Declaration:

I declare that no portion of the work referred to in the dissertation has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Copyright statement:

i) Copyright in text of this dissertation rests with the author. Copies (by any process) either in full, or of extracts, may be made only in accordance with instructions given by the author. Details may be obtained from the appropriate Graduate Office. This page must form part of any such copies made. Further copies (by any process) of copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the permission (in writing) of the author.

ii) The ownership of any intellectual property rights which may be described in this dissertation is vested in the University of Manchester, subject to any prior agreement to the contrary, and may not be made available for use by third parties without the written permission of the University, which will prescribe the terms and conditions of any such agreement.

iii) Further information on the conditions under which disclosures and exploitation may take place is available from the Head of the School of the School of Linguistics, Languages and Culture (or the Vice-President and Dean of the Faculty of Life Sciences for Faculty of Life Sciences' candidates.).

Abstract:

This dissertation examines the evolution of Latin complement patterns as they evolve into Romance (namely Spanish and Italian). It falls into three parts: the first attempts to illustrate Vincent's account of the changes of Latin complement patterns with concrete examples from Old Spanish and Old Italian (Vincent (1988:66-69)); the second deals with the origins of two Romance prepositional infinitives (namely *de* + infinitive and *ad* + infinitive) that have stood out in the survey of the changes of complement patterns and attempts to give a Minimalist interpretation of the grammaticalisation process that has to led to the specialised usages of these two infinitives; and the third narrates the evolution of these two prepositional infinitives from Old Spanish and Old Italian to their modern state. The first part of the dissertation will show that in the evolution from Latin to Romance *quod*-clause has generalised as the default finite complementiser, while *de* + infinitive and *ad* + infinitive developed along with it. The former appears in more contexts while the latter only in contexts that imply futurity. The second part begins with a recapitulation of the interpretation of grammaticalisation within the Minimalist framework (Roberts and Roussou (2003)) and will show that the grammaticalisation that leads to the formation of complementisers (C-elements) is especially interesting for it is not entirely consistent with the Minimalist analysis of grammaticalisation. The grammaticalisation of Latin *de* and *ad* will be shown to be similar yet different from Roberts and Roussou's (2003) case studies of the grammaticalisation of C-elements and is hence interesting. The final part of the dissertation will show that Spanish and Italian undergo different evolutions in their

treatment of *de* + infinitive and *ad* + infinitive and so, in terms of the syntactic development

of prepositional infinitives, Spanish and Italian do not show dialectal affinity.

<u>Introduction:</u>

In this dissertation, I intend to trace and examine the evolution of Latin complement

patterns into Romance with specific reference to Spanish and Italian. Most of all, I shall pay

particular attention to the choice of the 'complementiser' (i.e. the word that introduces the

complement clause) in Latin and Romance.

<u>Latin > early Romance:</u>

Vincent (1988:66-7) provides a concise description the complement patterns in Latin:

a)

Ut/*ne* + subjuntive: this construction may be freely used to express purpose (a so-

called final clause) after any type of verb... however, the same construction is used

with many verbs where the sense is not as much one of purpose but simply one of

futurity, in that the action/state identified in the *ut*/*ne* clause follows that expressed

in the governing verb. Thus, *Ubii Caesarem orant ut sibi parcat* 'the Ubii beg Caesar

to spare them', *sententiam ne diceret recusavit* 'he refused to give an opinion'. This

is one of the most widespread of Latin complement types, and is found regularly

after verbs of ordering (*imperare praedicere*), desiring *(optare*, *studere*, and

sometimes even *velle*, though this more normally takes an infinitive), warning

(*monere*), requesting (*rogare petere*), urging (*persuadere*), fearing (*timere vereri*) and

so on. With verbs of hindering (*impedire*, *prohibere*) another conjunction, *quin* (<

QUI-NE) is often found, but the construction is essentially the same. The generalisation which seems to hold here is that all these verbs express an attitude towards, or an attempt to bring about/forestall, an event which is yet to come. Accordingly, we will call them 'future-oriented'... note finally that many verbs in this class would take a following, so-called prolative, infinitive (see below) if the subjects of both actions were the same: *vereor laudare praesentem* 'I am afraid to praise someone who is present', *precor recipi* 'I beg to be received'.

b) (Prolative) infinitive: in origin the Latin infinitive is a verbal noun able to fill the role of subject or object of another verb. The subject function is seen in an example like *legere difficile est* 'to read is difficult', and in the use of the infinitive with many impersonal verbs *libet scribere* 'it is pleasing to write'. When used as an object, the infinitive soon came to be reanalysed as a dependent verbal form with an implied subject coreferential with that of its governing verb. Thus, *volo vincere* was originally to be understood as 'I want victory' but later as 'I want (I) win'. Other verbs which would permit such a construction are: *malle* 'to prefer', *audere* 'to dare', *conari* 'to try', *incipere* 'to begin', *scire* 'to know how to', *posse* 'to be able to'. Besides these are a small group where the infinitive may serve as a second accusative, e.g. *tondere filias suas docuit* 'he taught his daughters to shave (him)', literally 'he taught them shaving'.

c) Accusative + infinitive: the use of an infinitive and an accusative as the codependents of a single verb exemplified in the last example, must be sharply distinguished from

an instance such as *dicit te errare* 'he says that you are going wrong'. Here the

accusative *te* is semantically subject of *errare*, and bears no direct relation to *dicit*...

the so-called 'accusative and infinitive' construction is normal with verbs whose

complement is logically a proposition, i.e. verbs of saying, thinking, hoping,

perceiving, etc.: *audire* 'to hear', *videre* 'to see', *intellegere* 'to understand', *nuntiare*

'to announce', *simulare* 'to pretend', *promittere* 'to promise' and many more...

d) *Quod* + indicative: just as *ut* is in origin a marker of purpose, but comes to be used in

complement clauses in an attenuated sense, so *quod* 'because' introduces the

complement of a class of so-called verbs of emotion where in a loose sense the

complement can be said to express the cause or origin of the emotion: *dolet mihi*

quod tu nunc stomacharis 'it pains me that (i.e. because) you are angry now', *iuvat*

me quod vigent studia 'I am pleased that your studies are flourishing'. The dividing

line between this class and that of the accusative and infinitive is an uncertain one,

and it is not surprising to find the same verb taking both, with no discernible

difference of meaning: *gaudet miles quod vicerit hostem*'the soldier rejoices that he

has conquered the enemy' and *salvom te advenisse gaudeo* 'I rejoice that you have

come home safe'.   (Vincent (1988:66-7))

On the next page, Vincent (1988:68) mentions several changes in the complementation

system between Latin and Romance that correspond to the ones above:

e)   *Ut*/*ne*/*quin* + subjunctive have been lost altogether;

f) *quod* as the introducer of the finite clause has greatly increased its range and is

followed freely by either indicative or subjunctive;

g) the accusative and infinitive is limited to perception verbs;

h) the prepositions *ad* and *de* have developed specialised uses as introducers of

dependent infinitives;

i) the infinitive, unsupported by an introductory particle, survives but with a greatly

reduce number of verbs.   (Vincent 1988:68)

All this can be summarised as follows: a) > e) (the uses of *ut/ne/quin* (and *quominus*)

with clauses that denote futurity and hindering have been eliminated), b) > g) (the Latin

uses of accusative and infinitive for propositions have been reduced), d) (the usage of

quod +indicative has been expanded), h) (the emergence of *ad* + infinitive and *de* +

infinitive), i) (the uses of the bare infinitive have been reduced).[1] Vincent (1988:68-70)

elaborates on these changes and adds that 1) with regards to *ad* + infinitive, '*ad* occurs

most frequently with those verbs that we earlier characterised as 'future-oriented...' i.e.

ad occurs mainly in contexts where futurity is implied 2) with regards to *de* + infinitive, '...

the role of *de* seems to be more structural, and must be linked to the emergence of

quod/quid as a finite complementiser... in the area of complementation, the French

structures *il a décidé de nous accompagner* 'he decided to accompany us' vs *il a décidé*

que son fils nous accompagnera 'he has decided that his son will accompany us' are

typical and could be replicated from any other Romance language except... Rumanian...

as the role of the Latin complement pattern with *quod* + clause generalised, largely at

the expense of the accusative and infinitive, so a parallel pattern with *de* + infinitive

emerged beside it and incomplementary distribution to it.' i.e. the Romance reflexes of

---

[1] A very similar yet briefer statement is in Bauer (2010:625-7). Given that Bauer's analysis of Romance historical syntax is the most recent output from Romance philologists, it can be assumed that Vincent's analysis of Latin/Romance complementisers in 1988 still holds among the current researchers of Romance historical syntax.

de and *quod* are complementary in distribution, and this complementarity is determined mainly by the presence or absence of co-reference between the subject of the main verb and the logical subject of the infinitive, the former requires a *de* while the latter *quod* 3) '... a further result of the emergence of the new complement structures is to free the subjunctive from its obligatory dependence on the conjunction (*ut/ne/quin*)... and to establish a pattern whereby the subjunctive and the indicative alternate according to the semantic circumstances here as in main clauses. Thus, subjunctives are normal with governing verbs of fearing, doubting, believing, and of emotional attitude (wonder, surprise, sorrow, etc.) and when the controlling predicate is interrogative or negative, but indicatives are required after verbs of saying and in more generally affirmative contexts.' i.e. the mood (indicative or subjunctive) of the verb in the *quod*-clause in Romance is determined by the semantics of the main verb, with the subjunctive being required by non-affirmative main verbs and/or negated ones.[2]

In this dissertation, I propose to illustrate the changes of complement patterns between Latin and Romance with concrete examples, and in doing so I shall pay particular attention to the emergence of *de* + infinitive and *ad* + infinitive and the expansion of *quod*-clauses.

Chapter 1: complement clauses:

According to Vincent (1988:65, 70), complement clauses function as arguments of the main verb, namely those that function as the subject and as the object of the main verb, since these are the two essential arguments of any verb. In this chapter, I shall illustrate the changes in the use of complement patterns as the subject and the object of the main verb.

Section 1.1: complement clauses as the subject of the main verb:

In this section, I shall only discuss one construction, namely impersonal verbs. This

---

[2] Vergnaduzzo (2000:693) calls the type of subjunctive that is determined by the semantics (namely non-affirmative) of the main verb as 'intentional subjunctive' (*congiuntivo intensionale*) and the type of subjunctive that is determined by the syntactic environment (negation etc) of the main verb as 'polar subjunctive' (*congiuntivo polare*). These two terms will be used in this dissertation.

construction involves an object (dative or accusative) and a subject clause, and either there is co-reference between the object of the impersonal verb and the logical subject of the subject infinitive or there is not. In Latin, when there is co-reference, the bare infinitive is always used and when there is not, either an accusative and infintiive or a *quod*-clause is used e.g.

1) Te...   plaud-ere iuu-abit   (Sen Nat 4b,8)

 you.ACC.SG applaud-INF please-IMPERS.3RD.SG.FUT

 'It will please you to applaud.' (you are doing the 'applauding')

2) iuv-it ...   me   ti-bi...

 please.IMPERS.3RD.SG.PERF me.ACC   you-DAT.SG

 tu-as   litter-as   profui-sse   (Cic Fam 5,21,3)

 your-FEM.ACC.PL writing-FEM.ACC.PL benefit-INF.PERF

 'It pleased me that your writings benefited you.' (I am not doing the 'benefiting')

3) Quam iuu-at   quod   non ... inci-di (Plin Ep 8,6,17)

 How please-IMPERS.3RD.SG   QUOD   not fall-1SG.PERF.IND

 'How pleasing it is that I did not fall.' (I am doing the 'falling' but not the 'pleasing')

In early Romance, however, *de/di* + infinitive[3] is often found in competition with the bare infinitive in the presence of co-reference (e.g. 4) and 5), 7) and 8)) while the *quod*-clause[4] has ousted the accusative and infinitive in being the only attested contruction in the absence of co-reference e.g.

<u>Early Spanish:</u>

4) plaz-e   me   y-r   a-la   casa (SDom 103)

 please-3rd.SG.PRES me.ACC   go-ING   to-the   house

 'It pleases me to go to the house.' (I am the one doing the 'going')

---

[3] *de* is the Spanish reflex of Latin *de,* whreas *di* is the Italian one.
[4] The Spanish reflex for Latin *quod* is *que*, whereas the Italian one is *che*.

