

THE DESTINY OF LATIN SECOND CONJUGATION INFINITIVES IN ROMANCE

STUART DAVIS AND DONNA JO NAPOLI
Indiana University Swarthmore College

0. INTRODUCTION*

The second conjugation in Latin was marked with the theme vowel long /e:/, which received primary stress (as in *VIDĒRE* ('see')); and the third conjugation was marked with short /e/ and exhibited root stress (as in *CLAUDĒRE* ('close')). Modern Romance does not preserve the historical vowel length distinction, although some modern Romance languages have developed new length distinctions, e.g. some Northern Italian and Northern French dialects (see Sanga (1988), Martinet (1971), Walter (1982)), which are, however, irrelevant to the present study. The difference in modern Romance, then, between descendants of the Latin second and third conjugation infinitives should be manifest in the location of primary stress. Primary stress in second conjugation infinitives should fall on the theme vowel (i.e. conjugation vowel), while primary stress in third conjugation infinitives should fall on the root vowel. In modern Romance languages in which stress has been regularized so that it never appears on what would have been the antepenult in the Latin source (such as French, in which stress is fixed on the final syllable) one might expect the distinction between the two classes of infinitives to be lost entirely.

Interestingly, in almost all the modern Romance languages many of the original second conjugation infinitive descendants have switched conjugation classes, even in languages in which stress has not been

* We thank Rachel Ball, Steve Dworkin, Nancy Elliot, Jim Harris, Christine Kamprath, Yakov Malkiel, Joan Mascaro, Keith Mason, and Donna Steriade for discussion of various issues here when we were at an early stage in our research. We thank Brian Joseph for comments on our penultimate manuscript. Part of this work was supported by an NIH Training Grant NS-07134-09 to Indiana University at Bloomington. We thank the NIH, which is not to be held responsible in any way for or to be taken as endorsing any of the contents of this work.

regularized in the way described above. Usually, but not always, this involved a simple shift of stress so that they appear to descend from Latin third conjugation infinitives. Furthermore, in almost all of the modern Romance languages some of the original second conjugation infinitive descendants form a special infinitive class or a special conjugation class (special in a way to be clarified in this paper), even in languages in which stress has been regularized. For example, in Italian (Napoli and Vogel (forthcoming)) and in Provençal (Roniati (1930-41)) there is a special infinitive class, where these verbs are ordinary members of the second conjugation in every other respect, whereas in Romanian and in Friulan there is an entire special conjugation class. For ease of exposition we refer throughout this article to special conjugation (or verb) classes, even though in some Romance languages the distinction of interest here is seen only in the infinitive forms.

We contend that beginning in Proto-Romance second conjugation infinitives whose roots were not of a certain phonological shape (that is, whose roots did not fit a phonological template) switched conjugation classes (normally becoming third conjugation infinitives, but sometimes first or fourth conjugation infinitives – i.e. the *-ARE* or *-IRE* class, respectively – as well). This switch in conjugation classes did not happen all at once, but, rather, gradually over the centuries, so that today in almost all the Romance languages (or, at least, in the Romance languages in which the original Latin second and third conjugation infinitives have not fallen together entirely) the roots of verbs that still survive in the (historical) second conjugation conform to a specific phonological shape. Throughout this paper we refer to Latin verbs as the source for Romance verbs. Certainly, distinctions should be made between Classical and Vulgar Latin when one is attempting to reconstruct Proto-Romance (Lausberg (1971), Wright (1982), Hall (1986), among many others), but we do not believe such distinctions would lead to any different hypothesis from that we offer here.

The number of verbs that fall into the special verb class is under three dozen for all the Romance languages we have examined (and under two dozen for all the modern Romance languages). Given such a small data base, a solution listing these verbs as lexical exceptions to the general pattern of other descendants of Latin second and third conjugation infinitives might be feasible. There is persuasive evidence against this approach, however.

First, the phonological template we identify would be an unaccounted for coincidence if the verbs that fell into the special verb class were merely lexical exceptions.

Second, Davis, Mangano, and Napoli (1987) (hereafter DMN) conducted an experiment (reported on in section 1 below) that shows

that native speakers of Italian today are sensitive to the template. No list account of the special verb class is consistent with these results.

For these reasons, we will not consider further a lexical exception account of the data presented here.

Much has been written on the question of what happened to the second conjugation verbs in Latin and this work has typically concentrated on a single or on two closely related sister Romance languages. Frequently this work has cited what Malkiel ((1986) and earlier) has called multiple causation. That is, some linguists claim that two or more factors interact to determine the passage of an individual verb from Latin into a given Romance language. Factors cited include ambiguity, analogical attraction, the need to differentiate near-identical verbs, as well as a range of other historical, sociological, and psychological factors (as in Malkiel (1985), (1986)). Some have argued for an interaction between a particular semantic distinction and a phonological factor (such as Montgomery (1978), who argues that the static/dynamic distinction in verbs interacts with vowel height in the passage of Latin verbs into Spanish – see also Montgomery (1976)).

Explanations citing factors of the type described above cannot help but be specific to a single language or to two very closely related sister languages. That is because historical facts, for example, differ sometimes drastically from one language speaking area to another. Furthermore, explanations involving the associations of vowel height to the semantics of existing lexical items in a modern Romance language or analogy to other existing lexical items within a modern Romance language tend to be language specific since the Romance languages have not all treated vowel height in the same way, nor have the same set of lexical items survived in each daughter of Latin. Still, when one deals with language change, idiosyncratic and highly particularized explanations – often particular to individual lexical items and thus not of the sort that lends itself well to generalizations beyond the single item – may well be correct. And if they are correct, the fact that they are *ad hoc* is beside the point.

We therefore state right off our support for the work we have come across that deals with the question faced here. We, however, have taken a different tack with the hope not of supplanting previous work, but, rather, of shedding new light on the question.

In doing the research for this paper we asked ourselves what would happen if we considered only phonological information in trying to detect the factors that influenced the passage of Latin second conjugation verbs into the Romance languages. Such an approach demands that we set aside differences in history and culture between the various language areas and differences in the lexicon. It is a very limited approach.

However, we contend that this approach should be pushed as far as possible, for, if this approach were shown to be (anywhere near) empirically adequate, it would offer a simpler and more direct account than alternative accounts involving multiple causation.

We came to the conclusion that a purely phonological approach does, indeed, offer surprisingly clear results when we asked which verbs of the Latin second conjugation do not switch into other conjugation classes, but, rather, stay together in a special conjugation class, as opposed to which verbs would be forced to part ways with the other Latin second conjugation verbs and go into other conjugation classes.

We concluded that verbs of the Latin second conjugation which had a monosyllabic root containing no prevocalic sonorants and ending in a single consonant (with some language particular restrictions on the final consonant) stayed together and went into a special conjugation class in each Romance language. We formulate this restriction in terms of a phonological template to which some verb roots conformed and others did not. We posit this template for Proto-Romance and show that the daughter languages inherited it. The descendants of Latin second conjugation infinitives that did not have roots meeting this restriction eventually switched conjugation classes.

The template alone does not determine the change for any given verb root. It merely helps to identify which verbs are candidates for staying together in a special conjugation class and which are candidates for changing conjugation classes. But once candidates have been identified, other factors (such as ambiguity and analogy) come into play to determine when and how a candidate for change actually undergoes change. Thus we have identified an important factor – a phonologically based one – that played a role in conjugation class switches from Latin into Romance. (In fact, one might even claim that our template offers a phonological basis for analogical change.) There are only a handful of exceptions that we know of to our template, all of which are pointed out below. The fact that there are some exceptions may suggest that our template, rather than being strictly and purely phonological, is at least partly morphologically driven.

We here support our template by offering evidence from a variety of Romance languages. We consider data from Italian in great detail, since Italian turns out to be the most conservative of the Romance languages with respect to this phenomenon. We then compare other Romance sisters to Italian, including Romanian, French, and briefly, Catalan and Friulan, showing how our hypothesis is supported in each of these languages, although less perfectly than in Italian. Moreover, we argue that the template was present at an early stage in the development of Romance languages and that it gradually increased in strength and reach

(that is, it gradually attracted more verbs into its web, so to speak) over time. We would expect, then, that older stages of any modern Romance language would still have several second conjugation infinitives whose roots did not conform to the template. This prediction is borne out when we compare Old Provençal with Modern Provençal (also called Occitan, but here we will use the older, more familiar label). Even though we have not looked at all Romance languages, our evidence suggests that the solution offered here generalizes across Romance and that the template was present in Proto-Romance.

While our proposal will undoubtedly meet great initial resistance (given the fact that others have approached the issue and rejected a phonologically based account), we offer it in the spirit of earnest linguistic inquiry and in the spirit of cooperation. That is, our hypothesis identifies the Latin second conjugation verbs that are candidates for remaining together in a special conjugation class in Romance, and leaves to the work of others the explanation for the precise destiny of Latin second conjugation verbs that did not conform to the phonological template and wound up in other conjugation classes. Our work, then, complements that of others, contributing toward the understanding of the whole development.

1. OUR HYPOTHESIS AND ITALIAN

In this section we take a close look at Italian, often pointing out the relevance of data from other languages (data which appears in following sections) to a proper understanding of the data given here.

DMN look at second conjugation infinitives in Italian (infinitives with the theme vowel /e/), some of which have stress on the theme vowel (as in *vedere* ('see')) and the vast majority of which have stress on the last vowel of the root (the antepenultimate vowel, so long as no enclitics occur – as in *chudere* ('close')). They show that the roots of the verbs which have stress on the theme vowel have the following canonical form:

(1) $C_1 V C_1$

where C_1 = a group of zero or more [+consonantal] segments not containing a sonorant,¹

where V = vowel or diphthong (a diphthong being an unstressed high vowel adjacent to any other vowel),

and where C_1 = a single [+consonantal] segment other than /j/.

This class of second conjugation verbs, which we will call the Theme Class (since the theme vowel bears primary stress), contains only twenty-two verbs plus these same verbs with prefixes added, as listed in 2 below. (Actually, DMN listed twenty-three verbs, including the archaic *pavere* ('fear'). We do not include archaic roots unless there is a well-used verb in the language today made up of that archaic root plus a prefix.) Here and elsewhere, italicization indicates that the vowel carries ionic stress. A plus sign (+) before a verb indicates that this root without a prefix is archaic. We give only a single gloss for each lexical item (although, of course, many of them have multiple meanings) and only the first time it appears, for the sake of simplicity of exposition. Throughout this section we add examples and arguments to those of DMN.

