has since continued to exist, supported and guided by the *Real Academia Española* (RAE) to create unity amongst the Spanish speaking nations and linguistic uniformity (Zamora Vicente 1999). This has been happening since the 1700s. The RAE is still viewed to this day as the prevailing authority with respect to Spanish. The English language has not had an established institution, such as an academy whose role it is to standardise the language, to make sure it adapts and evolves, while keeping its linguistic uniqueness. English and Spanish have both changed over time with respect to the morphological structure of their verbal inflection affixes. Similarly, the syntactic structure has also changed, and in both languages, shows the increasing adoption and regularisation of periphrasis. This study observes how the Spanish morphosyntactic system, including the adoption of periphrasis, additional verb tenses and other structural changes, have impacted its developmental outcome. The study is guided by Hill and Bradford (2000), and Stump (1998) with respect to comparing English and Spanish grammar, and Pawlik (2016), Eifring and Theil (2005), Penny (1993, 2002), Ostler (2005) and Zagona (2002) and others for their research on the outcome of the morphosyntactic system.

A typological lens has been applied to this study. This lens is guided by Coseriu (1973), and by Hopper and Traugott's (2003) research on diachronic and synchronic implications in language development and Lehmann (1962) and Lapesa's (1981) research in Historical Linguistics. Hopper and Traugott (2003) claim that a diachronic approach contextualises the history of the Spanish language, juxtaposed with a synchronic approach which helps to formulate a theory for structural changes to a language. The study focuses on Spanish's structural changes between the 9th and 17th centuries AD. It is also guided by insights from Mesthrie et al's (2000) text on Sociolinguistics, Penny's (1991) textbook on the development of the Spanish Language and the findings of Appel and Muysken (1987), Velupillai (2012) and Meyerhoff (2006) on language contact and change.

1.1 Research Area

Linguists maintain that changes to any language are inevitable and unavoidable given that no language is inert nor immune to external influence (Bybee, 2005: 10-11). Spanish is no exception. The verbal system of Spanish was saliently and morphologically changed as part of a gradual transition from Medieval Spanish to Modern Spanish (Penny 1991, 2002; Ostler 2005). Similarly, there has been much discussion around the way in which the Spanish syntactic word order has been regularised since its departure from the synthesis of the Latin verbal conjugation system. Linguists and typology theorists, who include, amongst others, Bybee (2005), Baker (2010), and Greenberg (1963), support the idea that the idiosyncrasies of one language in relation to others reveal that language's susceptibility and resilience to change as this language is disseminated into other language communities. The investigative approach of this study is both diachronic and synchronic. It will observe the (morphosyntactic) structural changes alongside the contexts for these changes over the course of the history. There are two main parts to this study. The first part considers the trajectory of Spanish as a spoken and written language.

Morphosyntactic changes are categorised into two subparts, similar to the manner which is presented in the *Manual of New Grammar for the Spanish language* (NGLEM 2010). The NGLEM (2010) divides the study of morphosyntactic changes into two main areas. The first is concerned with both the structure and makeup of words and their variations, in other words the morphology. The variations in morphology in this instance refer to the verb inflectional affix changes with respect to Spanish. Inflectional morphology looks at the grammatical and lexical morphemes in conjunction with the verb inflectional affix variations. The second area focuses on the study of the syntax. This entails analysis of a sentence's components, such as its dominant word order in relation to its typological classification. The synchronic elements that come into play here are observed.

Hill and Bradford (2000) confirm that in Medieval Spanish, (10th to 15th century), the subject was positioned both before and after the verb in equal measure. Penny (1991, 1993), however, describes how this characteristic feature changed between the Medieval and Modern phases. This syntactic structure change meant that the outcome of the positioning of

enclitic pronouns (*me, te, la, lo, le, nos, os, los, las, les*) in Spanish utterances would be limited. While in Medieval Spanish these pronouns tended to be postverbal, in Modern Spanish their position is typically preverbal in relation to the conjugated pronominal verb. An elaboration of this theory is presented in the data analysis, section 3.12, with examples from Nieuwenhuijsen's (1995) findings of the pre- versus post verbal positionings of enclitic pronouns in sentences. Ultimately, in order to qualify the verbal and syntactical system changes from an empirical point of view, a typological lens is applied to substantiate a theory of the Spanish language's developmental outcome.

Alongside the examples provided in the first part of the study, a discussion of the exposure to other variants is introduced to theorise the sociolinguistic contexts surrounding the language's development from both diachronic and synchronic perspectives (Penny 1993; Pawlik 2016). This is the second part of the study which will therefore examine the extent to which sociolinguistic and contact factors have been involved in shaping the Spanish language. Linguistic scholars concur that Latin is the root of the Spanish language and of all other Romance Languages. This happened by virtue of the fact that people in the Western Roman Empire, 2000 years ago, learnt their language from parents and peer groups as do the current population of the Spanish speaking world. Latin continues to be used in parts of Europe, Africa and America, for instance it is used in technical fields, medical terminology, scientific nomenclature or taxonomy and is the official language of the Holy See and the Roman Rite of the Catholic Church (Penny 1991). Ecclesiastical Latin is used in sung celebrations of Mass in various churches. Due to the rise of nation-states in medieval and modern Europe and the crucial role that language plays in identity, both cultural and political, resulted in the development of a separate linguistic identity for each state with separate written standards (Penny 1991). There are three main ways that languages display variation: diatopically (i.e., in space), diachronically (i.e., over time) and sociolinguistically (i.e., the same place at the same time influenced by demographic factors, such as age, education, occupation and contextual circumstances). This study focuses on both the diachronic changes and the influence of sociolinguistic factors over time.

1.2. Rationale and Significance of the Research

The drive behind this research study stemmed from a personal interest in the trajectory and subsequent changes to the Spanish grammar system. This discussion examines the sociolinguistic contexts in which these systematic changes have materialised. There are several points to be considered. These include the identity, linguistic attitudes, the upward social mobility of language communities (Appel and Muysken 1987), the variants that Spanish was exposed to in periods of language contact and the individuals who, with a degree of prestige, had the impetus to endorse linguistic changes. In order to develop a theory on the linguistic development of Spanish, this study would fall short if the social and political history or the social system of the language communities were not observed.

The research is focused on the social and systematic circumstances surrounding Spanish's departure from the norms of its parent language, Latin. The research reasons that internal systematic linguistic changes have occurred intrinsically, as a form of linguistic preservation, but have also been influenced by factors such as upward social mobility and/or survival, in the face of social and political or symbolic power (Mesthrie et al. 2000).

In Hill and Bradford's (2000) account, the characteristic features and differences between the English and Spanish grammar systems at a bilingual level are examined. English is defined as a Germanic variant of the Indo-European language family. The authors explain how English lost all but one of its verb tense inflections. This single inflection marks the third person singular (subject pronoun) of the verb by adding an *-s* suffixed morpheme, in most instances, such as *talks*, *walks*, *listens*, and an *-es* in verbs ending in [tʃ] such as *teaches*. In general, all English sibilants in verbs, which include *kisses* [s], *buzzes* [z], *bashes* [ʃ], *vision* [ʒ], *teaches* [tʃ] and *judges* [dʒ], abide by a similar inflectional rule to the [tʃ] *teaches* sibilant (Ladefoged and Maddieson 1996). The subject of an English utterance is overtly discernible. Hill and Bradford claim that this is the compensatory result of a significant loss of inflectional affixes in English.

In addition, Stump (1998) argues that English has largely departed from its synthetic origins. He adds that a language is typologically classified as being a synthetic language when many pieces of information are coded by the inflection on the verb. He outlines how English would gradually evolve to be classified as an analytic language. This was due to the eventual adoption and regularisation of periphrastic forms in the syntactic system. A defining feature of analytic languages is periphrasis. In periphrastic structures, separate morphemes are structural features of the utterance. Inflectional affixes that code pieces of information into the verb of an utterance are not a structural feature in analytic languages. However, Stump counterargues that periphrasis is a feature of synthetic languages if structural gaps in an inflectional paradigm have been both filled and enhanced by periphrasis. This study considers how this respective adoption of periphrasis, has been an enhancement to the verbal paradigms of Spanish.

The idiosyncratic dropping of the subject pronoun in Spanish, for which it has become known as a pro-drop language, is a salient feature which illustrates the morphological and syntactical consequences following the departure of Spanish from its Latin origin. The *Real Academia Española* declares that the inflected verb or inflectional affix on the verb ‘contains in itself the subject, be it definite or indefinite, and is therefore equivalent on its own to a complete sentence’ (*Gramática de la Real Academia Española* 1931). The following utterance exemplifies this subject-verb coding in the example below. The verb *bailar* ‘to dance’, illustrated below is classified under the first conjugation group of Spanish regular verbs suffixed by *-ar*, is suffixed by the *-amos* affix inflection, to code the third person plural subject pronoun *nosotros* ‘we’. The inflectional affix is the same for the present simple third person and past simple third person plural conjugations of Spanish verbs suffixed with *-ar* (Hill and Bradford 2000).

Bailamos

dance-1PL.pret

‘We danced.’

A language's degree of synthesis is determined by the pieces of linguistic information coded in the inflectional affixes of its nouns and verbs (Eifring and Theil 2005). Spanish's pro-drop feature signifies that the crucial clue to the subject-verb, number and person agreement is coded in the inflection that the verb takes on in an utterance (Eifring and Theil, 2005: 9).

Lapesa (1981) focuses on how Spanish departed from its Latin roots on semantic, syntactic, phonological and morphological levels. Subsequently, he asserts, reading documents in Medieval Spanish is not an insurmountable challenge for modern readers. Pawlik (2016) is of the opposite opinion, claiming that Medieval Spanish is relatively unintelligible. From this point, he deduces that the Spanish grammatical system is not nearly as resistant to change as it was thought to be. Firstly, he claims that an adequate acquisition of Medieval Spanish vocabulary would have been required to be able to read the literature. Secondly, he points out that one of the main characteristics of Medieval Spanish, in its early stages of existence, was its exposure to other language variants. The changes that came from this exposure had an impact on the inherited Latin verbal paradigms, resulting in their being significantly restructured. The result is that the Latin paradigms still bear some resemblance to their Spanish counterparts. Examples will be provided to show this partial resemblance in the data analysis section of this study. However, over the course of time, the grammatical roles a single verb tense can denote in the Spanish grammar system's verbal paradigms have gradually become more limited. On the other hand, the number of verb tenses within the verbal paradigm has increased in modern Spanish compared to Latin. The verb tenses are bound by more regulated grammatical norms as a result. For the most part, the Spanish verbal paradigms have been significantly restructured.

Pawlik (2016) and Eifring and Theil (2005) note that the restructuring is particularly evident in the Spanish verbal system, but acknowledge that other linguistic categories were also affected. More importantly, the verbal paradigms are said to have stabilised over the course of the 15th and 16th centuries. Interestingly, Pawlik has also attempted to determine why the syntactical system has never been entirely coherent nor grammatically steadfast, a structural feature shared amongst other Romance languages such as French and Italian. Hill and Bradford (2002) concur that, due to Spanish's Latin origins, the marking of person, number, tense, aspect and mood are all signalled by the inflection on the verb. This is a structural

feature of synthetic languages. To put it another way, pieces of information coded in the verb are the focal point by which an utterance is understood in Spanish.

Not only have the verbal inflections from Latin been preserved in Spanish, but the malleable Latin word order has also been retained (Hill and Bradford, 2002:3). Meyerhoff (2006) claims that there are multiple reasons for language variation and change which have to do with social, educational, institutional, governmental or even language contact reasons. She cautions that the perception of linguistic features that have been changed over the course of time does not then inherently lower the status of a language. She stresses that linguists, unlike language purists, are not disconcerted by the loss, gain or modification of features. From a sociolinguistic perspective, it would be pertinent to consider the implication of agreed structural changes in comparison with those that have gone unnoticed, such as in the comparative method referred to above. However, this has not been considered in this study, but would add value to ongoing linguistic research on Spanish.

Meyerhoff (2006) and Velupillai's (2012) descriptions of the effects of language contact are applicable to the development of our theory of typological change in Spanish. Not only do their explanations apply but the authors also suggest that both language contact and language change be viewed from a positive stance. Meyerhoff (2006) clarifies how adopted features from the source language take on a distinct role in the recipient language. These roles are then reallocated in the recipient language. Velupillai's (2012) account also points this out. Meyerhoff surmises that feature reallocation occurs uniformly because gaps are filled by these structural changes in the recipient language's system. Velupillai emphasises that the focal point, when analysing the reallocation of features in a recipient language, should be an individual speaker's specific communicative needs for the feature and will therefore affect the developmental outcome of the language.

Mesthrie et al (2000) draw on the theories of Weinrich, Labov and Herzog (1968) to hypothesise on language change and variation in historical linguistics. Their hypothesis considers how challenging language change is to theorise on, claiming that the study of language change and sociolinguistics are interdependent. This is due to a number of factors.

Their argument is that prescriptivists, sociolinguistics and social groups within a speech community all have a different take on why languages change. While prescriptivists view linguistic changes as having adverse effects on the language's quality, sociolinguists apply academic analysis to make sense of linguistic changes from a social context perspective. Mesthrie et al explain how linguistic variation is brought about as a consequence of regional, social or stylistic differentiation in a language community. Their theory is that, in the same speech community, attitudes (Appel and Muysken 1987) and choices of variants affect linguistic variation in a single social group. In this study, Mesthrie et al's (2000) theories on variationist approaches to change are applied to the morphological and syntactical changes in Spanish, together with Hopper and Traugott (2003)'s theories on grammaticalisation. The results are demonstrated in the data analysis section.

1.3 Limitations of the Research

As a researcher currently living outside of Spain, an obstacle to this study has been not being able to interact with Spanish speaking communities who have witnessed these ongoing changes. I have therefore had to rely exclusively on published research that is available via online libraries. If this research were to be pursued at a higher level, literary works which have recently come to my attention would need to be considered. These include specifically the *Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics* edited by Manuel Díaz-Campos, published in 2011 together with *A Political history of Spanish: The Making of a Language* edited by José Del Valle, published in 2013. First-hand perspectives would also have been of considerable additional value to this research study. Nevertheless, the research available on language contact, (Appel and Muysken 1987) and (Velupillai 2012), Sociolinguistics (Mesthrie, Swann, Deumert and Leap 2000), the History of the Spanish language (Penny 1991, 1993, 1995), Historical Linguistics (Lehmann 1962), Languages and Empires (Ostler 2005), Grammaticalisation (Hopper and Traugott 2003), and the History of Spanish Grammar (Pawlik 2016) form the backbone of this study. Therefore, despite the foreseen obstacle, the review and analysis of the data has produced a discursive thesis on observed language change in Spanish.

1.4 Research Methodology

1.4.1 Research Approach

For the purposes of conducting this analysis, a typological approach, pursuant to Baker's 2010 text on Formal Generative Typology, was taken. Greenberg (1963) pioneered a set of linguistic universals, based on an analysis of 30 languages, to measure the extent to which the constraints in a language reveal its similarities to other languages. Eifring and Theil (2005) discuss how the Universal Grammar rules in a language make it comparable to other languages. Eifring and Theil (2005) also define the study of typology as an attempt to observe the way in which languages differ, while cautioning that this very variation is bound by certain constraints. These constraints can be observed by first considering a language's typological classification. Drawing on the work of Greenberg, this classification is determined by the basic word order, in terms of the subject, verb and object in an utterance. In this research study, changes to the morphology of the Spanish verb system, framed by the ensuing regularisation of its syntactic system, are elucidated. The sociolinguistic contexts within which these changes have occurred are theorised. It also observes how and where these changes tend to occur.

The methodology applied to this research to some extent emulates Baker (2010) through being a discursive essay. But more importantly has applied Hopper and Traugott (2003) and Coseriu's (1973) findings on how both diachronic and synchronic aspects need to be considered in the methodology. This approach has framed the historical context (diachronic) and pinpointed the moments (synchronic) in history in which these changes have occurred. Coseriu's approach is that both external and internal factors are at play in linguistic changes, but that these factors are interdependent. He clarifies this by explaining that changes are imposed by external factors while the system is thereby internally adapted. This internal systematic adaptation is one theory of how the system of a language is intrinsically preserved. This supports Mesthrie et al's (2000) caution, in reference to a 1968 paper by Weinrich, Labov and Herzog, that if changes in a language are to be examined, not only should the language's system be closely considered, but also its social system. Mesthrie et al's (2000) description of the trajectory of a change to a language's sound system supports their argument that both the language's system and its social system are at play in language

change. This is explored in the data analysis section of this study. This study makes use of Baker's (2010) approach, Hopper and Traugott (2003), Appel and Muysken (1987), Mesthrie et al (2000), Velupillai (2012) and Coseriu's (1973) research findings as an attempt to provide an observation to explain some of the structural changes to the Spanish system.

1.4.2 Research Questions

1.4.2.1 Primary Research Question

How has the past influenced the present 'shape' of the Spanish language?

1.4.2.2 Secondary Research Question

What does the current linguistic literature say about the impact of sociolinguistic and contact factors?

CHAPTER TWO - Literature Review

2.1 Background to the emergence of Modern Spanish

Salient inflectional affix changes in Spanish's verbal system are reported to have occurred around the transition periods from Vulgar Latin to the three distinct phases of its linguistic form: Medieval Spanish, Early Modern Spanish and Modern Spanish. To frame the research, the historical evolution of the community of Spanish speakers needs to be traced right back to the era in which Spain formed part of the Iberian Peninsula. This literature will accordingly focus on the historical background to the emergence of Spanish from its Latin ancestry amidst other substrate languages. As part of this study the morphological, verbal, phonological and syntactic systematic changes between Classical Latin, Vulgar Latin and the development of Spanish are reviewed in the data analysis section.