5) ...cómmo   vos   plaz-e   de   fa-r   (Cid 670)

How   you.ACC.PL   please.3rd.SG.PRES   DE   do-INF

'... how it pleases you to do.' (you are the one doing the 'doing')

6) a   mi   plaz-e   que

to   me.DAT.SG   please-IMPERS.3RD.SG.PRES QUOD

tod-os   se   ayunt-en

all-MASC.PL   REFL.PRO   convene-3RD.PL.PRES.SUBJ

a   lo   cumpl-ir (Lib 9v)

to   it   accomplish-INF

'It pleases me that all are convening to accomplish it.' (I am not the one doing the 'accomplishing')

Early Italian:

7) Poi   piace-vi   save-r...   (Dan Rime 42,9)

Then   please.IMPERS.3SG.PRES-you.DAT.PL   know-INF

'Then it pleases you to know...' (you are the one doing the 'knowing')

8) Piace-mi   di   presta-re...   (Dan Rime 114,7)

Please.IMPERS.3SG.PRES-I.DAT   DI   lend-INF

'It pleases me to lend it...' (I am the one doing the 'lending')

9) ... mi   piac-e   che

  Me.DAT.SG please-IMPERS.3RD.SG   QUOD

ciò   s-ia   apert-o (Dan Vn 38,5)

that   be-3RD.SG.PRES.SUBJ open-MASC.SG

'It pleases me that that is open.' (I am not 'open')

In these examples, the main verb is one of emotion ('it pleases') and so the verb in

the complement *quod*-clause is in the subjunctive, unlike the Latin counterpart (example 3):

quam iuuat quod non... incidi 'how it pleases that I did not fall...') where the verb in the

complement clause (*incidi*) is in the indicative. The evolution from Latin to Romance has

therefore witnessed two key changes: 1) the generalisation of *quod*-clause over the

accusative and infinitive with the result that the mood of the verb in the complement clause

is sensitive to the semantics of the main verb 2) the rise of *de/di* + infinitive in competition

of the original bare infinitive, which does not show that reduction of the use of the bare

infinitive but also shows evidence for alternation between *de* and *quod* according to the

presence or absence of co-reference (compare 5) and 6), and 8) and 9)).

Ut is also attested in Latin in the absence of co-reference, but it is restricted to

certain verbs, namely *verba accidendi* .[5]

Verba accidendi

10) ita   acci-dit   ut   par-em   feroci-ae

     so   happen-IMPERS.3RD.PERF   UT   equal-ACC.SG   fierceness-GEN.SG

     hu-ius ...   consul-em...   habe-rent...   (Liv. 8,5,7)

     this-MASC.GEN.SG   consul-ACC.SG   consider-3RD.PL.IMPERF.SUBJ

     'It so happened that they had a consul who was match to him in terms of boldness.'

These verbs, however, also employ the accusative and infinitive and the *quod*-clause

construction:

11) sed   acci-dit   perincommod-e

     but   happened-IMPERS.3RD.SG.PERF   very.inconvenient-ADV

     quod   e-um   nusquam   uid-isti   (Cic. Att. 1,17,2)

     QUOD   him-ACC.SG   nowhere   see-2SG.PERF.IND

     'But it was very inconvenient that you did not see him anywhere.'

---

[5] i.e. verbs of happening.

12) mi-hi   permir-um   acci-dit

  me-DAT.SG very.wonderful-N.NOM.SG happen-3RD.SG.PERF

  tant-am   temeritat-em   fui-sse...   (Cic fam. 3,10,5)

  so.big-FEM.ACC.SG boldness.FEM.ACC.SG be-INF.PERF

  'A most wonderful thing happend to me, namely that he had so much boldness.'

In 10), the verb in the *ut*-clause is in the subjunctive (*haberent*) whereas in 11) the

verb in the *quod*-clause is in the indicative (*uidisti*) when in both examples there is no

difference in terms of the historical reality of the event i.e. both complemenet clauses

express a historical fact. This has led scholars like Panchón (2003:363) to suggest that the

use of subjunctive in Latin *ut*-clauses is entirely 'mechanical' and is not related to the

semantics of the main verb at all. This is a sharp contrast to early Romance where *verba*

accidendi always take *quod* + indicative:[6]

Early Spanish:

Verba accidendi:

13) acaesç-e   algun-as vez-es

  happen-IMPERS.3RD.SG.PRES   some-FEM.PL time-FEM.PL

  que vend-en   la   sal...   (Lib 58v-59r)

  QUOD sell-3RD.PL.IND the.FEM.SG salt.FEM.SG

  'It happens several times that they are selling the salt.'

Early Italian:

14) avenn-e   che quest-a mirabil-e

  happen.IMPERS.3RD.SG.PRESQUOD this-FEM.SG wonderful-FEM.SG

---

[6] There are examples of Spanish *acaesçer* and Italian *avennire* taking a verb in the subjunctive, but these are examples of 'polar subjunctives' (see note 3) since the two Spanish examples in medieval Spanish that occur in 10v and 127r occur in the protasis of a conditional sentence and have hence acquired a hypothetical meaning, while the Italian examples occur with in contexts where the subjunctive is justified not by the semantics of the impersonal verb but rather its syntactic environment e.g. *Lett fior* 1291 (2), 16 p.603, riga 2 where the verb is in the protasis of a conditional sentence; Dante *Rime* 68,46 where the verb occurs in an indirect question.

donn-a	appar-ve	a	me... (Dan Vn 3,1)
woman-FEM.SG	appear-3RD.SG.PRET.IND	to	me.ACC

'It happens that this wonderful woman appeared to me.'

There is therefore evidence that as the Latin *ut*-clause was ousted by the generalisation of *quod*, the mood of the verb in the complement clause has become tied with the semantics of the impersonal verb (contrast 13) and 14) with 6) and 9), in the former pair the main verb (*acaesçe* 'it happens' and *avenne* 'it happens') is followed by an indicative verb in the complement clause (*venden* and *apparve*) and in the latter pair the main verb (*plaze* 'it pleases' and *piace* 'it pleases') is followed by a subjunctive verb in the complement clause (*ayunten* and *sia*)).

Apart from the rise of *de/di* + infinitive, there are also attestations of *a* + infinitive being used as the subject of impersonal verbs. However, the distribution of the latter is very limited, since it only occurs in early Spanish with *convenir* and only with *accadere* and *rimanere* in Medieval Italian:

Early Spanish:

15) vos convien-e... a ven-ir con armas (Cron 67b6)

you.DAT.PL suit-3RD.SG.IMPERS A come-INF with arms-FEM.PL

'It is convenient for you to come with arms.'

Early Italian:

16) A noi solo questo accade a domanda-re (Alb 103,15)

To we.ACC only this A ask-INF

'We happen to ask for only this.'

17) riman-e a di-re che... (Alb 127,35)

remain-3RD. SG. IMPERS A say-INF that

'It remains to say that...'

However, the two Italian examples are spurious, since it is possible to interpret the *a* + infinitive not as the subject of the impersonal verb but as a 'retroactive' adjective (i.e. the head noun to which the *a* + infinitive is attached is the object of the infinitive)[7] i.e. *a noi questo accade a domandare* 'to ask this befalls us' can be interpreted as 'this befalls us to be asked' and *rimane a dire che...* 'to say that... remains' can be interpreted as 'that... remains to be said'. The Spanish example 15) therefore is the only genuine example of *a* + infinitive being used as the subject of impersonal verbs in early Romance, since, given that *venir* is intransitive, it is impossible to interpret *venir* as a retroactive adjectival infinitive.

Conclusion to 1.1:

With impersonal verbs, when there is co-reference, Romance has introduced two prepositional infinitives in competition with the original Latin bare infinitive (though *de/di* + infinitive is far more widespread than *a* + infinitive), and when there is no co-reference, Romance has generalised *quod*-clause over Latin accusative and infinitive and *ut*-clause with the result that the mood selection of the verb in the complement clause is dependent on the semantics of the impersonal verb and/or its syntactic environment (see note 6).

Section 1.2: complement clauses as the object of the main verb:

There are many constructions in this category, and I have adopted Bolkenstein's (1976:168) categories in dividing my examples thus: 1) verbs that are always 'declarative' 2) verbs that are capable of being 'declarative' and 'imperative' 3) verbs that are always 'imperative'.

Section 1.2.1: verbs that are always 'declarative':

Bolkenstein (1976:168) characterises these verbs by the fact that they are never attested with 'imperative' force and he asserts that they are never attested with *ut*-clause +

---

[7] See Ageno (1978:285) for examples of *a* + infinitive being used as a retroactive adjectival infinitive.

subjunctive. This is indeed true with some verbs, but there are also other verbs in Latin that are attested with *ut*-clause + subjunctive without attaining 'imperative' force, and so I have divided my examples in this section thus: 1) 'declarative' verbs that only take accusative and infinitive and a *quod*-clause (this is in accordance with Bolkenstein's definition of verbs that are never 'imperative' and hence do not use *ut*-clause + subjunctive) 2) verbs that can take *ut*/*ne*-clause[8] + subjunctive without being 'imperative'. It will be shown that Romance has generalised the use of *quod*-clauses over the Latin accusative and infinitive and *ut*/*ne* + subjunctive , and alongside this generalisation *de*/*di* + infinitive has emerged.

Section 1.2.1.1: verbs that only take an accusative and infinitive and a *quod*-clause:

In Latin, there are many such verbs and I have decided to choose one type of such verbs: *verba putandi.*[9]

Verba putandi:

Accusative and infinitive:

18) puta-te   uos...   ad   parentali-a

    think-2ND.PL PRO.2ND.PL.ACC   to   festival-N.ACC.PL

    me-a   inuitat-os   es-se.   (Petron. 78,4)

    my-N.PL   invited-2ND.PL.ACC be-INF

    'You know that you have been invited to my festival.'

19) Qu-i   omn-is   se

    REL.PRO.MASC.SG   all-ACC.PL   REFL.PRO

    am-are   cred-it   (Plaut. Mil 1391)

    love-INF   believe-3RD.SG.PRES

    '... he who believes that everyone loves him (the believer).'

Quod-clause:

20) Putant-i   `   quod   tu...

---

[8] *Ne* is the negative counterpart to *ut*.
[9] i.e. verbs of knowing and thinking.

Thinking.PRES.PART-DAT.SG QUOD   you.NOM.SG

corpus   ess-es   lucid-um   (Aug con 4,16,31)

body-N.NOM be-2ND.SG.IMPERF.SUBJ bright.N.NOM

'...thinking that you were the bright body.'

21) Put-o   enim   quod

Think.1ST.SG.PRES   for   QUOD

non   sit   de   terr-a   (Aug con 11,2,4)

not   be-3RD.SG.PRES.SUBJ from   earth-ABL.SG

'for I think that it is from earth.'

In Romance, while both accusative and infinitive and *quod*-clause have been retained, there are also attestations for the use of bare infinitive and *de/di* + infinitive in early Spanish and Italian where there is co-reference between the subject of the main verb and the logical subject of the infinitive.

Early Spanish:

Bare infinitive:

22) Ni   tanto   me   atrever-ia

Not   so.much   REFL.PRO   dare-COND.1ST.SG

cre-er   merec-er (Que 58a 18)

Believe-INF   deserve-INF

'I would not so much dare to believe that I deserve it.'

de + infinitive:

23) crey-endo   de   los   tom-ar (Cor 138,20)

believe-GERUND   DE   them   take-INF

'believing that he (the believer) should take them.'

Accusative and infinitive:

24) L-os   crey-o   ser   ratonad-os (Laz 36,6)

Them-ACC.PL   believe-1SG.PRES   be-INF   rationed-MASC.ACC.PL

'I believe that they have been rationed.'

Quod-clause:

25) H-e   pens-ado   que

Have-1ST.SG.PRES   think-PAST.PART   QUOD

Nunca   me   ver-ás   jamas. (Oli 530,30)

Never   me.ACC   see-2ND.SG.FUT   never

'I have thought that you will never ever see me.'

26) Piens-o   que   se-an

Think-1SG.PRES   QUOD be-3RD.PL.PRES.SUBJ

bien   informados (Cap 22b,51)

well   informed-MASC.PL

'I think that they are well-informed.'

In the two Spanish examples of *quod*-clause (25) and 26)), one has a verb in the indicative

(*verás*) whille the other has it in the subjunctive (*sean*), and it is not obvious why this

example should be a 'polar' subjunctive. This detail will be discussed below.

