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ABSTRACT

This dissertation presents a syntactic study of Spanish prepositional finite clauses in a historical and crosslinguistic perspective. The goal is to analyze the syntax of those clauses and their components – prepositions (Ps) and finite clauses (complementizer phrases, CPs) – in Spanish and in several other European languages, and establish to what extent the current formal syntactic tools can provide an accurate account of the data that goes beyond language-internal explanations.

Argument and adjunct prepositional finite clauses are grammatical in present day Spanish, the former including que-clauses and indirect interrogative finite clauses. However, Old Spanish texts only document adjunct clauses (the traditional ‘adverbial clauses’); the argument ones do not become frequent until the 16th-17th centuries. Both types are examined in their properties and syntactic environment, and are compared to P + infinitives and P + noun phrase. Nominality of the clause, argumenthood and prepositionality, functional Ps vs. lexical Ps, the role of Case, and optionality of the P constitute the theoretical construct against which the evidence is checked.

Latin, (Old) Portuguese, (Old) French, and (Old) Italian are studied and compared to Spanish and among themselves. Several Germanic languages are surveyed, including (Old) English, the Nordic languages and Old Norse, (Middle) Dutch, and (Old High)
German. These languages show variable degrees of P + finite CP grammaticality, ranging from the high similarity between Portuguese or the Nordic languages and Spanish to the more limited similarity between Spanish and French, Italian or English. Nevertheless, it is documented that all these languages have some type of P + finite CP. In doing so, and since this dissertation devotes much attention to data, several relevant constructions are highlighted which challenge the commonly accepted conclusions about the clausal patterns of each language. Infinitives are also incorporated. The same theoretical construct applied to Spanish is used with these crosslinguistic data.

This dissertation contributes to the understanding of the syntax of Spanish prepositional finite clauses by looking at it from within and from a comparative perspective. It points out the need for crosslinguistically valid categories and explanations to comprehend the properties of human language.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Research question

This dissertation addresses the syntactic study of Spanish prepositional finite clauses, especially argument clauses, with particular attention to the questions and problems raised by the application of commonly accepted tools in formal syntactic work.

Prepositional finite clauses are common in present day Spanish, including argument clauses. However, this characteristic does not appear to be shared by closely related languages such as French or Italian. Observe the following set of examples with argument clauses complementing the prepositional verb acordarse (to remember) and the corresponding equivalents in the other languages:

(1)  a. Me acuerdo de que él era pequeño  Spanish
    b. Je me souviens (*de) qu’il était petit  French
    c. Mi ricordo (*di) che lui era piccolo  Italian
    d. Me recordo de que ele era pequeno  Portuguese

I recall that he was little
As the examples illustrate, while in Spanish and Portuguese the P de (of) is permitted before finite clause headed by the complementizer que (that), in French and Italian the same syntactic configuration is ungrammatical. The situation in Spanish has not been like this throughout its history. As will be shown in this dissertation, in older stages argument prepositional finite clauses are not attested. Observe the missing preposition in the following sentence, featuring the verb to remember (membra) in Old Spanish, also a prepositional verb at the time:

(2) & no se miembra que fauoresció la toma de cantalapiedra (Letras, Hernando del Pulgar, 15th c.)
   & not refl recalls that favored the seize of Cantalapiedra
   And he does not remember that he favored the seize of Cantalapiedra

This last example and the French and Italian ones depict prepositional verbs which do not accept the presence of the expected preposition when the object is a finite clause. This absence must have a syntactic basis that was operative in Old Spanish and also in present day French and Italian. What Old Spanish and present day French and Italian seem to share is a constraint against a preposition de selecting for a finite clause in argument contexts. This dissertation analyzes with a critical eye how far such comparison and others actually go, and how well syntactic theory can tackle the issues deriving from such a crosslinguistic approach.
This dissertation is designed from two perspectives that complement each other. The first perspective is historical, and involves the description and discussion of relevant data within the evolution of Spanish (argument) prepositional finite clauses. The second perspective is crosslinguistic. It involves the description and discussion of the syntax of several European languages, with the purpose of situating Spanish clauses in a wider context and revealing what can be learned from the comparison between Spanish and other related languages and from the comparison among these other languages as well.

This dissertation revolves around prepositional clauses, which have traditionally been included in the group of “subordinating conjunctions”. Other syntactic categories can combine with finite clauses too, such as adverbs (i.e., aunque (lit. ‘even that’, although) or ya que (lit. ‘yet that’, given that)). This latter group lies outside the scope of this research.

1.2. Organization of the dissertation

The dissertation is organized in 7 chapters. The first chapter is this introduction. The next section discusses the corpora used, the type of data included, and the traditional debate between the theoretical approaches to language/grammar change vs. the available data in historical studies.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature available on Spanish prepositional finite clauses. It includes a summary of leading works on the formation and syntax of adverbial (i.e., adjunct) prepositional clauses in Spanish and Romance, and specific important research
on Spanish argument prepositional finite clauses. These studies are divided into two groups: on the one hand, those which rely on analogy for the emergence and expansion of prepositional clauses (or “subordinating conjunctions” in more traditional works); on the other hand, those which concentrate specifically on the syntactic structure inside those prepositional clauses, without appealing to analogy. Since the motivation of this dissertation is syntactic, the latter approach will be adopted as the starting point.

Chapter 3 introduces the theoretical syntactic concepts serving as the framework for the dissertation. The first portion introduces the concepts of complementizer and complementizer phrases. It also discusses important questions with direct consequences for the study: the phrasal nature of the traditional unitary notion of subordinating conjunctions, the categorial status of the so-called prepositional complementizers, and the syntactic status of the cases in which an expected preposition fails to appear.

The second concept examined is the preposition. It addresses the division between functional and lexical prepositions, and the theoretical syntactic relation between functional prepositions and syntactic or abstract Case.

The third part centers around Case. It introduces the standard classification into morphological case and syntactic Case, and the subtypes: structural and inherent case/Case (the latter is further differentiated from lexical case/Case). This section includes two particularly important discussions: the criticisms against the necessity for any abstract Case at all, and the problems posed by finite clauses as receivers or not of Case.
The fourth question revolves around the syntactic analysis of the prepositions required by certain categories, such as *on* in *depend on*. Linguists generally agree that these prepositions must be ‘eliminated’ at some point in the syntactic analysis, with variations in the type of analysis proposed according to the theoretical framework of the author.

The final section deals with the problematic difference between arguments and adjuncts. Several criteria are examined. Special attention is devoted to prepositional finite clauses combining with nouns.

Chapter 4 presents and discusses the Spanish data. The first section is devoted to Old Spanish, where “Old” is to be understood in a lax way, roughly up to the moment when argument prepositional finite clauses are said to emerge/become more frequent around the 16th century. This fact serves as one of the cornerstones of the discussion in this dissertation. The syntax of prepositional phrases is studied and commented upon, including *P + NP/DPs, P + infinitives, and P + finite clauses*, both adverbial/adjunct clauses and complement/argument clauses. Indirect interrogatives are also studied. Variation in the presence or not of the preposition is also documented. The nominal features of CPs are criticized.

The second part introduces present day Spanish data, again including prepositional phrases with NP/DPs, infinitives, and finite clauses (with indirect interrogatives). Optionality and nominality are commented upon as well. This chapter presents the main theoretical problems and inconsistencies with categorization and features, such as the nominality of the clause as related with prepositions and the article, or the actual relation between prepositionality and argumenthood. The discussion in this section will call into
question the proposed hypotheses trying to explain the emergence of Spanish argument
prepositional finite clauses, with implications within Spanish syntax and
crosslinguistically.

Chapter 5 consists of the data from Latin and other Romance languages which serve
as comparison material with the Spanish data. Both historical and current data are
included for each language. Classical and Post-Classical Latin, Old and present day
Portuguese, Old and present day French, and Old and present day Italian are brought into
the discussion. Spanish is compared to very close languages in an attempt to show what is
similar, what is different, and especially what is unexpectedly different or similar. Many
particular cases make it possible to critique the general assumptions about the existence
of prepositional finite clauses in these languages. The conclusions reached only for
Spanish by some linguists are also reviewed and refuted.

Chapter 6 adds extensive Germanic comparative data. In principle, these languages
should be more different from Spanish than the other Romance languages, but the
Scandinavian languages are surprisingly similar to Spanish. Present day English and Old
English are studied. It is shown that the generally assumed statement that English does
not allow prepositional finite clauses does not hold up. Old Norse, Dutch, and German
are also studied. It is established that all of these languages have some type of P + finite
CPs. These results, along with those from Romance languages, reveal that the theoretical
tools used and some of the assumptions accepted regarding prepositional clauses are
insufficient to account for crosslinguistic data. The explanations produced for one
language are incompatible with some explanations for other languages despite their using the same theoretical categories and machinery.

Chapter 7 summarizes the discussions and comments accumulated in studying the data from Spanish and other languages. Some syntactic models which could account for crosslinguistic variation are critiqued. The need for well defined categories, features, properties, etc. is particularly emphasized. Finally, a list of future tasks is included.

1.3. Sources of data

The data used in this dissertation can be divided in two main groups: older stages of the languages studied and the present day languages.

The evidence presented for the modern languages comes from a large sum of examples available in many descriptive grammars, specialized papers, and corpora. Several examples are extracted from Google when needed, searching by typing in the target construction between double quotation marks.

As for present-day Spanish, I have collected data from multiple grammars, and scholarly papers. I have added my own examples when required. The examples of present-day Portuguese come from linguistic publications. Extra examples were extracted from Google. In these Google searches I included Portuguese Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese. Many of these examples indicate their origin in the URL. Patrícia Amaral provided me with some negative evidence, as indicated in the text. As for French and Italian, the majority of the examples were collected from scholarly publications,
including grammars and papers. Several examples, especially of Italian, were extracted from Google. These Italian examples were collected to supply evidence of constructions that were already considered standard and grammatical in the reference grammars that I was working with. Sandro Sessarego provided me with examples, as indicated in the text.

Regarding the Germanic languages, the core of the examples comes from grammars and papers. Colloquial data is collected from works by native speakers, especially for Dutch and Norwegian. The colloquial examples of Swiss German were provided by Dieter Wanner, a native speaker. Several examples were extracted from Google in order to illustrate grammatical constructions described in the reference grammars and papers. They include German German and Austrian German. The Scandinavian languages were searched using especially spelling differences in their complementizers and their different country codes in the URLs.

The older data were compiled from grammars, specialized articles, and corpora. It is important to keep in mind that “old” is to be interpreted in a lax way to include data spanning from the Middle Ages up to around the 16th-17th centuries. In the section on Old English I include some examples that are dated after that period.

The Examples of Old Spanish were collected from grammars and papers. Examples were also collected from González Ollé’s book *Lengua y literature españolas medievales*, and three on-line corpora:

1. Real Academia Española: *Corpus Diacrónico del Español (CORDE)* <www.rae.es>
2. Davies, Mark: *Corpus del Español* <www.corpusdelespanol.org>
The searches in these corpora were controlled for year but not for location. The same applies to Old Portuguese. In this case, the on-line corpus that I used was Davies, Mark and Michael Ferreira’s *Corpus do Português*: <www.corpusdoportugues.org>. Likewise, Old French data comes form grammars, papers, and one on-line corpus: University of Chicago’s *FRANTEXT* <http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/efts/ARTFL/databases/TLF07>. Again, examples were sorted out by data but not location. As for Old Italian, grammars, papers, and on-line corpus searches provide the necessary data. The corpus that I used for Old Italian is University of Chicago’s *Opera del Vocabolario Italiano* (ARTFL) <http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/efts/ARTFL/projects/OVI>. It is important to remark that all of the examples of Old Italian are from the Tuscany area. The Latin examples were collected from grammars and other linguistic works.

As for the Germanic languages, old data were collected from grammars and other scholarly works. Middle Dutch and Old (High) German are documented in as much detail as possible given that many resources were not available in a language that I could read easily. Old Scandinavian is represented only by Old Norse for the same reason. Nevertheless, I am confident that the data are sufficient to reach well-informed conclusions.

This dissertation is very data-centered. I aim at capturing the linguistic reality of the languages explored in as much detail as possible, including colloquial uses. One of the core discussion lines that I want to tackle in this research is the dialogue between the data and the formal theory.
1.4. Data and Historical Syntax

Regarding historical data, it is customary to mention the limited availability of historical evidence as a factor which may question the validity of any argumentation based on such limited data. It is true that no historical study can have access to as much data as a contemporary linguistic study, and that the recorded data may not be as pure (i.e. realistic, colloquial, non-formulaic, etc.) as desirable (cf. Campbell (1998: 335), Wanner (2000: 9 ff), Fischer (2007: 12 ff), among many others). Nevertheless, on a realistic note, there is no other solution than to make do with what we have at hand. Fortunately, in some cases such as Old Spanish the evidence is sufficient for good results. On a more positive note, some historical linguists actually conclude that historical texts are competent linguistic products as they are (Wanner (2000: 10)).

On the other hand, it is methodologically inadequate to speak of grammatical or ungrammatical constructions in the way those terms are used in studies of present day languages with living native speakers and their intuitions. Instead, attested/not attested is the actual category for old texts: the fact that some construction is not recorded does not imply that it was not in use at all. This does not mean that analyses of the recorded data may not lead to logical, well-sustained predictions in terms of grammaticality, but they always remain predictions. There is no negative evidence. To avoid this difficulty I adopt the attested/non-attested differentiation for the historical parts of this study.

On the other hand, the organization and goals of this dissertation allow me to overlook the relevance of the question of the reliability of the written word as a faithful reflection of the spoken language at a specific point in time. Since I group the data in two large
temporal groups (roughly, before and after the 16th-17th centuries), the question of whether a text dated in the 14th century actually reflects the language of that time or that of a previous state is not crucially binding on the discussions and conclusions in this dissertation because both the language of the 14th century and that of any previous stage are grouped in the same pre-16th century group.
CHAPTER 2

APPROACHES TO THE EMERGENCE OF SPANISH PREPOSITIONAL
FINITE CLAUSES: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

The main research question of this dissertation is to examine and evaluate the actual role of Case Theory in understanding the syntax of prepositional finite clauses and the locus of the change leading to their emergence in Spanish.

The study of the emergence of Spanish prepositional finite clauses has received much attention, in particular from two main approaches. On the one hand, the traditional or classical approach to this linguistic problem of the origin of P+ finite CPs has been that of analogy, that is, extension from other prepositional constructions in the language based on common surface properties. This will come as no surprise once the data are presented below. As will be seen, there were at least two prepositional syntactic constructions which would fit perfectly as the antecedent for the later prepositional finite clauses: both the prepositional infinitives and the PPs with nouns.

On the other hand, more recent works have attempted to establish the internal properties which may be at stake in the change. This second group, the minority one, not
only questions the explanatory precision of the analogical explanation, but more interestingly offers more specific information on the syntax of the configuration, opening at the same time important questions which will explored, discussed, and compared with many other languages, both in historical times and in their present-day stages. Therefore, this second approach to the subject will be adopted as the theoretical frame which will serve as the basis for the rest of this dissertation.

2.2. Surface structure approaches: Analogy

2.2.1. Herman (1963)

Herman (1963) is probably the principal study on the formation of subordinating conjunctions (and, therefore, of prepositional finite clauses; cf. next chapter) in the Romance languages, and an advocate of the analogical account.

The core hypothesis in this book is what has become the traditional account on the formation of the new Romance subordinating conjunctions: the Romance languages conserved only a reduced number of conjunctions (hence, complementizers) from Latin and consequently each language needed to form their own brand-new set of conjunctions following some specific frames.

This creative process is not only a Romance innovation, rather it is already on-going in the Latin period. As stated in all Latin grammars, apart from a rich infinitival system, Latin developed some finite subordination of its own, by using conjunctions such as *quod* (originally, a relative pronoun) or *quia*, a pattern later inherited by the Romance languages. Of all the Latin conjunctions (*quomodo* [the base for Medieval Spanish
commo], ut, quasi, si, ubi, quando, etc.), there is only one conjunction that widens its use in Post-Classical Latin: *quod*, which becomes a multipurpose conjunction, a role later played by its Romance descendent *que/che*.

As a reaction to the assumed semantic multiplicity of *quod*, some phrasal conjunctions are created already in the Post-Classical period, a process that will continue to be operative later on in the Romance period. Out of the different models for the new conjunctions, three are of extreme interest for this research. Notice in particular the third set (Herman 1963:74-101):

(1) 1. Pronoun + *quod*: causal *eo quod* (lit. ‘it that’)

2. P + pronoun + *quod*: causal *pro eo quod, ab eo quod, ex eo quod, in eo quod* (lit. ‘for it that’, ‘of it that’, etc.)

3. P + *quod*: *iuxta quod, secundum quod, praeter quod, propter quod, post quod,*
   *ante quod/antea quod, ad quod, de quod, pro quod, per quod*; also *propter quia, pro quia, secundum ut, ex quo, a quo, in quo*

As can be seen, the relationship between a pronoun and the conjunction *quod* is already present in Latin. As Herman indicates (1963: 76), it is characteristic of the Latin syntax to find a *quod* clause referring back to a pronoun in the main clause, as in *hoc dico quod* (lit. this I say, that…). Let us not forget the original relative nature of this *quod*. This syntactic phenomenon lies at the origin of the new conjunction *eo quod*, first a *quod*
clause referring back to an independent ablative pronoun, and from the Post-Classical period on, a fixed conjunction similar to quod (Herman 1963: 76).

The second creative process involves a preposition, with two possible paths: one with an intervening pronoun, as in pro eo quod (lit. ‘for it that’), and a second one without the pronoun, as in pro quod. Therefore, the configuration P+CP is already present in Latin. Consider the following examples of P+CP: This tendency to combine quod with another element increases, to the point that, as Herman (1963: 108) puts it, “par rapport aux textes classiques, la proportion des quod en locution augmente très sensiblement au cours de l’évolution du latin, et cela au détriment des quod construits seuls”. That is, combinations of a first element (for instance, a P) and quod are already in the rise within the Latin period, at the expense of quod functioning alone.

The previous panorama will be echoed during the Proto-Romance period. In effect, in the period of the 6th-9th centuries, Herman notes the presence of que/quod in all the diverse linguistic offspring of Latin, including, of course, the prepositional groups. These prepositional groups are present in the Romance period. Consider the following prolific causal conjunction ‘because’, with and without intervening pronouns (Herman 1963: 180-198):

(2) a. Spanish and Portuguese:

a. por que

b. por tal que, por esso que, por esto que, por aquello que, etc.
b. French:
   a. *por ço que, por ce que*
   b. *por que*
   c. *par que*

c. Italian:
   a. *perchè*
   b. *per ciò che*
   c. *però che*

Other examples of common conjunctions found in the Romance languages are Spanish *posque* (lit. ‘after that’), Italian *poi che* (lit. ‘after that’), French *puisque* (lit. ‘after that’), Spanish *antes que* (lit. ‘before that’), Spanish *mientre que* (lit. ‘while that’), etc.

According to Herman, all of these go back to Late Latin.

Other conjunctions were created during the Romance period as innovations in each separate language, such as Spanish *ata/fasta/fata que* (lit. ‘until that’), *de que* (lit. ‘since that’); Italian *acciò che* (lit. ‘to this that’, so that); French *à ce que* (lit. ‘to this that’), *de ce que* (lit. ‘of this that’), etc.

In general, then, Herman’s work highlights the existence of several active models producing new conjunctions from the Latin period on. In one word: analogy in the formation of new subordinating conjunctions.

---

1 There are other models beyond P + que, such as N + que: It. *fin che* (lit. ‘until that’), Fr. *de manière que* (so that); Past Participle + que: Fr. *supposé que* (lit. ‘supposed that’), Fr. *vu que* (lit. ‘seen that’), Sp. *dado que* (lit. ‘given that’), etc.
2.2.2. Tarr (1922)

Tarr (1922) studies the emergence of prepositional finite clauses in Spanish with particular attention to the argument clauses. In short, Tarr, like Herman, assumes an analogical account and a regularization process. Argument P+ finite CPs are the result of the analogical extension of the preposition from other prepositional constructions in the language:

The prepositional complementary clause, or rather, the forms *de que*, *a que*, *en que*, etc. obviously have their origin in the extension to use before the complementary clause of the preposition employed to introduce the noun or infinitive complement. (Tarr (1922: 253-254))

Other structures present in the old language also serve as models for the new construction:

1. Prepositional interrogatives and relative clauses:

   (3) he dubdado sobre [cuál haré antes] (Cárcel de amor. 15th c.)

   I have doubted about which I will make before

   I have doubted about which one to do first

   Serradilla (1995: 159)
2. P + pronoun + CP:

(4) Los castellanos, pesandoles mucho de lo que la reyna donna Vrraca su sennora
diera las fortalezas et los castiellos al rey de Aragon… (Primera Crónica
General, Alfonso X, 647a, 10. 13th c)

The Castilians, aggrieveing-them much of it that the queen Ms Urraca their lady
had-given the fortresses and the castles to-the king of Aragón

(5) Et esa noble reina donna Berenguella muy alegre por aquello que su fijo el rey
don Fernando auie conquerida la çipdat de Cordoua…fizo sus gracias a Dios
(Crónica General, 734b, 25.)

And that noble queen Mrs Berenguella very happy for that that her son the king
Mr Fernando had conquered the city of Córdoba made her thanks to God

This pronominal construction is attested not only with meaningless Ps de, a, en, but also
in some adverbial prepositional finite clauses such as por aquello que, despues desto que,
sin lo que, etc., as can be seen in the following examples:
And that noble queen Berenguella, very happy because her son Fernando had conquered the city of Córdoba, thanked God.

Tarr (1922: 110-111)

3. Prolepsis. In the proleptic construction the subject of the subordinate clause is anticipated in the main clause, where it is introduced by a preposition and connected to the verb in the main clause, as can be seen in the next example:

(6) me plaze de myo Çid que fizo tal ganancia (Cid 19r, 885. 13th c.)

Me pleasures of Myo Çid that did such victory

It pleases me that Myo Çid won

Tarr (1922: 120)

However, Tarr himself reduces the possible relevance of the prolepsis, since it is only frequent with the P de, meaning that this construction was not significant in the language and cannot account for the history of the majority of the prepositions.

4. P + *commo*, where *commo* is considered a conjunction like *que*:

(7) membrandoseles de *commo* son complidos cristianos (Siete Partidas, Alfonso X, I, 4, 57. 13th c.)
Remembering-themselves of how they-are faithful Christians

Remembering that they are faithful Christians.

Tarr (1922: 124)

In general, Tarr summarizes the analogical change and the features involved in the following paragraph:

On the breakdown of the classic Latin syntax of the subordinate element, the infinitive takes on many new verb functions, but, being a noun in its essential nature, its own construction in the sentence is assimilated to that of the simple noun much earlier than in the case with the que clause (...). But in the case of the intrinsic complementary clause (...) the que (corresponding to the Latin accusative and infinitive, ut, quod, etc.) persists, and the assimilation of the construction of the complementary que clause to that of the noun and infinitive complement is a gradual development that does not reach its logical culmination until the period of the modern Spanish, which is the only Romance language which arrives at complete uniformity of construction between the noun, the infinitive, and the noun clause. (Tarr 1922: 114-116)

Therefore, what is at stake for Tarr is the nominal properties of the finite clauses. The finite clause lagged behind the infinitive in becoming nominal, which prevented it from combining with prepositions until the 16th century. As time goes by, the finite clause mimics the infinitives and NPs and ends up being selected by Ps.

In combination with analogy, Tarr (1922: 259, fn 4) notes that some specific expressions (for instance, emotion expressions and verbs, but also others such as reparar, caer, etc.) underwent reanalysis, as a result of which their initially adjunct/adverbial finite complement (the cause of the emotion, the purpose, etc.), through constant co-
appearance, ended up as arguments. This reanalysis is linked to a reduction in the semantic content of the Ps involved. A paradigmatic example would be *a que* in *esperar a que*, where the initially purposive *a* becomes what “comes to be felt as its [of the verb of expression] (i.e., expected) complement” (Tarr 1922: 259, fn 4).

To sum up, Tarr argues that the formation of argument P+CPs in Spanish is the result of different linguistic forces. In line with Herman and others (see below), Tarr assumes the action of the analogy from other prepositional contexts, in combination with other specific changes in the internal syntactic features of the finite clauses (nominality) and reanalysis from adjunct into argument.

2.2.3. Cano (1977-78)

Although it focuses on the description of variation in the verbal regimes in medieval Spanish more than in the causes behind the prepositional usages (as will be exposed in the next chapter), it is nonetheless necessary to mention that Cano (1977-78: 336) also speaks of analogy, as can be seen in the following quote:

Un factor que hay que tener continuamente en cuenta en este campo es la analogía, o, si se quiere, el cruce o interferencia de construcciones: un verbo que adopta determinada construcción, por las razones que sean, puede atraer a ese tipo a otros verbos, o a otras estructuras, próximos significativamente.
A factor that must always be taken into consideration in this field is analogy, or, for better say, the crossing or interference of constructions: a verb that adopts a certain construction, for any reason, may attract to that same type other significantly close verbs or other structures. (My translation)
2.2.4. Bogard and Company (1989)

Analogy is the basis for Bogard and Company (1989), who study the introduction of the preposition *de* in the pattern N + (P) + *que*. The authors point out the current variation:

(8)  a. Tengo miedo **de que** vengas
    I-have fear of that you-come
    I am scared that you come

b. Tengo miedo **que** vengas
    I-have fear that you-come
    I am scared that you come

The appearance of the *P de* is considered to be caused by analogy with the pattern *de*+infinitive, as in, for instance, *miedo de ir* (lit. fear of going, ‘(to be) scared of going’) extending to *miedo de + finite clause*. This extension is considered to be put into motion in order to eliminate a possible confusion between complement clauses and relative clauses, as indicated in the following quote (Bogard and Company 1989: 260):

En el español, además, el nexo *que* tiene una interpretación preferente como completivo cuando va regido por verbos, y como relativo cuando depende de sustantivos. El cambio analógico a que nos referimos está motivado por el hecho de que la estructura que nos compete muestra una conjunción *que* con sustantivo pero con valor de completiva. Ante esta situación el sistema ejerce presión para desambiguar la semejanza de esta estructura con las oraciones de relativo, y se extiende así la preposición del esquema con infinitivo al esquema con *que* y verbo conjugado.
In Spanish, besides, the connective *que* has a preferential interpretation as completive when it is selected by verbs and as a relative when it depends on nouns. The analogical change we are referring to is motivated by the fact that the structure we are dealing with shows a conjunction *que* with a noun but with a completive value. In this situation the system puts pressure in order to disambiguate the similarity between this construction and the relative ones, and this way the preposition spreads from the infinitival scheme to the scheme with *que* and inflected verb. (My translation)

However, this hypothesis raises some questions. First, Serradilla (1995: 158) shows that the presence of the preposition does not always eliminate ambiguity, as the following example proves:

(9)  Sepades *que a nos es fecha rrelacion* en *que* vosotros andays de lugar en lugar muchos tiempos e annos (*Documentos Villa III*, 1499)

Know that to us is done relation in that you walk from place to place many times and years

They inform us that you have been wondering around for a long time

Serradilla (1995: 158)

Here *en que* could be a prepositional relative ("letter in which...") or the complement of the N via the P *en* ("news that..."). Also, if ambiguity were a problem in the past, Spanish should not have complement and relative clauses of the form N + *que* in order to avoid further cases of ambiguity, but this is contrary to fact, as the following examples prove:
The context makes it clear enough what type of *que*-clause each one is: (10a) only admits a relative interpretation, while in (10b) that same interpretation is impossible.


Serradilla (1995) shares with Bogard and Company the idea that analogy is the key factor. For this linguist, there has been a “tendencia uniformadora del idioma” (Serradilla (1995: 154)), whereby *que*, initially sufficient as subordinating marker, has been assimilated into the prepositional selectional properties of certain verbs and other expressions. As will be discussed later, this is reduced to argument clauses, for, as Serradilla (1996: 32) says, “[c]uando las preposiciones no están regidas por el verbo pueden aparecer ante QUE sin mayor problema (para que, por que, sin que…).” (When the Ps are not governed by the V they can appear before THAT without any problems (*para que, por que, sin que…*) (My translation).

The possible factors that may have favored the extension of the prepositional construction, most of which have already been discussed before, are listed below (see also Serradilla (1997: 236-260)):
1. Prepositional adverbial clauses, particularly the temporal *de que* (lit. ‘since that’). As has already been shown (cf. Herman (1963) above), the configuration P + finite CP is already found in adverbial clauses in Old Spanish. Serradilla focuses her attention in the fact that some of the adverbial clauses are introduced by the same Ps that will later on introduce argument clauses, as can be seen in the following examples:

(11) a. Y embâaron sus escuderos y moços a que me acompanıassen (*Celestina*. IX., 1499)

    And they-sent their squires and boys to that me they-accompany

    And they sent their squires and servants to accompany me

b. é erró mucho de que non metió sus fijas consıgo (*Gran Conquista de Ultramar*)

    and erred much of that non put his daughters with-him

    And he made a big mistake by not keeping his daughters with him

Serradilla (1995: 155)

In some sense, this is clearly reminiscent of Tarr’s (1922) reanalysis from adverbial clauses into argument clauses in cases like emotion verbs, where *de* would change from indicating the cause into a meaningless P; or *a que*, from a temporal meaning such as *esperar a que* in the sense of ‘wait until…’ into a governed P.

2. Prepositional interrogative clauses, which seem to have entered the language before. However, this is also a late phenomenon, and it is not the case that prepositional indirect
interrogatives were very common long before the emergence of argument finite clauses with *que*.

3. P + *commo*.

4. Ambiguity with the relative *que* to some extent, following Bogard and Company (1989).

5. P + pronoun + *que* construction.

6. The proleptic construction.

As can be seen, Serradilla’s work updates some of the ideas already developed in Tarr (1922), for instance, and argues in favor of a multiple-causation analogy, with different models pushing for the creation of prepositional argument finite clauses. There is no doubt these other prepositional models offered superficial frames which could really be copied into argument clauses.

The idea of analogy and the regularization process is reintroduced in Serradilla (1996), again speaking in terms of the spread of the P before a complement clause as a unifying tendency. However, as opposed to Bogard and Company (1989), who speak of P + infinitive, Serradilla (1996) argues that the origin of the argument prepositional finite clauses is to be found in the configuration P+N, which is also argued to be on the basis of the creation of Romance prepositional infinitives.

The same hypothesis is exposed in Serradilla (1997: 177). The extension of the P from the nominal configuration P+NP/DP into the infinitive is considered to be easier because of the previous existence of prepositional infinitives in Late Latin. These same
chronological criteria explain why prepositional finite clauses, which were never assigned Case in Latin and so were never selected for by a P, emerge at a later moment. Serradilla (1997) adds that *que* established itself as a default subordination marker, which explains why it is not necessary to use a P to select for it. In agreement with Cano (1985), and Tarr (1922), Serradilla (1997: 215-216) indicates that the P only appears when it is relevant semantically, that is, in the adverbial clauses such as *fasta que, desque, porque*, etc. Once *que* loses this general value as subordination marker will Ps start selecting for *que*-clauses.

Notice, however, that this traditional idea of *que* as the general marker of subordination, though appealing, poses some problems. On the one hand, as Serradilla (1997: 216, fn 8) notes, why the value as general subordination marker is lost only in Spanish and Portuguese and not in French or Italian is unexpected.

On the other hand, an answer is needed to why the prepositional combinations are needed at all even in the adverbial contexts if *que* was in itself self-sufficient, including adverbial meanings such as causal, final, etc. In other words, for this hypothesis to be completely functional, we need a proper justification for the appearance of any prepositional finite clauses, for instance *porque*. Remember that *porque* and *que* alone are found in the same periods expressing the same meaning. Why did so-called causal *que* not disappear completely once *porque* was formed, which, by the way, was in the Latin period?
2.2.6. Conclusions

As has been shown, the analogical approach revolves around the existence of models that either establish a general frame for new prepositional subordinating conjunctions, as in the case of adverbial conjunctions (cf. Herman (1963)), or, in the more specific case of argument prepositional finite clauses in Spanish, the extension from prepositional constructions attested earlier in the language. In the latter context, several possible frames are taken into consideration: prepositional pronominal clauses, comno-clauses, indirect interrogative clauses, etc.

However, with the notable exception of Tarr’s attention to reanalysis, not much is contributed to the understanding of the syntax of prepositional finite clauses and the features involved in their formation, etc. This is what the works reviewed in the next section concentrate on.

2.3. Syntactic approaches

2.3.1. Moreno (1985-86)

One of the analogical models proposed by Tarr (1922) is the configuration P + pronoun + que, where the finite clause is said to be in apposition to a meaningless pronoun which is what is really selected for by the P. This syntactic alternative to the direct P + finite CP becomes the locus of change in Moreno (1985-86). In this work, Moreno studies the paratactic cataphora, namely the syntactic/discourse procedure which consists of a pronoun referring to a finite clause which is situated later in the sentence. Examples of this cataphora are found in a variety of languages; for instance:
(12) a. They expect it of you that you cooperate

Moreno (1985-86: 178)

b. Wir dürfen nicht davon ausgehen, dass die Wolke ursprünglich überall dieselbe Dichte hat

We should not of-it depart, that the cloud originally everywhere the-same density has

We should not assume that the cloud has the same density all around

Moreno (1985-86: 179), amended by Dieter Wanner, pc

c. Eti slové ne tol’ko ubedili meniá v tom, chto ia ne krasavets… (Dětstvo, Otrochestvo, Ionost, Tolstoy)

These words not only convinced me of this, that am not beautiful…

These words not only convinced me that I am not a beauty…

Moreno (1985-86: 180)

d. My ne poëjali zá gorod potomú, chto shël dozhd (Russian)

We did not go out to the country for this, that it was raining

We didn’t go out to the country because it was raining

Moreno (1985-86: 181)

e. Attól félek, hogy megfáztak (Hungarian)

Of-it I-am-afraid, that I-get-cold

I am afraid of getting a cold

Moreno (1985-86: 183)
Even Latin had this construction, and notice that the particular examples Moreno cites involve argument PPs relating to a finite clauses:

(13) a. **In eo** est peccatus **si** non licuit

   In this is sin if not is-licit

   The trouble resides in that it was not licit

b. Totum **in eo** est tectorium **ut** concinnum sit

   All in this is plasterwork that elegant is

   All depends on the plasterwork being elegant

   Moreno (1985-86: 175)

This is exactly what we find in Old Spanish $P +$ pronoun $+ que$, as well as in French $de ce que$ and $à ce que$:

(14) a. **Por esso** vos la do **que** la bien curiedes

   For this you it I-give that it well you-take-care

   I give this to you so you take care of it

b. **por tal** fago aquesto **que** sirvan a so señor

   For that I-do this that they-serve to their lord

   I do this so they serve their lord well

   Moreno (1985-86: 172)
For Moreno, it is the change from a paratactic P + pronoun + *que* into a completely hypotactic –hence, subordination- configuration what might explain the creation of P + finite CP in Spanish. P + finite CP results from the loss of the connecting pronoun, and by the action of reanalysis. Therefore, whereas in French *par+ce que* became a fixed conjunction while keeping the original pronoun, in Spanish the pronoun was lost. Schematically, Moreno (1985-1986: 174) proposes the following change:

\[ (15) \quad porque: \quad \text{por + esso, que} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{por + Ø, que} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{porque} \]

Moreno suggests the same type of change for argument prepositional finite clauses. The Ø represents the empty space left by the elimination of the pronoun:

\[ (16) \quad \text{a. Estaba contento de } \text{Ø que} \quad \text{el trozo fuera tan abundante} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Was happy of that the piece was so abundant} \\
&\text{He was happy that the piece was so large}
\end{align*}
\]

\[ \text{b. Estoy de acuerdo con } \text{Ø que} \quad \text{venga} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Am of accord with that comes} \\
&\text{I agree with his coming}
\end{align*}
\]

Moreno (1985-86: 174)
The existence of some examples of P + pronoun + que in Old Spanish, just like the French de ce que or à ce que, would be evidence in favor of Moreno’s account of the facts.

Kayne (1999) also acknowledges the Spanish combination de que, and approaches it in the same lines as Moreno’s:

Spanish de (unlike French and Italian) can be followed by que + finite clause, although not by a finite clause without que. This may be related to French having …de ce que+finite clause, with ce a demonstrative/pronominal of some sort. (Kayne (1999: 41, fn 3))

Notice, however, that Kayne’s account poses some problems in a strictly synchronic analysis, for it requires an elided syntactic category of some sort occupying an empty position which in addition can never be overtly filled in the modern language, be it a pronoun (17a) or an article (17b):

(17) a. *Estoy contento de eso que vengas a mi fiesta
    I-am happy of that that you-come to my party

    b. *Estoy contento del que vengas a mi fiesta
    I-am happy of-the that you-come to my party

Notice, however, that some syntactic issues require further elaboration for this hypothesis to be fully operative. The main one has to do with the fact that the second step, which
assumes the pronoun-drop before the reanalysis, produces a syntactic “disturbance”, for it requires a main clause ending with a (transitive) preposition without complement, an analysis highly problematic for Spanish, a language where preposition-stranding is not allowed. In addition, the syntactic status of the que-clause would remain uncertain, in that, not being the complement of the P yet, it would still need to refer back but there would be nothing to refer to. Notice too that the supposition of a pro would be problematic, since, in pure syntactic terms, this pro would still be a pronoun, and what Moreno is arguing for is the elimination of the pronoun complement of the P. A possible solution for this syntactic impasse would be to suggest that the reanalysis is somehow contemporary to the pronoun-drop, although, as is well known, a reanalysis does not involve surface change but rather is restricted to a reorganization of the internal structure of the elements involved.

Another problem for Moreno’s account has to do with chronology. As was shown above (cf. Herman (1963)), porque or para que, for instance, are already attested in the first Spanish texts alongside their pronominal counterparts, which implies that, at least for the Romance period, it is difficult to see how the non-pronominal adverbial P+CPs could have derived from pronoun-dropping. Besides, in the case of French a similar hypothesis had already been contemplated and rejected by Herman (1963) himself in these same terms:

Le problème des rapports entre *por ce que* et *por que* est assez difficile à resoudre. Busse (…) affirme que *por que* provient de *por ce que*. (…) L’hypothèse de Busse ne paraît en effet pas être fondée: les simples arguments chronologiques
y contredisent, pusique *por que* n’apparaît point plus tardivement que *por ce que*. (Herman (1963: 188))

The problem of the relation between *por ce que* and *por que* is quite difficult to solve. Busse (…) affirms that *por que* comes from *por ce que* (…). Busse’s hypothesis does not seem to stand on good foundations: just the chronological arguments contradict it, for *por que* does not appear later than *por ce que*. (My translation)

Nevertheless, the pronoun-drop hypothesis, once its syntactic problems are solved, may work for the argument clauses, because in this case chronology fits in the picture.

### 2.3.2. Barra (2002)

In this work, the emergence of Spanish prepositional argument clauses is approached from a generative grammar perspective, with one main purpose: to account of the emergence of Spanish P + finite CPs by using syntactic properties only.

One of the key theoretical features of Barra’s study is the rejection of analogy as an explanatory force behind the change at stake, in clear opposition to a well-established tradition, as exposed in the previous pages. Thus, analogy is deemed as an extremely vague term which cannot be proven or delimited, that is, it cannot be reduced to systematic rules. In this, Barra is in keeping with the common criticism coming from generative grammarians against the concept of analogy. Take, for instance, Anttila’s (2003) comments on the issue:
Linguistics has traditionally been based on analogy, both synchronically and diachronically. (...) A basic split occurred in linguistics when generative grammar rejected the notion of analogy in the early 1960s, maintaining that there is only underlying phonology and phonological rules. (Anttila (2003: 435))

Consequently, Barra criticizes the previous analogical approaches with one main idea in mind: an analogical approach must justify why the proposed model leaves some forms unaffected. To be more precise, on the one hand Barra rejects Herman’s analogical hypothesis for it predicts that any P can combine with que and produce a new “subordinating conjunction”, when in reality this has not been the case. On the other hand, those studies that assert an analogical extension from prepositional infinitives (cf. Bogard and Company (1989) above, for instance) do not account for the fact that some Ps never combine with an infinitive:

(18)  a. Desde que estudio inglés
      Since that study English
      Since I am studying English

b. *Desde estudiar inglés
   Since study English

c. Según (que) cuentan
   According-to that tell
   According to what they say
d. *Según contar

According-to tell

From Barra’s perspective, analogy seems to have fallen short in a crosslinguistic view. For Barra it is necessary to explain why the analogical process of Spanish and Portuguese did not apply in French or Italian, where prepositional finite clauses are more restricted (but this question will be amply explored, discussed, and criticized in the following chapters). A final problem has to do with chronology, for Barra wonders why analogy did not apply before it actually did, as late as the 16th century for argument clauses for instance. Let us not forget that prepositional adverbial clauses are attested from the beginnings of the language, which opens the legitimate question of why the model was not active already in the 14th century, for instance.

For pro-analogists, the rejection of analogy as an explanatory mechanism is unwarranted, even in syntax (cf. Hankamer (1972), Cole (1973), Itkonen and Haukioja (1997)). Notice that Barra’s complaints against this mechanisms seem to respond more to a difference in the theoretical lens through which he is looking at the data than to the reality of the data itself (as happens with every different framework in Linguistics). The same set of examples Barra examines, with all the exceptions, are not a problem for pro-analogsists, under the agreed assumption that it is just natural to discover that the extension from a model has not been complete. Analogy is not exception-less (cf. Joseph (1998) and Wanner (2006)).
Once we have examined the principle criteria whereby Barra rejects analogy, we turn now to the core of this syntactic study. Since Barra attempts to explain a syntactic change in the sentential structures of Spanish, it is necessary to start by examining what his hypothesis is regarding subordination in Old Spanish. In this respect, Barra’s study clearly revolves around one very precise assumption about Old Spanish sentential syntax:

(19) \([V_i][\text{ANAPH} \text{ que } i \ldots]\) General structure in Medieval Spanish

\([\text{Main clause}][\text{anaphoric adjunct clause}]\)

Barra (2002: 71)

Medieval Spanish finite sentential syntax is reducible to the generalization in (19), in all cases (Barra (2002: 111, et passim)). As can be seen, Barra is arguing that there was no sentential complementation in Old Spanish. All subordination is just adjunction. Consider the following examples:

(20) a. \([\text{coñosco}] [\text{ANAPH} \text{ que } i \text{ a ti lo deuo agradesçer}]\) (Alexandre P 38c. 13th c.)