Poulter (1990) describes how, prior to the emergence of Vulgar Latin, Latin originated in Latium, not far from the Tiber River in Central Western Italy, where Rome remains the capital city. Classical Latin is the name now given (in English) to the variety which presided over the Roman Empire's greatest period of linguistic territorial rule, of which the Iberian Peninsula formed part. Equally, it is the variety from which ideas and concepts alluding to culture, learning, philosophy and religion materialised (Poulter, 1990). However, research has shown that Vulgar Latin and Classical Latin, coincide as varieties of Latin with respect to their historical linguistic periods (Cornell 1995; Smith 1996).

Poulter (1990) adds that Classic Latin was the language of teaching and was practised by the upper class, whereas Vulgar Latin was reserved for colloquial conversational contexts. More importantly, he confirms that Spanish emerged from Vulgar Latin rather than from Classical Latin, but that written evidence of Vulgar Latin is not as abundant as that of Classical Latin. Blake (1987) demarcates the end of the Roman Empire as coinciding with the emergence of different linguistic features distinct to certain regions using Vulgar Latin. He claims that Roman territory was linguistically divided into two different groups. Dacia, Dalmatia and the Italic Peninsula formed the Eastern linguistic region of the Roman territory and Spain, Portugal, Gaul (Latin: Gallia), Northern Italy and Raetia made up the Western linguistic region. Subsequently, diverse linguistic changes specific to these regions emerged in these two varieties. Morphological plural formation was one of the changes distinct to each region. Blake (1987) explains how the plurals were formed by suffixing the nouns with an -s in the

Western region whereas, in the Eastern region, the plural form was marked by omitting the final *-s* suffix, and instead adding a vowel suffix, such as an *-e* or *-i* (refer to Table 1 below, Vulgar Latin forms included). With respect to how Spanish (from the Western region) and Italian (from the Eastern region) differ in terms of plural formation, Blake (1987) uncovered a morphological linguistic feature of their nouns. This is a distinguishable feature of the two languages. By examining several nouns with phonetically similar spelling in Italian and Spanish, the two different morphological inflections, featured in Table 1 below were picked up (Blake 1987; Lapesa 1951; Penny 2002).

Table 1

Vulgar Latin	Spanish	Italian
<i>librum</i> - <i>libro</i> SG. n PL. n book books	<i>libro</i> - <i>libros</i> SG. n PL. n book books	<i>libro</i> - <i>libri</i> SG. n PL. n book books
<i>casa</i> - <i>casae</i> SG. n PL. n house houses	<i>casa</i> - <i>casas</i> SG. n PL. n house houses	<i>casa</i> - <i>case</i> SG. n PL. n house houses
<i>causa</i> - <i>causās</i> SG. n PL. n thing things	<i>cosa</i> - <i>cosas</i> SG. n PL. n thing things	<i>cosa</i> - <i>case</i> SG. n PL. n thing things

Blake, Lapesa and Penny are also of the view that while many linguistic changes occurred in the Medieval Spanish phase, the evidence from this phase is predominantly from literary and notarial writings. Both claim that while notarial writing is not a reliable source for vernacular changes, it is a valuable source of chronological accuracy and precision in historical linguistics. Poulter (1990) and Candau (1985) share the view that the Iberian nation descended from an era of contact between Greek and Phoenician communities and the earliest inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula. Others are of the view that this was in fact a

civilization that had migrated north from the African continent. Spaulding (1943) holds that the language variety of the Iberians is traceable in some inscriptions used in the Punic alphabet around and towards the end of the 1st century. He attests to the minor lexical influence that the Iberians have had on Spanish from this historical era of contact prior to the Roman stronghold. He provides examples of a number of nouns that have remained in Spanish which descended from this early Iberian variety.

<i>arroyo</i>	stream-masc
<i>García</i>	to this day a familiar family name in Spain
<i>sapo</i>	toad-masc
<i>manteca</i>	lard-fem
<i>cachorro</i>	puppy-masc

Spaulding (1943) notes that around the 11th century, the Iberian Peninsula, and specifically the coastal region bordering the Mediterranean Sea, was taken over by Phoenicians. The Phoenicians established several cities in Spain, declared as trading ports. These cities include Málaga, Carteya, Adra, Almuñécar and Cádiz. Spaulding credits the name *Hispania* as having descended from the Phoenician era. He claims that *Hispania* is a Semitic term which refers to something which is hidden or far away. However, he asserts that it was the art of writing that was the single most significant gift bestowed on Spain by the Phoenicians. The linguistic contribution of the Phoenicians to Spanish was not as significant as the gift of writing was to be. Subsequently, Spaulding (1943) outlines how the Tartessian culture materialised as a result of this Phoenician era in the Iberian Peninsula. Poulter (1990) also attests to the mention of the Tarshish city in the Bible, in the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, but claims that by the middle of the 1st century, there were no longer any traces of the Tartessian culture.

Spaulding clarifies the reasoning behind the dissolution of Tartessian culture in the Iberian Peninsula. He claims that around the period in which Carthage, along the coast of Africa, was established by the Phoenicians circa 1000 BC, the city became a stronghold in the Mediterranean. The inhabitants of Carthage had to defend their territory circa 600 BC against the Tartessians who attempted to seize the city of Gadir, which the Phoenicians had also

established. The Tartessians were defeated by the Carthaginians, which consequently led to the Romans invading and taking over the Peninsula. Further along the timeline, Spaulding details how the motive for the first Punic war, in 264 BC, was a territorial claim for Sicily (Italy) between the Carthaginians and the Romans. A second Punic war in 218 BC marked a second attempt by the Carthaginians to reclaim areas lost to the Romans in the first Punic war. This second defeat ultimately gave the Romans their Iberian Peninsula stronghold (Spaulding 1943).

In addition to the Phoenicians, Lapesa (1950) claims that the Greeks sought to establish trading ports in the Iberian Peninsula. The cities that materialized from the Greek era in the peninsula include Empúries (*Ampurias* in Spanish), a bygone coastal city off Catalonia, Spain as well as Rhodes in Greece. Lapesa corroborates the lexical footprint that the Greek era has left on Spanish, but does not credit the Greeks with other kinds of linguistic influence. Words that would materialise in Spanish, despite being of both Greek and Roman descent, were established during the Roman rule in the Iberian Peninsula. The terms that remained in the Iberian Peninsula were those that denote education, science, art and culture and religion. Some examples from Lapesa's (1951) work are listed below.

<i>matemática</i>	mathematics-fem
<i>telegrafía</i>	telegraphy-fem
<i>botánica</i>	botany-fem
<i>física</i>	physics-fem
<i>gramática</i>	grammar-fem
<i>poema</i>	poem-masc
<i>drama</i>	drama-masc
<i>obispo</i>	bishop-masc
<i>bautizar</i>	baptise-v
<i>ángel</i>	angel-masc

Poulter (1990) also details how three distinct Germanic Gothic language communities around the 5th century AD, referred to as the Vandals, the Swabians and the Alans, invaded the Iberian Peninsula. However, they did not leave significant linguistic lexical traces, save for the place name, Andalusia, the autonomous regional district in the south of Spain.

Andalucía (E. Mod Sp) > Vandalusia > Vandalucia (land of the Vandals)

Poulter details how at the start of the 8th century, circa 711 A D, the Moors defeated the Visigoths to take over Hispania. Those Christians who had managed to flee the Moorish dominance, concentrated in the South, had migrated to the northern regions of Hispania which the Moors had failed to claim. In 1085 A D, King Alfonso VI defeated the Moors in Toledo and in 1492, the Moors were defeated in Granada. This marked the end of Moorish dominance altogether in Spain.

Lapesa (1950) cites over 4000 words that were borrowed from Arabic, the language of the Moors, and would forever become part of the Spanish language. More specifically, the contextual significance for these borrowings includes terms used for war, agriculture, science and the home. Lapesa cautions that the linguistic traces of Arabic on Spanish only extend as far as the Spanish lexicon, and that no Arabic phonemes were appropriated into the resultant Spanish phonological system. The following are cited examples of Arabic lexical borrowings.

<i>tambor</i>	drum-masc
<i>alférez</i>	second/sub lieutenant-m or ensign-m
<i>acicate</i>	incentive-masc
<i>acequia</i>	irrigation canal (water conduit in Arabic)-fem
<i>aljibe</i>	cistern, reservoir-masc
<i>alcachofa</i>	artichoke-fem
<i>alfalfa</i>	alfalfa (a fodder plant)-fem
<i>algodón</i>	cotton-masc
<i>alcoba</i>	bedroom-masc
<i>azotea</i>	rooftop terrace-fem

algoritmo algorithm-masc

alquimia alchemy-fem

alcohol alcohol-masc

Penny (1991, 2002) recounts how the spoken variant of Spanish was the first of its kind to gradually emerge from Vulgar Latin. Spanish only took form as a written language around the 13th century. Spanish is thus derived from, but distinct from, Latin and stems from the linguistic communities in which it was first used primarily as a verbal communication tool. There is a common denominator to this historical description of invasions, periods of reign and/or subsequent dissolutions of language communities in the Iberian Peninsula. This common denominator is that Spain's northern regions were where the greatest variety of linguistic community influences on the Spanish language had been concentrated.

Ostler (2005) describes how a version of Spanish was first heard amongst Romans circa 210 BC, the origin of which is from a dialect of spoken Latin. He adds that four Paleo Hispanic languages (of which only some are derived from Latin via the Indo-European branch) were used in the Iberian Peninsula. Of these four, Basque (*Euskera*) is used to this day and is an official language of Spain. The other three were Celtic languages: Iberian, Celtiberian and Galician. The Galician language is a remnant of the region of Galicia, and is another one of the four official languages of Spain. Lambert (1994) and Prósper (2005) mention that Lepontic and Gaulish were used between the 3rd and 6th centuries BC in the Alps Region and that their linguistic traces remain in certain inscriptions and names of places. This suggests that it is feasible that Spanish will have had a Celtic language substrate.

In addition, Gaulish is believed to have had two dialects: Cisalpine (in the Italian Alps region) and Transalpine (in the French Alps). Furthermore, Celtiberian, also known as North Eastern Hispano-Celtic, was used between the 1st and 3rd centuries BC. North Eastern Hispano-Celtic is the denomination of both the language and the region of northeast Iberia. Much like Lepontic and Gaulish, Lambert (1994) claims that there are traces of Celtiberian in several place names and inscriptions in Spanish to this day.

In a similar fashion, Lambert (1994) lists Gallaecian, also denominated as North-western Hispano-Celtic, as having left its linguistic footprint in several written Latin texts. The

linguistic traces of Gallaecian, used in the north western part of the Iberian Peninsula, can be found in several Celtic inscriptions and in isolated words and sentences. These regions in the north western areas of Spain today make up some of the autonomous regional districts of the country. They include Galicia, western Asturias, western Castile and León, and the Norte Region in what is today now Portugal. Spaulding (1943) adduces that the Celts did not in fact seek to take on territory in Spain as their own, but to share the territory with other language communities already residing in the area. He proposes that the traces of the Celtic lexicon in Spanish are derived from an era of language contact between the Romans and the Celts in a region known as Gaul. For the most part, the traces of the Celtic lexicon that remained are a group of nouns. These nouns tend to refer to traded goods, or war weapons or equipment used in hunting. Spaulding (1943) provides the following list of Spanish words of Celtic origin:

<i>caballo</i>	horse-masc
<i>carro</i>	cart-masc (horse-cart)
<i>camino</i>	path-masc
<i>fleche</i> (fr.), <i>flecha</i> (E. Mod Sp)	arrow-fem
<i>lanza</i>	spear-fem
<i>cerveza</i>	beer-fem
<i>camisa</i>	shirt-fem

It has been conjectured that, like the Celtic languages, the Basque language has had a substrate influence on Spanish. The influence of Basque is traceable in the phonetic development of the Spanish lexicon (Penny 2002). The reason that the Basque language has been cited as a substrate to Spanish is because, once Spain was reclaimed by the Catholic monarchs in 1492, many speakers of the Basque community migrated to former Muslim territory to establish new communities. Their lineage is attested to in the place names and phonological changes in Spanish. Penny attributes the change from the /f/ in Latin to a muted /h/ in Spanish to the Basque linguistic community. This process of lenition and the way in which the Latin /f/ disappeared from most popular Spanish words has been intensely debated. Menéndez Pidal (1964) suggests that the first traces of this change were picked up in *Castile* and *La Rioja* which are geographically close to the Basque-speaking community of Spain. Menéndez Pidal uses Medieval Hispanic documents from this region as evidence that the

absence of a labiodental phoneme /f/ suggests that as speakers of Basque became bilingual in Latin, they replaced the /f/ with the aspirate /h/. There are two main objections to this theory. Firstly, that the change from /f/ to /h/ also occurred in some Romance territories where Basque would not have been an influence. Secondly, if /f/ was replaced by /h/ in a word such as, *farina* ‘flour’, why was this not the case in *forte*. The fact that the rural dialects of Spain and America still use *huérte* whereas the standard form is *fuerte* is explained by adherents to substratum theory that suggest that this is not unusual in dialect mixing (Penny 2002).

Oftedal (1985) defines lenition as a process by which the sound of a consonant becomes more resonant over time. It is cited as a natural change in the evolution of the linguistic system rather than resulting from a language’s social system. Basque is categorised as a Language Isolate by linguists. This is because its genealogical connection to other languages has not been corroborated to this day (Campbell 2017).

Ostler (2005) points to a defining and uniting characteristic of language communities whose languages derive from Latin. This characteristic is that the Latin-based system has tended to take precedence as the centre of the linguistic systems of these language communities, over any other feasible external linguistic influence. For this reason, Malone (2008) cautions against referring to Latin as a language that no longer exists, but rather as the language that never disappeared, but gradually evolved in different ways over time in different places via different substrate influences and natural change.

Ostler (2005) proposes that the Modern Spanish lexicon was most significantly influenced by Romance languages including Mozarabic (Andalusi Romance), Navarro-Aragonese, Leonese, Catalan, Portuguese, Galician, Occitan, and subsequently French and Italian, Arabic and German Gothic Language. More recently, English has started to influence Spanish. Zagora (2002) explains that the influences were determined by an era of Visigoth rule in the Iberian Peninsula between the 5th and 8th centuries, followed by the subsequent migration of these linguistic communities. Lapesa (1950) claims that, in the midst of this Visigoth rule, the linguistic community was resigned to interacting in Latin despite the Visigoths being of Germanic descent. Poulter (1990) states that the Visigoths settled in Hispania in the early part of the 4th century. Having migrated from Rome, they reached a group consensus to abide by Roman law. However, after eventually breaking free from the Roman Empire, the Visigoths

attempted their own takeover of a part of the Iberian Peninsula. Lapesa (1951) affirms that their linguistic footprint in Spain was not nearly as significant as their political power would suggest. He surmises that the outcome of the Visigoth era in Spain was detrimental to their subsequent communication ties with the rest of the Roman-ruled territories.

As has been mentioned previously, in the developmental outcome of its written form, the Spanish lexicon was greatly influenced by the live variants of Latin, including Classical Latin and Renaissance Latin. The continued evolution of the lexicon in the Iberian Peninsula coincided with the time in history in which the Roman Empire began to lose power and eventually fall. There are written forms of Castilian and other Central Ibero-Romance varieties (which evolved from Vulgar Latin) in the late 11th century, referred to as *Glosas* (*Studies in Historical Linguistics and Language Change* 2019). The use of the copula ‘ser’ which is still evident today in local dialectal conversations, was evident in Castilian texts written by Gonzalo de Berceo, who wrote his works in Berceo (today known as Rioja) around the 12th century (Dutton 1968). There were also examples of written forms from the provinces of Burgos, such as the *Tratado de Cabrerros* (1206). Of equal importance, for the written form, was the founding of the first Castilian University in Palencia in (1212). However, it was not until the 13th century, when Toledo became the cultural centre, which coincided with the same period that King Alfonso X is credited with having endorsed the standardisation of the written form of the Spanish language in his court. Even though this process had reportedly been started by Ferdinand III, King Alfonso X’s father, it was Alfonso who took the project on and saw it to its end. (Penny (2002), Lapesa (1981) and Ostler (2005).

This linguistic standardisation of the Spanish language in its territory coincided with the *Reconquista* movement, which lasted eight centuries (711-1492). Lapesa (1981) accounts how the *Reconquista* changed the face of Spain, as 700 years of Moorish dominance came to an end. This reconquering of land was initiated by the then reigning Catholic monarchs, Queen Isabella I of Castile and King Ferdinand II of Aragon who sought to reclaim the territory of Spain from the Moors through war and dominance. Beyond 1248, only Granada remained under Moor or what would be considered Arab rule. When Ferdinand and Isabella captured this area in 1492, speakers of Andalusian varieties of Castilian resettled in the area which meant that over the next 600 years, Castilian was the dominant spoken language from

the Cantabrian coast, to the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. This spread of Castilian on the map has been referred to as the *cuña castellana* ‘Castilian wedge’, which is referred to in the recent dialectological work by Inés Fernández-Ordóñez (and her research group) in the last 10-15 years (2006-2021). Consequently, this period in history would go on to have sociolinguistic repercussions on the Spanish language community. Throughout this period, territories bordering the Iberian Peninsula were not only unified, but several Vulgar Latin language communities, together with the Basque community, were amalgamated. This brought together what became known as the Castilians. Within Spain, Spanish is referred to as Castilian (*castellano*) due to its origin as a language in the medieval kingdom of Castille (Ostler 2006).

