

Article

Clitic Placement and the Grammaticalization of the Future and the Conditional in Old Catalan

Aina Torres-Latorre ^{1,*}  and Andreu Sentí ^{1,2} ¹ Departament de Filologia Catalana, Universitat de València, 46010 Valencia, Spain² Institut Interuniversitari de Filologia Valenciana, Universitat de València, 46010 Valencia, Spain; andreu.senti@uv.es

* Correspondence: aitola@alumni.uv.es

Abstract: The romance future and conditional tenses are the result of the grammaticalization of Latin periphrasis, mainly CANTĀRE HABEŌ. In some medieval Romance languages, including Catalan, two types of forms existed: synthetic forms (*faré* ‘I will do’) and analytical forms (*fer-lo he* ‘I will do it’). Analytical forms do not present univerbation and are thus less grammaticalized than synthetic forms. The present work aims to study the distribution of synthetic and analytical forms diachronically. A diachronic corpus (11th c.–16th c.) was compiled to serve this purpose. According to the syntactic restrictions of clitic placement, analytical forms could appear in the same syntactic environments than synthetic forms with postverbal pronouns (*faré-lo* ‘I will do it’). Therefore, only those contexts are analysed to assess the degree of grammaticalization. Some recent works point out that the grammaticalization of future and conditional was more advanced in the eastern languages of the Iberian Peninsula, such as Catalan, than in the western ones. The results from our corpus confirm these differences. In addition, the data show another grammaticalization process: the evolution of clitic placement towards a fixed preverbal position.

Keywords: clitic placement; future; conditional; grammaticalization; univerbation; Old Catalan



Citation: Torres-Latorre, Aina, and Andreu Sentí. 2023. Clitic Placement and the Grammaticalization of the Future and the Conditional in Old Catalan. *Languages* 8: 182. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8030182>

Academic Editors: Renata Enghels, Marlies Jansegers and Tom Bossuyt

Received: 2 February 2023

Revised: 23 June 2023

Accepted: 7 July 2023

Published: 28 July 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction¹

The study of clitic placement in Old Romance languages is of great importance as regards the understanding of the formation of two verbal tenses: the future and the conditional (FC). These tenses were the result of the grammaticalization of a Vulgar Latin periphrasis, CANTĀRE HABEŌ (‘I have to sing’), in most Romance languages, including Catalan (cf. Coleman 1971; Fleishman 1982; Lehmann 1995; Pérez Saldanya 1998; Hopper and Traugott 2003; Company 2012). Nevertheless, this grammaticalization was not completed in some Romance varieties: the so-called synthetic future or conditional (SFC) (1a) coexisted beside the analytical future or conditional (AFC), which was possible only with mesoclysis, i.e., with the presence of a clitic pronoun between the infinitive and the auxiliary² (1b) (Castillo Lluch 1996, 2002; Eberenz 1991; Moll [1952] 2006; Badia i Margarit 1984):

- (1) a. si Déus li ajudarà (*Costums*: 490)
if God him.DAT help.FUT.3SG
‘if God will help him’
- b. e Déus ajudar -li à (*Desclot, Crònica*: III.85)
and God help.INF him.DAT have.AUX.3SG
‘and God will help him’

This formal variation in the FC shows two different stages from the grammaticalization of the original Latin periphrasis. The SFC construction attained univerbation, and the infinitive and auxiliary, therefore, lost their boundaries and coalescence took place (cf. Lehmann 1985, 2020).³ The AFC construction is, on the contrary, a less grammaticalized

form, since the infinitive and the auxiliary are separated by at least a clitic pronoun. In the Middle Ages, this analytic construction could be found in western Romance varieties, such as Galician-Portuguese (2a), Astur-Leonese (2b), Spanish (2c), Aragonese (2d), Catalan (1b), Occitan (2e), and some Italian dialects (cf. Pérez Saldanya 1998; Paden 1998, pp. 183–86; de Andrés Díaz 2013, pp. 496–97, 499–500; Company 2006; Buridant 2019, pp. 371–72; Primerano and Bouzouita 2023, among others). Nowadays, it can only be found in Portuguese, in which it is preserved in formal registers (Cunha and Cintra 1992, p. 281).

- (2) a. Et eu dar vos ey este caualo
 and I give.INF you.PL.DAT have.AUX.1SG this horse
 ‘And I will give you this horse’
 (apud Martins 1994, p. 159)
- b. A ti fazer te lo é
 to you.SG.DAT make.INF you.SG.DAT it.ACC have.AUX.1SG
 uerdat
 true
 ‘To you I will make it come true’
 (apud Primerano et al. 2022)
- c. E tornar los é a sus terras e
 and bring back.INF they.ACC have.AUX.1SG to their lands and
 a sus heredades [...] to their landed properties
 ‘And I will bring them back to their lands and their landed properties’
 (apud Bouzouita 2016: 270)
- d. Dizir uos hemos quaoles horas
 tell.INF you.PL.DAT have.AUX.1PL which hours
 deue auer el infançon
 must.3SG have.INF the nobleman (minor nobility)
 ‘I will tell you which hours the nobleman must have’
 (apud Primerano 2019: 117)
- e. mas servir l’ ai dos ans o tres
 but serve.INF him.DAT have.AUX.1SG two years or three
 ‘but I will serve him two years or three’
 (apud Jensen 1994, p. 243)

The variation between the SFC and the AFC is not accidental. However, there is disagreement between the various proposals, which mainly focus on Old Castilian and whose hypotheses are different. On the one hand, for some scholars, the AFC displays a pragmatic function in which the clitic seems to reinforce the presence of an important entity in the discourse, since it appears in a central position in the predicate (Company 2006, p. 383). Therefore, the AFC is seen as a topicalization strategy (Company 1985, 2006; Company and Medina 1999). This pragmatic approach explains the loss of the AFC by means of the pragmatic restrictions of the form, which is considered marked, in contrast with the SFC, a less restricted construction that progressively starts to cover the space of AFC (Company 2006, p. 410). According to this view, the syntactic restriction of clitic placement in Old Romance languages do not play a role in the variation between SFC and AFC.

On the other hand, other scholars have precisely highlighted the connection between clitic placement and the distribution of the different forms of FC. In the Middle Ages, clitic placement with the FC is governed by the same syntactic–pragmatic restrictions than those with other tenses (Eberenz 1991; Castillo Lluich 1996, 2002; Bouzouita 2011, 2012, 2016; Sentí and Bouzouita 2022). The three following points support this perspective against the pragmatic approach and the perception of AFC as a marked configuration: (i) the AFC and SFC with postverbal clitics (SFC-p, also known as postposition or enclisis) can exclusively appear in the syntactic environments that require a postverbal clitic; (ii) in some linguistic varieties, such as Old Castilian, the AFC is (almost) the only available construction for

the environments which demand postposition; (iii) the SFC with preverbal clitics (SFC-a, also known as anteposition or proclisis) are permitted in those syntactic contexts in which preverbal clitics are expected with other verbal tenses. The syntactic–pragmatic restrictions of clitic placement will be discussed in more detail in Section 1.1.

Additionally, some authors have studied the AFC as a modal periphrasis with a marked configuration, a special case of fronting (cf. Fischer 2005; Mathieu 2006; Elvira 2015). Octavio de Toledo (2015), for instance, relates the AFC with fronting configurations of modal periphrasis in Spanish (i.e., *hacer lo debo* ‘I must do it’), whereby the infinitive and the clitics of the AFC display an informative function, which results in a weak focus (cf. Batllori and Hernanz 2015). Thus, although AFC and SFC-p appear in the same syntactic environments, both constructions would not share the same informative function. In her formal analysis, Batllori (2015) argues that the AFC expresses different modal, evidential and speech act meanings due to the movement from S_v to the left periphery, into Mood or Modality nodes. According to these authors, the loss of AFC (and SFC-p) is not because of the increase in SFC-a, but because of a more general linguistic change in Old Spanish: the various information structure options that were coded using word order fade away and they are replaced by syntactic marking (Octavio de Toledo 2015, p. 210). Although these proposals offer an explanation of the AFC and SFC-p variation, we do not consider the AFC as a marked configuration. As has been underlined before, in Old Castilian the AFC is (almost) the only possible construction in some syntactic environments. Modal or informative differences would thus not be expected in this form as no other form of FC takes up its place. Furthermore, in this paper, the AFC is not considered a periphrasis because, among other reasons, modal meanings have not been attested in our data.⁴ In addition, important differences have been attested in the evolution of these forms between some Romance languages (i.e., the Catalan data of this paper, see Section 3, in contrast with Old Castilian). In fact, we aim to provide empirical data in favour of a language contact hypothesis (Bouzouita 2016) to explain the diatopic propagation of the SFC (Primerano et al. 2023; see Section 1.2).

1.1. Clitic Placement in Old Catalan

The position of pronominal clitics with respect to the verb in Old Catalan (and Old Romance languages) is motivated by syntactic–pragmatic restrictions (Fischer 2002; Batllori et al. 2005; Sentí and Bouzouita 2022)—unlike in the present-day language, in which morphosyntactic restrictions related to the type of verb form govern clitic positioning (cf. GIEC 2016, Section 8.3.3; Bonet 2002).⁵

The syntactic–pragmatic environments in which the finite verb appears determine the position of clitics. Clitics generally occur in proclisis in subordinate clauses, while there are three possibilities in main clauses: (i) clitics can be proclitic in certain syntactic contexts, such as negative sentences, (ii) they appear only enclitically in others, and (iii) they admit variation in cases such as when the verb follows the subject. According to the literature, and particularly studies on Old Castilian, the following three groups of syntactic environments that determine the position of pronominal clitics have been established (cf. Eberenz 1991; Castillo Lluich 1996, 2002; Bouzouita 2008a, 2008b, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2016). The three groups are detailed in Table 1 and will be explained below.