(2) the twenty-two verbs of Class A:

avere ('have'), *cadere* ('fall'), *calere* ('be warm'), *dolere* ('hurt'), *dovere* ('must'), *giacere* ('lie down'), *godere* ('enjoy'), *licere* ('be allowed'), + *manere* ('remain'), *parere* ('seem'), *piacere* ('please'), *potere* ('can'), *sapere* ('know'), *sedere* ('sit'), *solere* ('be accustomed'), + *suadere* ('persuade'), *tacere* ('be silent'), *temere* ('fear'), *tenere* ('hold'), *valere* ('be worth'), *vedere* ('see'), *volere* ('want')

¹ This is slightly different from DMN, whose restriction does not permit root initial consonant clusters. Since almost all of the relevant consonant clusters involve sonorants (see below), the restriction in 1 is more general.

some of the above verbs plus prefixes – a representative sample:

accidere ('happen'), *decidere* ('decay'), *scadere* ('decline')

soggiacere ('be subject to')

rimanere ('remain'), *permanere* ('remain')

compiacere ('gratify'), *dispiacere* ('displease')

riscedere ('sit again'), *soprascedere* ('postpone')

dissuadere ('dissuade'), *persuadere* ('persuade')

appartenere ('belong'), *attenersi*² ('keep'), *detenere* ('hold back'), *ottenere* ('obtain'), *ritenere* ('retain'), *sostenere* ('stand'), *trattenere* ('restrain')

equivалere ('be equivalent'), *prevalere* ('prevail'), *rivalersi* ('avail oneself')

avvedersi ('notice'), *prevedere* ('foresee'), *provvedere* ('provide'), *rivedere* ('see again')

Of the twenty-two verbs in the first list in (2), four are reduced in usage: *calere* appears only in the third person singular, in the infinitive, and in participles; *manere* is archaic, having been replaced by *rimanere*; *suadere* has given way in frequency to *persuadere*; and *licere* is restricted in use to the third person singular indicative (*lice*), the third person singular and plural imperative (*liceva*, *licevano*), and the perfect participle (*licito*). As the reader will notice, two of the verbs in the Theme Class (*manere* and *licere*) do not conform to (1). We will discuss this fact below.

The second class, the Root Class, is much larger, containing all the remaining verbs of the second conjugation. This class receives primary stress on the last vowel of the root, not on the theme vowel. A sampling

² The *si* of *attenersi* is a reflexive enclitic. Clitics on infinitives in Italian are always enclitic.

of these verbs appears in (3) and a more comprehensive list is given in appendix A.³

(3) typical verbs of the second conjugation with root stress:

affliggere ('afflict'), assolvere ('absolve'), battere ('hit'),
chidere ('hit'), cogliere ('gather'), decidere ('decide'),
dipingere ('paint'), emergere ('emerge'), essere ('be'),
ingere ('pretend'), fondere ('melt'), gemere ('groan'),
giungere ('reach'), incidere ('cut'), intrudere ('intrude'),
leggere ('read'), mettere ('put'), mordere ('bite'), nascere
('be born'), nascondere ('hide'), offendere ('offend'),
percolere ('strike'), perdere ('lose'), radere ('shave'),
ricevere ('receive'), scegliere ('choose'), struggere ('destroy'),
tendere ('stretch out'), torcere ('twist'), uccidere ('kill'),
ungere ('oil'), vincere ('win'), vivere ('live')

syncopated verbs with root stress:

addurre ('allege'), bere ('drink'), dire ('say'), fare ('make'),
porre ('place'), tradurre ('translate'), trarre ('pull')

While the roots of (almost) all the verbs in the Theme Class, shown in (2) above, have the canonical form given in (1), the roots of the verbs in the Root Class, exemplified in (3) above, have a variety of forms, including:

- (4) roots of the form CVC (gemere 'groan'),
roots with initial clusters (stridere 'scream'),
roots with final clusters (fulgere 'shine'),
roots with initial and final clusters (spargere 'scatter'),
roots with initial sonorants (ridere 'laugh'),
as well as roots with final /j/ (dirigere 'direct').

³ The written letter *i* before the *-re* desinence in some of the examples in (3) (such as *cogliere*) is not rendered in speech by a vowel. Rather in this example the three letters *gli* are rendered by the palatal liquid /ʎ/. Thus it is correct to say that these verbs receive stress on the last vowel of their root.

DMN argue that the above facts are no accident. Instead, they are the result of the verbs of Latin being passed through a template in their derivation into Italian. Let us see how.

It is a well-known fact that most of the verbs in the Theme Class are derived from verbs of the second conjugation in Latin (the conjugation with the theme vowel of long /e:/), while most of the verbs in the Root Class are derived from verbs of the third conjugation in Latin (the conjugation with the theme vowel of short /e/). There are exceptions, however. At least two verbs which did not originate in the second conjugation of Latin appear in the Theme Class in Italian and many other verbs which did originate in the second conjugation of Latin do not appear in the Theme Class in Italian.

Here and later when we discuss other Romance languages, there is always the possibility that such exceptions are arbitrary and that we should, therefore, just admit that there is a small problematic residue rather than trying to force an account. We, however, often see what we consider to be motivation for the exceptional behavior of some verbs.

DMN argue that those verbs of the second conjugation in Latin which have the canonical form seen in (1) above wound up in the Theme Class in Italian and those that did not conform to (1) were excluded from the Theme Class. They therefore wound up in the Root Class or in other conjugations. Thus a full seventeen of the twenty-two verbs in the Theme Class originated in the second conjugation in Latin as verbs whose roots conform to (1). We give these in (5), where we have underlined the tonic theme vowel in the Italian verb and marked the long theme vowel in the Latin verb. An asterisk before a Latin verb indicates that this verb form has been reconstructed as existing in Proto-Romance, but did not appear in Classical Latin. We mark the length of the theme vowels only in Latin and not of any other vowels. (For glosses, see (2) above, where the Italian glosses suffice for the Latin verbs, as well.)

- (5) *avere* < HABĒRE; *calere* < CALĒRE; *dolere* < DOLĒRE;
dovere < DEBĒRE; *giacere* < IACĒRE; *godere* < GAUDĒRE;
parere < PARĒRE; *potere* < *POTĒRE; *sedere* < SEDĒRE;
solere < SOLĒRE; +*suadere* < SUADĒRE; *tacere* < TACĒRE;
temere < TIMĒRE; *tenere* < TENĒRE; *valere* < VALĒRE;
vedere < VIDĒRE; *volere* < *VOLĒRE

Three other verbs of the second conjugation in Latin which did not conform to (1) also have descendants in the Theme Class. We list them:

- (6) *licere* (also: *licere*) < *LICĒRE*; *placere* < *PLACĒRE*;

+ *manere* < *MANĒRE*

LICĒRE, *PLACĒRE*, and *MANĒRE* do not conform to 1 since their roots contain a prevocalic sonorant. Upon closer scrutiny, however, we can see that the first two of the three examples in (6) are not truly problematic for the DMN hypothesis, although the third is. Let us consider each separately.

First, although some finite forms of *licere* occur in Italian, the infinitive never occurs in speech. Instead, it is confined to lexical lists (as in verb lists and dictionaries). Thus it has been lost from actual usage. A potential exception that never occurs in usage is not much of an exception.

Second, while *PLACĒRE* has a prevocalic sonorant, its descendant, *placere* does not. Early in the derivation of Italian from Latin the /p/ cluster was replaced by /pi/ (where the /i/ is realized as an on-glide of the following vowel, and is [-consonantal]). The only words which contain an initial /pi/ cluster in Italian today are learned words borrowed from Medieval Latin relatively recently in the history of Italian. If /pi/ replaced the /p/ cluster in *placere* before the application of the template in 1 to this verb, the placement of *placere* in the Theme Class would follow.

However, we note the descendant of *PLACĒRE* in several languages we examine in this paper also ended up in the special verb class (see (35) for Romanian; (57) for Old Provençal; (67) for Friulan), even though in none of these other languages is the /p/ → /pi/ explanation available. Thus the descendant of *PLACĒRE* in these other languages would seem to be exceptional to a template like that in (1). There is, in fact, evidence suggesting that the descendants of *PLACĒRE* are not mere lexical exceptions to the template, but part of a larger class of phonologically identifiable exceptions. We find that prevocalic sonorants that are part of clusters beginning with a stop consonant were sometimes overlooked by the template in various languages. Thus, in Romanian besides (35), we find *a umplea* (in (34)). In French we have *plavoir* (where a third conjugation verb shifted into the special conjugation – see the discussion of (45) below). And in the Rhaeto-Romansh dialect of Surmiran we find *plascieir* and *creir* (see footnote 17 below). Other obstruent-sonorant clusters behaved as predicted by the template. In sum, while the descendants of *PLACĒRE* are exceptional to the template in

other languages (probably phonological rather than lexical exceptions), the Italian descendant *placere* may well not be exceptional.

Third, *MANĒRE* seems to be a clear exception, given the template in (1), since its root contains a prevocalic sonorant (and one that is not part of a cluster). However, *manere* is archaic, as noted above. We have found no speakers who say they would use it in speech. Instead, *rimanere* has become the verb of choice. The other descendant of this root is *permanere*, also in the Theme Class. We suggest that the replacement of *manere* by *rimanere* may have been hastened by the fact that the derivation of *manere* is so transparently an exception to the template in (1). While verbs like *rimanere* and *permanere*, having the same root, are exceptional to the template in (1), they are less transparently so, since the initial sonorant of the root is buried inside the polysyllabic forms and the root itself is bound to the prefix.

It is even possible that people have reanalyzed *riman-* and *perman-* as polysyllabic roots, where the initial segment and the final segment of the newly analyzed roots conform to the template. In this case, these roots would violate the monosyllabic condition of the template. However, the fact that roots in the Theme Class are monosyllabic is largely predictable without the template. Latin second conjugation verb roots are monosyllabic, with the single exception of *ABOLĒRE* shown in (18) below (which is of uncertain etymology, according to Zingarelli (1970)). Hence the fact that Romance special class verbs have monosyllabic roots is (close to) inevitable, regardless of the template. The condition in the is (close to) inevitable, regardless of the template. The condition in the template that the root be monosyllabic is invoked only once for excluding a verb root from the special class (as discussed below in regard to *ABOLĒRE* in (18)). On the other hand, no polysyllabic verb roots have switched from other conjugations into the special conjugation, although monosyllabic ones have (see (15-16) below).⁴ Thus we maintain the monosyllabic condition, while noting that speakers may not be as sensitive to it as they are to the conditions on the initial segment and final segment of the root. For these reasons, speakers may not view *riman-* and *perman-* as strong violations of the template.

Another possibility (and one that is not incompatible with the reanalysis suggestion above) is that *MANĒRE* is flagged in Proto-Romance as a lexical exception to the template. Its descendants in

⁴ There are other facts that suggest that the template in (1) should not be revised to allow polysyllabic roots in the special verb class. DMN did a statistical analysis of second conjugation verbs in Italian and found that fewer than 5% of the verbs in the Root Class have roots that conform to the template in 1 as stated. Without the monosyllabic condition, the expected percentage would be much greater. Thus, it appears that the template as stated in (1) helps to distinguish the canonical form of the Theme Class from that of the Root Class.

Old French (*manoir* in (47)) and Old Provençal (in (57)) also belong to the special verb class. But modern French no longer treats descendants of *MANĒRE* exceptionally, nor do the other modern Romance languages discussed in this paper (and see the comments on Romanian descendants following (23) and (30) below). That is to be expected: lexical exceptions drop out over time.