The first grammar book in Spanish is reported to have been handed to Queen Isabella I in 1492 by Antonio de Nebrija in the city of Salamanca. Its title was *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (Grammar of the Castilian language). Lapesa (1981) recounts Nebrija’s philosophy that an empire’s constant companion is its language. Besides his published modern Spanish grammar book, Nebrija’s works also include a grammar book for Latin (*Introducciones Latinae*) and a philosophy that holds that the ‘art’ of a language is captured on the page (Lapesa, 1981:391). Nebrija’s philosophy appears to hold that a language’s essence or identity, sealed in its written form, is what gives rise to its eventual hegemony.

It is also not surprising that Queen Isabella I, upon being presented with Nebrija’s book and learning of this philosophy, would honour this occasion. She had anticipated how the significance of this book on the Spanish language would convert it into a symbol of hegemony. One of her reasons for honouring the work was her foresight in envisaging how the timing of the handover of Nebrija’s book would coincide with the start of Christopher Columbus’ voyages to the Americas (Lapesa 1981; Penny 1991). This was a venture which Columbus persuaded her to sponsor in 1492 as he set out to what he thought would be India and landed in the Americas (Lapesa 1981).

The privileging of Castilian marks its independence as a language alongside the other three official languages of Spain - (Galician (*gallego*), Catalan (*catalá*) and Basque (*euskera* or *vasco*). Zagona (2002) describes Galician, Basque and Catalan as languages that are principally used in the northern regions of Spain. These include Galicia, the Basque country

and Catalonia. Alatorre (1989) agrees that the northern territories of Spain, which include the Basque country, Asturias and Catalan in the North Eastern parts, were considered too mountainous for the Moors to invade and conquer during the Muslim invasion around 711AD. This meant that these northern regions were not only able to preserve their territories but also to protect their linguistic community identity. Alatorre (1989) deduces that this could explain the conservation of their independent language status (Basque, Galician and Catalan) to this day in Spain. All three languages, alongside Castilian, hold official language status in Spain, though the sum total of their speakers is lower than that of Castilian (Spanish).

Penny (2002) attributes the dominance of the Castilian variant in literature to Spanish war heroes, such as *El Cid*. Around the time of the *Reconquista* movement, these heroes annotated their war escapades, leaving highly acclaimed accounts in narrative poetry that survive to this day. Both Penny (1991, 2002) and Spaulding (1943) detail how the Spanish literary achievements of the 16th and 17th centuries are highly acclaimed in Spanish literary criticism. For this reason, this period has unofficially been referred to as the Golden Age of the Spanish language. However, it is in fact denominated as Early Modern Spanish (*español medio* or *español áureo*).

The *Reconquista* movement framed the establishment of a Spanish variant (Castilian) that would still bear clear Romance origins (Penny 2002). Among the territories from which this variant is reported to have stemmed is Asturias in the northern region of Spain. Thereafter, Spanish would go on to expand to the southern regions. The Spanish language was also influenced by Moorish Arabic, Mozarabic, (a Christian Romance vernacular in Moor-dominated Spanish territories) and medieval Judaeo-Spanish or Ladino at a lexical level. Penny (1991, 2002) and Ostler (2005) mourn the loss of some of the variants that internally influenced the Spanish variant. The eventual dominance of the Castilian form of the Spanish language provoked the disappearance of these variants. Spanish eventually gained hegemony through its politically and socially unified linguistic community. The *Reconquista* movement brought with it an era of significant linguistic change and adaptation due to Spanish's inevitable exposure to other variants. This is significant to the developmental outcome of Spanish as it illustrates how language contact greatly influenced its trajectory.

In the discussion on language contact, Velupillai (2012) labels the language absorbing influences from another (usually) more dominant one as the recipient language. Consequently, the influencing language should be referred to as the source language. Similarly, she cautions that internal language changes should not be dealt with in isolation. Her reasoning is that one of the factors involved is the size and language ideologies of the linguistic communities largely determining the extent to which features were appropriated and regularised in recipient languages.

Velupillai (2012) also clarifies that specific linguistic features can be borrowed in their entirety between languages. She elaborates on this theory by exemplifying three unique instances in which linguistic borrowing occurs. The first is when both the form and function features are borrowed from the source language. The second is when only the function features are borrowed from the source language. This entails borrowing the source language's principles or rules but not its morphological structure. In the third instance, only partial linguistic borrowing occurs between the source and recipient languages. Her conclusion on the three instances of borrowing is that the resultant outcome of language contact is primarily determined by the linguistic practise and power that one language has over another within a language community. This power comes from one of two sources: political power or social prestige (Velupillai, 2012: 402).

Ostler (2005) suggests that persuasion, within prestige and power, is another driving factor that unites one language community with another. He describes how one language community may be persuaded by another for any number of reasons. These might include military domination, conversion to another religion, better education or schooling, a desire for prosperity or conscription in an army. Military domination, including conscription in the army, might be considered a form of political power. Hence Ostler's term "persuasion" must be understood broadly to include "coercion" (Mesthrie et al. 2000). However, religion, education and prosperity can all be classified under the concept of social prestige. Ostler insists that the ability to persuade or be persuaded between language communities is key. Persuasion determines a language's survival and conservation. This interplay between social or political power and linguistic system changes informs the theoretical direction in this study to a great extent.

In Velupillai's (2012) study of linguistic borrowing, she forewarns the reader that, in this context, borrowing should not be interpreted in its literal sense. In linguistics, borrowing is understood as one language (the recipient language/variant) emulating features of another (the source language/variant) by not only taking on those features but also reassigning them distinct roles. To avoid ambiguity, Velupillai prescribes a reinterpretation of the concept of linguistic 'borrowing' to be understood as 'code copying' in language contact contexts. Velupillai (2012), Penny (1991, 1995), Ostler (2006) and Pawlik (2016) share the view that the extent of code copying of linguistic elements would have depended on the current external forces on the language.

Velupillai's (2012) lens can be used to scrutinise Spanish by observing the political power or social prestige of the source languages in relation to Spanish or to the social system. Her discussions of how political power and social prestige can influence the outcome of language contact seem accurate with respect to Spanish. The secondary role that dialects were compelled to take on as they encountered Spanish across the Iberian Peninsula is evidence of the hegemony of Spanish. It can be conjectured that in the linguistic community in which a language is used, negotiated over and modified, there is a constant jostle for social prestige and political power. It is arguable that the eventual subjugation, by ceding the power, of one language community can be construed as a form of linguistic change to ensure survival. Those linguistic features that survive beyond the internal and external sources of this social pressure then determine a language's continued linguistic trajectory and development. Penny (1991, 2002) and Ostler (2005) cite how, by the end of the 16th century, some but not all of the source languages or dialects that had influenced the evolution of Spanish had vanished altogether amongst their original linguistic communities.

In the 18th century, which coincides with the beginning of the Modern Spanish era, an initiative was launched which sought to protect the interests of the Spanish language. The Modern Spanish era is also denominated as Contemporary Spanish and coincides with the emergence of the *Real Academia Española* (RAE) in 1719. In 1713, the Protectionist Academy of the Spanish Language, in accordance with the Statutes and Regulations of the *Real Academia Española 300 años* (2004), started operating out of Madrid (Vergaz 2010). This Academy was reportedly modelled on the Italian and French equivalents which were set up in 1582 in Italy (*Accademia della Crusca*) and in 1635 in France (*Académie Française*).

The academy was established by Felipe V (Phillip V), the King of Spain at the time and Juan Manuel Fernández Pacheco y Zúñiga, who after learning of the French Academy and its objective, sought to emulate this for the Spanish language. Following this, the *Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española* (ASALE; Association of Academies of the Spanish Language) was inaugurated in 1951 in Mexico as a collaboration of 23 different academies, including America, Spain, The Philippines and Equatorial Guinea, as a linguistic policy to establish a set of principles for the lexicon, grammar and orthography for Spanish speakers across the globe (RAE 2021).

In 1726, it became necessary to publish the orthography of the Spanish language when the editors of the dictionary, ‘Dictionary of Authorities’, were having difficulty choosing between the very different ways in which the same word was written at the time. These publications provided the first spelling rules, together with a declaration of the importance of correct writing to regulate the norms and uniformity in the language. Since its establishment, the RAE has vowed to devote its energy towards language planning and the continued linguistic prescription and preservation of the Spanish language. Vergaz (2010) cites its authority as the linguistic benchmark for Spanish, because it created a set of guidelines which are reviewed and regularised at pertinent occasions. In addition, Vicente (1989) details that the RAE has been a member of the Association of Academies of the Spanish Language since this Association began in 2017. Published reports by the Association detail that since 1951 the RAE has been the umbrella academy of 22 affiliate members. The value the RAE adds to the Spanish language-speaking communities around the world is that it attempts to bring about linguistic unification amongst all of them by providing a linguistic reference that can be relied on (*Real Academia Española, Gramática, 1931*).

The status of the RAE, on both a national and international level, was endorsed from its outset by King Phillip V in October 1714 (Vicente 1989). This endorsement aligns with the rationale and significance of this research. The significance is that the impetus of an individual or an entity, with status or social prestige, is a determining factor in the theory of linguistic change or preservation. To this day, the RAE continues its revisions and publications of collected grammar structures, thereby sealing its benchmark status in the Spanish-speaking world. The RAE’s live website and online dictionary search engine tool is

consulted by many linguists and students. It is possible to put forward a theory that this trusted academy, which endorses the rules and principles of a language, silently acts as a pillar of linguistic prescriptivism (Mesthrie et al. 2009) in the face of societal and linguistic evolution and continued development.

2.2 Conclusion of Literature Review

This literature review brings together the research work of Penny (1991, 2002), Ostler (2005), Zagona (2002), Lapesa (1950, 1960, 1981, 2000), Lehmann (1993), Poulter (1990), Spaulding (1971) and Candau (1985) with respect to Spanish's linguistic history and Historical Linguistics, in the context of Mesthrie et al's (2009) research on Sociolinguistics. In addition, the work of Velupillai's (2012) research on language contact and Zamora Vicente's (1999) research on the history and relevance of the *Real Academia Española* (RAE) have been studied.

The findings in the review have also demonstrated how the three other official languages in Spain have survived to this day. These are Catalan, Basque and Galician. Their preservation and status have to do with the geographical areas in which their language communities are concentrated. The historical description of the various invasions on the Iberian Peninsula during the Moorish invasion in the early 700s has shown that the Moors did not manage to conquer Catalan, Basque nor Galicia because these territories were demarcated by mountainous and treacherous terrain. The review also details how the period of history in which the *Reconquista* took place (from the years 718 to 1492) set a precedent for Castilian Spanish to linguistically preside over Spain. By this period, Castilian Spanish had largely come to predominate among the language variants that had influenced it in the north, across and down through all the southern territories of Spain. The *Reconquista* movement also signalled the subsequent spread of Spanish across the Atlantic when Queen Isabella II agreed to sponsor Columbus's voyage (Lapesa 1981).

It has been conjectured that, like the Celtic languages, the Basque language has had a substrate influence on Spanish (Penny 1991, 2002). Its influence, however, has been phonetic, such as the instance of lenition which is described as an intrinsic change in the developmental outcome of a language's system (Oftedal 1985; Campbell 2017).

Pertinent to the evolution of Spanish is Velupillai's (2012) discussion on how the outcome of language contact is to do with the political power and social prestige that one variant has over another in a period of language contact. She emphasises the need to understand language contact as code copying rather than linguistic borrowing in more general contexts. Her reasoning for this clarification is that the concept of borrowing implies that the process is temporary. As the Spanish language communities evolved and their populations increased, the varieties from which Spanish had borrowed or copied codes would go on to be subverted. The establishment of the RAE in the 18th century laid the ground for the regularisation and ultimate benchmarking of Castilian Spanish as a standard language. Other varieties of Spanish on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean would eventually be developed to emulate Castilian Spanish. The collaboration between the Spanish language academies through the RAE, which exist in practically all Spanish speaking countries has ensured that a single set of linguistic recommendations are strictly adhered to in any media and other publications (Penny 1991).

In this review of literature on the history of the Spanish language, it can be seen that there is an interplay between external influences such as social and political prestige or periods of territorial invasion and internal influences on linguistic system changes within Spanish that stem from language contact.

CHAPTER THREE – Analysis of some of the morphosyntactic changes with an emphasis on Tense and Aspectual Categories of Modern Spanish

3.1 Introduction

In the data analysis section, the morphosyntactic changes that occurred in Spanish between the 5th and 15th centuries are examined. The motivations behind these changes are analysed in both a systemic and sociolinguistic context. The 6th century grammatical system of Romance Castilian (or Medieval Spanish) is the starting point for the analysis. Early Spanish verbs, pertaining to Medieval Spanish, have been identified in italics and entitled as *E. Med SP* (Medieval Spanish). Their counterparts that emerged in Modern Spanish are also identified in italics, entitled as *E. Mod Sp* (Modern Spanish) and any translations in English have been provided for in parenthesis.

Up until the 5th century, Latin had been the basis from which all other Romance languages, including Spanish inherited their main structures. Ramos' (2009) research, cited by Pawlik (2016), suggests that in the Latin period, morphology played a greater role than it does in Modern Spanish. However, syntax of word order has played just as big a role in Modern Spanish as morphology. The role of syntax gained interest due to the publication of the first ever grammar book written by Antonio Nebrija for Modern Spanish in 1492 (RAE 2003), referred to in the Literature Review. Medieval Spanish is to a large extent closer to the Latin model, as morphology held far more weight in Medieval Spanish than it does in Modern Spanish. To illustrate the morphology of Classic Latin and Medieval Spanish, examples of structural morphological changes to vocabulary between Classic Latin, Medieval and Modern Spanish are illustrated in Table 1 below. These examples are cited from the 1851 publication of the RAE's guidelines to Modern Spanish orthography. For example, in Table 1, the first three examples illustrate the following:

- The verb for 'to do' in Medieval Spanish and Latin began with the same 'f' consonant', which in Modern Spanish became an 'h'.
- Where the interjection, 'and' in Medieval Spanish and Latin were not unlike, in Modern Spanish, it changed to a -y, pronounced in the same way as -e in the English alphabet.
- An affix morpheme *-otros* was added to the subject pronoun marker for the first-person plural, 'we' over the course of time.

Table 1

Classic Latin	Medieval Spanish	Modern Spanish	English
<i>facere</i>	<i>far</i>	<i>hacer</i>	do-2SG.inf
<i>e</i>	<i>et</i>	<i>y</i>	and-conj
<i>nos</i>	<i>nós</i>	<i>nos-otros</i>	we-1PL.pro
<i>fecisti</i>	<i>fezist(e)</i>	<i>hic-iste</i>	do-2SG.pret
<i>num-quam</i>	<i>nun-qua</i>	<i>nun-ca</i>	never-adv
<i>quando</i>	<i>quando</i>	<i>cuando</i>	when-pro
<i>filia</i>	<i>fyia</i>	<i>hija</i>	daughter-fem

The Latin verbal paradigm is not unlike the Medieval and Modern Spanish paradigms, together with the other Romance languages. Voice, mode, time, aspect, number and person are denoted in both Latin and Spanish verbs and the verbal paradigms are set up into four conjugation tables. These tables also present nominal or impersonal forms of the verbs including the infinitive, the gerund, the participle, the gerundive and the supine. This said, the nominal or impersonal forms do not code person, number or mood. This is exemplified in Table 2 and Table 3 below (Penny 1991). In both instances, the outcome of the structural changes in the imperfect indicative verbal paradigms of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd conjugation groups in Modern Spanish is structurally similar to the Latin and Medieval Spanish equivalents. In Table 2, the graphic accent *-ā* disappeared altogether and the consonant *-v* changed to a *-b* in the final syllables. In Table 3, the *-ā*, *-ē* and *-ī* graphic accents fell away, the consonant *-v* changed to a *-b* and there was a stem change from an *-so* to an *-su*.