Group 1 always leads to proclisis. Certain preverbal constituents always trigger proclisis, such as a *wh*-word, a negation marker, a preverbal NP non-coreferential with the clitic, a preverbal predicative complement, the contrastive conjunction *ans* (‘but’) or an infinitive or a participle dislocated before the verb (fronting).

Group 2 has only postverbal clitics. The syntactic–pragmatic environments in which a non-preverbal clitic is expected in all verb tenses are those that appear with the verb in the first position, paratactic clauses, after a vocative, and in coordinated adversative clauses after the conjunction *mas* or *però* (‘but’).

Finally, Group 3 is made up of those environments in which variation in clitic placement occurs: following a preverbal subject, after a dislocated preverbal NP coreferential

with the clitic pronoun, after a preverbal adverbial phrase, following a coordinative or disjunctive conjunction and following a non-root or absolute clause. The default position in these syntactic contexts is enclisis. However, some (pragmatic) marked configurations can trigger proclisis. Preverbal clitics appear when the preverbal constituent proves to be emphatic or prominent in the information structure. Following Granberg (1999), the emphatic constituent is considered focus if it receives informative prominence in the discourse.⁶ Even though analysing information structure in written medieval texts is not always reliable, some discourse phenomena can indicate the presence of emphasis (for example, a contrastive subject regarding a different previous entity in discourse). Regarding clitic placement, some studies on present-day Galician (Álvarez Blanco et al. 1986) and Old Castilian (Granberg 1988, 1999; Castillo Lluch 1996; Bouzouita 2008a, 2008b, 2011, 2012, 2016) have observed that this pragmatic function (emphasis) accounts for the presence of preverbal clitics in the aforementioned syntactic environments. Similar behaviour has also been recently observed in Old Catalan (Bouzouita and Sentí 2022; Sentí and Bouzouita 2022; Torres-Latorre 2023). Even so, a detailed exploration of the consequences of information structure in clitic placement in Old Romance languages is still pending.

Table 1. Syntactic–pragmatic environments governing clitic placement.

Syntactic–Pragmatic Environment		Preverbal Clitics	Postverbal Clitics
Main clauses: Group 1	Wh-pronoun	*	
	Negation	*	
	Non-coreferential NP	*	
	Prepositional complement	*	
	Predicative complement	*	
	Contrastive <i>ans</i> ‘but’	*	
	Infinitive	*	
	Participle	*	
Main clauses: Group 2	P1 (verb in first position)		*
	Paratactic clause		*
	Vocative		*
	Contrastive <i>mas, però</i> ‘but’		*
Main clauses: Group 3	Subject	*	*
	Coreferential NP	*	*
	Adverbial	*	*
	Coordinative conj. <i>e, y, i</i> ‘and’	*	*
	Disjunctive conj. <i>o</i> ‘or’	*	*
	Non-root and absolute clause	*	*

With regard to the grammaticalization of the FC, and according to the above-mentioned syntactic restrictions of clitic placement, the AFC could appear in the same syntactic contexts as the SFC with postverbal pronouns (Group 2 and 3). These contexts will, therefore, be examined in this work.

1.2. Objectives

According to the summarised state of the art, two different processes of linguistic change related to clitic placement are dealt with in this paper. First, the variation permitted between a more grammaticalized construction, i.e., SFC-p, and a less grammaticalized version of the FC, i.e., the AFC, since these forms appear in the same syntactic contexts. As previous studies have shown, both constructions are frequent in Old Catalan (Bouzouita and Sentí 2022; Sentí and Bouzouita 2022; Torres-Latorre 2023). However, this was not the case in Old Castilian. As already urged by Bouzouita (2016), SFC-p should be scrutinised in more detail in Ibero-Romance, because, whereas this form was rarely found in Old Castilian texts, it was quite a lot more frequent in some eastern texts written in this language, as already noted by Saralegui (1985). Some recent works (Bouzouita 2016; Bouzouita and Sentí 2022; Primerano et al. 2022) point out that the synthetic forms could have been spread

from Catalan to other languages and varieties in the Iberian Peninsula during the 11th–13th centuries (from Catalan to Navarro-Aragonese, from Navarro-Aragonese to Castilian, etc.), signifying that language contact may have played an important role. The empirical findings of the grammaticalization of the FC in Old Catalan, therefore, prove crucial to understand the Old Ibero-Romance.

The objective of this paper is to study the distribution of the SFC and the AFC diachronically and quantitatively and to analyse the grammaticalization process from the 11th to the 16th century. In this respect, an increase in the frequency of SFC-p, with univerbation and a more grammaticalized form, and a consequent decrease in the AFC would be expected, bearing in mind that the AFC is no longer used in contemporary Catalan. In fact, this development has been noted in Old Castilian and in Old Navarro-Aragonese in the 13th and 14th centuries. In Old Castilian, SFC-p was almost non-existent in the 13th century, and it remained uncommon in the 14th century, but the increase in its presence appears to be statistically significant (Primerano et al. 2023, Section 4.1). Although SFC-p was not as rare in Old Navarro-Aragonese as it was in Old Spanish, an increase in its use is also attested in these two centuries (Primerano and Bouzouita 2023).

Furthermore, another grammaticalization process participated in the evolution of Old Catalan: the evolution of clitic placement from the above-mentioned syntactic distribution towards a fixed preverbal position (as in present-day Catalan). In spite of the previous knowledge on pronominal clitics in Old Catalan (Fischer 2002; Batllori et al. 2005; Bouzouita and Sentí 2022; Sentí and Bouzouita 2022), this topic has yet to be studied quantitatively and qualitatively. There is lack of knowledge on which variation contexts favour preverbal placement and on the extent to which proclisis is linked to emphasis (or whether it can also appear in a neutral, i.e., non-emphatic environment, and therefore be used in innovative contexts). The same applies to its evolution throughout history and the fixing of word order with the clitics in proclisis to the finite verb, or its dialectal and discursive variations. This is the second purpose of this paper: we wish to contribute to explaining this process with data regarding the FC, again from the 11th to the 16th century.

In the following section (Section 2) we explain our selected corpus and some methodological issues. The empirical results and a discussion of the corpus-based study are then addressed: Section 3 shows the distribution of the AFC and SFC-p in Old Catalan, while Section 4 summarises the evolution of clitic placement towards anteposition. Finally, we present our conclusions in Section 5.

2. Methodology and Corpus

Old Catalan usually covers the period between the first attested Catalan texts (11th century) and the beginning of the modern age (16th c.) (Martines and Pérez Saldanya 2009).⁷ In order to carry out the study of the grammaticalization of the FC and clitic placement in this period, we have used the *Corpus Informatizat del Català Antic* (CICA 2006) (Claveria and Torruella 2012), which is the only available corpus that is devoted to the study of this period. Although the CICA (2006) corpus is not a morpho-syntactically annotated corpus, the extraction of the FC with clitics has been carried out semi-automatically by seeking the forms through a search for verb endings. Moreover, the analytic forms were found thanks to the diacritic accentuation available in the electronic edition of the texts.

The high token frequency of the FC made it necessary to restrict ourselves to select some texts from the CICA (2006) for this study.⁸ We have selected only those texts that were written in the same period as the preserved manuscript. We have selected texts from the second half of each century in order to analyse the linguistic change from one period to another. Diatopic variation has also been taken into account: we have established a balanced subcorpus for each group of Catalan dialects with a similar number of tokens (eastern and western Catalan). Despite having paid attention to the extraction of a similar number of tokens for each dialect, it was not easy to obtain these results for all the periods considered (see Table 2).⁹ Finally, a reasonable range of textual typologies has also been considered, such as religious, legal, narrative, historiographic texts and letters, although

attempting to preserve the representativeness of each discursive tradition in each period was quite challenging (Kabatek 2005, 2013).

Table 2. FC tokens retrieved for each period in each dialectal group.

Dialect	11th–12th	13th	14th	15th	16th
Eastern Catalan	-	732	925	213	360
Western Catalan	-	991	333	953	357
No dialectal adscription	218	1186	28	-	-
Total	218	2909	1286	1166	717

Those examples of the SFC and AFC with adverbial clitic pronouns (e.g., *en* < INDE and *hi* < IBI) have been analysed separately. This decision made it easier to compare Catalan and other Ibero-Romance languages that barely conserve these pronouns (e.g., Primerano 2021 for Navarro-Aragonese). Moreover, it also allowed a comparison between the behaviour of personal clitic pronouns and that of adverbial clitic pronouns, which has proved relevant (Section 3.1).

3. The Distribution of AFC and SFC-p in Old Catalan

The analytical and synthetic forms in Old Romance do not always coexist for pragmatic–syntactic reasons (Section 1). In fact, the AFC and SFC with postverbal pronouns appear in the same pragmatic–syntactic environments, whereas the SFC with preverbal pronouns are used in other contexts. Thus, the degree of grammaticalization of the FC can be observed only by means of the variation between the AFC and SFC-p. The use of SFC-p rather than the AFC shows a more grammaticalized construction of these two verbal tenses, since synthetic forms display univerbation (Lehmann 1985, 2020). Previous studies have already attested SFC-p from the 13th c. in Old Catalan (Bouzouita and Sentí 2022; Sentí and Bouzouita 2022; Torres-Latorre 2023). Although the AFC is more frequent, the presence of SFC-p in early periods of the language shows a high degree of grammaticalization. In fact, the aforementioned studies have found SFC-p to be more frequent in Old Catalan than in Old Navarro-Aragonese and in Old Spanish.