I-know that to you it I-must to-thank

I know that I have to thank you for this

Barra (2002: 74)

b. \([\text{Conosçì } [\text{lo}] \text{ anoche } \ldots] [\text{que } i \text{ me sacarie el alma oy en aqueste dia}]\)

(Alexandre P 1042ab. 13th c.)
I knew it last night that he would take my soul on this day

Barra (2002: 75)

c. [[c'esto_i] vos acomendo] [que, cojades dello cada uno .i. almu] (Fazienda de Ultramar, 73/1-2, 13th c.)

This you I-command that you pick of-it each one 1 piece

I command each of you to pick up one piece of it

Barra (2002: 79)

d. [comendol [c'aquesta cosa_i]] [que, non andidies tras otros dios] (Fazienda de Ultramar 150/24-25. 13th c.)

He ordered him this thing that not he went after other gods

He ordered him this, namely that he shouldn’t follow other gods

Barra (2002: 81)

e. [e siempre te acuerda_i] [ANAPH que; eres omne mortal] (Rimado de Palacio 48d. 14th-15th c.)

And always you remember that you are man mortal

And always remember that you are mortal

Barra (2002: 88)

All the previous examples reflect the same syntactic pattern: a subordinated clause, syntactically an adjunct, refers back to a main clause. In some cases, the subordinate
clause will be coreferent with a pronoun or an NP, which is the actual argument in the main clause. However, in other cases the subordinate clause may just refer back to the main clause without being coreferent with any nominal element. Barra argues that in all of them there is no complement clause, not even in (20a) where the clause is the only element modifying the V:

La estructura \([V_i]_{\text{ANAF que}}_{i-1} \ldots\) satisface las necesidades argumentales de V pero no satisface las propiedades sintácticas, dado que está en simple relación de adjunción (Barra (2002: 86))
The structure \([V_i]_{\text{ANAPH que}}_{i-1} \ldots\) satisfies the argument requirements of the V but it does not satisfy its syntactic properties, since the subordinate clause is only an adjunct to the V (My translation)

Accordingly, in (20a) the V does not assign Case to the clause. In (20b, c, d) Case is assigned to a pronominal element (lo, etc.) or to an NP (aquesta cosa, etc.). These latter examples remind of the cataphora mentioned by Moreno (1985-86).

In general, then, Barra partially inserts himself in the traditional view of Old Spanish subordination which is normally defined as multipurpose or loose (cf. Lapesa (1997: 217), Cano (1999: 172-173), Penny (2001: 223), Batllori et al. (2001), Elvira (2004)), although he goes much further by hypothesizing that all subordination is adjunction, which, of course, comes with a whole set of theoretical implication and consequences.

Now, the turning point is the nominalization of the finite clause. Once finite clauses become nominal in the 16th century, these adjunction patterns disappear and the clause
integrates into the main clause as a complement (as the direct object or as a prepositional complement) (Barra (2002: 92)):

La proposición-que del español moderno posee el rasgo nominal. Esto le permite ser legitimada en los mismos contextos que un sintagma nominal (Barra (2002: 173))
The contemporary Spanish that-clause has the nominal feature. This allows it to be licensed in the same contexts as a noun phrase (My translation)

As such, the finite clause may now receive Case (Barra (2002: 186)).

Up to the 16th century, therefore, no argument P + finite CPs are attested in Spanish (but see the next chapter for more extensive and detailed information). The change brings about the possibility of (argument) prepositional finite clauses. As expected, two syntactic factors are especially relevant:

1. The features of the Ps. Only some Ps will qualify to be able to select for a finite clause as their complement (Barra (2002: 92 ff.)

2. The features of the finite clause. Finite CPs must be nominal to be allowed as complements of Ps. Evidence that the Spanish finite clause has the nominal feature comes from the fact that it can be combined with an article:

(21)   **El que** Luis beba por la mañana sólo nos crea problemas

The that Luis drinks in the morning only us creates problems

The fact that Luis drinks in the morning only causes us trouble

Barra (2002: 281)
To meet the requirements, prepositions must be able to select for what Barra (2002: 197) calls “4-dimensional definite NPs”, that is, definite noun phrases with a temporal content (like *goal, fall, concert*, etc. as opposed to non-temporal nouns such as *friendship*). These nouns share the temporal content with finite clauses, which explains that, once Ps may select for them, they are ready to select for a finite clause (Barra (2002: 198)).

Barra classifies Ps in 3 groups according to their grammatical independence and semantic content:

1. Grammatically and semantically autonomous. These are the Ps in adverbial clauses: *para que, porque*, etc. These combinations of P + finite clause can appear in different contexts and have a distinctive meaning. Historically, these Ps appear to allow finite clauses since the first attestations of Spanish (and other Romance languages). Barra concludes that these Ps do not assign Case (Barra (2002: 284)).

2. Grammatically and semantically dependent. These combinations cannot appear freely since they require particular contextual conditions. Their interpretation is obtained through context. Combinations like *con que, en que, sobre que*, etc.

3. Grammatically dependent but without semantic interpretation. These combinations can only appear when selected and do not have any meaning. The only clear case is *de que*, but *a que* and *en que* could be included here. The P is not really selected; it only appears to give Case to the clause. That is, what has traditionally been described as a functional preposition acting as Case-marker.
The second part of the requirements has to do with the features of the finite clause. Here the assumption is that prepositional argument finite clauses only emerged once the finite clause became nominal and therefore could actually be selected for by a P. Though with different technical backgrounds, this idea is reminiscent of Tarr’s comments on the nominality of the finite clause in Spanish (see Tarr’s quotation above).

Notice the implication: the entrance of the P is linked to the creation of argument clauses in Spanish. Once finite CPs can be the object of Ps, they can also be the complement of transitive verbs. Moving away from Spanish, the question is what happens then with other languages.

Barra’s study has very clear crosslinguistic consequences. Take for instance French. French has not developed an argument P + finite CP system like Spanish. Rather, it continues the pronominal alternative (de ce que). Since the creation of prepositional argument finite clause is tightly linked to the creation of argument finite clauses in the language, the lack of the former automatically implies the lack of the latter. And this is in fact proposed by Barra: according to his own premises, French must not have complement clauses because its clauses cannot receive Case, as derives from the ungrammaticality of the argument configurations de que, à que or en que. Notice that it follows from this that French finite clauses are not nominal. Therefore, there is no finite sentential complementation in French, only adjunction, even those which seem to function as DO (Barra (2002: 399)). These extensions seem very risky, and Barra himself acknowledges the complication.
2.4. Conclusions

This chapter contains our first incursion in the questions this dissertation revolves around. Traditionally, the emergence of prepositional argument finite clauses in Spanish has been regarded as a question of analogy. In the end, for advocates of analogy is natural to conclude that analogy is behind a construction that shares certain crucial features with other related constructions (P + NP/DP and P + infinitive) which happen to be present in the language before. It fits well in the concept of extension (cf. Harris and Campbell (1995)), but also the basic 4-part analogy, in line with an Itkonen and Haukioja’s (1997) approach.

On the other hand, the analogical studies fall short in their syntactic explanations and inquiry into the formal structure of the language, and, of course, into the features of prepositional finite clauses. In order to understand what happened in the history of Spanish, it is mandatory to understand the syntax behind the specific construction. And these are the questions that Barra and, in a lesser degree, Moreno raise, as I have exposed above.

On the other hand, both Barra and Moreno try to include some succinct comparative evidence, for instance, Barra’s conclusions about French subordination, which open a pathway for research. As will be shown and discussed in the next chapters, French and Italian hide some surprises. In addition, the Scandinavian languages surprisingly share a rich prepositional finite clause system with Spanish and Portuguese. What can we learn from them? Thus it is imperative to examine what prepositional finite clauses are like in other related languages. What do the similarities and differences between those languages
and Spanish unveil about the nature of prepositional finite clauses? These are contrastive questions that, to my knowledge, have not been studied and thus are in need of immediate attention.

Moreover, we are dealing with a change in history. Thus, it is just natural to undertake a historical contrastive examination. How does the exploration of the history of other languages, mainly Romance and Germanic languages -all of which have identifiable finite clause and subordination structures and prepositions-, help us understand the history of Spanish?

In general, several questions must be answered:

-What are the options for prepositional sentential complementation/adjunction in the languages under study?
-How well does Case Theory actually account for them, both in Spanish and also crosslinguistically?
-Is there a causality link between the presence of a P, nominality features and argumenthood of the finite clause?

In order to provide successful answers to all these queries, several theoretical tools must be introduced. For instance, what is finite clause? What is the syntax of a finite clause? What is a preposition and what are their features? What is syntactic Case? What is a prepositional finite clause? Is there an established agreement on their nature? This is the main purpose of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. Introduction

The goal of this chapter is to introduce several theoretical tools that we will need for the discussion. There are two main groups. First, the syntax of finite clauses (COMP), prepositions (P), and the combination of both of them: prepositional finite clauses. The second has to do with the Theory of Case, in particular the nature of abstract (syntactic) Case, the role of Case licensing by prepositions, and Case and finite clauses.

3.2. Clauses and complementizers

In current syntactic theory a finite clause is understood as a Complementizer Phrase, that is the projection of a head Complementizer. This section deals with the syntactic properties of CPs, their different types, in particular, declaratives and indirect interrogatives. In addition, two questions have a great impact on this dissertation. On the one hand, I explore the nature of P + CPs as a subordinating conjunction vs. a prepositional phrase, and conclude that the latter is the most accurate analysis. On the other hand, I explore the categorical properties of the prepositions that introduce clauses: are they really Ps or are they prepositional complementizers? As will be shown, there is
no consensus on this issue, and the fact that prepositional complementizers have been applied to the study of French and Italian proves problematic when confronted with the Spanish equivalent data. The final section is devoted to the syntactic structure of those cases where there seems to be an invisible, underlying preposition. In all, this section aims at presenting and discussing the major points involved in the syntactic description of prepositional (finite) clauses.

3.2.1. The functional category COMP

A complementizer (COMP or C) is a syntactic category corresponding with the traditional concept of subordinating conjunction. In keeping with the principle of endocentricity, Cs are the heads of CPs (Complementizer Phrase), traditionally known as clauses, both finite and infinitival (cf. Demonte (1982), Haegeman (1991: 111-112), Bresnan (1970)). For the purposes of this dissertation, a subordinate clause will be understood in these syntactic terms\(^1\) (cf. Andersson (1975), among many others), a CP dependent on another category which either selects for it, if an argument, or rather is modified by the clause in the case of adjuncts (adverbial clauses).

There are several complementizers. The complementizer *par excellence* is *that* (English), *que* (Spanish, French and Portuguese), *che* (Italian). Other complementizers

---

\(^1\) As is well known, the difference between IP/TP as main clause or matrix clause and CP as the subordinate clause is not clear-cut. For instance, Adger (2003: 296) argues matrix clauses always project up to CP, even if the C is null. Also, the common phenomenon of that-deletion in dependent clauses (i.e., *I think she did not do it*) does not preclude describing such cases as being CPs with a null C. Despite these theoretical issues, the discussion in this dissertation targets very easily recognizable sentential complementation and adjunction constructions in the form <P + CP>, and therefore poses no problem to my syntactic definition of a subordinate clause.
introduce indirect interrogative clauses, for instance *if/whether* (English), *si* (Spanish, French), *se* (Italian). Indirect interrogatives (and exclamatives) are also CPs, introduced by wh-phrases located not in C, because they are not complementizers, but in Spec, CP after wh-movement. Consider the following syntactic trees (only pertinent information is shown, with intermediate projections):

(1) a. María dijo [CP que iría a la fiesta]

María said that would-go to the part

María said she would go to the part

b. María preguntó [CP si íbamos al cine]

María asked if went to-the cinema

María asked whetehr we were going to the movies
c. María preguntó \( [cP \text{ dónde íbamos}] \)

María asked where went

María asked where we were going
The complementizers *que* and *si* introduce subordinate clauses (*iría a la fiesta* and *íbamos al cine*). They determine the type of clause: a declarative clause in the case of *that/que*, a total indirect interrogative clause in the case of *if/whether/si*, and a partial indirect interrogative clause in the case of wh-phrases in Spec,CP (Haegeman (1991: 106), Fernández and Anula (1995: 314-321), Adger (2003: 292)).

CPs can be complements and adjuncts (cf. Dixon (2006)). The previous two CPs function as the complement (argument) of the verbs *decir* and *preguntar*, in this case as direct objects. Finite clauses can also function as (traditional) subjects, including extraposition:

(2) a. **Que sea lunes** no tiene por qué ser malo

    That it is Monday does not have to be a bad thing

b. No tiene por qué ser malo **que sea lunes**

    It does not have to be a bad thing that it is Monday

c. **Cuándo sea el examen** no me preocupa

    When the exam is going to be does not bother me

d. **That John was an academic** didn’t matter (to Mary)  

    Dixon (2006: 17)

e. It didn’t matter (to Mary) **that John was an academic**  

    Dixon (2006: 24)
As can be seen in the previous examples, clauses can occupy those positions typical of nouns, which explains why declarative and indirect interrogative clauses are normally labeled “noun clauses”.

CPs are also found in adverbial clauses, which are adjuncts:

(3)  
   a. **Before I went to the city**, I called home  
   b. I was reading **when she arrived**  
   c. Jason became invisible, **so that he could escape**  

   Adger (2003: 329)

*Before*, *when* and *so that* introduce these adverbial clauses. As adjuncts, they are not selected by any predicate and, therefore, they are optional. In principle, we may conclude that *before*, *when* and *so that* are complementizers as well, for they introduce subordinate clauses. Likewise, it could be said that Spanish adverbial clauses are introduced by subordinating conjunctions (hence, complementizers): *porque* (because), *para que* (so that), *cuando* (when), *antes (de) que* (before), etc. (cf. Kortmann (1998: 463)).

Sentential complementation can also be infinitival, and infinitive clauses are CPs (arguably with the exception of ECM infinitive clauses, which are considered to be only IP/TPs (cf. Adger (2003: 313))):

(4)  
   a. I tried **to call** you  
   b. I wanted **to call** you
c. Quería llamarte

I-wanted to-call-you

I wanted to call you

d. I intended for Jenny to be present

Adger (2003: 306)

For is one of the complementizers in infinitive CPs. Infinitival complementizers are English for and, as widely suggested, French de/à and Italian di/a:

(5)  

a. Je suis content [CP de parler l’anglais]

I am happy of to-speak the-English

b. Sono contento [CP di parlare l’inglese]

Am happy of to-speak the-English

I am happy to speak English

Infinitive, like finite clauses, can also be found in adverbial contexts:

(6)  

a. Llámame para que vayamos a comer

Call-me for that we-go to-to-eat

Call me to go eat

b. Llámame para ir a comer

Call-me for to-go to-to-eat

Call me (in order) to go to eat
As the examples show, Spanish adverbial clauses can be both finite and infinitival. At first sight, in (6b) a P introduces an infinitive. In (6a) the so-called conjunction (complementizer) \textit{para que} introduces a finite clause, somehow the finite equivalent of the infinitival one. And here we face an especially relevant theoretical problem that will be discussed upon in the next section: if \textit{para} is a P, why is \textit{para que} a subordinating conjunction/complementizer? Or is \textit{para} really a P in this structure?

### 3.2.2. Subordinating conjunctions or prepositional phrases?

Many (traditional, pedagogical) grammars of Spanish list \textit{porque}, \textit{para que}, \textit{hasta que}, etc. under the label “subordinating conjunctions”. A similar view is accepted by linguists like Schlieben-Lange (1992) or Herman (1963). Updating this categorization into more recent syntactic terms, elements like \textit{que}, \textit{porque} or \textit{antes que} would all be complementizers, located in C in a syntactic tree:

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(7)} \\
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{IP} \\
\end{array}
\end{equation}

Latin \textit{quod, ut, etc.}

Romance \textit{que, che, porque, para que, perché, parce que, etc.}
However, linguists have challenged this analysis throughout the years. For instance, López (1970: 19, fn 23) comments that already Pottier and Coseriu had argued that so-called conjunctions such as *para que* are not really units but prepositions introducing a finite clause. More recently, Pavón (1999, 2003) and Barra (2002) have reached the same conclusion. According to this analysis, *para* is always a P, be it followed by an infinitive, a finite clause or a noun. What is the evidence available to decide which analysis is right?

Pavón (1999: 630-632) examines the two possible analyses of P + finite clause. In favor of a unitary conjunction analysis, Pavón highlights the following points:

1. The preposition and the conjunction seem to form a unity, as shown by the fact that they cannot be separated by the coordination of two clauses (see also Bosque (1998: 214)). This doesn’t happen when the *que*-clause is selected by a verb:

   (8) a. *No salió *porque* quería quedarse en casa y *que* no le apetecía ver a sus amigos
   
   Not went-out for-that wanted to-stay in home & that not him felt like see to his friends
   
   S/he didn’t go out because s/he wanted to stay at home and because s/he didn’t feel like seeing his/her friends
   
   Pavón (1999: 630)

   b. *No he vuelto a verle desde que* nos encontramos en Valencia y *que* me dijo que iba a casarse
I have seen him/her since we met in Valencia and s/he told me that s/he was getting married.

c. Creo que me voy a quedar en casa y que voy a estudiar un poco más

I think that me go to stay in house and that go to study a little more

Pavón (1999: 631)

However, as Pavón herself notices, this test proves unsatisfactory. One reason is that it rules out the PP analysis for some Ps required by specific Vs. In these cases, there is no possibility of regarding the P + que as a unit or conjunction because the P is lexically selected by the V:

(9)  a. Cuento con que vengas y lo veas

I-count with that you-come and it you-see

I count on you coming and seeing it

b. *Cuento con que vengas y que lo veas

I-count with that you-come and that it you-see

I count on you coming and seeing it

c. Depende de que lo veas y te guste

It-depends of that it you-see and you likes
It depends on you seeing it and liking it

d. *Depende de que lo ves y que te guste

It-depends of that it you-see and that you likes

It depends on you seeing it and liking it

In addition, as Gaatone (1981: 206) points out, “insegmentabilité ne signifie pas inanalysabilité”, that is, units such as French au, aux, du or des, or Spanish del, al are not phonetically divisible but they contain two syntactic elements: the P and the article, which would appear in different parts in a syntactic tree. Therefore, we can regard porque, etc. exactly the same way.

2. An NP, adverb or pronoun cannot be conjoined with a finite clause with que as the object of a preposition, which is possible with a verb:

(10)  a. *Suspendió el examen por su inseguridad y que no se había esforzado demasiado

Failed the test for his/her insecurity and that not refl had worked hard much

S/he failed the test for his/her insecurity and because s/he had not worked very hard
b. *Te lo he traído para eso y que me des tu opinión

You it have brought for that and that me give your opinion

I have brought it for that and to have your opinion

c. Quiero un crédito y que me lo den ahora mismo

I want a loan and that me it give now self

I want a loan and I want it right now

d. Dijo eso y que, por favor, no le molestan más

Said that and that, please, not him bother more

He said that and that he did not want to be bothered any more

Pavón (1999: 631)

Now, in favor of the PP analysis, Pavón finds that those Ps introducing a finite clause may also introduce other categories, such as pronouns or NP/DPs, without any change in the meaning of the P, which means that the PP analysis is the most realistic one:

(11) a. No puedo hacerlo sin su consentimiento/que me dé su consentimiento/tener su consentimiento

Not can do-it without his permission /that me gives his permission /to-have his permission

I cannot do this without his permission/his giving his permission/having his permission
b. No fue por eso/que no quiso/ tener un compromiso anterior

Not was for that/that not wanted/to-have a commitment previous

S/he didn’t go for that/ because s/he didn’t want to/ for having a previous appointment

c. Te esperaré hasta entonces/que llegues

You I-will-wait until then/ that you-arrive

I will wait for you until then/ until you arrive

Pavón (1999: 631)

Support for this “decomposition” analysis of so-called subordinating conjunctions comes from other studies of other languages where the concept of subordinating conjunctions as units has long been opposed. One such case is the Scandinavian literature, for instance, in Andersson (1975: 16). Barreto (2002: 189) concludes the same for (Old) Portuguese até que, porque, para que, a que, or salvo que according to), and Lemle (1984: 165) for modern Portuguese. It is also applied to French by Le Goffic (1993: 436) and Gaatone (1981, 2004). For instance, for Gaatone (2004: 214) avant que is not a unit but actually a P avant introducing a finite clause headed by the complementizer que, itself the equivalent of an NP, that is, “un “nominalisateur”” (a nominalizing element), in line with the general assumption that finite clauses are nominal clauses, also mentioned in Andersson (1975: 178).

Therefore, it is obvious that prepositions and complementizers seem to have points in common. I have already discussed what complementizers and CPs are. Another category
that has gotten much attention is prepositional complementizers, to which I turn in the next section.

### 3.2.3. Prepositions or prepositional complementizers?

A different analysis would be to argue that those Ps we are studying here are themselves complementizers, at least when introducing clausal complements. That is, that they are prepositional complementizers. Consider the following set of Italian data:

(12)  

a. Paolo dice **che** Giorgio non può venire  

   Paolo says that Giorgio not can to-come  
   Paolo says that Giorgio cannot come  

b. Paolo dice **di** non poter venire  

   Paolo says of not to-can to-come  
   Paolo says that he (Paolo) cannot come  

c. Prima **che** Giorgio venga  

   Before that Giorgio comes-SUBJ  
   Before Giorgio comes  
   Vincent (1997: 171)  

d. Prima **di** venire  

   Before of to-come  
   Before coming  
   Vincent (1997: 171-172)
Vincent (1997) argues that *di* and *a* are complementizers because *di/a* + infinitive is equivalent to *che* + finite clause. As a consequence, since *che* is a complementizer, so must be *di* and *a*. Moreover, Vincent adds that *di* and *a* were Ps, but now they are complementizers. Thus Italian has complementizers that introduce infinitival clauses. Vincent states that these complementizers do not have any meaning in current Italian, although, interestingly, the choice of one complementizer or the other was semantically motivated: *a* with future and purpose-oriented complements and *di* with verbs of assertion and belief.

Vincent (1997) is not alone analyzing these Ps as complementizers. Leonard (1997: 137 et passim) argues that functional Ps (‘weak prepositions’ in his own words) are complementizers, although he mentions that they keep their Case-assigning properties (Leonard (1997: 178)), effectively implying that prepositional complementizers have a mixed nature. Since Leonard looks at French and Italian, he concludes that prepositional complementizers occupy the C position because they are in complementary distribution with C *que/che* (that) (Leonard (1997: 196)). The Spanish data are not included.

Rizzi (1992), in his well-known study about the fine structure of the left periphery (split-CP hypothesis), concludes that the complementizer *che* occupies the position of Force (the highest head), while its infinitival counterpart *di* occupies the Finite head (the lowest head). The important idea here is that Rizzi considers *di* a complementizer.

Other works approach the complementizer-like nature of these Ps in a similar but not exactly identical way. For instance, Kayne (1999) speaks of complementizers that “look
like” Ps, such as Italian di, French de and English to. In his critique of Kayne’s paper, Borsley (2001) calls French à/de, Italian a/di and English to prepositional complementizers. On his part, Burchert (1993: 7) postulates, too, that French de is an infinitival complementizer, with the following syntactic structure:

(13) Jean a promis [CP [C de [IP lire le livre]]]

Jean has promised of to-read the book

Jean has promised to read the book

Burchert (1993: 7)

A partially similar alternative is Martineau and Motapanyane’s (2000) analysis of French, where prepositions like à or de in infinitival clauses are said to be categorically Ps that occupy C.

Prepositional complementizers have been studied in French and Italian in particular, languages that are said not to have Ps introducing finite clauses. This is on the basis of the parallelism drawn by Vincent or Kayne, whereby a/di/de must be in the exact same structural position as que/che. Syntax provides an answer to this first dilemma: pronominalization lets us see that those examples of Italian and French where linguists have proposed a prepositional complementizer cannot be syntactically PPs since they are pronominalized by the direct object pronoun. This is what Rizzi (1988) noted when differentiating between infinitival complements:
a. A V takes a real PP when the same P appears with NPs, as in *Gianni aspira [ad ottenere questo]* (John aspires to obtain this) vs *Gianni aspira [a questo]* (John aspires to this). These PPs are substituted by *ci*: *Gianni ci aspira* (John aspires to it).

b. A P is an actual complementizer when it is only required by the V when taking an infinitive, as in *Credo di voler partire* (lit. ‘I-believe of to-want to-leave’, I believe I want to leave) vs. *Credo questo* (I believe this). These complements can both be substituted by the pronoun *lo* (it): *Lo credo* (I believe it), but never by *ne* (of it).

Similar examples are found in French. In (14a) and (14b) we find that *craigner* does not select a real P because the prepositional infinitive is pronominalized with *le* and not with the prepositional proform *en*, which is exactly the opposite in (14c) and (14d), where there is a real PP:

\[(14)\]

a. Pierre *le* craiganit, que cette affaire ne soit très compliquée

    Peter it feared, that this affair not was very complicated

    Peter was afraid that this affair might be very complicated

b. Pierre *le* craignait, d’arriver en retard

    Peter it feared, of-arrive in late

    Peter was afraid of arriving late

c. Jean s’en réjouit, que cette affaire soit terminée

    John refl-of-it rejoiced, that this affair is finished

    John was delighted that this affair was finished
d. Jean s’en réjouit, de partir bientôt à l’étranger

John refl-of-it rejoices, of leave son to the-abroad

John was very happy to be traveling abroad soon

Huot (1981: 48)

The optionality of the presence of the P found in subject infinitival clauses in French speaks in favor of *de* as a prepositional complementizer since it is not really necessary/selected:

(15)  

a. Pierre m’a dit que de prendre le RER lui avait changé la vie

Peter me-has told that of take the RER him had changed the life

b. Pierre m’a dit que prendre le RER lui avait changé la vie

Peter me-has told that take the RER him had changed the life

Peter told mer that taking the RER had changed his life

Huot (1981: 102)

Huot (1981) concludes that *de* is a complementizer. However, Huot (1981: 87) concludes that the same categorical status cannot be extended to *à*, contrary to expectations. This difference lies in the fact that *à* does not only introduce infinitival complements of verbs, but also NP/DPs complements, which points, according to Huot, to its prepositional nature. *À*, unlike *de*, is not syntactically restricted to those contexts equivalent to complementizer *que*: it is also maintained for noun phrases (16b, d):
In addition, Huot finds that the à-complements can be substituted for by the adverbial pronoun y, again a sign of prepositionality (cf. Rizzi’s (1988) classification between real PPs and complementizer di, where this same argument is used):

(17) Pierre y songe, à quitter sa place
Peter of-it dreams, to leave his place
Peter dreams of leaving his place

Huot (1981: 85)

French and Italian seem to fit well into the description of prepositional complementizers because they do not have productive P + finite clause, and these prepositional complementizers are in perfect complementary distribution with que/che, but this conclusion clashes completely with the Spanish data. And what’s more, they even clash with Italian, because this language turns out to be more problematic than expected, as will be exposed later. Suffice it to say that, after concluding that a/di are complementizers
and not Ps in Italian (when they introduce an infinitive), Vincent (1997) writes the following:

In any case, we should note the difference between *a*, which may be followed by a full finite clause (*tengo a che tu venga* ‘I’m counting on your coming’ (lit. ‘I hold to (it) that you come’), and *di* which may not (**dopo di che sono venuto**; contrast Spanish *después de que he venido* ‘after (of that) I came’). (Vincent (1997: 172))

What the analysis for *a che* in *tengo a che tu venga* might be, Vincent doesn’t specify, in spite of his being aware of the Spanish constructions. Even if Italian doesn’t have a really productive system of P + finite clauses, these combinations exist. And the same categorical mélange appears with these finite clauses: While for Scorretti (1991) *a che* is a complementizer, for Ledgeway (2000) *a* is just a preposition.

To sum up so far, there does not seem to be one clear conclusion regarding the existence or not of such thing as prepositional complementizers. There are some possible conclusions available at this point. On the one hand, it seems safe to accept that there is syntactic evidence that allows some type of compromise between those linguists who propose that any P + finite CP combination is always going to be a PP with a finite clause as the complement of the head P, and those who argue for the existence of prepositional complementizers: Some apparent Ps are actually functional Ps (Cs are also functional categories), which for some linguists implies that they do not project a real PP.

In addition, the previous discussion works for argument clauses, but we cannot lose sight of adverbial clauses. That is, we need to re-examine whether we should keep them
as PPs, as defined above, or whether they should be regarded as prepositional complementizers.

The answer must be the same as above, in line with Pavón (1999) or Barra (2002). In adverbial clauses like para que vengas (lit. ‘for that you come’, so that you come) the finite clause can be substituted by the pronoun eso (that) as well: para eso (for that). This means that we are dealing with Ps introducing different types of (nominal) complements, be it a pronoun, a finite clause or an infinitival. Notice that it would be difficult to prove that the prepositional elements introducing adverbial clauses are actually complementizers because they cannot be substituted by any type of nominal pronoun. In addition, the possible complementizer nature of the Ps with infinitives in adverbial clauses has not received much attention. To my knowledge, only Benincà (2001) affirms that the para in para + infinitive is a complementizer (in Italian), but this assertion is not accompanied by any type of syntactic evidence.

The exact opposite view is held in Huddleston and Pullum (2002), who go a step further and include all ‘subordinating conjunctions’, except the complementizers that, whether, and if, into the group of prepositions. For instance, in after she came, after would continue to be classified as a P and would not be a complementizer just because it introduces a finite clause. This means that, in their view, Ps can select for finite clauses. Of course, there is a trick here. The finite clauses they are talking about are arguably not exactly CPs, but only IPs (their ‘non-expandable clauses').
The last step was given by Emonds’ hypothesis that Ps and Cs are one and the same category (cf. Emonds (1976, 1985)). A CP would be a PP in reality. Yim (1985) summarizes this hypothesis:

Emonds (1976) suggests that subordinating conjunctions are prepositions and “conjunction + S” is actually a PP. His idea dates back to Jespersen (1924), in which Jespersen defines a subordinate conjunction as a sentence-preposition. He says that the difference between a preposition and a conjunction lies in the nature of the complement: the complement of a preposition is an NP, while that of a conjunction is a clause. Thus, the name of “subordinating conjunction” is superfluous; conjunctions fall under the category of preposition. (Yim (1985: 194-195)).

Embracing this latter option would wipe out the discussion regarding the syntax of prepositional finite clauses and the restrictions existing in languages such as English. However, as opposed to after or before, the nature of that or whether does not seem to fit in well with the current studies on the nature of prepositions, which is where we turn to in the next section.

3.2.4. Underlying prepositions?

Another theoretical question which has received some attention has to do with the syntactic analysis of those oblique clausal complements in languages where no P is allowed. Two representatives of such languages are French and Italian. In principle, French and Italian do not seem to allow prepositional sentential complementation:
(18)  a. Sono sicuro (*di) che lei è felice
       I-am sure that she is happy
       I’m sure that she is happy

       b. a. Je suis sûre (*de) qu’il lira le journal
          I am sure that-he will-read the journal
          I’m sure that he will read the newspaper

However, the Italian and French examples do not happen to pronominalize with the
expected direct object pronoun, as would be logical in direct complementation, but rather
with the adverbial pronouns *en/y (French) – ne/ci (Italian), the typical substitutes for

(19)  a. Ne sono sicuro
       Of-it I-am sure
       I’m sure of it

       b. J’en suis sure
          I-of-it am sure
          I’m sure of it

These examples reveal that apparently prepositionless finite clauses are pronominalized
as if they were introduced by a preposition, suggesting that they are in fact prepositional,
just like their Spanish and Portuguese equivalents, even if there is no P (cf. Elia at al. (1981) and Jones (1996), among others).

Early transformative studies argued for the existence of a P in deep structure which would disappear on surface structure. Such is the analysis in Huot (1981: 65). Consider the ungrammaticality of the following sentences:

(20)   a. *Jean ne se souvient pas de que cette route était fermée pour travaux

Jean not refl recall not of that this road was closed for Works

Jean does not remember that this road was closed for construction

b. *Jean ne se souvient pas de si ce magasin est ouvert au mois d’août

Jean not refl recall not of if this store is open in-the month of-August

Jean does not remember whether this store is open in August

Huot (1981: 65)

Huot assumes that there is a filter whereby the P is eliminated and the sentence becomes grammatical.

Another such study is Rosenbaum (1967: 4.4), who argues that English clausal complements without Ps are governed by a P in deep structure, but the P is deleted when the clause is in complement position (21a) (see also Lakoff (1968: 47)), but is maintained whenever the clause is topicalized (21b, c) or becomes the subject of a passive (21e, f):

(21)   a. We all hoped for that John would come
b. **That** John would come we all hoped for

c. **That** the plane flew at all was marveled at by them

Rosenbaum (1967: 83)

e. **That** they should all wear hats and blazers was insisted on by the principal

f. **That** the drug is harmless we can vouch for on the basis of long experience

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1019)

Consider also the results from pseudo-cleft:

(22) What they **concurred in** was **that** there was strong scientific evidence that the risks of not immunising children were real and in many instances serious

Granath and Wherrity (2005: 2)

In essence, these examples seem to suggest that prepositional verbs do indeed maintain their Ps when selecting for finite clauses, with the only difference that the P is invisible, silent, empty, etc. An immediate consequence of such an approach is that examples which seem to not be prepositional finite clauses would turn out to be so, adding to the list.

However, on the other side of the discussion, Huddleston and Pullum (2002) argue against the existence of empty Ps in those cases where the expected P is not grammatical in English. For these linguists, there are several problems with the previously mentioned examples. First, the examples of pseudo-cleft are too marginal in English and therefore
questionable in their grammaticality. Besides, some pseudo-cleft sentences do not have a grammatical “reconstructed” prepositional form by any means:

(23)  

a. What I’m getting **at** is **that** he may have been trying to mislead you  
b. What we’re counting **on** is **that** they won’t all turn up  
c. *I’m getting (**at**) **that** he may have been trying to mislead you  
d. *We’re counting (**on**) **that** they won’t all turn up

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1020)

In addition, they point out several prepositional verbs which do not accept left dislocation:

(24)  

a. **That** the report represents a serious indictment of the banks they concur **in**  
b. **That** a peaceful resolution can be found we must all hope/pray **for**

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1021)

Therefore, the authors conclude that there is no dislocation example to support the invisible presence of the P in examples such as **They concur that the report represents a serious indictment of the banks.** In short, Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1019) conclude that “[a]n oblique/object distinction cannot be justified by invoking latent prepositions”. They argue against the idea that wherever the presence of a P before a finite clause is ruled out there is actually a silent or somehow empty P.
It seems, then, that there is no clear way to accept the existence of empty Ps, particularly if we want to move away from the old transformational studies. Notice that the examples in French and Italian with the prepositional pronouns would allow us to include under the same syntactic analysis all of the examples of apparently non-prepositional finite clauses combining with otherwise preposition-governing verbs in Old Spanish and more. At the very least, what can be extracted from here is that nothing in the previous discussion prevents the preposition-less finite clauses from being arguments in the appropriate selected context.

3.3. The category Preposition

The second important category in this dissertation is the preposition (or, more generally, adposition, therefore including postpositions). The differentiation between argument prepositional finite clauses and adverbial/adjunct finite clauses depends in great measure on our understanding of the different types of Ps and their corresponding properties. The classification of prepositions into functional vs. lexical Ps is still open to debate. However, there is enough evidence to justify the conclusion that there is indeed a syntactic difference along those terms. For instance, there is psycholinguistic, clinical evidence supporting the division between lexical and functional prepositions (cf. Froud (2001), who worked with aphasics).

In Chomskyan linguistics, categories are defined in terms of positive and negative features: nouns are [+N] but [-V], and the opposite is said of verbs, which are [-N, +V].
Prepositions are no exception, although they are defined by defaults, as the absence of features: [-N, -V]. It would seem then that there is some type of conclusive definition of what a P is, but this is far from the truth. Actually, much work has been devoted to the study of whether all Ps really belong to the same class or whether there are different types of Ps. The general agreement is that they do not form a homogeneous class.

Ps are normally classified in two groups: lexical prepositions and functional prepositions. The lexical group is formed by those prepositions which show Case properties, strict subcategorization, argument structure, theta properties, inherent semantic features, and selectional properties (Rauh (1993: 101, 121)). Lexical Ps do select for their complements, which vary depending on each P. Consider, for instance, the following examples:

(25)  a. John stayed \textbf{in} the house  
     b. John stayed \textbf{in}  
     c. John went \textbf{into} the house  
     d. *John went \textbf{into}  
     e. I didn’t see him \textbf{before} the movie  
     f. I didn’t see him \textbf{before} the movie began  
     g. I didn’t see him \textbf{before}  

Rauh (1993: 102)
The set in (25) offers a rich sample of the properties and variety of lexical Ps. Notice that all of them are contentful Ps: * in and * into express location, while * before expresses time. They also vary in their selectional properties: while all three may select for an NP/DP, only * in and * before may be intransitive (and therefore * before is considered a P and not an adverb), like some verbs. Notice that Rauh is in agreement with Huddleston and Pullum (2002) regarding P + finite clause in (25f). Consider the following extra examples regarding selectional restrictions of lexical Ps:

(26)  a. Bill stayed * above the creek

        b. * Bill stayed * above an hour

        Rauh (1993: 108)

The ungrammaticality of (26b) proves that the lexical P * above cannot combine freely with any type of NP/DP but rather imposes semantic restrictions on their complements. * Above requires an NP/DP of locative nature, not a temporal one.

Lexical Ps head their maximal projections: PPs. Rauh (1993) shows that PPs can be fronted, can appear in cleft sentences, can be coordinated, can be substituted by proforms, and can be modified by * right:

(27)  a. *From the station* came John

        b. It was * before the movie* that I saw John

        c. * Before the movie began and until your arrival* it was very boring
d. Bill refused before I did and John refused then too

e. John stayed right in the house

Lexical Ps also have (inherent) case-assigning properties, as can be shown by the fact that they select for morphologically inflected pronouns:

(28)  a. Mary got the book from him

       b. Bill bought a book for her

As opposed to lexical Ps, functional Ps lack many of the previously noted properties. As other functional categories, functional Ps lack selectional properties and do not restrict their complements semantically (this is done rather by the category selecting the P instead). In addition, they cannot be substituted for by a proform (29b), cannot be coordinated with other PPs (29d), and cannot be modified by right (29c) (Rauh (1993: 134), Horno (2002: 99-100, 173-190)):

(29)  a. *Bill appealed to the station
b. *Bill believes there

c. *Bill believes right in science

Rauh (1993: 133)

d. *Bill believes in science and during his life

Rauh (1993: 134)

The ungrammaticality of (29a) is due to the incompatibility of the selectional requirement of the verb appeal and its complement the station. The P to is not imposing any selectional properties like it would if we were actually dealing with lexical directional to, which can freely select for locative complements on its own, independently of the verb. Notice the contrast in grammaticality between functional to (30a) and lexical to (30b):

(30)  a. *Bill appealed to the station

b. Bill went/sent a packet/walked/invited his friends to the station

Rauh (1993: 134)

In other words, functional Ps do not theta-mark their complements. There is no thematic relation between the P and the complement. This can be seen again in the following examples:

(31)  a. The lawyer had no influence over his door

b. John relied on his table

Rauh (2002: 17)
Obviously, the previous examples are not syntactically ungrammatical, but they are really semantically inappropriate (Rauh (2003: 17)). This awkwardness is due to the fact that it is not the Ps over or on which select for the NP/DPs his door and his table respectively, but rather influence and relied.

Lack of θ-properties does not mean lack of Case-assigning properties. In fact, functional Ps maintain their case-assigning properties, as can be seen in the morphological requirements of the pronoun:

(32)  a. Bill believes in her

Rauh (1993: 134)

b. *Bill believes in she

In other words, lexical Ps have a lexical-conceptual structure (LCS), while functional Ps lack it (Horno (2002: 176)). In this sense, functional Ps just have no expression in the LCS in an analysis along the lines of Culicover and Jackendoff (2005).