Table 2**Development of the imperfect indicative of -ar verbs**

Latin	Old Spanish (E. Med Sp)	Modern Spanish (E. Mod Sp)	English
<i>cantābam</i>	<i>Cantava</i>	<i>cantaba</i>	sing-1SG.imp
<i>cantābās</i>	<i>Cantavas</i>	<i>cantabas</i>	sing-2SG.imp
<i>cantābat</i>	<i>Cantava</i>	<i>cantaba</i>	sing-3SG.imp

<i>cantābāmus</i>	<i>Cantávamos</i>	<i>cantábamos</i>	sing-1PL.imp
<i>cantābātis</i>	<i>Cantabades</i>	<i>cantabais</i>	sing-2PL.imp
<i>cantābant</i>	<i>Cantavan</i>	<i>cantaban</i>	sing-3PL.imp

Table 3

Development of the imperfect indicative of -er and -ir verbs

Latin		Old Spanish (E. Med Sp)	Modern Spanish (E. Mod Sp)	English
<i>dēbēbam</i>	<i>devía</i>		<i>debía</i>	should- 1SG.imp
<i>dēbēbas</i>	<i>devías</i>	<i>devíes</i>	<i>debías</i>	should- 2SG.imp
<i>dēbēbat</i>	<i>devía</i>	<i>devíe</i>	<i>debía</i>	should- 3SG.imp
<i>dēbēbāmus</i>	<i>devíamos</i>	<i>devíemos</i>	<i>debíamos</i>	should- 1PL.imp
<i>dēbēbātis</i>	<i>devíades</i>	<i>devíedes</i>	<i>debíais</i>	should- 2PL.imp
<i>dēbēbant</i>	<i>devían</i>	<i>devíen</i>	<i>debían</i>	should- 3PL.imp
<i>subībam</i>	<i>sobía</i>		<i>subía</i>	climb- 1SG.imp
<i>subībās</i>	<i>sobías</i>	<i>sobíes</i>	<i>subías</i>	climb- 2SG.imp
<i>subībat</i>	<i>sobía</i>	<i>sobíe</i>	<i>subía</i>	climb- 3SG.imp
<i>subībāmus</i>	<i>sobíamos</i>	<i>sobíemos</i>	<i>subíamos</i>	climb- 1PL.imp
<i>subībātis</i>	<i>sobíades</i>	<i>sobíedes</i>	<i>subíais</i>	climb- 2PL.imp

subībant *sobían* *sobíen* *subían* climb-
3PL.imp

Pawlik's (2016) findings attest to the fact that certain verbal categories in Romance languages might have either merged or disappeared entirely. This appears to have been the case in Spanish for two of the five finite forms of verbs inherited from Latin. These five forms in Latin were the infinitive, the gerund, the participle, the gerundive and the supine. Woodcock (1959) explains what the supine refers to. He describes how in English, a Germanic language, the supine has been used to refer to the *to*-infinitive in specific proverbs such as the following one,

'To err is human; to forgive divine.'

Furthermore, Woodcock (1959) asserts that the supine form is alleged to have been the 4th declension on some of the Latin verbs, and identical to the accusative or dative case, in *adventus* 'arrival', *mōtus* 'movement', *reditus* 'return', etc. However, the supine is distinct, because it could be both a verb or a noun, and even acquire a direct object. Its common forms used *-tum* or *-sum* as its inflectional suffixes, and its function was to communicate intention on a verb of movement. The example Woodcock (1959) gives to illustrate the supine form is given below:

lūsum it Maecenās, dormītum ego Vergiliusque

'Maecenas went to play a game, Virgil and I to sleep.'

Of the five finite verb forms inherited from Latin, only three remained in Medieval Spanish or Romance Castilian. These include the infinitive of a verb together with the gerund and the participle forms. Conjointly, the number of verb tenses was also narrowed down. However, the internal structural system of Latin would never be entirely displaced, even as the Romance languages came into being. These instances of a reduction in the verb tenses are examined in 3.4.

Lloyd (1987) reflects on the grammatical categories in the internal structure of the Latin and Spanish verbal systems. These categories include voice, mood, aspect, person and tense. His

findings confirm that both the Latin and Spanish verbal paradigms make use of the active and passive voices. The presence of both the active and passive voices give the speaker the option to emphasise the active subject's role in the utterance (active), or to demote the subject in favour of focusing on the events in the utterance (passive).

Pawlik's (2016) description of the morphosyntactic history of the Spanish verbal system from the 5th to the 15th centuries unravels interesting details on the evolution of aspect as a grammatical category marked by the inflection on a verb. The morphemes that marked aspect were morphologically transformed. However, those that denoted person, number, tense and mood remained as they were. The restructuring and changes with respect to aspect are examined later in this chapter.

Lloyd (1987) analyses data pertaining to mood. Mood is marked by the inflection on the verb in both Latin and subsequently Medieval Spanish and Modern Spanish. Mood can be marked as indicative, subjunctive or imperative in an utterance. Like Latin, Spanish's verbal system consists of the indicative mood, which is made up of six verb tenses. However, in Spanish, the subjunctive mood consists of four verb tenses. This is because, over the course of time, two of the subjunctive mood verb tenses began to take on a secondary role in the verbal paradigms. The imperative mood is not examined in this analysis. The emphasis is on the developmental outcomes of the indicative and subjunctive moods.

In terms of the verb tense paradigms in Spanish, the conjugation of a verb is exemplified in two morphological aspectual frameworks: the imperfect and the perfect aspect. The paradigm for the imperfect configures the present, the imperfect and the future verb tenses. The paradigm for the perfect outlines the perfective verb tenses. The perfective tenses are the present perfect, the pluperfect and the future perfect verb tenses. Lloyd (1987) also adds that the paradigms of both Spanish and English verb tenses are mapped out in accordance with their aspect. This is explored with examples in section 3.8 of this chapter.

3.2 The gradual population of the verbal paradigms by periphrastic perfective tenses

Hill and Bradford (2000) concur that structural makeup is the only similarity between the present perfect tense in Spanish and its counterpart in English. They claim that there is little

to no correspondence in the respective uses in the two languages, because in Spanish the use of the present perfect compound tense is more frequently used in literary speech or educated speech and not often found in everyday conversation. The contrasting uses of the preterit perfect in Spanish and the present perfect in English remain a point of interest amongst Modern Spanish scholars. As illustrated below, both are compound verb tenses, in which the past participle form of the lexical verb follows the inflected auxiliary verb, ‘have’ in English and *haber* ‘to exist’ in Spanish. The auxiliary verbs in both languages are suffixed with inflectional morphemes which code the subject of the utterance in the present simple form.

E. Mod Sp

1. (*yo*) *h-e* *am-ado*
 I-1SG have-1SG love-PP
 ‘I have loved.’

2. (*tú*) *ha-ø-s* *am-ado*
 you-2SG have-2SG love-PP
 ‘You have loved.’

3. (*él*) *ha-ø* *am-ado*
 he-3SG have-3SG love-PP
 ‘He has loved.’

4. (*nosotros*) *h-e-mos* *am-ado*
 we-1PL have-1PL love-PP
 ‘We have loved.’

5. (*vosotros*) *hab-é-is* *am-ado*
 you-2PL have-2PL love-PP
 ‘You have all loved.’

6. (*ellos*) *ha- ϕ -n* *am-ado*

they-3PL have-3PL love-PP

‘They have loved.’

The observed change in Spanish from its synthetic roots to the adoption of analytic features, particularly with respect to compound perfective tenses, is supported by a significant corpus of research. The resultant outcome, which favours analytic features, was picked up on in the Medieval to Modern Spanish phase. Pawlik (2016) acknowledges the significance of synthetic characteristic features that were inherited from Latin, although, he points out that during the Medieval to Modern Spanish phase, analytic features were incorporated into its morphosyntactic system. He lists five different instances of periphrastic verb tense forms in Modern Spanish, illustrated in examples 7 to 11. An additional example, cited by Penny (1991) in 12 is also included.

In examples 9 and 10 below, the structural changes appeared to have had an impact on the general principle of word order in Modern Spanish periphrastic verbal expression. It can be conjectured that there was a tendency towards uniformity in periphrastic verbal expression over the course of time. The auxiliary verb was changed to the initial verb in Modern Spanish. However, in example 9, the reverse tendency occurred. This is because, while the Latin future simple was periphrastic, in Modern Spanish the semi-independent auxiliary was changed to a bound morpheme, future simple suffix *-é*, thereby reverting to synthesis. Penny (1991) states that as synthetic features were replaced with analytic verbal expression, there were still marked instances of the reverse tendency towards synthesis, such as the case in example 12 below. This reverse to synthesis was mainly observed in the future and conditional paradigms.

7. Indicative present perfect of *cantar*

h-e *cant-ado*

have-1SG sing-PP

‘I have sung.’

8. Subjunctive present perfect of *cantar*

ha-ya cant-ado

have-1SG.subj sing-PP

‘I have sung.’

9. Lat. Fut. Simple periphrastic

cantar h-e

sing-v.inf have-1SG

‘I have sung.’

E.Mod Sp Fut. ‘é’ derivative affix

cantar-é

sing-1SG.fut.

‘I will sing.’

10. Lat. Plu.perf. periphrastic

amar hab-ia

love-PP have-1SG

‘I had loved.’

E.Mod Sp Pluperf. periphrastic

hab-ía am-ado

have-1SG love-PP

‘I had loved.’

11. E.mod compound perfect infinitive

haber cant-ado

have-v.inf sing-PP

‘Having sung’

12. Lat fut. periphrastic

contar te -lo -é

tell-inf you-pro it-pro 1SG.fut

‘I will tell you about it.’

E.Mod Sp fut. synthetic

te lo contar-é

you-pro it-pro tell-1SG.fut

‘I will tell you about it.’

3.3. The regularisation of the passive voice in Spanish

The use of the analytic periphrastic verb tenses began around the same time as a reformation of the passive voice, between the 15th and the 17th century, or the Early Modern Spanish period (Aleza 1987). The order of the restructured passive voice also shows the characteristics of an increasingly analytic language. Pawlik (2006) claims that this is because the marking of gender and number of the past participle in concordance with the subject was imposed on the morphosyntactic system. An Early Modern Spanish example of the periphrastic analytic passive voice is given in 13 below.

13. *La* *hymn-e* *es* *cant-ad-a*
the-art hymn-fem be-3SG sing-3SG.PP-fem
‘The anthem is sung’

The past participle *cantar* is suffixed with an *-a* to concord in gender and number with the subject. *La hymne* is the feminine gendered subject of the utterance. In addition, Pawlik (2016) states that in early to Medieval Spanish, gender marking was much more significant and was also a feature of compound verb tenses in the active voice. This is exemplified in 14 below which is an utterance in the active voice and its verb tenses is the compound analytic present perfect.

14. *La* *he* *cant-ad-a*
it-pro have-1SG sing-PP. fem
‘I have sung it’

However, the fixed gender and number marking of the past participle form in the lexical verb in the active voice gradually fell away over the course of time between the Medieval, Early Modern Spanish and Modern Spanish eras.

3.4. Changes and levelling in verb conjugation groups

Penny (1991, 1993) outlines that the inflectional affixes on the conjugation of Spanish verbs were morphologically changed in the Medieval Spanish period (approximately the 8th to the 14th or 15th centuries). According to Garcia de Diego (1970), of the four verb conjugations inherited from Latin, only three remain in Spanish and other Romance languages to this day. The remaining three also dropped the suffixed vowel 'e' at the end, leaving them all with the consonant 'r' at the end of the stem to mark the infinitive.

The two conjugations that merged into just one group of Spanish verbs in the second conjugation group were the *-ēre* and *-ere* suffixed verbs. Garcia de Diego (1970) states that there were several reasons for this morphological merging. These include the shift of the syllable stress to the penultimate syllable of the verb. Secondly, the 'i' and 'e' vowels were merged, thereby levelling the verb-subject conjugations to four in the Spanish verbal paradigm. By the same token, the inflectional distinction, which previously distinguished the two conjugations, merged into one spelling only in the third person plural conjugation of the verb.

Penny (2002) reports on the consequences of these morphological changes, which she also refers to as a reduction within the Spanish verb conjugation system. The present simple indicative conjugations had virtually equalised by the Vulgar Latin (3rd to the 5th century) period in Hispania (the Roman name for the terrain). With respect to the reduction of the verb conjugation system, the verb tenses that constitute this system were restructured. A select number of verbs were rearranged from one of the three conjugation groups to another. Penny explains that this was largely due to a reinterpretation of their Latin counterparts. The following morphological changes are cited from Penny's (2002). The first is in the group of Latin verbs suffixed with *-ere* in the example just below. The result of this change was that verbs that had been categorised in the *-ere* suffixed group in Latin migrated to the third conjugation group of verbs in Spanish in which the stems are suffixed by *-ir*. It is feasible at this stage to point out that a loss to one of the verb's conjugation groups would result in another group being enhanced by an addition. Other select verbs, which had formerly belonged to the *-ere* suffixed group of Latin verbs, joined *-ir* suffixed stem verbs in Spanish.

Vulgar Latin	E. Mod Sp
15. <i>lucēre</i>	<i>lucir</i> ‘to flaunt/shine’
16. <i>fugere</i>	<i>huir</i> ‘to escape/flee’
17. <i>succutere</i>	<i>sacudir</i> ‘to shake’
18. <i>percipere</i>	<i>percibir</i> ‘to perceive’

Pawlik (2006) claims that the *-ir*, third conjugation group of verbs was favoured in Medieval Spanish. It is therefore not surprising that several other verbs were also systematically migrated from one verb conjugational group to the favoured *-ir* suffixed, third verbal conjugation group in Spanish. Garcia de Diego (1970) lists the following Latin verb conjugation group changes that occurred between Vulgar Latin and Spanish. The list of conjugation group changes from *-ere* to *-ir* in Spanish included below.

Vulgar Latin	E. Mod Sp
19. <i>dicere</i>	<i>decir</i> ‘to say’
20. <i>battere</i>	<i>batir</i> ‘to beat/whisk’

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 21. <i>ringere</i> | <i>reñir</i>

'to tell off' |
| 22. <i>cingere</i> | <i>ceñir</i>

'to cling to' |
| 23. <i>vivere</i> | <i>vivir</i>

'to live' |
| 24. <i>petere</i> | <i>pedir</i>

'to ask for' |

3.5 The enclitic pronoun *se* as an added passive marker, other than *ser* + past participle

The analytic passive voice was restructured in a similar manner in spoken Latin resulting in the systematic restructuring of other verb tenses. This occurred as a result of passive verb expressions in which the bare infinitive form is classified as a reflexive verb. The Spanish reflexive verb is reserved for utterances in which the subject of the verb is also the object of the action indicated by the verb at the same time and in the same utterance (Pawlik 2016). This is referred to as the *Voz Media* (Middle Voice) and is illustrated in example 2 below. Pawlik (2016) cites that Spanish inherited the analytic Vulgar Latin passive voice in its entirety, although Spanish had already started to feature alternative versions to the traditional passive voice. He reports that towards the end of the Middle Ages (10th to 15th century), a middle passive voice, also referred to as the *Voz Media* (Middle Passive) marked with the enclitic pronoun *se*, had come into being. The middle passive voice is formed by *se* + the inflected third person singular verb. In example 25, *se* is the enclitic pronoun followed by the third person indicative present simple conjugation of the verb *vender* (to sell) to emphasize what is for sale. In example 26, the middle passive voice is used in Spanish, which is interpreted in the active voice in English.

25. *Se vend-e ropa a segunda mano aquí.*
 be-pass.ref sell-3SG clothes-fem to-art second-AP hand-fem here-adv
 ‘Second-hand clothing is sold here’

26. *Se ha-n i-do ya*
 ENCL.pro have-3PL leave-PP already-adv
 ‘They have already left.’

Two periphrastic forms: *ser* + past participle and *estar* + past participle in the analytic passive voice emerged and would then be used. Both *ser* and *estar* signify ‘to be’; in other words, they are both Spanish copulas. It is important to distinguish the different criteria which determine their application in a Spanish utterance. The *ser* periphrastic passive was used to denote the action of the verb and the *estar* periphrastic passive the resultant outcome. In Spanish, *ser* is used to form the dynamic passive voice (Sihler 1995). An example of this is given in 3 below, however, since this construction is considered less idiomatic, the more frequently used dynamic passive voice construction is formulated with the enclitic pronoun *se* followed by the past participle of the lexical verb as per example 28. The *estar* passive voice is considered as the opposite of the dynamic passive voice. It is referred to as the static passive voice, because it is not perceived as a traditional passive in Modern Spanish Grammar (RAE 1931). As is the case for English, in the Spanish examples 27 and 29 below, the participles’ roles in both utterances are as the complement to the verb.

27. *La ventana es abiert-a*
 the-art window-fem be-3SG open-PP.fem
 ‘The window is (being) opened.’

28. *La ventana se abr-e*
 the-art window-fem pro-SG open-3SG
 ‘The window is (being) opened.’

29. *La ventana está abiert-a*
 the-art window-fem be-3SG open-PP.fem
 ‘The window is open/The window has been opened.’

The two periphrastic passives resulted in different uses for the two copulas in Modern Spanish. Hill and Bradford (2000) state that to this day the two Spanish copulas, *ser* and *estar*, denote different characteristics in Spanish. The copula *ser* denotes permanent characteristics while the copula *estar* denotes temporary characteristics. *Ser* ‘to be’ in Spanish emerged as one of the two copulas, from a combination of the Latin *esse* ‘to be’ and *sedere* ‘to sit’ verbs, whereas *estar* resulted from the Latin verb *stare* ‘to stand’. Pawlik (2016) confirms that in the Middle Ages (5th to 10th century), the verb *ser* denoted roles that were later reserved for *estar* in Medieval and Modern Spanish.

3.6 The eventual regularisation of word order

Zagona (2002) clarifies that Modern Spanish is a head-initial language. A characteristic of a head-initial language is that the functional categories, such as determiners, auxiliary verbs, articles or prepositions, typically precede the lexical categories they govern. These lexical categories constitute noun phrases and lexical verbs. Therefore, functional categories precede noun phrases and subordinate conjunctions and connectors, such as relative pronouns, precede their respective subordinate clauses. A challenge to the description of Spanish as a head-initial language is that possessive adjectives can be placed after the noun to emphasise or restate the possessor. Zagona argues that, with respect to the head-initial word order, the second, *Los libros míos*, is viewed as more emphatic than the first example sentence, *Mis libros*.

Zagona considers that this post-nominal word order is more emphatic under a regularised head-initial syntactical system. Similarly, adjuncts such as adverbs or adverbial phrases are positioned in both head-initial and head-final points in an utterance to emphasise one grammatical category over another in the context of the utterance, and to the speaker’s intention. Equally, adjuncts can precede verb phrases or complements; i.e., in the mid position of the utterance, as is illustrated in examples 30 and 31 below.