The empirical results regarding the distribution of the AFC and SFC-p (with personal pronouns) in Old Catalan are summarised in Table 3. This table considers only two of the three possible constructions of the FC: the AFC and SFC-p. The data contained in it, therefore, originate from the syntactic environments of Groups 2 and 3 explained previously (Section 1.1). The results with adverbial pronouns (*en*, *hi*) will be presented hereafter (Section 3.1).

Table 3. The distribution of the AFC and SFC-p with personal pronouns (11th–16th c.).

Chronology	AFC	SFC-p
Preliterary Catalan (11th–13th c.)	50% (1/2)	50% (1/2)
13th century, 2nd half	61.2% (180/294)	38.8% (114/294)
14th century, 2nd half	60.2% (50/83)	39.8% (33/83)
15th century, 2nd half	58.1% (25/43)	41.9% (18/43)
16th century, 2nd half	80% (12/15)	20% (3/15)
Total	61.3% (268/437)	38.7% (169/437)

At first sight, both forms, the AFC and SFC-p, are present throughout the period. The distribution of the two forms does not have the exact expected evolution, signifying that SFC-p does not appear to gain ground, while the AFC disappears over time. The distribution of the AFC and SFC-p does not change in the following periods. Leaving aside preliterary Catalan, which is deemed unusable since only two tokens have been attested,¹⁰ the differences between the remaining centuries shown in Table 3 are not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 2.4328$, $p = 0.487565$; significant at $p < 0.05$). The AFC always predominates, with

61.3% (268/437) of the total of instances, over SFC-p, with 38.7% (169/437). There appears to be a preference for the AFC in the 16th century (80%, 12/15), but the limited number of both constructions in this century makes the statistical differences between periods non-significant. It would, therefore, appear that the more grammaticalized construction (SFC-p) does not increase in frequency over time, as would be expected in this kind of linguistic change process (Bybee 2003).¹¹

However, some empirical findings may be relevant in order to understand the grammaticalization of the FC. First, it is important to point out that an example of FC with postverbal clitics (SFC-p) is found in the 11th c. (3). The presence of a clitic cluster could have triggered this appearance of the unverbated form, which shows the grammaticalized FC construction at an early date, quite a long time before its appearance in other Ibero-Romance languages. In fact, SFC-p is already a productive construction in the 13th century, considering the 38.8% (114/294) of instances, whereas it is a rare form in Old Castilian, as will be seen later.

(3) et ajudaré ·ls te a tener
 and help.FUT.1SG them.ACC you.DAT to have.INF
 contra tots homines et contra totas fèminas (Documenta feudals 3: 77)
 against all men and against all women
 ‘and I will help you have them against all men and against all women’

Leaving aside preliterary Catalan (see Note 8), the data show a progressive decrease in both the AFC and SFC-p from the 13th c. onwards. Table 4 (below) shows the relative token frequency of the AFC and SFC-p per million words (in relation to the number of words in each period). The AFC represents 215.55 tokens per million words in the 13th century, whereas it represents 36.69 in the 16th century, that is, a seventh of what it was in the 13th century. The decrease in both the AFC and SFC-p, which can already be observed in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries, is owing to an increase in SFC-a and will be studied in the following section (Section 4). The limited number of tokens in the 16th century is not owing to differences in the size of the corpus. The reason why only 15 tokens are found in our corpus can be explained by the relative frequency, which indicates the general tendency to decrease of both the AFC and SFC-p constructions. There appears to be a preference for the AFC in the century in question (80%, 12/15), but the limited quantity of both constructions in this century make the statistical differences between periods non-significant.

Table 4. The distribution of the AFC and SFC-p with personal pronouns (11th–16th c.) as regards relative frequency (%) per million words.

Chronology	AFC	SFC-p
Preliterary Catalan (11th–13th c.)	39.72 (1/25176)	39.72 (1/25176)
13th century, 2nd half	212.55 (180/846841)	134.62 (114/846841)
14th century, 2nd half	146.84 (50/340517)	96.91 (33/340517)
15th century, 2nd half	58.29 (25/428921)	41.97 (18/428921)
16th century, 2nd half	36.69 (12/327032)	9.17 (3/327032)

The comparison of the empirical data from Old Catalan with Old Castilian and Old Navarro-Aragonese also provides some important findings to understand the grammaticalization of the FC in the Iberian Peninsula. Old Catalan differs from the behaviour of Old Castilian and Old Navarro-Aragonese: despite the fact that the AFC is the main form throughout the period, it is not as frequent as the two other varieties, as summarised in Table 5.

Table 5. AFC and SFC-p in Old Catalan, Old Navarro-Aragonese and Old Castilian (13th–14th c.).

Language	Chronology	AFC	SFC-p
Catalan	13th century	61.2% (180/294)	38.8% (114/294)
	14th century	60.2% (50/83)	39.8% (33/83)
	Total	61% (230/377)	39% (147/377)
Navarro-Aragonese ¹²	13th century	89.1% (49/55)	10.9% (6/55)
	14th century	75% (51/68)	25% (17/68)
	Total	81.3% (100/123)	18.7% (23/123)
Castilian ¹³	13th century	99.8% (1827/1830)	0.2% (3/1830)
	14th century	97.3% (359/369)	2.7% (10/369)
	Total	99.4% (2186/2199)	0.6% (13/2199)

In the case of Old Castilian, [Primerano et al. \(2023, Section 4.1\)](#) have discovered that AFC are by far the most frequent in the 13th and the 14th centuries (99.4%) when compared to SFC-p (0.6%); in that of Old Navarro-Aragonese, [Primerano and Bouzouita \(2023\)](#) have found 81.3% of AFC, which is considerably more than the 18.7% obtained for SFC-p in the same two centuries. With regard to Old Catalan, SFC-p represents 38.8% (114/294) and 39.8% (33/83) in the 13th and the 14th centuries, respectively, and it is, therefore, much more frequent. As expected, Old Catalan has the highest degree of grammaticalization of the FC. Furthermore, an increase in SFC-p is perceived in the 14th century in both Old Castilian and Old Navarro-Aragonese, but this is not the case of Old Catalan, in which the variation between the two forms is stable. The 15th century has yet to be studied in these two other languages.

The differences between Catalan on the one hand and Castilian and Navarro-Aragonese on the other can be partially explained by the intervention of certain morphological factors that contribute to the choice of AFC or SFC-p. It has been suggested that certain morphological and even syntactic factors could induce the choice of SFC-p rather than AFC. These factors have been studied principally for Old Castilian ([Bouzouita 2016](#)), but also for Old Navarro-Aragonese ([Primerano and Bouzouita 2023](#)). Since SFC-p is an uncommon construction in both languages, these works sought the causes of the presence of SFC-p and not of the AFC, which is the construction by default. The inductors of SFC-p would also be triggers of the grammaticalization process of the FC. The factors analysed in these works are the verbal tense (if it is a future or conditional), the conjugation class, the presence of a syncope in the verb and the introduction of a non-finite verbal form after the FC.

A more detailed study of these factors is still necessary for Old Catalan ([Torres-Latorre n.d.a](#)). However, some differences between Old Catalan and Old Castilian and Old Navarro-Aragonese can be noted only by observing our preliminary empirical data. First, the presence of a syncope in the FC is much more common in Catalan than in the other two languages. This syncope is the omission of the thematic vowel of the verb and can be found in some verbs of the second conjugation (*volerà* > *volrà* ‘he will want’) and a few verbs of the third conjugation too (*partirà* > *partrà* ‘he will leave’).¹⁴ A verb with a syncope always prefers SFC-p over the AFC ([Bouzouita 2016](#), p. 284; [Primerano and Bouzouita 2023](#)), as (4a) shows. That is for phonetic reasons: mesoclisism cannot be conducted if there is a syncope. A form such as **volr-la à* (‘he will want her’) is not possible when following the phonetic rules of these languages, but the same form without a syncope (*voler-la à* ‘he will want her’) is indeed possible. In our data, every instance of non-preverbal clitics with the FC has the SFC-p form, as expected.

During the Middle Ages, the presence of a syncope was optional in the three Romance languages mentioned. Nevertheless, it was much more frequent in Old Catalan. In fact, in contemporary Catalan the presence of a syncope is mandatory in the verbs of the second conjugation which formerly varied (*voler* ‘to want’ > *voldrà* ‘he will want’, with an epenthetic *d*; *saber* ‘to know’ > *sabrà* ‘he will know’, etc.). Contemporary Spanish has, on the contrary, preferred to maintain the omitted vowel in some of the verbs which had an optional

syncope (*saber* ‘to know’ > *sabrá* ‘he will know’, with a syncope; but *perder* ‘to lose’ > *perderá* ‘he will lose’, without a syncope). The differences in frequency in the presence of a syncope in this group of verbs could explain a slight tendency in favour of SFC-p in Old Catalan with respect to the rarity of this construction in Old Castilian and Old Navarro-Aragonese.

Second, there is one particularity of Catalan’s verbal conjugation that distinguishes Old Catalan from Old Castilian and Old Navarro-Aragonese. In Catalan, in the second conjugation, most verbs take a rhizotonic form (Pérez Saldanya 1998, pp. 40–48), that is, they are verbs whose stressed syllable is in the stem, such as *conèixer* (‘to know’, ‘to meet’) or *perdre* (‘to lose’). Alsina (2022, p. 192) finds that rhizotonic verbs also prefer SFC-p over the AFC, but, although a preference for SFC-p is confirmed in our corpus (4b), some tokens of the AFC are also attested (4c). The inclination towards SFC-p is for phonetic reasons: a rhizotonic verb with mesoclisism is not unpronounceable in Old Catalan, but in a form such as *defendre-nos hien* (4c) the main stress remains far from the word ending, in the syllable *-fen-*, and in Catalan, oxytones and words stressed on the penultimate syllable are far more common (Oliva and Serra 2002). This factor could once more entail a slight preference in Catalan for SFC-p when compared with Old Castilian and Old Navarro-Aragonese. However, it is still necessary to quantitatively explore both factors (Torres-Latorre n.d.a).