Extra evidence of the different nature of functional Ps is that they may be dropped in coordination (33a), while lexical Ps may not (33b) (Horno (2002: 175), Zaring (1991: 369), Demonte (1992: 426)):

(33)  a. La tesis versa sobre el populismo y Ø el nacionalismo

The thesis verses about the populism and the nationalism
The dissertation revolves around populism and nationalism.

b. *La universidad prescindió de sus servicios y Θ su aportación valiosa

The university dispensed of his services and his contribution valuable

The university dispensed with his work and valuable contribution

Horno (2002: 175)

The most popular representative of a functional P is the English of, the empty preposition/Case-marker par excellence in the linguistic literature which allows for the licensing of the complement of Ns and As (Chomsky (1981: 50)). Chomsky (1981) explains the structure of destruction of the city as follows:

At D-structure, destruction (...) subcategorizes and θ-marks the NP object the city (...). If the projection principle is valid, this must also be true at S-structure and LF. There is no problem if the of-insertion rule is an adjunction rule forming the NP [NP of NP] (...), or if the of-phrase is base-generated as a PP (...). If the of-insertion rule creates a PP, however, we must continue to hold that destruction subcategorizes its NP object at S-structure and LF. Note that still another possibility would be to assume that the of-insertion rule forms a neutralized NP-PP of the form [-V], in which case, again, no problem arises and this category will share properties of both NP and PP. (Chomsky (1981: 51))

However, there is compelling evidence against the last resort nature of functional Ps. Chomsky (1995: 113) criticizes this idea of the P of as a last resort mechanism inserted just to provide Case for the NP which cannot receive it from an N or an A. Chomsky notes that of cannot be inserted in any other “special” contexts to save the derivation:
a. *It seems of Susan to be here

b. *I am proud of Bill to be here

c. *Bill tried of Mary to be here

d. *Bill believed sincerely of Sam

e. *Bill believed sincerely of Mary to be here

d. *My proof of John to be here

Chomsky (1995: 113)

Chomsky denies the last resort saving properties of of-insertion, and, instead, argues that this P is to be understood as the materialization of Case, but restricted to nominal ([+N]) complements:

[S]uppose A and N are, in fact, (genitive) Case assigners, as is overtly visible in German (...). Of can then be regarded as the realization of this genitive Case in this configuration in English. (Chomsky 1995: 114)

Therefore, there is no positive evidence for any last resort strategy for derivation-saving purposes. Notice also that it is very difficult to justify why it is the case that, if it is just a question of last resort strategies, there should be more than one functional “Case-marker” P, as seems to be the case in Spanish, etc. That is, why not of/de all the time in all contexts?
The insertion of the semantically empty P of serves to express the inherent Case of the complement of Ns and As. According to Chomsky (1995: 114), then, inherent Case requirements may be satisfied either inherently without any P, or structurally with the insertion of a P. Similar views are held by Napoli (1991):

The of that appears in [the destruction of the city], then, can be viewed as a P whose function is to assign Case to the following NP. Thus Ns and As take “prepositional Objects” rather than Direct NP Objects because Ns and As are not Case-assigners” (Napoli (1991: 193))

Rauh (1993: 136) proposes that, given the characteristics of functional Ps, they do not really project a PP but rather it is their complement which projects. Therefore, when the so-called complement of the functional P is an NP/DP, the maximal projection ends up being an NP/DP, not a PP. So, “P thus corresponds to inherent Cases in case-marking languages, for example, the accusative in the context of Lehren or the genitive in the context of gedenken in German, which are also assigned lexically” (Rauh (1993: 136); cf. also Rauh (2002: 18), Stowell (1981: 126-127)).

A similar view is held by Svenonius (2004). For Svenonius all (spatial) prepositions (lexical Ps) take one argument: Ground (Svenonius (2004: 15)). As opposed to these real prepositions, the functional Ps (‘grammatical Ps’ in his words) do not take a Ground argument. Therefore,
One way to deal with adpositions of this type is to suppose that the DP in question is not originally a complement of the adposition, but is an argument of the verb, with the adposition being introduced later. (Svenonius (2004: 25))

These are not truly Ps and therefore do not have Ground as their complement, as opposed to lexical Ps. Extreme examples of these ‘grammatical Ps’ are Case-markers of in English and a in Spanish (as used in animate direct objects). Svenonius (2004: 27) concludes that “case makers are not P”.

A similar view is expressed in Kempchinsky’s (1988) study of Spanish pronominal verbs, where she argues that the PP complement of verbs such as quejarse (‘to complain’) is actually an NP and that the P is the materialization of inherent Case (Kempchinsky (1988: 204)) (cf. also Campos and Kempchinsky (1991: 175)).

Demonte (1992) differentiates between verbs that select for one specific P (consistir en, versar sobre, depender de, etc.) and those which take Ps (normally a or de, but also en or even por) that are not real Ps but only Case (insistir en, abusar de, renunciar a, pugnar por, etc.). Notice that Demonte subdivides the same Ps into full-fledged prepositional usages and mere Case-marker ones, which means that Ps per se do not fall into one or the other group once and for all.

Furthermore, Scorretti (1991: 158-159) concludes that the Italian P di in examples such as pentirsi dei propri crimini and pentirsi di aver mangiato i mandarini is “not a real preposition in these contexts (…) (but rather) a mere Case marker in di-complements of nominals”. Scorretti extends these conclusions to the examples with the P a (Scorretti
(1991: 161)). Notice that Scorretti’s hypothesis enters in direct conflict with the distinction produced by Rizzi (1988), as mentioned above.

Horno (2002: 215, fn 28) argues that functional Ps do not project a Spec (only up to P’ in her terms), but, contrary to Svenonius and others, she maintains that they are categorically Ps and not just Case-markers. Actually, Horno is against the very concept of functional Ps as Case-markers (Horno (2002: 185-186)) due to the following reasons:

a. Ps and case coexist in several languages.

b. Is the functional P the expression of Case or its assignment? If a marker, then what assigns Case when functional Ps are present?

In general, these comments show how unsatisfactory the idea of a Case-marker is, inasmuch as it seems an ill-understood and ill-explained concept which at times looks more like an excuse for lack of a better explanation.

The link between functional P and Case finds its ultimate expression in works such as Tremblay (1996), who rejects not only the prepositional nature of functional Ps but also proposes a new functional maximal projection for them which captures their Case-like nature and their lack of θ-properties (cf. Lamontagne and Travis (1987: 177), Travis and Lamontagne (1992: 161)):

Dummy Case assigners do not belong to the category P, but rather to the functional category K (Kase). Dummy Case assigners not being inherently relational do not license arguments. This lexical difference expresses the fact that DCAs [Dummy Case assigners] do not link arguments. (Tremblay (1996: 86))
The syntactic representations of KPs and PPs are as follows (Tremblay (1996: 87)).

(35) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{KP} \\
\text{Spec} & \text{K’} \\
\text{K} & \text{compl}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PP} \\
\text{Spec} & \text{P’} \\
\text{P} & \text{compl}
\end{array}
\]

In principle, they look the same, but the radical difference is that K does not have an argument structure and, as such, does not relate two DPs, which is exactly what a true P – a relator- does (Tremblay (1996: 87)). Consequently, the Spec and complement positions of P must always be occupied, assuming that the Spec may be filled with an empty PRO coindexed with an NP which acts as the real Spec of P, as exemplified below:

(36) Mary put the book on the table

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{Spec} & \text{V’} \\
\text{V’} & \text{PP} \\
\text{V} & \text{DP}_i \\
\text{the book} & \text{Spec} \text{P’} \\
\text{PRO}_i & \text{P} \\
& \text{DP} \\
& \text{on} \text{the table}
\end{array}
\]

Tremblay (1996: 87)
KPs are considered to be the syntactic representation of both a regular Case position as in the object of a transitive verb (which here has moved from the putative V position to the K position\(^2\)), and the well-known functional P of (Travis and Lamontagne (1992: 166):

(37)  

a. Appreciate Mary

```
VP  
  V  
   t_i  
  KP  
    K  
     appreciate_i  
    DP  
      Mary
```

b. Appreciation of Mary

```
NP  
  N  
   appreciation  
  KP  
    K  
     of  
    DP  
      Mary
```

Travis and Lamontagne (1992: 166)

A well known formulation in the same line but with far-reaching consequences is Grimshaw’s Extended Projection. According to this hypothesis, all Ps, not just the functional ones, are the real maximal projection of a nominal. The same as CP is the extended projection of a verb, a PP is so for a noun:

\(^2\) Obviously, it is not relevant right now to raise the question here whether right movement is legitimate or not, as would be in a Kaynean analysis.
CP and PP [are] the highest extended projections of the verbal system and the nominal system respectively. C standing in the same relationship to IP and VP as P does to DP and NP. (Grimshaw (2000: 119))

That is, “PPs are indeed a kind of nominal –the biggest kind there is” (Grimshaw (2000: 128)).

So far, I have shown that there is extensive literature in defense of a tight relationship between functional Ps and Case. I have shown there is no consensus on the exact nature of functional Ps, in particular de/di/of and à/a. The idea that they are just Case-markers seems short-sighted and raises questions that need answering. The only point in common is the description of functional Ps as an alternative manner of expressing Case. Case is also a necessary tool for this dissertation, and it is the subject of the next section.

3.4. Case Theory

Another tool we need is Case/case. This section has two main goals. Firstly, I introduce the concept and syntax of Case, with special attention to the difference between structural Case and inherent Case (and lexical Case). Secondly, the discussion focuses on current views on Case Theory, in particular, on recent works advocating for the elimination of abstract (syntactic) Case. The third section explores the subject of Case and finite clauses, that is to say whether finite clauses must, may or just cannot get/have Case. The answer is highly dependent on accepting abstract Case as an explanatory notion. The final section is
devoted to the study of different accounts on the syntax of prepositional verbs, in particular regarding the syntactic link between the V and the object of the P.

3.4.1. Case

Blake (2001: 1) defines case as “a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads”. This definition captures the essence of case as a relation between a selecting category and a nominal element.

Case in Chomskyan approaches serves to license nominal elements in the clause, as expressed in the (now outdated) Case filter, which establishes that every overt NP must be assigned abstract case (Chomsky (1981: 49)). Initially, Case is assigned by certain categories, namely V (v), P, and I/T, but others (N and A) cannot assign it. Case is assigned under government, for instance with Vs and Ps selecting and governing their complements, or in a Spec-head configuration, as happens with Nominative Case assigned by I/T (in combination, in old terms, with V) (cf. Hornstein et al. (2005: 113), among many others). Consider the following examples:

(38)  a. **Juan compra el pan**
      John buys the bread

      b. **Juan lo compra**
      John it buys

      John buys it
In (38a) *Juan* and *el pan* are NPs, and so they must be licensed in order to be visible to be part of the clause (the former Visibility requirement). While *Juan* receives its Nominative Case from I/T, *el pan* is assigned Case from the V (v) *compra*. The same process takes place in the pronominal alternative in (38b). In (38b) the pronoun *lo*, given the context, is substituting for the full NP *el pan* in (38a).

Notice, however, that in Spanish only personal pronouns such as *lo* show casual morphology. As opposed to language such as Latin, German or Finnish, the overt, visual expression of case is not evident. Neither is it in English. However, Chomskyan linguistics (and other frameworks) assume that the licensing which is overtly expressed by the morphological inflection on the pronoun in (38b) above is also present, albeit abstractly, in the NPs *Juan* in (38a, b) and *el pan* in (38a). Thus, abstract Case (written with capital C) plays its role as the general property present (assigned, checked, etc.) in all those NPs which show no morphological case (written with low-case C) (cf. Culicover 1997: 24, among many others). What the exact relation is between Abstract Case and morphological case will be explored below. For the moment, let us accept the general assumption that morphological case is a part of a wider notion, i.e. Case, as has been traditionally maintained (cf., for instance, Haegeman (1991: 144), and Culicover (1997: 24), among many others). Chomsky (1995) offers a good summary of the relation between Abstract Case and morphological case:

In some languages (Sanskrit, Latin, Russian, …), Case is morphologically manifested, while in others, it has little (English, French, …) or no (Chinese, …)
overt realization. In line with our general approach, we assume that Case is always present abstractly. (Chomsky (1995: 110))

The notion of Case assignment has been subject to revision throughout the years, while always maintaining the basic idea that case is a nominal feature that explains the operations of NP/DPs in the sentence. In the Minimalist Program, much of the theoretical skeleton of P&P is revised and reinterpreted, Case assignment inclusive. For one thing, the crucial relation of government is abandoned, leaving Case assignment open to revision. As with many other linguistic properties, Case is revisited in terms of feature-checking. Former Case-assigning categories such as V (now v) or I (now T) are said to contain an uninterpretable Case-feature which either checks and erases/values a matching Case-feature of whatever NP they select for, or just establishes an Agree relation with an NP containing a matching Case-feature checking (Hornstein et al. (2005: 140)) or Agree and valuation (Adger (2003: 217 et passim)). For instance, Nominative Case assignment is now understood as a process whereby the uninterpretable Nominative Case feature in T(ense) “values a case feature on an NP under Agree” (Adger (2003: 211)). Case features are uninterpretable and, hence, must be checked and valued (Adger (2003: 212)). In general, assignment is transformed into matching/checking and erasing (Butt (2006: 75), Hornstein et al. (2005: 121)).
3.4.2. Types of Case

Once the notion of Case has been introduced, it is necessary to understand the different types of case that exist in the theory. In general, there are two main types: structural Case and inherent Case. In short, the former is independent of θ-assignment, while the latter goes hand in hand with a θ-role. A third type – lexical Case – has been proposed to describe idiosyncratic Case. Let us start by paying attention to the following examples:

(39)  a. **He** called **me**
    b. **I** called **him**
    c. **Peter** called **John**
    d. **John** called **Peter**

Notice the morphological contrast between (39a) and (39b). While in (39a) the third person referent is the subject and shows Nominative case, the same referent shows a different case once its syntactic function changes, as seen in (39b), where the same referent is expressed by an Accusative pronoun. By assumption, this difference in case becomes a difference in Case in (39c, d), where there is no morphology to show it.

The difference in case expressed in the previous examples, extended to their abstract, invisible counterparts in (39c, d), has been captured by proposing different Cases.

On the one hand, there is a Structural Case, which is not strictly linked to a theta-role and is assigned to any NP realizing a particular function in a specific location in the
syntactic tree. Nominative and Accusative are generally assumed to be structural Cases.

Consider the following pair of examples:

(40)  

a. Julia melted the ice cream into mush

b. The ice cream melted into mush

Butt (2006: 57)

In both sentences the NP the ice cream has the same θ-role: it is the theme or patient. However, even though the theta-role remains the same, the abstract Case assigned to the NP changes: while in (40a), the ice cream, being the DO, is assumed to be assigned Accusative Case, in (40b) this same NP is assigned Nominative Case (Butt (2006: 58)). This shows how structural Case assignment is independent from theta-role assignment.

On the other hand, Genitive and Dative are normally regarded as typical inherent Cases. The traditional description of inherent Case is the following, by Chomsky (1986):

Thus, we assume that inherent Case is assigned by α to NP if and only if α θ-marks NP, while structural Case is assigned independently of θ-marking. Now all lexical categories assign Case: P, N, and A assign inherent Case at D-structure, whereas V (along with INFL containing AGR (…)) assigns structural Case at S-structure. (Chomsky (1986: 193))
It is especially important to remark that, in the classic account of Case, prepositions assign inherent Case\(^3\). As Eguren and Fernández (2004) indicate:

Las preposiciones o bien son marcas de Caso inherente (aquellas que no tienen significado, como la preposición *de*), o bien asignan dicho Caso (las preposiciones dotadas de contenido que introducen adjuntos con significado adverbial). (Eguren and Fernández (2004: 137))

Prepositions are either marks of inherent Case (those that have no meaning, like the preposition *de*), or they assign such Case (those prepositions with meaning that introduce adjuncts with an adverbial meaning). (My translation)

Inherent Case assignment can be regarded as the realization of a θ-role (Culicover (1997: 44)). As indicated above, the difference between structural and inherent Cases resides in that the latter is linked to θ-role assignment (Blake (2001: 60), Woolford (2006: 123), among others); that is, they are linked to some specific semantic content (cf. Haegeman (1991: 165)). Haegeman (1991) exemplifies inherent Case with the following example:

---

\(^3\) Some linguists speak of oblique as a structural Case assigned by Ps (cf. Hornstein et al. (2005: 123)). Notice that inherent Case is defined as “permanent” (see the German examples below). If so, it makes sense to argue that the case assigned by Ps is structural, for a pronoun will have oblique Case in Spanish o, English, Italian or French when it is the complement of a P but that same pronoun will be in Nominative Case, a clear structural Case, if it is in subject position. At the same time, nothing has changed in regards of functional Ps, which continue to be described as inherent Cased materializations. Since I will adopt a critical view on Case, nothing is really dependent on whether Case is inherent or structural for the purposes of this study. As I understand, it seems that a second view on the nature of inherent Case has to do with the possibility of certain NP/DPs to be licensed on their own without any Case-assignment per se because there may be no other syntactic way to do it (for instance, PRO). In the end, as Lasnik et al. (2005: 29, fn 14) regret, “Chomsky has used the word ‘inherent Case’ in too many different senses”. These linguists cite Chomsky (1986) as the standard view on inherent Case, but immediately after they mention Ps as structural Case assigners, even though Chomsky (1986) includes them as inherent Case assigners.
(41) a. Sie hilft ihm

She helps him-DAT
She helps him

Haegeman (1991: 165)

b. Sie gedachte vergangener Freuden

She remembered past-GEN joy-GEN
She remembered past moments of joy

Haegeman (1991: 166)

The Case assigned to the pronoun ihm in (41a) is said to be inherent because the fact that it is precisely Dative and not Genitive is entirely dependent on the assigning category, here the verb helfen. Compare it to the casual selecting properties of the verb gedanken in (41b), which, unlike helfen, selects for a Genitive object and not a Dative one. The thematic requirement of the German helfen specifies that it necessitates an argument object in Dative case, as does gedanken with its corresponding Genitive one. Since these are all examples of inherent Case, it comes as no surprise that the pronouns retain their cases in passives, as the following examples show:

(42) a. Ihm wird geholfen

He-DAT is helped

b. *Er wird geholfen

He-NOM is helped

Haegeman (1991: 175)
c. Sie sieht ihn
   She sees he-ACC

d. Er wird gesehen
   He-NOM is seen

e. *ihn wird gesehen
   He-ACC is seen

Haegeman (1991: 174)

As the ungrammaticality of (42b) proves, the assignment of Case by helfen is constant regardless of the structural position of the pronoun. It must remain Dative. The same restriction does not apply with sehen.

Therefore, Case/case goes hand in hand with theta-role assignment. The selected Case is, thus, not dependent on the structural position of the NP in the clause, as happens with structural Case, but rather on the selecting properties of the selecting head.

Woolford (2006) further differentiates between inherent Case and lexical Case. While inherent Case is “regular, associated with particular θ-positions”, lexical Case is “idiosyncratic Case, lexically selected and licensed by certain lexical heads (certain verbs and prepositions)” (Woolford (2006: 111)). Lexical Case is said to be licensed by lexical heads V or P, and inherent Case by v. That is, Vs and Ps that select for specific Cases in a non-predictable manner are regarded as lexical Case assigners, as in the examples of prepositional argument clauses in this dissertation.
However, recent works have found problems with abstract Case as a licensing feature/functional category. This is the topic of the next section.

3.4.3. Morphological case vs. abstract Case

The study of Case/case and Ps has benefitted from much attention in the recent years. This section aims at providing the critical view on the relationship between Case and case, and Case/case and Ps which will set the discussion pathway later in this dissertation. The first part of this section has to do with recent studies challenging the existence of Case. The second part exposes recent reviews of the syntactic relationship between Ps and case.

The notion of Case as abstract Case has been subject to criticism lately. In short, the most recent updates point to the inexistence of abstract Case as a real instrument in language. If it can be established that the theory can do without such an abstract concept as syntactic–abstract–Case, then it is just fair and necessary to eliminate it.

The first point of examination is the actual relationship between (abstract syntactic) Case and (morphological) case. Take for instance the following quotation from Marantz (2000):

I argue that the proper treatment of morphological case necessitates a complete break between abstract Case and morphological case (...). Giving content to the theory of morphological case allows for the elimination of abstract Case theory from the theory of syntax. The mapping between semantic roles and argument positions, augmented by the subject requirement of the Extended
Projection Principle, is sufficient to license NPs in argument positions. (Marantz (2000: 9))

That is, syntactic evidence shows that the concept of abstract Case can be done without. We find the same idea in McFadden (2004):

True case is a phenomenon of the post-Spell-out PF branch of the derivation, and in order to understand its real role in language, we must keep it separate from whatever handles DP-licensing within the pre-Spell-out narrow syntax. (McFadden (2004: 11))

What is the actual evidence which lets us do without abstract Case? Remember that the concept of abstract or syntactic Case was born as an extension of morphological case to those cases where no morphology is visible. Extending abstract Case to those nominal elements without case-marking allowed for a generalization in terms of licensing of nominal elements in the sentence. Where do we find examples of licensing of nominals? A well known situation is the licensing of the subject position, where the NP/DP is said to receive or be assigned Nom Case, directly or after movement. All sentences must have a subject, as expressed by the Extended Projection Principle.

The existence of the EPP, in itself also worth criticizing and exploring, serves, however, to comply with the need for having a subject. There is no need to postulate any need for Case-checking since the EPP takes care of it. At the very least, it would be redundant to have both abstract Case and the EPP (McFadden (2004: 7)). It is true that
there seems to be a debate on whether there is Case or EPP. Linguists seem to have been taking positions regarding the existence or not of either Case or the EPP. Notice, however, that McFadden and Marantz provide extra evidence to do without abstract Case (McFadden (2004: ch 8)). Instead of abstract case as a licensing tool in language, McFadden concludes that all is needed is some type of semantic integration:

Nominal phrases do not require abstract licensing beyond what is needed for integration into the semantic interpretation. (McFadden (2004: 277))

A different line of criticism comes from those linguists who regard abstract Case as only another name for grammatical function (Alsina (2001)), thus challenging the theoretical consistency of Case and arguing that Case may really be nothing other than a meaningless, fancy label for the common grammatical functions: being a subject (or rather being in the subject position, in Chomskyan terms) is equivalent to having Nominative Case checked by T, etc.

A second question is how to understand and formalize the relationship between case and Ps. Recent works have recovered the classic idea that Ps substituted for cases when the latter disappeared. A clear example of this is Latin. In addition, case and Ps may be present in the same language at the same time, as in Latin or German. So what is the relationship between them? For Blake (2001), “Adpositions can be considered to be analytic case markers as opposed to synthetic case markers like the suffixes of Turkish or Latin.” (Blake (2001: 9)).
A similar idea is entertained in Asbury (2008), who claims that morphological case is reducible to P, D or phi-features. Thus, both Ps and morphological cases are one and the same category: they are both expressions of the same P category, the former a separate morpheme and the latter a bound morpheme. Case features are reducible to other elements of the grammar. Consequently, Asbury (2008: 6) concludes that “case is an epiphenomenon”.

In syntactic terms, Asbury goes back to the previously mentioned functional KP (recall Tremblay (1996)), and redoes it by substituting the head K, for which she finds no evidence (Asbury (2008: 15)), by a regular P. KP is reinterpreted as PP, where P may be a real P or a bound casual morpheme, the difference being the phonological output of the category. The PP is the extended projection of the NP (recall Grimshaw’s Extended Projections). In this sense, an NP would naturally project up to the PP. The full NP structure is actually as follows (Asbury (2008: 22)):

(43)

```
(PP)
   /   \
(P)   (DP)
       /   \  
(D)   (ϕP) 
       / \  \  
  (ϕ)  (NP)  
      /    \  
     (N)   
```

Thus, as Asbury (2008: 16) puts it, “both adposition phrases and noun phrases with morphological case are PPs”. If Ps and Case or case would be the same category with
different phonetic outcomes. To sum up, Asbury (2008) concludes that there is no abstract Case, only morphological case, in that syntactic Case can be reinterpreted in terms of P, D or phi-features, and asserts that “case is only present where it is literally visible: that is, where it is morphologically distinct” (Asbury (2008: 178)). Asbury (2008) is thus in agreement with McFadden (2004). This takes care of the morphological difference between inflected pronouns, such as personal pronouns in Spanish and English, versus the “un-inflectionable” finite clause. Pronouns have case and therefore it is logical to speak of case with them. Clauses do not have case, thus Case/case is irrelevant with them.

Bayer et al. (2001: 474) are in the same line of thought. They claim that “the diving line between preposition and Case might not be universally justified (...).” KP may be realized as either a P or oblique Case:

It should be noticed that the amount of semantic content of P is independent of P’s Case feature or Case-assigning property. The interesting cases are here examples such as mit nichts (‘with nothing’) where nichts lacks a Case paradigm altogether, and where P is able to make up for this defect. (Bayer et al. (2001: 476-477))

For Bayer et al. (2001), not all nominals have or must have any case/Case at all, effectively demoting the relevance of Case/case in the grammar.

The conclusions from this section are very interesting. On the Case-friendly side, if we assume that Ps assign inherent Case (or lexical Case), then it means that the Ps involved are not real Ps but Cases themselves. If so, since Case and P are one and the same, the
presence or absence of a P, in particular as functional P, is syntactically irrelevant: with or without Ps a nominal (including clauses) with inherent Case is automatically licensed because it does have Case.

On a more negative note, the most recent works on Case/case reject this nominal licensing mechanism. If so, this has immediate crucial consequences for our discussion. For instance, without Case, then the syntax of prepositional finite clauses, and their history à la Barra (2002), must be recast in different terms because Case is wiped out of the discussion. For the moment, with this important criticism in mind, let us focus in the previous literature on Case and finite clauses. As will be shown, for some linguists finite clauses do not get Case, which for our purposes has the same theoretical effects than rejecting the notion of Case.

3.4.4. Case and finite CPs
Now that the notion of Case has been introduced and amply criticized, it is time to examine the relationship between Case and a finite clause. In particular, there is one main question: Do finite clauses have/receive/check Case after all? There are three fronts in this issue: those who advocate against Case for finite clauses, those who propose the opposite, and those in the middle.

The most popular advocate of the first group is Stowell (1981), in particular in his Case-Resistance Principle (CRP):
Case may not be assigned to a category bearing a Case-assigning feature (Stowell (1981: 146))

Consistent with his theoretical framework, a clause (S or CP) contains a category which can assign Case (I or T), which immediately disqualifies the clause to be assigned Case in return. In effect, finite clauses cannot be assigned Case. Support for his hypothesis comes from sentences like the following:

(44) a. *We were talking about that the Marines went to China

   b. *I consider that John came home to be fortunate

   Stowell (1981: 149)

   c. *Although that the house is empty may depress you…

   Stowell (1981: 153)

   d. That Pauline moved to Kansas surprised me

   Stowell (1981: 152)

   e. Paul already knows that Jim lives with his sister

   Stowell (1981: 159)

The ungrammaticality of (44a, b, c) indicates that finite clauses are not like NPs, which is extra evidence in favor of his rejection of Case for clauses. Remember that only nominal categories needed Case in order to comply with the demands of the Case Filter. Sentences (44d, e) would seem to be counterarguments because they are in NP-like positions and
should be getting Case. Stowell’s answer, in line with Emonds (1976), is to assume that those clauses are actually not in argument positions but rather topicalized and just happen to be coreferent with an empty element that is the one really occupying the argument positions of subject and object. This way clauses are structurally prevented from getting Case⁴.

More recently, Picallo (2002: 141-142) argues that argument CPs (and CPs with article as in *El que llueva* (lit. ‘The that it rains’, “The fact that it rains”)) contain a [-Case] feature. Theoretically, CPs are specified for Case, but in reality in the end they never possess any real Case. To this Picallo (2002: 142) adds that “[a]ny other morphological expression of Case is impossible because it manifests a form of the [+Case] specification, a property of nominals or nominal-like syntactic objects”, which clauses are not. The same Caseless assumption is adopted by Demonte and Fernández’s (2005).

In the middle of the debate we find some linguists who find that finite clauses may receive Case but just in some specific configurations. For instance, Napoli (1993: 193) notes that NPs require Case, but clauses do not. However:

Notice that the fact that phrases other than NPs (such as clauses) do not require Case does not prevent them from receiving Case if they should appear in a position to which Case is normally assigned (Napoli (1993: 193))

---

⁴ Note that this conclusion is tricky, because, according to the theory, θ-role and Case are assigned to the whole chain (Culicover (1997: 41), among others). This implies that a finite clause coreferent with a pronoun will receive one Case and one θ-role, shared with the pronoun. Therefore, it is not true that finite clause sin extraposition are not assigned Case.
Lasnik et al. (2005: 16) argue that finite clauses may receive Case, for instance when in subject position:

\[(45) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. *It seems that } & 2+2=4 \text{ to be true} \\
\text{b. That } & 2+2=4 \text{ seems to be true}
\end{align*}\]

Lasnik et al. (2005: 16)

The fact that (45b) is grammatical is proof that a finite clause can be the subject, and, accordingly, is supposed to receive Case. Notice that Stowell’s topicalization hypothesis is not applied here.

Kempchinsky (1992) explores the syntax of Case and clausal complements in several languages within the perspective of Stowell’s CRP’s rejection of double Case assignment. Kempchinsky finds that the differences between Case-marked sentential complements and the non-Case-marked ones resides in the creation or not of licit Case chains, which imply double Case assignment. Kempchinsky assumes Enç’s temporal chain (‘anchorage’) between the subordinate clause and the matrix clause, whereby there exists a temporal chain shared by C, I and V. The idea is that “[a]ssignment of a Case index to the subordinate clause breaks the temporal chain, resulting in ill-formedness” (Kempchinsky (1992: 24)).

Let us examine one example. In French, for instance, prepositional verbs do not select for PP in reality but only for NPs or CPs. Therefore, in a sentence like Je compte sur l’aide de mes amis (I count on the help of my friends) (Kempchinsky (1992: 30), the V
compter is actually selecting for an NP, and the P is just the materialization of inherent Case from the V. Kempchinsky concludes that in French there is an indexing relation between V and its complement, NP or CP, which means that if a P were to select for any complement there would be an illicit Case chain because both the verb and the P would assign Case to the complement. That is believed to explain why P + finite clause is not allowed in French. Notice that, for this explanation to work, Kempchinsky needs to get rid of the Ps in French prepositional verbs and also must give an alternative account of Spanish and Portuguese prepositional verbs, because this principle against double Case is expected to hold crosslinguistically and therefore there must be something special in Spanish and Portuguese that prevents double Case assignment to take place in them, given the fact that P + CP are perfectly grammatical. Kempchinsky argues that in these languages there is no Case-index because the P in these languages is both the inherent Case assigner and the materialization of such inherent Case. This P projects its own PP, while its French counterpart is just a Case marker.

Notice the immediate complications: in order to accept Kempchinsky’s explanation in terms of indexes, we have to abandon any attempt at a homogeneous understanding of functional P in closely related languages such as French and Spanish, apart from the fact that accepting that an inherent Case-marking P projects up to a full-fledged PP requires extra justification or else it risks turning into a post hoc theoretical artifact (see the many comments about this issue in this chapter). In addition, current models of syntactic analysis do not accept indexes or chains.

Bayer et al. (2001: 470) point out that German *dass*-CPs have nominal properties without being exactly like NPs. These finite CPs can be in Nominative and Accusative positions and have those structural Cases checked. However, they cannot occupy a position where they would be assigned Dative. Thus structural Cases such as Nominative and Accusative may be realized by finite CPs, but not inherent Cases such as Dative.

The final group is that of those who argue that finite clauses do receive Case. A good representative is Plann (1986), who falsifies the crosslinguistic value of Stowell’s CRP by using Spanish data. Plann notes that Stowell’s CRP accounts for the finite clause in English, but not in Spanish. The main reason is that in Spanish finite clauses can be selected for by Ps, a Case-assigner in her framework. Likewise, Contreras (1985) criticizes Stowell’s CRP on the basis of Spanish and English data (especially, P + indirect interrogatives) and concludes that clauses can receive Case.

This section has exposed different arguments in favor and against Case for finite clauses, and the nominal properties of finite clauses by proxy. None of the languages studied in this dissertation have morphologically inflected clauses. Hence, if Case is not appropriate anymore and only case is real, then the existence or not of Case features in the licensing of finite sentential arguments (and adjuncts) immediately becomes void.
3.4.5. Prepositional transitivity?

As it turns out, functional Ps do not project full-fledged PPs. For Scorretti (1991) all prepositional Vs have functional Ps. This line of thought eliminates any relevance to the presence of the P. Therefore, what looks like a PP is actually not a real PP at some point (of the derivation) but rather some type of special DP which has a somehow unexpected P.

One of the main works regarding this issue is again Stowell (1981: 144), who claims that, whenever there seems to be a PP in an argument position, actually the theta-role is assigned not to the PP as such, but rather to the complement of the P. Both a Case-marker P and a real, contentful P would be the same syntactically regarding Case-assignment: in both contexts Case is not assigned to the whole constituent but only to the NP inside.

More recent of such advocators is Botwinik-Rotem (2004):

It is widely assumed that the internal argument of a PP-verb is not the PP, but rather the DP complement of the P (Botwinik-Rotem (2004: 41))

A similar perspective is entertained in Demonte (1992), who argues that some prepositional Vs do not have real Ps but only Case-markers (see above). Same thing with the previously mentioned studies that rely on inherent Case-markers and deny that functional Ps are indeed Ps. Let us add, for instance, Napoli (1993):

The *of* that appears in [the destruction of the city], then, can be viewed as a P whose function is to assign Case to the following NP. Thus Ns and As take
“prepositional Objects” rather than Direct NP Objects because Ns and As are not Case-assigners. (Napoli (1993: 193))

Functional Ps such as of and those “lexically selected by other lexical head, or the IO prepositions to and for” (Napoli (1989: 46-47)) do not assign any θ-roles to their complements. Thus, in examples such as I’m fond of pasta, You shouldn’t rely on translations, or Jim baked the carrot cake for Sally:

pasta is an argument of fond, not of; translations is an argument of rely, not on. Sally is an argument of baked, not for. We can say that the prepositions [of, on, and for] transmit the theta role from the actual theta assigner to the argument (Napoli (1989: 47)).

The same treatment is dispensed to other functional Ps selected by Vs, Ns, or Adjs.

This whole idea of prepositional verbs (V+P in particular) has been extensively advocated for by Cano (1981) for (Old) Spanish, arguing that V+P constructions are just but another way of transitivity, even if this type includes a preposition. That is a more traditional way to capture the hypothesis that these Vs θ-mark the complement of the P but not the PP per se, and that the P does not really have much syntactic weight.

In Old Spanish, there are verbs which alternate between a prepositional construction and a prepositionless one. It is true that in some cases the presence or absence of the P produced different meaning. However, crucially, there are others where the DO construction is very similar to the prepositional one:
(46) assí que el cauallero entendió en su muerte (*Crónica Alfonso XI*)

once that the knight understood in his death

Once the knight found out about his death

Cano (1977-78: 346)

For Cano “el valor del complemento con *en* es enteramente el de un Objeto Directo, y la construcción puede sustituirse por una estructura transitiva como «conocer algo»” (Cano (1977-78: 346)) (the value of the complement with *en* is entirely that of a direct object, and the construction can be substituted by a transitive structure such as ‘know something’. My translation).

More evidence of what Cano calls “prepositional transitivity” is found in those Vs which could select for a variety of complements in the old language, including DO and several prepositional objects. Consider the following examples where such irregularity in the selectional properties of the V *pensar* is exemplified:

(47) a. Et quanto más pensé en la rreligión… (*Calila*)

And as more I-thought in the religion

And the more I thought about religion

b. & penso muy bien dél (*Conde Lucanor, Don Juan Manuel*)

& he-thought very well of-him

And he thought very well of him

Cano (1977-78: 349)
Cano (1977-78) concludes that this variation indicates that “las preposiciones ya no tienen sentido por sí mismas, y que en todos los casos nos hallamos ante complementos de objeto” (Cano (1980: 348)) (the prepositions do not have any meaning, and in all those cases what we have is direct objects. My translation).

Neeleman (1997) and Neeleman and Weerman (2001) offer an approach to these constructions which somehow formalizes Cano’s suggestions, that is, a formalization of the idea that prepositional verbs seem to behave as if the P were actually part of the verb and not a complete syntactic element of its own. As Neeleman (1997: 93) points out, “there does not seem to be a thematic relation between the PP and the verb, but rather between the verb-preposition combination and the DP contained in the PP”.

Neeleman proposes that the P is indeed independent in the narrow syntax, thus the V and the P do project their own phrases. Only later at LF will the P incorporate in the V, forming a complex predicate and θ-marking the complement DP together (Neeleman and Weerman (2001: 106)). Syntactically, the resulting tree would be as follows (Neeleman (1997: 104)):

(48)
The previous tree captures the idea that $P + V \theta$-mark the complement DP without completely eliminating the presence of a PP, although it also implies that “[a]s opposed to other complements of V, however, no thematic relation licenses the presence of the prepositional phrase as a whole” (Neeleman (1997: 116)). Idiomatic selection takes care of the particular one-to-one arbitrariness of the preposition selection in each case. Neeleman’s analysis relies on the principle of Procrastination to justify why P-incorporation must wait until LF. As is well known, recent versions of Chomskyan grammar have done away with such global economy/reference set computation principles, thus forcing an immediate question regarding how to translate Neeleman’s justification into current concepts.

A very similar explanation is found in Hoekstra (1984):

Let us assume, that in the case of prepositional objects the preposition may be taken to assign Case to its complement, harmlessly in this situation, but that it is the verb that determined the $\theta$-role of the complement. While it makes sense that Case government is determined purely in terms of configurational properties, this is not true for thematic government. Given the fact that it is the verb that determined the $\theta$-structure of the PP domain, rather than the preposition itself, we may say that the clause is governed in the relevant sense by the verb. (Hoekstra (1984: 112))

Similarly, Horn (2002: 460) concludes that some prepositional verbs such as *contar con, hablar de* or *alegrarse de* undergo a process of reanalysis whereby the group V+P ends up as one unit. In this sense, the P is also eliminated.
A different approach is developed in Baker (2003). Baker regards all Ps as functional categories. What is more, Baker proposes that all PPs are strictly adjuncts, which obviously means that there is no such thing as prepositional arguments. However, his analysis must face the fact that many of the so-called prepositional verbs require the presence of their complement PPs. This can be seen in that a verb such as *depend* must co-occur with this complement introduced by *on*. Baker finds a way to overcome this descriptive problem by keeping the adjunct nature of all PPs but claiming that in these cases the PP is in reality coreferential with a nominal empty element which is the actual argument of the verb (somehow echoing Stowell’s and other linguists’ ideas). Consider the following representation:

\[(49)\quad \text{Chris} \ [\text{VP} [\text{depends} <\ldots \theta_i> e_i] \text{on checks} ]\]

Baker (2003: 321)

The PP *on checks* is not the real argument of the verb, but, anyway, is said to license the nominal empty position complementing the V. This hypothesis effectively advocates for a nominal object for these Vs, and places the PP out of sight.

Baker (2003) finds support for this analysis on the basis that these PPs behave like adjuncts in many respects. For instance, they do not require strict locality, in English, as opposed to regular arguments of Vs:
(50)  a. Chris **depends** very much **on** Pat

b. ??Chris **trusts** very much **Pat**

Baker (2003: 322)

While in (50a) intervention is allowed, it is not the case with (50b).

As Baker himself recognizes, this hypothesis still requires some extra work and further evidence for it to be complete. Notice that adopting it would amount to eliminating other question that we have to answer: if all PPs are adjuncts no matter what, then it is useless to examine whether prepositional finite clauses are indeed argument clauses because they would also be automatically adjuncts.

To sum up, there is a generally accepted analysis that the Ps in prepositional verbs are somehow eliminated, either in overt syntax or later in the derivation, but the goal is the same: to get rid of a P that should not be there. Or at least there seems to be no appropriate way to describe its syntax and that is why there is this general insistence in doing away with it. In fact, for our purposes we can describe the syntax of prepositional finite clauses dependent on verbs or other categories as either all cases of functional Ps not projecting a real PP but some type of defective PP-KP as hypothesized in Asbury (2008), or we could continue Rizzi’s division and draw a line between real, required Ps and functional, sporadic Ps.

However, not all linguists agree on the syntactic irrelevance of the P. Baltin and Postal (1996) present evidence against a reanalysis of prepositional verbs, that is, against any type of incorporation of the P into the V. Some of the evidence is as follows:
a. I discussed \text{the problems he was having with deliveries} with Lorenzo
b. *I [argued with] \text{the driver's union leader} about such problems

Baltin and Postal (1996: 129)

These couple of examples prove that, while heavy NP-shift can take place with regular transitive verbs (51a), it is ungrammatical with prepositional verbs (51b), which is unexpected if prepositional objects were actually just direct object NPs.

Another piece of evidence comes from ellipsis. The Ps in prepositional verbs cannot be deleted in ellipsis of the verb, again unexpected if \(V + P\) form a unit:

a. Frank called Sandra and Arthur _____ Louise
b. *Frank talked to Sandra and Arthur _____ *(to) Sally

Baltin and Postal (1996: 129)

The reanalysis hypothesis cannot explain either why intervention is allowed between the verb and the preposition:

I depended, \textbf{unaccountably I might add}, on Bill to be there

Baltin and Postal (1996: 140, fn 12)

Baltin and Postal highlight that the reanalysis should be able to include all the material intervening between the verb and the preposition, which seems highly problematic.
Against the idea of semantically empty Ps, Blake (2001: 34) claims that “[i]f one takes the governed ablative of a Latin verb like ūtī ‘to use’ to be ‘voided of its semantic contents’” we would lose the generalization that “[t]he ablative in Latin is the case used to express instrumental function and this would appear to be appropriate for ūtī ‘to use’”. Similar complaints against the idea of desemanticized prepositions are present in Weinrich (1978). These semantic reservations could easily apply to many other prepositional verbs, such as alegrarse de (‘to be happy about’), where de is said to express the cause. However, in this case it is easier to provide a clear counterargument, because it is precisely the special multiplicity of meanings accumulated in the prepositions de or a which has invited the conclusion that they are actually meaningless.

Another voice against the elimination of the role of the P is Rodríguez (2000: 238), who argues, contra Cano, that it is not possible to speak of “prepositional transitivity” on the grounds that it was common in Old Spanish for movement verbs to lack the current standard P. In these cases, however, given the intrinsically intransitive nature of the Vs, it is not possible to argue that, when missing the P, those same verbs were transitive.

In conclusion, these different approaches share one interest: to try to make sense out of the presence of an unnecessary P which syntactically should not be there. If these functional Ps do not have a θ-grid, then they do not select any complements, that is, the P works like a bridge between the V and the object. The problems appear when trying to locate where the P is somehow eliminated. The criticism against the reanalysis analysis points to the fact that the P exists, a problem Neeleman and Weerman try to get rid of by appealing to LF. The truth is that there seems to be no completely satisfying account of
the big theoretical contradiction in all this: these Ps are present and absent at the same time, a contradiction that the data which will be analyzed in the next chapters will illustrate, in that actually some of these Ps were and are optional in several languages in some contexts.

3.5. Arguments vs. adjuncts

A final theoretical point of extreme importance revolves around the syntax of arguments and adjuncts, and the difference between them and its theoretical implications. As will be shown, to this day there are no exhaustive criteria to differentiate between arguments and adjuncts without any counterexamples or other problems.