30. *Mi-s* *libro-s*
 my-poss books-masc.pl
 ‘My books’

31. *Lo-s libro-s míos*
 the-art books-masc.pl mine-pro
 ‘My books’

This set of norms in the syntax was less fixed in Medieval Spanish. In Medieval Spanish, closed class grammatical categories, such as determiners and prepositions, were normalised as head-initial components of the utterance. Otero (1975) and Saltarelli (1994) identify that clauses headed by open class grammatical categories, such as nouns, adjectives and verbs, were not as syntactically rigidly or linearly governed at that point. Therefore, the following syntactical word orders were interchanged and applied by language users. These word orders were head-complement (SVO) and complement-head (VSO).

Fontana (1993) points out that early or Medieval Spanish would be considered as a verb-second position in both the main and subordinate clauses. By the time Modern Spanish had evolved, the position of the verb in relation to the other constituents was not limited to a V2 word order, even though the speakers sought to regularise the word order. The favoured order of syntactical constituents was still head-complement; in other words, SVO. However, the syntactical order interchangeability of interrogative statements, example 32, as well as of noun phrases specifically in the passive voice in example 33 remains a common feature among Romance languages.

32. *¿Vienes con -migo?*
 come-2SG with me-prep+DOP
 ‘Are you coming with me?’

33. *Se vend-e bota-s en es-a tienda.*
 ENCL.pro sell-3SG boot-fem.PL in-prep this-dem.pro shop-fem
 ‘Boots are sold in that shop’

Similarly, Hill and Bradford (2000) claim that it was standard for the enclitic pronouns to be postverbal in Medieval Spanish. However, in Modern Spanish they tend to be preverbal in relation to the conjugated pronominal verb. Nieuwenhuijsen (1995)'s research on the position of the enclitic pronoun in Spanish has uncovered that the positioning of this pronoun in Modern Spanish is entirely linked to the form or role of the verb. In Medieval Spanish, the placement of the pronoun was not as constrained. In addition, a different word could be placed between the enclitic pronoun and the verb, which is not the case for Modern Spanish. The placement of the enclitic pronoun in Modern Spanish is predominantly preverbal for the finite verbs, whereas in the imperative, infinitive and gerund forms of the verb the enclitic pronoun is postverbal.

Interestingly, Nieuwenhuijsen's (1995) findings, examples of which have been cited below, propose the following hypothesis of the enclitic pronoun placement change. The hypothesis is that the speaker in Medieval Spanish was not as confined by specific syntax constraints as happened when Modern Spanish came into being. Therefore, in Medieval Spanish, the speaker's choice of placement would ultimately determine the nuance intended. Nieuwenhuijsen states that the language users were the determiners of the structure with respect to enclitic pronoun placement. However, in Modern Spanish these syntactic rules have evolved to be bound by constraints, provided by the linguistic system, exemplified below.

E. Mod Sp

34. *lo* *dice*

it-pro say-3SG

'He says so.'

35. *cierra-la*

close-3SG.imp.pro

'Close it.'

36. *a* *-l* *terminar* *-lo*
upon-prep the-art finish-v.inf it-pro
'Once it was finished'

37. *pensándo-lo*
think-ger.pro-masc
'Thinking about it'

3.7 The restructuring and gradual normalisation of *haber*, *ser* and *estar* as auxiliary verbs

With reference to the introduction of periphrastic compound verb tenses in Spanish, Lapesa (2000) claims that it is equally significant to focus on the alternating and subsequent normalising roles played by the auxiliary verbs *ser* and *haber*. Lapesa picks up on the change from *ser* to *haber* as evidence of the change that happened in what is referred to as the periphrastic compound pluperfect past in Modern Spanish. Prior to the use of *haber* as the auxiliary, together with the past participle of the lexical verb to mark the remote past, *ser* had this aspectual role. *Ser* not only marked the analytic periphrastic passive, but also the erstwhile imperfect indicative past before it changed to the pluperfect past with *haber*. Lapesa's theory is that, along the trajectory of the different periods of the Spanish language, there was a significant fluctuation in the positioning and regularisation of *ser* and *haber* within the verbal paradigms. Romani (2006) affirms that in Medieval Spanish there existed a preference for certain classes of verbs, opting for *ser* or *aver* (< *haber*). However, at the time no prescriptive or academic grammatical ruling on the application of one over the other had been imposed and regularised.

Ariza (1998) outlines that in the 13th century the auxiliary verb *haber* gradually came into use with intransitive and reflexive verbs in periphrastic verb tenses. This aspectual role had previously been played by *ser*. Eventually, in the 14th century, *haber* was applied in all instances of perfective compound verb tenses and by the 15th century this was a standardised rule in the verbal paradigms. Ariza (1998) remarks that in later centuries, for example the 17th

century, the use of *ser* as an auxiliary verb in perfective verb tenses was still used, but only in certain dialects of Spanish. Examples shown below.

38. In church communities

<i>Nacido</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>Dios</i>
to be born-PP.masc	to be-3SG	God-masc

‘God is born.’

39. In local dialectal conversations (in north-central regions such as Berceo (today known as La Rioja) and Burgos)

<i>Alto</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>el</i>	<i>poyo</i>
high-adj	be-3SG	the-def.art	bench-masc

‘The bench is high up.’

In the 2009 publication of *New Spanish Grammar*, produced by the *Real Academia Española* (RAE) it was cited that to this day, periphrastic sentences with *ser* and the past participle have remained in some idiomatic sayings. For example,

40. Idiomatic expression

a). *Es* *llegad-a* *la* *hora*
be-3SG arrive-PP. fem the- art time-fem

‘The time has come.’

b). *Era* *llegad-o* *el* *momento*
be-3SG.imp arrive-PP. masc the- art moment-masc

‘The moment had arrived.’

Ariza (1998) points out that *haber* was allocated the aspectual role of principal auxiliary verb in periphrastic compound perfective tenses. Pawlik (2016) asserts that the grammatical role

changes of *haber* in Spanish were also impacted by a process of grammaticalisation. This process began in Medieval Spanish with the adoption and application of periphrastic verbal structures.

Pawlik (2016) also claims that, towards the final parts of the Middle Ages (10th to the 15th centuries), *aver* (Medieval Spanish), *haber* (Modern Spanish) and *tener* were interchangeable as the lexical verb which signified ‘to have’ in the sense of possession, but that *aver* (*haber*) still acted in its grammatical aspectual role as of one of the two auxiliary verbs. The subtle way these different meanings were distinguished in the lexical role were as follows. The verb *aver* (*haber*) denoted possession at its emerging stages or an activity of a temporary nature. Within the categories of grammar, this temporary state meaning is referred to as the inchoative aspect. For this reason, *aver* was applied as the lexical verb to denote possession alongside an abstract direct object. On the other hand, *tener* came to denote possession in the lasting sense. Ariza (1998) details that during the 15th century, *aver* was entirely replaced by *tener* as the single lexical verb to denote possession, be it temporary or lasting.

Consequently, through its evolution as the principal auxiliary verb in compound perfective verb tenses, *aver* (*haber*) would be altered through grammaticalisation (Pawlik, 2016). Through this process, *aver* was no longer considered a lexical verb since it could no longer be used to denote any kind of possession in Spanish. In some instances, where there has been grammatical aspectual role loss, this same loss has been compensated for in the system. According to Ariza (1998), this same aspectual role-redefining tendency affected the two copulas, *seer/ser* (Medieval Spanish and Modern Spanish respectively) and *estar*. Like *aver*, *estar* denoted a state that was only temporary. This aspectual grammatical role meaning for the verb *estar* has remained in Modern and Contemporary Spanish.

Subsequently, however, the range of interpretations that the verb *estar* would take on widened. Only as recently as the end of the 18th century were the significant grammatical aspectual roles that the two copulas would play clearly divided up and regularised by the *Real Academia Española* (RAE) for specific contexts. Therefore, for many years, *ser* was still employed to identify the location of an entity or a person. Once this was regularised in the

18th century, a localisation identification was reserved for the verb *estar* in Spanish. The following examples 41 and 42 in Contemporary Spanish illustrate this.

41. *¿Dónde estás?*
 where-int.pro be-2SG
 ‘Where are you?’

42. *Estoy a -l lado de la plaza*
 be-1SG to-prep the-art side-masc of-prep the-def square-fem
 ‘I am next to the (town) square’

Prior to its exclusive categorisation in the passive voice (*ser* + past participle), the range of meanings of the auxiliary verb *ser* alongside a past participle could be an active voice marker together with intransitive verbs, reflexive verbs and resultative states. Citing Pawlik’s (2016) research data, some examples of this change for *ser* are illustrated below. Nevertheless, over the course of time, *ser* was regularised in its aspectual role as the auxiliary verb employed in periphrastic compound passive voice sentences. This left room for *haber*, which became the only auxiliary verb used in the periphrastic perfective tense (refer to sentences 3 and 4 below), and for *estar* to be changed and regularised as the only copula used to denote a temporary resultative state in examples 43, 44 and 45.

Used as an Intransitive Verb

E. Med Sp

43. *son ven-ido-s*
 be-3PL come-PP. masc
 ‘They have come’

E. Mod Sp

han lleg-ado
 have-3PL arrive-PP
 ‘They have arrived’

Used as a Reflexive Verb

E. Med Sp

44. *son junt-ado-s*

E. Mod Sp

se juntan or se han junt-ado

be-3PL join-PP.PL join-3SG or join-3SG.pres. perf.

‘They have joined forces’

Used to denote a resultative state of being

E. Med Sp

45. *son cans-ado-s*

be-3PL tired-PP. masc

‘They are tired’

E. Mod Sp

están cans-ado-s

be-3PL tired-PP.PL

3.8 The restructuring of aspect as a grammatical category

Pawlik (2016) also examines the aspectual content of periphrastic perfective verb tenses. He found that the use of aspect began in the 5th century (Medieval Spanish period) and towards the start of the 13th century (Modern Spanish period), a compound verb tense had been employed to denote perfectivity. He cites *habeo cantatum* ‘I have sung’ as an example of this, claiming that initially, possession was emphasized when these forms were applied. This limited their use to utterances which had a personal subject, or in which the direct object was transparent. His example sentence is the following.

Classical Latin

46. *Habeo cultellum comparatum*

E. Mod Sp

El cuchillo lo tengo compr-ado

the-art knife-masc it-DO have-1SG buy-PP

‘The knife, it, I have bought’

In the above example in Modern Spanish, the named masculine subject noun phrase *el cuchillo*, ‘the knife’, which is followed by the masculine direct object pronoun marker, *lo* ‘it’, reinforces the possessive nature of the verb pattern coming after. The placement of the direct object pronoun ahead of the verb *tener* (to denote possession) reinforces the fact that the subject has taken ownership of the knife. To put it another way, the ownership aspect of the utterance is reinforced by the positioning of the direct object pronoun in front of this

utterance as though it were part of the noun phrase. The verb *comprar* ‘to buy’ is inflected in its past participle form, *compr-ado* to mark its adjectival past participle role in conjunction with *tener* ‘to have’. *Comprado* is suffixed with a masculine gender morpheme -o to maintain agreement in gender and number with the masculine subject, *el cuchillo*. Pawlik (2016) surmises that because the concept of possession was inherently marked in this way in Vulgar Latin constructions, the gender and number direct object concordance was developed in Medieval Spanish. This direct object concordance lasted up until the end of the Middle Ages (5th to 10th century). The following is taken from Pawlik’s (2016) illustration of what emerged from Medieval Spanish concerning the syntactic order with respect to a perfect verb tense and direct object concordance. Below the perfective tense auxiliary verb, *he* (*haber*) is positioned ahead of the past participle and the concordance of gender and number is marked in the lexical verb’s past participle form in this periphrastic compound perfective tense.

Classical Latin

47. *habeo vacca(m) comparatu(m)*

E. Mod Sp

a) *Comprad-a he un-a vaca*
 buy-PP.fem have-1SG a-indef.art cow-fem
 ‘I have bought a cow’

Pawlik (2016) also claims that along the course of the 13th to the 15th centuries the direct object compound perfect tense participle concordance gradually disappeared. This left the perfect tenses with an uninflected past participle. The result was the stabilisation of the following syntactical order in the compound perfect aspect tenses, which is the Modern Spanish equivalent of the above utterance, *Comprada he una vaca*.

b) *He compr-ado un-a vaca.*
 have-1SG buy-PP a-indef cow-fem
 ‘I have bought a cow’

Lapesa (2000) describes how the perfective of certain intransitive verbs, including *venir* ‘to come’, *ir* ‘to go’ and *salir* ‘to leave’ were previously conjugated with *esse*. The Latin

example cited below conforms to a word order contrary to what is expected of word order norms in Medieval and Modern Spanish compound tenses.

Classical Latin

48. *venitus est*

E. Mod Sp

<i>Él</i>	<i>ha</i>	<i>ven-ido</i>
he-subj	have-2SG	come-PP

‘He has come.’

Penny (1993) speculates that this reversed word order in compound perfective tense formation was initially intended for deponent verbs. She cites *morir* ‘to die’ as an example of a deponent verb in Latin. Deponent verbs are typically interpreted in the passive voice but are expressed in the active voice. The participle is positioned before the auxiliary verb in the following Latin deponent perfect tense: *mortuus est*. In Spanish, this translates to *él ha muerto* (‘He has died’). Lapesa (2000) explains that this reversed auxiliary-participle word order, the gender and number agreement and the overt use of the pronoun *él* are characteristic features of Medieval Spanish periphrastic compound perfective tenses. Spanish verbs that were not deponent, such as *venir*, *ir* and *salir*, were initially constructed with a participle before the auxiliary verb and marked the gender and number in accordance with the subject until the 14th century.

E. Med Sp

49. *Venid-o-s* *son*
 come-PP.masc be-3PL
 ‘They have come.’

E. Mod Sp

50. *Ello-s* *ha-n* *ven-ido*
 they-3PL.masc have-3PL come-PP
 ‘They have come.’

E. Med Sp

51. *venid-a* *es*
 come-PP.fem be-3SG
 ‘She has come.’

E. Mod Sp

52. *Ella* *ha* *ven-ido*
 she-pro have-3SG come-PP
 ‘She has come.’

Thereafter *ser* was replaced by *haber* as the exclusive auxiliary verb employed in perfective compound tenses. Lapesa (2000) confirms that *ser* and *estar* would gradually also take on *haber* as the auxiliary verb in their own periphrastic compound perfective tense constructions. Pawlik (2016) cautions that perfectivity in the action of the verb was not denoted only through periphrastic compound tenses. In addition, the progressive aspect had materialised during the course of the development of Spanish. The progressive aspect could be constructed with the verbs *estar*, *ser* or *ir*, together with the gerund morpheme suffixed to the lexical verb. Equally, both a past perfective aspect and past imperfect aspect could be formed using the verb *estar* in Spanish.

The past perfective aspect is constructed with the preterit of the auxiliary verb *estar* in conjunction with the gerund of the lexical verb. The imperfect perfective aspect is formed with the imperfect inflection of the verb *estar* and the gerund of the lexical verb. In line with these findings, Pawlik (2016) surmises that the morphosyntactic restructuring of the Castilian Spanish verbal system created periphrastic verbal constructions that effectively overhauled synthetic Latin verbal forms. During this process, perfective compound participle tenses underwent significant changes prior to the stabilisation of their forms. These changes bear testimony to the restructuring of aspect in Spanish.

3.9 The enhancement of the subjunctive mood and the standardisation of periphrastic perfective verb tenses

While this study is concerned with the changes between Medieval and Modern Spanish, Pawlik (2016) clarifies that these enhancements had already started to occur in the Vulgar Latin era between the 3rd and 5th centuries. His research examines the reconstruction and explicit enhancement of the subjunctive mood in the Spanish verbal system. Pawlik (2016) provides clear examples of the morphosyntactic changes to the subjunctive mood, using the example of the marking of the verb *amar* ‘to love’ in its respective verbal categories. For the purpose of this study, the verb *cantar* ‘to sing’ is used as the sample verb. *Cantar* belongs to the first group of conjugated verbs in Spanish, whose stems are suffixed with *-ar*. The first change to the verbal system was the appearance of the present perfect compound tense. Hill and Bradford (2000) note that the Spanish auxiliary verb *haber* is conjugated and partnered with the past participle of the lexical verb to mark the present perfect tense. It is important to also mention that their findings on the present perfect tense demonstrate that this tense is

mainly used in cultivated or educated speech contexts, and mainly in Spain to this day. This might substantiate Pawlik's (2016) nominating the present perfect as one of the enhancements to the verbal system and that use of the present perfect is considered a marker of sophisticated speech. Below, in example 53, the first-person conjugation of this verb is in the present perfect tense.

53. *He cant-ado*
 have-1SG sing-PP
 'I have sung.'

Subsequently, the conditional would manifest in the Spanish verbal conjugation system. This mood was affixed with the inflectional morpheme '-ía' on the whole infinitive stem of the verb. An example of this is *cantaría* (sing-1SG+-ía-cond.) 'I would sing'. The formation of the conditional is listed under the future verb tense categories of verb conjugations in Hill and Bradford (2000). The future is also implicitly denoted by the conditional, be it unknown or hypothetical. In addition to this, two more future verb tenses came into existence within the subjunctive mood. These were *cantare* (future simple subjunctive) 'I will sing' and *hubiere cantado* (future perfect subjunctive) 'I will have sung'. However, Hill and Bradford (2000) emphasise that in Modern Spanish the use of these two specific future subjunctive verb tenses is confined to legal texts or idiomatic expressions rather than modern spoken contexts. The pluperfect tense, which later became the subjunctive imperfect verb tense in Spanish, originated from an inflectional suffix from its erstwhile indicative Latin counterpart. Pawlik provides us with the following example in 54 below.