Moreover, instances of SFC-p in which none of the factors mentioned above (verbal tense, conjugation, syncope, rhizotonic verbs or non-finite verbal forms after the FC) are attested. The first conjugation (verbs with infinitives finished with *-ar*, i.e., *cantar* ‘to sing’) is characterised by a total preference for the AFC in Old Castilian (Bouzouita 2016) and in Old Navarro-Aragonese (Primerano and Bouzouita 2023), but in Old Catalan there are examples such as (4d), in which a verb of the first conjugation appears with the SFC-p construction. The variation between AFC and SFC-p, therefore, requires an explanation. Nevertheless, with regard to the evolution of the variation in the two constructions, these factors appear constant throughout the period studied. For instance, the case of (4d) is from the 13th century, and it does not contain any of the factors that favoured SFC-p. It is possible that there were no cases of SFC-p without the presence of any of these factors in a previous stage of the language, and SFC-p later spread to other verbs, such as *alegrar* from example (4d). Unfortunately, this can only be hypothesised, since previous stages of the Catalan language have not been preserved.

- (4) a. Nostre Senyor no vol la mort del
 Our Lord NEG want.PRES.3SG the death of-the
 peccador, e **volrà-** **la** lo rey? (Tirant: 268)
 sinner and want.FUT.3SG it.ACC the king
- ‘Our Lord does not want the death of the sinner, and the King will want it?’
- b. e **conexerets** **-ho** (Lletres reials: 564)
 and know.FUT.2PL it.ACC
- ‘And you will know it’
- c. si s crexien de gent, **defender** **-nos**
 if REFL increase.IMP.3PL of people deprive.INF us.ACC
hien la Ciutat (Fets: 48r)
 have.AUX.3PL the City
- ‘If they increased in number, they would deprive us of the City’
- d. **Alegrarà** **·s** lo just (Vides: 104)
 Be happy.FUT.3SG REFL the just
- ‘The just will be happy’

To sum up, the distribution of the AFC and SFC-p with personal pronouns is stable from the 11th c. to the 16th c., that is, the presence of the AFC does not decrease in favour of SFC-p. Nevertheless, another change occurs in the same period: the grammaticalization process of pronominal clitics and, in particular, their fixation in the preverbal position (Section 4). Both the AFC and SFC-p eventually cease to exist when anteposition becomes the only possible position of clitics. Although signs of evolution towards SFC-p have not been observed in the period studied, the data from Old Catalan show a more advanced

stage of the degree of grammaticalization of the FC in the 13th and the 14th c. than occurs in other peninsular languages. Old Catalan frequently exhibits SFC-p and the AFC is used to a lesser extent when compared with Old Navarro-Aragonese and Old Castilian, as has been shown quantitatively. The morphological differences between the languages (syncope, rhizotonic verbs) could partially justify this contrast, but a more detailed study of these factors is still required (Torres-Latorre n.d.a).

3.1. AFC and SFC-p with Adverbial Pronouns

Thus far, the distribution of the FC with non-adverbial pronouns has been studied. Adverbial pronouns in Old Catalan are mainly *en* (<ĪNDE) and *hi* (<ĪBI), but also *hic* (<HĪC) (Ribera 2020). The decision to analyse them separately was made for two reasons: (i) *en*, *hi* and *hic* may have different degrees of pronominalization in Old Catalan and could, therefore, behave differently to personal clitic pronouns; (ii) the grammar of Old Romance languages varies in the case of these pronouns, signifying that it is not possible to compare the languages in this respect with the same reliability as in the case with the remaining pronominal system.

The pronouns *en* and *hi* are preserved in contemporary Catalan, unlike in Spanish, from which they disappeared in the 15th c. (Badia i Margarit 1947, p. 128). In the Middle Ages, their behaviour was more clitic-like in Old Catalan than in the other peninsular Romance varieties. In Old Castilian, they are often considered to be pronominal adverbs rather than adverbial pronouns (Badia i Margarit 1947; Meilán García 1994; Polo Cano 2006; Matute 2016). In Old Navarro-Aragonese, they appear to be more similar to clitics than to adverbs (Matute 2016, p. 221). *Hic* appears to be the least pronominalized form of the three and is not conserved in contemporary Catalan. Unfortunately, no instance of the FC with a non-preverbal pronoun *hic* has been attested. Table 6 provides a summary of the data obtained for the AFC and SFC-p with regard to the pronouns *en* and *hi*.

Table 6. The distribution of the AFC and SFC-p with adverbial pronouns (11th–16th c.).

Chronology	AFC	SFC-p
Preliterary Catalan (11th–13th c.)	0% (0/2)	100% (2/2)
13th century, 2nd half	45.8% (38/83)	54.2% (45/83)
14th century, 2nd half	25% (5/20)	75% (15/20)
15th century, 2nd half	28.6% (2/7)	71.4% (5/7)
16th century, 2nd half	50% (2/4)	50% (2/4)
Total	40.5% (47/116)	59.5% (69/116)

The lower number of tokens contained in Table 6 in contrast with the total number of occurrences with personal pronouns was to be expected, as only two pronominal clitics were studied. The total number of 437 instances of clitics in the AFC or SFC-p with non-adverbial pronouns (see Table 3) now contrasts with the total of 116 that have been attested. The general distribution of the AFC and SFC-p with adverbial pronouns is almost the opposite of the distribution of the two constructions with non-adverbial pronouns. As a reminder, the AFC represents 61.5% (268/436) of tokens, while SFC-p has 38.5% (168/436) as regards personal clitics. With adverbial pronouns, SFC-p is the main form, with 59.5% (69/116) of tokens, and the AFC follows with 40.5% (47/117). The differences between the two groups of pronouns are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 16.4142, p = 0.000051$; significant at $p < 0.05$).

With regard to the evolution of the distribution of the AFC and SFC-p with adverbial pronouns, there appears to be some variation, although it is not quantitatively important. In preliterary Catalan, the only two instances attested are SFC-p. However, a greater presence of the AFC has been found in the 16th c., with 50% (2/4), although the total number of instances is highly reduced and it is not, therefore, possible to draw strongly founded conclusions.¹⁵ The differences between the other periods studied are not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 3.4742, p = 0.324119$; significant at $p < 0.05$), and the AFC does not, therefore,

disappear with adverbial pronouns either. Although there is a preference for SFC-p from the very beginning, its presence does not increase in the period studied. A decrease in the frequency of both constructions is also found with adverbial pronouns, mainly in the 15th and the 16th centuries.

The different status of the pronouns *en* and *hi* may possibly provide an explanation of the difference between the distribution of the AFC and SFC-p. In Old Catalan, adverbial pronouns are less grammaticalized than personal pronouns such as *el* ('him'), *la* ('her') or *li* ('to him, to her'), because the transition from adverbs to pronouns is not yet complete. In fact, the difference between the distribution of the AFC and SFC-p and that of adverbial pronouns has also been observed in Old Navarro-Aragonese (Primerano 2021, p. 418), a language in which adverbial pronouns behave as normal clitic pronouns to an even lesser extent. However, this explanation cannot be completely confirmed without considering the aforementioned morphological and syntactic factors which favour SFC-p rather than AFC (verbal tense, conjugation class, syncope, rhizotonic verbs, non-finite form after the FC). For example, the adverbial pronoun *hi* frequently collocates with the verb *haver* as in *hi haurà* ('there will be') and *haver* has a rhizotonic form with FC (*haure* 'to have'). A review of the factors in relation to this hypothesis is, therefore, also required (Torres-Latorre n.d.a).

In conclusion, the AFC and SFC-p have a stable distribution from the 11th c. to the 16th c. as regards both non-adverbial and adverbial pronouns. There are two differences between Old Catalan, on one hand, and Old Castilian and Old Navarro-Aragonese on the other: (i) the grammaticalization of the FC is more advanced in Old Catalan since SFC-p is found in the above-mentioned syntactic environments in main sentences (Group 2 and Group 3) from the 11th c. onwards, and with an important frequency during the 13th and the 14th c.; (ii) the diverging evolutions of the variation in the distribution of the AFC and SFC-p, which is stable in Catalan rather than in favour of SFC-p. The progressive symmetrical disappearance of AFC and SFC-p is owing to another grammaticalization process, that of pronominal clitics, which is discussed in the following section (Section 4).

4. The Evolution of Clitic Placement towards Anteposition

In the Middle Ages, the position of pronominal clitics with finite verbs was owing to syntactic-pragmatic restrictions (for Old Catalan, see Fischer 2002; Batllori et al. 2005; Sentí and Bouzouita 2022). It followed the distribution into three groups of syntactic-pragmatic environments summarised in Table 1 (Section 1.1). However, in present-day Catalan, clitic placement follows only morphological restrictions: (i) finite verbs (apart from the imperative) can be used only with preverbal clitics, (ii) the imperative, the infinitive and the gerund can be used only with postverbal clitics, and (iii) verbal periphrases can be used with either preverbal or postverbal clitics (Bonet 2002, p. 937; GIEC 2016, Section 8, pp. 200–1).