Other verbs that would have been exceptions to the template in (1) have also been lost from the language, adding support to the claim that the obsolescence of *MANĒRE* is being hastened by the fact that it does not conform to the template. In fact, such forms show that infinitives violating the template slowly change or disappear over time (i.e. the effect of the template has been gradual). Some of the infinitives which violated the template and are now obsolescent are shown in (7). (Here and elsewhere, if a single gloss will suffice for both Latin and the daughter language, we will use that gloss.)

- (7) +licere < LICĒRE; +orere < HORRĒRE ('be afraid'); +pentere < PAENTĒRE ('repent')

Licere violates the template since the root begins in a sonorant. *Orere* violates the template since the root ends in a long (geminate) consonant (see also footnote 9). *Pentere* violates the template since the root ends in a consonant cluster. (*PAENTĒRE* here has a frequently used descendant in Italian in the third conjugation: *pentirsi*.)

It appears that while the template in (1) was present in Proto-Romance, it is still present today, accounting for the continued gradual loss of verbs from the Theme Class that do not conform to the template. DMN give further evidence that the template in 1 is operative in Italian today. They wrote Italian dialogues which incorporated infinitives of made up second conjugation verbs and asked native speakers to read these dialogues into a tape recorder. Most speakers excluded from the Theme Class any infinitive whose root did not conform to (1). We touch on the issue of how alive this template is in Romance in general throughout this paper and return to it in section 4.

As we expect, other verbs of the Latin second conjugation that did not conform to (1) did not go into the Theme Class in Italian, but into the Root Class or other conjugations. For example, verbs whose roots contained a prevocalic sonorant went into the Root Class (i.e. they underwent stress shift).⁵ (The list in (8) is representative rather than exhaustive, as are all the verb lists in this paper unless otherwise stated,

except for the complete list of verbs in the special conjugation class in each language examined.)

- (8) *compiere* < COMPLĒRE ('complete');

empiere < IMPLĒRE ('fulfil');

fremere ('shiver') < FREMĒRE (but also: FREMĒRE) ('grumble');

lucere < LUCĒRE ('be light'); *mescere* < MISCĒRE ('mix');

molcere < MULCĒRE ('soothe'); *mordere* < MORDĒRE ('bite');

mungere < MULGĒRE ('milk'); *muovere* < MOVĒRE ('move');

nuocere < NOCĒRE ('harm');

prandere < PRANDĒRE (but also: PRANDĒRE) ('dine');

ridere < RIDĒRE ('laugh'); *splendere* < SPLENDĒRE ('shine');

stridere ('rasp') < STRIDĒRE (but also: STRIDĒRE) ('creek')

or, more rarely, into other conjugations.^{6,7}

6 Recall from footnote 1 that DMN phrased the template in 1 so as to disallow any root initial consonant clusters (instead of any prevocalic sonorant consonants), thus accounting for the conjugation switch:

- (1) *studiare* < STUDĒRE ('study')

This is unexpected on the account here. Since *STUDĒRE* contains no prevocalic sonorant consonant, we did not expect by our template to find a conjugation switch here.

However, the form *studiare* may not represent a conjugation switch, four alternative accounts have been suggested to us. First, it might be derived from the reconstructed first conjugation verb **STUDĀRE*, as in Meyer-Libke (1930-1935). Second, it could be a learned borrowing. Third, it could be a verbal derivative of the noun *STUDIUM*. And fourth, it could be a learned innovation backformed on the Italian noun *studio*. In the latter three cases, the newly formed verbs would naturally occur in the productive Italian conjugation - the first.

As far as we know *STUDĒRE* is the only Latin verb that tends to favor the DMN version of the template over ours here (and that favoring, of course, only occurs if *studiare* is, in fact, a descendant of *STUDĒRE*). That is, it appears that there are no other Latin second conjugation infinitives whose roots end in a single consonant and begin with a consonant cluster that does not contain a sonorant that survived into Italian. So there are no other verb roots that can serve for a comparison of the predictions of the two versions of the template.

5 The root of *COMPLĒRE* and *IMPLĒRE* is -PL-, which contains the sonorant /l/. Here there is no root vowel, so stress appears on the vowel of the prefix in Italian.

- (9) ammonire < (AD)MONĒRE ('warn');

chiarire < CLARĒRE ('clear up');

florire < FLORĒRE ('flower'); muffire < MUCĒRE ('mould')

Naturally, many Latin verbs shifted conjugation classes as they passed into Italian and the other Romance languages, and our template is relevant to only a small number of these shifts. It could be, then, that the examples in (9) shifted randomly or for reasons extraneous to our template. Our point is simply that the template offers a potential account of the shift. This remark holds equally well for all the mentions of shift below.

Other verbs that did not conform to (1) were lost:

- (10) LATĒRE ('lie hidden'); MADĒRE ('be wet')

As with (9) above, a caveat is in order. Many Latin verbs did not survive in Italian, just as many did not survive in other Romance languages. Thus it is possible that these verbs were lost randomly or for reasons extraneous to our template. Our point is simply that the template offers a potential account of the loss of these verbs. This remark holds equally well for all the mentions of loss below.

The caveats below (9) and (10) taken together form an interesting argument for our template. That is, the template makes predictions as to which verbs cannot appear in the special conjugation class, whether those

7 The verbs in (9) raise a new issue. All of these Italian verbs show the so-called inchoative affix in the present tense of the subjunctive and indicative moods, although in all other respects they are ordinary third conjugation verbs (Napoli and Vogel (forthcoming)). The question arises as to whether the underlying infinitive of these verbs should include the inchoative affix or not. Accordingly, the related question arises as to whether the underlying infinitive of the Latin source verbs should include the inchoative affix or not. That is, does *chiarire*, for example, come from *CLARĒRE* or **CLARESCĒRE*? If the source verb had the inchoative affix and if this affix were reanalyzed as part of the root, then the root would be polysyllabic and the template would (correctly) predict that the descendant could not appear in the special conjugation class. In support of the polysyllabic root as the proper source for such verbs, let us point out the otherwise unaccounted for exception: *putire* < *PUTĒRE*. Here a root which appears to conform to the template shifted, unexpectedly, into the third conjugation in Italian. *Putire*, however, shows the inchoative affix in the present tenses, thus if the source verb had the inchoative affix (**PUTESCĒRE*), the shift would follow from the template.

We cannot go further with these speculations here, since serious handling of the issue would entail entering a debate that would take us far astray of our main issue. We therefore leave this question for future study. Below we will not raise this issue again, although of course the same issue arises for the relevant verbs in all the languages handled in this paper.

verbs shift conjugation classes or are lost. The template, therefore, pulls together conjugation shifts and losses that with any other analysis we know of are unable to be related; the template captures a generalization, and by doing so demonstrates its explanatory value.

Returning now to empirical support for the template, we find that verbs whose roots ended in a consonant cluster went into the Root Class.^{8,9}

- (11) *ardere* < ARDĒRE ('be on fire');

astergere < (AB)STERGĒRE ('wipe away');

excellere < EXCELLĒRE (but also: EXCELLĒRE) ('excel');

fervere < FERVĒRE (but also: FERVĒRE) ('burn');

fulgere < FULGĒRE (but also: FULGĒRE) ('shine');

indulgere < INDULGĒRE ('indulge'); *miscere* < MISCĒRE;

molere < MULCĒRE; *mordere* < MORDĒRE;

ungere < MULGĒRE; *pendere* < PENDĒRE ('hang');

prandere < PRANDĒRE (but also: PRANDĒRE);

respondere < (RE)SPONDĒRE ('answer');

splendere < SPLENDĒRE;

tergere < TERGĒRE (but also: TERGĒRE) ('wipe away');

tondere < TONDĒRE ('shear');

torcere < TORQUĒRE ('twist'); *urgere* < URGĒRE ('urge')

8 The template in (1) singles out verb roots that end in a single consonant and here in the text we talk about verb roots that end in a consonant cluster. One might ask what happened to Latin verbs of the second conjugation whose roots ended in a vowel. We know of none. However, if there were any, they did not show up in either the Theme or Root Class of the second conjugation in Italian.

9 We include *miscere* in 11 since the root in Latin ends in /sk/ and even in Italian the root ends in the long consonant /s/. (Chierchia (1986)). The template is applicable also to roots ending in long consonants, as is evidenced by the conjugation class shift in examples

or into another conjugation:

- (12) *abhorrire* < (AB)HORRĒRE ('abhor');

assorbire < (AB)SORBĒRE ('absorb'); *penitersi* < PAENTĒRE
or were lost, as with:

- (13) *SORDĒRE* ('be dirty')

(Of course, many of the verbs in (11) also appear in (8). More discussion about *abhorrire* is found in footnote 9.)

Only one Latin verb of the second conjugation had a root ending in a single consonant which became /j/ in Italian. This verb did not wind up in the Theme Class, but, instead, the Root Class.

- (14) *vigere* < VIGĒRE ('thrive')

Thus the template in (1) has the additional restriction that the root final consonant cannot be a voiced affricate.¹⁰ Further evidence for this restriction comes from the experiment reported on in DMN. In their experiment the nonsense Italian infinitive whose final root consonant ended in /j/ (*togere*) was always pronounced with root vowel stress. (This differed from nonsense infinitives whose roots ended in /č/, which were pronounced by some subjects with theme vowel stress.)

Additional historical evidence can be found to support the correctness of the template in (1). There are two Theme Class verbs in Italian that do not derive from the Latin second conjugation, but derive instead from the Latin third conjugation:

- (15) *cadere* < CADĒRE

¹⁰ It is quite possible that the additional restriction is unnecessary, since there is evidence in modern Italian that /j/ (unlike /č/) should be analyzed as being two consonants. Evidence for this comes from the fact that in some dialects the definite article *lo* is used before words beginning with /j/, while the definite article *il* is used before words beginning with /č/. In general, *il* is used before words beginning with a single consonant, or before words beginning with two consonants where the consonants are distant from each other in terms of sonority. *Lo* is used before words beginning with vowels or glides and also before words beginning with two consonants where the two consonants are very close in terms of sonority. Thus /č/ acts like a single consonant and /j/ acts like two consonants with respect to article selection in the relevant dialects. For a detailed analysis, see Davis (to appear).

- (16) *sapere* < SAPĒRE

We would predict that no verb could switch into the Theme Class unless it conformed to the template in (1). (15) and (16) are compatible with this prediction, since they conform to the template.

In fact, it appears that the switch of conjugation classes exemplified in (15-16) took place in Proto-Romance. The descendants of *CADĒRE* wound up in the special verb class in all the Romance languages studied here except Catalan. The descendants of *SAPĒRE* wound up in the special verb class in all the Romance languages studied here except Romanian, where all descendants of *SAPĒRE* were lost (see examples (33), (43), (52), (60), (62), and (67) below).