54. *cantaveram* > *cantara*
 sing-1/3SG.subj.imp sing-1/3SG.subj.imp
 'to sing'

This is signalled as the only instance of a verb tense changing from one mood to another: from the indicative to the subjunctive. Despite this, Pawlik (2016) asserts that the instances in which the subjunctive mood would have been applied in Latin differ from those in Spanish. He claims that in certain instances where the indicative would have been used in Medieval or

Modern Spanish, the subjunctive would have been opted for in Latin. It is feasible to consider two possible motives for this change. The speakers would have intrinsically changed the system of the language to meet a communicative need. If said speakers of the language use the categories in a distinct manner or to their liking, their impact on language change can be considerable.

An examination of the pluperfect indicative in relation to its Latin construction could clarify whether its gradual change of use from the indicative to the subjunctive in Spanish was for systemic or for sociolinguistic reasons or both. Pawlik (2016) clarifies that, in Medieval Spanish, since both auxiliary verbs *habere* and *esse* were employed to mark the perfective aspect, the inherited Latin inflection for the pluperfect indicative tense (-eram in *cantaveram*) would not serve the purpose of marking the perfective tenses. It was for this reason that the imperfect of the subjunctive was developed and the main reason that *cantaveram* would subsequently change from the indicative to the subjunctive mood in the paradigm. Pawlik's example in 55 below demonstrates the outcome in Spanish.

55. <i>canta-veram</i>	>	<i>cant-ara</i>	>	<i>hab-ía</i>	<i>cant-ado</i>
sing-1SG-ind. pluperf		sing-1SG.imp.subj		have-1SG.pluperf	sing-PP

Interestingly, Pawlik (2016) observes that the subjunctive pluperfect in Latin *cantavissem* could be employed to mark the imperfect of the subjunctive in Spanish. What followed was a gradual morphological change for the second and additional inflectional suffix in the imperfect subjunctive in Spanish on the verbal paradigm, in example 56 below.

56. <i>cantavissem</i>	>	<i>hubiese/hubiera cantado</i>	>	<i>canta-se</i>
sing-1/3SG.pluperf.subj		sing-1/3SG.imp.subj		sing-1/3SG.imp.subj

Penny (1993) confirms that in the 14th century these two inflectional suffixes were interchangeably applied to denote the imperfect tense of the subjunctive mood. Over time, according to Penny, Spanish-speaking communities in geographically different locations began to favour using one over the other. The outcome of this was that the inflectional morpheme *-ara*, in *cantara* went on to supersede *-ase* in *cantase* in Castilian Spanish. Ultimately, the two pluperfect subjunctive inflections *hubiera/hubiese* + past participle of the

lexical verb overtook the Latin imperfect subjunctive *cantarem*. Penny (1993) explains that the speech communities had a role to play in this change. In a similar fashion to the pluperfect indicative, the pluperfect subjunctive tenses marked a more remote moment in the past than the imperfect subjunctive did. It has been suggested that with the introduction of the periphrastic pluperfect subjunctive a communicative need was filled by this. The application of the pluperfect allowed for subtle nuances in space and time to be communicated.

Pawlik (2016) comments that, as Spanish continued to leave its Latin roots behind, over the course of the restructuring of the morphological verb tense system the Latin preterit perfect of the subjunctive mood *cantaverim* was receded and the future subjunctive in Spanish emerged. In the sequence below, the trajectory of the inflectional morpheme change that brought about the form became the unmarked future simple subjunctive in Modern Spanish, in example 57 below (Pawlik 2016).

Latin	E. Mod Sp			
57. <i>canta-v-erim</i>	<i>haya</i>	<i>cant-ado</i>	>	<i>cant-ar-é</i>
sing-1SG.fut	have-1SG.subj	sing-PP		sing-1SG.fut

Nowikow (1995) asserts that the future subjunctive in Spanish is likely to vanish from colloquial Spanish. The present tenses in the indicative and subjunctive took its place in Modern Spanish. As mentioned before, Hill and Bradford (2000) state that the future simple subjunctive and the resulting future perfect subjunctive in Spanish are, to this day, reserved for legal or administrative texts. These future simple subjunctive and future perfect subjunctives do not feature in spoken Spanish or in non-bureaucratic texts (Hill and Bradford 2000).

Pawlik (2016) provides examples of how the indicative and subjunctive present tense replaced the future subjunctive. These are taken from Spanish texts dating back from the 15th to the 17th centuries. Around this period, the future subjunctive was employed in the conditional in example 58 and employed a grammatical role that the subjunctive indicative would do in Modern Spanish in example 59 below.

58.

E. Med Sp

a) *Si acaso enviudares, recordarás mis palabras.*

E. Áureo Sp

b) *Si acaso enviudas, recordarás mis palabras.*

‘In the event that you become a widow, you will remember what I have said.’

59.

E. Med Sp

a) *Cuando llegare, se lo daré.*

E. Áureo Sp

b) *Cuando llegue, se lo daré.*

‘When I arrive, I will give it to him.’

With respect to person and number marking in the verbal paradigms, Pawlik (2016) draws our attention to a second person plural morpheme inflectional change between Medieval and Modern Spanish. The second person suffixed with a /d/ in Medieval Spanish was done away with in Modern Spanish. Pawlik’s examples in 60 and 61 below are evidence of the outcome of this inflectional loss. He claims that several motivations underpinned this inflectional change. The increased usage of the subject personal pronoun marker *vos* has been considered as the most popular motive. Interlocutors use this marker in Modern Spanish as a verbal cue of respect. This inflectional change speaks to an observed tendency of language communities to favour morpheme markers which convey an elevated status.

E. Med Sp

60. *cantades*
sing-2PL

E. Mod Sp

cantáis
sing-2PL

61. *sodes*

be-2PL

sois

be-2PL

3.10 The levelling of the first- and third-person inflectional morpheme markers

An equally significant morphosyntactic change shown in Pawlik’s (2016) findings is the inflectional morpheme levelling in the first- and third-person singular in a few verb tenses. Pawlik cites a list of verb tenses in which the first- and third-person singular inflections merged. The list includes the imperfect indicative, the conditional, the subjunctive present and the imperfect of the subjunctive. Pawlik illustrates this inflectional levelling by marking the verb *cantar* ‘to sing’ in the various tenses below. The first-person singular pronoun in Spanish is *yo*, and the third person singular pronouns are *él/ella/usted*. *Usted* is the formal second person pronoun marker, which is marked with the third person singular inflection.

Pawlik (2016) asserts that inflectional morpheme levelling is a process by which the language system is simplified over the course of time. Initially, this occurs in the spoken variant, and is subsequently standardised in the written system of the language. This introduces an angle that has not yet been examined in this analysis. Evidence of this simplification can be seen in the levelling of the first- and third-person inflectional morphemes in Spanish. These select inflectional morphemes were, at one point, distinct in all the verb tenses. Pawlik estimates that a feasible motive for their simplification was their frequent usage in the spoken language. He adds that this same phenomenon of personal pronoun inflectional morpheme levelling went on to impact Portuguese, Catalan, and other Iberian Romance languages.

62. <i>yo</i>	<i>cant-aba</i>	> <i>él/ella</i>	<i>cant-aba</i>
I-1SG	sing-1SG.imp	he/she-3SG.pro	sing-3SG.imp
‘I used to sing.’		‘He/she used to sing.’	
63. <i>yo</i>	<i>cantar-ía</i>	> <i>él/ella</i>	<i>cantar-ía</i>
I-1SG	sing-1SG.cond	he/she-3SG.pro	sing-3SG.cond
‘I would sing.’		‘He/she would sing.’	
64. <i>que yo</i>	<i>cant-e</i>	> <i>que él/ella</i>	<i>cant-e</i>
rel I-1SG.pro	sing-1SG.pres. subj	rel he-3SG.pro	sing-3SG.pres. subj
‘that I sing’		‘that he sing’	

65. <i>que</i>	<i>yo</i>	<i>canta-ra/canta-se</i>	>	<i>que</i>	<i>él/ella</i>	<i>canta-ra/canta-se</i>
rel	I-1SG.pro	sing-1SG.imp.subj		rel	he-3SG.pro	sing-3SG.imp.subj
	‘that I sang’			‘that he sang’		

Pawlik (2016) asserts that the levelling would unlikely have taken place had the first- and third-person pronoun final consonants on the inflections not also fallen away before the Medieval Spanish period. These final consonants were *-m* in the first-person singular conjugation and *-t* in the third person singular conjugation. These suffixes were lost in the Vulgar Latin period about three to six centuries before Spanish was written down. To this effect, it can be surmised that the levelling of these inflections would have been influenced by two forces.

- The first force is an instance in which the system is changed internally. This makes way for an external force, such as a linguistic community, to determine and subsequently standardise their preferences within the internal system of the language. In the Medieval Spanish period, these preferences were concerned with opposing elements such as prestige and simplicity. The prestige was evident from those formal cues and lexical forms that have outlasted others to this day. The simplicity speaks to the systematic levelling of morphemes. Simplicity, as a preference, is also evident in the dwindling grammatical category roles, such as the gender-number concordance in the former passive voice and perfective tenses.
- Pawlik (2016) suggests that the second force has a simpler explanation for the observed inflectional levelling in the initial personal pronoun conjugations. He puts this down to the fact that their brief and less differentiated morphological structures rendered them more susceptible to reduction over the course of the language’s linguistic evolution.

Mańczak (1989) explains how certain grammatical categories are less susceptible to change as their own systems evolve. French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese and Romanian all stem from Latin. Mańczak theorises that the singular subject pronoun, the indicative mood, the present tense and the 3rd person singular of the verb are not only more frequently used in Romance languages by virtue of their grammatical functions, but also more than in any other

language. The less frequently used categories include the plural subject pronoun, non-indicative moods and non-first-person singular subjects. Like Pawlik (2016), Mańczak also claims that this explains why frequently used grammatical categories over those that are less frequently used have had their inflectional morphemes levelled or changed along the course of time.

3.11 The morphosyntactic restructuring of the Spanish verbal paradigms from the 5th to the 15th centuries

The first two of the three tables below are from Penny's (1993) analysis, cited in Pawlik (2016). They have been identified as Table 3, 4 and 5, respectively. These tables present an outline of the morphological restructuring of the verb tense paradigms between the Medieval and Modern Spanish periods. Penny remarks that the changes within the Medieval Spanish era should be observed in two intervals of time. Table 3 depicts the inherited Latin inflectional morpheme markers of the first-person singular in a Medieval Spanish verb tense paradigm. Penny has marked the structures that would eventually cease to exist. These include the future perfect indicative tense and the preterit imperfect subjunctive tense. In Table 4, she presents the Spanish verb tense system, marking only the first-person singular inflections on the verb *cantar* as they emerged and were regularised in the paradigm towards the 13th century. The third table (Table 5) is from a Modern Spanish verb tense reference in Bradford and Hill (2000). It illustrates the system as it is to this day, based on the framework of the two first tables.

Table 3 Medieval Spanish (E. Med Sp) 8th to 15th century

	Indicative		Subjunctive	
	Imperfect	Perfect	Imperfect	Perfect
Future	CANTABO	<i>CANTAVERO</i>	-	-
Present	CANTO	-	CANTEM	-
Preterit	CANTABAM	CANTAVI	<i>CANTAREM</i>	CANTAVERIM
Pluperfect	-	CANTAVERAM	-	CANTAVISSEM

Table 4 Early Modern Spanish (E. Áureo Sp) 15th to the 17th century

	Indicative		Subjunctive	
	Imperfect	Perfect	Imperfect	Perfect
Conditional	CANTARÍA	AVRIA CANTADO	-	-
Future	CANTARÉ	AVRE CANTADO	CANTARE	OVIERE CANTADO
Present	CANTO	(H)E CANTADO	CANTE	AYA CANTADO
Preterit	CANTAVA	CANTE	CANTASSE	-
Pluperfect/Preterit Perfect or Past Anterior	-	CANTARA/OVE CANTADO/AVIA CANTADO	-	OVIESSE CANTADO

Table 5 Modern Spanish (E. Mod Sp) 17th century to date

	Indicative		Subjunctive	
	Imperfect	Perfect	Imperfect	Perfect
Conditional	CANTARÍA	HABRÍA CANTADO	-	-
Future	CANTARÉ	HABRÉ CANTADO	CANTARE	HUBIERE CANTADO
Present	CANTO	HE CANTADO	CANTE	HAYA CANTADO
Preterit	CANTABA	CANTÉ	CANTARA/ CANTASE	HUBIERA/HUBIESE CANTADO
Pluperfect (Preterit Perfect)	-	HABÍA CANTADO	-	-

Penny (1993) and Maurer's (1959) observations include the marking of perfectivity in the Latin verb system by adding a distinct morpheme after the /v/ consonant in each instance. However, in spoken Latin, the suffixing after the /v/ appeared to fall away in favour of briefer forms to mark perfectivity. The following examples illustrate this consonant drop along the course of linguistic change between the Spoken Latin and Medieval Spanish periods.

Vulgar Latin

E. Med SP

66. *cantav-eram*

cant-ara(m)

sing-1/3SG.pluperf

sing-1/3SG.subj.imp

67. *cantav-issem*

cant-asse(m)

sing-1/3SG.pluperf

sing-1/3SG.subj.imp

As the perfective tenses started to stabilise, Maurer (1959) recalls how the morphological structures of conjugated verbs in the perfective tenses were developed with the Latin auxiliary verb and copula ESSE in mind. This is illustrated by the following inflectional morpheme changes in example 68.

68. *cantav-eram*

>

cantav-ero

>

cantav-issem

plu.perf.ind

fut.perf.ind

plu. perf. subj

sing-1/3SG

sing-1/3SG

sing-1/3SG

The analytic periphrastic compound forms emerged from perfective tenses. *Habere*, an auxiliary verb and the Medieval Spanish equivalent of *haber* in Modern Spanish, was subsequently normalised as the auxiliary verb for analytic periphrastic compound perfective tenses in Modern Spanish, along with the past participle of the lexical verb. Maurer (1959) cited the example below in 69 in which a structural change occurred from perfective tenses to periphrastic analytic constructions in the verbal paradigms.

Classical Latin		VL to E. Med Sp		E. Mod SP
69. <i>cantavi</i>	>	<i>habeo cantatum</i>	>	<i>cant-é</i>
sing-1SG.pret		have-1SG sing-PP		sing-1SG.pret
analytic		periphrastic compound		analytic

Cantavi, inherited from the Classical Latin verbal paradigm, changed to *habeo cantatum*. This also signals the emerging of compound perfective tenses. Maurer (1959) has conjectured that *canté*, the subsequent form for the preterit perfect, emerged from *cantavi*. This preterit perfect form is said to have appeared in the verbal paradigms by virtue of an Iberian Romance variant. Heine and Kuteva (2002) have observed how languages change from synthetic inflectional modes to periphrastic modes through a process of grammaticalisation. Since this inflection in the conjugation could only denote the remote past, the periphrastic perfective compound tense would occupy a different dimension of time and space. This space stemmed from a communicative need to be able to mark a more recent past action. In effect, this recent past role was to be filled by compound perfective tenses. This process is exemplified a little further on in example 74 this section.

From a diachronic approach to linguistics, grammaticalisation is a process by which lexical categories are transformed into grammatical ones. Categories that are grammaticalised are then eventually assigned new grammatical roles (Hopper and Traugott 1993). Dubois et al (1979) in Pawlik (2016) provide some examples to illustrate an instance of grammaticalisation in the development of Spanish. A lexical morpheme in Latin viz. *mens, mentis*, and more specifically the ablative case for this lexical morpheme *-mente*, would in Spanish be changed to a grammatical morpheme, and the adverb suffix. Some of Pawlik's examples of adverbs with the *-mente* suffix are illustrated below in 70, 71 and 72.

70. *lentamente*

‘slowly’

71. *violentamente*

‘violently’

72. *salvajemente*

‘wildly’

Redirecting the focus once more to the grammaticalisation in the perfective aspect tenses, Maurer (1959) highlights the significant restructuring of the inflectional morphemes, including the future and conditional perfective tenses. Penny (1993, 2002) argues that this process of morphological restructuring was born principally out of communicative needs. Up to this point, the Latin verbal paradigms had not consisted of compound perfective tenses. However, the very nature of the verbal paradigm system meant that space could be made for these gradual additions. In examples 73 and 74 below, Maurer has identified the additions to the verbal paradigms that were not present in Latin. The first is the compound present perfect and the second is the periphrastic compound conditional perfect:

Compound present perfect tense

73. *he cant-ado*
have-1SG sing-PP
‘I have sung’

Periphrastic compound conditional perfect tense structural change

E. Med SP		E. Áureo SP		E. Mod SP
74. <i>cantar-ía</i>	>	<i>avía cant-ado</i>	>	<i>habr-ía cant-ado</i>
sing-1SG.cond		have-1SG.cond sing-PP		have-1SG.cond sing-PP
‘I would sing’		‘I would have sung’		‘I would have sung’

Maurer (1959) and Pawlik (2016) point out the process of grammaticalisation that affected the simple and periphrastic conditional perfective tenses in Spanish. Previously, these tenses were on a par in the Spanish verbal paradigms. The resultant change to the conditional affected the role of the former pluperfect conditional *cantara*. The grammatical role it was changed to denoted an inferred outcome of an unrealised past state. The pluperfect conditional was replaced by a compound periphrastic pluperfect conditional. This meant that

the original pluperfect conditional would be displaced to a different space-time aspect on the paradigm. Within this aspectual role, it would denote the original indicative pluperfect, alongside the periphrastic compound form, *avía cantado*. The latter outlasted *cantara* as the preferred pluperfect inflectional form and *cantara* was shifted to the subjunctive mood. Together with *cantase*, *cantara* became one of the two accepted imperfect subjunctive forms in Modern Spanish. Here, in particular is where grammaticalisation had the greatest impact. It is feasible to conjecture a theory about these additions to the perfective tenses. The way in which the verbal paradigm changed overtime suggests that these perfective additions had intrinsically been able to occupy grammatical roles other verb inflections could not.