In the case of finite verbs (with the exception of the imperative), clitic placement has, therefore, gone through a fixation process to the preverbal position. This fixation process has not yet been studied sufficiently. In this section, the results obtained for the FC will be analysed by considering the three possible constructions of these two verbal tenses: SFC-a, the AFC and SFC-p. An evolution towards anteposition is expected from the 11th c. to the 16th c. Because of space limitations, only the results obtained for personal pronouns will now be considered and also because adverbial pronouns do not behave differently in the frequencies of SFC-a (Torres-Latorre 2022). The results will be examined first quantitatively and then qualitatively.

Table 7 shows the total number of frequencies of the three constructions, without making any distinction according to the groups of syntactic-pragmatic environments. All the attested instances of the FC with personal pronouns are included. Since the variation between the AFC and SFC-p has already been reviewed, both options are considered together from this point on.

Table 7. The position of personal pronouns with the FC (11th–16th c.).

Chronology	SFC-a	AFC or SFC-p
Preliterary Catalan (11th–13th c.)	98.7% (151/153)	1.3% (2/153)
13th century, 2nd half	86.3% (1854/2148)	13.7% (294/2148)
14th century, 2nd half	91.6% (904/987)	8.4% (83/987)
15th century, 2nd half	95.4% (889/932)	4.6% (43/932)
16th century, 2nd half	97.6% (616/631)	2.4% (15/631)
Total	91% (4414/4851)	9% (437/4851)

At first glance, it will be noted that SFC-a is by far the most frequent throughout the periods studied. Nevertheless, a more detailed analysis shows differences between centuries (statistically significant: $\chi^2 = 126.8946$, $p < 0.00001$; significant at $p < 0.05$). Surprisingly, the period in which the frequency of SFC-a is greatest is that of preliterary Catalan, with 98.7% (151/153) of the instances in our corpus, but methodological issues oblige us not to consider these results (see Note 10). The remaining centuries do show the expected development towards anteposition: the smallest percentage of SFC-a is in the 13th c. (86.3%, 1854/2148), followed by the 14th c. (91.6%, 904/987), the 15th c. (95.4%, 889/932) and finally, the 16th c., in which this percentage reaches 97.6% (616/631) of tokens. The differences among the four centuries are still statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 110.4827$, $p < 0.00001$; significant at $p < 0.05$).

The data from all syntactic-pragmatic environments could be conditioned by a larger or smaller presence of a particular environment in each century, i.e., subordinate clauses, in which the required pronouns are preverbal. The results in Table 7 must, therefore, be viewed with caution. From this point on, attention will consequently be focused on: (i) the main sentence environments in Group 2, i.e., the group in which no token should take the SFC-a form, according to the grammar of the 13th–14th centuries (§Section 4.1), and (ii) the environments in Group 3, which are characterised by the possibility of variation between anteposition and postposition governed by pragmatics (information structure) (Section 4.2).

4.1. The Evolution of Clitic Placement in Group 2

Group 2 is distinguished by the fact that it permits only postverbal clitics (Section 1.1). The expected position of clitics in this environment with the FC would be either the AFC or SFC-p. However, the results from our corpus indicate a different distribution, since SFC-a is possible in some environments from the 13th c. Table 8 provides a quantitative summary of the evolution of the environments in Group 2. The table does not contain preliterary Catalan because no token from this group has been found for this period.

Table 8 proves that anteposition is gaining ground both quantitatively and qualitatively from the 13th century to the 16th century. In Group 2, 0% of this construction was to be expected according to the bibliography for Old Castilian and Old Romance in general (Eberenz 1991; Castillo Lluch 1996, 2002; Bouzouita 2008a, 2008b, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2016). In spite of this, examples of preverbal clitics in this group have been attested even in the 13th century. SFC-a is found only after a vocative in the 13th and the 14th centuries (5a); in the 15th century, it appears for the first time with the verb in the first position of the phrase (5b); in the 16th century, SFC-a is also attested in a paratactic clause (5c), with the presence of a contrastive conjunction *mas* or *però* ('but') being the only environment in this group in which SFC-a is never found. Only the context after a vocative, therefore, appears to be sufficiently innovative for the presence of preverbal clitics in the first two centuries, but a clear change can be noted in the 15th, and especially in the 16th, centuries, since other environments in Group 2 have the SFC-a construction.

Table 8. The position of personal pronouns with the FC in Group 2 (13th–16th c.).

Chronology	Environment	SFC-a	AFC or SFC-p
13th century, 2nd half	P1	0% (0/16)	100% (16/16)
	Paratactic	0% (0/0)	0% (0/0)
	Vocative	69.2% (9/13)	30.8% (4/13)
	Contrastive <i>mas, però</i>	0% (0/7)	100% (7/7)
14th century, 2nd half	P1	0% (0/5)	100% (5/5)
	Paratactic	0% (0/2)	100% (2/2)
	Vocative	50% (2/4)	50% (2/4)
	Contrastive <i>mas, però</i>	0% (0/3)	100% (3/3)
15th century, 2nd half	P1	33.3% (2/6)	66.7% (4/6)
	Paratactic	0% (0/0)	0% (0/0)
	Vocative	85.7% (6/7)	14.3% (1/7)
	Contrastive <i>mas, però</i>	0% (0/0)	0% (0/0)
16th century, 2nd half	P1	85.7% (6/7)	14.3% (1/7)
	Paratactic	100% (1/1)	0% (0/1)
	Vocative	100% (1/1)	0% (0/1)
	Contrastive <i>mas, però</i>	0% (0/3)	100% (3/3)
Total		36% (27/75)	64% (48/75)

- (5) a. E tu, diabla, I' **esperaràs** en aquest
 and you.SG devil him.ACC wait.FUT.2SG in this
 loc entrò que El vinga (Vides: 119)
 place until he come.SUBJ.3SG
 'And you, devil, will wait for him in this place until he comes'
- b. M' **esforçaré** al meu poder per serveys
 REFL make an effort.FUT.1SG in.the my power by services
 (Tirant: 1371)
 'I will make the biggest possible effort by services'
- c. Lo acòlith encendrà [...], servirà [...], portarà [...],
 the acolyte light.FUT.3SG serve.FUT.3SG carry.FUT.3SG
 ministrarà se pararà ab camís,
 [...], REFL prepare.FUT.3SG with shirt
 manage.FUT.3SG cordó (Baccallar: 267)
 amit y lace
 amice and lace
 'The acolyte will light [...], will serve [...], will carry [...], will manage [...], will prepare himself with a shirt, an amice and lace'

Of these three instances provided as examples, the first (5a) can be explained for pragmatic reasons: the vocative, *diabla* ('devil'), is preceded by an emphatic subject, *tu* ('you'), signifying that the anteposition of the clitic could be triggered by emphasis (Torres-Latorre 2023, Section 3.1). This pragmatic cause explains the high frequency of SFC-a after a vocative, since all the tokens in this environment have another element before the vocative which could be subject to emphasis. Furthermore, (5a) originates from the *Vides de sants rosselloneses*, a text which has been observed to be highly innovative as regards clitic placement (Torres-Latorre 2023). The reason for this innovation appears to be its diatopic adscription: *Vides de sants rosselloneses* belongs to septentrional Catalan, the Catalan dialect closer to Occitan, and Old Occitan may be more advanced than Catalan as regards both the grammaticalization process of the FC and the fixation of clitic placement in the preverbal position. This hypothesis should be verified in future research. Whatever the case may be, the instances of SFC-a in the first position (5b) and in a paratactic clause (5c) can be understood only as innovative examples of anteposition.

4.2. The Evolution of Clitic Placement in Group 3

The results regarding all environments presented in Table 7 include subordinate clauses and Group 1, that is, the syntactic contexts in which only SFC-a is possible. The difference between preverbal clitics and others, therefore, can be better observed if only the data from Group 3 are taken into account, since this group is made up of those environments in which variation in position is possible (Section 1.1). The quantitative review of Group 3

in Table 9 is more reliable as regards the expansion of anteposition than the general results seen in Table 7.

Table 9. The position of personal pronouns with the FC in Group 3 (11th–16th c.).

Chronology	SFC-a	AFC or SFC-p
Preliterary Catalan (11th–13th c.)	95.8% (23/24)	4.2% (1/24)
13th century, 2nd half	41.8% (166/397)	58.2% (231/397)
14th century, 2nd half	74.6% (191/256)	25.4% (65/256)
15th century, 2nd half	84.8% (179/211)	15.2% (32/211)
16th century, 2nd half	96.3% (129/134)	3.7% (5/134)
Total	67.3% (688/1022)	32.7% (334/1022)

However, this reasoning is not yet conclusive, since the variation within Group 3 can sometimes be explained by a more accurate classification in each of the syntactic–pragmatic environments. For instance, emphasis can cause the appearance of a preverbal clitic, as mentioned briefly in Section 1.1. If this is the case, it is necessary to examine the instances of SFC-a one by one in order to determine whether or not they are innovative examples of anteposition. A review of each of the tokens belonging to Group 3 is, therefore, necessary. Only some examples of this group will be commented on in this paper owing to space constraints (see Torres-Latorre n.d.b; cf. Bouzouita and Sentí 2022 and Sentí and Bouzouita 2022 for a tentative study on the effect of pragmatics in these contexts in the 13th and 14th c.), and the focus will be solely on the quantitative view of this phenomenon. Table 9, therefore, provides a summary of the evolution of clitic placement in this group of variation.