In this section I introduce the syntactic representation of arguments and adjuncts according current syntactic theory, with their corresponding implications. In addition, I enumerate some tests used in the literature on order to try to differentiate between argument and adjunct, with controversial results. Finally, I show the problems some of tests face when confronted with data, and illustrate Dowty’s (2000) account of dual analysis.

Syntactically, the difference between complements (object arguments) and adjuncts can be easily visualized in a tree: while complements are syntactically sisters to the head they complement, adjuncts are not. This means that adjuncts are located “further” form the head than complements (Radford (1988: 187), Carnie (2002: 117), among many others):
Of course, the idea behind this representation is that complements are closer in that they are specifically required and selected by the heads, while adjuncts are more independent and not selected.

In Minimalist terms, a complement phrase merges when selected in order to satisfy some features that must be checked and erased or valued, whereas adjuncts do not do have that effect. As Adger (2003: 112) puts it, adjuncts enter the derivation without being “requested” or “needed” but rather as an external accessory. In doing so, an adjunct, as opposed to the merging of a complement, “does not create a new [syntactic] object, it expands one of the old ones (…)” (Adger (2003: 112)).

The crucial consequence is that adjuncts do not really “exist” for syntactic computations. Chomsky (1995: 325) suggest that adjunction “may not really belong to the system we are discussing here [Narrow Syntax or the syntactic component per se in a derivation]” (cf. also Eguren and Fernández (2004: 311-312). In particular, Chomsky (2001: 17) assumes that adjuncts merge (enter the derivation) late, as opposed to complements. As a consequence, adjuncts just don’t count; in other words: “if α is adjoined to β, the construction behaves as if α isn’t there apart from semantic
interpretation” (Chomsky (2001: 17)). Much more theoretical machinery could be invoked here, but it is not necessary because the main idea is that, as opposed to complements, being an adjunct has clear consequences in syntactic computation.

Once the syntax of complements and adjunct has been introduced, it is time to explore the different tests. The classical difference between arguments and adjuncts is the obligatoriness of the former and the optionality of the latter (cf. Dowty (2000: 2)). There are several other tests that have traditionally been applied to tell argument and adjuncts apart, for instance:

a. Complements are required and selected for, while adjuncts are not, which means that adjuncts have freer combinatory properties than complements do (Radford (1988: 192)):

(55)  a. a student of physics  
    b. *a boy of physics  
    c. a student with long hair  
    d. a boy with long hair  

Radford (1988: 192)

While the adjunct with long hair can modify different nouns, of Physics can only be the complement of a semantically “matching” head.
b. Adjunct positions, but not complements, are recursive (Radford (1988: 189), Carnie (2002: 120)):

(56)  
  a. the student [with long hair] [with short arms]  2 adjuncts
  b. *the student [of Physics] [of Chemistry]  2 complements

Radford (1988: 189)

c. A complement and an adjunct cannot be coordinated (Radford (1988: 190), Carnie (2002: 124-125)):

(57)  
  a. *a student of Physics and with long hair
  b. *a student with long hair and of Physics

Radford (1988: 190)

The following are often cited examples of prepositional complements, where the P is particularly specified in each separate case (notice they are not interchangeable):

(58)  
  a. I defer to your suggestion
  b. John waited for the taxi
  c. I can rely on you
  d. Nothing can detract from her merit
  e. He declaimed against Syntax

Radford (1988: 344)
Several regularly prepositional verbs appear without their prepositions when selecting for finite clauses, which nevertheless are commonly described as complements:

(59)  

a. I **insist** [that the Council’s decision be reconsidered]  

Radford (1988: 353)

b. She **inquired** [who was coming]

c. They **wonder** [when they’ll be allowed to leave]

d. They **debated** [whether conclusive evidence had been presented]

Radford (1988: 354)

However, there are still many issues to be solved before linguists can offer a consistent difference between arguments and adjuncts. Let us concentrate on the first test mentioned above: the optionality of the adjuncts. If arguments are always mandatory, this poses some syntactic trouble when dealing with those common transitive verbs which can be used intransitively, like *comer* (to eat) or *beber* (to drink) (cf. Vater (1978: 24) for similar issues in German). Several solutions have been proposed, which I am not going to go over here, but that does not eliminate the basic theoretical problem.

An intermediate position is held by Dowty (2000), who argues for a dual analysis of adjuncts and arguments in the following terms:

Virtually all complements have a dual analysis as adjuncts, and any kind of adjunct can potentially receive an analysis as a complement (Dowty (2000: 12))
For Dowty, prepositional phrases such as the infinitival *to please Mary* would have an intrinsic dual nature, which would manifest itself as an adjunct in *sing to please Mary* but as a complement in *try to please Mary* (Dowty (2000: 12)). This hypothesis has implications for language learning, since Dowty indicates that speakers would access first “a preliminary analysis which serve[s] language-learners as a semantic “hint” or “crutch” to figuring out the idiosyncratic correct meaning of the complement analysis (…): a preliminary adjunct analysis of the to-PP (…) gives way to a complement analysis of to-PP” (Dowty (2002: 10)). This proposal materializes the blurred nature of the difference between certain adjuncts and arguments, particularly prepositional phrases. At the same time, it forces us to dilute a very clear syntactic difference, as indicated above.

Other positions challenge the “common grounds” in a different manner. For instance, let us remember Baker’s (2003) tentative hypothesis that all PPs are adjuncts, effectively eliminating any need for further discussion regarding these phrases.

In a similar line of thought, and of particular relevance for this dissertation as well, Grimshaw (1990) claims that sentential complements to Ns are not arguments at all. Bresnan differentiates between prepositional and non-prepositional complements, the latter being argument. However, when it comes to clauses, Grimshaw argues that those clauses introduced by functional Ps such as *to* and *of* do not transmit θ-roles, and do not θ-mark their objects. Therefore, it is perfectly possible for a noun to take a preposition and a CP without (sic) the CP acting as a grammatical argument. So in cases of P + CP the behavior
predicted depends crucially on whether the preposition is acting as a theta transmitter (Grimshaw (1990: 79)).

Partially similar reservations are expressed in Leonetti (1999), which prove satisfactory. Leonetti’s arguments will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4

DATA AND SYNTAX OF THE PREPOSITIONAL FINITE CLAUSES IN OLD
AND PRESENT-DAY SPANISH

4.1. Introduction

This chapter will be devoted in its entirety to the syntax and history of Spanish prepositional finite clause. The study will develop in two main directions: on the one hand, the finite clauses will be located in the general context of PPs, including PP with nouns and prepositional infinitives. On the other hand, the theoretical tools presented in the previous chapter will be evaluated, with the purpose of clarifying to what extent they shed light on the history and properties of the prepositional finite clause.

The study of Spanish explores two main periods, Old Spanish and present-day Spanish. Old Spanish will be understood as covering the period prior to the extension of prepositional argument finite clauses around the 16th – 17th centuries, the key change around which this section will be revolving. Since argument P + finite CPs become common in the 16th-17th century, my approach fortunately coincides with one of the standard periodization limits (linked to the history of literature): that between Medieval Spanish - Middle Ages (up to the end of the 15th c.) and the beginning of Classical
Spanish – Renaissance (in the 16th c.), although examples from the 16th-17th centuries may be included and discussed when necessary to understand the linguistic situation being examined. This methodological option is supported by the fact that my interest lies in particular in examining what the language had to offer at different relevant synchronic moments in its history. The study of present-day Spanish concentrates on 20th-21st Spanish.

4.2. Old Spanish

Before concentrating on the prepositional finite clauses in Old Spanish, it is necessary to pay attention to the general picture of preposition selection with NP/DPs and, in particular, infinitives, the other possible clausal complements of a P. The purpose is to analyze the syntax of both functional and lexical Ps, and to compare the three types of complements.

4.2.1. P + NP/DP

4.2.1.1. Argument and adjunct P + NP/DP

In this section I will show that Ps in Old Spanish could select for NP/DPs, both pronouns and full phrases. These selectional properties are present in both argument and adjunct (adverbial) configurations.

The first group is illustrated below. As can be seen, verbs, nouns and adjectives could select for apparent prepositional phrases with required Ps, which, as explained in chapter 3, can be syntactically analyzed as non-PP projecting functional Ps (meaningless Ps,
without θ-grid, with no selectional constraints because they are imposed by the V; cf. Rauh (1993)). The first set of examples includes full NP/DPs:

(1) a. se podrie **membrar de todas las cosas pasadas** *(Estoria de España I, Alfonso X, 13th c.)*

  Refl could recall **of all** the things past

  S/he could remember all the past things

b. de como se deue tener la fe. & **creer en la sancta Trinidad** *(Estoria de España I, Alfonso X, 13th c.)*

  of how refl must have the faith & believe in the saint Trinity

  On how one must have faith and believe in the Saint Trinity

c. commo el fiador non deue ser preso. saluo si se **obliga a ello**. *(Leyes de estilo. Esc Z. III. 11, c. 1310)*

  how the lender not must be imprisoned except if refl forces to it

  How the lender must not be imprisoned unless so required

d. quitaredes **dubda de vos e de Don Jaime e seredes mas seguro de el** *(De Doña Guillerma Desprats a Jaime II, 1318)*

  you’d-eliminate doubt of you & Mr. Jaime and you’d-be more sure of him

  You would eliminate any doubt cast on you and D. Jaime and you would be

  surer about him
The same Ps could combine with pronouns:

(2)  a. **Amembrando me de ti** en mio lecho / en cada vela **cuyando de ti** (Biblia Latina, 13th c.)

   Remembering refl of you in my bed / in each vigil thinking of you
   
   Remembering you in my bed / each vigil thinking of you

   b. Todos **en ti creemos e a ti adoramos** (Milagros de Nuestra Señora, Berceo. 13th c.)

   All in you   believe and to you adore
   
   We all believe in you and adore you

On the other hand, lexical Ps (that is, meaningful Ps with θ-grid and selectional restrictions of their own, heading adverbial, adjunct PPs not required by the V, etc.) are attested with nominal complements as well, both pronouns and full NP/DPs, exactly like their functional counterparts:

(3)  a. **por mi e por todos los reyes** (Documentos castellanos, Alfonso X. 13th c.)

   for me and for all   the kings
   
   for me and for all the kings

   b. Yo adobare conducho **pora mi & pora mis vassallos** (Cid. 13th c. vv. 249-250)

   I will fix   food   for me and   for my   vassals.
I will fix food for me and for my vassals.

c. Dia es que vernan **fasta ti** desde assur **fasta las cibdades** dela fortaleza

(*Biblia romanceada judío cristiana. 14th c.*)

Day is that will-come until you from Assur until the cities of the fortress

The day will arrive when they’ll come to you from Asur until the cities of the fortress

d. & **desde la fortaleza** fasta elrrio (*Biblia romanceada judío cristiana. 14th c.*)

and from the fortress until the river

and from the fortress to the river

In conclusion, Old Spanish offers numerous data proving that all types of Ps were completely compatible with nominal phrases as their dependent, be it a real object for the lexical Ps, or just the actual object of the V/A/N via a functional P.

4.2.1.2. Variability in argument prepositional selection

I have shown that there existed no restrictions against nominal objects for Ps in Old Spanish. A different issue is whether those Ps were rigorously fixed for every single selecting predicate, including those Ps required by verbs, nouns or adjectives. In reality, one of the defining characteristics of the prepositional selection in Old Spanish is actually its instability or variability, and NP/DP-selection is no exception (cf. Cano (1977-78: 336)).
There are two types of variability. On the one hand, variability is found when a single category (for instance, a V) may select for different Ps without a (total) semantic difference. On the other hand, some governing categories may select for a prepositional object or a direct object in free variation.

The first type of variability has to do with several Ps being compatible with one same category. Observe the following examples:

(4) *Pensar de = pensar en* (lit. ‘to think of = to think in’)

a. Et quanto más pensé *en la religión* (*Calila e Dimna*, 13th c.)
   
   And as more I-thought in the religion
   
   And the more I thought about religion

b. Mas *de mi amor pensat* (*Razón de amor*, 13th c.)
   
   But of my love think
   
   But think about my love

   Cano (1977-78: 349)

The second variable scenario is reflected in the following examples, where the presence or absence of a P is not relevant):

1 Of course, in some cases the presence of the P was semantically relevant, as the well-known case of *pensar vs. pensar en* exemplifies (to think vs. to think about something). Cf. Serradilla (2001: 146) for more information.
(5)  

a. Si uos **un Dios creedes** *(Disputa entre un cristiano y un judío, c 1220)*

   If you a God believe
   
   If you believe in a god

b. Onde, Señor, **creyme deste consejo** & vete de aqui. *(Conquista de Ultramar, 13th c.)*

   Where, Sir, believe-me of-this advice & go-you of here
   
   Whence, Sir, believe my advice and leave
   
   Cano (1977-78: 345)

c. **Creo en dios** padre criador del cielo & dela tierra *(Libro de las tres creencias, Alfonso de Valladolid, 1320)*

   I-believe in god father creator of-the heaven & of-the earth
   
   I believe in god father, creator of heaven and earth

The variation between prepositional and non-prepositional selection is not restricted to verbal paradigms, since it is also found with nouns. Consider the following examples:

(6)  

a. si ellos parassen **mientes Ø la palabra** que dice nuestro Señor Ihesu Christo

   enel eeuangelio *(Libro de los gatos, III, 22, c 15th c.)*

   If they stopped minds the word that says our lord Jesus Christ
   
   in-the Gospel
   
   If they paid attention to the words of JC in the Gospel
   
   Tarr (1922: 116)
b. Parad mientes en vos señor (Crónica del Cid, 15th c.)

Stop minds in you sir

Pay attention to yourself, sir

Parar mientes requires a P but the absence of the P is also attested. In addition, Tarr (122: 57-58, fn. 2) adds that acordarse (to remember) could be used with a direct object until the classical period since “one could say both me acuerdo una cosa and me acuerdo de una cosa” (‘I remember one thing’ instead of the expected ‘I remember of one thing’). This same variation survives after the medieval period:

(7) a. Acuérdate lo que debes. (Viaje, Lope, 17th c.)

Remember-you the what you-must

Remember what you must

b. ¿Acordáis de aquellos tiempos pasados… (Lozana andaluza, Delicado, 16th c.)

Remember-you of those times past

Do you remember those past times…?

(Cano 1984: 238)

As can be seen, the oscillation between the prepositional and the direct selection is still alive in the 16th century and beyond. The same can be said of non-prepositional complements of nouns:
(8)  

a. como aquel que lo había gana (Lazarillo, 141. 16th c.)

Like that who it had cravings
Like that one who was longing for it

Cano (1984: 211)

b. Los avía gran piadad (Vida, Santa Teresa, 16th c.)

Them had great mercy
S/he had great mercy for them

4.2.1.3. Conclusions

1. Functional and lexical prepositions could combine with nominal phrases, including full noun phrases and pronouns. There was some variation, and it was frequent to find that the same verb could function with more than one required P.

2. The non-prepositional examples of *parar mientes* and the like seem to suggest a reanalysis, but this mechanism does not seem to provide an accurate account of similar examples in present-day English (cf. the comments on Baltin and Postal (1996) in 3.4.5. above). Obviously, present-day English is not like Old Spanish, but these V+N
combinations do not to fit well into the standard definition of a compound, as Barra (2002: 107) proves. For one, these constructions allow interpolation, which is by the way one of the criteria mentioned by Baltin and Postal (1996) against the idea of reanalysis.

3. The lack of P shows that nominal phrases could, but did not have to, be licensed via a P. They could be licensed positionally (Gutiérrez Rexach and Bosque (2004, ch. 3: 46)). Therefore, prepositional verbs seem to be able to license their objects as if they had turned into transitive verbs. The same is possible with some nouns, which challenges even more the assumption that nouns cannot θ-mark/assign Case directly to their objects in languages such as Spanish. That is, of course, unless we assume that these non-prepositional noun phrases could actually self-license thanks to the syntactic position they occupy as objects, a type of inherent Case. Notice that this is not to say that nouns did generally not require Ps to select for their objects in Old Spanish, only that, as happens with verbs, some nouns showed variation.

The possibility of the absence of the required P is a feature in common with the finite clauses, as will be seen below. Thus, finite clauses were not the only categories to allow variation.

Once the situation with nouns has been explored and discussed, it is time to explore the CPs. In order to be able to compare with the finite clauses, I briefly review the syntax of the infinitive in Old Spanish in the next section.

---

2 As far as I know, linguists do not report adjectives directly selecting for their complements without the P.
4.2.2. P + infinitive

4.2.2.1. Argument and adjunct P + infinitive

As happened with NP/DPs, throughout the history we find different prepositions selecting for infinitives, both in argument and adjunct (adverbial) contexts. Let us start by examining some examples of prepositional argument infinitives:

(9) a. no ay hombre que se pueda **alegar de ver** la ynfanta & los duelos que haze

   (*Historia de la linda Melosina*, Jean D'Arras, 15th c.)

   Not there’s man that refl can be-happy of see the infant & the sorrow that makes

   There is no man who can be happy of seeing the infant and her grief

b. Loth ovo **miedo de see** en Segor (*La fazienda de Ultra Mar*, Almerich, 13th c.)

   Lot had fear of be in Segor

   Lot was scared of being in Segor

c. y el que quisiere ser **seguro de no tener** necessidad (*Cifar*, c. 1300)

   & that that wanted be sure of not have necessity

   And whoever wanted to be sure of not being in need

d. los quales serviuicios e derechos **se acostumbraron a dar** a los sennores de Gallizia (*Documentos castellanos de Alfonso X*, 13th c.)

   the which services and rights refl accustomed to give to the sirs of Galicia
e. **Conténtate con venir** mañana (*Celestina*, Rojas, 15th c.)

Be-happy-you with come tomorrow

Be happy that at least you’re coming tomorrow

Lapesa (2000: 572)

f. *non dubdas en meterte* a periglo de muerte (*Primera Crónica General*, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

not you-doubt in entering-you to danger of death

You do not hesitate in putting yourself in danger of death

Beardsley (1921: 245)

g. *Éstos se adoban por ir* con el Campeador (*Cid*, 1997, 13th c.)

These refl prepare for go with the Campeador

These prepared themselves to leave with the Campeador

Lapesa (2000: 571)

Prepositional infinitives could also function as adjuncts. As expected, these are PPs introduced by lexical Ps:

(10)  

a. *se auie levantado de dormir* (*Primera Crónica General*, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

Refl had raised of sleep

He had got up from sleeping

b. el rey caualgo con el *a escorrirle* fuera de la uilla (*Primera Crónica General*, Alfonso X, 13th c.)
the king rode with him to escort-him out of the city
The king rode together with him to escort him out of town

c. el caualgo luego et sus fijos *pora yrse* pora alla (*Primera Crónica General*, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

he rode then and his sons for go-refl toward there

Then he and his sons rode on horseback to go there

Schulte (2001: 3)

d. quiero hacer todavía del necio *sobre sello* (*Comedia Seraphina*, 356, 22)

I want do still of-the ignorant about be-it

I want to act like a fool aside from being one

Keniston (1937: 540)

e. non deuen escapar *sin recibir* grandes penas (*Primera Crónica General*, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

not must escape without receive big pains

They cannot escape without big punishment

Beardsley (1921: 255)

f. Que se non fuesen dende *fasta seyer* vengados (*Alexandre P*, 13th c.)

that refl not went of-there until be revenged

that they not leave until they were revenged

Lapesa (2000: 574)
The data show that different types of Ps could select for infinitives, as with nouns and pronouns. The parallelism is not perfect because, as Barra (2002: 241) points out, *desde* (‘since, from’) and *según* (‘according to’) are never attested with infinitives, although they accept other complements, such as nouns and even finite clauses.

A particular issue of interest regarding the syntax of prepositional infinitives in Old Spanish has to do with their argument status. Schulte (2001, 2004, 2007) indicates that argument infinitives (and other Romance languages) result from the reanalysis of previously adjunct infinitives with clear adverbial interpretations. According to Schulte (2001),

> the emergence of prepositional complementizers in Romance has its origin in the fact that certain matrix verbs are, from a pragmatic point of view, likely to co-occur with particular adjunct types. Speakers will use these pragmatically likely combinations more frequently than others, which leads to their gradual grammaticalization along a continuum, from typical adjunct to complement. In the process, prepositions originally specifying thematic relations between matrix clause and adjunct turn into semantically bleached complementizers. (Schulte (2001: 1))

This is probably the case of some of the earliest examples cited above. For instance, *alegrarse de hacer algo* (to be happy about doing something), where we can still today infer a causal reading (to be happy because of something). However, other examples seem more dubious. For instance, *acostumbrar a hacer algo* (to be used to doing something) does not lend itself to a quite straightforward clausal interpretation, and yet it is present in the old language. In addition, the concept of “prepositional
complementizer”, apart from not being well defined in the literature, does not fit well into the syntax of Spanish, as was mentioned in chapter 3.

To sum up, there is no general restriction for Ps to take infinitives as their complements, be they lexical Ps selecting for their objects, or just functional or functional-in-the-making Ps mediating between the actual selecting category and the object. Again, this is the same situation as with nouns.

4.2.2.2. Variation with P + infinitive

The similarity between P + NP/DP and P + infinitive is also found when it comes to variation (cf. Cano (1977-78: 363)). An excellent proof of the asystematicity of these constructions is the following example, where the V saber (to know) combines with two infinitives: one with a P and the other in direct selection:

(11) omnes de corte que ssabían bien de trovar e cantar, e de joglares que ssopiesen bien tocar estrumentos (Setenario, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

courtiers that knew how to compose and sing, and of minstrels that knew how to play instruments well

Cano (1977-78: 364)
There are three types of variation with infinitives: optional P and predicates which take P + infinitive but Ø+NP/DP (cf. Cano (1977-78)).

The first group consists of those predicates which may or may not take a P when selecting for an infinitive:

(12)  

a. **vsan caçar** conellos liebres & perdices (*Libro de la Caza*, Don Juan Manuel, 14th c.)

    use hunt with-them hares & partridges

    They normally hunt hares and partridges with them

b. Los que agora **vsan de caçar** conellos (*Libro de la Caza*, Don Juan Manuel, 14th c.)

    the that now use to hunt with-them

    Which they now hunt with them

c. falcones con que los omnes **vsan açaçar** (*Libro de la Caza*, Don Juan Manuel, 14th c.)

    falcons with which the men use to-hunt

    falcons with which men normally hunt

    Cano (1977-78: 367)
This variation reaches past the Middle Ages:

(13) a. Nos amenzan quitarlos de los brazos de sus madres (Guerra de Granada, Hurtado de Mendoza, 16th c.)

Us warn remove-them of the arms of their mothers
They warn us with taking them off their mothers’ arms

b. Amenazava de venir sobre las tierras del Papa (Diálogo de las cosas acaecidas en Roma, Alfonso de Valdés, 16th c.)

Warned of come over the lands of the Pope
S/he warned about taking over the Pope’s lands

c. hace mención ser cristianos (Diálogo de la lengua, Valdés, 16th c.)

makes mention be christians
it mentions their being Christians

Cano (1984: 212)

d. no haciendo mención de haber venido primero a esta Española (Historia de las Indias, Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, 16th c.)

not making mention of have come first to this Hispaniola
not mentioning the fact that he had come first to this Hispaniola

The optional presence of the P affects even some pronominal verbs, which are sporadically attested without the P (cf. Cano (1984: 245 ff)), particularly acordarse:
(14)  a. no se espante V.S. el Marqués haber dado 500 ducados (Libro de la vida y costumbres, Alonso Enríquez de Guzmán, 16th c.)

Not refl scares you the marquis have given 500 ducats

Sir, do not be horrified about the fact that the marquis has given 500 ducats

b. me maravillo hazer tal cosa (Teatro, Lope de Rueda, 16th c.)

me amazed do such thing

I am amazed at doing such thing

c. me acuerdo aver visto uno (Diálogo de la lengua, Juan de Valdés, 16th c.)

me recall have seen one

I recall seeing one

Cano (1984: 246)

The second variation group is made up of those verbs which accepted a prepositional infinitive (even if not exclusively) alongside a non-prepositional NP/DP object (Cano (1977-78)). That is to say, an extra P for the infinitives. The consistency of this phenomenon varies from one verb to another:

(15)  a. Nenguno non prueue de enganar a las gentes (Fuero Juzgo, 13th c.)

Nobody not try of deceive to the people

No one try to deceive the people

Cano (1977-78: 368)
b. ¿Por que fazes de tardar anuestro companero? (Sendebar, 13th c.)

   Why do-you of be-late to-our mate?
   Why are you making our mate be late?

c. Bien merese de ser juez (Villasandino, 15th c.)

   Well deserves of be judge
   S/he deserves to be a judge

   Cano (1977-78: 369)

This syntactic property is maintained as well after the Middle Ages:

(16)  a. te juro de casarme contigo (Comedia Seraphina, 16th c.)

   you I-swear of marry-me with-you
   I swear I'll marry you

   Cano (1984: 251)

b. Yo habia aceptado de me ir con ellos (Cartas, Cortés, 16th c.)

   I had accepted of me go with them
   I had agreed to go with them

   Cano (1984: 252)

Notice the existence of variation is this group as well, and in this particular case even with the same author in the same book:
(17) a. que me **consintáis de usar** destos vocablos (*Diálogo de la lengua*, Juan de Valdés, 16th c.)

that me allow of use of-these words

that you allow me to use these words

b. porque me **consintáis ser** escasso en las demás (*Diálogo de la lengua*, Juan de Valdés, 16th c.)

so that me allowe be short in the rest

so you allowe me to be short with the rest

Cano (1984: 251)

This construction is also found when the infinitives are the traditional subjects, as the verbal agreement shows, again attested before and after the 16th century:

(18) a. conujene **asaber** (*Visión deleitable*, Alfonso de la Torre, 15th c.)

is-better to-know

It must be known

Cano (1977-78: 337)

b. Estonçe nos conuiene **de fazer lo** luego (*Poridat de poridades*, 13th c.)

Then us is-better of do it now

Therefore we’d better do it right away
c. a. Fácil es de lo dezir / Y aun de fazer (Bias contra Fortuna, Santillana, 15th c.)

Easy is of it say & even of do

It is easy to say it and even easier to do it

Cano (1977-78: 338)

And after the Middle Ages:

(19) a. se le antojase de hacerse pastor (Quijote, Cervantes, 17th c.)

refl him felt-like of do-him shepherd

he were to feel like becoming a shepherd

b. ni a vos se os irá de la memoria de hablar a esa señora (Lozana andaluza, Delicado, 16th c.)

nor to you refl you will-go of the memory of speak to this lady

nor will you forget about speaking with this lady

Cano (1984: 253)

c. No le plugo de me ver (Libro de la vida y costumbres, Alonso Enríquez de Guzmán, 16th c.)

Not him pleased of me see

S/he didn’t like seeing me

Cano (1984: 254)
These prepositions with infinitives qualify as functional Ps and could be argued not to project up to a PP (or just a functional PP in Asbury’s (2008) terms) because they are pronominalizable by a direct object pronoun. First, they can refer back to a direct object pronoun (as the finite clauses do, see below) (cf. Beardsley (1921: 261-264)). Consider the following examples:

(20)  a. Yo non lo merezria de seer tan honrrada (Vida de Sancta Oria, Berceo, 13th c.)
I  not  it  would-deserve of be so honored
I wouldn’t deserve to be so honored

Beardsley (1921: 261)

b. qual serie lo mejor: de yr a los moros o atenderlos (Primera Crónica General, Alfonso X, 13th c.)
which would-be the best: of go to the moors or wait-for-them
which one would be the best choice: to go to the moors or to wait for them

Beardsley (1921: 262)

Notice that the infinitive may be introduced by *de*, but not obligatorily, as the following example proves:
(21)  lo que era peor de todo, **venir** los dAfrica a Roma (*Primera Crónica General*, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

the what was worse of all, come the of-Africa to Rome

what was worst of all, the Africans coming to Rome

Beardsley (1921: 262)

In addition, these prepositional infinitives can be substituted by a direct object pronoun, as the following 16th century example shows (cf. Cano (1984: 251)):

(22) **VALDÉS.-** Esta cosa, como veis, es de mucha consideración; dejadme pensar bien en ella, y si me pareciere cosa hacedera, y si viere que puedo salir con ella razonablemente, **yo os prometo de hacerla.**

**MARCIO.-** Con esto nos contentamos, y yo, en nombre de los tres, acepto la promesa, y os convido desde ahora para de hoy en ocho días, porque el señor Coriolano pueda decir lo que, después de haber bien pensado, hallará acerca de la conformidad de la lengua toscana con la latina. Una cosa me queda que demandar; **prometedme todos de no negármela,** toque a quien tocare.

**VALDÉS.-** **Yo por mi parte lo prometo,** pues ya no puede ser más negro el cuervo que sus alas.

**PACHECO.-** **También yo lo prometo** por la mía.
The verb *prometer* takes a direct object *lo*, and this *lo* is substituting the apparently prepositional infinitives *de hacerla / de no negármela*. For Cano (1984: 248) these extra *de* with infinitives are one of the most typical alternations in Classical Spanish. This is a “*de*, carente de todo valor semántico, marcaba sólo desde el punto de vista formal la rección de un infinitivo por parte de un verbo transitivo” (Cano 1984: 248). That is, a meaningless *P de* which introduced an infinitive whereas other complements are not introduced by the *P*. Needless to say, variation, and its polymorphous syntax, came from the Middle Ages, therefore these words are as valid for before the 16th century as they are for Classical Spanish.

In general, linguists note an “excess” of prepositions with infinitives in the old language (cf. Herrero (2005: 89)). Even though there are lists of verbs with variation (in this, verbs have attracted all the attention), there is little to no predictability in general, particularly if we want to defend the idea that all of the entries of one verb (one lemma) are to be stored in the brain as one lexical entry. Take for instance the variability of *temer* (to be afraid of):
(23)  
a. Non los temades (*Biblia ladinada* I-i-3, c. 1400)
   Not them be afraid
   Don’t be afraid of them

b. non temades seruir alos caldeos (*Biblia. Escorial I.j.8*, a 1300)
   not be afraid serve to the Chaldeans
   Don’t be afraid of serving the Chaldeans

c. non vos quebrantedes nin temades dellos. (*Biblia ladinada* I-i-3, c. 1400)
   Not you break nor be afraid of them
   Do not break down or be afraid of them

d. non temades de seruir alos Caldeos (*Biblia ladinada* I-i-3, c. 1400)
   not be afraid of serve to the Chaldeans
   Don’t be afraid of serving the Chaldeans

The examples show the dual selectional properties of *temer*, and this is represented in very similar texts from around the same period. (23b) and (23d) contain the same sentence but from two different bibles and with two different syntactic representations. Why the preposition is present in one text but not in the other is not predictable from any specific syntactic or contextual information.

4.2.2.3. Conclusions

Like nouns, Old Spanish infinitives could combine with Ps, functional and lexical. The mixed situation of infinitives raises the following theoretical questions:
1. Types of prepositions. As for adverbial clauses, there is not much theoretical dilemma: they are common PPs with the Ps as their heads. The problems arise with the argumental examples:

a. P + infinitives substituted by direct object pronouns. Here Old Spanish groups together with present-day French or Italian, as will be shown in the next chapter. Syntactically, they are non-projecting Ps, K(ase)s projecting up to KP, or just functional Ps projecting a functional PP in Asbury’s (2008) analysis.

b. However, the fact that even required Ps could be left out with infinitives (but also in some cases with nouns) proves that those Ps did not add much content of their own that was not recoverable. This is theoretically unexpected and should not be possible. Therefore, if maravillarse (to be amazed at) and other verbs normally required the presence of a P but could do without it at times, then these required Ps do not fit well in Rizzi’s classification. Actually, they seem to support a wider notion of functional P, as in Scorretti (1991) or Asbury (2008), who suggest that all required prepositions with verbs and nouns or adjectives are in fact functional.

c. There is one more piece of evidence in favor of the functional nature of all these required Ps: the fact that in many cases the “required” P is not just one, as happens in the present-day language, but there seem to be different possible functional Ps for several selecting categories:
for example, both *començar* and *mereçer* construed with *a, de*, and the direct infinitive; *acordarse* and *trabajarse* both followed by *de, en, por*, and the direct infinitive; *digno de* and *digno para*, etc. (Tarr (1922: 115, fn 9))

d. It is assumed that the non-prepositional alternatives are licensed. To my knowledge, non-prepositional alternatives are not considered adjuncts in syntax. Thus, the complement infinitives in both *temo hacer* and *temo de hacer* are arguments, objects.

e. Infinitives with a functional P such as *de* can nevertheless be adjuncts, as happens in (20). Prepositionality does not equal argumenthood.

2. This variation is the basis of Cano’s “prepositional transitivity”. I have shown in chapter 3 that reanalysis-based explanations have been called into question. However, the question here is how to describe the syntax of categories such as *temer*, which have a dual nature. When *temer* selects for a prepositional object, we can think of it as a functional P. However, we need to account for the non-prepositional alternatives, and how both alternatives relate to each other, given that they are also semantically equal. Should we expect a latent, empty P? If so, it would be necessary to set the limit for other verbs.

3. Case. According to the theory of case presented in chapter 3, we have to conclude that the infinitival data shows two types of Case assignment (checking, etc.): inherent, 0-related Case (structural Case for some linguists) by lexical Ps in adverbial examples, and
inherent Case by functional Ps. However, Case does not account properly for the non-prepositional objects of categories normally requiring a P. Let us examine the following examples in particular:

a. *Me acuerdo una cosa*

b. *Temer* + infinitive (see (23))

c. Lope de Rueda’s *me maravillo hacer tal cosa*

These must also be nominal objects and argument, so according to the theory Case must be assigned/checked. In principle, it should be some type of Accusative structural Case since they look like some type of direct object. However, *acordarse* and *maravillarse* are frequently prepositional and do not pronominalize with direct object pronouns (or at least such case has not been reported for the old language\(^3\)). Old Spanish had adverbial pronouns equivalent to French and Italian *y/ci, en/ne*, namely *hi/i/y* and *ende/end/ent*, and, not surprisingly, prepositional verbs such as *maravillarse* pronominalized with them:

(24)  *marabillóse ende mucho (Libro de los estados, Don Juan Manuel, 14th c.)*

   Amazed-refl of-it much

   S/he was very amazed at it

---

\(^3\) Notice that even if these verbs could pronominalize with a direct object pronoun they would pose an immediate theoretical problem because we do not expect pronominal verbs to be able to have a direct object (cf. Kempchinsky (1992)).
If so, we have here the repetition of the question whether there is an empty P in *me maravillo hazer tal cosa* or not, as discussed in 3.2.4. above.

Self-licensed inherent Case is used in theory to cover those constructions where there is no apparent Case-assigner, thus allowing nominal complements such as the ones examined here to be positionally self-licensed (cf. Ledgeway’s (2000) analysis of non-prepositional finite clauses in Neapolitan, or Barra (2002: 54-55) for Latin clauses). If functional Ps are Case-markers and appear as the materialization of inherent Case, then the absence of these functional Ps poses a big theoretical problem (unless, of course, we do without abstract/syntactic Case, as Asbury and McFadden propose).

4.2.2.4. The nominality of the infinitive. The infinitive with article

So far we have seen that infinitives appear in the contexts where nouns appear as well, thus we can conclude that infinitives must be nominal. The fact that they can be prepositional is generally seen as “a clear shift towards nominality, as the prototypical prepositional structure is undoubtedly [preposition + noun]” (Schulte (2004: 98); cf. also Raposo (1987), probably the standard analysis regarding the nominality of (Romance) infinitives). Since they can be the objects of a P, they share this context with nouns:

    excelled in piety and in give alms
S/he excelled at piety and at giving alms

Beardsley (1921: 2)

There are other examples where infinitives are coordinated with noun phrases:

(26) a. demandaron [fabla] et [traer pleytesia con el rey] (Primera Crónica General, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

Requested speak and bring respect with the king

They requested information and to bring respect for the king

b. prometiéndoles (...) [mucho bien] et [mucha merçed], et [meiorarles los fueros], et [baxarles los pechos] (Primera Crónica General, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

promising-them much good and much mercy and better-them the priviledges and lower-them the payments

promising them much good and mercy, and to better their priviledges and to lower their payments

Beardsley (1921: 2)

In principle, this set of data points to the conclusion that the infinitive is nominal. However, notice that the previous infinitives have direct objects, a property unexpected of nouns. Beardsley (1921: 2) himself raises this question and speaks of infinitives used as nouns which can still take objects, as a mixed category (cf. also Schulte (2004: 99-104)).
A related syntactic construction where we find so-called nominal infinitives is the use of the article. The infinitives with article could be introduced by a variety of Ps:

(27) a. La hora del pedir (Apolonio, 13th c.)

The hour of the ask

The time of asking

b. En el transladar acaeçe muchas veces (Obras completas, Don Juan Manuel, 14th c.)

In the translate occurs many times

In translating it happens many times that…

Lapesa (2000: 530)

c. Al salir de la ecclegia cabalgaron (Cid, 2241, 13th c.)

At the leave of the church rode

After leaving the church they rode

Lapesa (2000: 534)

d. Ni por el hablar en la plaça se ha de sacar el sabio (Oráculo, Gracián, 17th c.)

Nor for the speak in the plaza refl has of get the wise

The wise man won’t be found even by his speaking in the plaza

e. sobre el partir de las tierras / y el poner de los mojones (Romancero)

about the divide of the lands & the put of the markers

about the division of the lands and the placement of the markers
Other D(eterminer) elements can introduce the infinitival clause, such as demonstrative determiners:

(28)  

a. **Sobrestes crescer et minguar** dell imperio de Roma departe la estoria de Orosio (*Primera Crónica General*, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

   About-this grow and shrink of-the empire of Rome speaks the story of Orosio

   The story of Orosio talks about the expansion and fall of the Roman Empire

Lapesa (2000: 560)

b. **con aquel gozarla** los ojos (*Los quince discursos*, Morales, 16th c.)

   with that enjoy-her the eyes

   with his enjoying her eyes

Keniston (1937: 545)

Notice that some infinitives behave like nominal categories and take prepositional objects like other nouns do, whereas other infinitives, even though they are themselves introduced by P-like nouns still retain their verbal nature because they have direct objects (cf. Schulte (2004: 100-101)), as in (28b). Beardsley (1921) offers several examples of coordinated nouns and infinitives (prepositional and non-prepositional, with and without articles) where nevertheless the infinitives retain their objects:
(29)  a. Ieiunios e vigilias e **rezar el psalterio** (*Vida de Santa Oria*, Berceo, 13th c.)

Fasts and vigils and pray the psalter

Fasts, vigils, and prayers from the psalter

b. fazie muchas epistolas **del aorar de los ídolos** et **de poner** en los templos **el altar del uençimiento** (*Primera Crónica General*, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

did may letters of the honor of the ydols & of put in the temples the altar of the victory

S/he wrote may letters about honoring the ydosl and about putting the latar of victory in the temples

Beardsley (1921: 12)

Notice in particular the second example, where a prepositional infinitive with article and taking a prepositional object (thus nominal-like) is coordinated with another prepositional infinitive which nevertheless is taking a direct object.

The conclusion is that infinitives could be introduced by articles and other D categories, and could be the object of a P. However, those two arguably nominal-like configurations do not imply that the infinitives involved always become nominal, as seen in their ability to have direct objects. In addition, Lapesa (2000: 543) reports that interrogative infinitives do not admit the article, but nothing prevents these interrogative infinitives from being the direct object of a transitive verb, a nominal property. Therefore, neither the presence of the article nor the fact of being the object of a P can be regarded
as necessary conditions for a clausal category to turn into a nominal one. The extension of these conclusions to the finite clause later on will yield interesting results.

4.2.3. P + finite clause

The examination of nouns and infinitives offers a background in which to insert the syntax of prepositional finite clauses, which are the main focus of this dissertation. I have shown that there is no stability in the presence of the P, except in the adverbial cases, which seem unproblematic. Several examples revealed that noun phrases and infinitives could indeed be positionally licensed without the materialization of an inherent P. In addition, we saw that the nominal nature of infinitives need not correlate with the presence of an article or with being introduced by a preposition. Verbal infinitives could combine with a D category.

In the next sections we are going to explore finite clauses (i.e., argument declarative that-clauses, indirect interrogatives, and adverbial finite clauses), with the purpose of investigating their combinatorial properties, their possible nominal nature, and how they compare to nouns and infinitives. The notions of argumenthood vis-à-vis prepositionality and Case will be under special scrutiny.
4.2.3.1. Argument P+ finite clauses

Linguists tend to draw a line about the 16th century for argument prepositional finite clauses. Before that period, the preposition was (generally) not allowed, as the following 13th c. examples, contrasting a prepositional infinitive with a non-prepositional finite clause, both depending on the same noun (*hueb/vos*, ‘necessity’) and from the same text, illustrate:

(30)  a. Nos **huebos** avemos en todo **de ganar** algo (*Cid*, 123, 13th c.)

       Us needs have in all of win something

       We need to gain something in all

b. **huevos** avemos **que** nos dedes los marcos (*Cid*, 138, 13th c.)

       needs have that us give the marks

       We need you to give us the marks

       Herrero (2005: 89)

Notice also this early example where a non-prepositional clause depends on the noun *aduenentiam*:

(31)  Ego Eolalia, facio **aduenentiam** cum filia mea Gometiza, **quod** ego do ei la medietat de les meas kasas del alraual (*DLE* n 259.1-2, 1146)
I Eulalia, make agreement with daughter my Gometiza, that I give her the half of the my houses of-the poor-area

I Eulaia agree with my daugtehr Gometiza that I give her half of the houses I own in the (poor) quarter

Bogard and Company (1989: 262)

The restriction against P + finite clause affected all three types of possible categories (verbs, nouns, and adjectives). Observe the following examples (example c was taken from González Ollé’s (1993) corpus of medieval texts):

(32)  

a. Demandole et dixol que se marauellaua / que con todos los otros tan mal se acordaua (Apolonio, 13th c.)

Asked-him and told-him that refl amazed that with all the otehrs so bad refl agreed

S/he asked for him and told him that he was amazed that he had so bad relations with the rest

b. tu me ayuda (…) / que yo saque a Castylla del antygo dolor (Poema de Fernán González, 13th c.)

you me help that I take to Castille of-the ancient pain

Help me release Castille from the old pain

Barra (2002: 66)
c. ¡O, miémbrate que descendiste a la tierra… (Soliloquios –La Ciudad de Dios, Pedro Fernández Pecha, 14th c.)