Early Italian:

Bare infinitive:

27) Crede-vate-lo   voi   av-ere? (Nov 91,334,8)

Believe-2ND.PL-it   you.PL   have-INF

'Did you believe that you had it?'

19

28) se   io   pensava   di   vol-ere

   if   I   think-1SG.IMPERF   DI   want-INF

   cerc-are   un-a   comun-e   vi-a.... (Dan Vn 13,1)

   look.for-INF   a-FEM.SG   common-FEM.SG   way-FEM.SG

   'if I thought that I was wanting to look for a common way.'

Accusative and infinive:

29) Cred-iamo   l-a   benivolenz-a   un-a

   Believe-1ST.PL.PRES   ART-FEM.SG   kindness-FEM.SG   one-FEM.SG

   Ess-ere   simil-e   al-l-a   onestà (Alb 312,5)

   Be-INF   similar-FEM.SG   to-the-FEM.SGhonesty-FEM.SG

   'We believe that kindness alone is similar to honesty.'

quod-clause:

30) si   pens-ò   che   s'   aproxim-ava

   REFL.PRO   think-3RD.SG.PRET   QUOD   REFL.PRO   approach-3RD.SG.IMPERF

   l-a   festa (Nov 1281/1300 (fior) p. 273, riga 20)

   the-FEM.SG   festival-FEM.SG

   'It was thought that the festival was approaching.'

31) Cred-ette   che   quell-a

   Believe-2ND.PL.PRES   QUOD   that-FEM.SG

   Fos-se   person-a (Nov nov. 046, p. 229. Riga 5)

   Be-3RD.SG.SUBJ.IMPERF   person-NOM.SG.FEM

   'You believe that that was the person.'

As with early Spanish, early Italian verbs of thinking permit a verb in the indicative

(_s'approximava_) as well as in the subjunctive (_fosse_), and there is no immediately obvious

reason (e.g. conditions that cause the use of 'polar' subjunctive) why a subjunctive should

be used. More will be said about this below.

Furthermore, there is an example of 'nominative and infinitive' in early Spanish:

32) L-os   qu-ales   creerían

   Those-PL   such-PL   believe-COND.3RD.PL

   yo   no   hab-er   le-ido   las   reglas (San Prov 23)

   I.NOM not   have-INF   read-PERF.PART the.FEM.PL rule-FEM.PL

'Those who would believe that I have not read the rules.'

Conclusion to 1.2.1.1:

How do we make sense of all this? Firstly, it has been argued (Pountain (1998) for Spanish, Dardano (1963:107) for Italian) that accusative and infinitive constructions are learned imitation of Latin rather than a genuine Romance construction, and so we are justified to remove the accusative and infinitive from our list of Romance constructions. Early Romance has therefor retained the use of Latin *quod*-clause with *verba putandi* and has added to it the use of the co-referential bare infinitive and *de/di* + infinitive, while Spanish has even introduced the use of non-coreferential 'nominative and infinitive' with the bare infinitive. According to Mensching (2000:18), Italian *di* + infinitive always has co-reference, and since he has not given any example of non-coreferential Spanish *de* + infinitive in object position, we can assume that in both languages *de/di* + infinitive always has co-reference. With the *quod*-clause, however, there has been no assertion that these clauses are always used without co-reference, and since the use of *quod*-clause with co-reference is not strictly ungrammatical i.e. it is not ungrammatical to say 'I think that I am X', and so evidence is needed to show that *quod*-clauses are constructed mainly in non-coreferential contexts, since non-coreferentiality cannot be assumed for *quod*-clauses.[10] It is therefore uncertain whether *de* and *quod* really complement each other in terms of co-

---

[10] This marks the difference between infinitival constructions and *quod*-clauses, since infinitives, unless realised with an overt object, is assumed to have co-reference with some other element of the clause, and so co-reference in infinitival constructions can be assumed unless there is evidence that suggests otherwise.

reference here, as Vincent asserts (1988:68)).

As for the mood selection of the verb in the *quod*-clause, there has as yet (to my knowledge) no statistical analysis of the choice of one or the other, and so it is difficult to identify the conditions which decide which one is used. Nonetheless, we can now refine Vincent's claim and argue that Romance affirmative verbs do not necessarily take the indicative mood, since there is evidence of affirmative verbs being used with a subjunctive verb when it is difficult to argue that this use is one of 'polar' subjunctive.

Section 1.2.1.2: 'declarative' verbs that can take an *ut/ne* clause:

There are several 'declarative' verbs that take *ut/ne* + subjunctive in Latin without being 'imperative', and here I shall focus on one, namely *verba timendi.*[11]

Verba timendi:

In Latin, verbs of fearing are attested with the bare infinitive, the accusative and infinitive, *quod*-clause, *ut/ne*-clause + subjunctive. There is always co-referentiality with the bare infinitive, but not necessarily with the other constructions.

Bare infinitive:

32) Vere-or   intro-ire   (Plaut Mil 4,4,32)

     fear-1ST.SG.PRES   enter-INF

     'I am afraid of entering.'

33) Nil   metu-unt   jur-are   (Cat 64,146)

     Not   fear-3RD.PL.PRES   swear-INF

     'They are not afraid of swearing.'

Accusative and infinitive:

34) Vere-ar...   me   amor-is   caus-a

     Fear-1SG.PRES.SUBJ   me.ACC   love-GEN.SG   sake-ABL   enter-INF

---

[11] i.e. verbs of fearing.

inced-ere   (Plaut Mil 1285-6)

enter-INF

'I fear that I might enter for the sake of love.'

Quod-clause:

35) Non   debetis   tim-ere   quod

Not   must-2ND.PL.PRES   fear-INF   QUOD

Ab   de-i   uiu-atis   prouidenti-a   (Hier. In Matt 10,29)

From   god-GEN.SG   live-2ND.PL.PRES.SUBJpower-ABL.SG

'You must not be afraid that you are living away from the power of the god.'

36) Quid...   tim-es   quod

Why   fear-2ND.SG.PRES   QUOD

Ill-e   operam   amico   dat   su-o? (Ter Haut. 910)

he.NOM   service-ACC   friend-DAT.SG give-3RD.SG.PRES   own-DAT.SG

'Why are you afraid that he might do his friend a service?'

Ut/*ne* + subjunctive:

With the use of *ut* and its negative counterpart *ne*, Latin verbs of fearing are striking in that they use *ne* to express a positive fear and *ut* to express a negative one:

37) Id   paues   ne   duc-as   ill-am,

it.N.ACC   fear-2ND.SG.PRES   NE   marry-2ND.PRES.SUBJher-ACC.SG

tu,   autem   ut   du-cas   (Ter. Andr. 349)

you   but   UT   marry-2ND.PRES.SUBJ

'You are afraid of marrying her, and you, of not marrying her.'

38) Metu-o   ut   subst-et   hosp-es   (Ter And
    5,4,11)

fear-1SG.PRES UT   stand.firm-3RD.PRES.SUBJ   guest-NOM.SG

'I am afraid that the guest might stand firm.'

In early Romance, however, there are attestations for the a bare infinitive, a prepositional infinitive, and a *quod*-clause is used:

Early Spanish:

Bare infinitive:

39) Tem-ia   perd-er   el   regno   (Loor 36)

Fear-3RD.SG.IMPERF   lose-INF   the   kingdom

'He was afraid of losing the kingdom.'

de + infinitive:

40) Temiendo-se   de   mat-ar-se   (Cron 466a15)

Fear.PRES.PART-REFL.PRO   DE   kill-INF-REFL.PRO

'being afraid of killing themselves.'

en + infinitive:

41) Non   dubd-as   en   met-er-te   a   periglo   (Cron 40b12)

Not   fear-2ND.PRES EN   put-INF-you   to   danger

'You are not afraid of putting yourself in danger.'

Quod + indicative:

42) Tem-o   que   nada   le   dix-iste   (Eli 155,6)

fear-1ST.PRES QUOD nothing   him.DAT   say-2ND.SG.PRET.IND

'I fear that you did not tell him anything.'

Quod + subjunctive:

43) Tem-í   que   me   pusieran   fuego (Ter 15,20)

Fear-1SG.PERTQUOD me.ACC   put-3RD.PL.IMPERF.SUBJ   fire

'I was afraid that they might put fire on me.'

Medieval Italian:

Bare infinitive:

44) Tem-eva   cad-er   (Dan Pg 25,117)

Fear-3RD.SG.IMPERF fall

'He was afraid of falling.'

di + infinitive:

45) non   temono   di…

not   fear-3RD.PL.PRES   DI

ingann-are   la   deità..   (Lan 6,300,27)

deceive-INF   the   goddess

'They are not afraid of deceiving the goddess.'

Quod + subjunctive:

46) Temo   che   la   ven-uta   non   sia

Fear-1ST.PRES QUOD the   come-PERF.PART   not   be-3RD.SG.PRES.SUBJ

folle   (Dan If II 35)

crazy

'I am afraid that the one who has come is not mad.'

Conclusion to 1.2.1.2:

Once again, we see early Romance generalising the *quod*-clause over the the accusative and infinitive, and here even *ut* and *ne* have been ousted by *quod*-clause. Prepositional infinitives are Romance innovations, and it should be noted that Spanish allows *en* + infinitive here. All attestations of prepositional infinitives are coreferential here since Mensching (2000) has not shown any example of non-coreferential prepositional infinitive in object position. However, there has not been any assertion that the verb in the *quod*-clause must be non-coreferntial, and so it is uncertain whether there really is *de* and *quod* alternation according to co-reference.(see note 10). Finally, while this construction always has a subjunctive verb in the *quod*-clause in early Italian (Vegnaduzzo

(2000:695)), in Spanish there are examples (42) and 43)) for both indicative and subjunctive following a verb of fear, and so there is mood fluctuation here.

Conclusion to 1.2.1:

In analysing 'declarative' verbs, it has emerged that the original Latin accusative and infinitive and *ut*/*ne* –clauses have been ousted by the generalisation of *quod*-clauses. Furthermore, prepositional infinitives have been innovated in Romance, and the one that occurs most frequently here is *de*/*di* + infinitive. However, there are certain issues that remain to be investigated, namely whether *quod*-clauses really are always non-coreferential (and hence support Vincent's claim that *de* and *quod* complement each other in terms of co-reference) and the issue of mood selection, for although the persistence of the subjunctive mood in early Italian fear clauses seems to support Vincent's claim that the verb in Romance *quod*-clauses are sensitive to the semantics of the main verb (here the verb expresses emotional attitude, namely fear, and so the use of the subjunctive is justified), the fluctuatation between the indicative and subjunctive moods in the verbs of thinking and Spanish verbs of fearing disturbs his claim.

Section 1.2.2: verbs that are capable of being 'declarative' and 'imperative':

In Latin, according to Bolkenstein (1976:168), the choice between the 'declarative' and 'imperative' aspect of these verbs is determined by the complement they take: if they take an accusative and infinitive or a *quod*-clause, it is behaving 'declaratively', but if it takes another complement (notably an *ut*-clause, but there are also others that take a bare infinitive), it is 'imperative'. I have identified two classes of verbs in this category according to the complement that is taken.

Section 1.2.2.1: verbs that use *ut*-clause + subjunctive as 'imperative':

Verba dicendi:

Latin:

In Latin, verbs of saying can either express a statement or a command. In the former

scenario, a bare infinitive, an accusative and infinitive and a *quod*-clause + indicative or subjunctive may be used. As with the previous sections, the bare infinitive is only used when there is co-reference, while the other two do not require co-reference.

Bare infinitive:

47) a-it   es-se   parat-us (Hor 1,7,22)

say-3RD.SG   be-INF   ready.NOM.SG.MASC

'He says that he is ready.'

Accusative and infinitive:

48) obtemperat-urum   te   es-se   dic-is (Cic Catil. 1,20)

comply.FUT.PART-ACC.SG.MASC   you.ACC.SG be-INF say-2ND.SG.PRES

'You say that you will comply.'

49) Pler-ique   de-os   es-se   dix-erunt... (Cic Nat Deo 1,1)

Many-NOM.PL   god-ACC.PL be-INF   say-3PL.PERF

'Many people have said that gods exist.'