Other verb roots switched conjugation classes after Proto-Romance had already broken down into the early stages of the modern Romance languages. Only verb roots which conformed to the template in (1) switched into the special verb class. For example, descendants of the Latin third conjugation root *CAP-/CIP-* appear in the special verb class in Romanian (33), French (43), and Old Provençal (53). Descendants of other verbs switched into the special class in these languages, as well (*BIBĒRE* for Romanian, *FALLĒRE* for French, *GEMĒRE* for Old Provençal).

Another bit of historical evidence for the correctness of the template in (1) comes from the form in (17):

- (17) *prudere* < PRURIRE ('itch')

Here an original Latin fourth conjugation infinitive switched conjugation classes to become a Root Class infinitive in Italian. It is noteworthy that *PRURIRE* became a Root Class infinitive (with root vowel stress) and not a Theme Class infinitive (with conjugation vowel stress). Because the location of stress on fourth conjugation infinitives is identical to that on Theme Class infinitives (i.e. on the conjugation vowel), one would have expected *PRURIRE* to become a Theme Class infinitive. The only explanation for *PRURIRE* becoming a Root Class infinitive instead of a Theme Class infinitive when it changed conjugations appears to be the incompatibility of prevocalic sonorant consonants with Theme Class infinitives.

We add further support for the template in (1) by examining what happened to polysyllabic roots of second conjugation verbs in Latin. By template (1) we would expect them to go into the Root Class or other conjugations. We have found only one second conjugation Latin infinitive with a polysyllabic root. As predicted by the template in (1), this verb changed conjugation classes.

(18) *aboire* < *ABOLĒRE* ('aboish')

(An alternative account of (18) is that *aboire* is a back formation from the noun *abolito* (Bloch and Wartburg (1960).)

We have seen a wide range of support for the template in (1) for Italian. Furthermore, the evidence and discussion above indicate that some version of this template existed in Proto-Romance. Given the fact that the derivation of Latin second conjugation verbs into all the modern Romance languages is per force problematic (with the loss of long vowels from Latin into the Romance daughters), we claim that the template in (1) has its counterpart in all the Romance languages. That is, each Romance language inherited the template from Proto-Romance. Specifically, we will test the proposal that each Romance language treats in some special way those infinitives which descend from Latin infinitives of the second conjugation whose roots have the following canonical form:

(19) $C_1 \vee C_2$

where C_1 = a group of zero or more [+consonantal] segments not containing a sonorant,

where V = a vowel or a diphthong,

and where C_2 = a single [+consonantal] segment.

Notice that (19) differs from (1) only in that (1) precludes the final consonant of the root from being /j/. We suggest (19) as the basic template, the part that will be common to all Romance languages and that was found in Proto-Romance. However, it will become clear below that the daughter languages exhibit some additional restrictions. For example, French, Romanian, Old Provençal, Modern Provençal, and Catalan preclude verb roots ending in nasals from the special verb class. We have already seen that Italian precludes verb roots ending in voiced affricates, but we will see below that French and Old Provençal have generalized this restriction to preclude verb roots ending in any affricate, and Modern Provençal has further generalized to preclude verb roots ending in sibilants. We have not found any additional conditions that hold only of a single Romance language, but we wouldn't be surprised to find languages that have introduced new restrictions over time.

We will now proceed to defend this hypothesis. We will first discuss several Romance languages individually and then offer a general picture at the end.

2. ROMANIAN

There are four conjugations in Romanian: the first has infinitives ending in -a; the second, in -ea; the third, in -e; the fourth, in -i. Only the third conjugation infinitives have root vowel stress, while the others have theme vowel stress. Given what we have seen above in Italian, we naturally propose that the template in (19) will be imposed on Latin second conjugation verbs in such a way that those verb roots which conform to it will wind up in the second conjugation in Romanian and those which do not will wind up in other conjugations.

This hypothesis is supported by the data. We find a familiar list of verbs in the expectedly small second (-ea) conjugation. Thus, parallel to (5) for Italian, we have the list in (20). (We give glosses in this section only if a Romanian verb differs significantly in meaning from its Italian cognate or if some verb in Latin or Romanian is brought up for the first time without the Italian cognate having been mentioned before.)

(20) a avea < *HABĒRE*; a dura < *DOLĒRE*; a zăcea < *IACĒRE*;

a părea < *PARĒRE*; a putea < **POTĒRE*; a sedea < *SEDĒRE*;

a tăcea < *TACĒRE*; a vedea < *VIDĒRE*; a vrea < **VOLĒRE*

And, of course, verbs consisting of the above roots plus prefixes also fall into the second (-ea) conjugation:

(21) a dispărea ('disappear')

In support of our claim that Romanian applied the template in (19), we point out that infinitives of the Latin second conjugation whose roots contained a prevocalic sonorant consonant wound up in conjugations other than the second in Romanian.¹¹

(22) a luci < *LUCĒRE*; a mește < *MISCĒRE*; a mulge < *MULĠĒRE*;

a prîzni < *PRANDĒRE* (but also: *PRANDERE*);

a rămîne < *(RE)MANĒRE*; a rîde < *RIDĒRE*

¹¹ Just as Italian *studiare* is in the first conjugation (see footnote 6 above), its Romanian cognate *a studia* is in the first conjugation. Again, the explanation may be that this is a learned borrowing or that this verb descends from the reconstructed Latin verb **STUDIARE*.

or were lost:

- (23) LATĒRE; LICĒRE; MADĒRE

We should mention here the archaic second conjugation form *a mînea* (from *MANĒRE*), which has been replaced by the third conjugation verb listed in (30) below.

Second, infinitives of the second conjugation in Latin whose roots end in a consonant cluster wound up in different conjugations in Romanian. The majority of these verbs ended up in the third (-*e*) conjugation:

- (24) *a arde* < *ARDĒRE*; *a depinde* < *PENDĒRE*;

a fierbe < *FERVĒRE* (but also: *FERVĒRE*);

a mulge < *MULGĒRE*;

a răspunde < *(RE)SPONDĒRE*; *a şterge* < *(AB)STERGĒRE*;

a stoarce < *(EX)TORQUĒRE*; *a tunde* < *TONDĒRE*

while others ended up in the first (-*a*) conjugation:

- (25) *a fulgera* < *FULGĒRE*

and others ended up in the fourth (-*i*) conjugation:

- (26) *a absorbi* < *(AB)SORBĒRE*;

a prinzi < *PRANDĒRE* (but also: *PRANDĒRE*)

Again, there are questions about (20) which must be answered. First, not all the Latin verbs that occurred on the list in (5) for Italian occur on the list in (20) for Romanian. The missing verbs are:

- (27) *CALĒRE*; *GAUDĒRE*; *SOLĒRE*; *SUADĒRE*

- (28) *TIMĒRE*; *TENĒRE*

- (29) *DEBĒRE*; *VALĒRE*

Of these, those in (27) do not survive as verbs in Romanian.

The descendants of (28) are given in (30), where we add the thriving descendant of *MANĒRE* (in (6) above for Italian), as well:

- (30) *a rămîne* < *(RE)MANĒRE*; *a teme* < *TIMĒRE*;

a ţine < *TENĒRE*

We take (30) as evidence that Romanian, makes use of an additional restriction against root final nasals. This restriction is stated in (31) and serves as an addendum to the template in (19) for Romanian:

- (31) C_j = a single consonant other than a nasal.

In support, we point out that some dictionaries list the verb *a ţine*, which is now archaic. Thus, Romanian, like Italian, has gradually forced out of the second (-*ea*) conjugation exceptions to the template, where Romanian employs the restriction against root final nasals as an addition to the template.

So far as we know, (31) is the only restriction Romanian imposes on the template in (19), since there is no evidence to suggest that root final affricates are excluded from the second (-*ea*) conjugation (in contrast to the restriction against a root final voiced affricate in Italian). This is because *VGĒRE* has no descendant in Romanian and certainly the voiceless affricate is allowed (as we see by the fact that *LACĒRE* and *TACĒRE* occur in (20)).

As for (29), the apparent descendants of these Latin second conjugation verbs are shown in (32).

- (32) *a datora*/ *a datori* < *DEBĒRE*; *a valora* < *VALĒRE*

The switch to the first (or an alternation between first and fourth for the descendant of *DEBĒRE*) is unexpected, given our hypothesis. We would instead have expected the Romanian reflexes of Latin *DEBĒRE* and *VALĒRE* to remain in the second (-*ea*) conjugation. However, these turn out not to be a problem for our hypothesis since neither *a datorai* nor *a valora* descends directly from the corresponding Latin second conjugation verb. *A datorai* is a derived verb coming from the Latin noun *DEBITORUS*, and *a valora* is also a derived verb, from the French noun *valeur*. Thus the two forms in (29) are not counterexamples to our hypothesis, after all. (We have been unable to ascertain whether or not any verb descendants of *DEBĒRE* and *VALĒRE* are attested in the history of Romanian.)

Returning to (20), we have another issue to face: (20) is not a complete list. The second conjugation in Romanian contains other verbs. For example, it contains the four verbs listed in (33), which are descended from Latin third conjugation verbs.

- (33) a bea < BIBĒRE ('drink'); a cadea < CADĒRE;

a scadea < (EX)CADĒRE; a incapea < (IN)CAPĒRE

The occurrence of these verbs in the second conjugation in Romanian provides support for our hypothesis, since we would predict that if verbs from other conjugations were to switch into the second conjugation, their roots would have to conform to the template in (19), plus the restriction in (31). All of the roots of the infinitives in (33) conform to the template in (19) plus the restriction in (31), where the last two verbs in (33) have the prefixes *s-* and *in-*, respectively. (Notice that the middle two verbs in (33) compare to (15) above for Italian. However, no descendant of *SAPĒRE* survives in Romanian, in contrast to (16) for Italian.)

The two remaining verbs that appear in the second conjugation in Romanian are:

- (34) a umplea < IMPLĒRE

- (35) a plăcea < PLACĒRE

In light of (22-23) above, however, we can see that Romanian's template certainly disallowed roots containing a prevocalic sonorant consonant. Furthermore, over time *a umplea* has been replaced by the third conjugation verb *a umple* and while *a plăcea* does occur, the more common descendant of *PLACĒRE* is the third conjugation verb *a plăce*. (We thank Donca Steriade for both of these observations.) We admit (34) and (35) as exceptions, then, and these exceptions appear to be disavored in usage. As noted in section 1 above, examples like (34-35) suggest that prevocalic sonorants that are inside clusters starting with an obstruent are sometimes overlooked by the template.

Thus, though Romanian does have forms that violate the template (listed together in (36) for convenience), all of these forms are archaic and are in the process of being lost from the modern language.

- (36) a plăcea < PLACĒRE; a încea < TENĒRE;

a umplea < IMPLĒRE

The slow demise of forms violating the template is exactly what we would predict under the hypothesis that the template's effect (its strength and reach) increased gradually over time.

We conclude that the template in (19), along with the restriction in (31), accounts for the passage of Latin second conjugation verbs into Romanian.