Oh, recall-you that descended to the earth…

Oh, remember that you descended into the earth…

Nouns are also subject to this restriction (examples from González Ollé’s (1993) corpus):

(33)  

a. e por esso e pauor/ que a esa quieras meior (Razón de amor con los Denuestos del agua y el vino, c. 1205)

& for that have fear that to that love better

And because of that I am scared that you may love her better

b. venja li el mandado que jazia esmortejdo el Emperante (Roncesvalles, c. 1230)

came him the news that lay dying the emperor

And news came to him that the emperor lay dying

The restriction applies to adjectives as well (from González Ollé’s corpus):

(34)  

a. Sennor, non so digno que tu entres so el mio techo (Traducción del Evangelio de San Mateo, c. 1260)

Lord, not am worthy that you enter under the my roof

Lord, I am not worthy that you enter my house
b. ca so **cierto que** vos non pagaríades de ninguna cosa que buena non fuesse

*(Libro del caballero y del escudero, Don Juan Manuel, 1326)*

because am sure that you not proud of no thing that good not was

Because I am sure that you would not be proud of anything that was not good

Once the restriction has been profusely exemplified, it is time to focus on the syntax of the finite clause in Old Spanish both prior to and after the change that led to the creation of (argument) prepositional finite clauses. The task in this section is to test the accuracy and explanatory power of the theoretical tools generally used, and explore the relationship between finite clauses and nouns and infinitives.

Different accounts were already introduced in chapter 2. On the one hand, Moreno (1985-86) established a diachronic correspondence between prepositional clauses with an intervening pronoun and the later non-pronominal prepositional clauses. On his part, Barra (2002) argued in favor of analyzing all the previous examples as adjuncts to the main clause, only turning into arguments once, in short, the finite clause became nominal around the 16th century, and therefore could be selected for by a P and receive Case. Hence, what were previously adjuncts became arguments of the selecting categories (verbs, nouns, and adjectives).

However, the previous positions ignore two very important facts: first, “argument” finite clauses were not the only prepositional finite clauses in Old Spanish; second, *que*-clauses are not the only CPs in the language, as explained and justified in chapter 2.
Therefore, the examination of these two other relevant groups must be included for this study to be precise and complete.

4.2.3.2. Early examples of P + finite CPs

Even though there seems to be a consensus around the 16th-17th centuries as the date where argument prepositional finite clauses appear and become frequent, it is nonetheless true that many linguists have found several early examples.

For instance, Serradilla (1995) shows some early examples of P + que-clause, concluding that “el uso de preposición no comienza, como algunos han dicho, en el siglo XVII sino que sus orígenes están en la época medieval” (Serradilla (1995: 149)) (The usage of the preposition does not begin, as some have said, in the 17th century but rather their origins are in the medieval period) (My translation). Consider the following examples of N + P + que:

(35) a. con muy grand **alegría de que** auien conquistas todas las tierras del mundo

(Primera Crónica General I, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

with very big happiness of that had conquered all the lands of the world

very happy that they had conquered all the lands in the world

b. por **razón de que** se fazien allí muchas serpientes (Primera Crónica General I, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

for reason of that refl made there many snakes
because many snakes proliferated there

Serradilla (1995: 150)

c. Un monje me ha dado quenta, de que es mal fraile Contreras (Coplas del Provincial, 15th c.)

A monk me has given tale of that is bad friar Contreras

A monk has communicated me that Contreras is a bad friar

Tarr (1922: 129)

As expected, early examples of prepositional finite clauses are attested with adjectives:

(36)  
a. dijo Turín al rey que bien cierto fuese de que eso poco que él sabía que gelydiría (Libro de los Estados, Don Juan Manuel, 14th c.)

said Turin to-the king that very sure was of that that little that he knew that him-it would tell

Turin told the king to stay reassured that the little he knew he would tell him

b. que bien fuese seguro de que, maguer los cristianos eran pocos, que aquel Dios en que ellos creían era muy poderoso (Gran Conquista de Ultramar P, 13th c.)

that well was sure of that although the Chrisitnas were few, that that God in that they believed was very powerful

that he were very sure that, although the Christians were few, the God they believed in was very powerful

Serradilla (1995: 152)
And also with verbs:

(37) a. et quel gradeciesen de que no los mandara matar (Primera Crónica General I, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

and that-him thanked of that not them ordered kill

and that they should thank him for not ordering their deaths

Serradilla (1995: 152)

b. penso en que fuesen fasta Hierusalen (Gran Conquista de Ultramar P, 13th c.)

thought in that went until Jerusalem

He thought about them going to Jerusalem

c. et non esperades a que vos afinque mas por ello (Conde Lucanor, Don Juan Manuel, 14th c.)

and not wait to that you he-repeats more for it

and don’t wait for him to repeat it more

Serradilla (1995: 153)

These examples show that the existence of argument prepositional finite clauses is not an “invention” of the 16th century. Therefore, the finite clause was already available to be the object of a P, contra Barra (2002).
4.2.3.3. Other types of prepositional finite clauses

4.2.3.3.1. Adverbial prepositional finite clauses (adjunct clauses)

Thus far, it would seem that it was the combination of a P selecting for a finite clause which was indeed ungrammatical in Old Spanish. However, this conclusion is far from the truth. As Serradilla (1996) notes,

[c]uando las preposiciones no están regidas por el verbo pueden aparecer ante QUE sin mayor problema (para que, por que, sin que…) (Serradilla (1996: 32)) when prepositions are not selected for by the verb, they can appear before que without any problems (para que, porque, sin que…) (My translation).

Hence, as it turns out, adverbial clauses have made extensive use of the configuration P + finite CP since the first attestations of the language without any ungrammaticality. Observe the following examples:

(38)  a. Por las antedichas razones et **porque** estas fiaduras en oluido non sean caydas

(Fuero de Zorita de los Canes, 13th c.)

Fort he foretold reasons and for-that these loans in forget not are fallen

For the above mentioned reasons and so that these loans do not fall into oblivion

Méndez (1995: 45)

b. **desde que** salio dAffrica (Primera Crónica General, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

since that left of Africa

since he left Africa

Méndez (1995: 131)
c. e touo la villa apoderada hasta que el rey salio de la tutoria  

(Méndez (1995: 133))

& had the city controlled until that the king left of the tutoring

And had the city under his control until the king was old enough

The immediate conclusion is that once again we see that there was no constraint against prepositional finite clauses in Old Spanish. According to Case Theory, we have the necessary evidence to affirm that the finite clause could be licensed by a P in Old Spanish.

Of course, the existence of these prepositional clauses has always been acknowledged. In some cases, a difference in the theoretical approach has led linguists to overlook them. For instance, Herman (1963) simply speaks of subordinating conjunctions and therefore does not contemplate the prepositional nature of these combinations.

In other cases, these data pose a problem, but a syntactic solution was proposed to overrun it. This is the case of Barra (2002: 284-285). Barra assumes that finite clauses were not nominal categories before the 16th century, so the adverbial causes must be exempt form Case. His solution resides in establishing a feature-based differentiation between functional Ps and lexical Ps beyond the standard assumptions of the theory: while the prepositions that are found with argument prepositional finite clauses assign Case, those prepositions that introduce adverbial finite clauses do not assign Case.
because of their adverbial origins, effectively eliminating the theoretical relevance of the early prepositional nature of the adverbial finite clauses in Old Spanish.

However, these same prepositions discussed here could take noun complements, which must be assigned Case because in the end Case was “created” to license nouns. The morphologically inflected pronouns in (3) made it visible that there is (morphological) case assignment/checking. What is more, Bassols (1992: 144) points out that already in Latin there remain only minimal remnants of the adverbial origin of some of these prepositions. Evidence for this comes both from the fact that they can no longer be found used productively as adverbs (Bassols (1992: 149)), and from the fact that all of them assign case.

In conclusion, in a Case-based study such as Barra (2002) to deny the existence of Case in some contexts becomes an ad hoc solution, which skews the hypothesis. In Case terms, the existence of prepositional finite clauses already as far back as in the 13th century shows that in principle the finite clause was as nominal and Case-friendly in Old Spanish as in Classical and present-day Spanish, which calls into question the hypothesis that the change leading to argument prepositional finite clauses could be Case-related.

4.2.3.3.2. Prepositional indirect interrogative finite clauses

A second group that must be included is another type of completive clause: the indirect interrogatives. These clauses are also finite CPs, therefore their historical behavior and their syntactic properties must be examined if we really want to understand the features
of finite sentential subordination. Being finite CPs too, we must find out whether they could be introduced by Ps in Old Spanish and how their development was like compared to *que*-clauses.

First, indirect interrogative CPs appear without Ps in Old Spanish, showing the same syntactic properties as *que*-clauses, as expected because both are CPs. The following examples include verbs, nouns, and adjectives:

(39)  

a. **miémbrat** [**quando** lidiamos cerca Valençia la grand] (*Cid*, 3316, 13th c.)

    recall-you when fought near Valencia the great

    Remember when we fought near Valencia the great

    Girón (1988: 144)

b. **Marauillosse** mucho [**que** podrie seer] (*Primera Crónica General*, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

    Amazed-refl much what could be

    He was very amazed at what it could be

    Girón (1988: 164)

c. para **mientes** [**quan** buena cosa es] (*Castigos e documentos*, Sancho IV, 13th c.)

    stop minds how good thing is

    Consider what a good thing it is

    Girón (1988: 163)

---

The sporadic medieval examples of *de commo* and *en commo* will not be studied here because there is evidence that shows their fossilized nature (cf. Serradilla (1997: 247) and Herrero (2005: 143)).
d. ruego te que pares mientes [si fis yo alguna cosa por ti] (Primera Crónica General, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

I beg you consider whether I did something for you

Girón (1988: 163)

e. E por ser mas cierta [si era assi] (Gran conquista de Ultramar, 13th c.)

& for be more sure if was thus

And in order to be surer whether it was that way

As happens with que-clauses, there are some early examples of prepositional indirect interrogatives before the 16th century:

(40) a. he dubdado sobre [cuál haré antes] (Cárcel de amor, Diego de San Pedro, 15th c.)

I have doubted which one I will do first

b. Fue mucho espantado de [quan fuerte era] (Crónica Alfonso XI, 14th c.)

S/he was horrified to see how strong he was

d. se maravillaron mucho de [cuán pequeño hombre era Pedro el Ermitaño]

(Gran Conquista de Ultramar, 13th c.)

refl amazed much of how Little man was Pedro the Hermit

165
they were amazed at how little of a man was Pedro the Hermit

Serradilla (1995: 159)

As expected, there are also examples from the 16th century on, once again dependent on verbs, nouns, and adjectives:

(41) a. Algo estuvieron los españoles _perplejos en [si  irían solos o no] (Segunda carta, Cortés, 16th c.)
   Some were the Spaniards perplexed in if would-go alone or not
   The Spaniards were a little perplexed whether they would alone or not

b. se me quito _la duda de [si  era antojo] (Vida, Santa Teresa, 16th c.)
   refl me removed the doubt of whether was whim
   I did not doubt any more whether it was a whim

Keniston (1937: 641)

c. yo _me espanto de [quin  recontento bibo] (Viaje del cielo, 17th c.)
   I me horrify of how happy live
   I am horrified how happy I live

d. La dificultad _consiste en [si  esta elección ha de ser de uno o de muchos] (Idea de un  príncipe político cristiano, Saavedra Fajardo, 1616)
   The difficulty consists in if this election has of be of one or of many
   The difficulty resides in whether the election must be made by one or many
To complete the picture, we must add that indirect interrogatives can be the complements of lexical Ps and form adverbial clauses:

(42) a. quiso hacer diligencia para [si podría hallar el cuerpo en el río] (Historia General del Perú, Murúa, 16th c.)

wanted do procedure for if could find the body in the river
S/he wanted to start procedures to find out whether the body was in the river

b. por [si podría ver en qué seguirlo] (Espejo de príncipes y caballeros, Ortúñez de Calahorra, 16th c.)

for if could see in what chase-him
in case he could see in what to follow him

In conclusion, this second type of finite clause is attested introduced by prepositions both in argument and adverbial clauses, thus in parallel with the que-clauses.

4.2.3.4. P+ finite CPs with pronouns

Like in (Old) French, in Old Spanish prepositions could select for a pronoun to which the finite clause was an adjunct, thus establishing a non-argument link between Ps and finite clauses. Remember that this construction is considered to be the origin of prepositional finite clauses for Moreno (1985-86). Observe the following example:
(43) **acusado** seré **de lo [que] vos he servido** (Cid, 2r v.73, 13th c.)

Accused I-will-be of it that you have served

I will be accused of having served you

In this example, *acusado* selects for the P *de*, which takes the pronoun *lo* as its complement. Arguably, the finite clause is an adjunct to the pronoun, “although [these constructions] do not have the full appositional force (particularly those with *lo* and *aquello*) of the separated forms *de esto... que*, etc. (cf. O. Fr. *de ço ... que*) or the modern Spanish *de esto: de que* (*de esto tengo miedo, de que*, etc.)” (Tarr 1922: 109). Other categories requiring Ps are attested.

In principle, for studies such as Barra (2002) this construction seems like the ultimate last resort solution because it prevents a finite clause from being the object of the P. However, the existence of examples in adverbial clauses denies that conclusion because adverbial clauses are introduced by lexical Ps which can take finite clauses from the first attestations of the language. Consider the following example:

(44) **marauillauanse ende mucho por aquello que** siempre le uieran yazer encerrado en su alcaçar (Primera Crónica General, Alfonso X, 13th c.)

Amazed-refl of-it much for that that always him saw lie locked in his fortress

They were amazed because they had always seen him shut up in his fortress

Tarr (1922: 112)
4.2.3.5. P + finite clause and variation

The extension of the argument prepositional finite clauses from the 16th century on did not eliminate the non-prepositional alternatives. As Cano (1985: 89-90) proves, the “entrance” of the P with finite clauses is not across the board, and depends on each separate verb. As happened with nouns and infinitives, there was ample optionality, which still exists in the current language5:

(45)  a. ni él **aguardó a que** le respondiese (*Novelas ejemplares*, Cervantes, 17th c.)

   nor he waited to that him answered
   nor did he wait to get an answer from him

b. sin **aguardar que** Zoraida le respondiese (*Quijote*, Cervantes, 17th c.)

   without wait     that Zoraida him answered
   without waiting for Zoraida’s answer

   Cano (1985: 83)

c. ¿Quién **duda que** la moja la tinta (...)? (*Hora*, Quevedo, 17th c.)

   Who doubts that it wets the ink?
   Who doubts that the ink wets it?

d. No **dudava de que** se yva derecho al cielo (*Vida*, Santa Teresa, 16th c.)

   Not doubted of that refl went right to the heaven
   S/he didn’t have any doubts that he was going right to heaven

---

5 This is not to say that the presence/absence of the P may not have any meaning differences in some cases. Cf. Cano (1985: 84).
e. No se puede **dudar en que** era la costumbre (*Errores celebrados*, Juan de Zabaleta, 17th c.)

Not refl can doubt in that was the custom

On ecannot doubt that it was customary

Cano (1985: 86)

As happened with optionality with nouns and verbs, we first must ask ourselves whether there is any syntactic difference and how the theoretical tools of Case, etc. let us understand the data. Let us use as background the hypothesis exposed in Barra (2002) whereby the absence of the P is indication of adjunction. While the prepositional options would be argument clauses, the non-prepositional ones would retain the original adjunct syntax. There are at least two theoretical issues with such a hypothesis:

1. Accepting that there is a syntactic difference between the prepositional and non-prepositional options implies that it would be advisable to account for the optionality with nouns and infinitives in the same terms, but, to my knowledge, no linguist has argued that the NP/DPs or infinitives complements of non-prepositional alternatives are adjuncts.

   Notice that the absence of the regularly required P with nouns and infinitives can be taken care of by assuming prepositional inherent Case, that is, a self-licensing Case (again, if abstract Case is to be accepted as a valid tool). That is the invisible counterpart of the functional Ps. Barra (2002: 54-55) describes Latin finite clauses as licensed this
way, so there should be no theoretical problems in keeping the same explanation for Classical (and present-day) Spanish. Of course, the other option involves getting rid of Case for finite clauses at once for being uninformative.

2. One of the criteria applied to adjunct clauses is the lack of temporal anchorage to the tense of the main clause. As is well known, the syntax of the finite clause in Old Spanish is full of violations of SOT, and hence the label of “loose syntax” for the period. Barra (2002: 84) mentions this test as well and concentrates on the presence or absence of the subjunctive mood, controversially described as the selected mood (as opposed to the independent indicative (cf. the different views in Bosque (1990)). In this sense, the presence of subjunctive in the subordinate clause becomes a mark of argumenthood (cf. Carrasco (1998, 2000)). This theoretical assumption should correlate with the presence and absence of the P: the prepositional counterparts should be in one mood, especially the subjunctive, and the non-prepositional counterparts should be in indicative, since it is the non-selected mood. This type of work deserves a dissertation of its own, so it is not my intention to undertake a thorough analysis of mood differences, but what I can offer is that the expected division is not reflected in the data.

On the one hand, there are verbs which optionally take the P. However, both indicative and subjunctive are attested for both the prepositional and the non-prepositional alternatives. Thus the presence or absence of the P does not affect the mood selection:
(46) **Quejarse (de) que** (to complain)

a. **se quejaba que le habían quitado** el cargo (*Jornada de Omagua y Dorado: crónica de Lope de Aguirre*. Francisco Vázquez. 16th c.)
   
   refl complained that him had stripped the position
   
   He was complaining that they had been stripped of his position.

b. todos ellos **se quejaban que** con tales industrias el gobernador y sus capitanes **hubiesen querido** entrevenir (*Guerras civiles peruanas*. Pedro Cieza de León. 1551)
   
   all they refl complained that with such tactics the governor and his captains had wanted to intervene
   
   All of them complained that in that way the governor and his captains had wanted to intervene

C. **quejándose de que había hecho** blasfemar su nombre a los enemigos (*Predicación del Evangelio en las Indias*. José de Acosta. 1570)
   
   complaining-refl of that he had made the enemies blaspheme his name
   
   complaining that he had made the enemies blaspheme his name

D. **quejándose de que** el obispo **se hubiese introducido** en esta visita (*Política indiana. Libro cuarto*. Juan de Solórzano Pereira. 1614)
   
   complaining-refl of that the bishop refl had introduced in this visit
   
   complaining that the bishop had joined this visit
On the other hand, there are verbs which are only attested with one mood in the subordinate clauses even though they allow optionality of the P. Again, the presence or absence of the P does not affect mood selection:

(47) Obligar (a) que (to force)

   a. Y así el amor que a vuesa merced tengo, **me obliga a que diga** algo de lo mucho que hay que decir deste perfecto varón. (*Vida del P. Baltasar Álvarez*, Luis de la Puente, 1589)

   & so the love that to your mercy have, me forces to that say something of the much that has that say of this perfect male

   And therefore the love I have for you forces me to tell you some of the many things that must be said about this perfect man

   b. **obligando que** el tímido ganado atónito **se esparza** (*La gatomaquia*, Lope, 1598)

   forcing that the shy cattle astonished refl scatters

   forcing the shy cattle to scatter in astonishment

Finally, there are verbs which always require the P and yet allow both indicative and subjunctive in the subordinate when we would expect only one mood, especially subjunctive since the P must be present all the time:
(48) Depender de que (to depend on)

a. la justicia de este tal hombre depende de que será oído (Exposición del primer salmo dividida en seis sermones, Constantino Ponce de la Fuente. 16th c.)

the justice of this such man depends of that will-be heard

Justice for this man depends on the fact that he will be listened to

b. su sosiego depende de que los comarcanos le tengan y no se alboroten (Discurso político al rey Felipe III al comienzo de su reinado, Baltasar Álamos de Barrientos, 1585)

his calm depends of that the locals him have and not refl agitate

His calm depends on the fact that the locals have it too and do not get agitated

These are just a reduced sample of a much wider issue that would require much work of its own, but they already show that the presence or the absence of the preposition does not relate to mood selection. If mood selection is linked to argumenthood, then we can at least suspect that the prepositional and the non-prepositional examples may be equally argumental. Mood selection seems to be independent from the presence or absence of the P.

A final point of interest is the presence of “extra” prepositions. On the one hand, certain verbs which were already peculiar with the infinitives carry this peculiarity over to the finite clauses, for instance the verb prometer. Prometer could take a prepositional infinitive but the pronominalization of such prepositional infinitive was done with the
direct object pronoun *lo*. The same syntax is found with a finite clause. Compare the following examples:

(49)  

(a) Yo os **prometo de hacerla** (*Diálogo de la lengua*, Juan Valdés, 16th c.)

I promise you to do it

I promise you to do it

Cano (1984: 251)

(b) habéisme de **prometer de que** (...) no interromperéis el hilo de mi triste historia (*Quijote I*, Cervantes, 17th c.)

You must promise me you won’t interrupt the thread of my story

Tarr (1922: 238)

Since the infinitive behaves like a non-prepositional in terms of pronominalization, we have to assume that the finite counterpart reflects the same syntax. Thus in the example in (49b) we find a technically non-selected functional P which does not project a PP by assumption (cf. Rizzi (1988)).

A related situation is found with verbs such as *temer*, which, as I showed above, have a dual nature. Consequently, it comes as no surprise that *temer* accepts *de que* alongside *que*:

**que**
(50)  a. non temades de seruir alos Caldeos (Biblia ladinada I-i-3, c. 1400)

    not fear of serve ot-the Chaldeans
    do not be afraid of serving the Chaldeans

b. aquellos que temían de que les succediesse alguna adversidad (Jardín de flores curiosas, Antonio de Torquemada, 1569)

    those that feared of that them happened some adversity
    those that were afraid of suffering some adversity

On the other hand, there are other examples of “unexpected” (i.e., non-projecting, functional) prepositions also mirroring the infinitives. Let us recall infinitival constructions such as the following:

(51)  yo mucho lo querría, de vevir solitario commo vevir solia (Vida de San Millán, Berceo, 13th c.)

    I much it would-want of live alone like live used-to
    I would love to go back to living on my own

    Beardsley (1921: 264)

Here we have an infinitive introduced by a functional P de. Remember that Ps such as this must be analyzed as non-projecting Ps because the presence or absence of the P is of no syntactic relevance. This construction crosses over to the finite realm, as the following examples prove:
(52)  a. de que haya vencido a don Quijote de la Mancha, póngalo muy en duda
    (Quijote II, Cervantes, 17th c.)
    That he has beaten Don Quixote, I doubt it very much
    Tarr (1922: 238)

    b. De que seáis mujer, no me lo podéis negar (Las dos doncellas, Cervantes, 17th c.)
    That you are a woman, you cannot deny it to me
    Tarr (1922: 242)

In these cases we find that the P does not go hand in hand with argumenthood, because
the examples in (52) are not arguments but adjuncts to a pronoun, effectively continuing
the syntax of finite clauses being adjuncts to pronouns discussed in (43). We could
assume, in line with Barra (2002), that the finite clauses found in apposition to pronouns
in Old Spanish are the direct reflection of the restriction against argument prepositional
finite clauses. However, that would be expected from non-prepositional finite clauses
because in his terms the entrance of the Ps creates argument finite clauses. Thus, the fact
that these examples are prepositional and adjuncts at the same time is left unexplained in
such a hypothesis.
4.2.3.6. Finite clauses and the article

In the section on infinitives we saw that these non-finite CPs could be accompanied by an article and other types of D categories already in the old language. The article will also start to be allowed with finite clauses around the 16\textsuperscript{th} - 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries. Lapesa (2000) indicates that the indirect interrogatives with article are first documented already in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, as the following set of examples documents:

(53) a. \textbf{El cómo} es esta que llaman unión, y lo que es, yo no lo sé dar a entender (\textit{Vida}, Santa Teresa, 16th c.)

The how is this that call unión, and what is, I not it know give to understand

How this so-called union is and what it is, I cannot explain

b. Y ya que avemos dicho \textbf{el por qué} es ‘monte’ Cristo (\textit{Nombres}, Fray Luis de León, 16th c.)

& already that have said the why is mount Cristo

And now that we have already said why it is ‘mount’ Cristo

c. Trató con su dueña \textbf{el cómo y cuándo sería} (\textit{Alfarache}, Mateo Alemán, 17th c.)

Dealt with his woman the how and when would-be

He dealt with his wife how and when it would take place

Lapesa (2000: 543)

According to Lapesa (2000) and Herrero (2005), a century will pass until the article appears with the \textit{que}-clause, and this construction will later become more frequent from
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the 18th century on (Lapesa (2000: 544)). Observe the following examples, the first of which actually dates back to the 16th century:

(54)  a. Importúnele que no permita el que esté Vuestra Merced en presencia de tal Magestad sin reverencia, temor, y amor (Epistolario espiritual, Juan de Ávila, 16th c.)

Bother-him that not allows the that is your mercy in presence of such majesty without reverence, fear, and love

Bother him so he does not allow that you are in presence of such majesty without reverence, fear, and love

Tarr (1922: 24)

b. Si os da alivio el que yo me ausente (Antona García, Tirso, 17th c.)

If you gives relief the that I me absent

If it makes you feel better that I be absent

Herrero (2005: 82)

c. El que sea esto así, yo lo sé; el por qué sea así, ignoro (Persiles, Cervantes, 17th c.)

The that is this thus, I it know; the why is thus, ignore

That this is thus, I know; why it is thus, I ignore

Lapesa (2000: 544)
These clauses with articles could be (traditional) subjects and objects (Lapesa (2000: 544), Herrero (2005: 82)), which takes us again into the nominal-like question. Are these *el*-finite CPs nouns? A first restriction which should not exist if these clauses are nouns is found in their behavior as objects of Ps: surprisingly, the only finite clauses with article that are attested as complements of Ps are the interrogatives, not the *que*-clauses:

(55)  Tratóse del cómo y cuándo se avían de descubrir unos a otros (*Guerra de Granada*, Hurtado de Mendoza, 16th c.)

Dealt-refl of-the how and when refl had of discover ones to others

It was discussed how and when they were supposed to disclose to each other

Lapesa (2000: 543)

The data prove that nouns could be the objects of P without any noteworthy problems; hence the likely ungrammaticality of P + article-*que*-clause does not fit well into the expectations. One could think of some type of feature constraint against *el*-finite CPs as objects of Ps but, apart from the fact that it would be an ad hoc amendment, whatever form that constraint would take must face the fact that it only applies to one type of *el*-finite CPs, because it does not apply to indirect interrogatives. Whatever the constraint, it must be independent from the feature composition of finite CPs.

In addition, finite clauses with articles pose several other problems, on their own and in comparison to similar structures with infinitives:
1. Only indirect interrogatives can be introduced by a D-element other than the definite article, in direct contrast with the ungrammaticality of any type of D element introducing an interrogative infinitive. Thus the two types of finite CPs considered exhibit the exact opposite behavior to their infinitival counterparts.

2. Infinitives with articles are not necessarily nominal (recall Schulte (2004) above). It is true that the presence of the article should be the most telling test for the nominal nature of the Spanish finite clause after the 16th century. It fits the chronology well, because el-finite CPs appeared around the 17th century. Actually, this connection has been made in the literature (cf. Barra (2002: 280-281), for instance). However, our previous examination of infinitives, which could retain their direct objects even when introduced by an article, calls into question the reliability of this test, in particular in a framework where features are ideally not gradable.

4.2.4. Conclusions

- Prepositions could take NP/DPs, infinitives, and finite clauses in Old Spanish.
- Absence of an expected P occurs with NP/DPs, infinitives, and finite clauses, although it is only generally frequent with the latter.
- The notion of prepositional complementizers as a separate category is untenable once we realize that the same Ps that combine with infinitives appear with finite clauses too. Since finite clauses are already introduced by undisputed
complementizers such as *que* or *si*, the P may not occupy the C position. Obviously, the counterproposal would be to argue for categorial difference between prepositional complementizers for infinitives and prepositions with finite CPs. However, in section 3.2.3. I argued that Ps introducing infinitives and finite clauses are better analyzed as one category.

- The existence of adverbial finite clauses and some early examples of argument prepositional finite clauses is enough evidence against any operative constraints barring P + finite clause in Old Spanish.

- Case cannot account for the change in the emergence of argument prepositional finite clauses. In answer to Barra’s (2002) criteria, the finite clause was as nominal before the 16th century as it was afterward. Therefore, following his Case-based analysis, the finite clause must have received Case before the 16th century, as evidenced by the ample attestation of adverbial clauses of the type P + finite CP. Attempts to deny the Case-assigning properties of the Ps in adverbial clauses are at odds with the existence of morphological evidence of the contrary, as the examples of P + pronoun show.

- Nominality is not linked to the presence of articles. Infinitives with articles could maintain their verbal properties. If articles do not necessarily nominalize CPs such as infinitives, then we should not expect any difference regarding the other type of CPs: the finite clause. In addition, finite clauses are even more restricted in that they only allow the definite article *el* (the).
• Prepositionality does not imply immediate argumenthood, which goes in both directions: a *de que* clause is not mandatorily an argument; the opposite does not seem to be true either, as the examples with mood selection indicate.

### 4.3. Present-day Spanish

This section moves us forward in time to present-day Spanish. The purpose is to examine the syntax of prepositional finite clauses, again in comparison with nouns and especially infinitives. The theoretical tools and hypotheses that have been tested against the old data will be tested once again with modern data to ask again what their informative value really is in the end and how they help us understand the constructions at hand.

#### 4.3.1. P + NP/DPs

The syntax of prepositional phrases with NP/DPs as objects is very homogeneous in present-day Spanish since the P, as opposed to the examples of variation found in Old Spanish, must always be present, both in argument selection and with lexical Ps in adverbial adjuncts, as the following examples prove:

(55) a. Cuento *(con) tu participación

    Count     with your participation

    I count on your participation
b. Me alegro *(de) tu participación
   Me am-happy of your participation
   I am happy about your participation

c. Insisto *(en) tu participación
   Insist in your participation
   I insist on your participation

d. Aspiro *(a) ese puesto
   Aspire to that position
   I aspire to that position

e. Estoy cansado *(de) tu comportamiento
   Am tired of your behavior
   I am tired of your behavior

f. La propuesta *(de) reforma es necesaria
   The proposal of reform is necessary
   The reform proposal is necessary

In the modern language it is easier to reveal that some verbs may change their meaning depending on whether they take a P or not. This is probably the case of pensar vs. pensar en:

(56)  a. Pensó la respuesta
   Thought the answer
   S/he came up with the answer
b. Pensó **en la respuesta**

Thought about/of the answer

S/he thought about/of the answer

At the same, there are linguists who question whether all the existing double selection verbs correlate with real differences in meaning. For instance, Horno (2002: 94) wonders what (if any) the difference is between the following two sentences:

(57) a. Rosa cuida **de la casa**

Rosa cares of the house

Rosa takes care of the house

b. Rosa cuida **la casa**

Rosa cares the house

Rosa takes care of the house

Horno (2002: 94)

Indeed, I agree with Horno (2002) in that I see no meaning difference between these sentences, which indicates that not all P vs. no-P actually produce a difference in terms of lexical aspect.

As expected, noun phrases can be the objects of lexical Ps heading PPs functioning as modifiers (syntactic adjuncts):
(58)  a. Lo hice **por esa razón**

    It did for that reason

    I did it for that reason

b. Encontraron varios libros antiguos **en el desván**

    Found several books ancient in the cellar

    The found several old books in the cellar

In conclusion, the situation with nouns is straightforward in modern Spanish. Both required (arguably functional) Ps and adverbia (lexical) Ps accept noun phrases as their objects. Ps are mandatory.

**4.3.2. P + infinitives**

The situation becomes richer with infinitives. Ps in Old Spanish accepted infinitives as their objects, and they still do in the present. The literature has paid much attention to the nominal features of the infinitive. I already showed that nominality and infinitive did not always correspond in the old language. Now let us explore what happens in the present.

Raposo (1987) concludes that (Romance) infinitives are nominal categories and this is based on the results coming from different tests, namely (adapting his examples using Spanish data):
1. Infinitives cannot be directly selected for by a non-Case assigning category such as N or A. Therefore, they require -in his terms- a Case-marker P:

\[(59)\]

a. *El miedo \(\emptyset\) suspender el examen

The fear fail the exam

b. El miedo a suspender el examen

The fear to fail the exam

2. Infinitives can be objects of verbs, like other NPs:

\[(60)\]

El niño teme [\textit{suspender el examen}]

The boy fears fail the exam

The boy is afraid of failing the exam

However, once again several examples of Spanish infinitives seem to question their nominal nature. Observe the following groups of examples. The first group includes nominal properties such as adjectives and modifying PPs. The second group forces the verbal features of the infinitive by combining it with adverbs and including a subject:

\[(61)\]

a. Su caminar cansado

His walk tired

His tired walking
b. Este tiritar de frío
   This shiver of cold
   Those shivers from the cold

c. Ese telefonear de Pedro
   That phone of Peter
   That phoning of Peter’s

   Anula and Fernández (1997: 6)

d. *Su caminar cansadamente
   His walk tiredly

e. *Este tiritar fríamente
   This shiver coldly

f. *Ese telefonear Pedro
   That phone Peter

   Anula and Fernández (1997: 7)

These examples illustrate the nominal side of the infinitive. As a noun, it accepts adjectives, and PP-modification. However, the following examples contradict the conclusions:

(62)  a. El continuo dar dinero de María
   The continuous give money of Mary
   Mary’s continuous donation of money

   b. El dar continuamente dinero María

188
The give continuously money Mary

Mary giving money all the time

Anula and Fernández (1997: 8)

These examples go in the opposite direction. Here we have, like happened in Old Spanish, an infinitive -dar- which in (62a) accepts the article, like nouns do, but nonetheless has a direct object. What is more, it has a direct object like a regular verb, but it nevertheless accepts PP-modification like nouns. The result looks like a mix of nominal and verbal properties. And (62b) is no different: an infinitive with article but modified by an adverb, with a direct object and a subject.

Now here we are faced with the same important theoretical dilemma: are infinitives nominal or not? Remember that infinitives matter because they are tightly related to our understanding of finite clauses due to the fact that both are CPs.

Going back to prepositions, in present-day Spanish infinitives can be the object of all types of prepositions, as illustrated in the following examples, with and without the article. Notice that indirect interrogative infinitives can now be the object of (required) Ps (63d). First, the required Ps:

(63)  a. Es propenso a cantar en público
       Is prone to sing in public
       S/he is prone to singing in public

       b. Son expertos en arreglar averías
Are experts in fix breakdowns
They are experts in fixing breakdowns

Anula and Fernández (1997: 10)

c. Está orgulloso del elocuente hablar de su hijo
Is proud of the eloquent speak of his son
He is proud of his son’s eloquent speech

Anula and Fernández (1997: 9)

d. Estamos interesados en cómo resolver el asunto
Are interested in how to solve the matter
We are interested in how to solve this issue

Suñer (1999: 2153)

Lexical Ps heading adjunct PPs also accept the infinitive:

(64)  a. Compró lotería para ganar el premio
Bought lotto for win the prize
He bought lottery ticket to win the prize

Anula and Fernández (1997: 10)

b. Se promulgó una ley contra el excesivo beber de los jóvenes
Refl enacted a law against the excessive drink of the youngsters
A law was enacted against the excessive drinking of the young

Anula and Fernández (1997: 9)
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(64a) contains an infinitive with a direct object. (64b) shows an infinitive with PP-modification. Again, a repetition of the previous mixing of nominal and verbal features, but both infinitives are objects of Ps.

According to Raposo (1987), the previous examples with prepositions prove the nominal nature of the Spanish infinitive. On the contrary, Anula and Fernández (1997: 10) argue that, notwithstanding the presence of the P, these infinitives are not nominals because they do not show the regular properties of nouns:

(65) a. *Está orgulloso de ganar cómodo mucho dinero (adjective modification)
    Is proud of earn comfortable much money

b. *Compró lotería para ganar de María (subject expressed by a modifying PP)
    Bought lotto for win of Mary

    Anula and Fernández (1997: 10)

In (65a) the infinitive does not allow an adjective, unexpected of a noun. In (65b) the problem is the impossibility of having a PP-modifier, also unexpected.

These previous non-nominal prepositional infinitives would contrast with the nominal ones, which in their view are those introduced by an article:

(66) a. Está orgulloso del elocuente hablar de su hijo
    Is proud of-the eloquent speak of his son
    He is proud of his son’s eloquent speech
b. Se promulgó una ley contra el excesivo beber de los jóvenes

Refl enacted a law against the excessive drink of the youngsters

A law was enacted against the excessive drinking of the young

Anula and Fernández (1997: 9)

Anula and Fernández’s division appropriately accounts for the fact that prepositional infinitives with articles cannot be verbal:

(67)  

a. *Está orgulloso del hablar su hijo (subject)

Is proud of the speak his son

b. *Está orgulloso del hablar elegantemente de su hijo (adverb)

Is proud of the speak elegantly of his son

c. *Está orgulloso del hablar elegantemente su hijo (adverb and subject)

Is proud of the speak elegantly his son

d. *Se promulgó una ley contra el excesivo beber los jóvenes (subject)

Refl enacted a law against the excesive drink the youngsters

e. *Se promulgó una ley contra el beber los jóvenes (subject, no adjective)

Refl enacted a law against the drink the youngsters

At any rate, the general problem remains what to think of the many mixed examples presented above, especially without the articles.
For Anula and Fernández (1997) the immediate conclusion is that any verbal-like category only nominalizes if and when they are introduced by a D element, as an article, for instance. For that reason, the absence of the article indicates non-nominal (cf. also Plann (1981: 207)). I already discussed that this conclusion does not stand up. For one, notice that the ungrammatical examples above cannot be recovered by simply including an article and making them nominal, contrary to expectations:

(68) a. *Está orgulloso del ganar cómodo mucho dinero
   Is proud of-the earn comfortable much money

   b. *Compró lotería para el ganar de María
   Bought lotto for the win of Mary

It seems after all that the article is not so infallible a nominalizer as it might seem telling form the general theoretical assumptions in the syntactic literature. Actually, de Miguel (1996) finds that “[t]he fact that a determiner heads the clause does not imply that the infinitival form has nominal status” (de Miguel (1996: 31)), again on the basis of examples of infinitives with articles that keep their verbal nature. Therefore, once more we discover that the presence of the article is not accurate measure for nominality.

Now if the article does not mean nominality, then it will not be either with the finite clause. If the infinitive objects of Ps can nevertheless be verbal (a rejection of Raposo’s (1987) arguments), then denying the nominal requirement of the objects of prepositions eliminates the base arguments of hypotheses such as the one developed in Barra (2002)
regarding the emergence of argument prepositional finite clauses. In general, what we are
discovering here is the problematic and insufficient nature of some of the theoretical tools
used to analyze clausal and nominal categories. Let us turn now to finite clauses.

It is important to note that, as with NP/DPs, the Ps in modern Spanish are mandatory
with infinitives:

(69) a. *Me alegro Ø poder ayudarte
    Me happy can help-you

b. *La idea Ø estudiar inglés toda la tarde

The idea study English all the afternoon

Therefore, it seems that the old option where the P was absent and the object was
arguably licensed positionally without an overt functional P is not operative in the
modern language. One would want to stipulate that this is due to the need for Case to be
assigned/checked, etc. but the severe counterargument is that the infinitives in (69) are
not even infinitives with articles, which for Anula and Fernández (1997) and Plann
(1981) would be the only nominal infinitives. In addition, notice that (63b) and (64b)
both have direct objects, so the whole issue of Case-licensing should not apply here
because Case is defined as a property of nouns. Notice too that these infinitives are not
nominal, and yet they can be the object of Ps. Again, it seems that prepositionality and
nominality are not so intertwined after all.
4.3.3. P + finite clauses

4.3.3.1. Argument prepositional finite clauses

4.3.3.1.1. *Que*-clauses

In present-day Spanish prepositions may select for a finite clause in both argument and adjunct positions. Observe the following examples of the former (with verbs):

(70)  a. *Me acuerdo de que* viniste a mi casa

       Me recall of that came to my house
       I remember you came to my house

   b. *Aspira a que* lo llamen de esa compañía

       Aspires to that him call from that company
       He aspires to be hired by that company

   c. *Insiste en que* vengas

       Insist in that come
       S/he insists on your coming

   d. *Cuento con que* vengas

       Count with that come
       I count on you coming

   e. *Optaron por que* no les dieran los libros

       Opted for that not them give the books
       The preferred not to be given the books
Nouns can also select for prepositional finite clauses:

(71)  a. La idea de que vengas

The idea of that come
The idea that you come

b. Mi primera objeción a que lo haga Jaime es que quizá no es la persona indicada

My first objection to that it does Jaime is that perhaps not s the person adequate
My first objection to having Jaime do it is that maybe he is not the appropriate person

Leonetti (1999: 2092)

c. Mi conformidad con que el pago se haga mañana

My consent with that the payment refl does tomorrow
My consent with doing the payment tomorrow

Leonetti (1999: 2089)

d. Tenemos interés en que vengan

Have interest in that come
We are interested on their coming

e. Tengo prisas por que los documentos sean aprobados

Have rush for that the documentns are approved
I need to have the documents approeved as soon as possible
Adjectives can also be combined with prepositional finite clauses:

(72)  
a. Estoy seguro de que vino  
Am sure of that came  
I am sure s/he came  
b. Es contraria a que los medios actúen así  
Is opposed to that the media act thus  
She is against the media acting like that  
c. Estoy interesado en que les envíen esos libros gratis  
Am interested in that them send those books free  
I am interested in their being sent those books for free  
d. Está conforme con que venga  
Is happy with that comes  
S/he is ok with his/her coming  

In conclusion, in present-day Spanish que-clauses may be the object of both functional and lexical Ps.