The results obtained for the group of variation obey the same development as the total of tokens included in the other groups (Table 7). Preliterary Catalan again differs from the other periods, with SFC-a being attested with by far the most frequency (95.8%, 23/24). The evolution from the 13th c. to the 16th c. shows a noticeable increase in SFC-a: it starts with 41.8% (166/397) in the 13th c. and concludes with 96.3% (129/134) in the 16th c. Indeed, the differences between the four centuries are statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 201.6922, p < 0.00001$; significant at $p < 0.05$). Group 3 clearly shows the evolution towards anteposition and the fixation of clitics in this position, regardless of the syntactic context or pragmatic motivations.

It is first necessary to explore the case of preliterary Catalan. This period has the highest level of SFC-a in both the group of variation (see Table 9) and all the possible environments (see Table 7). However, all the preverbal clitics are to be expected, since emphasis can explain anteposition in all the instances, as can be seen in the following example (6), in which the adverb of manner *sí* (‘yes’, ‘this way’) triggers anteposition, as usually occurs with adverbs of manner, not only in Old Spanish (Granberg 1988, pp. 155–94), but also in Old Catalan (Bouzouita and Sentí 2022).

(6) Sicut superius és escrit sí
as above write.PASS.3SG this way
t' ó tenrei (Jurament feudal 3: 71)
you.DAT it.ACC have.FUT.1SG
‘As above it is mentioned, I will have it this way to you’

The gradual increase in SFC-a in the remaining centuries is linked to an increase in the possible environments in which SFC-a can be found. This was the case of Group 2 (Section 4.1) and also of Group 3. Merely as an illustration of this increase, four examples of innovative cases of anteposition are discussed, three after an adverbial phrase (7a–c) and the last after a subordinate clause or an absolute clause (7d). According to the literature on Old Castilian (Granberg 1988, pp. 155–94), adverbs which express a cause and temporal adverbs of chronological progression are followed by postverbal clitics. Nevertheless, from the 14th c. onwards, cases of anteposition are attested in Old Catalan after a causal adverbial phrase (7a) and anteposition is already found after a temporal adverb of chronological progression

in the 13th c. (7b), although it appears in only one text, which is highly innovative for dialectal reasons, as mentioned previously (Torres-Latorre 2023). Examples of preverbal clitics after these temporal adverbs are once again found in the 15th c. (7c). With regard to innovation after subordinate and absolute clauses, the first examples of anteposition are found after an absolute clause in Old Catalan in the 15th c. (7d).

- (7) a. et Déus, per la sua bonea, vos ó
 and God because-of his goodness you.DAT it.ACC
aministrarà
 provide.FUT.3SG
 'and God, because of his goodness, will provide it to you'
 (Muntaner, *Crònica*: 14v)
- b. Eu derocaré aquest temple, e après lo
 I demolish.FUT.1SG this temple and then it.ACC
redificaré
 rebuild.FUT.1SG
 'I will demolish this temple, and then I will rebuild it'
 (*Vides*: 373)
- c. Après vos farà tres figues e les
 Then you.DAT do.FUT.3SG three figs and them.ACC
 vos posarà en la barba. Après vos
 you.DAT put.FUT.3SG in the beard. Then you.DAT
dirà
 say.FUT.3SG
 'Then he will flip you off in your face. Then he will say'
 (*Tirant*: 848)
- d. E fet lo dit anniversari, ne
 And hold.PART the mentioned anniversary PART
romandrà
 remain.FUT.3SG a la Seu lo X.e.
 in the Cathedral the 10th
 'And held the mentioned anniversary, it will remain in the Cathedral the 10th'
 (*Solemnitats*: 357)

These four examples illustrate the expansion of SFC-a to environments in which the AFC or SFC-p were previously the usual constructions. A thorough analysis of all of the occurrences of the environments in Group 3 is still necessary in order to review the role played by emphasis in the selection of a preverbal or postverbal clitic position (Torres-Latorre n.d.b). Nevertheless, the data shown in this section confirm the expected evolution towards anteposition in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

5. Conclusions

The study of the grammaticalization of the FC in Old Catalan contributes to understanding the formation of the FC in Ibero-Romance languages. Unlike Old Spanish, in which the SFC with postverbal clitics are rare, the empirical findings in our Catalan corpus attest SFC-p from an early time in the 11th c. and an important token frequency in the 13th and 14th c. (38–39% of the tokens in those syntactic environments that prevent preverbal clitics). The corpus-based data presented in this paper show a more advanced stage of the degree of grammaticalization of the FC in the 13th and the 14th c. in Old Catalan than in other peninsular languages. SFC-p appears frequently in Old Catalan and less use is made of the AFC when compared with Old Navarro-Aragonese and Old Castilian, as has been shown quantitatively. Although some morphological differences among the languages (syncope, rhizotonic verbs) have been suggested in order to partially justify this contrast, the high frequency of the unverbated FC in Old Catalan, even in examples without those morphological features, should be highlighted, since it indicates a more grammaticalized FC. As suggested by Bouzouita (2016), diatopic variation in Old Ibero-Romance could explain the differences in the distribution of the AFC and SFC-p in these languages. The results obtained for Old Catalan appear to confirm a language contact phenomenon in which Catalan (and probably Occitan) spread the more grammaticalized FC (i.e., SFC-p) to Navarro-Aragonese and Castilian (see Primerano et al. 2023).

However, our corpus is unable to confirm the expected increase in frequency of the more grammaticalized construction, i.e., SFC-p in Old Catalan. In fact, the distribution of the AFC and SFC-p with personal pronouns is stable from the 13th c. to the 16th c. This could be accounted for by another ongoing linguistic change process in

diachrony that has been addressed in this paper: clitic positioning. In the 13th–14th centuries, syntactic–pragmatic restrictions governed clitic positioning, and clitics were able to occupy various positions in Old Catalan, unlike in modern and contemporary Catalan (Senti and Bouzouita 2022). However, this syntagmatic variability disappears in the 16th c., and clitics occupy a fixed slot, mainly a preverbal position, according to the morphological features. This process, which Lehmann (1985) terms as fixation, is part of the grammaticalization of clitic pronouns. This paper outlines the general evolution, although this process should be addressed in more detail in order to, for example, understand the loss of pragmatic conditioning (Torres-Latorre n.d.b). Our empirical corpus data make it possible to draw several conclusions. The first innovative examples with preverbal clitics are attested in the 13th and 14th centuries (preverbal clitics following a vocative), which show the beginning of a change; more examples of preverbal clitics in main sentences (Group 2) are found in the 15th c. (preverbal clitics in the first position of a sentence). It appears that the fixation is almost accomplished in the 16th c., despite some examples of the AFC or SFC-p. This process explains why the SFC-p does not increase in frequency in the Middle Ages. In fact, both the AFC and SFC-p decrease in frequency from the 13th c. onwards in favour of preverbal clitics (SFC-a). The grammaticalization and coalescence of the FC become mixed with another simultaneous grammaticalization process in Old Catalan: that of clitics and the fixation of clitic placement.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.T.-L. and A.S.; methodology, A.T.-L. and A.S.; validation, A.T.-L. and A.S.; formal analysis, A.T.-L.; investigation, A.T.-L. and A.S.; resources, A.T.-L. and A.S.; data curation, A.T.-L. and A.S.; writing—original draft preparation, A.T.-L. and A.S.; writing—review and editing, A.T.-L. and A.S.; visualization, A.T.-L.; supervision, A.S.; project administration, A.T.-L. and A.S.; funding acquisition, A.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the European Union, Next Generation EU with a Grant for the Requalification of the Spanish University System (Ministry of Universities of the Government of Spain) (Ref: UV-EXPSOLP2U-1801406) and by the Universitat de València (“Ajudes per a accions especials d’investigació 2022”, Ref. UV-INV_AE-2653948).

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available in the corpus (CICA 2006) and in some other Old Catalan published texts. The analyzed data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

Notes

- ¹ This work has been supported by the research group Vacàlic+ (Universitat de València, Ref. GIUV2013–137).
- ² We shall refer to the “infinitive”, but please note that this element of the Romance construction of the FC does not always coincide with the full form of the infinitive, although diachronically speaking it originates from this verb form. We shall similarly refer to the “auxiliary”, despite the fact that it is no longer a proper auxiliary. See Alsina (2022) for an analysis of the AFC as a compound word consisting of an infinitive, a clitic cluster, and a bound auxiliary.
- ³ In this paper, the term *univerbation* is used as suggested by Lehmann (2020, p. 205), i.e., “the syntagmatic condensation of a sequence of words recurrent in discourse into one word”. It is, moreover, considered to be a gradual process that can have weaker and stronger phases.
- ⁴ There is no agreement about the linguistic status of the AFC. Some authors consider the AFC a periphrasis (Company 2006; Batllori 2015; Octavio de Toledo 2015), but others consider this construction a compound word (Alsina 2022). See Octavio de Toledo (2015, Section 1) and Primerano (2019, Section 3.2.1) for a comprehensive state of the art.
- ⁵ All verb tenses generally require proclisis. However, verbal periphrases admit both proclisis to the finite verb and enclisis to the non-finite one. When the verb appears in the imperative, infinitive or gerund, only enclisis is possible.
- ⁶ There are different approaches to informative structure and different associated terminology (cf. Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2021). In this paper, we consider *focus* as the information that is highlighted in a given sentence (see Bouzouita and Sitaridou 2023, Section 2).

For sake of terminological clarity, it should be borne in mind that *focus* is not (always) linked to new information, even though it is quite common.