3. FRENCH

French has four conjugations according to *Heath's New French and English Dictionary* (although some textbooks of French say there are only three – essentially setting aside *Heath's* third conjugation as irregular verbs) where the fourth conjugation, whose infinitive ends in *-re*, corresponds to the Root Class of the second conjugation of Italian. We find that by and large the verbs of the first conjugation in French (with infinitives ending in *-er*) descended from first conjugation verbs in Latin; verbs of the second conjugation in French (with infinitives ending in *-ir*), from the fourth conjugation in Latin; and verbs of the fourth conjugation in French (with infinitives ending in *-re*), from the third conjugation in Latin.

Verbs of the second conjugation in Latin went in a variety of directions in French. Many went into the fourth conjugation in French, a few into the first and second conjugations. But those verbs of the second conjugation in Latin that met the template in (19) above went into the third conjugation (with infinitives ending in *-oir*).¹² (Once more, we give glosses in this section only of unfamiliar verbs.)¹²

- (37) avoir < HABĒRE; +chaloir < CALĒRE;

+se douloir < DOLĒRE; devoir < DEBĒRE;

+apparoir < PARĒRE; pouvoir < *POTĒRE;

asseoir < (AD)SEDĒRE; +souloir < SOLĒRE;

valoir < VALĒRE; voir < VIDĒRE; vouloir < *VOLĒRE

The Italian cognates of all eleven of the above verbs fell into the Theme Class of the second conjugation (see (5) above).

In support of our hypothesis, we point out that Latin second conjugation verbs whose root contained a prevocalic sonorant consonant do not appear in the third (*-oir*) conjugation of French, but in some other conjugation:

¹² An anonymous reader has suggested that *voir* and *asseoir* do not belong on the list in (37), arguing that these verbs should be analyzed as containing the infinitive marker *-r*: *avra+ir* and *asra+ir*. According to this reviewer, they behave as though they have changed conjugations since they are now conjugated almost always like *croire* (from *CREDEĒRE*). This alternative analysis is not problematic for us if the template were sensitive to the prevocalic sonorant *w*, in light of the data in (38) below.

- (38) *emplir* < *IMPLĒRE*; *florir* < *FLORĒRE*;

frenir < *FREMĒRE* (but also: *FREMĒRE*);

+*loisir* < *LICĒRE*; *luire* < *LUCĒRE*; *moisir* < *MUCĒRE*;

mordre < *MORDĒRE*; *resplendir* < *(RE)SPLENDĒRE*;

rire < *RIDĒRE*

From (38) we have omitted descendants of *NOCĒRE* and *PLACĒRE*. Old French had *nuisir*, which is now lost and has been replaced by the analogical creation *nuire*, and *plaisir*, which is now exclusively nominal, where the analogical creation *plaie* has arisen to fill the gap. Notice that in these two instances, both the Old French verb and the modern analogical creation do not belong to the special conjugation class, as we would predict.

And, as we would predict, Latin second conjugation verbs whose roots ended in a consonant cluster did not go into the third (-*oir*) conjugation in French, but into some other conjugation:

- (39) *mordre* < *MORDĒRE*; *pendre* < *PENDĒRE*;

repentir < *(RE)PAENTĒRE*; *resplendir* < *(RE)SPLENDĒRE*;

repondre < *(RE)SPONDĒRE*; *absorber* < *(AB)SORBĒRE*;

tondre < *TONDĒRE*; *tordre* < *TORQUĒRE*

Of course, some of the examples in (39) also appear in (38).

There are some potential problems with the list in (37), however. First, the French list in (37) is shorter than the comparable Italian list in (5). Thus we need to account for the difference. The missing cognates fall into two groups: those that were apparently lost from French and those that wound up in French in other conjugations. Among those apparently lost from the language is the descendant of:

- (40) *TIMĒRE*

Those that wound up in different conjugations are:

- (41) a. +*gesir* < *LACĒRE*; *taire* < +*taisir* < *TACĒRE*

b. *tenir* < *TENĒRE*

c. *jouir* < +*gaudir* < *GAUDĒRE*;

persuader < *(PER)SUADĒRE*

In order to protect our hypothesis we need to account for these facts. First, we see that two of the verbs (*LACĒRE* and *TACĒRE*) had roots ending in /k/ in Latin. /k/ before a front vowel in Latin typically became an affricate in Romance (and went on to become a fricative in French, as in *cent* [s]). Recall that Italian disallowed the voiced affricate /tʃ/ (although it allowed the voiceless counterpart /tʃ/) to close a root in Theme Class verbs. We propose that French had a stronger restriction than Italian, blocking both voiced and voiceless affricates from closing roots of its third (-*oir*) conjugation verbs.¹³ In support, notice that *YGCĒRE* has no descendant in French (compare to (14) above for Italian), and the descendant of *LICĒRE* was lost after switching conjugation classes (see (38) above). Thus second conjugation Latin verb roots that ended in an affricate as they passed into French were blocked from the French third (-*oir*) conjugation and switched conjugation classes (as in (41a)). We give this restriction in (42):

- (42) C_3 = a consonant other than an affricate.

(We assume that the root of *asseoir* ends in the sibilant, where the *e* before the *oir* desinence is simply a relic of an older orthographic convention – witness the older forms *veoir* > *voir* and *cheoir* > (*e*)*choir*.)

Furthermore, French employed a restriction not observed by Italian, but already found above to be operative in Romanian: Latin second

¹³ In fact, infinitives which end in -*CLĒRE* in Latin often wind up as -*ir* infinitives in French, perhaps due to predictable phonetic changes. Thus beside the descendants of *LACĒRE* and *TACĒRE* discussed in the text, we also find:

(i) *nuire* < +*noisir* < *NOCĒRE*; *plaie* < +*plaisir* < *PLACĒRE*

In all these cases the /i/ which marks the conjugation class may result from the combination of a yod (from the preceding /k/, which palatalized) with the diphthong /ei/ (< ionic free ē), and the simplification of the resulting triphthong. None of these verbs seemed to become *bona fide* members of the -*ir* conjugation. Instead, their preterite and past participle forms lack the characteristic thematic vowel /i/. This fact may explain why none of these -*ir* forms survived as verbs into the modern language, whereas those verbs listed in (38-39) that end in -*ir* truly switched to the -*ir* conjugation, and survived.

conjugation verbs whose roots ended in nasals were blocked from the third (-*oir*) conjugation in French. That is, they were either lost (as in (40)) or switched conjugation classes (as in (41b)). Also *MANÈRE*, whose Italian descendant (*rimanere*) survived in the Theme Class despite the root initial sonorant (see the discussion of (6) above), became the French third conjugation verb +*manoir*, which was eventually lost. Here both the initial sonorant and the root final nasal may have contributed to its demise. We conclude that the restriction given above in (31) for Romanian held in French.

The remaining verbs that switched conjugations are listed in (41c). We list the conjugation switch of *joir* as an unexplained exception, although if the root final *d* of Latin were lost early, this verb might have been shifted out of the special conjugation because its root ended in a vowel. Turning to *persuader*, we find that it is a 14th century borrowing from Latin (according to the *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Française*) and, as such, it was borrowed into the productive first conjugation.¹⁴

In sum, the fact that (37) is a shorter list than (5) is not problematic for our hypothesis, after all.

A second potential problem with (37) is that it is not complete: there are other verbs in the third conjugation of French according to *Heath's*. We list those here:

- (43) choir < CADÈRE; falloir ('be necessary') < FALLÈRE ('fall');

recevoir < (RE)CIPÈRE; savoir < SAPÈRE

- (44) mouvoir < MOVÈRE

- (45) pleuvoir < PLUÈRE ('rain')

The French verbs in (43) descended from Latin verbs of the third conjugation, rather than second. However, (43) actually supports our hypothesis. This is because we would predict that if infinitives from other conjugations were to switch to the French third conjugation (ending in -*oir*), they would have to conform to the template in (19) with the added restrictions in (31) and (42) above. All the roots of the infinitives in (43) conform to the template with these additional restrictions. (And compare

- (43) to (15), (16), and (33) above.) Notice that French does not distinguish long and short /*l*/. Thus the root of *falloir* ends in a single consonant and does not violate the template.¹⁵

In sum, (43) supports rather than threatens our hypothesis.

The example in (44) is, likewise, at first a surprise. In light of (38) above, we know prevocalic sonorant consonants should be disallowed by the template. As it turns out, however, *mouvoir* occurs today only in written language (where in speech we find alternatives such as *bouger* and *déplacer*). Furthermore, *MÉOVERE* has another archaic descendant, but in the first conjugation (*Harap's New Standard French and English Dictionary* (1980):

- (46) +mouver 'turn over soil, stir' < MOVÈRE

Surely extensive allomorphy may be one reason why *mouvoir* is now archaic. Yet there is no evidence against saying the template contributes to the loss of this verb. The facts here, then, are perfectly compatible with our template.

(45) gives, however, a true exception. In fact, (45) is particularly disturbing because, not only does it violate the template in (19), but it changed conjugation classes to do it. Thus we admit this exception to our hypothesis and we note once more that roots with a prevocalic sonorant after a stop consonant are sometimes exceptions to the template (as we saw with Italian and Romanian examples above).

We conclude that the template in (19) with the restrictions in (31) and (42) accounts for the passage of second conjugation verbs of Latin into French. We note once again that the template's strength and reach gradually increased over time, so that in Old French one finds verbs like those in (47), which violated the template. These verbs today are either obsolescent or in a different conjugation class.

- (47) +ardoir < ARDÈRE; +manoir < MANÈRE;

+lamoir < TEMÈRE

¹⁴ It is interesting to note that *persuader* shows up in (41c), since we have found Italian speakers who stumble over whether to put its cognate *persuadere* in the Theme or Root Class of the second conjugation. Like its French counterpart, *persuadere* is learned in Italian (Zingarelli (1970)). Perhaps this fact makes speakers uncertain as to which verb class to place it in.

¹⁵ *FALLÈRE* also has the descendant *fallir*.

Notice that our account of *falloir* in the text calls for the template applying after the degemination of [ll]. An alternative is that geminate consonants were exempt from the template. We choose the former account, because of examples like Italian *abborre*, discussed in footnote 9 above.

4. CONTINUITY: OLD PROVENÇAL AND MODERN PROVENÇAL

In the preceding three sections we have seen that the template in (19) was operative in Proto-Romance and survived into Italian, Romanian, and French. We have also seen that two specific restrictions were added to the template in (19) that was present in Proto-Romance: a restriction against root final voiced affricates and a restriction against root final nasals. Italian added the first restriction. Romanian added the second restriction. French added both and generalized the first to all affricates. We have also seen that Italian, Romanian, and French exhibit archaic verbs that violate the template, among them:

- (48) Italian: +manere < MANĒRE; +pentere < PAENTĒRE

Romanian: +a mînea < MANĒRE; +a ţinea < TENĒRE

French: +manoir < MANĒRE

(The second archaic Romanian verb in (48) violates the template restriction against root final nasals.) Furthermore, all three languages exhibit exceptions to the template that are going out of use. Thus, *licere* never occurs in the infinitive form and *mouvoir* is restricted to the written language:

- (49) Italian: *licere* < LICĒRE

French: *mouvoir* < MOVĒRE

And both *a plăcea* and *a umplea* alternate with the more common third conjugation forms *a plăce* and *a umple*.