4.3.3.1.2. Indirect interrogative clauses

Que-clauses are perfectly grammatical as prepositional objects. In this section, I provide data of the other type of finite clauses we are examining: the indirect interrogative finite clauses.
As expected, indirect interrogatives can be the complement of functional Ps with verbs (73a, b, c), nouns (73d-g), and adjectives (73h, i):

(73)  

a. **Se olvidó de cómo desarmar la alarma**  
Reflected forgot of how to dismantle the alarm  
S/he forgot how to dismantle the alarm

b. **Platicaron sobre si le convenía viajar la semana entrante**  
Spoke about whether him suited to travel the week next  
They spoke about whether he could travel the following week

Suñer (1999: 2151)

c. **Me carcome la duda de si se presentará Marianito**  
Me preys the doubt of whether refl will-come Marianito  
It preys on my mind whether Marianito will show up

d. **Me carcome la duda de quién demonios se presentará**  
Me preys the doubt of who demons refl will-come  
It preys on my mind who the hell will show up

i. **No estoy seguro (de) cómo y dónde le convendría establecer su negocio**  
Not am sure of how and where him would-suit establish his business  
I am not sure how and where he should launch his business

Suñer (1999: 2153)
As can be seen, indirect interrogatives, also finite CPs, show a parallel behavior to the *que*-clauses. Therefore, whatever syntactic analysis is offered and whatever conclusions are reached for *que*-clauses must be applicable to indirect interrogatives if indeed there is serious content in the commonly used category COMP.

### 4.3.3.2. Adverbial prepositional finite clauses

Prepositional adverbial finite clauses abound in present-day Spanish, thus continuing the system found in Old Spanish, and again showing lexical Ps selecting for finite CPs:

(74)  

a. Voy **porque** quiero  
    Go for-that want  
    I go because I want to  

b. Lo hice **para que** lo vieras  
    It did for that it see  
    I made it so you could see it  

c. No fui **hasta que** dejó de llover  
    Not went until that stopped of rain  
    I didn’t go until it stopped raining  

d. Fui **sin que** me llamaran  
    Went without that me called  
    I went without having been called
However, certain Ps do not accept finite clauses:

(75)  a. *ante que

       in-front-of that

   b. *contra que

       against that

   c. *bajo que

       under that

   d. *hacia que

       toward that

Interestingly, these Ps do not accept infinitives either, thus revealing that this may be some special constraints operating for particular Ps and sentential content (probably a semantic restriction (cf. Barra’s (2002) classification of P in semantic terms)):

(76)  a. *ante comer

       in-front-of eat

   b. *contra comer

       against eat

   c. *bajo comer

       under eat

   d. *hacia comer

       toward eat
4.3.3.3. Optional prepositions

In present-day Spanish many argument prepositional finite clauses still coexist with their corresponding non-prepositional counterparts, historically interpreted as a continuation of the original forms which were never completely substituted by the innovative ones (Tarr (1922: 65, fn. 6)). However, optionality is not possible for all expressions because the P is mandatory for certain verbs. It is the P de that can be left out in most cases, but a and en can also be absent:

(77)  

a. Me acuerdo **(de) que** viniste a mi casa

Me recall of that came to my house

I recall that you came to my house

b. Depende *(de) que* haya suficientes personas

Depends of that are enough people

It depends on there being enough people

c. Estoy esperando **(a) que** salga el sol para salir a correr

Am waiting to that rises the sun for go to run

I am waiting for the sunrise to go jogging

d. Me opongo *(a) que* se enseñe religión en las aulas

Me oppose to that refl teaches religion in the classrooms

I oppose the teaching of religion in the schools

e. Insiste **(en) que** vengas

Insists in that come
S/he insists in your coming

f. La mejor solución consiste *(en) que cada uno se responsabilice de lo suyo

The best solution consists in that each one reflexively takes responsibility for his/her own stuff.

The best solution consists in having each one take responsibility for their own stuff.

g. Cuento *(con) que vengas

Count with that come

I count on your coming

h. Me amenazó *(con) que llamaría a la policía

Me threatened with that called to the police

S/he threatened me with calling the police

i. Optaron *(por) que no les dieran los libros

Opted for that not them give the books

They preferred not to be given the books

As has been commented above, the presence or absence of the P may have semantic repercussions in certain verbs, such as the following one:

(78) Los niños creen en que el Ratoncito Pérez les dará dinero ≠ Los niños creen que...

The kids believe in that the Mouse Pérez them will-give money ≠ The kids believe that…
The kids believe that the Mouse Pérez will give them money

With nouns, where the P *de* dominates, the prepositionless alternates are more easily attested, but here there is not complete optionality either:

(79)  a. El hecho *(de)* que llueva es bueno para el campo

The fact of that rains is good for the country

The fact that it is raining is good for the fields

b. La hipótesis *(de)* que X es igual a Y

The hypothesis of that X is equal to Y

The hypothesis that X equals Y

c. La negativa *(a)* que salieran del país

The negative to that leave of the country

The negative to their leaving the country

d. Tiene fe *(en)* que todo va a salir bien

Has faith in that all goes to go well

S/he has faith that everything is going to be ok

e. Tenemos interés *(en)* que vengan

Have interest in that come

We are interested in their coming
Optionality is also found with adjectives, but again, not across the board:

(80) a. Estoy seguro **(de)** que vino

Am sure of that came

I am sure that s/he came

b. Esto es independiente ***(de) que*** vengan o no

This is independent of that come or not

This is independent from their coming or not

c. Es contraria ***(a) que*** los medios actúen así

Is opposed to that the media act thus

She is opposed to the media behaving this way

d. Estoy interesado ***(en) que*** les envíen esos libros gratis

Am interested in that them send those books free

I am interested in having those books sent to them for free

The variation found with argument que-clauses is also present when the object is an interrogative CP, also with diverse results:

(81) a. Me acuerdo **(de) a qué hora** vino

Me recall of at what hour came

I remember what time s/he came
b. Todo depende *(de) cuántas personas* vengan al final
   All depends of how-many people come to-the end
   It all depends on how many people show up in the end

c. El hecho *(de) quién* lo había roto era irrelevante
   The fact of who it had broken was irrelevant
   The identity of the person who had broken it was irrelevant

d. Ante la pregunta *(de) si* deberíamos ir o no, no supimos qué contestar
   Before the question of if should go or not, not knew what answer
   To the question of whether we should go or not, we didn’t know what to answer

e. Su respuesta *(a) si* deberíamos ir o no fue positiva
   His answer to if should go or not was positive
   His answer to the question whether we should go or not was positive

f. No estoy seguro *(de) si* fue o no
   Not am sure of if went or not
   I am not sure whether s/he went or not

g. No estoy seguro *(de) quién* estaba allí
   Not am sure of who was there
   I am not sure who was there

The data point to an asymmetric situation. While the categories with the P *de* seem to favor optionality, it is not always the case, as *depende de* in (81b) shows. On the other hand, it would seem that *si*-clauses are more likely to appear without the P, but again it is
not across the board, which eliminates any possible generalization in this respect. What we do find is that the behavior of que-clauses and indirect interrogative clauses is parallel, as expected given that both are (complement) finite CPs.

4.3.3.4. Finite clauses with article

The finite clause can be preceded by an article in present-day Spanish, which some linguists (for instance, Barra (2002)), have interpreted as extra evidence in favor of the nominal nature of the finite clause. However, it has already been discussed above that the presence of the article with a CP does not equal nominality.

Nevertheless, the behavior of finite clauses with articles is in itself a source of syntactic surprises which further question the applicability of notions such as nominality and argumenthood to finite clauses in the way current syntactic theory might assume it to be. Let us start with a nominal property these el-finite CPs do have. Like nouns, they can be the objects of certain transitive verbs, another typical nominal position:

(82) a. Lamento el que no te prestaran ayuda
    Regret the that not you lent help
    I regret that they didn’t give you a hand

b. Celebro el que te haya tocado la lotería
    Celebrate the that you has taken the lottery
    I am happy that you have won the lottery
However, the asymmetry reappears because *they* are not always grammatical as direct objects, even with verbs that can actually take clausal objects, as can be seen in the following pair of examples:

(83) a. Niego que sea así

Deny that is thus

I deny that it is that way

b. *Niego el que sea así

Deny the that is thus

I deny that it is that way

One extra problem for the link between nominality and the presence of the article is that, even though on theoretical grounds we should describe the resulting category as a DP with a CP as the complement of the D, this DP surprisingly cannot be the object of any P, functional or lexical (contra Plann’s (1981) grammaticality judgments for some prepositions). No P in Spanish accepts a finite clause with an article as its complement.

Let us start by examining required Ps with some of the predicates that I have been using in this section:

(84) a. *Me acuerdo del que viniste a mi casa

Me recall of-the that came to my house
b. *Aspira al que lo llamen de esa compañía
   Aspires to-the that him call from that company

c. *Insisto en el que vengas a la fiesta
   Insist in the that come to the party

d. *Cuento con el que vengas
   Count with the that come

Finite clauses with articles cannot be the object of lexical Ps in adverbial clauses (adjuncts) either, so the restriction operates in all Ps:

(85) a. *Fui por el que me apetecía
   Went for the that me felt-like

   b. *Fui para el que me vieran allí
      Went for the that me saw there

   c. *Estudió hasta el que lo llamaron por teléfono
      Studied until the that him called for phone

   d. *Fui sin el que me llamaran
      Went without the that me called

Indirect interrogatives group together with que-clauses in this respect as well, with the exception of some cases of el por qué and el cómo (but not always), which only add more evidence to the lack of systematicity we are encountering:
The fact that supposed nominal elements cannot be the objects of any type of Ps is highly problematic because it runs against the accepted assumption that the basic objects of Ps are nouns, but it fits very well into the repeated issues found with infinitives. If we assume once again that, like infinitives, the presence of the article does not mean nominality. However, notice that infinitives with articles could be the object of Ps, which means that the finite clauses must be even more restricted than the infinitives. As Plann (1981: 234) points out, no D category is allowed with finite clauses other than the definite article el (the), which is also very different from what happens with real nouns and even with the infinitives:
(87) \textbf{El/*Ese/*Este/*Aquel/*Un} que Juan no haya dicho nada no importa

The/That/This/That /A that John not has said nothing not matters

It doesn’t matter that John has said nothing

Plann (1981: 234)

To sum up, there is no easy way to categorize these finite \textit{el}-CPs. They can be the direct objects like NP/DPs, but surprisingly they cannot be the object of any type of Ps, with the exception of a couple of indirect interrogatives. To make things worse, it is important to highlight that the very same \textit{el}-finite CPs which cannot be the object of Ps turn out to be perfect complements for the same Ps once the article is removed. Once again, the data seem to offer the opposite results to what is expected according to the theory, for traditionally the presence of the article has been regarded as the quintessential indicator of nominality (cf. Barra (2002: 281), for instance).

4.3.3.5. The question of argumenthood and prepositions

Thus far, I have shown the evidence that marks the inconsistency and the problems with the theoretical tools customarily used to approach the syntax of CPs and, in particular, argument and adjunct prepositional finite clauses.

Another important theoretical issue of high relevance to the understanding of the syntax and history of prepositional finite clauses in Spanish has to do with argumenthood. Let us remember that so far nothing has truly been called into question regarding the fact
that functional Ps such as de, a or en introduce arguments (or at least serve as ‘bridges’ between the selecting category and the object). Consequently, we may conclude that all de que, en que or a que (that is, minus those examples clearly attributable to adverbial readings, like Old Spanish a que being a final ‘in order that’) are arguments. However, several works have challenged this conclusion, especially regarding the argument status of the prepositional finite clauses depending on nouns, as in la idea de que... (the idea that...), for instance.

Grimshaw (1990: 79) suggests that all prepositional finite clauses depending on nouns may turn out to be adjuncts because they will not be θ-marked by the N nor by the P.

A similar approach is expressed in Leonetti (1999), who proves that some prepositional finite clauses depending on nouns are adjuncts by applying a set of tests to determine whether the prepositional finite CPs are argument or just adjuncts/appositions.

The first test to prove this difference has to do with the possibility of forcing an explicative apposition between commas, thus with a distinctive intonation (Leonetti (1999: 2091)):

(88) a. La solución de que no haya aparcamiento no puede ser la grúa

The solution of that not is parking not can be the tow-truck

The solution to the lack of parking slots cannot be the tow-truck

Leonetti (1999: 2090)

b. *La solución, que no haya aparcamiento, no puede ser la grúa

The solution, that not is parking, not can be the tow-truck
The solution, the lack of parking, cannot be the tow-truck
c. La causa de que Jorge haya suspendido es que no ha puesto interés
   The cause of that Jorge has failed is that not has put interest
   The cause of Jorge’s failing the exam is his lack of interest
d. *La causa, que Jorge haya suspendido, es que no ha puesto interés
   The cause, that Jorge has failed, is that not has put interest
   The cause, Jorge’s failing the exam, is his lack of interest

Leonetti (1999: 2091)

The CPs in (88a, c) are arguments because they cannot be restated between commas. Compare them with the following group of examples of adjunct/appositive prepositional clauses:

(89) a. La objeción de que Jaime no es la persona indicada resulta ridícula
   The objection of that Jaime not is the person adequate results ridiculous
   The objection that Jaime is not the right person is ridiculous
   Leonetti (1999: 2092)

b. La objeción, que Jaime no es la persona indicada, resulta ridícula
   The objection, that Jaime not is the person adequate, results ridiculous
   The objection, that Jaime is not the right person, is ridiculous

c. La hipótesis de que el Caso no funciona es una posibilidad
   The hypothesis of that the Case not works is a possibility
The hypothesis that Case does not work is a possibility
d. La hipótesis, que el Caso no funciona, es una posibilidad

The hypothesis, that the Case not works, is a possibility

The hypothesis, that Case does not work, is a possibility
e. El hecho de que vinieras ya fue suficiente regalo de cumpleaños

The fact of that came already was sufficient gift of birthday

The fact that you came was a very good birthday present

f. El hecho, que vinieras, ya fue suficiente regalo de cumpleaños

The fact, that came, already was sufficient gift of birthday

The fact, that you came, was a very good birthday present

Some of the sentences between commas may sound strange but they improve once we include an es decir (that is) between the commas (this option is not possible for the argument examples in (88)).

The argument clauses identify the content of the noun they complement. Notice that the content la causa de que... can be expressed by a transitive verb and a direct object:

(90) a. La causa de que Jorge haya suspendido es que no ha puesto interés

The cause of that Jorge has failed is that not has put interest

---

<sup>6</sup> This does not imply that all nouns with related transitive verbs will obligatorily have only argument clauses. For instance, Leonetti (1999: 2090) proves that the noun solución can have both argument and adjunct clauses, even though there is a transitive verb solucionar (to solve). The opposite is not true either, because a noun such as ventaja, which has no transitive verb counterpart, also allows both argument and adjunct clauses (Leonetti (1999: 2090)).
The cause of Jorge’s failing the exam is his lack of interest

b. La falta de interés de Jorge causó su suspensión

the lack of interest of Jorge caused his F

Jorge’s lack of interest caused his failure

The same is not possible with *la hipótesis de que*... for instance. But, as Leonetti (1999: 2091-92) shows, these adjunct clauses allow to be restated as copulative sentences, which highlights the fact that noun and finite *la*cause are at the same level (i.e., adjunction) and therefore there is no real subordination from one into the other. Notice that (91c) does not correspond to (90a):

(91)  a. La hipótesis de que el Caso no funciona es una posibilidad

The hypothesis of that the Case not works is a possibility

The hypothesis that Case does not work is a possibility

b. La hipótesis es que el Caso no funciona

The hypothesis is that the Case not works

The hypothesis is that Case does not work

c. #La causa es que Jorge ha suspendido

The cause is that Jorge has failed

A second test revolves around the possibility of combining with indefinite nouns. Only the argument clauses can combine with both definite and indefinite nouns:
(92)  a. **Una** ventaja de que no llueva es que no hay ocasión de perder el paraguas

An advantage of that not rains is that not is occasion of lose the umbrella

An advantage of the fact that it is not raining is that there is no chance to lose the umbrella

b. *Un hecho de que sólo hayas tomado dos platos de tortellini indica que no te encuentras bien

A fact of that only have taken two dishes of tortellini indicates that not you find well

A fact that you have only eaten two dishes of tortellini means that you’re not feeling well

Leonetti (1999: 2093)

Leonetti adds some other tests, but the evidence so far is sufficient to conclude that the presence of a (functional) P does not imply the argumenthood of the finite clause. The same de que clause may be an argument or an adjunct. After all, this is just logical in a language where there are commonly used prepositional appositions: those of nominal phrases such as la ciudad de Toledo (Toledo city), la calle de Alcalá (Alcalá Street), or el mes de febrero (the month of February) (cf. Suñer (1999: 550)), where the prepositional phrase is not an argument of the noun they modify. Consequently, there is no way to relate the existence of argument finite clauses with their being introduced by a preposition, which immediately falsifies one of the basic points included in Barra’s (2002) study of the emergence of argument prepositional finite clauses in Spanish. The
hypothetical change from non-prepositional-therefore-adjunct clauses into prepositional-therefore-argument clauses is untenable once we have proven that the same prepositional clauses may be arguments or adjuncts.

4.4. Conclusions

The following points summarize the findings of this section:

- There is no restriction against P + finite clauses in present-day Spanish. Prepositions of both types can take nouns, infinitives, and finite clauses. Variation persists in the finite clauses only, and even there but with restrictions that do not correspond to just one P.

- The theoretical tools reviewed in chapter 3 are not precise enough to cover all the necessary examples and yield a clear-cut description of the functioning of the language. The problems with the definition of nominality with the other type of CP –the infinitive clause-, in particular regarding the presence of the article, neutralized the hypotheses that rely on the existence of el-finite CP in Spanish to conclude that finite clauses are nominal categories at all.

- Likewise, Case-based analyses are inapplicable from the very moment that there is no way to reach an appropriate conclusion about the nominality of the Spanish CP, or quite a negative one. The fact that finite clauses can be the objects of Ps is not positive evidence for their nominal status either because the supposedly “nominal” el-finite CPs cannot. In addition, infinitives can be objects of Ps too,
regardless of whether they are accompanied by an article or not; even infinitives with open verbal features such as direct objects and subjects can be objects of Ps.

- The presence of a (functional) P such as *de* introducing the clause does not indicate that such a clause is an argument. This affects our understanding of the syntax of finite clauses in Old Spanish, because we cannot accept that finite clauses became arguments once they could be prepositional, as proposed in Barra (2002). Thus adjunct prepositional finite clauses are not only introduced by lexical Ps such as *para* or *hasta*.

Putting the modern data together with the old, we find that prepositions could select for NP/DPs, infinitives, but also finite clauses, even accepting that the argument clauses were reduced in number before the 16th century. However, the properties of the finite clause as discussed in Barra (2002) were the same before and after that moment. Thus the emergence of the argument prepositional finite clauses is independent from questions of nominality, Case, etc. These theoretical tools have proven insufficient.

Infinitives, finite clauses, and prepositions are not exclusive categories to Spanish. Other (European) languages have them. The existence or not and the possible constraints for prepositional finite clauses in several other Romance and Germanic languages will be the focus of the next two chapters. Such investigation will help us situate the Spanish prepositional finite clause in a wider panorama, which in the end is the main goal in Linguistics.
CHAPTER 5

CROSSLINGUISTIC EVIDENCE 1: PREPOSITIONAL FINITE CLAUSES IN
LATIN AND ROMANCE LANGUAGES

5.1. Introduction
This chapter explores the syntax and history of prepositional finite clauses of Latin and some Romance languages, namely Portuguese, French, and Italian. Being so closely related to Spanish, comparing the syntax and history of these languages offers a perfect scenario to examine and discover what is common and what is different, especially what is unexpectedly different, and what the implications for the theory are.

Latin, as the mother language, occupies the first pages. It is shown that P + finite CPs are attested in Post-Classical Latin. Classical Latin has the pronominal alternative. This pronominal alternative is also a typical feature of French, starting in the Old French period. The supposed ungrammaticality of P + finite CP in (Old) French and (Old) Italian is contrasted with the data, which shows that both languages actually allow such configuration. Infinitives are explored as well.

In the following pages, I will show that there is no actual constraint against P + finite clauses in any of these languages, even if there are important differences. These
differences support the discussion of this section and provide actual data for study and discussion in a crosslinguistic perspective. Variation/optionality is discussed too.

5.2. Latin

5.2.1. The Latin prepositional finite clause

Prepositional finite clauses are not just a Romance phenomenon. On the one hand, Herman (1963: 74-86) documents the existence of an initially correlative *eo quod* (lit. ‘this-ABL that’) which eventually can be selected for by several Ps in Classical Latin, namely *ab eo quod*, *ex eo quod* (also *ex hoc quod*), *in eo quod* (also *in id quod*), *per hoc quod* (also *per id quod*), and especially *pro eo quod*. Consider the following examples:

(1)  

a. **ab eo quod** ignis propter splendorem fulget (*De lingua latina* V, Varro)  
    to this that fire for splendor shines  
    because fire shines for splendor  
    Herma (1963: 78)

b. sol uero dicitur aut **ex eo quod** solus sit aut quod solite per dies surgat et occidat (*Opera, I*, Fabius Planciades Fulgentius)  
    sun truly is-said or for this that alone is or that often for days rises and dies  
    It is called sun either because it is alone or because it often rises and sets for days  
    Herman (1963: 79)
c. iudicatus quidem est in eo, quod non credidit (Opera V, S. Eusebius Hieronymus)

judged then is in this that not believed

He was judged because he didn’t believe

Herman (1963: 81)

e. pro eo quod pecunia ingenti me honorasti (Historia Apollonii regis Tyri, 41)

for it that money great me honored

because you honored me with great wealth

Herman (1963: 84)

This syntactic construction where the pronoun is the real object of the P and the finite clause is only an adjunct to the pronoun is also found in Old Spanish, as I showed in section 4.2.3.4.

If the previous correlative construction were the only one involving a P and a finite clause, Latin would not be so relevant. However, (Post-Classic) Latin itself already had its own share of true adverbial prepositional finite clauses, which are not negligible in number: iuxta quod, secundum quod, prater quod, propter quod, post quod, ante quod (also antea quod), ad quod, de quod, pro quod, per quod. Observe the following examples:
These sentences prove that finite clauses could be the object of Ps before the Romance period, even if this is just limited to adjunct clauses.
In the Spanish Late Latin texts Bastardas’s (1953) findings leave no doubt: “La conjunció \textit{pro que} es ya frecuente en nuestras cartas” (Bastardas (1953: 93)), that is, \textit{pro que} (lit. ‘for that’) was already frequent. Consider the following example:

\begin{equation}
\text{et non autorigaua lex illo stare \textbf{pro [que erat in etate parbula] (Cartulario de San Vicente de Oviedo, 781-1200)\& not authorized law this be for that was in age young}\end{equation}

And the law did not authorize it because s/he was still too young

Bastardas (1953: 93)

The chronology of these P + finite CP supports an analysis such as Moreno’s (1985-86). In particular, Bastardas (1953: 189) argues that \textit{pro quod/que} is the result of the elimination of the pronoun \textit{eo} in \textit{pro eo quod}. The first examples of \textit{pro que} date back to the 6\textsuperscript{th} century, which points to the fact that “[e]n general, la unión de una preposición con una conjunció es cosa propia del latín tardío” (Bastardas (1953: 189)).

\textbf{5.2.2. The Latin prepositional infinitive}

In general, prepositional infinitives do not exist in Latin, and are considered to be a Romance phenomenon. However, as Bastardas (1953: 167) points out, “[e]n el siglo VII el infinitivo con preposición era ya normal en el habla popular” (in the 7th century the
infinitive with P was already usual in the colloquial language) (My translation). There is, nevertheless, one difference in chronology worth mentioning. While most prepositional infinitives are a fully Romance creation, the \(a(d) +\) infinitive construction is attested already in the Latin period. Consider the following Medieval Latin examples with different Ps:

(4) a. si aliquis homo ad disrupendum uenerit (…) tunc abiatis ad prendere de nos ipsa ereditate (Cartulario de San Vicente de Oviedo, 781-1200)

If any man to disrupt came (…) then have to take of us this inheritance

If someone came to destroy, then you should take this inheritance from us

Bastardas (1953: 162)

b. Solatos populatos et alios pro populare (Becerro Gótico de Cardeña, c. 1086)

Lands populated & other for populate

Land populated and others yet to pupulate

Bastardas (1953: 170)

c. fui ad casa de Fredinando cum Froila et rogauimus illum per cartam traslatare de uinia (Cartulario de Santo Toribio de Liébana, 8th-9th c.)

went to house of Fredinando with Froila & begged him for letter translate of vineyard
I went to Frediando’s house with Froila and we begged him to translate the letter of the vineyard.

Bastardas (1953: 171)

5.2.3. Conclusions

The main finding in this section is that the prepositional clauses are already present in the Latin period, including both prepositional infinitives and alternatives with intervening pronouns. All these configurations will multiply in the Romance period.

5.3. Portuguese

5.3.1. Present-day Portuguese

5.3.1.1. The Portuguese prepositional finite clause

Portuguese mirrors Spanish in admitting both argument and adjunct prepositional finite clauses. These finite CPs may be selected for by Vs, Adjs, or Ns:

(5) a. Os miúdos lembrem-se de que os pais lhes prometeram uma bicicleta

The kids remember-refl of that the parents them promised a bike

The kids remember that their parents had promised them a bike

Duarte (2003: 600)
b. Eles autorizaram-nos a que consultásemos o manuscrito raro

They authorized-us to that we-consulted the manuscript rare

They authorized us to consult the rare manuscript

Duarte (2003: 602)

c. O João insistiu em que fôssemos à festa dele

The John insisted in that we-went to party of-him

John insisted that we go to this his party

Duarte (2003: 614)

d. Toda a equipa se mostrou receptiva a que os dois jovens fossem contratados

All the tema refl-showed receptive to that the two youngsters were hired

The whole team was receptive to the idea of hiring both youngsters

Duarte (2003: 603)

e. Todos estamos conscientes de que a solução do problema não é fácil

All are aware of that the solution of the problem not is easy

We all are aware that the solution to the problem is not easy

Duarte (2003: 614)

f. Durante a Idade Média, os geógrafos não defendiam a ideia de que a Terra é redonda

During the Age Middle, the geographers not defended the idea of that the Earth is round
During the Middle Ages, the geographers did not defend the idea that the Earth is round.

Duarte (2003: 614) argues that the previous examples are not subordinating conjunctions but rather PPs with a finite clause as the prepositional object, in keeping with our conclusions for Spanish. Evidence in favor of this analysis comes from the fact that the same Ps can introduce the other type of finite clause we have been discussing: the indirect interrogative finite CPs:

(6)  a. Não me lembro de [quem ou quando foi]
    Not me recall of who or when was
    I don’t remember who it was or when it took place
    <www.bestiario.com.br/23_arquivos/coisas_de_hotel.html>
    b. Já nem me lembro de [quando foi a ultima vez que corri tanto num jogo de futebol]
    Yet not me recall of when was the last time that run so-much in-a game of football
    I can’t remember when was the last time I run so much in a football match
    <estounaholanda.no.sapo.pt/junho.html>
c. Nao me lembro de [como se chamava]

Not me recall of how refl called

I don’t remember its name

<janavila.tipos.com.br/arquivo/2008/06/04/salvar-como>

d. na dúvida de [se o bebê está recebendo todos os nutrientes]

in-the doubt of whether the baby is getting all the nutrients

In the doubt of whether the baby is getting all the nutrients

<brasil.babycenter.com/stages/1000>

e. em resposta de [se cumpria os limites de velocidade]

in answer to whether fulfilled the limits of speed

in response to whether s/he respected the speed limits


Also, these required Ps, along with the lexical ones in adverbial clauses, admit infinitives as well (cf. also Duarte (2003: 622-623)):

(7) a. Alguém já se lembrou de fazer isto?

Someone yet refl recalled of do this

Did someone remember to do this?

<forum.autohoje.com/showthread.php?t=44950>
b. o presidente da República me **autorizou a fazer** o pré-projeto

the president of-the republic me authorized to do the pre-project

The president of the Republic authorized me to do the pre-project


c. ele **insistiu em fazer** algumas cenas de ação

he insisted in do some scenes of action

He insisted in doing some scene actions

<www.cinepop.com.br/especial/procurado.htm>

d. Obama rejeita **idéia de fazer** discurso no Portão de Brandemburgo (Noticias Terra Brasil, 7/18/08; <noticias.terra.com.br>)

Obama rejects idea of do speech in-the Gate of Brandenburg

Obama rejects the idea of doing a speech at the Brandenburg Gate

Duarte (2003: 401-402) includes these required Ps in the group of Case-markers, in keeping with such linguists as Scorretti or Svenonius, who propose that these functional Ps are not Ps and therefore project no real PP but rather a KP (or just a functional PP in Asbury’s (2008) terms). A Rizzi-like analysis would argue in favor of a different classification of these Ps as real Ps because they are constant with these Vs, Ns and As, and because they cannot be substituted by a DO pronoun such as *o* (it):
Regardless of Case, which was problematic for Spanish, we can agree that these Ps are functional Ps and not lexical because they do not have meaning or θ-grid, etc. In this Portuguese is like Spanish once again. Remember that functional Ps are subject to much variation, meaning that their syntactic weight is minimal. For instance, these Ps are the ones that will allow optionality with sentential complements. Like Spanish, the optionality of the required P is attested in Portuguese too, as the following examples illustrate, where the P *de* is normative (cf. Mollica (1995: 17 and ff)):

(9) a. o senhor secretário de Estado ainda **nos convence que** pagar impostos faz bem à saúde (Sábado, 12/17/88)

The sir secretary of State even us convinces that pay taxes does well to health

The secretary of State even convinces us that paying taxes is good for our health
b. desejosos que o convívio resultasse num sucesso (Expresso, 11/4/89)
    wishful that the meeting resulted in a success
    wishful that the meeting became a success

c. começaram por chamar a atenção para o facto que a Foz “cresceu junto a o rio (...)” (O Jornal Ilustrado, 8/23/91)
    started for call the attention for the fact that the Foz grew next to the river
    They started by calling the attention to the fact that Foz grew up next to the river

Where Spanish and Portuguese diverge is in the fact that Portuguese allows particular uses of functional Ps which only appear with NP/DPs or infinitives, but not with finite clauses. This is the case with verbs such as gostar, necessitar o precisar (Duarte 2003: 636-637). Observe the asymmetry of the following Portuguese examples:

(10) a. O João gosta da Maria
    The John likes of the Mary
    John likes Mary

b. O João gosta de tocar flauta
    The John likes of to-play flute
    John likes playing the flute

Duarte (2003: 637)
c. O João gosta que a Maria toque flauta
The John likes that the Mary plays flute
John likes Mary to play the flute

Duarte (2003: 636)

Remember that similar examples but only limited to the infinitives used to be grammatical in Old Spanish but have since been ruled out of the language. However, here the P is also used with nouns, which resembles the syntax of French and Italian, as will be shown later. Besides, Portuguese joins the question whether the P is latently present or not in the finite clause example. Duarte (2003) finds the explanation in Case Theory and asserts that verbs such as gostar are case-defective, therefore—and here comes the crucial part:

quando seleccionam complementos que exijam Caso (como acontece com os pronomes, os sintagmas nominais e as completivas infinitivas), os mesmos precisam de ser legitimados através da preposição usada típicamente como marcador casual em português, a preposição de. (Duarte (2003: 637))
When they select for complements that need Case (as happens with pronouns, NPs and infinitive clauses), said complements need to be licensed with the typical CaseMarker preposition in Portuguese, the preposition de. (My translation)

Such statement has immediate theoretical consequences. Let us reintroduce Case Theory since Duarte uses it. If the P de appears with some complements only because those are the nominal ones (because only nominals require Case), and among these are not the
finite clauses, then for Duarte the Portuguese finite clause is not nominal and cannot check Case (that is why it does not require the presence of the P de). Evidently, if the finite clause is not nominal in Portuguese, then the syntax of P + finite CPs has nothing to do with Case.

5.3.1.2. Adverbial prepositional finite clauses

Bechara (1999) and Brito (2003) analyze the traditionally called subordinating conjunctions in Portuguese as phrases headed by Ps, Advs, etc. In this sense, para que is in reality a PP headed by the P para which select for a finite clause introduced by que. Other PPs functioning as adverbial clauses are sem que (lit. without that), porque (lit. for that), desde que (lit. since that), até que (lit. until that). Consider the following examples where we see clearly that por remains a P all the time:

(11) a. Houve seca em Portugal em 1981, **porque** não choveu

   Was drought in Portugal in 1981, for-that not rained

   There was drought in Portugal in 1981 because it didn’t rain

   Brito (2003: 711)

   b. **Por** não ter **chovido** em Portugal em 1981, houve seca

   For not to-have rained in Portugal in 1981, was drought

   Due to a lack of rain in Portugal in 1981, there was drought

   Brito (2003: 712)

Not rained in Portugal in 1981, for that was drought

It didn’t rain in Portugal in 1981, for that reason there was drought

Brito (2003: 713)

Observe the following extra examples of adverbial prepositional finite clauses (adjuncts):

(12) a. Fugiste para que ele não te visse

Fled for that he not you saw

You ran away so he could not see you

Brito (2003: 717)

b. há algumas etapas que não podem ser realizadas sem que outras já tenham sido cumpridas

are some steps that not can be done without that others yet have been fulfilled

There are some steps that cannot be done without having already done others

<ww.iq.ufrgs.br/aeq/carbopFuncionamento.htm>

c. Até que a morte nos separe

Until that the death us separates

Until death separates us

In conclusion, all types of Ps can take finite clauses in Portuguese.
5.3.1.3. Nominality and the finite clause: the article

I already discussed that the presence of the article does not imply the nominality of the finite clause (or of the infinitive). However, there is one important point to highlight with regards to the grammaticality of the article with CPs in Portuguese.

Remember that in Spanish both infinitives and finite CPs can appear with articles. Recall also that this was used as a confirmation of the nominal features of the modern Spanish finite clause. (cf. Barra (2002)). Therefore, since Portuguese P + CPs mirror the Spanish ones, the expectation is that the Portuguese finite clause should be grammatical with article. Surprisingly, this is not the case, because examples like the following are ungrammatical:

(13) *[O [que ele fale português]] (Patrícia Amaral, pc)

The that he speaks Portuguese

The only possible way of saving this sentence is by including o facto que (the fact that):

(14) O facto de [que ele fale português]

The fact of that he speaks Portuguese

The fact that he speaks Portuguese
It could be the case that articles and clauses do not work together in Portuguese for independent reasons, but this conclusion runs into problems once we find out that articles may combine with other types of clauses in this language: some indirect interrogatives and both the regular and the inflected infinitives. Consider the following examples of indirect interrogatives with article:

(15) a. imagino **o como** deve estar a mae desses garotos

    imagine the how must be  the mom of-those kids

    I can imagine how the mom of those kids must be


b. Imagino **o quanto**  deve ser dificil para vc ter uma irmã assim

    imagine the how-much must be difficufl for you have a sister thus

    I can imagine how difficult it must be for you to have such a sister

    <sunflowerrecords.blogspot.com/2008/08/am-la-dificil.html>

c. gostariam de saber **o por que** devo me batizar

    would-like of know the for-what must me baptize

    They would like to know why I must get baptized

    <spacebrasil.sites.uol.com.br/comunhao.htm>
Notice that the infinitives pattern with the finite clause in allowing \( o \ fa(c)to \ de \ que \) as well, which makes the ungrammaticality of (13) even more strange and unexpected. Consider the following examples of infinitives with article and with \( o \ fa(c)to \ que \):

\[ (16) \]

a. **O (tu) criticares-me o tempo todo entristece-me**

The (you) criticize-me the time all saddens-me

The fact that you criticize me all the time makes me sad

Duarte (2003: 630)

b. **O facto de (tu) me criticares o tempo todo entristece-me**

The fact of (you) me criticize the time all saddens-me

The fact that you criticize me all the time makes me sad

Duarte (2003: 631)

c. Pedro vai explicar **o não ter votado em Nixon**

Pedro goes explain the not have voted in Nixon

Pedro explained not having voted for Nixon

d. Pedro vai explicar **o fato de não ter votado em Nixon**

Pedro goes explain the fact of not have voted in Nixon

Pedro explained not having voted for Nixon

Perini (1977: 131)
In the end, Lapesa (2000) is right:

Spanish has gone beyond Italian or Portuguese in the tendency toward allowing determiners with verb phrases [clauses], reaching the point where the article can be used with declarative finite clauses. (My translation)

To sum up, Portuguese seems to have the same syntactic possibilities as Spanish in terms of prepositional finite clauses. Prepositions can take finite clauses. In addition, especially because of this similarity, the impossibility of articles with finite clauses comes as a big surprise which in the end can be added to the several problems already discussed regarding articles, nominality, etc. Once again, the theoretical tools usually applied do not provide a complete account crosslinguistically, even in the case of two very close languages such as Spanish and Portuguese.

5.3.2. Old Portuguese

5.3.2.1. Finite clauses

In short, the history of Portuguese prepositional finite clauses resembles that of Spanish. As Said (1966: 222) indicates, several Ps could take a que-clause as their object in Old Portuguese, including de, a, com, por, pera (pora), des, até, and sem.
Prepositional finite clauses include the adverbial ones and the argument ones. According to my own search in Davies and Ferreira’s corpus of Portuguese, the first attestations of the argument prepositional finite clauses date back to the 16th - 17th centuries, chronologically similar to the Spanish case (exception made of the early examples in Old Spanish, of course). Consider first the following examples of argument prepositional finite clauses, including examples de, a, em, and com:

(17)  a. quando me começava a **alegrar de que** fosseis vindo (*Cartas familiares*, Francisco Manuel de Melo, 1650)  

        when me started to be-happy of that were come  

When I was starting to feel happy of your coming  

b. nem **antes de que** lembrados seiam (*Forais manuelinos*, 16th c.)  

        nor before of that remembered are  

Nor before they remember  

c. Deos não lhe manda nem o **obriga a que** seja virgen (*Historia do Japan 1*, Frois, 16th c.)  

        God not him orders nor him forces to that is virgin  

God neiter orders him nor forces him to remain a virgin  

d. pera que com vossos sacrifícios, e orações nos **ajudeys a que** não a desmereçamos (*Carta escrita en Cangoxima a 5 de novembro de 1549*, Padre Mestre Francisco Xavier, 1598)
for that with your sacrifices and prayers us help to that not it un-deserve
so that with your sacrifices and prayer you help us become just recipients of it
e. que quanto o padre mais insistia em que lho contasse, tanto o ele negava mais obstinadamente (Historia da vida do Padre S. Francisco Xavier, Lucena, 1600)
that as-much the father more insisted in that it tell, as-much it he denied more stubbornly
the more the father insisted in my telling it, the more he denied it very stubbornly
f. não tem conta com que os seos sejão poucos e os inimigos muitos (Historia do Japam 2, Frois, 16th c.)
not has count with that the his are few and the enemies many
He does not care about the fact that his people are few but his enemies, many
g. Estai seguro de que nao há cousa neste mundo tao abatida (Apólogos dialogais, Francisco Manuel de Melo, 17th c.)
Be sure of that not is thing in-this world so dispirited
Be sure that there is no a saddest thing in the world

As expected, indirect interrogatives could also be prepositional:

(18) a. incertos de [quem havia chegar primero] (Sermões, Vieira, 17th c.)
Uncertain of who had arrive first
Uncertain as to who had to arrive first
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b. foges de te lembrar de [quem sou] (Pão partido, Manoel Bernades, 1696)

escape of you recall of who am

You try to avoid remembering who I am

Dias (1959: 264)

In addition, as in Spanish, in the older stages of the language argument clauses were not introduced by a P (cf. Silva (1989: 744), Silva (1994: 110)):

(19) a. e outro nom quer dar lugar que aguarde (Leal conselheiro, 1437-38)

& other not wants give place that wait

And other does not want to give me the chance to wait

b. e que Deus o quisesse ajudar que regesse ben e dereitamente (Crónica Geral de Espanha de 1344, 14th c.)

& that god him wanted help that returns well and right

And that god wanted to help him return well and right

c. e nembrate que sem elles tu nom foras (Livro da virtuosa bemfeitoria do infante Dom Pedro, 15th c.)

& recall-you that without them you not be

And remember that without them you would not exist
c. maravilhousse que podya aquello seer (Crónica Geral de Espanha de 1344, 14th c.)

marvelled-refl what could that be

He marveled at what that could be

d. eu som certo que sempre me conselharedes bê (Crónica Geral de Espanha de 1344, 14th c.)

I am certain that always me will-advice well

I am confident that you will always give me good advice

This optionality is also maintained later on, again as in Spanish (cf. Brandão (1963: 545)):

(20) a. queixando-se que S. A. lhe proibisse não se meter no negócio (Cartas, Padre António Vieira, 17th c.)

Complaining-refl that S.A. him forbade not refl enter in-the bussiness

Complaining that Your Majesty had barred him from joining the bussiness

b. se maravilhavam que fosse filha daquele pobre vilão Janicola (Proveito, Gonçalo Fernandes Trancoso, 16th c.)

refl marveled that was daughter of that poor peasant Janicola

They were marveled that she was indeed the daughter of that poor peasant Janicola
c. & ninguém vos obriga que deses, nem que queirais (Contos & historias de proveito & exemplo, Gonçalo Fernandes Trancoso, 1575)

& nobody you forces that give, nor that want

And nobody forces you to either give or want to

d. e insistia que pelo menos quinze dias se auzentasse (Historia do Japam I, Frois, 16th c.)

& insisted that for-the less fifteen days refl be-absent

& insisted that he be absent for at least 15 days

e. não há duvida, que os homês são peyores inimigos que os Demonios (Sermões, Vieira, 17th c.)

not has doubt, that the men are worse enemies that the demons

There is no doubt that men are worse enemies than demons

f. que estivessem seguros que ainda não era chegada sua hora (Historia do Japam 3, Frois, 16th c.)

that were sure that still not was arrived their hour

That they were sure that it was not their time yet

Dias (1959: 261)

Adverbial P + finite CPs are attested in Old Portuguese (cf. Brandão (1963: 545)).