- 7 This period includes preliterary Catalan (from 11th c. to 1250), the first texts written completely in Catalan (from the 13th c.), medieval Catalan (until 15th c.) and the early modern period (16th c.). The period from the 11th c. to the 16th c. covered is considered to be relatively homogeneous and bounded to the standard Catalan disseminated by the royal *scripta* in the Crown of Aragon.
- 8 The selected texts are the following: for preliterary Catalan (1000–1250): all texts available at [CICA \(2006\)](#) were examined because the extension of texts in this period is, unfortunately, limited; for the 13th c.: *Vides de sants rosselloneses*, *Costums de Tortosa*, *Clams i crims a la València medieval* (1), *Llibre de Cort de Justícia de Cocentaina* (1), *Llibre de Cort de Justícia de Cocentaina* (2), *Crònica de Bernat Desclot* and *Llibre dels Fets*; for the 14th c.: *Regiment de preservació de la pestilència*, *Crònica de Ramon Muntaner*, *Ordinacions con los reys e reynas d’Aragó*, *Epistolari de la València medieval* (I-3 and I-4), *Un llibre reial mallorquí del segle XIV*, *Procés criminal contra Antònia Marquès*, *Manual de consells*, *El procés de Sueca*; for the 15th c.: *Faula de Neptuno i Diana*, *Rahonament fingit entre Francesch Alegre i Sperança*, *Somni de Francesc Alegre*, *Història de les amors de París e Viana*, *Tragèdia de Lançolot*, *Llibre de les solemnitats de Barcelona* (2 and 3), *Lletres reials a la ciutat de Girona* (II-5 and II-6), *Tirant lo Blanch*, *Manual de consells de Gandia a la fi del segle XV* (1); for the 16th c.: *Biografia de Català de Valeriola*, *Constitucions del convent de Sant Josep*, *Diari de Frederic Despalau*, *Edicte del virrei Lluís Vich i Manrique*, *El Libre de Antiquitats de la Seu de València* (2), *El sínode del bisbe Baccallar*, *Història general del Regne de Mallorca*, *Instrucció y doctrina que ensenye lo que deu considerar y contemplar lo christià*, *Les memòries del cavaller valencià Gaspar Antist*, *Libre del Mostassaf de Mallorca* (14), *Llibre de les Solemnitats de Barcelona* (6), *Los col-loquis de la insigne ciutat de Tortosa*, *Memòries de Jeroni de Saconomina*, *Memòries de Perot de Vilanova*, *Relació de l’entrada i estança a València del rei don Felip II*, *Relació del furt del Santíssim Sacrament a Alcoi*, *Suplicació sobre la cisterna de l’estudi de gramàtica de Randa*. Two texts not included in the [CICA \(2006\)](#) have also been incorporated into our corpus: *Llibre de contemplació en Déu* (by Ramon Llull; 13th c.) and the Gospels of Matthew and John (from the Catalan Bible known as the *Bíblia del segle XIV*, 14th c.; see [Bouzouita and Sentí 2022](#)). Some texts have not been studied in their entirety in order to attain an equilibrium between centuries.
- 9 A large quantity of the available texts originate from eastern Catalan in the 14th c., whereas most of them belong to western Catalan in the 15th c., as can be seen in [Table 2](#). This is a well-known difficulty in the study of the history of Catalan.
- 10 Only two tokens are found in preliterary Catalan owing to certain methodological issues. On the one hand, the FC are only two verbal tenses of the entire verbal conjugation of Catalan. Moreover, they are not the most frequent in written texts of the typologies included in our corpus, in which the majority are the present and past tenses. In addition, only the FC with clitic pronouns are studied. According to our empirical findings, SFC-a is the most common construction among the three possible positions of clitics, since it is the only possible construction in subordinate clauses and in Group 1. The AFC and SFC-p, therefore, continue to be limited constructions in quantitative terms. Furthermore, specific reasons can explain the lack of data in certain centuries. As mentioned in the description of the corpus ([Section 2](#)), all the texts from [CICA \(2006\)](#) for this period were analysed because of their limited extension. Moreover, the earliest documents usually combine the use of Catalan with the use of Latin, signifying that instances of Catalan FC are scarce.
- 11 We are aware, as one of the reviewers points out, that the stop of the rise in frequency of a grammaticalization construction does not necessarily imply that the construction slows down within the grammaticalization process, and it does definitely not mean that it enters a degrammaticalization process ([Bybee 2011](#), p. 77). Although we do not state that the grammaticalization of FC stops, we deem important the standstill of the relative frequencies of SFC-p and AFC in relation with one another, since not only the more grammaticalized expression does not rise in frequency, but also the less grammaticalized does not seem to disappear if only these two constructions are taken into account. Moreover, the quantitative evolution of SFC-p and AFC in Old Catalan diverges from the evolution of these two forms in other Ibero-Romance languages (see [Primerano et al. 2022](#)).
- 12 The data regarding Navarro-Aragonese are taken from [Primerano and Bouzouita \(2023\)](#).
- 13 The data regarding Old Castilian are taken from [Primerano et al. \(2023\)](#).
- 14 See [Moreno Bernal \(2004\)](#) for a morphological study on Spanish future tense focused on the realization of synopes.
- 15 Interestingly, the preference for the AFC with non-adverbial pronouns in this century was more marked than in the total of instances, with 80% of the occurrences in the century (see [Table 3](#)).

References

- Alsina, Àlex. 2022. The morphological and syntactic status of the analytic and synthetic future in medieval Catalan. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 21: 187–208. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Álvarez Blanco, Rosario, Xosé Luís Regueira Fernández, and Xosé Henrique Monteagudo Romero. 1986. *Gramática galega*. Vigo: Galaxia.
- Badia i Margarit, Antoni Maria. 1947. *Los complementos pronominalo-adverbiales derivados de “ibi” e “inde” en la Península Ibérica*. Madrid: CSIC, *Revista de Filología Española*.
- Badia i Margarit, Antoni Maria. 1984. *Gramàtica històrica catalana*. València: Tres i Quatre.
- Batllori, Montserrat. 2015. Análisis comparativo de las construcciones de dislocación a la derecha y su incidencia en el orden de palabras del español, catalán y portugués medievales. In *El orden de palabras en la historia del español y otras lenguas iberorromances*. Edited by Mónica Castillo Lluch and Marta López Izquierdo. Madrid: Visor, pp. 83–110.

- Batllori, Montserrat, and M. Lluïsa Hernanz. 2015. Weak Focus and Polarity: Asymmetries between Spanish and Catalan. In *Syntax over Time. Lexical, Morphological and Information-Structural Interactions*. Edited by Theresa Biberauer and George Walkden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 280–98.
- Batllori, Montserrat, Narcís Iglésias, and Ana Maria Martins. 2005. Sintaxi dels clítics pronominals en el català medieval. *Caplletra* 38: 137–77.
- Bonet, Eulàlia. 2002. Cliticització. In *Gramàtica del català contemporani*. Edited by Joan Solà, Maria-Rosa Lloret, Joan Mascaró and Manuel Pérez Saldanya. Barcelona: Empúries, vol. 1, pp. 933–89.
- Bouzouita, Miriam, and Andreu Sentí. 2022. La gramaticalización del futuro y el condicional en el iberorromance del siglo XIV a partir de traducciones bíblicas paralelas: El caso del castellano y el catalán antiguos. In *Traducción bíblica e historia de las Lenguas Iberorrománicas*. Edited by Andrés Enrique-Arias. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, pp. 243–73.
- Bouzouita, Miriam, and Ioanna Sitaridou. 2023. Cambios en el orden de palabras y la estructura informativa. In *Lingüística histórica del español/The Routledge Handbook of Spanish Historical Linguistics*. Edited by Steven Dworkin, Gloria Clavería and Álvaro Octavio de Toledo y Huerta. London: Routledge, pp. 221–32, in press.
- Bouzouita, Miriam. 2008a. The Diachronic Development of Clitics in the History of Spanish. Ph.D. dissertation, King's College, London, UK.
- Bouzouita, Miriam. 2008b. At the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface: Clitics in the History of Spanish. In *Language in Flux: Dialogue Coordination, Language Variation, Change and Evolution*. Edited by Robin Cooper and Ruth Kempson. London: College Publications, pp. 221–63.
- Bouzouita, Miriam. 2011. Future Constructions in Medieval Spanish: Mesoclisism Uncovered. In *The Dynamics of Lexical Interfaces*. Edited by Ruth Kempson, Eleni Gregoromichelaki and Chris Howes. Stanford: CSLI Publications, pp. 91–132.
- Bouzouita, Miriam. 2012. Los futuros analíticos y sintéticos en la Fazienda de Ultra Mar. In *Actas del VIII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*. Edited by Enrique Montero Cartelle. Santiago de Compostela: Meubooks, vol. 2, pp. 1631–42.
- Bouzouita, Miriam. 2013. La influencia latinizante en el uso del future en la traducción bíblica del código Escorial I.i.6. In *Actes del 26é Congrès de Lingüística i Filologia Romàniques (València, 6–11 de setembre de 2010)*. Edited by Emili Casanova Herrero and Cesáreo Calvo Rigual. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, pp. 353–64.
- Bouzouita, Miriam. 2016. La posposición pronominal con futuros y condicionales en el código escurialense I.i.6: Un examen de varias hipótesis morfosintácticas. In *Lingüística de Corpus y Lingüística Histórica Iberorrománica*. Edited by Johannes Kabatek. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, pp. 271–301.
- Buridant, Claude. 2019. *Grammaire du français médiéval (XI^e–XIV^e siècles)*. Strasbourg: Société de Linguistique Romane, Éditions de linguistique et philologie.
- Bybee, Joan. 2003. Mechanisms of change in grammaticization: The role of frequency. In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Edited by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 602–23.
- Bybee, Joan. 2011. Usage-based theory and grammaticalization. In *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Edited by Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 69–78.
- Castillo Lluch, Mónica. 1996. La posición del pronombre átono en la prosa hispánica medieval. Ph.D. dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain.
- Castillo Lluch, Mónica. 2002. Distribución de las formas sintéticas y analíticas de futuro y condicional en español medieval. In *Actas del V Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*. Edited by María Teresa Echenique Elizondo and Juan Pedro Sánchez Méndez. Madrid: Gredos, pp. 541–50.
- CICA. 2006. Corpus Informatitzat del Català Antic. Directed by Joan Torruella, Manuel Pérez Saldanya and Josep Martines. Available online: <http://www.cica.cat> (accessed on 15 January 2023).
- Claveria, Gloria, and Joan Torruella. 2012. El Corpus informatizado del catalán antiguo (CICA) y su herramienta de explotación (Estación de análisis documentales, EAD). In *Nuevas Perspectivas Para la edición y el Estudio de Documentos Hispánicos Antiguos*. Edited by María Jesús Torrens Álvarez and Pedro Sánchez-Prieto Borja. Berna: Peter Lang, pp. 405–25.
- Coleman, Robert. 1971. The Origin and Development of Latin Habeo+Infinitive. *The Classical Quarterly* 21: 215–32. [CrossRef]
- Company, Concepción. 1985. Los futuros en el español medieval, sus orígenes y su evolución. *Nueva revista de filología hispánica* 34: 48–107. [CrossRef]
- Company, Concepción. 2006. Tiempos de formación romance II: Los futuros y condicionales. In *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española*. Edited by Concepción Company. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica/Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, vol. 1, pp. 347–418.
- Company, Concepción. 2012. Historical morphosyntax and grammaticalization. In *The Handbook of Hispanic Linguistics*. Edited by José Ignacio Hualde, Erin O'Rourke and Antxon Olarrea. Londres/New York: Blackwell, pp. 673–93.
- Company, Concepción, and Alfonso Medina. 1999. Sintaxis motivada pragmáticamente: Futuros analíticos y futuros sintéticos en el español medieval. *Revista de Filología Española* 79: 65–100. [CrossRef]
- Cunha, Celso, and Luís F. Lindley Cintra. 1992. *Gramática do Português Contemporâneo*. Lisboa: Edições João Sá da Costa.
- de Andrés Díaz, Ramón. 2013. *Gramática comparada de las lenguas ibéricas*. Gijón: Trea.
- Eberenz, Rolf. 1991. Futuro analítico y futuro sintético en tres obras con rasgos coloquiales: El 'Corbacho', 'La Celestina' y 'La Lozana Andaluza'. In *Homenaje a Hans Flasche: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag 25. November 1991*. Edited by Rafael Lapesa Melgar. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp. 499–508.