Quod-clause + indicative:

50) nunc   dic-am   quod... aut   oramus...

now   say-1ST.SG.FUT   QUOD either pray-1ST.PL.PRES

aut   or-are   desin-imus... (Jer 22,22)

or   pray-INF   stop-1ST.PL.PRES

'Now I shall say that either we pray or we stop praying.'

Quod-clause + subjunctive:

51) ... dixerunt   quod   is   de-um   haberet

Say-3RD.PL.PERF   QUOD he   god-ACC.SG   have-IMPERF.SUBJ

qu-i   bene   uiu-eret (Aug debe 3,17)

REL.PRO.MASC.SG   well   live-3RD.SG.IMPERF.SUBJ

'... they said that he who lived well was the one who had god.'

When the verb expresses a command, an *ut/ne*-clause[12] + subjunctive is used:

52) dic-am   ut   reuort-antur   dom-um. (Ter Haut. 340)

   tell-1SG.FUT   UT   return-3PL.PRES.SUBJ home-ACC.SG

   'I shall them to return home.'

53) dice-bam,   pat-er,   ti-bi   ne

   Tell-1SG.IMPERF   father.VOC   you-DAT.SG   NE

   matr-i   consul-eres   mal-e (Plaut. Asin. 938)

   mother-DAT.SG   consult-2ND.SG.IMPERF.SUBJ bad-ADV

   'I was telling you, father, not to consult my mother badly.'

In early Spanish, if the verb expresses a statement, a bare infinitive is used with co-reference. Accusative and infinitive and *quod*-clauses + indicative are also attested:

Early Spanish:

Bare infinitive:

54) Que   dec-ia   s-er   escriban-o   (Cor 55,11)

   REL.PRO   say-IMPERF.3RD.SG   be-INF   scribe-MASC

   '... who was saying that he was a scribe.'

Accusative and infinitive:

55) ... mi   remedio   dic-es   no   s-er

   My   remedy   say-2ND.SG.PRES   not   be-INF

   señora   de   cuenta?   (Eli 49,9)

   lady   of   reason

   '... as for my remedy, you are saying that it is not a lady of reason?'

Quod-clause + indicative:

56) Porque   nos   fu-e   dich-o

---

[12] *Ne* being the negative counterpart of *ut* express prohibition rather than command.

Because	us.DAT.PL	be-3RD.SG.PRET	said-MASC.SG

que	algun-os	anda-van	con	nuestr-as	cart-as...(Lib 117r)
QUOD	some-MASC.PL	walk-3RD.PL.IMPERF	with	our-FEM.PL	letter-FEM.PL

'because it was said to us that some people were walking with our letters.'

If the verb expresses a command, *quod*-clause + subjunctive is used:

Quod-clause + subjunctive:

57) Deziéndo-les...   que   veng-an...   (Lib 2v)

Tell.PRES.PART-them.DAT.PL   QUOD   come-3RD.PL.PRES.SUBJ

'... telling them to come.'

Early Italian:

If the verb expresses a statement, either *di* + infinitive (with co-reference),

accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative or *quod* + subjunctive are used:

di + infinitive:

58) Dic-e   di   recar-si   a   memoria

Say-3RD.SG.PRES   DI   bring.to.oneself-REFL.PRO   to   memory

li   anni   passati...   (Bon Tra 6,127,28)

the.PL   year-PL   past-PL

'He says that he will bring to himself to memory that past years.'

Accusative and infinitive:

59) Dicea   la   su-a

Say-3RD.SG.IMPERF   the.FEM   own-FEM

Ess-ere   migliore   vita   (Alb 256,13)

be-INF   best   life

'He was saying that his own was the best life.'

Quod-clause + indicative:

60) Dico   che... tutta si   confess-a   (Dan If 5,8)

Say-1ST.SG.PRES   QUOD whole REFL.PRO   confess-3RD.SG

'I say that it confesses in its entirety.'

Quod-clause + subjunctive:

61) se   io... dico   ch'   io   vogli`-a

if   ì   say-1ST.SG.PRES   QUOD I   want-1ST.SG.PRES.SUBJ

tratt-are   di   cos-e   grand-i...   (BrunRet, p. 188, riga 12)

deal-INF   about thing-FEM.PL big-FEM.PL

'If I say that I want to deal with big things.'

If the verb expresses a command, however, *quod* + subjunctive is used.

Quod-clause + subjunctive:

62) Soavemente disse   ch'   io   pot-asse   (Dan Pg 2,85)

Sweetly   say-3RD.SG.PRET   QUOD I   drink-1ST.SG.IMPERF.SUBJ

'He sweetly told me to drink.'

Conclusion to 1.2.2.1:

The use of the accusative and infinitive has been, as with verbs of thinking, regarded as learned imitation of Latin ((Pountain (1998) for Spanish, Dardano (1963:107)), and so it can be eliminated from our list. Romance has therefore retained the use of *quod*-clause and Italian has even introduced the use of *di* + infinitive with 'declaration' while Spanish opts for the bare infinitive. Furthermore, it is interesting that there is less fluctuation between mood selection for *quod*-declarative than in the previous category (although the Italian example does show 'declarative' *dire* + subjunctive, this has been explained by Vegnaduzzo (2000:701) by the fact that the verb of saying is in the protasis of a conditional sentence and has hence acquired a modal colour; Vergnaduzzo (2000:701) also explains other occurrences of 'declarative' *dire* + subjunctive convincingly by using 'polar subjunctive'

usages (see note 3)- these convincing explanations set 'declarative' *dire* + subjunctive apart

from the previous category where there was no obvious reason why a subjunctive should

have been used). This may be because as the verb of saying is capable of expressing

command when construed with *quod* + subjunctive, the use of subjunctive in declarative

contexts has been consciously avoided lest confusion arises. The relationship between

Italian *di* + infinitive and declarative *quod* is uncertain, for although Mensching (2000:18)

has shown that *di* + infinitive is always co-referential, there has been no assertion that the

use of *quod* here must be non-coreferential. We have also caught a glimpse of how

Romance indirect commands function, namely the use of *quod*- clause + subjunctive, which

has ousted the use of Latin *ut*-clause + subjunctive. This construction will recur in the

following sections where Latin 'imperative' verbs are dealt with.

Section 1.2.2.2: verbs that use bare infinitive as 'imperative':

There exist some verbs in Latin of this category (i.e. both 'declarative' and

'imperative') that, rather than using *ut*-clause + subjunctive to express a command, use a

bare infinitive.

Verba admonendi et docendi:[13]

When they express statements, they typically use accusative and infinitive:

Accusative and infinitive:

63) H-i...   homin-em   admon-ent

These-MASC.PL   man-ACC.SG   warn-3RD.PL

re-m   es-se   praeclar-am   (Cic Verr. II 2,36)

matter-FEM.ACC.SG   be-INF remarkable-FEM.ACC.SG

'These men are warning the man that the matter is remarkable.'

64) Doc-ui   per   litter-as

inform-1ST.SG.PERF   through   letter-FEM.PL.ACC

---

[13] i.e. verbs of warning and teaching.

i-d	nec	opus	es-se...	(Cic Att. 16,8,1)
it-N.SG.ACC	not	necessary	be-INF	

'I informed him through letters that it was not necessary.'

When they express advice/teaching (i.e. command), they are attested with the bare infinitive:

Bare infinitive:

65)
e-um	su-ae	libidin-es	flagitios-ae
him-ACC.SG	his-FEM.NOM.PL	lust-FEM.NOM.PL	disgraceful-FEM.NOM.PL

fac-ere	admone-bant...	(Cic Verr 2,1,63)
do-INF	advise-3RD.PL.IMPERF	

'His disgraceful lusts were advising him to do it.'

66)
Qu-i	te...	nihil	sap-ere
REL.PRO.MASC.SG	you.ACC	nothing	know-INF

doce-at	(Cic Phil 2,8)
teach-3RD.SG.PRES.SUBJ	

'... who teaches you to know nothing.'

In early Romance, it is hard to find counterparts to these Latin verbs that still retain this double quality, but as far as their 'imperative' side is concerned, there is evidence that the original Latin bare infinitive has been substituted by a *quod*-clause + subjunctive and/or a prepositional infinitive, although the bare infinitive is still retained for the verb of teaching.

Early Spanish:

Bare infinitive:

67)
Le	enseñe		agrad-ar a	Dios	(Avi 248)
Him.ACC	teach-1ST.SG.PRET	thank	to	god	

'I taught him to thank God.'

de + infinitive:

68) Person-a   que   me   avis-ara

Person-SG   REL.PRO   me.ACC   advise-3RD.SG. IMPERF.SUBJ

de   u-yr   l-as   ocasiones   (Ter 22,9)

DE   flee-INF   the-FEM.PL   occasion-FEM.PL

'the person who advised me to flee the occasions.'

a + infinitive:

69) Amonest-an   a   bien   viv-ir

advise-3RD.PL.PRES   A   well   live-INF

a   l-os   hombr-es   (Mor 160,14)

to   the-MASC.PL   men-MASC.PL

'They are advising the men to live well.'

70) Quien   me   enseñ-ara   a   tem-er   a   dios (Ter 9,20)

Who   me.ACC   teach-3RD.SG.IMPERF.SUBJ   A   fear-INF   to   God

'... who taught me to fear God.'

Quod-clause + subjunctive:

71) me...   avis-aban   que   no   me   fiase

me.DAT   advise-3RD.PL.IMPERF   QUOD   not   REFL.PRO
trust

de   aquell-os   vasall-os   (Eli 111,5)

DE   those-MASC.PL   vassal-MASC.PL

'They warned me not to trust those vassals.'

Early Italian:

Bare infinitive:

72) ... m'   insegn-i   and-are   (BonVi 11,27,25)

Me.ACC   teach-2ND.SG.PRES.SUBJ   walk-INF

'... that you should teach me to walk.'

<u>*A* + infinitive:</u>

73) … l'   uomo   informare   a   ben   fa-re   (Zuc 1,64)

     the   man   instruct-INF   A   well   do-INF

     '... to instruct the man to do it well.'

<u>*Quod* + subjunctive:</u>

74) Amnmoniamo   che   tutt-i   quell-i…

     Advise-1ST.PL.PRES   QUOD   all-MASC.PL   those-MASC.PL   REFL.PRO

     si   guardino   (Tes 36,7)

     REFL.PRO   protect-3RD.PL.SUBJ

     'We advise all of those people to protect themselves.'

Conclusion to 1.2.2.2

From Latin to Romance, therefore, although the bare infinitive has not been lost, the rise of the *a* + infinitive, *di* + infinitive and *quod*-clause + subjunctive in this usage has brought them in rivalry with the bare infinitive. It should also be noted that all the attestations of *quod* have a subjunctive verb and that there is no fluctuation of mood whatsoever. This is the first time that we see the emergence of *a* + infinitive (barring the sporadic occurrences with impersonal verbs), and it will recur in other 'imperative' contexts.

Conclusion to 1.2.2:

In this category, there is ample evidence of the elimination of *ut*-clause + subjunctive in favour of *quod* + subjunctive here, and while there is fluctuation of mood with the 'declarative' verbs, there is no fluctuation with the 'imperative' ones just whatsoever. The use of *quod* with 'imperative' verbs further shows the versatility of *quod,* since it is used with both 'declarative' and 'imperative' verbs, and the fact that the choice of mood of the verb in the *quod* –clause (rather than the choice of complement pattern, as in Latin i.e. accusative and infinitive (declarative) vs. *ut*-clause + subjunctive (imperative)) has become

the sole marker of whether the verb is 'declarative' or 'imperative' supports Vincent's claim that the mood of the verb in the *quod* –clause in Romance is sensitive to the semantics of the main verb. Furthermore, this category shows a tighter organisation of mood selection between indicative and subjunctive in the *quod*-clause than the previous one, presumably because ambiguity can arise if the mood of the verb is not selected properly. As for the rise of prepositional infinitives, it is interesting to see that *a* + infinitive has been innovated here in 'imperative' contexts, whereas with 'declarative' verbs only *de/di* + infinitive (and Spanish *en* + infinitive with verbs of fearing) is attested. Moreover, in the use of these prepositional infinitives as 'imperative' verbs there is no complementarity between *de/di/a* + infinitive and *quod* in terms of co-reference, since in both constructions the logical subject of the infinitive is the same.