Consider the following examples, dating up to the 16th century:
(21)  

a. & **porque** queremos senpre sseer a uosso sserviço (*Textos Notariais. Arquivo de Textos Notariais em Português Antigo*, 13th c.)  

& for-that want always be to your service  
And because I want to be always at your service  

b. Fery o meu servo, **porque** elle aja medo e tome enxemplo (*Fabulario Esopo*, 15th c.)  

Wounded the my serve, for-that he has fear & takes example  
I hurt my serve so that he gets scared and takes note  

Huber (1933: 308)  

&  


c. **em que** quem te deo, t’a pida (*Manual d’Epicteto*, Sousa, 16th c.)  

in that who you gave, you-it requests  
in that whoever gave it to you requests it back from you  

Dias (1959: 262)  

&  


d. **Sem que** t’o merecesse nem te errasse (*Lusiadas*, Camões, 16th c.)  

Without that you-it deserved nor you erred  
Without my deserving it or making any mistake  

Dias (1959: 287)  

&  


e. **ata que** traga aquela farinha do trijgo que leuou (*Posturas do concelho de Lisboa*, 1360)  

until that brings that flour of wheat that took  
until s/he brings back the wheat flour that s/he took  
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Finally, it is necessary to point out that some indirect interrogatives could take an article, namely *porque*, *como* and *quão* (Dias (1959: 266)):

(22) a. se está deixando ver **o como** em hâa alma entra a heresua (*Sermões*, Frei João de Ceita, 16th c.)

refl is letting see the how in one soul enters the heresy

It is now possible to see how heresy enters a soul

Dias (1959: 266)

b. porque sabia bem **o porque** o faziam (*Crónica do condestável Nuno Alvarez*, 1431)

because knew well the why it did

because he knew well the reason why they were doing it

c. pois não sabendo a hora, nem **o quando** pode ser isto (*Cartas Espirituais*, Antonio das Chagas, 1665)

after not knowing the hour, nor the when can be this

afterward not knowing what time or when this could take place

The existence of these finite clauses with article makes the inexistence of the equivalent one with *que* even stranger, particularly in an approach that considers that the article is a sign of nominality (for instance, Barra (2002)).
5.3.2.2. Prepositions and infinitives

In this Portuguese is like Spanish too. For one, prepositional infinitives are attested with those predicates that required the P with nouns and from the 16th century on with finite clauses as well:

(23)  

a. Nenhuu escriuā nō seya **ousado de fazer** carta (*Foro Real, Afonso X, 1280?*)

No Scribe not be daring of do letter

May no scribe dare write a letter

b. o cavaleiro malfeitor que **cuidou de fazer** un mōesteiro (*Cantigas de Santa Maria, Alfonso X, 13th c.*)

the knight criminal that thought of make a monastery

the delinquent knight who considered building a monastery

c. Nos **hobrygamos** (...) **á amparar & a defender & a lyurar** a uos o dyto errdamēto (*Textos Notariais. Arquivo de Textos Notariais em Português Antigo, 13th c.*)

Us force to protect & to defend & to release to you the said inheritance

We commit ourselves to protect, defend, and give to you said inheritance

d. e senpre se **deleitarā em fazer** prazer a Deos (*Vidas de Santos de um Manuscrito Alcobacense, 13th c.*)

& always refl will-enjoy in do pleasure to God

And he will always enjoy pleasing God
Adverbial clauses could also be infinitival:

\[(24)\]

a. ou outra besta que seya guardada **por fazer** fillos \((Foro Real, Afonso X, 1280?)\)

or other beast that be kept for make kids

or keep other beast to have offspring

b. E se huu nõ quiser dar sa parte do logar **pera fazer** a parede \((Foro Real, Afonso X, 1280?)\)

& if one not wanted give his part of the palce for do the wall

And if someone did not want to cede their part of the place in order to build a wall

c. **sem fazer** hy muyta detëeça, se foy pera a vila d' Ulmedo \((Crónica Geral de Espanha de 1344 (Ms. P), 14th c.)\)

without do there much stop, refl went to the ville of Olmedo

without stopping there for long, he went to the ville of Olmedo

There is also optionality. For instance, several verbs admit both the prepositional and the non-prepositional constructions \((cf. Abraham (1938: 50-51), Russo (1942: 50-54), Dias (1959: 220), Said (1966: 339))\), again proving that the use of Ps with CPs was not fixed in the old language:
(25) a. E, se acharem que com devo de lidar, lidarei com elles (Crónica Geral de Espanha de 1344, 14th c.)

And I they thought that I must fight, I will.

b. podême dizer o que eu devo fazer (Crónica Geral de Espanha de 1344, 14th c.)

can-me tell the what I must do

They can tell me what to do

c. cada uu deseja de chegar ali onde tem em guarda suas riquezas (Livro de vita Christi, 1446)

each one wishes of arrive there where has in keep his wealth

Everyone wants to arrive where they are keeping their wealth

d. aquele que deseja casar com a moça fea por seer bem vestida (Boosco deleitoso, 15th c.)

that who wishes marry with a girl ugly for be well dressed

that who wishes to marry an ungly young woman because she is well dressed

5.3.3. Conclusions

- Portuguese has prepositional finite and infinitival clauses, including indirect interrogatives, as in Spanish
• The so-called subordinating conjunctions of Portuguese are also proven to be prepositions taking finite clauses, be the P functional or lexical

• Argument prepositional finite clauses are not attested in Old Portuguese, while adverbial clauses are, as in Spanish. This points to a parallel history in Portuguese and Spanish

• There is also optionality/variation as in Spanish, both in the old period and in present-day

• Surprisingly, Portuguese does not allow the article with a que-clause, unexpected if the clause were clearly nominal

5.4. French

5.4.1. Present-day French

5.4.1.1. Prepositions and finite clauses

5.4.1.1.1. Argument finite clauses: The pronominal element

One of the main features of French prepositional constructions is that a predicate, for instance a verb, may select for prepositional objects but such P can only take a noun or an infinitive directly, while finite clauses require the mediating presence of the so-called pronoun ce (this), as the following paradigm shows:
Therefore, argument prepositional finite clauses such as the ones found in Spanish are disallowed in French. This is not so say that there are no equivalent expressions, but they require a ce. Observe the following examples, with selecting verbs, nouns, and adjectives, all of which require the pronoun ce:
(27) a. Jean abuse de ce que son frère est plus faible
   Jean abuses of this that his brother is more weak
   Jean takes advantage of his brother being weaker

b. Jean se refuse à ce que sa présence à cette réunion soit annoncée
   Jean refuses to this that his presence to this réunion is announced
   Jean refuses that his presence in the meeting be announced

Huot (1981: 159)

c. La difficulté consiste en ce que nous avons peu de temps
   The difficulty consists in this that we have little of time
   The difficulty consists in that we have little time

Le Goffic (1993: 343)

d. Il ne cachait pas sa crainte de ce que Jean était physiquement fragile
   He not hid not his fear of this that Jean was physically fragile
   He did not hide his fear that Jean was physically fragile

e. J’admirais son habileté à ce que tout soit fait dans les délais nécessaires
   I-admired his ability to this that all is done within the deadline necessary
   I admired his ability to have everything done within the deadlines

Huot (1981: 189)

f. Jean est toujours très attentif à ce que chacun puisse exprimer son avis
   Jean is always very attentive to this that each can express his opinion
   Jean always pays much attention to allowing everybody to speak their mind
The French construction involves an intervening pronoun, a construction also found in Latin (section 5.2.1.) and, to a lesser extent, in Old Spanish (section 4.2.3.4.). In principle, the P takes a complement pronoun to which the finite clause is an adjunct:

(28) \[ \text{Je me plains \{PP/KP de \{DP \{D ce \{CP que tu n'étais pas là\}]} \]}

I am complaining about your not being there

Therefore, there is not direct selection of the finite clause by the P.

However, this would be if we were to analyze the \emph{ce} in \emph{de ce que} and \emph{à ce que} as a pronoun. For Bouchard and Hirschbuhler (1987: 50), \emph{ce que} was reanalyzed as a complementizer and therefore a unit. This way the resulting constituent analysis becomes as follows, where the P is now directly taking a CP:
Jean me plains \[[PP/KP \text{de } [CP \text{ ce que } [TP \text{ tu n’étais pas là}]]]\]

I me complain of this that you not-were not there

I am complaining about your not being there

The same opinion is expressed by Rouquier (1990), who concludes that

\[ce que \text{ “conjonction” ne subsiste en français moderne que dans certains énoncés prépositionnels. Il est difficile, sinon impossible pour ces énoncés de proposer une punctuation entre le ce et le que: } *\text{je tiens à ce: que tu partes}.”\] (Rouquier (1990: 53))

*Ce que* as a conjunction [complementizer] survives in modern French only in certain prepositional expressions. It is difficult, or rather impossible, to propose a punctuation between *ce* and *que* such as *je tiens à ce: que tu partes* [lit. I am-determined to this: that you leave] (My translation)

That is to say, the possible adjunction analysis is weakened by the impossibility of an entonation pause.

More recently, Zaring (1992) argues that *ce* is actually a clausal determiner, not a pronoun. Evidence in favor of this comes from the missing properties of *ce* as a pronoun. For instance, it cannot be the only object of the preposition; instead, *cela* or *ça* should be used:

\[*\text{Je m’habite à ce}\]

I me-accustom to this
I am getting used to this

Zaring (1992: 56)

In addition, the syntactic productivity of this *ce* is very reduced because it is restricted to finite clauses and does not work with any other categories. Witness the ungrammaticality with an infinitive in (31a). *Ce* must always be adjacent to the finite clause and allows no interpolation, which questions the internal divisibility of *ce que* (31b):

\[(31)\]

\[a. \quad \text{*Je m’habite à ce [dormir pendant la journée]} \]

I me-accustom to this sleep during the day

I am getting used to it sleeping during the day

\[b. \quad \text{*Je m’habitue à ce évidemment qu’elle dorme pendant la journée} \]

I me-accustom to this evidently that she sleeps during the day

I am getting used to it evidently that she sleeps during the day

Zaring (1992: 56)

Furthermore, the fact that *P + ce* is not a constituent independent from the finite clause is evidenced by the fact that it cannot be substituted by the corresponding prepositional pronoun (clitic) *y* or *en* while at the same time leaving the finite clause in its place:
(32)  a. *J’y veillerai qu’il se couche de bonne heure

I-to-it will-watch that-he refl goes-to-bed of good hour

I will see to it that he goes to bed early

b. J’y veillerai

I-to-it will-watch

I will see to it

Zaring (1992: 67)

*Ce* is also used in French as a demonstrative determiner, as in *ce livre* (this book).

Therefore, given that it is not a pronoun, Zaring (1992: 68) concludes that this *ce* is a D too, which selects for a finite clause:

\[(33) \text{J’ai profité de [DP ce [CP qu’il a fait beau]]} \]

I-have benefitted of this that-it has made beautiful

I took advantage that it was a nice day

Zaring (1992: 69)

In conclusion, the apparent pronoun turns out to be a non-pronominal D, which changes the syntax and constituent structure of the prepositional finite clauses in French, the main consequence being that the previously adjunct finite clause is assumed to be selected by/integrated into the DP.
What remains in Zaring’s analysis is the idea that the D element acts as an element in the middle preventing the finite clauses from getting Case, in keeping with Stowell’s CRP (Zaring (1992: 71)). Notice that otherwise there remains the uncomfortable question of how to justify the presence of ce. However, I have already shown that Case does not help us understand the syntax of prepositional finite clauses, and there is more to say about this regarding French later on.

To sum up, on the positive side, with this analysis, doing without Case, we can keep the idea that ce acts as any other (non-pronominal) determiners and then rewrite the syntax of P + ce + CP as a PP where a P combines with a DP-CP. Crosslinguistically, we also benefit from the fact that P + ce + CP now turns into the (most approximate) French version to the Spanish el-finite CPs discussed in the previous chapter. On the negative side, the fact that P + ce is optional in many cases seems to challenge the DP analysis because only the P should be eliminated or optional, while ce que should remain, which is contrary to the data, as will be shown in the next section. Crosslinguistically, the previous gains are counteracted by the fact that it can not apply to Italian accioché, for instance, although this may be overrun by adding that ce is a determiner in French while ciò is not in Italian.
5.4.1.2. Optionality of P+ ce

We saw that Spanish and Portuguese allow some optionality or variation in the P. Although French has a different construction, there is still the possibility for finite clauses to appear without the P. What is more interesting is that, contrary to expectations, not all the predicates expected to allow for a P + ce + que do in reality. Zaring (1992: 58-60) enumerates three groups:

1. Mandatory presence of P + ce. The Vs, Ns and Adjs in this group must combine with P + ce when selecting for a finite complement. There is no optionality:

(34) a. Je m’habitue *(à ce) qu’elle dorme pendant la journée
   I me-accustom to this that-she sleeps during the day
   I am getting used to her sleeping during the day

   b. Paul est attentif *(à ce) que ses enfants fassent leurs devoirs le soir
   Paul is attentive to this that his children do their homework the evening
   Paul pays attention that his kids do their homework in the evening

   Zaring (1992: 58)

2. Optional P+ce. As Zaring points out, the majority of these examples are with the P de. The P à tends to be obligatory:
(35) a. Les étudiants se plaignent toujours (de ce) qu’ils ne peuvent pas nous comprendre

The students refl complain always of this that-they not can not us understand

The student are always complaining that they cannot understand us

Zaring (1992: 58)

b. Ma mere est fière (de ce) que ma sœur ait eu tant de succè

My mom is proud of thist that my sister has had so-much of success

My mom os proud of my sister’s big success

Zaring (1992: 59)

c. Le fait (de ce) que tu l’as déjà vu

The fact of this that you it-have already seen

The fact that you have already seen it

3. Ungrammatical P + ce. This is the unexpected group because it consists of those predicates which require Ps with NP/DPs and infinitives but not with finite clauses. Observe the following asymmetries:

(36) a. Je me souviens *(de) son adresse/ *(d’)avoir dit cela / *(de ce) que Marc est parti assez tôt.

I me recall of his address / of-have said that/ of this that Marc is
left rather early

I remember his address/ having said that / that Marc left rather early

Zaring (1992: 59)

b. La crainte *(de)* animaux/ *(de)* se tromper/ *(de ce)* qu’il se trompe

The fear of-the animals/ of refl mistake/ of this that-he refl mistakes

The fear of the animals/ of making a mistake/ of his making a mistake

Even though Zaring (1992) resorts to Case, the exceptionality of the presence or absence of the P points out the problems to cover all the examples and to make any types of predictions as to when the P + ce is going to be optional or not. Take for instance se souvenir vs. se plaindre. Both have the same functional P de, both are pronominal, and yet the former only accepts que while the second allows optionality.

A final group shows the opposite asymmetry: Vs which take a P with CPs but not with NP/DPs. The prepositionality of these complements is called into question once we find out that no y/en pronominalization is allowed. Observe the following patterns:

(37)  a. Pierre a demandé à effectuer cette mission

Pierre has demanded to effect this mission

Pierre has requested to undertake this mission

Huot (1991: 166)
b. Pierre a demandé à ce que tout soit réglé avant la fin de l’année

Pierre has demanded to this that all is paid before the end of the year

Pierre requested to have all paid by the end of the year

Huot (1991: 168)

c. *Pierre a demandé à un changement

Pierre has demanded to a change

Pierre requested a change

Huot (1991: 167)

d. *Pierre y a demandé

Pierre of-it has demanded

Pierre has requested it

Huot (1991: 166)

e. Pierre l’a demandé / Pierre a demandé ça

Pierre it-has demanded / Pierre has demanded that

Pierre has requested it/that

Recall that Old Spanish also had verbs of this type, which were pronominalizable by the direct object pronoun lo (it).
5.4.1.3. The indirect interrogative finite clause

Indirect interrogatives are the other type of finite CP we have examined. Since French allows no argument P + CP, it is expected that indirect interrogatives should be ungrammatical too. In principle, no required P can introduce an interrogative finite clause:

(38) a. *Je ne me souviens pas de [si le magasin est ouvert au mois d’août]
    I not me recall not of if the store is open in-the month of-august
    I don’t remember whether the store opens in August
b. *Je ne me souviens pas d’[à qui j’ai prêté ce libre]
    I not me recall not of-to who I have lent this book
    I do not remember who I lent this book to
c. *Jean ne s’est jamais inquiété d’[avec qui son fils partait en vacances]
    Jean not refl-is never worried of-with who his son left in holidays
    Jean has never worried about who his son was going on vacation with

Huot (1981: 56)

The constraint is linked to the presence of the P because similar sentences are perfectly grammatical with the same or equivalent selecting predicates once the P is removed:
(39)  
a. Jean ne se souvient pas [si ce magasin est ouvert au mois d’août]
   Jean not refl recall not if this store is open in-the month of-august
   Jean does not remember whether this store is open in August

b. Je ne me souviens pas [à qui j’ai prêté ce livre]
   I not me recall not to who I have lent this book
   I do not remember who I lent this book to

   Huot (1981: 152)

c. Jean ne s’est jamais soucié [s’il restait de l’argent à la fin du mois]
   J. not refl-is never worried if-it remained of the-money at the end of-the month
   Jean never worried about whether there was any money left by the end of the month

   Huot (1981: 481)

The constraint seems to be porous, since several linguists report a number of colloquial examples where required Ps select for indirect interrogatives:

(40)  
a. Je ne me souviens pas de [qui a dit cela]
   I not me recall not of who has said that
   I do not remember who said that

   Huot (1981: 57)
b. Tu te rends compte de [combien il doit avoir d’estime pour toi]
   You give account of how much he must have of love for you
   You must realize how much appreciation he has for you

c. Elle a été un peu étonnée d’où on l’emmenait
   She has been a little amazed of where we her-took
   She was a bit astonished about where we were taking here

d. Ça dépend de [comment c’est fait]
   That depends of how it is done
   It depends on how it is done

   Huot (1981: 57, fn 21)

e. On peut s’interroger sur [quelles étaient les circonstances quand le décrochage est intervenu] (Radio Informations, 08/2000)
   We can wonder about which were the circumstances when the switch-over is occurred
   We can wonder which the circumstances were when the switchover took place

   Blanche-Benveniste (2001: 91)

f. à propos de la question de [si le bascon est plus ancien que le latin]
   to purpose of the question of if the Gascon is more ancien that the Latin
   regarding whether Gascon is older than Latin

<www.occitania.org>
The special resistance to Ps deployed by the French indirect interrogatives should be reduced to the overt presence of the P, but there is more to it because such restriction does not explain why these interrogative CPs cannot freely combine with Ns or As, with or without the mediation of a P (Huot (1981: 128-131)):

(41) a. *Es-tu sûr (de) [si Jean a reçu ces papiers]?
    Are-you sure of if Jean has received these papers?
    Are you sure whether Jean has received these papers
    Huot (1981: 131)

b. *Jean était toujours aussi incertain (de) [quand il deviendrait titulaire]
    Jean was always so unsure of when he would-become tenured
    Jean was always unsure when he would get tenure
    Huot (1981: 153)

c. *La question (de) [quand il cesserait de travailler] ne lui était jamais venue à l’esprit
    The question of when he would-stop of work not him was never come to the-spirit
    The question of when he would retire never crossed his mind
    Huot (1981: 130)
Huot (1981) reports, however, several counterexamples that qualify the generalization:

(42)   a. Soyez attentif à [de quoi Pierre parlera]
       Be attentive to of what Pierre will-speak
       Pay attention to what Pierre will speak about

       b. Soyez attentif de quoi Pierre parlera
       Be attentive of what Pierre will-speak
       Pay attention to what Pierre will speak about

Huot (1981: 491)

       c. As-tu fait attention s’il restait assez d’essence?
       Have you made attention if it remained enough of gasoline
       Have you paid attention to whether there was enough gas left?

Huot (1981: 489)

       d. As-tu fait attention où Pierre habitait?
       Have you made attention where Pierre lived
       Have you paid attention to where Pierre was living?

In conclusion, it seems that indirect interrogatives are starting to move toward prepositionality, although the (partial) constraint is still present. Notice that argument P + *que*-clauses are not reported even in colloquial French. We could want to draw a syntactic line between the *que*-clauses and the indirect interrogatives, but again these two
clauses are finite CPs and both share a number of properties; one of them is that indirect interrogatives, like *que*-clauses, can actually be the direct object of transitive verbs:

(43)  

a. Demandez-lui donc [s’il ne connaît pas une auberge]

Ask-him then if-he not knew not a hostel

Ask him if he did not know a hostel

b. Je ne sais vraiment pas [quel charme il peut trouver à cette region]

I not know truly not what charm he can find at this region

I do not know what charm he can find in this region

Huot (1981: 130)

c. Je pense [qu’il dit la verité]

I think that-he says the truth

I think he is telling the truth

d. Je veux [qu’elle chante]

I want that-she sings

I want her to sing

We can not conclude that *que*-clauses and indirect interrogatives are different categories.
5.4.1.4. Adverbial clauses

Thus far the generally held assumption that French does not allow prepositional finite clauses seems to stand up fairly well. The indirect interrogatives already damaged its foundations, and the final coup de grâce comes from the understanding of the syntax of adverbial finite clauses. Adverbial clauses demonstrate that there exists no restriction at all against P + finite CP in French. Observe the following examples:

(44)  a. Pierre a tout prévu pour que ce voyage se passe sans ennui

Pierre has all foreseen for that this trip refl passes without ennui

Pierre has organized everything so that this trip is not boring  

Huot (1981: 59)

b. Pierre est parti sans que personne ait songé à lui demander son adresse

Pierre is left without that person has thought to him request his address

Pierre left without no one thinking of asking him for his address  

Huot (1981: 493)

c. Dès que Pierre sera là, nous commencerons les travaux

Since that Pierre will-be there we will-start the works

Once Pierre arrives, we will start the work  

Huot (1981: 82)

d. C’est une jeune fille au pair qui garde mes enfants pendant que je travaille

It-is a young woman au pair who keeps my kids during that I work
An au pair young woman looks after my kids while I am working 
Delatour et al. (1991: 267)

e. Selon que son travail sera fini ou non, Jean nous rejoindra le 15 août

According-to that his job will-be ended or not, Jean us will-join the 15 August

Depending on whether his work is done or not, Jean will join us on August 15

Huot (1981: 82)

f. J’irai le voir avant qu’il parte (Académie)

I-will-go him see before that-he leaves

I will go see him before he leaves

Grevisse (1980: 1339)

The reason why these examples may have been overlooked has to do with their theoretical definition. If understood as ‘subordinating conjunctions’ they would be categorized as units, as complementizers, and not as PP which happen to have a finite clauses as the object. This is the opinion held by Gaatone (1981), who explains the syntactic structure of avant que as follows:

La préposition introduit et subordonne une phrase nominalisée par que à un terme précédent, de même qu’elle introduit un syntagme nominal et le subordonne à un terme précédent dans la phrase (Gaatone (1981: 204))

The preposition introduces and subordinates a clause nominalized by que to a preceding term, as it introduces a noun phrase and subordinates it to a preceding term in the clause (My translation).
This same PP structure applies to *après que, dès que, pour que, outre que, pendant que, au lieu que, depuis que, sans que* (Gaatone (1981: 206); cf. also Jones (1996: 382)).

In French, as happens with Spanish, not all Ps select for the whole range of complement. For instance, the P *depuis* accepts both an NP/DP (45a) and a finite clause (45b), but surprisingly not an infinitival (45c):

(45)   a. Il n’était pas revenu depuis la fin de la guerre
    He not-was not returned since the end of the war
    He had not returned since the end of the war

b. Il n’était pas revenu depuis que son travail l’avait appelé à Paris
    He not-was not returned since that his job him-had called to Paris
    He had not retuned since his job had taken him to Paris

c. *Il n’était pas revenu depuis avoir déménagé
    He not-was not returned since have move-out
    He had not returned since moving out

Huot (1981: 80)

Other Ps, such as *contre* (against) exhibits even more limited selectional properties, in that it only takes NP/DPs:
(46)  a. Pierre s’est toujours élevé **contre** ses mesures

       Pierre refl-is always rised against his measures

       Pierre has always protested against his measures

b. *Pierre s’est toujours élevé **contre que** de telles mesures soient soumises à un vote

       Pierre refl-is always rised against that of such measures are subjected to a vote

       Pierre has always protested against having such measures put to the vote

c. *Pierre s’est toujours élevé **contre ce que** de telles mesures soient soumises à un vote

       Pierre refl-is always rised against this that of such measures are subjected to a vote

       Pierre has always protested against having such measures put to the vote

       Huot (1981: 94)

Notice that **contre que** is impossible, not even with **ce**. Now this poses another question regarding the features of **ce**. **Contrre** takes nouns, and if **ce** is really a pronoun, then the ungrammaticality of **contre ce que** is left unexplained; unless the relationship between the **que**-clauses and the P must be “closer” than one of just adjunction (cf. Zaring (1992) above).
5.4.1.2. Prepositions and infinitives

Another important restriction is that out of all the selected Ps, only the functional ones, *de* and *à*, can select for an infinitive (cf. Kempchinsky (1992: 35)):

(47)  

a. Marie refuse *de* sortir

Mary refuses of leave
Marey refuses to go out

b. C’est *utile à savoir*

This-is useful to know
It is useful to know

Hawkins and Towell (2001: 273)

Other possible required Ps, while grammatical with NP/DPs, cannot combine with an infinitive. *Compter sur* just eliminates the P, whereas *consister en* switches from *en* to *à*:

(48)  

a. Je compte (*sur*) avoir l’aide de mes amis

I count on have the-help of my friends
I count on having my friends’ help

b. *L’activité consiste en* parler avec les visiteurs

The-activity consists in speak with the visitors
The activity consists in speaking with the visitors
c. L’activité consiste à parler avec les visiteurs

The activity consists to speak with the visitors

The activity consists in speaking with the visitors

Kempchinsky (1992: 35)

Notice again that the restriction does not apply to adverbial clauses, where P + infinitives are perfectly grammatical:

(49)  a. Les étudiants ont fini par comprendre

The students have ended for understand

The students ended up understanding

Jones (1996: 385)

b. J’y suis allé pour parler avec lui

I-there am gone for speak with him

I went there in order to speak with him

c. après avoir acheté une glace

after have bought an ice-cream

after having bought an ice-cream

Hawkins and Towell (2001: 305)

d. sans me regarder

without me look

without looking at me
The behavior of the infinitive partially mirrors that of the *que*-clauses in that it cannot be the object of a number of required Ps. At the same time, this contrast does not extend to the adverbial clauses, again like *que*-clauses. What is striking is that the infinitives can be introduced by Ps but the number is limited to only two when it is required Ps (arguably the most frequent ones and the most “meaningless”). This phenomenon poses the problem how to understand the properties of infinitives and the finite clause with respect to Ps. We should find either no required (that is, functional) Ps at all, resulting in a homogeneous CP syntax (albeit the prepositional indirect interrogatives), or all the required Ps should be grammatical, because it seems problematic to defend the existence of a variety of infinitives depending on the P that select them or not. This would unnecessarily multiply the category infinitive. Notice that the P *en* in *consister en* is a functional P in principle (cf. Scorretti (1991)), therefore its nature is no different from *de* or *à*. Arguing that *en* retains some (locative) meaning is not a proper answer because it disregards the fact that *à* is still locative in French, as in *J'habite à Columbus* (I live in Columbus) and also because more meaning should make the P more likely to appear given that the meaningful Ps in adverbial clauses are not subject to this restriction.

The discussion about the presence or not of the article is irrelevant in French because no infinitive can be accompanied by the article:
(50)  (*Le) boire de la bière le matin empêche de travailler

The drink of the beer the morning prevents of work

Drinking beer in the morning prevents from working

Barra (2002: 279)

Notice that the article is ungrammatical even when the infinitive shows identifiable nominal properties such as PP-modification. If an infinitive with such properties cannot take the article, the French data joins the sum of examples questioning the linkage between nominality, prepositionality, and presence of the article.

In conclusion, it seems difficult to find a coherent explanation for this constraint in terms of the features of the infinitive in relation to those of the finite clause. In the end, it looks like the restriction is more on the side of the Ps than on the side of the CPs, but again this is theoretical problem because, in principle, de, à, en or sur can be functional, that is, they can be required Ps.

5.4.2. Old French

5.4.2.1. Prepositions and finite clauses

5.4.2.1.1. De ce que

De ce que already appears in Old French in those contexts where the P de is selected by a V or any other element. Herman (1963: 223) notes that “[e]n français, la forme habituelle
est *de ce que*: le groupe est assez fréquent à partir du XIIᵉ siècle” (that is, *de ce que* is rather frequent from the 12th century). Observe the following examples:

(51) a. Guenes est fels *d’ico qu’il le traït* (*Roland*, 11th c.)

Guenes is furieux of-this that-he him betrayed

Guenes is furious that he betrayed him

b. Achimelech s’esmerveillad *de çó que* David vint si sultifs (*Li quatre libre des reis*, 12th c.)

Achimelech refl-marvelled of this that David came so alone

Achimelech marveled that David came on its own

Herman (1963: 223)

The fact that this *ce* was a real pronoun is not in doubt given that it could be the direct complement of Ps and Vs, at least until the 16th century. Interestingly, *ce* as object was lost with Vs and remained only with Ps (Darmesteter (1931: 72-73, 4th book)). This questions the pronominal character of this *ce* (cf. Zaring (1992) above for modern French).

5.4.2.1.2. Argument P + finite clause: *De quoi*

The data point to the conclusion that there seems to have been no period in French language history when argument *de que* or *à que* have been grammatical. However, there
was an alternative to *de que* which was indeed grammatical in Old and Classical French. Tobler (1905: 207) mentions the existence of a *de quoi* which is syntactically equivalent to Spanish *de que*:

(52)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. non sans regret de quoy} & \text{ (…) nous n’avons eu des myettes du pain} \\
\text{(Marguerite d’Alençon u. G. Briçonnet, 16}^{\text{th}} \text{ c.)} \\
\text{Not without regret of that we not-have had some crumbs of-the bread} \\
\text{Not without regretting that we have not had breadcrumbs} \\
\text{Tobler (1905: 207-208)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. aucuns ayans envie, De quoy Vertu perpetuoit sa vie (Marot, 16}^{\text{th}} \text{ c.)} \\
\text{no one having envy of that Virtue perpetuated his life} \\
\text{no one envying the fact that Virtue perpetuated his life} \\
\text{Glauning (1873: 15)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c. L’autre se plaint dequoy ses bras tant beaux devienent longs rameaux} \\
\text{(Marot, 16}^{\text{th}} \text{ c.)} \\
\text{The-other refl complains of that his arms so beautiful become large branches} \\
\text{The other complains that his beautiful arms are becoming large branches} \\
\text{Glauning (1873: 15)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d. Je me sens bien heureux de quoi mon petit Loir est si près de ta Sarthe} \\
\text{(Sonnets, Ronsard, 16th c.)} \\
\text{I me feel well happy of that my little Loir is so close of your Sarthe}
\end{align*}
\]
I am very happy that my little Loir river is so close to your Sarthe river

Meyer-Lübke (1900: 655-656)

e. Je ne m’étonne plus de quoi je gagne tant (Galerie du Palais, Corneille, 1631-32)

I not me-surprise more of that I earn so-much

I am not surprised any more about earenign so much

Meyer-Lübke (1900: 656)

f. Si le monde se plaint de quoi je parle trop de moy, je me plains de quoy

il ne pense seulement pas à soy (Les Essais, Montaigne, 16th c.)

If the world refl complains of that I speak too-much of me, I complain of that

it not thinks only not to it

If the world complains that I speak too much about myself, I complain that it
doesn’t think only about itself

This is the kind of prepositional combination that mirrors Spanish de que, that is an argument P + finite CP without any pronoun ce and therefore with direct selection of the clause by the P.

Now it is obvious that the examples do not include que but quoi, which is the tonic relative/interrogative pronoun found in, for instance, pourquoi (lit. ‘for what’, why). If it is a relative/interrogative pronoun and not a complementizer, then there is nothing special because pronouns can be selected for by a P in Old French. However, Tobler (1905: 208)
argues that this *quoi* is “identique non pas au pronom *quoi*, mais à la conjonction *que*”.

That is to say, this *quoi* is not a relative/interrogative pronoun *what* but rather a real complementizer *that*. A similar explanation is found in Meyer-Lübke (1900):

Nous avons un sens different dans *de quoi*, qui ne devient assez frequenau XV*Ve siècle et qui doit avoir supplanté *de que* par analogie avec d’autres cas où l’on avait *quoi* tonique après les prepositions. (Meyer-Lübke (1900: 655-656))

We have a different sense in *de quoi*, which does not become frequent until the 15th century and that must have taken the place of *de que* by analogy with other cases where the tonic *quoi* appeared after a preposition (My translation).

The complementizer nature of this *quoi* finds support in other uses which show the interchangeability between *que* and *quoi*: for instance, *por quoi* alongside *por que*, and *par quoi* alongside *par quoi*, where the atonic *que* takes the place of *quoi* (Tobler (1905: 208); cf. also Moignet (1973: 162, 248, 321) and Schlieben-Lange (1992: 348)):

(53)  

Coment porra de ceste estoire ouvrer, **Par quoi** la puist seur verité fonder

(*Enfances Ogter*, c. 1340)

How will-can of this story work for what it can on truth found

How s/he will be able to work with story in fashion to found it on truth

Tobler (1905: 208)
In addition, Tobler (1905: 209, fn 2) notes that the opposite is also attested, whereby the atonic form *(que)* is used instead of the expected tonic *(quoi)*:

(54)  
a. A faire chose de conrie *(Fabliaux et contes, eds. Barbazan et Meon)*
   To do thing of which-we-laugh
   To do something we can laugh at

b. Ce fu cele (…) De c’om porroit plus grant bien dire Que… *(Joufrois, 12th c.)*
   It was this of who-we could more great well say that…
   It was her of who we could say that…

Tobler (1905: 209, fn 2)

5.4.2.1.3. Adverbial clauses with optional pronouns

Other surprising Old French data are found in the realm of adverbial clauses. Like Spanish and Portuguese, adverbial prepositional finite clauses are attested in Old French. The surprise in Old French is that, as Rouquier (1990: 55) mentions, Old French showed alternations between the presence or absence of *ce* in adverbial clauses, as listed below (cf. also Grevisse (1980: 1249)):

(55) Presence and absence of *ce* attested:
   après ce que/après que
   avant ce que/avant que
(56) Only direct selection attested:
    avers que
    envers que
    entre que
    jusque que

(57) Obligatory presence of ce:
    à ce que
    de ce que
en ce que
endroit ce que
o ce que
parmi ce que
sur ce que

First, consider the following examples which prove that adverbial prepositional finite clauses with pronouns. Notice that some of the examples listed go beyond the Old French period, illustrating how this pronominal possibility was not a chronologically negligible phenomenon:

(58)  a. *por ce que* boene estoit et bele (*Erec et Enide*, Chrétien de Troyes, 1170)

For this that good was and beautiful
Because she was good and beautiful

b. *Que devant ce que* Jhesus Criz Venist en terre (*Roman de l' Estoire dou Graal*, Robert de Boron, 1199)

That before this that Jesus Christ came in earth
That before JC came to Earth

c. *Et apres ce que* la messe fu chantee (*Queste del Saint Graal*, 1225)

And after this that the mass was sung
And after the mass was sung
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d. car elle est morte des ce que vos alastes a la cort le roi Artus (*Questa del Saint Graal, 1225*)

because she is dead since this that you went to the court the king Arthur
because she is dead since you went to King Arthur’s Court

e. sans ce que je l’ai trouvé (Vaugelas, 17th c.)

without this that I him-have found
without the fact that I have found him

Grevisse (1980: 1250)

To this list I would like to add the adverbial usage of à ce que, which, according to Herman (1983: 220), “n’apparaissant qu’au XIIe siècle, n’est pas une locution finale, mais (...) elle est employee, en général, dans un sens temporal”. That is, a temporal “conjunction” which is first attested in the 12th century. Observe the following example:

(59) Á çó qu’il al prueire parlad (*Li quatre libre des reis*, 12th c.)

To this that-he to-the priest spoke
Once he spoke with the priest

Herman (1983: 220)

This conjunction is syntactically different from argument à ce que. As for de ce que, Jensen (1990: 503) points that it was common with verbs of emotion “conveying a strong
causal connotation” (cf. also Darmesteter (1931: 192, 4th book)). Consider the following examples:

\[(60) \]  
\[\text{a. sont dolant de ce qu’il s’en va (L’Escoufle, Jean Renart, c. 1200)} \]
\[\text{are painful of this that-he refl-from-there goes} \]
\[\text{They are sad that (= because) he is leaving} \]

\[\text{b. mut li aveit pesé de cego qu’il l’ot si cungeé (Chievrefoiil, Marie de France, 12th c.)} \]
\[\text{much him had weighed of this that-he her-had thus left} \]
\[\text{He had suffered much that (= because) he had left her this way} \]
\[\text{Jensen (1990: 503)} \]

Notice, however, that this strong connotation is still present in Spanish with the same type of complements to the same type of emotion verbs, as can be seen in *Me alegro de que vengas* (I am happy that you are coming) being easily reinterpreted as *Me alegro porque vienes* (I am happy because you’re coming). How we define the interrelation between syntax and semantics, how well this distinction applies to other *de*-complement-taking verbs and categories, and in particular whether we (can or must) regard the object of the emotion as syntactically the same as a cause is no more than the nth case of uncertainty in the quest for a clear-cut division between arguments and adjuncts.
As mentioned above, many Ps allowed direct selection, thus in line with the syntax of Old Spanish and Old Portuguese (cf. Buridant (2000: 567 et passim)). Therefore, we can conclude that there was no constraint in French either against prepositional finite clauses:

(61) a. **Des que** cele les vit venir, de parler ne se pot tenir (*Erec et Enide*, Chrétien de Troyes, 1170)

Since that that them saw come, of talk not refl could control

Once she saw them coming, she could not keep herfeslf from speaking

Jensen (1990: 479)

b. Ensemble furent **jusque** a Deu s’en ralerent (*Saint Alexis*, 11th c.)

Together were until-that to God refl-there returned

They were together until they returned to God

c. La noit demurent **tresque** vint al jur cler (*Roland*, 11th c.)

the night rest until-that came to-the day clear

They remained the night until the clear day

d. Alés vos ent **avant que** pis ne vos aveigne (*Roman de Troie*, Benoît de Sainte-Maure, 12th c.)

Go you from-here before that worse not you comes

Go away before something worse comes to you

Jensen (1990: 481)
e. **devant que** la mort le retiengne (Roman de Thèbes, 1150)

   before that the death him retains

   before death takes him

f. **pour que** je la veulle destruiré (Roman de Thèbes, 1150)

   for that I it want destroy

   because I want to destroy it

g. Et **selon que** leur force est grandre (Le Livre du chemin de lonc estude, Christine de Pisan, 1402)

   And according-to that their force is grander

   And the greater their force is

Darmesteter (1930) established a diachronic correspondence between the pronominal alternatives and the non-pronominal ones in some cases while in general highlighting that the reasons behind the dropping or maintenance of the pronoun may be capricious:

Dans quelques-unes de ces locutions, le pronom *ce* est tombé à une époque plus ou moins récente: *avant que, après que, depuis que, pour que* (blâmé par Vaugelas), *puisque*. *Ce* est resté dans les autres locutions. Il est difficile de dire pourquoi il s’est maintenu ici et est tombé là. (Darmesteter (1930: 180, 2nd book))

In some of these locutions, the pronoun *ce* dropped in a more or less recent period: *avant que, après que, depuis que, pour que* (censured by Vaugelas), *puisque*. *Ce* remained in the other locutions. It is difficult to say why it remains in the latter cases and dropped in the former. (My translation).
What all the previous examples demonstrate is that the presence of the pronoun *ce* may not be described as a last resort strategy to avoid Ps from selecting for a finite clause. Traditionally, the presence of this pronoun could be justified in terms of Stowell’s CRP, or any other work in those lines (Barra (2002) itself), but since Ps could take finite clauses since the Late Latin period, the existence of the adverbial pronominal alternatives should immediately be ungrammatical or unnecessary. If there had been real resistance against P + finite clauses for some reason (for instance, Barra’s (2002) appeal to the lack of nominal features of the clause) etc., we would expect the pronominal alternative to apply across the board and to be the only possible outcome.

Finally, on the one hand, note that the pronominal strategy does not differentiate between the syntax of argument and adjunct (adverbial) finite clauses, which forces us to reject any attempt at explaining the syntax of P + finite CPs in terms of the opposition argument/adjunct. On the other hand, a Case-based explanation runs into problems here too, because *ce* was a pronoun and, as such, a nominal. According to Case theory, nouns need Case to be licensed; therefore *ce* must have received Case. If *ce* received Case, then the finite clauses did as well.

5.4.2.2. Infinitives and prepositions

Old French infinitives speak well of the lack of fixed prepositionality selection that we have also seen in Spanish and Portuguese (cf. van Reenen and Schøsler (1993), Buridant
Observe the following examples with verbs allowing multiple selection:

\[(62)\]

\(a.\) pensent Ø vivre touz iours (*Le sermon*, Guischart de Beaulieu, 12\(^{th}\) c.)

\[
\text{think live all days}
\]

they think they are going to live forever

\(b.\) que il n’i pensent pas a ateindre (*Miracles de Notre Dame de Chartres*, Jean le Marchant, 13th c.)

\[
\text{that they not-there think not to reach}
\]

that they do not think to arrive there

\(c.\) pensa tost de moi sivre (*Le roman de la rose*, Guillaume de Lorris, c. 1230)

\[
\text{thought soon of me follow}
\]

He thought to follow me soon

\(d.\) L’aultre se retira et commença de rire (*Cent nouvelles nouvelles*, 15th c.)

\[
\text{The-other refl retired & commenced of laugh}
\]

The other left and started to laugh

\(e.\) il commença tresfort et soudainement a plorer (*Cent nouvelles nouvelles*, 15th c.)

\[
\text{he started very strong & suddenly to cry}
\]

Suddenly he started to cry very much

van Reenen and Schøsler (1993: 528)
f. commença Ø grouller (*Cent nouvelles nouvelles*, 15th c.)

started growl

He started to growl

Martineau (2000: 166)

The fact that certain verbs could use a P optionally raises the question whether we must conclude that the presence or absence of the P is irrelevant to the licensing of their objects. Linguists have not argued the complement status of the objects when there is no preposition present. Actually, the opposite has been proposed, arguing that the infinitives with *a* were probably final adjuncts first and were grammaticalized later (cf. Martineau (2000), Schulte (2001, 2004)).