- Elvira, Javier. 2015. ¿V2 en español antiguo? In *El orden de palabras en la historia del español y otras lenguas iberorromances*. Edited by Mónica Castillo Lluch and Marta López Izquierdo. Madrid: Visor, pp. 27–47.
- Fischer, Susann. 2002. *The Catalan Clitic System. A Diachronic Perspective on Its Syntax and Phonology*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.
- Fischer, Susann. 2005. Construcciones con avance estilístico en el catalán antiguo. *Caplletra* 38: 119–35.
- Fleishman, Susanne. 1982. *The Future in Thought and Language. Diachronic Evidence from Romance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GIEC Institut d'Estudis Catalans (IEC). 2016. *Gramàtica de la Llengua Catalana*. Barcelona: IEC.
- Granberg, Robert Arthur. 1988. Object Pronoun Position in Medieval and Early Modern Spanish. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA.
- Granberg, Robert Arthur. 1999. Clitic Position in Thirteenth-Century Spanish: Sentences with Preverbal Subjects. *La Corónica* 27: 89–113.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jensen, Frede. 1994. *Syntaxe de l'ancien occitan*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kabatek, Johannes. 2005. Tradiciones discursivas y cambio lingüístico. *Lexis: Revista de lingüística y literatura* 29: 151–77. [CrossRef]
- Kabatek, Johannes. 2013. ¿Es posible una lingüística histórica basada en un corpus representativo? *Iberoromania: Revista dedicada a las lenguas y literaturas iberorrománicas de Europa y América* 77: 8–28. [CrossRef]
- Lehmann, Christian. 1985. Grammaticalization: Synchronic variation and diachronic change. *Lingua e Stile* 20: 303–18.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*, 2nd ed. Edition of *Thoughts on Grammaticalization: A Programmatic Sketch*, 1982. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2020. Univerbation. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 41: 205–52. [CrossRef]
- Leonetti, Manuel, and M. Victoria Escandell-Vidal. 2021. *La estructura informativa*. Madrid: Visor.
- Martines, Josep, and Manuel Pérez Saldanya. 2009. Per a una gramàtica del Català Antic: Objectius, metodologia i un tast. In *Per a una gramàtica del català antic*. Edited by Manuel Pérez Saldanya and Josep Martines. Valencia: Institut Interuniversitari de Filologia Valenciana, pp. 7–39.
- Martins, Ana Maria. 1994. Clíticos na história do português. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Mathieu, Eric. 2006. Stylistic fronting in Old French. *Probus* 18: 219–66. [CrossRef]
- Matute, Cristina. 2016. Entre pronombres y adverbios: Mecanismo de cambio en la historia dialectal peninsular de *hi/ý < ibi*. *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 96: 201–37.
- Meilán García, Antonio José. 1994. Funcionamiento y valores del pronombre *ende* en el castellano antiguo. *Revista de Filología de la Universidad de La Laguna* 13: 245–62.
- Moll, Francesc de B. 2006. *Gramàtica històrica catalana*. Valencia: Publicacions de la Universitat de València. First published 1952.
- Moreno Bernal, Jesús. 2004. La morfología de los futuros románicos. Las formas con metátesis. *Revista de filología románica* 21: 121–69.
- Octavio de Toledo, Álvaro. 2015. Futuros que se miran el ombligo: Mesoclisys y anteposición de formas no personales en la historia del español. In *El orden de palabras en la historia del español y otras lenguas iberorromances*. Edited by Mónica Castillo Lluch and Marta López Izquierdo. Madrid: Visor, pp. 141–234.
- Oliva, Salvador, and Pep Serra. 2002. Accent. In *Gramàtica del català Contemporani*. Edited by Joan Solà, Maria-Rosa Lloret, Joan Mascaró and Manuel Pérez Saldanya. Barcelona: Empúries, vol. 1, pp. 345–91.
- Paden, William Doremus. 1998. *An introduction to Old Occitan*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Pérez Saldanya, Manuel. 1998. *Del llatí al català. Morfosintaxi verbal històrica*. Valencia: Publicacions de la Universitat de València.
- Polo Cano, Nuria. 2006. Breve aproximación a los adverbios pronominales “y” y “ende” en documentos notariales de la Vizcaya tardomedieval. *Oihenart* 21: 377–93.
- Primerano, Antoine. 2019. La gramaticalización de los futuros y condicionales en el navarroaragonés de los siglos XIII y XIV: Un análisis morfosintáctico-pragmático. Master dissertation, University of Ghent, Ghent, Belgium.
- Primerano, Antoine. 2021. Los derivados de *ibi* e *inde* en navarroaragonés antiguo: Una aproximación a su sintaxis. In *Quand le syntagme nominal prend ses marques: Du prédicat à l'argument*. Edited by Peter Lauwers, Katia Paykin, Mihaela Iliaoaia, Machteld Meulleman and Pascale Hadermann. Reims: Épure, pp. 405–25.
- Primerano, Antoine, and Miriam Bouzouita. 2023. La gramaticalización de los futuros y condicionales en el navarroaragonés de los siglos XIII y XV: Una comparación con el castellano medieval. *Revue Romane*, in press.
- Primerano, Antoine, Aina Torres-Latorre, Andreu Sentí, and Miriam Bouzouita. 2022. Morfosintaxis y pragmática del futuro y condicional de las lenguas iberorrománicas. Paper presented at XXX Congreso internacional de lingüística y filología románicas, La Laguna, Spain, July 6.
- Primerano, Antoine, Aina Torres-Latorre, Andreu Sentí, and Miriam Bouzouita. 2023. La gramaticalización del futuro y el condicional en iberorromance antiguo: Castellano y catalán en contacto. *Revista de historia de la lengua española*, in press.
- Ribera, Josep Enric. 2020. *La sintaxi dels pronoms clítics no personals en català antic*. Alacant: Universitat d'Alacant/Departament de Filologia Catalana.
- Saralegui, Carmen. 1985. Sobre la morfología de algunos futuros y condicionales de las hablas hispánicas. *Homenaje a Álvaro Galmés de Fuentes* 2: 203–12.
- Sentí, Andreu, and Miriam Bouzouita. 2022. The Syntax of Old Catalan Clitics: Llibre dels Fets. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 21: 47–77. [CrossRef]

- Torres-Latorre, Aina. 2022. La gramaticalització del futur i el condicional en català antic (segles XIII-XV): Un estudi de corpus. Master's dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona/Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.
- Torres-Latorre, Aina. n.d.a. Formes analítiques o formes sintètiques: Factors morfològics que condicionen la dualitat formal del futur i el condicional en català antic, in preparation.
- Torres-Latorre, Aina. n.d.b. Productivitat i pragmàtica en la sintaxi dels clítics pronominals en català antic. *Anuari de Filologia. Estudis de lingüística*, submitted.
- Torres-Latorre, Aina. 2023. La gramaticalització del futur i el condicional al català del segle XIII: Formes analítiques i formes sintètiques. *Zeitschrift für Katalanistik* 26, in press.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.