Penny (1993) explains why the compound pluperfect *avía cantado* and the preterit perfect *ove cantado* had deliberately been put into the same time-space aspect, as exemplified earlier in Table 4. In her view, both verb tense inflections had shared this aspectual role at some point because their distinct past tense aspectual roles had not yet been distinguished. Therefore, the changes with respect to these two tenses would have stemmed from systematic limitations which would have impelled internal changes to the system. In addition to this, the interlocutors who used the system imposed their communicative needs on it, which in turn resulted in further internal changes happening to the system. This could be regarded as external pressure on the system, as in this instance the pressure would have come from the speakers of the language.

According to González (2000), as a continuation of the trajectory of this verbal paradigm outcome, the preterit perfect indicative, *ove cantado*, was used up until the 13th century. Prior to the change from *ove cantado* to *hubo cantado*, the trajectory of this inflectional verb tense change took an interesting turn. Previously, it had been used to convey an absolute past tense. Subsequently, in the 14th and 15th centuries, the preterit perfect indicative verb tense *ove cantado* would take on the aspectual role of denoting the immediate and consecutive occurrence of two past actions.

With respect to the subjunctive mood inflectional changes, González (2000) details how the two future subjunctive tenses came to fruition in the Medieval Spanish phase. As illustrated in Table 4, these were with the simple future subjunctive *cantare* and the compound future

perfect subjunctive *oviere cantado*. The imperfect subjunctive inflection changed from *cantasse* to *cantase*, illustrating that an -s had been dropped. Modern Spanish to date does not feature any geminate -ss consonants in its lexicon. *Cantara*, which had been the pluperfect indicative inflection, switched aspectual roles on the verbal paradigm and, together with *cantase*, became one of the two accepted inflections of *cantar* to denote the imperfect of the subjunctive in Modern Spanish. This left room for the new periphrastic compound pluperfect subjunctive to occupy an aspectual role in the paradigm. A compound present perfect subjunctive verb tense (*h*)*aya cantado* materialised. Stemming from the former indicative compound perfect (*h*)*e cantado*, which subsequently went on to become the indicative present perfect verb tense inflection.

Pawlik (2016) estimates that the inflectional changes which restructured the Spanish verbal paradigm were not dissimilar to those that took place in other Romance languages. He claims that, for this reason, the tense-mood verbal paradigms for Spanish are not difficult for speakers of other Romance languages to make sense of. The reverse instance would be the same for other Romance language paradigms with respect to Spanish speakers. In terms of these changes, the analytic periphrastic compound tenses appeared to have settled in the perfective aspect of the verbal paradigms. Specifically, a change for *cantara* from the indicative to the subjunctive mood would also ensue. Firstly, *cantara* lost its grammatical aspectual role in the indicative pluperfect as it migrated to the imperfect subjunctive aspect, which it has since then shared with *cantase*. Secondly, the analytic compound perfective tense, *avía cantado*, surpassed it. Pawlik's conjectures that the compound perfective tense, which was later named the pluperfect verb tense, alluded to a more remote past than was the instance for *cantara*. He anticipates that this change, like other changes, gradually closed subtle communicative gaps for interlocutors. Structural gaps in the Spanish verbal paradigms were opened and filled by periphrastic compound perfective verb tenses, whereas previously speakers in Latin would have used an adverb for this nuance (Day and Zahler 2014).

3.12 The impact of sound change regularity

Poulter (1990) cites many instances of phonological changes between Latin and Spanish in the development of the Spanish vowel and consonant systems. Below are a number of examples of the phonological changes that differ between Latin and Spanish. One example is the 'f' consonant in Latin, which preceded a vowel, that was changed to a muted 'h' in

Spanish. Stevens (2000) observes that the other labiodental consonant, /v/, has been the subject of much research debate in Modern Spanish. Penny (2002) states that the likely pronunciation was the voiced bilabial fricative /β/ for both, a pronunciation inherited from Medieval Spanish and spelled /v/ or /b/. Stevens (2000) proposes that the application of the allophonic variant /b/ or /v/ is determined by linguistic, social, and stylistic conditions. Therefore, the social context plays a large role in phonological system variation in Spanish. Some examples of this have been given below.

Vulgar Latin	E. Mod SP
---------------------	------------------

75. <i>filum</i>	<i>hilo</i> thread-masc
------------------	----------------------------

76. <i>ferrum</i>	<i>hierro</i> iron-masc
-------------------	----------------------------

77. <i>femina</i>	<i>hembra</i> female-fem
-------------------	-----------------------------

Similarly, in Poulter's findings, he picked up that 'p', 'k' and 'g', voiceless stops, were altered to b, d and g, which are voiced stops. Below are some examples.

Vulgar Latin	E. Mod SP
---------------------	------------------

78. <i>focum</i>	<i>fuego</i> fire-masc
------------------	---------------------------

79. <i>sapit</i>	<i>sabe</i> know-3SG
------------------	-------------------------

80. <i>auditum</i>	<i>oído</i> ear-masc
--------------------	-------------------------

Additionally, the double consonants, which were ‘cc’, ‘pp’, ‘tt’, ‘ss’ and ‘mm’ were simplified to single consonants ‘c’, ‘p’, ‘t’, ‘s’ and ‘m’.

Vulgar Latin	E. Mod Sp
81. <i>vacca</i>	<i>vaca</i> cow-masc
82. <i>cippum</i>	<i>cepo</i> trap-masc
83. <i>cattus</i>	<i>gato</i> cat-masc
84. <i>passu</i>	<i>paso</i> path-masc
85. <i>communu</i>	<i>común</i> common-masc

On a final note, the Latin words that were typically suffixed with an ‘r’, which Poulter (1990) refers to as the final ‘r’, appear to have been transposed in Spanish. This transposition process has occurred through the development of Spanish from Latin. Poulter (1990) and Penny (1991) refer to this linguistic process as metathesis and cite commonly featured words in Spanish in which metathesis has occurred. Examples of this below:

Vulgar Latin	E. Mod SP
86. <i>semper</i>	<i>siempre</i> always-adv
87. <i>inter</i>	<i>entre</i> between-prep
88. <i>intro</i>	<i>dentro de</i> (< <i>de + intro</i>) within-prep
89. <i>super</i>	<i>sobre</i> above-prep

3.13 The involvement of sociolinguistic and contact factors in the eventual dominance of Castilian Spanish

This section elaborates what has already been covered in the Literature Review to draw out the role of sociolinguistic factors in the outcome of Modern Spanish. Sociolinguists regard the cultural aspects of borrowing as a process of learning and acculturation. Anthropological linguists, in turn, suggest that language borrowing is a more important indicator of cultural change in a community than any other element (Mesthrie et al. 2000).

The findings of Velupillai (2012), Meyerhoff (2006), Appel and Muysken (1987) and Mesthrie et al (2000) illustrate how changes come about in a recipient language after periods of language contact or exposure to other varieties. It is also noted that there can be change without contact. For example, American and British English are gradually diverging at a colloquial level, and this is not due to contact, but rather to different selections from earlier choices of words available (Mesthrie et al. 2000). These changes may or may not remain in the recipient language due to a number of reasons (Appel and Muysken 1987) which include:

- linguistic adaptation
- receptiveness to change or
- a linguistic community's acquiescence upon noticing the potential for upward social mobility.

There is a general consensus amongst the abovementioned linguists that language change is caused by an interdependence between the language's system and the social system in which it is situated. It is therefore important to consider both systems when providing examples of linguistic changes in Spanish.

As already noted, the Visigothic monarchy and aristocracy ruled Spain from the 5th to the early 8th century. It is likely that Visigoths from the start spoke Latin bilingually, together with their Germanic vernacular (Penny 1991). However, Latin continued to be the language of culture and administration throughout this period, and the Visigoth linguistic footprint on the Latin of Spain was minimal. The ruling Visigoth group made up a small proportion of the total population and despite their political power, they abandoned bilingualism to assimilate their speech with that of their subjects. This political power did not give them cultural

prestige, which therefore allowed for linguistic diversification. This meant that diatopic variation of speech was increased rather than diminished (Penny 1991). Velupillai (2012) refers to this as the first instance of borrowing, i.e., when both the form and function features are borrowed from the source language.

Once the Visigoth ruling in Spain fell, due to the Moorish conquest at the start of the 8th century, the city of Toledo became a significant seat of power. The Moor invasion brought with it a more developed and prestigious culture which had linguistic consequences for Hispanic Latin and its subsequent languages. The Moorish conquest changed the dialectal map of Spain and gave importance to varieties of Romance, that might have remained unimportant and peripheral, had this not happened (Penny 1991). However, Lapesa (1950) notes that the extent of linguistic borrowing from Arabic to Spanish was limited to the Spanish lexicon. This reinforces the theory that borrowing of a word from a source language does not necessarily presuppose a knowledge of the language (Mesthrie et al. 2009).

The Castilian Christians of Northern Spain sought to reclaim Visigoth Christian Spain back from the Moors (Islamic rulers). To do this required the reconquering of Toledo in 1085. It was this reconquering of Toledo that bestowed Castilian speech with a certain prestige that it might not have had, had this historical event not occurred. It was also a significant reason for the eventual national status of Castilian speech (Penny 1991). This is a clear example of how the political power and social prestige of a language determines the linguistic practises in a language community (Velupillai 2012).

Although the RAE themselves consider that they have played a pivotal role in implementing a Spanish language policy, many linguists view this type of language planning as too prescriptive in nature (Mesthrie et al. 2000). However, linguists such as Penny (1991) acknowledge that in the current Spanish speaking world there is no evidence of any states wanting to promote their local variety as distinct from the varieties used in other states. This is reinforced by the collaboration between academics in Spanish speaking countries to ensure a single set of linguistic recommendations, is enshrined in official RAE publications. Although there is considerable variation in the lexis, it does not impact effective communication between different Spanish speaking regions (Penny 1991).

In conclusion, this discourse analysis has considered the sociolinguistic factors and the morphosyntactic changes that occurred within Spanish between the Medieval and Modern Spanish eras. It has provided a framework for the historical context (diachronic) and highlighted the moments (synchronic) in the trajectory of Spanish where changes occurred. Both external and internal factors have been explored and how these have influenced the linguistic changes from Medieval to Modern Spanish. This has included consideration of the language system as well as the social system (Mesthrie et al. 2009). The analysis provides an observation to explain some of the structural changes to Spanish.

CHAPTER FOUR – Conclusion

Pawlik (2016) argues that for a Modern Spanish speaker and in particular a foreign language speaker of Modern Spanish, Medieval Spanish would be incomprehensible not only on a grammatical level, but also on a lexical and orthographic level. This indicates how important it is to consider the full trajectory of changes in a language and not just take a synchronic approach (Cosieriu 1973; Hopper and Traugott 2003; Lehmann 1962; Lapesa 1981) to understand more fully ‘how the past has influenced the present shape of the Spanish language’. In addition, it is important to consider ‘the impact of sociolinguistic and contact factors’ in the trajectory of change. One of the turning points in the history of the Spanish language showing how the past has influenced the present shape and the associated sociolinguistic and contact factors involved was the period of the rule of the Visigoth monarchy and aristocracy from the 5th to the 8th century. Their impact on the Latin of Spain was limited (Penny 1991). They were a minority rule, and in spite of their political power, they did not have cultural prestige. They abandoned bilingualism and allowed for linguistic diversity rather than imposing uniformity, which meant that diatopic variation of speech was increased rather than diminished during their rule (Penny 1991; Lapesa 1981).

The data analysis has observed some of the morphosyntactic changes that have occurred over time. The first observation is how periphrastic perfective tenses came into being. These include inflectional affix restructuring to verbs in the tense, mood, person, number and aspectual categories, as well as the introduction of periphrastic forms. This restructuring has in fact meant that Spanish has departed from its synthetic parent language, Latin, and adopted analytic characteristics of which periphrastic compound perfective verb tenses are the clearest examples (Pawlik 2016; Penny 1991). This suggests that grammaticalisation, exemplified in several parts of the analysis, had a pivotal role in the outcome of the Modern Spanish morphosyntactic system. This occurred in Spanish as it changed from Medieval to Modern (Slade 2013). An example given in the analysis is the auxiliary verb *haber*, which emerged as the overriding auxiliary verb in compound perfective tenses. Another observation is that a clear division was made between the grammatical roles of the two Spanish copulas *ser* and *estar*. It seems to indicate that sociolinguistic factors have had an influence in this instance of grammaticalisation. This concurs with the notion that the trajectory of change of a language’s

lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactic system, is not only affected by substrate languages but also by the social system in which it is used (Penny 1991).

The analysis observed, when looking at the regularisation of the passive voice in Spanish, between the 13th and 15th centuries, that this coincided with the adoption of analytic periphrastic verb tenses. In Early Medieval Spanish, gender marking was far more significant and a feature of compound verb tenses in both the active and passives voices. However, the gender marking in the active voice disappeared altogether between the 5th and the 15th centuries (Pawlik 2016; Aleza 1987). This ‘simplification’ could be an illustration of linguistic adaption due to the interdependence between the language’s system and its social context (Appel and Muysken 1987).

When looking at the changes and levelling in verb conjugation groups, it was observed that only three of the four verb conjugation groups inherited from Latin, remain in the Spanish language today (Garcia de Diego 1970). Changes occurred to the inflectional affixes on the conjugation of Spanish verbs during the 8th to the 14th century. In the remaining three verb conjugation groups, the suffix vowel *-e* was dropped, leaving them all with the consonant *-r* to mark the bare infinitive form at the end of the stem. Overall, these morphological changes resulted in a reduction within the Spanish verb conjugation system. This was largely due to a reinterpretation of their Latin counterparts (Penny 2002). Of these three conjugation groups inherited from Latin, *-are*, *-ere* and *-ire*, the *-ire* group was favoured in Medieval Spanish. Many verbs that belonged to the *-ere* conjugation group in Latin, migrated to the *-ir* conjugation group between Vulgar Latin and Modern Spanish (Garcia de Diego 1970). This favouring of one verb conjugation group over another could be an example of a linguistic adaptation due to different selections from earlier choices of phonetic and grammatical variants available (Mesthrie et al 2000).

In addition, the analysis has brought together the discussion around the syntactic restructuring of Spanish. This is concerned with the interchangeability, in equal measure, of the positioning of the subject in relation to the verb. It was established that through a process of regularisation, the SVO word order as opposed to VSO would become the overriding syntactic order in an utterance, but not exclusively. This also extended to the outcome of enclitic pronoun placement, whose syntactic order would be determined by verb form

constraints (Nieuwenhuijsen 1995). Nieuwenhuijsen's hypothesis states that in Modern Spanish the positioning of the enclitic pronoun is entirely linked to the form or role of the verb. However, in Medieval Spanish the placement of the enclitic pronoun and therefore the word order was not as constrained. This exemplifies how changes in the linguistic system are inextricably linked to the changes in the social system and possibly the aspiration for upward social mobility (Appel and Muysken 1987). These perceived constraints were further entrenched by the establishment of the RAE (Zamora Vicente 1999).

In considering how the past has influenced the present shape of the Spanish language, the analysis revealed that the restructuring of aspect as a grammatical category showed progressive changes at various stages of the language's development. From the 5th century to the 15th century the changes that overhauled the synthetic Latin verbal forms include the following;

- the perfective *haber* auxiliary would from the 10th century onwards, be positioned ahead of the lexical verb's past participle, and this was followed by *haber* becoming the overriding auxiliary verb in compound periphrastic perfective tense construction (Pawlik (2016), Penny (1993) and Lapesa (2000))
- the direct object compound perfect tense participle concordance was replaced by a participle that was uninflected in the course of the 13th to the 15th century (Pawlik 2016)
- *estar*, *ser* and *ir* together with a gerund morpheme suffixed on the lexical verb could also denote the progressive aspect in the same period (Pawlik 2016)
- both the past perfective aspect and the past imperfect aspect could be formed using the auxiliary *estar* (Pawlik 2016)

These linguistic adaptations provided more options for the Spanish speaker and this could possibly have contributed to the potential for upward social mobility, but this would require further investigation (Appel and Muysken 1987).

The enhancement of the subjunctive mood and the standardisation of periphrastic perfective verb tenses had already started to occur in the Vulgar Latin era between the 3rd and 5th century. This particular enhancement exemplifies both how the past has influenced the present shape of the Spanish language from a sociolinguistic and contact factors perspective.