- (50) Romanian: *a plăcea* < PLACĒRE; *a umplea* < IMPLĒRE

These data, along with the experiment we reported upon above that was done by DMN, suggest that the template was inherited from Proto-Romance, gradually gained strength and reach, and is still operative today, continuing to force exceptions to it out of the relevant conjugation classes.

In order to test this hypothesis, we might look at an older stage of a modern Romance language. The prediction is that the template will be evident, but not to the extent that it is in its modern Romance descendant. That is, if as the template's strength and reach increased, more and more verbs were forced out of the relevant conjugation classes,

then an older stage of a Romance language should exhibit only partial effects of the template. The language we will examine is Old Provençal, and we will see that it supports our hypothesis nicely.

Old Provençal had four conjugations. The first conjugation infinitives ended in *-ar* and contained primarily descendants of the Latin first conjugation. The second conjugation infinitives ended in *-er* with final stress and contained primarily descendants of the Latin second conjugation. The third conjugation infinitives ended either in *-er* with the penultimate stress or in *-re* and contained primarily descendants of the Latin third conjugation. And the fourth conjugation infinitives ended in *-ir* and contained primarily descendants of the Latin fourth conjugation.

We must point out that it is particularly difficult to be sure whether an Old Provençal infinitive ending in *-er* is in the second or third conjugation, given that the only difference would be stress assignment. The sources we consulted did not always supply the relevant stress information, and when they did, they did not always agree with one another (see Grandgent (1909), Anglade (1921), Meyer-Lübke (1930-35), Fernandez Gonzalez (1985), and, especially, Smith and Bergin (1984)). Furthermore, they did not discuss the basis upon which stress is reconstructed nor did they all note that it is (obviously to us – given the disagreement we found between sources) controversial. The data we give here, then, reflect these variations in sources. We suggest that these variations may reflect forms from different dialects of Old Provençal, in which case it may be that the template's effects were felt more strongly in some dialects than in others. However, even given the fact that a few of our examples below are unclear since two stress patterns are given for them, most data are clear, at least insofar as our sources consistently assigned a single stress pattern and conjugation to them.

That the template in (19) applied in Old Provençal is evidenced by many facts. First, those verbs of the Latin second conjugation that met the template went into the second (*-er* with final stress) conjugation in Old Provençal.

- (51) *aver* < HABĒRE; *caler* < CALĒRE; *doler* < DOLĒRE;

dever < DEBĒRE; *jazer* < IACĒRE; *parer* < PARĒRE;

poder < *POTĒRE; *sezer* < SEDĒRE; *soler* < SOLĒRE;

tazer < TACĒRE; *temer* < TIMĒRE; *tener* < TENĒRE;

valer < VALĒRE; *vezer* < VEDĒRE; *voler* < *VOLĒRE.

Second, third conjugation verbs in Latin that switched into the second conjugation in Old Provençal all conformed to the template in (19). These are shown in (52) and (53) (where the verbs in (53) also had doublets in the fourth conjugation). This is as expected under our hypothesis. We would not expect any verbs that did not conform to the template to switch into the second conjugation.

(52) *cazer* < CADĒRE; *saber* < SAPĒRE

(53) *caber* / *cabir* < CAPĒRE; *gener* / *genir* < GEMĒRE

Third, several Latin second conjugation verbs containing a prevocalic sonorant consonant (as in (54)) or ending with consonant clusters (as in (55)) switched into other conjugations.

(54) *complir* < COMPLĒRE; *emplir* < IMPLĒRE;

florir < FLORĒRE; *fremir* < FREMĒRE (but also: FREMĒRE);

luzir < LUCĒRE; *resplendir* / *resplendre* < (RE)SPLENDĒRE;

rire < RIDĒRE

(55) *ardre* < ARDĒRE; *pendre* < PENDĒRE;

resplendir / *resplendre* < (RE)SPLENDĒRE;

respondre / (RE)SPONDĒRE; *tondre* < TONDĒRE

Furthermore, the added restrictions against root final affricates and nasals exhibited in the other Romance languages studied above is felt to some extent in Old Provençal, since several of the relevant roots of the second (-*er* with final stress) conjugation have doublets in other conjugations.

(56) *jazir* / *jazer* < IACĒRE; *tenir* / *tener* < TENĒRE;

laisser / *taizir* / *taire* / *tazer* < TACĒRE

However, the template in (19) has not caused conjugation switches of nearly so many verbs in Old Provençal as in Italian, Romanian, and French today. Thus we find many Old Provençal second conjugation verbs with roots containing a prevocalic sonorant consonant (as in (57)), and root final consonant clusters (as in (58)), most of which have doublets in other conjugations.

(57) *lezer* < LICĒRE; *manir* / *mandre* / *maner* < MANĒRE;

meiser < MISCĒRE; *morder* / *móder* < MORDĒRE;

molzer / *mólzer* < MULĒRE; *moire* / *mover* < MOVĒRE;

noire / *nozer* < NOCĒRE; *plaie* / *plazer* < PLACĒRE

(58) *esterzer* < (AB)STERGĒRE; *moire* / *móder* < MORDĒRE;

molzer / *mólzer* < MULĒRE; *terzer* < TERGĒRE;

lorser / *lórser* < TORQUĒRE

(Of course, some of these examples appear on both lists.)

At this point it would be interesting to examine data from Modern Provençal, where we predict that many more verbs descending from Latin second conjugation roots which do not meet the template will have been lost or switched conjugation classes. In other words, if our hypothesis is correct about the template in (19) gradually increasing in strength and reach over time, we expect that in Modern Provençal all (or most) of the verbs in (57-58) would no longer be in the (historical) second conjugation.

An examination of Modern Provençal data bears out the prediction. (Here we consider only generalizations across Modern Provençal, although interesting complications arise in some North Provençal dialects (Dauzat (1900:173)).) According to Alibert (1935), none of the verbs in (57-58) survive as -*er* infinitives with conjugation vowel stress. The only infinitives having conjugation vowel stress in Modern Provençal are listed in (59-60).

(59) *aver* < AVĒRE; *caler* < CALĒRE; *poder* < *POTĒRE;

soler < SOLĒRE; *valer* < VALĒRE; *voler* < VOLĒRE

(60) *caber* < CAPĒRE; *saber* < SAPĒRE

All of these, except *soler*, have alternates in other conjugation classes; such as *aveire*, *caldre*, *pode*, *valdre*, and *voldre* for the verbs in (59), and *caupre* and *saupe* for the verbs in (60).

Note that (59) and (60) together form a shorter list than (51) (the corresponding list for Old Provençal). This difference can be accounted for under the assumption that the condition on the template exemplified

in (56) (against root final affricates and nasals) persists into Modern Provençal, with the addition that the condition against root final affricates has been expanded to include any root final sibilant.¹⁶

Hence our prediction is correct. Only those verbs meeting the template in (19), with the added restriction that the final root consonant cannot be a nasal or a sibilant, have remained in the second conjugation in Modern Provençal.

We conclude that the template in (19) introduced itself into Proto-Romance and stayed on in the daughter languages, growing stronger and gradually winnowing away the verbs that went into the conjugations of the Theme Class (*-ere* with theme vowel stress) in Italian, second (*-ez*) in Romanian, third (*-oir*) in French, and second in Provençal.

5. IBERO-ROMANCE, CATALAN, AND FRIULAN

Ibero-Romance shows no evidence today of the template in (19). This is because both Spanish and Portuguese have regular stress assignment (to the theme vowel of the infinitive), and thus do not set aside a special conjugation class marked by unusual stress for the descendants of Latin second conjugation verbs that met the template (in contrast to Italian). Furthermore, there are only three conjugations in these modern languages (where most of the descendants of both the Latin second and third conjugations fall into the *-er* (second) conjugation of the modern languages), and thus they do not set aside a special conjugation class marked by a particular infinitival ending for the descendants of Latin second conjugation verbs that met the template (in contrast to Romanian and French). Wright (1982) says that the reduction to three conjugation classes in Spanish had already taken place by the seventh century.

On the other hand, it is theoretically possible that Ibero-Romance once had a special conjugation class for the relevant verbs and that this special class conflated with the *-er* conjugation class at an early point in the development of Ibero-Romance. If such a conflation had occurred,

¹⁶ This still fails to account for the fact that two other descendants of the Latin second conjugation have switched conjugations in Modern Provençal:

(i) *doler* < *dolēre*; *deure* < *dēvere* < *DEBĒRE*

The unexpected change of these out of the second conjugation from Old to Modern Provençal suggests that Modern Provençal is beginning to lose the second conjugation altogether, similarly to Catalan and Friulan, as we discuss in section 5 below.

all traces of the original special conjugation class would have been obliterated.

There are two reasons why we tentatively suggest that this hypothesis should be considered seriously. First, the evidence from Italian, French, Romanian, and Old Provençal indicate that the template was in effect in Proto-Romance. Certainly languages can lose features of their immediate predecessor language, and, in fact, the loss of the template could have been one of the distinguishing characteristics of Proto-Ibero-Romance. Still, all other things being equal, one would not be surprised to find the template in Ibero-Romance, just as in the other Romance languages we have examined above.

Second, there is evidence that those Romance languages that clearly exhibit the effects of the template are gradually losing the special conjugation class, undergoing a process that is of the type hypothesized above for Ibero-Romance and thus supporting the hypothesis for Ibero-Romance. The presence of the template has, over time, severely limited the number of verbs in the special conjugation class set aside for descendants of Latin second conjugation verbs that met the template. Thus today the number of verb roots in the special conjugation class in Italian, French, Romanian, and Modern Provençal is less than two dozen in each. It is even possible (although many factors, including external factors such as the reintroduction of archaic forms under prescriptivist pressures, could get in the way) that gradually the special conjugation class in each of these languages will be lost, with the most commonly used verbs holding out the longest.

In fact, if we look at two more Romance languages, Catalan and Friulan, we find in both a drastic reduction, heading clearly toward total elimination, of the special conjugation class.

In Catalan there are four conjugation classes. The first has infinitives ending in *-ar* and contains mainly descendants of the Latin first conjugation. The fourth has infinitives ending in *-ir* and contains mainly descendants of the Latin fourth conjugation. But it is the second and third conjugations of Catalan that are of the greatest interest to us.

The second conjugation in Catalan has infinitives ending in *-er* with theme vowel stress. This is an extremely small conjugation, containing only six verbs. Five of those verbs descended from Latin second conjugation verbs that met the template in (19):

(61) *haver* < *HABĒRE*; *poder* < **POTĒRE*; *voler* < **VOLĒRE*;

soler (but also: *soldre*) < *SOLĒRE*;

valer (but also: *valdre*) < *VALĒRE*

The sixth verb is descended from a Latin third conjugation verb that met the template in (19):

(62) *saber* < *SAPĒRE*

(Compare to (16) above for Italian.)