Section 1.2.3: verbs that are always 'imperative':

Latin uses both the bare infinitive and *ut/ne*-clauses to express commands here (cf the previous category where some verbs use *ut/ne*-clause while others use bare infinitive to express commands- there, however, verbs could only choose one or the other, whereas here there are verbs that can choose both to express commands), and here there is no # functional difference between the two. However, not all verbs take both the bare infinitive and *ut/ne*-clause, and so I have divided my examples according to which complement structures they take.

Section 1.2.3.1: verbs that can take both the bare infinitive and *ut*-clause + subjunctive:

There are quite a few verbs that can take both the bare infinitive and *ut*-clause + subjunctive, and I have chosen two categories here: *verba imperandi et permittendi*.

Verba imperandi

Latin:

Accusative and infinitive:

   75) Marcell-us   arm-a   propere   cap-ere

Marcellus-NOM.SG   arms-N.PL   quickly   take-INF

milit-es... iub-et   (Liv. 25,41,1)

soldier-ACC.PL   order-3RD.SG

'Marcellus orders his soldiers to take arms quickly.'

76) Quinque ei-usdem   legionis   reliqu-as

    Five   same-GEN.SG   legion-GEN.SG   remaining-FEM.PL

    cohort-es   profici-sci   imper-at (Caes. Gall 7,60,3)

    cohort-FEM.PLdepart-INF   order-3RD.SG.PRES

    'He is ordering the five remaining cohorts of the same legion to depart.'

Ut-clause + subjunctive:

77) aud-ire   iub-et   uos   imperat-or...   histric-us

    listen-INF   order-3SG.PRES you.ACC.PL commander-NOM.SG of.actors-NOM.SG

    bon-o-que   ut anim-o   sede-ant   in   subselli-is (Plaut. Poen. Prol 4-5)

    good-ABL.SG-and UT soul-ABL.SGsit-3PL.SUBJ on   bench-ABL.PL

    'The commander of the actors orders you to listen and to sit on the benches with an attentive heart.'[14]

78) Apoll-o   mihi...   imper-at   ut

    Apollo-NOM.SG   me.DAT.SG   order-3RD.SG.PRES   UT

    ego   illic   oculos   exur-am   (Plaut Men. 840-1)

    I   there eye-ACC.PL   burn-1ST.SG

    'Apollo orders me to burn his eyes there.'

In Romance, there is evidence of the bare infinitive, *de*/*di* + infinitive, *a* + infinitive and

quod-clause + subjunctive in this usage:

Early Spanish:

---

[14] This example shows the juxtaposition of an accusative and infinitive and an *ut*-clause + subjunctive as the object complement of the main verb 'to order' (*iubet*).

Bare infinitive:

79) Me   mand-as   finc-ar   (SMill 61)

me.ACC   order-2ND.PRES   stop-INF

'You are ordering me to stop.'

De + infinitive:

80) Ellos   ordena-van   de   pone-r   (Cron 87a47)

They   order-3RD.PL.IMPERF   DE   put-INF

'They ordered to put them on.'

Quod-clause + subjunctive:

81) Mando-me   que   lleg-asse

Order.3RD.PRET-me.ACC   QUOD   arrive-IMPERF.SUBJ

cerca   de-l   animal   (Laz 19,28)

close   from-the   animal

'He ordered me to approach the animal.'

82) Orden-aron   que   anden   en   el   Corral   (Lib 35v)

Order-3RD.PL.PRET   QUOD   walk-3RD.PL.PRES.SUBJ   on   the   Corral

'They ordered them to walk on the Corral.'

Early Italian:

Bare infinitive:

83) Comandò   a   Pompeio...   veni-re   (BonOro 6,8,408)

Order-3RD.SG.PRET   to   Pompeio   come-INF

84) Quest-o   dono   ordinò   offere-re

This.MASC.SG   gift.MASC.SG   order-3RD.SG.PRET   offer-INF

Proserpina   a   sè   (Lan 6,297,38)

Proserpina   to   REFL.PRO

a + infinitive:

85) mandò   Idio   il   Figliuol   suo

order-3RD.SG.PRET   Idio   the   son.MASC.SG   own-MASC.SG

a   fa-re   questa   battaglia   (Gior78,377)

A   do-INF this-FEM.SG   battle-FEM.SG

'He ordered his own son to do this battle.'

86) Egli   ordinò   un   suo   discepolo...

He   order-3RD.SG.PRET   a   POSS.ADJ.MASC.SG   disciple.MASC.SG

a   tene-re   la   cattedra   (Teso 2,24,a275)

A   hold-INF   the.FEM.SG   cathedral.FEM.SG

'he ordered a disciple of his to hold the cathedral.'

Quod-clause + subjunctive:

87) elli   me   comand-ava   molt-e   volte

he   me.ACC   order-IMPERF.3SG   many-FEM.PL   time-FEM.PL

che   io   cerca-sse   per   vede-re   (Dan Vn 2,8)

QUOD   I   try-IMPERF.SUBJ.1ST.SG   in.order.to   see-INF

'He ordered me many times to try to see it.'

88) Ordin-iamo   che   nessuno   de-la   Compagnia

Order-1ST.PL   QUOD   none   of-the.FEM.SG   Compagnia

Vad-a   ad   alcun-o   luogh-o...   (Stat p.35)

Go-3RD.SG.SUBJ   to   some-MASC.SG   place-MASC.SG

'We order that no one of the Compagnia should go to some place...'

In the evolution from Latin to Romance, therefore, *quod*-clause has generalised to the expense of *ut*-clause + subjunctive, and while the bare infinitive infinitive is retained, *de/di* + infinitive and *a* + infinitive have been innovated. It should also be noted that early Spanish preferred *de* + infinitive with verbs of ordering, while early Italian preferred *a* +

infinitive.

Verba permittendi:[15]

Bare infinitive:

89) sin-e   e-um   modo   uen-ire   salu-om

                                                                                 (Plaut Most. 11-2)

    Allow-IMPERATIVE   him-ACC.SG   soon   come-INF   safe-MASC.ACC.SG

    'Allow him to come home safe quickly.'

Ut-clause + subjunctive:

90) Neque enim d-i   sin-ant   ut...   Belg-arum...

    Not   for   god-NOM.PL allow-3RD.PL.SUBJ   UT   Belgians-GEN.PL

    dec-us   ist-ud   et   claritud-o   sit... (Tac 1,43)

    glory.NOM.SG that-N.NOM.SG   and   renown-NOM.SG   be.3RD.SG.SUBJ

    'For may the gods not allow there to be that glory and renown of the Belgians.'

In Romance, either a bare infinitive or *de/di* + infinitive or a *quod*-clause is used.

Early Spanish:

Bare infinitive:

91) no   permit-istes   a   mi   lengua   da-r   fin

    not   allow-2ND.PL.PRET   to   my   tongue   give-INF   end

    y   remate   a   otr-as   razon-es (Eli 136,7)

    and   cap   to   other   reason-PL

    'You did not allow my tongue to put an end and cap to other reasons.'

92) les   non   querie   el   consent-ir

    Them.ACC   not   want.3RD.SG.IMPERF he   agree-INF

    de   faz-er   las   trauessur-as (Cron 465a41)

    DE   do-INF   the.FEM.PL   travesty-PL

---

[15] i.e. verbs of permitting.

'He did not allow them to do the travesties.'

de + infinitive:

93) le   otorg-ava   de   ge   le   da-r (Cron 371a47)

him.DAT.SG   grant-3RD.SG.IMPERF DE   him.DAT.SG   it.ACC give-INF

'He allowed him to give it to him.'

94) de   bev-ir   con   varon-es   mi   ley

DE   live-INF   with   man-PL   my   law

non   me   lex-a (Alix 1863)

not   me.ACC   leave-3RD.SG

'My law does not allow me to live with men.'

Quod-clause + subjunctive:

95) No   permitir-a   que... se   haya   de

Not   allow-FUT.3RD.SG   QUOD REFL.PRO   have-3RD.SG.SUBJ   to

desconcert-ar (Cis 8,16)

disconcert-INF

'He will not allow him to be disconcerted.'

Early Italian:

Bare infinitive:

96) ... se   Idio   li   permett-esse   fa-re (Gior 78,377)

  If   Idio   them.ACC   allow-3SG.IMPERF.SUBJ   do-INF

'... if Idio had allowed them to do.'

di + infinitive:

97) Conced-ette   loro   di   fa-re (Zuc 1,484)

allow-2ND.PL   them.ACC   DI   do-INF

'You allow them to do.'

98) ... che me   soffer-ino   d'   aud-ire (Dan Vn 7,7,25,5)

    That   me.ACC   allow-3RD.PL.PRES.SUBJ   DI   hear-INF

'... that they should allow me to hear.'

Quod-clause + subjunctive:

99) si   conced-e   che   uomo parl-i

    REFL.PRO   allow-3RD.SG   QUOD   man   talk-3SG.SUBJ

    di   sé   e   poss-a   di-re (Dan Cv 1,12,11)

    about REFL.PRO   and   can-3SG.SUBJ speak-INF

    'It is allowed that a man can talk about himself and can speak.'

Once again, we see *quod* + subjunctive generalising at the expense of Latin *ut*-clause + subjunctive, and while the bare infinitive is retained, *de/di* + infinitive is brought into competition with it. This category also differs from the previous one in that there is no attestation of *a* + infinitive here.

Section 1.2.3.2: verbs that only take *ut*-clause in Latin:

In this category, I focus on two types of verb classes: *verba petendi et cogendi*.

Verba petendi:[16]

Latin:

100)   nunc hoc   uos   rog-at   ut   lice-at

         now   this you.ACC.PL   ask-3RD.SG   UT   allow-IMPERS.3RD.SG

         posside-re   h-anc   nom-en   fabul-am (Plaut. Trin. 20-1)

         possess-INF this-FEM.ACC name-ACC.SG   play-ACC.SG

         'Now he is asking you to allow this play to have a name.'

101)   ... ut   mor-s   Sulpici-i   Quirin-i   public-is

---

[16] i.e. verbs of seeking.

UT   death-NOM.SGSulpicius-GEN.SG   Quirinus-GEN.SG   public-ABL.PL

exequi-is   frequentar-e-tur   peti-uit   (Tac 3,48,1)

rite-ABL.PL frequent-IMPERF.SUBJ-PASS ask-3RD.PERF

'He asked that the death of Sulpicius Quirinus be decorated with public rites.'

In Romance, however, these verbs are found with *de/di* + infinitive and a *quod*-clause +

subjunctive.

Early Spanish:

Quod-clause + subjunctive:

102)   después   rueg-an   a   algun-os   que

afterwards   ask-3RD.PL   to   some-PL   QUOD

les   gan-en   la   entrada... (Lib 70v-71r)

them.DAT.PL gain-3RD.PL.SUBJ   the.FEM.SG   entrance

'afterwards they ask some people to gain the entrance for them.'

103)   Pid-e   a   Dios   que   me   preste

Ask-3RD.SG   to   God   QUOD me.ACC   lend-3RD.SGSUBJ

aqu-el   sufrimient-o (Rue 42,3)

That-MASC.SG suffering-MASC.SG

'He asks God to lend me that suffering.'

Early Italian:

di + infinitive:

104)   di   riman-ere   con   voi...

DI   stay-INF   with   you.PL

ci   preg-ate?   (Tris 378)

us.ACC ask-2ND.PL.PRES

'Are you asking us to stay with you?'

quod-clause + subjunctive:

105) intend-o preg-are … che

intend-1ST.SG.PRES ask-INF QUOD

mi soffer-ino d' aud-ire (Dan Vn 7,7)

me.ACC allow-3RD.PL.PRES.SUBJ DI hear-INF

'I intend to ask them to let me hear.'

Once again, there has been a generalisation of *quod*-subjunctive over original Latin *ut*-clause, and here *de/di*+ infinitive has arisen along with it. It should be noted that there is no example of prepositional infinitive with Spanish.

Verba cogendi:

Latin:

Ut-clause + subjunctive:

106) viri fortis (est) ne suplici-is

man-GEN.SG brave-GEN.SG be.3RD.SG not supplication-ABL.PL

mov-eri ut... paeniteat (Cic Mil 82)

move-INF.PASS UT repent-3RD.SG.IMPERS.SUBJ

107) non pot-es tu cog-ere me

not can-2ND.SG you force-INF me.ACC

ut tibi maledic-am (Plaut. Most 893)

UT you.DAT.SG curse-1ST.SG.PRES.SUBJ

In Romance, however, there are attestations for *de/di* + infinitive and *a* + infinitive.