The change to the verbal system was the appearance of the present perfect compound tense in the indicative mood. This links to Pawlik's (2016) observation that the present perfect is one of the enhancements to the verbal system and that the present perfect is considered a marker of sophisticated speech. In terms of the enhancement of the subjunctive mood, the pluperfect tense, which later became the subjunctive imperfect verb tense in Spanish, originated from an inflectional suffix of its erstwhile indicative Latin counterpart. Pawlik (2016) claims that in certain instances where the indicative would have been used in Medieval or Modern Spanish, the subjunctive would have been opted for in Latin. This change in the system of the language would have been to meet a communicative need. In the 14th century, the two inflectional suffixes in the imperfect subjunctive were used interchangeably. Over time Spanish speaking communities in geographically different locations began to favour using one over the other. The speech communities also had a role to play in the two pluperfect subjunctive inflections overtaking the Latin imperfect subjunctive (Penny 1993). The second person suffixed with '-d' in Medieval Spanish had been done away with in Modern Spanish. One of the reasons for this was the increased usage of the personal subject pronoun marker - *vos* as a verbal cue of respect. The language communities have shown a tendency to favour morpheme markers which convey an elevated status (Pawlik 2016). The restructuring of the morphological verb tense resulted in Spanish continuing to leave its Latin roots behind (Pawlik 2016).

Pawlik's (2016) suggests that it was the increasing prevalence of the use of the first-and third-person inflectional morphemes that resulted in their eventual levelling. This levelling process contributed to the simplification of the language system over time. This inflectional morpheme levelling also had an impact on Portuguese, Catalan, and other Iberian Romance languages. When considering how the past has impacted the present, Pawlik (2016) states that the first- and third- person pronoun final consonants had already fallen away in the Medieval Spanish period. This was a result of two forces. The first force is exemplified by two opposing elements, prestige and simplicity. Prestige is evident from the current use of cues and lexical forms in Modern Spanish. Simplicity is evident in the diminished role of gender-number concordance in the former passive voice and perfective tenses and in the levelling of the first- and third-person inflectional morphemes in some verb tenses. Pawlik (2006) suggests that the second force has a simpler explanation for the observed inflectional levelling in the initial personal pronoun conjugations. This is that their brief and less

differentiated morphological structures made them more susceptible to being levelled over time.

The analysis of the morphosyntactic restructuring of the Spanish verbal paradigms from the 5th to the 15th centuries showed that there were a number of reasons why this restructuring occurred. Firstly, through grammaticalisation which had filled the communicative needs for subtle nuancing in the past, and secondly by the social contexts in which these changes occurred. The communicative need to mark a more remote past tense grammatically rather than by circumlocution or adverbs was one of the reasons that this emerged (Penny 1991). An additional reason for this was the change to the auxiliary verbs used in compound tenses, particularly between *ser* and *haber*. Subsequently, compound periphrastic perfective tenses were regularised in the Spanish verbal paradigm. This regularisation led to a greater number of verb tenses for the speakers to choose from and stabilised the word order to a greater degree than before (RAE 2001). However, the regularisation on the verbal paradigms has also narrowed down the meanings a particular verb tense can denote. Thus, through the process of verb tense and aspect enrichment, the versatility of a specific verb tense would be forfeited (Pawlik 2016). The syntactic restructure and the addition of more verb tenses to the paradigms suggests that; “when considering how the past has influenced the present shape of the Spanish language,” there seems to have been a need for guidance on the principles of the language in an attempt to create uniformity in the linguistic system. This uniformity is another role that the establishment of the RAE has provided (Zamora Vicente 1999).

Another observation from the analysis is that Spanish gradually moved away from the synthetic nature of Latin to an increasing degree of analyticity (Penny 1991). At the same time, instances of sound change regularity in the Spanish phonological system seem to have resulted in the gradual loss of labiodental variants, voiceless stops being replaced by voiced stops and double consonants being replaced by single consonants. As observed, a process of metathesis by which the final ‘r’ was transposed to a different part of particular words in Spanish was exemplified in the analysis. For this reason, lexical words in Spanish are morphologically and phonologically distinguishable from their Latin counterparts. The phonological system as a whole appears to have changed in some features in the developmental outcome of Spanish. Some of the phonological changes are reflected in the

Modern Spanish orthography (Poulter 1990; Stevens 2000). This could be indicative of another quest for uniformity in the linguistic system. These changes were further embedded with the establishment of the *Real Academia Española* (RAE) which released a dictionary on the orthography rules for the Spanish language soon after its establishment. This could be seen as a top-down imposition as a result of the perceived power of the RAE on the Spanish linguistic system. When considering the impact of sociolinguistic and contact factors, the role of the RAE has been central as a constant source of reference and evolving guide to the language. The RAE is considered the authority reference for the Spanish language and has remained at the forefront of its linguistic evolution since the establishment of the Academy in the 18th century. The role of the RAE appears to have not undermined the continued dissemination and variations of Spanish in and to other territories beyond the borders of Spain (Zamora Vicente 1999).

This discursive analysis has relied on the insights of many different linguists. The analysis draws on the significance of their work in order to understand how the structure of Spanish has been influenced by both its social and linguistic systems. This examination of how the past influences on the Spanish language, but not all of the idiosyncrasies of the language, has shed some light on how the modern shape of the language emerged. A personal insight gained by me through this study is that an authoritative body such as the RAE, which was established in the 18th century, does not necessarily lead to a stringent control over variation in the Modern Spanish language. I would suggest that this is significant for a language that is the second most spoken language in the world today. A future research area could be to analyse how this has been achieved by what might be perceived by some linguists as a prescriptive language academy, although it is embraced by the global Spanish speaking community.

Reference List

Academia Norteamericana de la Lengua Española. Academy of the Spanish Language, viewed 14 August, 2021, <<https://www.anle.us/>>

Adelaar, W. (2004). *The Language of the Andes*. Cambridge University Press

Aleza Izquierdo, M. (1987). *Ser con participio de perfecto en construcciones activas no oblicuas (español medieval)*, Cuadernos de Filología, Anejo III, València

Alonso, A. (1951). *Historia del ceceo y del seseo españoles*. Centro Virtual Cervantes. 7 (1-3): 112-200, viewed 24 December 2020, <http://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/thesaurus/pdf/07/TH_07_123_123_0.pdf>

Appel, R and Muysken, P. (2006). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Bibliovault OAI Repository, the University of Chicago Press. 72. 10.2307/327522

American Community Survey 1-year estimates (2017). Viewed on 14 February, 2020. Retrieved 2018-12-12. https://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/anuario/anuario_06-07/pdf/cifras.pdf

Ariza, M. (1998). *El comentario filológico de textos*, Arco/Libros, Madrid

Baker, M and McCloskey, J (2007). *On the Relationship of Typology to Theoretical Syntax*. Linguistic Typology 11:273-284

Baker, M (2010). Formal Generative Typology. In B. Heine and H. Narrog (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 285-312

- Baker, M (2011). *The interplay between Universal Grammar, universals, and lineage specificity*: Some reflections raised by Dunn, Greenhill, Levinson, and Gray (2011). *Linguistic Typology* 15: pp. 473-482
- Baker, M and Kramer, R (2018). *Doubled Clitics are Pronouns: Amharic Objects (and beyond)*. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 36: pp. 1035-1088
- Ball, M and Fife, J (1993). *The Celtic Languages*: London and New York: Routledge
- Blake, R. J. (1987). *New Linguistic Sources for Old Spanish*. *Hispanic Review* 55. pp. 1-12
- Blake, B. J. (1994), *Case*. Cambridge University Press, Great Britain
- Banos J. M. (coord.). *Liceus*, Madrid: pp. 83-101
- Bybee, J. (2015). *Language Change*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 10–11
- Brunstad, E. (2003). *Standard language and linguistic purism*. *Sociolingüística*. pp. 52-70
- Candau, M. (1985). *Historia de la Lengua Española*. *Scripta Humanística*: Potomac, Maryland
- Campbell, L. (2017). *Language Isolates*. Routledge
- Comrie, B. (1980). *Morphology and word order reconstruction: Problems and prospect*. In J. Fisick (ed.). *Historical Morphology*. Mouton. pp. 83-96
- Corominas, J (1973). *Breve diccionario etimológico de la lengua castellana*, Madrid: Gredos
- Cornell T. J. (1995). *The beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars*, London

Coseriu, E. (1973) *Síntesis del texto: Sincronía, Diacronía e Historia* (El problema del cambio lingüístico). Madrid: Editorial Gredos S.A.

Day, M. and Zahler, S. (2014) *The Continuous Path of Grammaticalization in Modern Peninsular Spanish*. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers

Díaz y Díaz, M (1991). *Libros y librerías en La Rioja altomedieval*, Logroño, IER

Diez, Friedrich (1863). *Introduction to the grammar of the Romance languages*. London, Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate

Dorian, N. (1994). Purism vs. Compromise in Language Revitalization and Language Revival. *Language in Society*. Cambridge University Press. Vol. 23, No. 4: 479-494

Dutton, B. (1968). The Profession of Gonzalo de Berceo and the Paris Manuscript of the Libro de Alexandre. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 37 (1960): 137-145. Translated in Berceo, 80 (1968): 285-294

Echenique Elizondo, M. ^a T. and Martínez Alcalde, M. J. (2013). *Diacronía y gramática histórica de la lengua española*, Tirant lo Blanch, Valencia

Eifring, H and Theil, R. (2005) *Linguistic typology*, Chapter 4 in *Linguistics for Students of Asian and African Languages*. University of Oslo

Erichsen, G (2018), *Languages of Spain Not Limited to Spanish*, viewed 10 December 2020, <<https://www.thoughtco.com/spains-linguistic-diversity-3079513>>

Eska, J. F. (1998). The linguistic position of Lepontic. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, vol. 2, Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

- Fontana, J. M. (1993). *Phrase Structure and the Syntax of Clitics in the History of Spanish*.
 Doctoral Thesis: University of Pennsylvania
- Jaffe, A. (2016), Indexicality, stance and fields in sociolinguistics. In N. Coupland
 (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates*. Cambridge, UK: CUP
- Heine, B. and Kuteva, T. (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge:
 Cambridge University Press
- Hill, S. and Bradford, W. (2000). *Bilingual Grammar of English-Spanish Syntax*. University
 Press of America. Lanham: United States
- Hopper, P and Traugott, E (2003). *Grammaticalization*, second edition. 1-276. Stanford
 University Press
- Lapesa, R. (1950). *Historia de la Lengua Española*. Escelicer, S. L.: Madrid
- Lapesa, R. (1960). *Le dictionnaire historique de la langue espagnole*. Paris.
- Lapesa, R. (1981) [1942], *Historia de la lengua española* (9th ed.), Madrid: Gredos
- Lapesa, R. (2000). *Estudios de morfosintaxis histórica del español*, t. 1-2, Cano R.,
 Echenique M. T. (eds.), Gredos, Madrid
- Lambert, P. (1994). *La langue gauloise : description linguistique, commentaire d'inscriptions
 choisies*, Collection des Hesperides, Editions Errance, Paris
- Lehmann, W. (1993). *Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics*. London: Routledge

Lipski, J. (2021). The Spanish Language of Equatorial Guinea. *Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies*, 8 (2004): 115-30. Viewed August 14, <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20641705>>

Lloyd, P.M. (1987). *From Latin to Spanish: Historical Phonology and Morphology of the Spanish Language*, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia

Ladefoged, P and Maddieson, I (1996). *The Sounds of the World's Languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Luraghi, S. (2017). *Typology and Historical Linguistics*. In A. Aikhenvald & R. Dixon (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology* pp. 95-123. Cambridge University Press

Malone, E. (2008). *Language and Linguistics: Endangered Language*. National Science Foundation.

Manczak, W. (1989). *Fonética y morfología histórica del español*. Wydawnictwo UJ, Kraków

Márquez, F (1995). *Vita: Alfonso X*, Harvard Magazine

Maurer, T.H. (1959). *Gramática do latim vulgar*, Livraria Académica, Rio de Janeiro

McArthur, T, ed. (1992). Descriptivism and prescriptivism: Contrasting terms in linguistics. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford University Press

Menéndez Pidal, R (1964). *Orígenes del español: estado lingüístico de la Península Ibérica hasta el siglo XI*. 5th Edition. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J, Deumert, A. and Leap, W. (2009). *Introducing Sociolinguistics* (2nd Edition). Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

Meyerhoff, M. (2006). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge

Moreno Fernández, F. (2009). *La lengua española en su geografía*. Madrid: Arco/Libros

NGLE (*Nueva Gramática de la lengua española: Manual*) (2009). Real Academia Española y Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española, Espasa Libros: Madrid

NGLEM (*Nueva Gramática de la lengua española: Manual*) (2010). Real Academia Española y Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española, Espasa Libros: Madrid

Nieuwenhuijsen, D. (1995). *¿Colocolo o lo coloco?* The position of the enclitic pronoun in old Spanish. *Neophilologus*. 79. pp 235-244.

Nieuwenhuijsen, D and Garachana, M. (eds.) (2019). *Studies in Historical Linguistics and Language Change Grammaticalization, Refunctionalization and Beyond*. Basel, MDPI AG, pp. 31-46

Nowikow, W. (1995b). Las causas de la desaparición del futuro de subjuntivo. *Munus Amicitiae. Studia Linguistica in honorem Witoldi Mańczak*, Krakow, pp.111-117

Oftedal, M (1985). *Lenition in Celtic and in insular Spanish: the secondary voicing of stops in Gran Canaria*. Oxford University Press, USA

Ostler, N (2005). *Empires of the Word: A Language History of the World*, New York: HarperCollins

- Otero, C. P. (1975). *The development of the Clitics in Hispano-Romance*, in *Diachronic Studies in Romance Linguistics*, ed. Saltarelli, M and Wanner, D. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 153-175
- Pawlik, J. (2016). *El español medieval: hacia la consolidación de un idioma*. Tomo 2, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM
- Penny, R. (1991). *A History of the Spanish Language*. Cambridge University Press
- Penny, R. (1993). *Gramática historia del español*, Ariel: Barcelona
- Penny, R. (2000). *Variation and Change in Spanish*. Cambridge University Press
- Penny, R. (2002). *A History of the Spanish language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Poulter, V. L. (1990). *An Introduction to Old Spanish*. Peter Lang Publishing: New York. pp. 58-77
- Prósper, B.M. (2005). *Estudios sobre la fonética y la morfología de la lengua celtibérica en vascos, celtas e indoeuropeos*. Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, pp. 333-350
- Ramos, G. A. (2009). *Las categorías de género, número y caso. Sintaxis del latín clásico*
- Real Academia Española. (1815). *Ortografía de la lengua castellana*. Retrieved 2021-01-13 – via Internet Archive
- Real Academia Española. (1931). *Gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe S.A.

Real Academia Española (1973), *Esbozo de una nueva gramática de la lengua española*, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe

Real Academia Española. (1979). *Esbozo de una nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe S.A.

Real Academia Española. (1982). *Manual de gramática española*, 2 vols, Madrid. Aguilar

Real Academia Española. (1986). *Gramática esencial del español*. Madrid. Espasa Calpe S.A.

Real Academia Española. (1992). *Diccionario de la lengua española, 21ra edición*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe S.A.

Real Academia Española. (2003). *Ortografía de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe

Real Academia Española. (est. 1713) government website, Spain's Ministry of Education viewed 15 February, 2021, <<https://www.rae.es/la-institucion/historia>>

Real Academia Española. (est. 1713) government website, Spain's Ministry of Education, viewed 15 February, 2021, <<https://www.rae.es/obras-academicas/ortografia>>

Sala, M. and Posner, R. (2020) *Spanish language*. Encyclopaedia Britannica, May 6, 2020, <<https://www.britannica.com/topic/Spanish-language>>

San Martín, Pablo (2005). Nationalism, identity and citizenship in the Western Sahara. *The Journal of North African Studies*. Taylor & Francis. 10 (3-4): 565-592

Sihler, A. (1995). *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, Oxford University Press

Slade, B. (2013). *The diachrony of light and auxiliary verbs in Indo-Aryan*, *Diachronica* 30.4 (2013): 531–578. University of Utah

Smith, C. H. (1996). *Early Rome and Latium. Economy and Society, c. 1000 – 500 BC*, Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford

Stump, G. (1998). *Inflection*. In A. Spencer and A. M. Zwicky (eds.), *The handbook of morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 13–43

Spaulding, R. K. (1971) [1943], *How Spanish Grew*, Berkeley: University of California Press

SPS (Sahara Press Service), Sahara Press Service website, viewed 14 August, 2021, <<http://www.spsrasd.info/news/en/content/about-us>>

Stevens, J. (2000). *On the Labiodental Pronunciation of Spanish /b/ among Teachers of Spanish as a Second Language*. *Hispania*, 83(1), pp. 139-149

Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic Purism*. *Studies in Language and Linguistics*. Longman

Thomas, H. (2010). *The Golden Age: The Spanish Empire of Charles V*. Allen Lane: United Kingdom

Traugott, E.C. and Heine, B (eds.) (1991). *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. John Benjamins

Velupillai, V. (2012). *An Introduction to Linguistic Typology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Vidal de Battini, B.E. (1966). *El español de la Argentina*, Buenos Aires: Consejo Nacional de Educación

Zagona, K. (2002). *Sintaxis generativa del español*. Visor Libros: Madrid

Zamora Vicente, A. (1979). *Dialectología española*. 2da. ed. Madrid: Gredos

Zamora Vicente, A. (1999). *Historia de la Real Academia Española* (1.^a edición). Madrid:
Espasa