The third conjugation in Catalan has infinitives ending in *-er* with penultimate stress or infinitives ending in *-re*. It contains mainly descendants of the Latin third conjugation. However, it also contains many descendants of the Latin second conjugation. In particular, it contains those verbs that we might have expected to go into the Catalan second conjugation if Catalan made use of the template in (19). (The only exception we know of is the descendant of *GAUDĒRE*, which went into the fourth conjugation: *gaudir* – but this is probably a Latinism.)

(63) *caldre* < *CALĒRE*; *doldre* < *DOLĒRE*; *deure* < *DEBĒRE*;

jaure / *jeure* < *IACĒRE*; *pareixer* < *PARĒRE*;

plaure < *PLACĒRE*; *seure* < *SEDĒRE*;

soldre (but also: *soler*) < *SOLĒRE*; *indre* < *TENĒRE*;

temer < *TIMĒRE*; *valdre* (but also: *valer*) < *VALĒRE*;

veure < *VIDĒRE*

(We include examples with an epenthetic post liquid /d/ in Catalan, just in case this /d/ was epenthesized after the relevant verbs had already descended into their Catalan conjugation.)

The fact that all the verbs in (63) wound up in the third conjugation in Catalan rather than in any other is explained if Catalan originally used the template in (19) to restrict which verbs could go into the second conjugation, and if the second and third conjugations are in the process of conflation, where the second conjugation verbs are gradually being moved into the third conjugation. That is, Catalan attests precisely the kind of conjugation class conflation that we suggest as a possibility for Spanish and Portuguese, with the difference that in Catalan the original root vowel stress of the Latin third conjugation is prevailing as conflation proceeds, whereas in Spanish and Portuguese the original theme vowel stress of the Latin second conjugation prevailed after conflation. (The stress pattern contrast between Catalan and Ibero-Romance is, of course,

no surprise, given that in many respects Catalan is closer to Modern Provençal than to Spanish and Portuguese.)

There is only one verb whose descendant we might have expected to appear unequivocally in the Catalan second or third conjugation and that does not: *TENĒRE*. Instead, we find two descendants: *tindre*, listed above in (63); and *tenir*, in the Catalan fourth conjugation:

(64) *tenir* < *TENĒRE*

Tenir is a learned form and its frequency is minimal compared to the popularly used *tindre*. We point this doublet out because an important point emerges here. We propose that *tindre* and *tenir* give evidence that Catalan employed the restriction against root final nasals that we have seen in other Romance languages (Romanian, French, and both Old and Modern Provençal). Thus the descendants of *TENĒRE* were barred from the Catalan second conjugation and went directly into the third and fourth. Looking back at (63), then, we propose that the descendant of *TMĒRE* was also barred from the Catalan second conjugation and went directly into the third conjugation, rather than arriving there via the waning second conjugation.

As further evidence that Catalan employed the template in (19), we point out that all the descendants of Latin second conjugation roots that had a prevocalic sonorant consonant are today in other conjugations than the second in Catalan:

(65) *complir* < *COMPLĒRE*; *florir* < *FLORĒRE*; *lloir* < *LUCĒRE*;

romandre < *MANĒRE*; *munyir* < *MULĠĒRE*;

moure < *MOVĒRE*; *noure* < *NOCĒRE*; *riure* < *RIDĒRE*;

umplir < *IMPLĒRE*

And, finally, all the descendants of Latin second conjugation roots that ended in consonant clusters and which survive in Catalan are in other conjugation classes:

(66) *munyir* < *MULĠĒRE*; *dependre* < *PENDĒRE*;

respondre < *(RE)SPONDĒRE*; *tondre* < *TONDĒRE*;

tórcer < *TORQUĒRE*

In sum, Catalan offers one more example of a Romance language that made use of the template in (19) and supports the idea that as the template continues to extend its reach, the special conjugation class is shrinking across Romance, perhaps even toward eventual extinction.

The final Romance language we will look at is Friulan, (also known as Friulian and Friulano), an Alpinoromance language spoken in the Friuli section of the northeast of Italy. This is the only one of the languages we examine in this paper that exhibits a phonemic contrast between long and short vowels, though only in stressed syllables. This is not evidence of a strong conservative tendency, however. Distinctive vowel length was not inherited from Latin, but, rather, was re-introduced at a much later point (Rizzolatti (1981), Zannier (1983)). Accordingly, the distribution of long and short vowels in Friulan does not reflect the distribution of long and short vowels in Latin and we do not, therefore, indicate the (irrelevant) vowel length.

In Friulan we find that the special conjugation class is the second. Only a handful of verbs remain in that conjugation today (all of which are expected cognates for us by now, including two descendants of the Latin third conjugation).

(67) *cjade* < *CADĒRE*; *pare* < *PARĒRE*; *plase* < *PLACĒRE*;

pode < **POTĒRE*; *save* < *SAPĒRE*; *tase* < *TACĒRE*;

teme < *TIMĒRE*; *vale* < *VALĒRE*; *ole* < **VOLĒRE*

That the template in (19) applied in Friulan is demonstrated by the usual range of data. Thus, Latin second conjugation roots with prevocalic sonorant consonants switched conjugations. (The Friulan third conjugation infinitive ends in unstressed *-i*, while the fourth ends in stressed *-i*. The first conjugation ends in *-a*. We mark the stressed vowels of the third conjugation only here.)

(68) *jempla* < *IMPLĒRE*; *móigi* < *MULGĒRE*;

muáridi < *MORDĒRE*; *móvi* < *MOVĒRE*; *nózi* < *NOOCĒRE*;

ridi < *RIDĒRE*; *sfori* < *FLORĒRE*

And Latin second conjugation roots with final consonant clusters switched conjugations:

(69) *árdi* (but also: *arde*) < *ARDĒRE*; *móigi* < *MULGĒRE*;

muáridi < *MORDĒRE*; *péndi* < *PENDĒRE*;

respuindi < (RE)SPONDĒRE

But other verbs that we would expect to find in the second conjugation (because they meet the template) are now in the third or fourth conjugation.

(70) *dui* < *DOLĒRE*; *góidi* < *GAUDĒRE*; *tigni* < *TENĒRE*;

viódi < *VIDĒRE*

One verb has doublets in both the second and third conjugations:

(71) *dove* / *dévi* < *DEBĒRE*

We suspect that this verb is currently changing from second to third conjugation and that *dove* will not survive much longer. Thus Friulan is beginning to lose its special (i.e. second) conjugation class altogether.

6. CONCLUSION

The template in (19) was used by all those Romance languages studied here that exhibit the crucial data. This fact supports our claim that the template existed in Proto-Romance and opens the possibility that the template was present at an early stage in every Romance language. While any distinction between descendants of the Latin second conjugation and those of the Latin third conjugation is not apparent in Spanish and Portuguese today, we have tentatively suggested that this may be the result of a conflation of conjugation classes. The template in (19) is still used today by Italian, Romanian, and French and is quite definitely part of the defining characteristics that distinguish conjugation classes in these languages.

We reiterate that the template has increased in strength and reach gradually over time in the Romance languages, winnowing out second conjugation infinitives that did not conform to the template. The gradual strengthening of the template can be seen in the fact that older stages of a Romance language may have many verbs that violate the template while their modern counterparts do not (except for Spanish and Portuguese, in which original second and third conjugation infinitives

have fallen together as the modern second conjugation). This can be seen, for example, in comparing Old French (as in (46-47)) with Modern French, and Old Provençal with Modern Provençal. Old Provençal had many second conjugation infinitives that violated the template (in (57-58)). None of these have survived in the same conjugation class in Modern Provençal. The template's impact has been absolute on roots ending in consonant clusters (as far as we are aware, there are no exceptions to this in any Romance language that still distinguishes the historical second and third conjugations), and it has been nearly absolute on roots containing prevocalic sonorants (with exceptions being Italian *rimanere*, *permanere* (see discussion following (6)); Romanian *a urmplea*, *a plăcea* (34-35); and French *mouvoir*, *pleuvoir* (44-45) – the former of which is dying out in the spoken language).¹⁷

The specialist in any given Romance language will find that within that language the number of examples that support our template is small, and may see alternative accounts that hold for that specific language. This specialist may also be aware of unusual or archaic forms that we did not come across in our survey which may present complications for us. We can only hope that readers will bring such examples to our attention. What we ask the specialist to focus on now is the fact that the data across the languages studied here taken in their entirety are persuasive, the more so since we have not appealed to accounts that hold for only a single Romance language and not generally across Romance. Furthermore, the experiment reported on in Davis, Mangano, and Napoli (1987) gives conclusive evidence that the template's effect is potent today in Italian. The important fact is that polysyllabic roots, CVC roots where the onset C is a sonorant, and CVCC roots do not occur in the special infinitive or conjugation class in any modern Romance language we have examined. If they did, our template would be falsified. Their absence is the motivation for our hypothesis.

Although the template is indeed successful in identifying which of the Latin second conjugation infinitives are candidates for switching conjugation classes as they descend into modern Romance languages, it

17 The absoluteness of the template to roots ending in two consonants and its near absoluteness to roots with a prevocalic sonorant are also evidenced in the Rhaeto-Romansh dialect Surmiran of southeastern Switzerland, for which Christine Kampirath has provided us with information. In this dialect there are no second conjugation infinitives whose roots end in consonant clusters. There are, however, two second conjugation infinitives which violate the template by having a prevocalic sonorant in their root: *placèter* < *PLACĒRE*, and *creir* < *CRĒDERE*, as noted in section 1 above. We would expect that these infinitives would soon switch conjugation classes. It is examples like these that led us in section 1 to suggest that the application of the template is weaker when the prevocalic sonorant is part of a consonant cluster beginning with a stop.

does not predict which conjugation class the template-violating infinitive switches into. We note, however, that in the majority of cases, the conjugation class change simply involves a shift of stress from the conjugation vowel to the root vowel (and, depending on the language, this may trigger further phonological changes). This is best seen by the Italian data in (8) and (11),¹⁸ the Romanian data in (22) and (24), the Catalan data in (65-66), and the Friulan data in (68-69). For second conjugation infinitives whose roots end in two consonants, the motivation behind the stress shift is transparent: the root vowel is in a heavy syllable while the stressed conjugation vowel is in a light syllable. Stress then shifts from the light syllable onto the heavy syllable. Thus this would be an instance in which a heavy syllable attracts stress.¹⁹ For second conjugation infinitives whose roots do not end in two final consonants but contain a prevocalic sonorant, the motivation behind the stress shift is less apparent. Here it seems that a sonorant in the onset of a syllable containing the root vowel causes stress shift. These, then, would be cases of syllable onsets influencing stress shift. Davis (1988) has shown that an onset-sensitive stress shift rule occurs in the Australian language Madimadi. The Romance cases discussed here would constitute additional examples of onset-sensitive stress shift.