Early Spanish:

a + infinitive:

108) pued-es   mov-er   a   omne

can-2ND.SG   move-INF   to   man

a   f-er-lo   (SLaur 39)

A   do-INF-it

'You can get a man to do it.'

109) La   virtud   que   me   oblig-a

The   virtue-FEM.SG REL.PRO   me.ACC   oblige3RD.SG

A   s-er   bueno   (Men 64,1)

A   be-INF good

'The virtue that obliges me to be good.'

Early Italian:

Di + infinitive:

110) Il   constrinse   di   confess-are (Bon Oro, 6,18,408,15)

He   force-3RD.SG.PRET   DI   confess-INF

'He forced to confess…'

111) M'   invit-a   lo   meo cor   d'   am-are (Gui 32,536,5,5)

Me   invite-3RD.SG the   my   heart DI   love-INF

'My heart invites me to love.'

A + infinitive:

112) Mo-sse   Boezio…   a   parl-are (Dan Con 1,2,11,10)

Move-3RD.SG.PRET   Boezio   A   speak-INF

'He moved Boezio to speak.'

113)   Sua   condizione   mi   string-e

His-FEM.SG   condition-FEM.SG   me.ACC   force-3RD.SG.PRES

a   seguit-are   (Dan Pd 6,30)

A   follow-INF

'His condition forces me to follow.'

What is striking in this category is the lack of *quod*-clause + subjunctive. Furthermore, there seems to be some mismatch in terms of the choice of prepositional infinitve, for while Spanish prefers *a* + infinitive, Italian shows signs of using both.

Conclusion to 1.2.3:

The most notable change from Latin to Romance is the use of *quod* + subjunctive for original *ut* – clause + subjunctive to express commands (although *quod* + subjunctive is not found with *verba cogendi* where the burden is held entirely by prepositional infintives, namely *de/di* + infinitive and *a* + infinitive). Furthermore, this chapter has seen the rise of *de/di* + infinitive and *a* + infinitives to express commands, and there are some interesting deviations between early Spanish and early Italian: with *verba imperandi*, early Italian prefers *a* + infinitive whereas early Spanish prefers *de* + infinitive; with *verba petendi*, while early Spanish uses *quod* + subjunctive, Italian shows attestations for *di* + infinitive; with *verba cogendi*, early Spanish uses *a* + infinitive while early Italian uses both *di* + infinitive and *a* + infinitive. These may suggest dialectal patterns in proto-Romance, and their subsequent evolutionwill be taken up in chapter 3.

Conclusion to chapter 1: complement patterns from Latin to Romance:

Now that we have had a survey of the complement patterns, we can tabulate them thus:

45

Table 1: Complement patterns from Latin to Romance:

	Latin	Spanish	Italian
Complement as the subject of the verb (coreference)	Bare infinitive (co-reference)	Bare infinitive *De* + infinitive *A* + infinitive (with *convenir*)	Bare infinitive *Di* + infinitive *A* + infinitive (spurious with *accadere* and *rimanere)*
Complement as the subject of the verb (no coreference)	Accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative, *ut*-clause + subjunctive	*Quod* + indicative or subjunctive (according to semantics of verb)	*Quod* + indicative or subjunctive (according to semantics of verb)
Complement as the object of the main verb (declarative- verb of thinking) (coreference)	Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative	Bare infinitive *De* + infinitive Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative/subjunctive	Bare infinitive, *Di* + infinitive Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative and subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (declarative- verb of thinking) (no coreference)	Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative	Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative /subjunctive	Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative /subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (declarative- verb of fearing) (coreference)	Bare infinitive, accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative, *ut/ne* + subjunctive	Bare infinitive, *de* + infinitive, *quod* + indicative/subjunctive	Bare infinitive, *di* + infinitive, *quod* + subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (declarative- verb of fearing (no coreference)	accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative, *ut/ne* + subjunctive	*quod* + indicative/subjunctive	*quod* + subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (declarative/imperative)	Declarative: Accusative and infinitive Imperative: *Ut*-clause + subjunctive, bare infinitive	Declarative: bare infinitive, accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative Imperative: *quod* + subjunctive, bare infinitive, *de* + subjunctive, *a* + inf	Declarative: *di* + infinitive, accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative/subjunctive Imperative: *quod* + subjunctive, bare infinitive, *di* + infinitive, *a* + inf

Complement as the object of the main verb (ordering)	Bare infinitive *Ut*-clause + subjunctive	*quod* + subjunctive, *de* + infinitive	*quod* + subjunctive, *a* + infinitive
Complement as the object (permitting)	Bare infinitive *Ut*-clause + subj	Bare infinitive, *de* + infinitive, *quod* + subj	Bare infinitive, *di* + infinitive, *quod* + subj
Complement as the object of the main verb (asking)	*Ut*-clause + subjunctive	*quod* + subjunctive	*di* + infinitive, *quod* + subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (cogendi)	*Ut*-clause + subjunctive	*A* + infinitive	*Di* + infintive, *a* + infinitive

Several remarks can be made: *quod*-clause (+ indicative /subjunctive according to context) has completely supplanted Latin accusative and infinitive and *ut*-clause + subjunctive, and it is very often used along with *de/di* + infinitive and *a* + infinitive. Vincent's claim (1988:68) that these two prepositional infinitives emerged along with the generalisation of *quod*-clause has therefore received empirical support. However, Vincent's other claim that *de* and *quod* alternate according to the presence and absence of co-reference respectively has not received empirical confirmation, since non-coreferentiality cannot be assumed for *quod*-clauses like coreferentiality can be for infinitives (see note 10). As for the two prepositional infinitives, with the exception of *verba cogendi*, the distribution of *de*/*di* + infinitive is far wider than *a* + infinitive, since, with the exception of Spanish *verba cogendi*, wherever *a* + infinitive occurs *de/di* + infinitive occurs as well, and there are many slots in which *de/di* + infinitive, but not *a* + infinitive, occurs, namely non-imperative contexts since *a* + infinitive is only restricted to imperative contexts. All this seems to conform with the original meaning of these two prepositions: Latin *ad* denotes 'direction towards' (Hofmann and Szantyr (1972:219), whereas Latin *de* is topic-marker since it means 'about' (Hofmann and Szantyr (1972:261-2). These meanings suggest that Latin *ad* denotes a strong sense of futurity and is apt for being used as a complementiser in indirect commands- Vincent's remarks about Romance *a* + infinitive (1988:68) have therefore been confirmed by the data. Latin *de*, however, is semantically rather weak as a

marker of topic since it merely creates more emphasis on its nominal complement, and as such it is possible to understand why it enjoys such a wide distribution as a complementiser in Romance since it is probably compatible with the semantics of any construction. More will be said about the origins of Romance prepositional infinitives in the next chapter.

Chapter 2: Latin > Romance- the rise of prepositional infinitives:

The previous chapter has given us plenty of evidence of the Romance innovation of prepositional infinitives, especially that of *de/di* + infinitive and *a* + infinitive, which occur regularly in all the complement patterns analysed. In this chapter, I propose to analyse the syntactic status of these prepositional infinitives and trace their origins.

Section 2.1: preposition or complementiser?

Infinitives are verbal nouns, and as such the use of prepositions in prepositional infinitives is ambiguous, for it is unclear whether they are functioning as prepositions taking a nominal complement or a complementiser taking a clausal complement. However, there have been some proposals as to how one can distinguish the two e.g. Benucci (1992:23-6) and Skytte (1983:31), both of whom propose that if the preposition in question is only followed by a infinitive and not by a noun in a particular construction, it should be regarded as a complementiser and not a preposition e.g. Mod Italian *credo di fare questo* 'I believe that I am doing something' is grammatical, but *credo di questo is not (whereas *credo questo* 'I believe this' is) (Benucci (1992:23)), and so the use of *di* + infinitive after *credo* should be regarded as a complementiser. Given that there are no attestations of any of our prepositional infinitives taking nominal complements in their respective construction, it can be assumed that they are all complementisers rather than prepositions.

Our next goal should therefore be to account for the grammaticalisation, and the theoretical model I propose to use is Minimalism.

Section 2.2: Grammaticalisation and Minimalism:

The latest treatment of grammaticalisation within the Minimalist framework is Roberts and Roussou (2003). In that work, they are using Lightfoot's model of language change (1998) as the basis of their argument (Roberts and Roussou (2003:1). Lightfoot (1998:chapter 3) argues that the formation of the internal grammar of any language is achieved during first language acquisition, and he identifies three components in this process (1998:66-68): 1) the child's linguistic environment which serves as the input for the formation of the child's internal language (I-L) 2) the principles and parameters of Universal Grammar (UG), the former of which allow the child to analyse his/her linguistic environment and to set the values of the latter 3) the linguistic output i.e. the child's I-L, which is the result of first language acquisition. Lightfoot's model of language change therefore predicts that the evolution of languages should be in the form of 'random walks' i.e. there should be no common trends in the linguistic history of unrelated languages, since Lightfoot argues (1998:66) that the linguistic environment is different for each child and the child's analysis of his/her linguistic environment is entirely random and haphazard. In the absence of language contact where children who speak two different languages share the same linguistic environment, there is no reason why two children should form I-Ls of a similar kind and so there should not be any cross-linguistic trends.

This prediction, however, is incompatible with the phenomenon of grammaticalisation, since grammaticalisation is precisely one of those trends that occur cross-linguistically (see Heine and Kuteva (2002) for cross-linguistic examples of grammaticalisation). Roberts and Roussou (2003:2) therefore modify Lightfoot's model slightly and argue that grammaticalisation always involves structural simplification, and since UG, according to Roberts (2001), has a predilection for simpler syntactic structures in its analysis of the child's linguistic environment, grammaticalisation can occur cross-linguistically. A prototypical case of grammaticalisation is the rise of English modals, which is described by Roberts and Roussou (2003:40-1) thus:

[$_{TP}$ Sone [$_{TP}$ hit mæi [$_{VP}$ t$_{mæi}$ [$_{TP}$ T[$_{VP}$ ilimpen]]]}]> [$_{TP}$ Soon [$_{TP}$ it may [$_{VP}$ happen]]]]

As seen, the newer structure is simpler than the older one in that it has fewer branches, and as such there has been a loss of syntactic movement (namely the movement from V to T of *mæi* in the original structure) with the result that *mæi* is directly merged under a higher syntactic position (T). Roberts and Roussou's characterisation of grammaticalisation as structural simplification, therefore, entails that UG prefers merging the grammaticalised element directly onto a higher syntactic position to employing syntactic movement that transfers the grammaticalised element upwards.

However, of the three categories of grammaticalisation that Roberts and Roussou analyse,[17] the grammaticalisation that results in the formation of complementisers (C-elements) has turned out to be the most problematic, since it is not always the case that the grammaticalisation process that results in the formation of C-elements involves an 'upward' shift of syntactic elements. A good example of the grammaticalisation that results in the formation of a complementiser is the grammaticalisation of English *to* in *to*-infinitives, which is particularly relevant for this dissertation since it involves a shift from preposition to complementiser (P> C), just like Latin/Romance *de* and *ad*. Roberts and Roussou (2003:105) schematise the grammaticalisation thus:

VP [$_{PP}$ to [$_{DP}$ V + enne]] > [$_{VP}$ V [$_{CP}$ [$_{MP}$ *to* [$_{TP}$ [$_{T}$ V + enne]]]]]

As shown, the grammaticalisation that results in the formation of English *to* is problematic in two ways: 1) the end structure is actually syntactically bigger than the previous one, although Roberts and Roussou (2003:105) still maintain that there has been structural simplification since there has been a change from an adjunct (VP PP) to a complement (V CP)- this issue is unresolved and will not be dealt further here 2) there has # been a 'downward' shiftmovement of the grammaticalised element, since *to* as a

---

[17] Roberts and Roussou (2003) divide their Minimalist analysis of grammaticalisation into three sections: T-elements, C-elements and D-elements. Within the Minimalist framework, the first one corresponds to verbal inflections, the second to complementisers and the last one to determiners of nouns.

complementiser occupies the MP position in the hierarchy of C-elements, which is a relatively low position. The grammaticalisation of English *to* in *to*-infinitives, therefore, is problematic. Roberts and Roussou's explanation for all this (2003:106) is that as English *to*-infinitive developed at the expense of *that*-clauses with the subjunctive in Middle English (see Los (1999:chapter 12)), there was an upward shift of the original modal content of the subjunctive inflection (i.e. T) to a higher complementiser position (M) and so there was still some kind of 'upward' shift and hence conforms with the Minimalist conception of grammaticalisation. Such is the Minimalist characterisation of the grammaticalisation of C-elements.[18] How does the grammaticalisation of Latin *de* and *ad* correlate with all this?

Section 2.3: the grammaticalisation of Latin *de* and *ad*:

It so happens that scholars have investigated the C-domain of the Romance languages, and Rizzi (1997:288) gives the following hierarchy:

... Force... (Topic)... (Focus)... FinP[19]

In identifying the relative positions of the various complementisers in the Romance languages, Rizzi (1997:288) postulates this:

[$_{Force\ P}$ *que/che*... (Topic)... (Focus)... [$_{FinP}$ *de/ad* [TP...]]]]]]

This hierarchy is confirmed by the following examples (taken from Rizzi (1997:288)):

114) Cred-o che loro apprezz-erebbero molto

believe-1ST.SG.PRES QUOD they appreciate-3RD.PL.COND much

Il tu-o libro.

The your-MASC.SG book.MASC.SG

'I believe that they would appreciate your book very much.'

115) Cred-o di apprezz-are molto

---

[18] A similar upward shift of modal content (subjunctive tense specifically) from T to C has been postulated by Roberts and Roussou for the grammaticalisation of Calabrian *mu* (Roberts and Roussou (2003:97)) and Greek *ina* (Roberts and Roussou (2003:85)), and so this shift of subjunctive property (an irrealis mood marker) from T to C seems to be the underlying property in the Minimalist analysis of the grammaticalisation of C-elements (see Roberts and Roussou (2003:129)).

[19] This Fin IP is equivalent to the MP in the analysis of English *to*-infinitive.

Believe-1ST.SG.PRES DI appreciate-INF much

il tu-o libro.

The your-MASC.SG book.MASC.SG.

'I believe that I would appreciate your book very much.'

116)   Cred-o   che   il   tu-o   libro

Believe-1ST.SG.PRES QUOD   the   your-MASC.SG book-MASC.SG

loro   lo   apprezzer-ebbero   molto

they   it   appreciate-3RD.PL.COND   much

'I believe that, as for your book, they would appreciate it very much.'

117)   *Cred-o   il   tu-o   libro

Believe-1ST.SG.PRES the   your-MASC.SG book.MASC.SG

che   loro   lo   apprezzerebbero   molto

QUOD   they   it   appreciate-3RD.PL.COND   much

'I believe, your book, that they would appreciate it very much.'

118)   *Credo   di   il   tuo   libro

Believe-1ST.SG.PRES DI   the   your-MASC.SG book.MASC.SG

apprezz-ar-lo   molto

appreciate-INF-it   much

'I believe 'of' your book, to appreciate it very much.'

119)   *Credo   il   tuo   libro

Believe-1ST.SG.PRES   the   your.MASC.SG book.MASC.SG

di   apprezz-ar-lo   molto

DI   appreciate-INF-it   much

'I believe, your book, 'of' to appreciate it very much.'

In these six examples, the first three are grammatical while the last three are not, and the fact that the *quod*-clause can come before the topicalised element (*il tuo libro*) but the *di* + infinitive (functioning as a complementiser) cannot has led Rizzi (1997) to argue that *di* (and *ad*) must be placed lower than *que*/*che* in the hierarchy of C-elements. The grammaticalisation of Latin *de* + infinitive and *ad* + infinitive from prepositions to complementisers, therefore, can be schematised thus:

VP [PP *de/ad* [DP V + enne]] > [VP V [CP [FinP *de/ad* [TP ...]]]]][20]

As with the grammaticalisation of English *to*-infinitives, the end structure is actually bigger than the original one and there has been a 'downward' shift in the position of Latin/Romance *de* and *ad*. Furthermore, if we apply Roberts and Roussou's defence of the grammaticalisation of C-elements to the grammaticalisation of *de* and *ad* here, it is possible to argue that the original content of the verbal inflection of the otherwise finite complement clause (i.e. the original T-element) has been shifted upwards from T to FinP. There is, therefore, a close comparison between Roberts and Roussou's analysis of the grammaticalisation of C-elements and the grammaticalisation of Latin *de* and *ad*.

However, there is a key difference between the Roberts and Roussou's analysis of C-elements and the grammaticalisation of Latin/Romance *de* and *ad*, and that is Roberts and Roussou's examples of C-elements all involve the demise of subjunctives (the subjunctive tense died out in Greek, Calabrian and English, and this death is held to be intimately

---

[20] The issue of whether the original structure involved a VP and a PP adjunct or not is a matter of conjecture, since, unlike the history of English *to*-infinitives, there has been no systematic analysis or collection of data for the grammaticalisation of Latin/Romance *de* + infinitive and *a* + infinitive, and so the original state of affairs is unknown.

related to the grammaticalisation of Greek *na*, Calabrian *mu* and English *to*). In the transition from Latin to Romance, however, the original Latin subjunctive has not been lost but has even expanded in its usage in *quod*-clauses (see Vincent (1988:68)). The grammaticalisation of Latin/Romance *de* and *ad* therefore is not exactly the same as the other cases. Furthermore, while *ad* is only employed in contexts that denote futurity (i.e. indirect commands) where the corresponding *quod*-clause employs a subjunctive, *de* is not since it is also employed in contexts (namely 'declarative' contexts) where subjunctive is not obligatory (see sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.2), and in the case of *de*, there has been an 'upward' shift not of the subjunctive irrealis marker from T to C but that of the indicative content. The grammaticalisation of Latin/Romance *de* and *ad* therefore is similar yet different from Roberts and Roussou's analysis of C-elements, and as such it offers new insights into the Minimalist approach towards the grammaticalisation of C-elements.

Conclusion to chapter 2:

The grammaticalisation of C-elements has posed a problem for linguists of the Minimalist persuasion since it is not always a case of structural simplification where the end product is structurally simpler (i.e. syntactically smaller) than the previous one, and the grammaticalisation of Romance *de* and *ad* conforms to this problem in that the traditional analysis (e.g. Rizzi 1997) of the Romance C-domain does entail that there would have been a downward 'shift' in terms of the position of *de* and *ad.* Furthermore, while Roberts and Roussou's three case-studies of the grammaticalisation of C-elements are closely related to the death of the subjunctive mood in the respective languages, this is not the case in Romance, and in the case of *de*, there may have been an 'upward' shift of the indicative mood marker. The grammaticalisation of Latin/Romance *de* and *ad* is therefore a fascinating syntactic change that deserves more research.

Chapter 3: Modern Spanish vs Modern Italian:

Now that we have dealt with the transition from Latin to Romance, it is perhaps apt

to 'complete the story' by tracing the evolution of prepositional infinitives from early Romance to modern Romance. The similarities and differences between the use of prepositional infinitives in the history of these two languages will also shed light on Romance dialectalisation. Let's first remind ourselves of the configurations of prepositional infinitives in early Romance:

Table 1: Complement patterns from Latin to Romance:

	Latin	Spanish	Italian
Complement as the subject of the verb (coreference)	Bare infinitive (co-reference)	Bare infinitive *De* + infinitive *A* + infinitive (with *convenir*)	Bare infinitive *Di* + infinitive *A* + infinitive (spurious with *accadere* and *rimanere)*
Complement as the subject of the verb (no coreference)	Accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative, *ut*-clause + subjunctive	*Quod* + indicative or subjunctive (according to semantics of verb)	*Quod* + indicative or subjunctive (according to semantics of verb)
Complement as the object of the main verb (declarative- verb of thinking) (coreference)	Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative	Bare infinitive *De* + infinitive Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative/subjunctive	Bare infinitive, *Di* + infinitive Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative and subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (declarative- verb of thinking) (no coreference)	Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative	Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative /subjunctive	Accusative and infinitive *Quod* + indicative /subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (declarative- verb of fearing) (coreference)	Bare infinitive, accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative, *ut/ne* + subjunctive	Bare infinitive, *de* + infinitive, *quod* + indicative/subjunctive	Bare infinitive, *di* + infinitive, *quod* + subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (declarative- verb of fearing (no coreference)	accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative, *ut/ne* + subjunctive	*quod* + indicative/subjunctive	*quod* + subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (declarative/imperative)	Declarative: Accusative and infinitive Imperative:	Declarative: bare infinitive, accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative	Declarative: *di* + infinitive, accusative and infinitive, *quod* + indicative/subjunctive

	Ut-clause + subjunctive, bare infinitive	Imperative: *quod* + subjunctive, bare infinitive, *de* + subjunctive, *a* + inf	Imperative: *quod* + subjunctive, bare infinitive, *di* + infinitive, *a* + inf
Complement as the object of the main verb (ordering)	Bare infinitive *Ut*-clause + subjunctive	*quod* + subjunctive, *de* + infinitive	*quod* + subjunctive, *a* + infinitive
Complement as the object of the main verb (permitting)	Bare infinitive *Ut*-clause + subjunctive	Bare infinitive, *de* + infinitive, *quod* + subjunctive	Bare infinitive, *di* + infinitive, *quod* + subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (asking)	*Ut*-clause + subjunctive	*quod* + subjunctive	*di* + infinitive, *quod* + subjunctive
Complement as the object of the main verb (cogendi)	*Ut*-clause + subjunctive	*A* + infinitive	*Di* + infintive, *a* + infinitive

The distribution of prepositional infinitives in modern Romance, however, is very different.

Section 3.1: modern Spanish:

Spanish goes as far as it can to delete the *de* + infinitive, since it is no longer found with impersonal verbs (120), 121)), verbs of thinking, verbs of fearing, verbs of ordering:

120) Que   me   plac-e   oír-le

How   me.DAT.SG   please-3RD.SG.IMPERS   INF-him.DAT

Es-a   expresión   devot-a   (Belarmino 93)

That-FEM.SG   expression.FEM.SG   devout-FEM.SG

'How it pleases me to hear that devout expression from him.' (cf 5) where *plazer* takes *de* + infinitive in early Spanish)

121) A   determinad-as   edad-es

At   certain-FEM.PL   age-FEM.PL

Convien-e   dorm-ir   (Amistades 21)

Suit.3RD.SG.IMPERS.PRES   sleep-INF

'At certain ages it is suitable to sleep.' (cf 15 where *convenir* takes *a* + infinitive)

122)   ... cre-í   encontr-ar   una   extraña

Believe-1ST.SG.PRET   find-INF   a.FEM.SG   strange-FEM.SG

Expresión   (Variaciones 25)
expression.FEM.SG

'I believed that I found a strange expression.'(cf 23 where *creer* is used with *de* + infinitive)

123)   Tem-í   quedar-me   dormid-o   (Tormenta 45)

fear-1ST.SG.PRET   stay-REFL.PRO asleep-MASC.SG

'I was afraid of staying asleep.' (cf 40 where *temer* is used with *de*+ infinitive)

124)   El   principio   de-l   honor orden-a   mat-ar (Martes 19)

The   prince   of-the honourorder-3RD.SG kill-INF

'The prince of honour orders killing.' (cf 80) where there is *ordenar de* + infinitive).

The only exception to this elimination of *de* + infinitive is the use of *decir de* + infinitive (verb

of saying) to express commands. Since in early Spanish there is no attestation for such a

usage, it seems possible that modern Spanish has inserted this *de* in order to

distinguish *decir* 'to command' from *decir* 'to say', the latter of which has always taken the

bare infinitive:

125)   Me   dij-o   de   hac-er-me   su   amiga

Me.DAT   tell-3RD.SG.PRET   DE   make-INF-me his   friend
(Retablo 31)

'He told me to make me (=become) his friend.'

By contrast, the verbs of teaching and compelling (*verba docendi et cogendi*) that take *a* +
infinitive in early Spanish still do

in modern Spanish:

126)   El   cura   le   enseñ-a   a   habl-ar (Forja 11)

The   priest him.ACC   teach-3RD.SG.PRES   A   speak-INF (cf 70))

'The priest is teaching him to speak.' (cf 70).