While a large majority of the template-violating second conjugation infinitives have switched into the (historical) third conjugation, there are some (original) second conjugation infinitives in each of the languages considered that have shifted into other conjugation classes. We offer no specific explanation for why such verbs end up in the classes they do. Rather we suggest that with these verbs non-phonological factors such as analogical attraction may influence where a template-violating second conjugation infinitive ends up. Consider, for example, the descendant of *TĒNERE* in French. Recall that French restricts the template in (19) so that the root final consonant cannot be a nasal. The modern day descendant of *TĒNERE* is *tenir*. The change here has involved a switch in conjugation vowel (not a shift in stress) so that *tenir* looks like it has descended from a Latin fourth conjugation infinitive (the non-existent **TENIRE*). It is quite possible that *TĒNERE* has become *tenir* in French under the analogical influence of *venir* (< *VENIRE*) 'come', a verb that also occurs in French. Thus, template-violating second conjugation

18 For a formal synchronic account of stress on the Italian second conjugation infinitive, see Davis (1988).

19 In these languages, however, heavy syllables do not always attract stress. This is seen, for example, in Italian infinitives like *abbordare* ('board') and *vestire* ('dress') in which the light penultimate syllable is stressed and not the heavy antepenultimate syllable. Nevertheless, the stress shift always takes place with -ere infinitives.

infinitives can switch into other conjugation classes besides the (historical) third. The template we propose in (19) helps identify only which infinitives are candidates for changing classes, not which classes they switch into.

Finally, the template in (19) is unable to account for the fact that in Catalan, Friulan, and Modern Provençal there are several second conjugation infinitives that conform to the template but nonetheless have switched conjugation classes (as seen respectively by the data in (63), (70), and footnote 16). We suggest that in these languages the template has played an active role until recently. However, now even the verbs that meet the template are gradually changing conjugation classes. (This can also be seen in the fact that several of the verbs that conform to the template and are still in the second conjugation have doublets in other conjugations; see, for example, the data in (61) and footnote 16.)²⁰ This fact could be evidence of a tendency toward eliminating the grammatical expense of an exceptional conjugation class as the size of that special class dwindles. We would not be surprised if the second conjugation infinitives were soon lost altogether from these languages. Perhaps a similar destiny eventually awaits the relevant conjugation classes of Italian, Romanian, and French, as well.

The reader will have undoubtedly noticed that some restrictions to the template added over time were common to more than one daughter language of Proto-Romance. French, Romanian, Old Provençal, Modern Provençal, and Catalan preclude verb roots ending in nasals from the special verb class. Italian precludes verb roots ending in voiced affricates; French and Old Provençal preclude verb roots ending in any affricate; Modern Provençal precludes verb roots ending in all sibilants. One might be led, then, to propose that the template in Proto-Romance incorporated all the restrictions found in any of its daughters, where the daughters were then free to lose or modify these restrictions. That is, Proto-Romance would have had restrictions against both root final nasals and root final voiced affricates, where the daughters inherited both or one or none of these restrictions, and where the daughters were free to

²⁰ We are aware that a few of the Old Provençal second conjugation infinitives which conformed to the template had doublets in other conjugations. These included:

(i) *doler, dolre* < *DOLĒRE*; *dever, deure* < *DEBĒRE*;
sezer, seire < *SEDĒRE*; *vezet, veire* < *VIDĒRE*.

These doublets are unexpected since the second conjugation roots conformed to the template. Perhaps even at the time of Old Provençal the template's winnowing effect on the second conjugation was clear enough that it was already leading to the demise of the second conjugation.

modify these restrictions (for example, French generalizing to all affricates). We do not assume this position, however. We suggest that Proto-Romance did not have these restrictions and that the daughter languages added restrictions over time.

We expect our suggestion to be met with surprise. That is, so far as we know, a template that is a monosyllable which excludes sonorants from the set of onset consonants and nasals (as in several languages) and voiced affricates (or all affricates, or sibilants – depending on the particular language) from the set of final consonants is a new mechanism in the linguistic literature. We know of nothing resembling this template. The data, however, strongly support the template. But on the basis of uniqueness alone, one might propose that the template in (19) with all the restrictions found in any of the daughter languages was present in Proto-Romance. That way only one language (Proto-Romance) need have this unique mechanism.

Despite the initial attractiveness of this approach, we find that the data are more naturally accounted for if some daughters added restrictions to (19) rather than some losing restrictions. The template in (19) is the only thing all the languages studied here have in common. In fact, the only two daughter languages that have an identical template are French and Old Provençal (where both incorporate restrictions against root final nasals and affricates). If Proto-Romance had all the restrictions exhibited in any of the daughter languages, then there is no reason why the only two daughters that exhibit absolutely identical templates are closely related ones. Why shouldn't two more distant daughters, such as Romanian and Friulan, for example, have identical templates? But if Proto-Romance incorporated only the template in (19) and each daughter added restrictions, then the fact that French and Old Provençal have identical templates would follow if Gallo-Romance added restrictions to the template which were then inherited by both French and Old Provençal (and later generalized in Modern Provençal to preclude all root final sibilants).

Furthermore, we believe that the fact that the added restrictions in the various daughters have strong similarities can be understood in terms of phonological factors that can be involved in rules of stress shift. The elaboration of this position is beyond the scope of this paper, but forms a major part of a longer study that we are presently engaged in.

REFERENCES

- Alibert, Louis 1935. *Grammatica Occitana*. Societat d'Estudis Occitans, Tolosa.
 Anglade, Joseph 1921. *Grammaire de l'Ancien Provençal*. Klincksieck, Paris.

- Block, Oscar and W. von Wartburg 1960. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Française*. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Chierchia, Gennaro 1986. "Length, syllabification, and the phonological cycle in Italian". *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 8, 5-34.
- Dauzat, A. 1900. *Morphologie du patois de Vinzelles*. E. Bouillon, Paris.
- Davis, Stuart 1988. "Syllable Onsets as a Factor in Stress Rules". *Phonology* 5, 1-19.
- Davis, Stuart to appear. "Italian Onset Structure and the Distribution of *il* and *lo*". *Linguistics*.
- Davis, Stuart, Linda Mangano, and Donna Jo Napoli 1987. "Stress on Second Conjugation Verbs in Italian". *Italica* 64, 477-98.
- Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Française* 1960. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Fernández González, José Ramón 1985. *Gramática Histórica Provenzal*. Universidad de Oviedo.
- Grandgent, Charles 1909. *An Outline of the Phonology and Morphology of Old Provençal*. D.C. Heath & Co., Boston.
- Hall, Robert 1948. *Descriptive Italian Grammar*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Hall, Robert 1986. "From Bidialectalism to Diglossia in Early Romance", in *Language in Global Perspective*. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Dallas, Texas. 213-22.
- Harp's New Standard French and English Dictionary* (v. 2) 1980. Harrap & Co. LTD, London.
- Heath's *New French Dictionary* 1932. D.C. Heath and Co., New York.
- Lausberg, Heinrich 1971. *Linguistica Romanza, I Fonetica*. Feltrinelli, Milano.
- Malkiel, Yakov 1979. "Problems in the Diachronic Differentiation of Near-homophones". *Language* 55, 1-36.
- Malkiel, Yakov 1985. "Excessive Self-Assertion in Glotiodiachrony: Portuguese *softer* and its Latin and Spanish counterparts". *Lingua* 65, 29-50.
- Malkiel, Yakov 1986. "From Old Portuguese *caer* 'to fall' to Modern *cair*: Three Explanations". *Romance Quarterly* 33, 5-10.
- Martinet, André 1971. *La prononciation du français contemporain*. Droz, Geneva.
- Meyer-Lübke, W. 1930-1935. *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3rd edition. Winter, Heidelberg.
- Montgomery, Thomas 1976. "Complementarity of Stem-Vowels in the Spanish Second and Third Conjugations". *Romance Philology* 29, 281-96.
- Montgomery, Thomas 1978. "Iconicity and Lexical Retention in Spanish". *Language* 54, 907-16.
- Napoli, Donna Jo and Irene Vogel forthcoming. "The Conjugations of Italian". *Italica*.
- Rizzolatti, Piera 1981. *Elementi di linguistica Friulana*. Società Filologica Friulana. Udine, Italy.
- Ronjat, Jules 1930-41. *Grammaire istorique des parles Provençaux modernes*. Société des langues romanes, Montpellier.
- Sanga, Glauco 1988. "La lunghezza vocalica nel milanese e la coscienza fonologica dei parlanti". *Romance Philology* XLI 3, 290-97.
- Smith, Nathaniel and Thomas Bergin 1984. *An Old Provençal Primer*. Garland Publishing Co., New York.
- Walter, Henriette 1982. *Enquête phonologique et variétés régionales du français*. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Wright, Roger 1982. *Late Latin and early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France*. F. Cairns, Liverpool.
- Zanier, Guido 1983. *El Friulano*. 2nd edition. Universidad de la Republica: Montevideo, Uruguay.
- Zingarelli, Nicola 1970. *Vocabolario della lingua italiana*. Decima edizione. Zanichelli, Bologna.

APPENDIX

- accendere/ acciudere/ accingersi/ accludere/ accorgersi/ affliggere/
 aggiungere/ alludere/ annettere/ appendere/ ardere/ aspergere/ assistere/
 assolvere/ assumere/ astergere
- battere
- chiedere/ chiudere/ cingere/ circonflettare/ cogliere/ compiere/
 comprendere/ comprimere/ concedere/ concernere/ concludere/
 congiungere/ conoscere/ conquistare/ contondere/ correre/ correggere/
 credere/ crescere/ cuocere
- decidere/ devolvere/ difendere/ dipendere/ dipingere/ dirigere/ discutere/
 distinguere/ distinguere/ dividere
- elidere/ emergere/ empiere/ ergere/ esigere/ esimere/ espellere/
 esplodere/ esprimere/ essere/ estinguere/ evadere
- feverre/ figgere/ fingere/ fliggere/ fondere/ frangere/ friggere/ fulgere/
 fungere
- gemere/ giungere
- incidere/ includere/ incombere/ indulgere/ ingiungere/ intridere/
 intrudere/ invadere
- ledere/ leggere/ lucere/ ludere
- mescere/ mettere/ molcere/ mordere/ muovere/ mungere
- nascere/ nascondere/ nuocere
- offendere
- pascere/ pendere/ percuotere/ perdere/ piangere/ pingere/ piovere/
 porgere/ prandere/ prediligere/ prendere/ proteggere/ prudere/ pungere
- radere/ redimere/ reggere/ rendere/ ricevere/ ridere/ riflettere/ redigere/
 reggere/ restringere/ retrocedere/ riempire/ rifiutare/ rilucere/
 rinascere/ ripetere/ rispondere/ rodere/ rompere

scegliere/ scendere/ scindere/ sciogliere/ scorgere/ scrivere/ scuotere/
solvere/ sorgere/ spargere/ spegnere/ spendere/ spingere/ stridere/
stringere/ struggere/ svenire

tangere/ tendere/ tergere/ tingere/ togliere/ torcere

uccidere/ ungere/ urgere

vendere/ vertere/ vincere/ vivere/ volgere

synocopated verbs

addurre (adducere)/ bere (bevere)/ dire (dicere)/ fare (facere)/ porre
(ponere)/ tradurre (traducere)/ trarre (trahere or trahere)