127) Hay que oblig-ar-le a ped-ir la absoluta

Have.3RD.SG.IMPERS QUE oblige-INF-him A ask-INFthe absolute

'It is necessary to oblige him to ask for the absolute.' (cf 109)) (Martes 200)

128) El incentivo que me mueve a escrib-ir

The incentive REL.PRO me.ACC move.3RD.SGA write-INF

'The incentive that moves me to write.' (cf 108)) (Morir 14)

In the history of Spanish, therefore, there has been a drastic reduction of *de* + infinitive and a consequent rise of bare infinitives. *A* + infinitive, on the other hand, remains constant.

Section 3.2: Modern Italian:

Modern Italian, on the other hand, seems to have strengthened its use of *di* + infinitive, as these figures show for the verb of thinking (Skytte (1983:119-120 n.8)):

Table 2:

1200s:	
credo + Inf	61%
credo + *di*Inf	39%
1400s:	
credo +Inf	73%
credo + *di*Inf	27%
1600s:	
credo + Inf	28%
credo +*di*Inf	72%
1700s:	
credo + Inf	7%
credo +*di*Inf	93%
1900s:	
credo +Inf	2%
credo +*di*Inf	98%

The result of which is that there is no longer *di* + infinitive and bare infinitive alternation with the verb of thinking (128) or the verb of fearing (129):

129) ... quando creder-ai d' av-er-li trovati

When believe-2ND.SG.FUT DI have-INF-themfound-MASC.PL[21]

'when you believe that you have found them.' (Fenoglio: Ventitré p. 119)

(cf 27) where *credere* is used with the bare infinitive)

130) Non tem-evo di pecc-are (Fenoglio Ventitré p. 143)

Not fear-1SG.SG.IMPERF DI sin-INF

'I was not afraid of sinning.' (cf 44) where *temere* is followed by a bare inf.)

This Italian predilection for *di* + infinitive can also be seen in the spread of *di* + infinitive to the use of *dire* 'to command' (130) and other verbs of ordering and permitting:

131) Dim-mi di non part-ire... (Manzini: La sparv p. 139)

Tell-me.DAT DI not leave-INF

'Tell me not to leave.' (cf 62) where *quod* + subjunctive is used)

132)

Ordinò al-la cugina di restituir-gli

Order-3RD.SG.PRET to-the cousin DI restore-him.DAT

(Morante: M. e s. p. 167)

'He ordered his cousin to restore it for him.' (cf 84) where a bare infinitive is used and 85) where *a* + infinitive is used with *ordinare)*

However, with the *verba cogendi*, there has been a generalisation of *a* + infinitive, since verbs in this category that previously took *di* + infinitive are now attested with *a* + infinitive:

133) Constring-endo-lo a lasci-are

Force-PRES.PART-it A leave-INF

la scuola... (Morante (M e s. p. 230)

---

[21] *Credere* + bare infinitive does occur in modern Italian, but mainly when there is a predicate e.g.

non credette necessario parl-ar-ne (Morante: M e s. p. 354)
not believe-2ND.PL necessary talk-INF-it
'You do not believe it to be necessary to talk about it.'
and also in very literary (and hence archaising) style. (see Skytte (1983:127).

the   school

'forciing him to leave school' (cf 110) where *costringere* is constructed with *di* + infinitive)

134)   Il   padrone   lo

The   owner   him.ACC

Invit-ava   ad   accomod-ar-si (Morante M e s. 208)

Invite-3RD.SG.IMPERF   A   accomodate-INF-REFL.PRO

'The owner was inviting him to accomodate himself.' (cf 111) where *invitare* is constructed with *di* + infinitive).

Such are the main trends in the history of Spanish and Italian prepositional infinitive, and it is interesting to see that *de/di* + infinitive and *a* + infinitive have had very different fates in the history of these two languages: the former dies in Spanish and grows in Italian, while the latter is retained in Spanish and strengthened in Italian. It seems that there has been very little dialectal interaction between Spanish and Italian here.

Conclusion:

In this dissertation I have tried to trace the evolution of Romance prepositional infinitives by comparing the syntactic structures of Latin and early Romance. My comparison does not imply that there was a straightforward one-to-one relationship in the evolution of Latin constructions to Romance, since this would dangerously oversimplify historical linguistics. However, this comparison has allowed us to see what innovations early Romance has made, and the two most important themes in this dissertation are 1) the generalisation of *quod*-clause and 2) the rise of *de/di* + infinitive and *a* + infinitive. The Minimalist analysis of the grammaticalisation process is also interesting since apart from conforming with the Minimalist approach towards the grammaticalisation of C-elements, the grammaticalisation of *de/di* + infinitive has revealed another type of upward 'shift', namely that of the

indicative mood. I hope that I have given a clear analysis of the history of Romance prepositional infinitives.

(word count 13405)

Bibliography:

Ageno, F. (1978): 'Infinito' in *Enciclopedia Dantesca. Appendice.* Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, p. 268-292.

Bauer, B. (2010): 'Morphosyntactic persistence from Latin into Romance' in *The Cambridge History of the Romance languages, Vol 1*, by Ledgeway, A., Maiden, M. and Smith, J. C. (eds), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 543-639.

Benucci, F. (1992): 'Romance Infinitival Particles as Specifiers of CP' in *Proceedings of the XVII Meeting of Generative Grammar,* Trieste, February 22-24, 1991. Volume presented to Giuseppe Francescato on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Bolkenstein, M. (1976): The Relation between Form and Meaning of Latin Subordinate Clauses Governed by *verba dicendi*, *Mnemosyne*, ser. 4, 39, p. 156-175.

Heine, H. and Kuteva, T. (2002): *World Lexicon of Grammaticalisation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hofmann, J. B. And Szantyr, A. (1972): *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik,* Munchen, Beck.

Lightfoot, D. (1999): *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change, and Evolution.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Los, B. (1999): *Infinitival Complementation in Old and Middle English.* The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Mensching, G. (2000): *Infinitive Constructions with Specified Subjects: a Syntactic Analysis of the Romance languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Panchón, F. (2003): 'Complétives en *ut*' in *Grammaire Fondamentale du Latin,Tome X. Les propositions complétives en latin*, by Bodelot, C. (ed), Paris: Peeters , p. 335-481.

Pountain, C. (1998): 'Learned syntax and the Romance languages: the 'accusative and infinitive' construction with declarative verbs in Castilian', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96:393-410. Roberts, I. and Roussou, A. (2003): *Syntactic change. A Minimalist approach to grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi 1997. 'The fine structure of the left periphery', in Haegeman, Liliane (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 281-337

Roberts, I. (2001): 'Language change and learnability', in Bertolo, S. (ed.) *Language Acquisition and Learnability.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 81-125.

Vincent, N. (1988): 'Latin' in *The Romance Languages*, by Harris, M. and Vincent, N. (eds), London: Routledge, p. 26-78.

Latin:

Aug debe	Augustine: *De beata vita*
Aug con	Augustine: *Confessiones*
Caes Gall	Caesar: *Bellum Gallicum*
Cat	Catullus: *Carmina*
Cic Att	Cicero: *Epistulae ad Atticum*
Cic Catil	Cicero: *In Catilinam*
Cic Fam	Cicero: *Epistulae ad familiares*
Cic Mil	Cicero: *Pro Milone*
Cic Nat Deo	Cicero: D*e natura deorum*
Cic Phil	Cicero: *Phillipics*
Cic Verr	Cicero: *In Verrem*
Hier	Hieron: *Latin Vulgate*
Hor	Horace: *Epistulae*
Jer	Jerome: *Epistulae*
Liv	Livy: *Historiae*
Petron	Petronius: *Satyricon*
Plaut Asin	Plautus: *Asinaria*
Plaut Men	Plautus: Menaechmi
Plaut Mil	Plautus: *Miles Gloriosus*
Plaut Most	Plautus: Mostellaria
Plaut Poen	Plautus: *Poenulus*
Plaut Trin	Plautus: *Trinummus*
Pliny Ep	Pliny: *Epistulae*
Tac	Tacitus: *Annales*
Ter Andr	Terence: *Andria*

Ter Haut	Terence: *Heauton Timorumenos*
Sen Nat	Seneca Minor: *Quaestiones Naturales*

Early Spanish:

Alix	Anonymous: *El Libro de Alixandre*
Avi	Avila, J: *Epistolario espiritual*
Cap	Fernández de Córdoba, G.: *Cartas del Gran Capitán*
Cid	Anonymous: *Cantar del mio Cid*
Cis	Jiménez de Cisneros, F.: *Cartas dirigidas a don Diego López de Ayala*
Cor	Cortés, H.: *Segunda carta-relación al Emperador*
Cron	Anonymous: *Primera Crónica General*
Eli	Muñón, S: *Tragicomedia de Lisandro y Rosalia, llamada Elicia*
Laz	Anonymous: *La vida de Lazarillo de Tormes*
Lib	Anonymous: *Libro de los Ordenamientos de la ciudad de Sevilla*
Loor	Gonzalo de Berceo: *Loores de Nuestra Sennora*
Men	Guevara, A.: *Menosprecio de corte y alabanza de aldea*
Mor	Morales, A.: *Los quince discursos*
Oli	Pérez de Oliva, H: *Teatro*
Que	Anonymous: *Question de amor de dos enamorados*
Rue	Rueda, L: *Teatro*
San Pro	D. Yñigo Lopez de Mendoça: *Los proverbios de D. Yñigo Lopez de Mendoça con su glosa.*
SDom	Gonzalo de Berceo: *La vida del Sancto Domingo de Silos*
SLaur	Gonzalo de Berceo: *El Martyrio de Sant Laurençio*
SMill	Gonzalo de Berceo: La Estoria de Sennor Sant Millan
Ter	Teresa de Jesús: *La vida de la madre Teresa de Jesús, escrita de su misma mano*

Early Italian:

Alb	L. B. Alberti: *I libri della Famiglia*
Bon Oro	Bono Giamboni: *Orosio*
Bon Tra	Bono Giamboni: *Trattato*
Bon Vi	Bono Giamboni: *Vizi e Virtudi*
Bru Ret	Brunetto Latini: *Rettorica*
Dan Cv	Dante Alighieri: *Convivio*
Dan If	Dante Alighieri: Inferno
Dan Rime	Dante Alighieri: *Rime*
Dan Pd	Dante Alighieri: *Paradiso*
Dan Pg	Dante Alighieri: Purgatorio
Dan Vn	Dante Alighieri: *Vita Nuova*
Gior	Giordano da Pisa: *Quaresimale Fiorentino*
Gui	Guido Cavalcanti: *Donna me prega*
Lan	Lancia, A.: *Eneide volgarizzata*
Lett Fior	Anonymous: *Lettera Fiorentina*
Nov	Anonymous: *Novellino*
Stat	Anomymous: *Stat.Fiorentino*
Tes	Anonymous: *Testi Fiorentini*
Teso	Anonymous: *Tesoro di Brunetto Latini volgarizzato*
Tris	Tristano Riccardiamo: *App*
Zuc	Zucchero: *Pater Parte non numerata*

Modern Spanish:

Amistades	Hortelano, J, G.: *Nuevas amistades* (Seix Barral), Barcelona, 1961.
Belarmino	Pérez de Ayala, R.: *Belarmino y Apolonio* (Ed Saturnino Calleja), Madrid, 1921.
Camisa	Lauro Olmo: *La Camisa (*Ed Arión, El Bululú), Madrid, 1963.

Martes	Ramón del Valle-Inclán: *Martes de carnaval* (Imprenta Rivadeneyra), Madrid, 1930.
Morir	Ricardo Fernández de la Reguera: *Cuando voy a morir* (Ed Destino), Barcelona, 1951.
Retablo	Ramón del Valle-Inclán: *Retablo de la avaricia, la lujuria y la muerte (*Imprenta Rivadeneyra), Madrid, 1927.
Tormenta	Hortelano, J, G.: *Tormenta de verano* (Seix Barral), Barcelona, 1962.
Variaciones	Martínez-Menchén, A.: *Cinco variaciones* (Seix Barral), Barcelona, 1963.

Modern Italian:

Fenoglio Ventitré	Fenoglio, B.: *I ventitré giorni della città di Alba.* La malora. Gli Oscar 1970.
Manzini: La sparv	Manzini, G.: *La sparviera,* Oscar 1971.
Morante, M e s.	Morante, E.: *Menzogna e sortilegio*, Einaudi 1962