At any rate, accepting the hypothesis of reanalysis, we see that the argumenthood of the *a*-infinitives is not related to the entrance of the P because they were prepositional already before becoming arguments. A Case-based study would also encounter theoretical problems to justify how it is possible for the objects to be non-prepositional. We already saw a similar situation in Old Spanish.

As expected, lexical Ps could take infinitives in adverbial clauses:

(63) a. *A lui tranchier mar querras fer* (*Roman d’Eneas*, 12th c.)

To it cut badly will-want iron

In order to cut it you will need

Ménard (1976: 166)
b. *Après mangier* sont alé reposer (*Le Couronnement de Louis*, 12th c.)

After eat are gone rest

After eating, they went to rest

c. Ne veintroiz mie *par foïr* (*Roman d’Eneas*, 12th c.)

Not will-win not for flee

You will not win by fleeing

Ménard (1976: 167)

d. N’en partirés *sans* la teste *trenchier* (*Raoul de Cambrai*, 12th c.)

Not-from-here will-go without the head cut

You will not leave without me cutting your head

Ménard (1976: 168)

5.4.3. Conclusions

- In both Old and modern French Ps may take finite clauses, thus there is no constraint against P + finite CP
- Indirect interrogatives can only partially be introduced by Ps. More examples are attested in colloquial French
- Infinitives can also be introduced by a P
- There is optionality/variation, with some special limitations (remember that there are some limitations in Spanish as well). In particular, there are some asymmetrical examples where the presence of *de ce* is blocked even though the
selecting category requires the P with other complements. This calls into question the standard syntactic analysis of *de/à ce que* because it seems difficult to explain why P + *ce* would be banned

- Argument prepositional finite clauses are not attested today, but there is a very interesting counterexample in *de quoi*

- In present-day French the *ce* element runs into problems if defined as a pronoun

- The coexistence of direct selection and the pronominal alternative in Old French proves that *ce* was not intended as a last resort to avoid P + CP

- The pronominal strategy does not differentiate between argument and adjunct clauses

- The fact that *de ce que* and *à ce que* did not lose the pronoun *ce* is not linked to any type of restrictions against P + finite CP. For instance, the pronoun *ce* is maintained even with the adverbial *à ce que*, where arguably the pronoun was unnecessary since adverbial clauses allowed direct prepositional selection

- Infinitives provide an extra look into the imperfect relationship between nominality, prepositions, and presence of articles

- Barra (2002: 399) argues that French lacks argument finite clauses. However, apart from other (crosslinguistic) evidence presented in this dissertation, the fact that French clauses allow extraction is a syntactic sign of their argument status. For instance, extraction is allowed from an *à ce que* subordinate clause in *Qui tiens-tu à ce que Jean rencontre ?* (Bouchard and Hirschbuhler (1987: 50))
5.5. Italian

5.5.1. Present-day Italian

5.5.1.1. P + finite CPs

5.5.1.1.1. Argument P + finite CPs

5.5.1.1.1.1. Che-clauses

In principle, Italian groups with French in not allowing direct selection of the finite clause in argument contexts. Consider the following examples with prepositional verbs:

(64) a. Max si dimentica (*di) che ha promesso un viaggio a Pio

Max refl forgets of that has promised a trip to Pio

Max forgets that he promised Pio a trip

Elia et al (1981: 349)

b. Luca si lamenta (*di) che mangia poco con Maria

Luca refl regrets of that eats little with Maria

Luca regrets eating seldom with Maria

Elia et al (1981: 375)

c. Angelica si vergognò (*di) che il padre l’avesse vista seminuda

Angelica refl shamed of that the father her had seen half-naked

Angelica felt ashamed that her father had seen her half-naked

Maiden and Robustelli (2000: 369)
d. Ciò dipende (*da) che tu sei venuto
That depends from that you are come
That depends on your having come

Elia et al (1981: 284)

The same constraints apply to finite clauses with nouns and adjectives:

(65) a. Ciò dipende dal fatto (*di) che tu sei venuto
That depends from-the fact of that you are come
That depends on the fact that you have come

Elia et al (1981: 284)

b. L’idea/L’ipotesi (*di) che Luigi non sappia l’italiano è davvero assurda
The-idea/The-hypothesis of that Luigi not knows the-Italian is truly absurd
The idea/hypothesis that Luigi does not speak Italian is really stupid

Maiden and Robustelli (2000: 319)

c. Pucci è felice (*di) che tu venga
Pucci is happy of that you come
Pucci is happy you are coming

Elia et al (1981: 312)

d. Sei certo (*di) che la cintura sia allacciata?
Are sure of that the belt is fastened
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Are you sure the belt is fastened?

Maiden and Robustelli (2000: 324)

Other prepositional verbs which may accept bare finite clauses include *assicurarsi, dimenticarsi, meravigliarsi, ricordarsi*, etc. (cf. Acquaviva (1991: 647)).

At this point the data seem to show that argument P + finite CPs are ruled out in Italian. But, as opposed to French and in partial agreement with Spanish and Portuguese, Italian does have some argument P + finite CPs. As Rizzi (1988: 509) indicates, in Italian the preposition *a* may select for a “frase con verbo di modo finito” (a finite clause), as the following examples illustrate:

(66)  

a. Ada bada (a) **che** tutto riesca

Ada cares to that all succeeds

Ada takes care that everything turns out well

Elia et al. (1981: 295)

b. Tengo (a) **che** sia avvertita

I have to that is warned

I am anxious that she be informed

c. Fa attenzione (a) **che** gli studenti siano preparati

Make attention to that the students are prepared
Pay attention that the students are ready

Ledgeway (2000: 82)

d. Maria mira (a) che il futuro sia felice

Maria looks to that the future is happy

Maria looks forward to a happy future

Elia et al. (1981: 344)

e. Mario aspira (a) che scrivano

Mario aspires to that write

Mario aspires to have them write

f. Mario contribuisce (a) che scrivano

Mario contributes to that write

Mario contributes to their writing

Scorretti (1991: 160)

The same possibility is available for nouns and adjectives:

(67) a. Mari ha interesse (a) che Diego la perdoni

Mari had interest to that Diego her forgives

Mari is interested in Diego’s forgiveness

Elia et al. (1981: 343)

b. Sono favorevole (a) che tu parta

Am favorable to that you leave
I am favorable to your leaving

Rizzi (1988: 519)

c. Sono contrario (a) che tu parta subito

Am opposed to that you leave immediately

I am opposed to your leaving right away

Cinque (1990: 36)

There is a very clear difference between the behavior of de and that of a. Notice also that a but not de has a pronominal counterpart of the type P + pronoun + che:

(68) In linea generale, occorre fare la massima attenzione acciochè le feci degli animali malati non contaminino i mangimi e l'acqua di bevanda

In line general, occurs make the maximum attention to-this-that the feces of the animals sick not pollute the fodder and the water of drink

In general, it is necessary to pay maximum attention to avoid that the feces of the sick animals pollutes the fodder and the drinking water

Notice that the existence of this pronominal construction is not incompatible with the grammaticality of the non-pronominal a che, which calls into question the validity of many of the similar explanations of French à ce que and de ce que. Besides, if
pronominal intervention were a real last resort we would expect to find *dicciochè, which is contrary to fact (but see section 5.5.2.1.1. for Old Italian).

Acquaviva (1991) tries to capture the difference between *a and di* by arguing that the \*P a actually introduces a final adverbial clause, that is, an adjunct and not an argument. This could be the case, meaning that it could be an adverbial clause. Italian supports this option because *a* may introduce clear adverbial final clauses, thus showing different syntactic and semantic properties. Consider the following examples where *a* equals *per*, and both Ps have a final interpretation (both are lexical Ps):

(69)  

a. Vado a Milano *a* trovare un mio amico  
Go to Milan to find a my friend  
I am going to Milan to meet a friend of mine

b. Vado a Milano *per* trovare un mio amico  
Go to Milan for find a my friend  
I am going to Milan to meet a friend of mine

Acquaviva (1991: 652)

However, then we need to question what we do with the rest of the sentences. Furthermore, the final interpretation is not available in all cases. In the following example it is difficult to extract a final interpretation out of the prepositional finite clause:
In addition, such a recategorization of this P should have crosslinguistic consequences, for instance for Spanish. Once we include Spanish or Portuguese, we should question whether the adjunct analysis should be extended to *de* too, because *de* can introduce finite clauses in these two languages. Although I have shown that there are adjunct *de que* clauses in Spanish, it is in opposition to those cases where they are argument.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the existence of several examples, collected from Google, which feature *di che*. The examples have not been controlled for origin or native language of the author. Consequently, it is logical to suspect that some of these examples may be mistakes or typos, but the fact that there are many of them (on just two searches I collected 26 examples, including *pensare di che*, *prima di che*, *sicuro di che*, and *dicere di che*) raises the question whether there may be something else going on of more linguistic value. At any rate, this is just an initial approach in need of further clarification, control of the examples, and deeper examination:

(71) a. li abbiamo nutriti e cresciuti e amati già *prima di che* nascessero

Them have nurtured & grown & loved yet before of that were-born
We already nurtured, grew, and loved them before they were born

b. Pensavo di che la'more verso mio marito fosse ineguagliabile

I thought that the love toward my husband were incomparable

5.5.1.1.2. Indirect interrogatives

The complicated situation with *che*-clauses reappears in the other type of finite CP. In principle, we should expect that no prepositional indirect interrogatives would be grammatical in Italian, and this is what we find with *se*-clauses (*whether*-clauses) (cf. Elia et al (1981: 286), Fava (1991: 676)). Consider the following examples:

(72)  

a. Dubitava se gli fosse permesso

Doubted if him were allowed

He doubted whether it was allowed to him

Fava (1991: 676)

b. *Dubitava su se gli fosse permesso

Doubted on if him were allowed

He doubted about whether it was allowed to him
c. Dipende se vuoi viaggiare oggi o domani

Depends if want travel today or tomorrow

It depends on whether you want to travel today or tomorrow

<http://forum.wordreference.com/showthread.php?t=371973>

d. *Dipende da se vuoi andare in cinema o no

Depends from if want go in cinema or not

It depends on whether you want to go to the movies or not

e. non si può mai essere sicuri se una ridefinizione semantica analoga sarà accettabile

not refl can never be sure if a redefinition semantic analogous will-be acceptable

One can never be sure whether an analogous semantic redefinition will be acceptable

<www.robertocrivello.com/parolecomuni.html>

f. *Non sono sicuro di se veramente mi piace questo libro

Not am sure of if truly me pleases this book

I am not really sure wther I like this book

g. Lo tormentava il dubio se gli convenisse veramente farlo

Him tormented the doubt if him should truly do-it

He was tormented by the doubt whether it was better for him to do it

Fava (1991: 715)
h. *Lo tormentava il dubio di se gli convenisse veramente farlo

Him tormented the doubt of if him should truly do-it

He was tormented by the doubt whether it was better for him to do it

No P can take an indirect interrogative with *se, despite the fact that these clauses are pronominalized with the corresponding prepositional clitic *ne, as expected of a PP:

(73) [Se è già partito], non *ne sono certo (Sandro Sessarego, pc)

If is yet left not of-it am certain

Whether he has already left, I am not certain of it

The ungrammaticality vanishes as soon as the indirect interrogative is introduced not by the complementizer *se but why a wh-phrase, as the following examples prove (cf. Fava (1991: 676)):

(74) a. Dubitava su [*che cosa gli fosse veramente permesso]

Doubted on what thing him was truly allowed

He doubted about what was truly allowed to him

Fava (1991: 676)

b. e poi si lamenta di [*perché il paese non va avanti]

& after refl regrets of why the country not goes forward
And afterward he feels sorry thinking about why the country does not advance

<www.forum.rai.it/lofiversion/index.php/t184350.html>

c. Perciò dipende da [perché e da [come è finita] ]
   For that depends from why and from how is finished
   For that reason it depends on why and how it was ended
   <www.acomeamore.com/forum/ricominciare-t5788.html>

d. la risposta a [perché il cielo è blu]
   the answer to why the sky is blue
   <www.focus.it/Community/cs/forums/permalink/196437/197085/ShowThread.aspx>

e. La questione di [chi sia l'autore dell'Iliade e dell'Odissea] continua ad essere al centro di vivaci dispute per secoli
   The question of who is the-author of the-I. & of the-O. continues to be at the center of lively disputes for centuries
   The question of who the author of the Iliad and the Odyssey is continues to be at the center of lively debate for centuries
   <bfp.sp.unipi.it/dida/oscrit/omeric.htm>

f. perché non sei mai sicuro di [quando sarà l'ultima volta che li vedrai]  
   because not are never sure of when will-be the last time that him will see
   because you are never sure when it will be the last you will see him
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Contrary to the cases with a che, where the P a may be optional, the presence of the P with these interrogatives seems to be obligatory at least at times, as the following example indicates:

(75) Avevo dubitato *(di) che cosa gli sarebbe potuto accadere

Have doubted of what thing him would-be could happen

We had doubted about what could have happened to him

Fava (1991: 700)

Once again, we find that there is not regular, generalized behavior. If indeed Ps cannot take finite CPs in Italian, apart from the a che examples, we find that wh-interrogatives can be perfectly introduced not only by a but also by di, which means that there is no actual constraint against di + finite CP. If we wanted to invoke Case here, it would be difficult to justify why Case can not be assigned to the finite CP with che/se while there is no problem to assign the exact same Case to the also finite CP indirect interrogatives listed above (and in the examples with a che).

One could think of a categorial difference between indirect interrogatives and che/que-clauses, but this is not possible because there are che/que-clauses and indirect interrogatives which can indeed be prepositional and thus exhibit the same behavior. The difference might be between total interrogatives (yes/no questions) introduced by the complementizer se/si/whether and partial interrogatives introduced by wh-phrases, but
then the differentiation should hold true in other contexts as well. For instance, a clear problem would be how to reconcile the newly separated categories with the fact that both can be the direct object of a transitvie verb. In addition, this differentiation does not apply crosslinguistically, since it is not active in Spanish and Portugese, and several other languages (see chapter 6).

5.3.1.1.2. Finite clauses and articles

Spanish allows the article with finite clauses. Portuguese and French do not. Italian does not either, judging from the following example:

(76)  *Il che venga alla festa non significa niente

   The that comes to-the party not means nothing
   His coming to the party does not mean anything

According to some linguists (for instance, Barra (2002)), the presence of the article makes explicit the nominal characteristics of the finite clauses in a language. Once we have seen that Italian finite clauses can be the object of Ps, following the logical argument we should expect to find the finite clause with the article, but it is not the case. The same happens in Portuguese (see section 5.3.1.3.), where argument P + finite CPs are nonetheless widely attested.
However, if we are to conclude that Italian finite clauses cannot be nominal nor nominalized with an article, we have no answer for the following grammatical example, where a finite CP of the indirect interrogative type appears with the article and as the object of a P:

(77) Informati del come e il perché si è fatto

Informed of-the how and the why refl is done
Informed about how and why it was done

Lapesa (2000: 551)

Notice that por qué and cómo were the only interrogatives that accepted the article in Spanish as well. One more asymmetry that leaves us once again without any type of generalization as to the nominal features of the finite clause, this time in Italian.

5.5.1.1.3. Adverbial P + finite CPs

As in French, the question whether Italian allows or not prepositional finite clauses comes to a definite, positive end once adverbial clauses are brought into the discussion. Observe the following examples:
a. **Perché** possa comprare
   For that can buy
   So that he can buy

b. **Perché** ha mentito
   For that has lied
   Because he has lied

Tekavčić (1980: 463)

(c. Ciò è avvenuto **senza che** io potessi far nulla
   This is occurred without that I could do nothing
   This happened without my being able to avoid it

Rizzi (1988: 510)

d. Ha fatto di tutto **salvo che** non ha voluto perdere l’onore
   Has done of all save that not has wanted lose the-honor
   He has done everything except that he did not want to lose his honor

Tekavčić (1980: 459)

e. **Dacché** Maria ha cominciato a fumare
   Since that Maria has begun to smoke
   Since Maria started to smoke

Giusti (1991: 725)

f. **Dopo che** Serena conobbe Mario
   After that Serena met Mario
At the same time, there are several possible combinations that do not exist (Elia et al (1981: 285-286):

(79) *da che/*in che/*su che/*dentro che/*sopra che/*con che/*contro che

5.5.1.2. Infinitives and prepositions

Italian also has argument infinitives. Remember that Rizzi (1988) speaks of real Ps versus prepositional complementizers on the basis of Italian infinitives. The former are depicted in the following examples, where the P is obligatory when the argument is an NP/DP or an infinitive:

(80) a. Dubito di poter capire quel libro
    Doubt of can understand that book
    I doubt I can understand this book

b. Dubito della tua buona fede
    Doubt of-the your good faith
    I doubt your good intentions
c. Mi meraviglio **di** vederti così abbattuto
    Me marvel **of** see-you this depressed
    I am amazed to see you this depressed

d. Mi meraviglio **del** tuo comportamento
    Me marvel **of**-the your behavior
    I am amazed at your behavior

    Acquaviva (1991: 637)

e. Oreste tiene **al** successo
    Oreste cares to-the success
    Oreste is looking forward to success

f. Oreste tiene **a** che tutto vada bene
    Oreste has to that all goes well
    Oreste cares very much that everything goes well

    Elia et al (1981: 283)

Alongside these prepositional verbs, there are examples where the P only appears for the infinitives, not for NP/DPs. These are the so-called prepositional complementizers:

(81)  a. Gianni ha promesso **di** aiutarci
    Gianni has promised of help-us
    Gianni has promised to help us
b. Gianni l’ha promesso

Gianni it-has promised

Gianni has promised that

c. Paolo dice di non poter venire

Paolo says of not can come

Paolo says he cannot come

Vincent (1997: 171)

d. Paolo lo dice

Paolo it says

Paolo says so

As can be seen, these infinitives pronominalize with the direct object pronoun lo, which is why they are not considered real PPs. Old Spanish and French show similar examples. Remember also that, while Rizzi (1988) differentiates between real Ps and non real Ps, other linguists such as Scorretti (1991), Rauh (1993) or Svenonius (2004) group all these cases under the label functional, non-projecting P on the basis that they do not have meaning and that they do not select for the object (cf. section 3.3).

Italian infinitives may be introduced by a reduced number of Ps, somehow mirroring the situation with finite clauses. Lexical prepositions in adverbial infinitive clauses are grammatical:
(82)  

a. Vado a Milano a trovare un mio amico

Go to Milan to find a my friend

I am going to Milan to meet a friend of mine

b. Vado a Milano per trovare un mio amico

Go to Milan for find a my friend

I am going to Milan to meet a friend of mine

Acquaviva (1991: 652)

c. Se ne andò senza parlare

Refl from-there went without speak

He left without speaking

Kempchinsky (1992: 41, fn 20)

d. Dopo aver cenato, uscì di nuovo

After have dined, went-out of again

After having dinner, I went out again

Skytte and Salvi (1991: 556)

However, when it comes to argument clauses, only the functional Ps *dì, a* (and some limited examples with *da* in fixed phrases such as *averedare da* + infinitive) are allowed, as the following examples illustrate (cf. Skytte (1983: 487-536), Cinque (1990), Kempchinsky (1992)):
(83) a. *Contavo su essere onesto
    Counted on be honest
    I counted on being honest
b. *L’ho dedotto da non essere stato accettato
    It-have deduced from not be been accepted
    I have deduced it from not having been accepted
c. *La sua fortuna consiste in avere molti amici
    The his fortune consists in have many friends
    His fortune consists in having many friends
    Cinque (1990: 35)
d. La donna si accontentò di guardarla senza dire nulla
    The woman was satisfied with looking at him without saying anything
    Maiden and Robustelli (2000: 369)
e. L’hanno costretto a lasciare la scuola
    The forced him to leave the school
    Skytte and Salvi (1991: 499)
h. Si dimenticò che aveva da finire la spesa
    He forgot that he had to finish doing the shopping
    Skytte and Salvi (1991: 532)
Some prepositional verbs even change their required Ps for one of the allowed ones. Observe the following contrasting examples:

(84)  
a. Conto **di** / *su essere a casa per la sette  
Count of on be at house for the seven  
I count on being at home by seven  
b. Conto *dei / sui ritardi dei treni  
Count of-the / on-the delays of-the trains  
I take the train delays for granted  

Acquaviva (1991: 649)

Both examples include the same verb, but, while *contare su* may take NP/DPs, the P must change into *di* in order to accept an infinitive. Notice that *di* is not acceptable for NP/DPs.

One of the options available in Italian to save the infinitives of prepositional verbs consists in using an infinitive with an article, a construction that we already know from the Spanish examples. Consider the following examples, all of which would be ungrammatical if the article *il* (the) were not accompanying the infinitive:

(85)  
a. Non per questo cessava **dal** pensare a lui  
Not for this ceased of-the think to him  
Not for this did he stop thinking about him
b. insistendo **nel** notare che il modo di essere… (*Etica e politica*, Croce)

insisting **in-the** note that the way fo be

insisting on noting that the way of being

c. una certa fantasia **nell’**inventar pretesti che mi divertivano (*Le piccole vacanze*, Arbasino)

a certain **in-the** invent excuses that me amused

a certain fantasy in making up excuses that amused me

Skytte and Salvi (1991: 567)

d. Finirai **col** farlo arrabbiare

Will-end with-the do-him anger

You will end up making him angry

Skytte and Salvi (1991: 534)

e. una conseguenza naturale **dell’**esser nati (*La storia*, Morante)

a consequence natural of-the be born

a natural consequence of being born

Skytte and Salvi (1991: 569)

The conclusion would be that only infinitives with articles are grammatical because of some particular properties of the Italian infinitives. As a result, it would seem fair to draw the generalization that in Italian infinitives with articles are indeed perfect reflexes of
nouns, etc. Now the question is that infinitives with articles are not always grammatical in all the possible (and expected) cases, such as the following ones:

(86) a. *Mi pento dell’aver parlato
    Me regret of-the-have spoken
    I regret having spoken

    Skytte and Salvi (1991: 569)

    b. *Contavo sull’essere onesto
    Counted on-the be honest
    I counted on being honest

Furthermore, the presence of the article cannot be regarded as a special strategy in the language to somehow take care of the impossibility of some required (functional) Ps to select for a CP, even if it is infinitival. This generalization does not hold up because lexical prepositions can also take infinitives with articles:

(87) a. Nel guardarlo, Anna trasse ancora un sospiro profondo, quasi dolorante
    (Menzogna e sortilegio, Morante, 193)
    In-the look-him, Anna brought also a sigh deep almost painful
    While looking at him, Anna gave a deep sigh, almost painful
b. With-the do-him continuous snubs, will-end for do-it anger on-the serious
By snubbing him all the time, you will end up maing him really angry

c. Anna, all’udirlo, non seppe nascondere un suo rapido turbamento (Menzogna e sortilegio, Morante, 167)
Anna, at-the-hear-him, not knew hide a her rapid confusion
Anna, after hearing him, could not hide a quick moment of confusion

Skytte and Salvi (1991: 568)

d. between the-be at Siracusa & the-be there
between being in Siracusa and being here
Skytte and Salvi (1991: 569)

We could claim that the infinitive in Italian is just special and that it behaves differently from Spanish or French. However, that conclusion runs with more problems than it actually seems to resolve. If Italian infinitives are special, then we need to come up with a special explanation for such common crosslinguistic behavior as the infinitive being the grammatical subject and the direct object:
(88) a. [Andare in vacanza] potrebbe servire anche a te
   Go in vacation could serve also to you
   Going on vacation would be useful for you too

   b. Piero vorrebbe [andare in vacanza]
   Piero would-want go in vacation
   Piero would want to go on vacation

   Skytte and Salvi (1991: 483)

Infinitives with and without the article and with verbal properties may be in subject position, as the following examples prove:

(89) a. Il vederti qui non mi sorprende
   The see-you here not me surprises
   Seeing you here doe not surprise me

   b. Vederti qui non mi sorprende
   See-you here not me surprises
   Seeing you here doe not surprise me

   Skytte and Salvi (1991: 566)

What the actual nature of the infinitives is is an open question with a difficult answer, as has already been discussed in this dissertation. Remember that the Spanish data did not
allow for a clear classification of the infinitive as a noun, even with the article. The nominal nature of the Italian infinitives is discussed in Kayne (2000), who states the following:

The idea that Romance infinitives are nominal appears to be further supported by the fact that in several Romance languages an infinitive phrase can be preceded in certain contexts by the definite article (Kayne (2000: 284)).

Here we face again the general assumption that the article leaves no doubt as to the nominal nature of the infinitive, even if it is not true once we examine the data. Pérez (1998-99) argues that the Italian infinitive has nominal and verbal properties and adds that the presence of the article does not turn it into a noun, in line with de Miguel (1996). Actually, Kayne (2000) concludes that French and Italian infinitives are only partially nominal because they cannot appear in all the contexts where a DP can:

French and Italian ‘bare’ infinitive phrases [i.e. without the article], despite having certain nominal properties, do not occur in ordinary DP positions (Kayne (2000: 288)).

This is based on evidence already presented such as the impossibility of Ps with infinitives such as in the aforementioned example *Contavo su essere onesto. Now notice that this hypothesis is incomplete because it is not true either that Ps in Italian cannot take
an infinitive without the article. Again, it seems that we are better off ignoring the question whether infinitives are or are not nominal because it will not get us anywhere.

5.5.2. Old Italian

5.5.2.1. Finite clauses

5.5.2.1.1. Argument clauses

The situation in Old Italian is similar to that of Spanish, Portuguese or French. In principle, there is no argument $P +$ finite $CP$, as the following examples illustrate:

(90) a. Io so che tu ti meravegli, che io non cognosandoti, ti ho saludado. (*Storia di Apollonio di Tiro*, 14th c.)

I know that you you marvel, that I not knowing-you, you have greeted

I know you are amazed that, even though I do not know you, I have greeted you

b. e mandárno il bando che tutti li poveri andassero alla riva (*Novellino*, 13th c.)

& sent the message that all the poor went to-the shore

& they sent the message that all the poor people should go to the shore

Frenguelli (2002: 19)

c. avendo novelle che’l suo figliuolo era coronato re di Buemia (*Cronica delle cose occorrenti ne’ tempi suoi*, Compagni, 1310-12)

having news that-the his son was crowned king of Bohemia
gettign the news that his son was cronwed as king of Bohemia

Frenguelli (2002: 20)

d. Ciascuno è certo che la natura umana è perfettissima di tutte l’altre nature
(Convidio, Dante, 1304-07)

Everyone is certain that the nature human is most-perfect of all the-other natures

Everybody is sure that the human nature os the most perfect of all

Fiumara (2006: 140)

e. Ben può Hector essere sicuro che, s’io lo troverò, elli ucciderà me o io lui. (La storia di Troia, Binduccio dello Scelto, 1322)

Well can Hector be sure that, if-I him will-find, he will-kill me or I him

Hector can be completely sure that, if I find him, he will kill me or I will kill him

The OVI corpus does not retrieve any examples of prepositional indirect interrogatives either.

Even though the general construction is non-prepositional, there are several examples where we already find the direct selection of the P and the finite clause. Notice that the first examples modify the noun fin or fino and for some linguists this could be a complex preposition (cf. Vignuzzi (1978: 359)). Nevertheless, the last three examples are clearly complementing Vs:
(91)  a. Tu apparerai fino a che tu vorrai (Ammaestramenti degli antichi latini e toscani, Bartolomeo da San Concordio, 1308)

You will-appear until to that you will-want
You will appear until you want to

b. e durò infino a che Saul fu fatto re del popolo d'Israel (L’Ottimo Commento della Commedia, t. I Inferno, 1334)

& lasted until to that Saul was made king of-the people of-Israel
& it lasted until Saul was crowned king of Israel

c. tutte attendendo miravano a che Lia o a parlare o a partirsi si disponesse (Comedia delle ninfe fiorentine (Ameto), Boccaccio, 1342)

all waiting looked to that Lia or to speak or to leave-refl refl prepared
all waiting were looking forward to Lia’s getting ready to either speak or leave

d. aspettando a che riuscir volesse (Decameron, Boccaccio, c. 1370)

waiting to that succeed wanted
hoping that he wanted to succeed

e. pensando a che per quello era obligata (Decameron, Boccaccio, c. 1370)

thinking to that for that was forced
thinking about the fact that she was forced for that

Furthermore, there are examples of the pronominal alternative with a, accioché, which linguists cite among the list of Old Italian adverbial final “conjunctions”. The fact that the
examples show *accioché* combining with categories that usually require *a* with other complements, and given the fact that we may assume a neutral analysis whereby the *che*-clause is an adjunct to the pronoun *ciò*, the *a ciò* segments could be regarded as complements instead of just cases of the final *accioché*. Observe the following examples:

(92)  
a. Costui la vergine con gravezza *mirava*, overo *accioché* appendesse l'armi trojane nei templi, overo *accìo che* si potesse gloriare delle nobili vestimenta dell'oro di prigioni (*Ciampolo di Meo Ugurgieri*, a. 1340)

That the virgin with seriousness looked, or to-that-that apprehended the-arms Trojan in-the temples, or to-that that refl could glorify of-the noble clothes of-the-gold of-the prisons

The virgin was looking forward to either his apprehending the Torjan arms in the temples, or to his glorifying himself with the noble clothes of the gold from the prisons

b. **Conviene a ciò che** l'uomo abbia dal cominciamento buoni costumi (*Tesoro di Brunetto Latini volgarizzato da Bono Giamboni*, 13th c.)

It is advisable that the man has good suits from the beginning

c. però che **intende a ciò, che** si dica, che questa, una anima essendo, hae in sè virtude (*L’Ottimo Commento della Commedia*, t. II *Purgatorio*, 1334)

but that intends to that tha refl says that this, a sould being, has in it
virtue

But that he wants that they say that this one, being a soul, has virtue inside

The difficulty in comprehending the syntax behind these examples is logical because they coexisted with a PP *accioché* used with clear adverbial meaning in Old Italian, as will be shown below (cf. Rohlfs (1969: 182), Tekavčić (1980: 472), Barbera (2007: 8)).

The surprise comes when a search in the Old Italian corpus OVI retrieves examples of a similar construction but with *di*. To my knowledge, no linguist has acknowledged the existence of an adjunct/adverbial *di ciò che* in Old Italian, or of any complement *di ciò che* for that matter. Neither Herman (1963), nor Rohlfs (1969), nor Tekavčić (1980) include a *di ciò che*. However, the amount of examples leaves no doubt as to the pertinence of this construction beyond pure chance:

(93) a. I Savj *si maravigliarono di ciò che* lo vidono sì abbaïto (*Libro dei Sette Savj di Roma*, 13th c.)

The Wise refl marvelled of that that him saw this depressed

The Sages were amazed to see him so depressed

b. Sapìa *si meravillìò di ciò, che* Dante fusse vivo ancora (*Commento al Purgatorio*, Francesco di Bartolo da Buti, 1395)

Sapia refl marvelled of that that Dante was alive still

Sapia was amazed that Dante was still alive
c. **pentuto di ciò che** io non aveva prestamente risposto a messer Cavalcante che
il figliuolo vivea (*Esposizioni sopra la Comedia di Dante*, Boccaccio, 1374)
sorry of that that I not had quickly answered to sir Cavalcante that
the son lived

sorry not to have answered immediately to mister Cavalcante that his son was alive

d. non volendosi **ricordare di ciò che** esso avea dal suo signor ricevuto
(*Esposizioni sopra la Comedia di Dante*, Boccaccio, 1374)
not wanting-refl recall of that that that had of-the his sir received
not wanting to remember that he had received that from his lord

e. Molto **si doleva di ciò che** elli era calvo (*Fatti di Cesare*, 13th c.)
Much refl pained of that that he was bald

He was very sad of being bald

f. e diceva che per ciò lo fece, chè **dolente era di ciò, che** li due tribuni li avevano
tolta la gloria del rifiutare (*Fatti di Cesare*, 13th c.)
& said that for this it did that painful was of that that the two courts him had
taken the glory of-the refusing

& he said that he did it because he was resentful that the two courts had denied
him the glory of a rebuttal

g. molto **tristi di ciò che** non trovavano nulla che mettere ne l'altro lato

(*Leggenda Aurea*, 14th c.)
very sad of that not found nothing that put in the other side
very sad not to find anything to put on the other side

h. E Josafat avea grande allegrezza di ciò che 'l Signore, (…), avea difesa la verità (Leggenda Aurea, 14th c.)
& Josafat had big happiness of that that the sir had defended the truth
& Josafat was very happy that the lord had defended the truth

i. e dicevano che quello era malvagio segno, di ciò che la bestia si fuggì del suo sacrificio (Fatti di Cesare, 13th c.)
& said that that was bad sign of that that the beast refl fled of the its sacrifice
& they said that it was a bad sign that the beast had escaped its sacrifice

Assuming the analysis of di ciò che as di ciò plus an adjunct che-clause, it is safe to regard di ciò as the complement of the different selecting categories in the examples above. The pronominal nature of ciò is sure because it can be the only object of the P:

(94) ma poi, pentuto di ciò, fu liberato per l'orazione di costui (Leggenda Aurea, 14th c.)
but after, sorry of that, was freed for the prayer of that
but afterward, sorry about that, he was released thanks to his prayer
5.5.2.1.2. Adverbial clauses

Irrespective of the argument examples, we find clear evidence that Old Italian was not subject to any constraints banning P + finite CP in the adverbial clauses headed by lexical Ps, which are widely attested (cf. Medici (1978: 338-344)). Consider the following examples:

(95)  

   a. perché l’altrre parole siano meglio intese (Rettorica, Latini, c. 1260-61)

      For-that the-other words are better understood
      So that the other words can be better understood

      Vegnaduzzo (2007: 15)

   b. Ed elle, dacché ebbero inteso quel che le Virtú voleano (Libro de’ vizi e delle virtudi, Giamboni, 1292)

      And they, from-that had understood what that the Virtues wanted
      And, once they understood what the Virtues wanted

      Barbera (2007: 6)

   c. prima che partisse quella (Convivio, Dante, 14th c.)

      before that left that

      Before tha one would leave

      Fiumara (2006: 176)

   d. Sanza che’n noi trovasse trieva o patti (Il Fiore e il Detto d’Amore, 14th c.)

      without that in us found truce or pacts
without getting any truce or pact from us

e. **purché** mal non n’avenga (*Tesoretto*, Latini, 1266)

for that bad  non of it comes

so that no harm is caused

Vegnaduzzo (2007: 17)

Several Ps admitted a pronominal construction with an adverbial meaning (cf. Medici (178: 338)). Observe the following examples, including an adverbial example of the previously mentioned *accioché*:

(96) a. E però canto sì amorosamente **a ciò che** sia gaudente lo meo corag[g]io di bona speranza (*A pena pare ch’io*, Messer Jacopo Mostacci, 1250)

And but sing thus lovely to this that is happy the my heart of good hope

But I sing this lovely so that my heart be happy of good hope

b. **per ciò che** ella amava ben lui (*Decameron*, Boccaccio, c. 1370)

for this that she loved well him

Because she loved him very much

Dardano (1995: 42)
c. Omai proverà come non attese quello che promise, in ciò che promettea di trattare per rettorica ogne causa et ogne questione (Rettorica, Latini, c. 1260-61)

Or never will-prove how not got that that promised, in this that promised of treat for rhetoric every cause and every question

Or he will not prove that he achieved what he promised, in that he promised to deal with every cause and question with rhetoric

5.5.2.2. Infinitives and prepositions

As we saw with the other languages, Old Italian aslo had some fluctuation in the usage of Ps with infinitives, a reminder of the unstable role of Ps in licensing objects in this period. As Rohlfs (1969) says,

il nesso con di poté divenire in molti casi usuale in luogo del semplice infinito-oggetto, cfr. desiderava (di) venire, preferisco (di) non mangiare, credeva (di) perdere, sperava (di) guarire. (Rohlfs (1969: 98))

the nexus with di could become usual in many cases instead of the non-prepositional object infinitive. Cf. desiderava (di) venire (I wished to come), preferisco (di) non mangiare (I prefer not to eat), credeva (di) perdere (I thought I was losing), sperava (di) guarire (I hoped to heal) (My translation)

Observe the following group of examples, where we find several verbs with and without the P di:
a. tanto desiderava di combattare con Pompeio (*Fatti di Cesare*, 13th c.)

so desired of fight with Pompeius

He desired so much to fight Pompeius

b. e mellio desiderava passare per forza che per amore (*Fatti di Cesare*, 13th c.)

& better desired pass for force that for love

& he preferred to pass by force than by love

c. Neuno è sì vecchio che non si creda di potere vivere un anno (*Fiori di filosafi e d'altri savi e d'imperadori*, 1271-75)

No-one is this old that not refl believes of can live a year

No one is so old not to believe themselves to be able to live one more year

d. e non credo potere avere il regno di Cielo (*Il Libro de' vizî e delle virtudi*, Giamboni, 1292)

& not believe can have the kingdom of heaven

& I do not believe to be able to have the kingdom of heaven

e. e pensarono di fare vendetta (*Cronica, Giovanni Villani*, a. 1348)

& thought of do revenge

& they thought of revenge

f. pensarono pacificarse co’ Ghibellini (*Cronica delle cose occorrenti ne' tempi suoi*, Compagni, 1310-12)

thought pacify-refl with-Ghibellini

They thought about making peace with Ghibellini
A different type of variation is found with those verbs which could take either *a* or *di*, which points out that both Ps must be categorially equivalent:

(98)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. è <strong>obbligato</strong> naturalmente <strong>di dire</strong> verità (Il Libro de' vizï e delle virtudi, Giamboni, 1292)</th>
<th>b. è <strong>obbligato a rendere</strong> quiderdone (Tesoro di Brunetto volgarizzato da Bono Giamboni, 13th c.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is forced naturally of say truth</td>
<td>is forced to offer recompense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is naturally forced to tell the truth</td>
<td>He is forced to provide a recompense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, nouns and adjectives could also be complemented by infinitives with P:

(99)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. <strong>certo di conquistare</strong> questo regno (Il Libro de' vizï e delle virtudi, Giamboni, 1292)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sure of conquer this kingdom</td>
<td>Sure about conquering this kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Egerland (2007: 5)
b. attenti / a disbramarsi (Purgatorio, Dante, 14th c.)

attentive to satisfy-refl
attentive to satisfy themselves

Egerland (2007: 29)

c. Usura è uno studioso desiderio d’aver alcuna cosa oltre la sorte (Il Libro de’ vizi e delle virtudi, Giamboni, 1292)

Usury is a studied wish to have some thing beyond the luck
Usury is the conscious wish to have more than just luck

Egerland (2007: 35)

Prepositions could take infinitives in adverbial infinitive clauses:

(100)  a. per fare la pace co li romani (Storie de Troia e de Roma, 1252-58)

for do the peace with the Romans
in order to make peace with the Romans

b. senza fare alcuna dimora (Fatti di Cesare, 13th c.)

without do any delay
without any delays

c. dopo avere mirato (Fiammetta, Boccaccio, 1343-44)

after have looked
after having looked
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Possibly, the most interesting issue regarding infinitives in Old Italian has to do with the fact that, as opposed to modern Italian, Ps such as *con* and *in* could take an infinitive without the article. Notice that *con* + infinitive is still found as late as the 19th century:

(101)  a. e le loro case afforzarono **con asserragliare** le vie con legname (*Cronica delle cose occorrenti ne' tempi suoi*, Compagni, 1310-12)

& the their houses reformed with close the ways with wood

And they reinforced their houses by blocking the paths with wood

b. cioè **in darsi** tutta la persona (...), cioè **in dare** speranza (*De Amore di Andrea Cappellano volgarizzato*, 14th c.)

that-is in give-refl all the person , that-is in give hope

that is in giving the whole person, that is in giving hope

Egerland (2007: 40)

c. La guerra finí **con riconoscere** tutti il nuovo duca (*Manzoni*, 19th c.)

The war ended with recognize all the new duke

The war ended by all recognizing the new duke

Rohlfs (1969: 101)

The direct selection did not preclude the presence of the article:
(102) a. Ne l’andare dee l’uomo essere savio di non andare troppo piano (Fiori e vita di filosofi e d’altri savi e d’imperadori, 1271-75)

In the-walk must the-man be wise of not walk too slow

The man must be wise when walking and avoid walking too slowly

b. col guatame uccide (Quaresimale fiorentino, Giordano da Pisa, 1306)

with-the look kills

it kills with its look

Egerland (2007: 40)

5.5.2.3. Conclusions

- Italian has P + finite clauses, especially adverbial finite clauses. There is no constraint against P + finite CP
- Infinitives can also be introduced by a P, but with limitations
- Present-day a che shows that argument finite clauses are not banned in Italian
- There is optionality in the presence of a
- Indirect interrogatives are selectively grammatical: only those introduced by wh-phrases can be prepositional
- Italian does not allow the article with a che-clause but it does with some indirect interrogatives, even though both are theoretically CPs
• The presence of the article does have an effect on prepositional infinitives, allowing more Ps, although this construction is also found in adverbial infinitival clauses too

• Old Italian is like Spanish in not allowing argument prepositional finite clauses in general, although there are examples of a che already

• Adverbial prepositional finite clauses (adjuncts) were perfectly grammatical in Old Italian, thus proving there existed no constraint against P + finite CP in the past either

• I could find no examples of prepositional indirect interrogatives in Old Italian

• A che could alternate with accioché. There existed a di ciò che in Old Italian, parallel to French de ce que. Other Ps also admitted a pronominal alternate: per/in ciò che. The last resort value of the pronominal alternative is questioned because in, per and a permit direct selection

• Prepositional infinitives were grammatical in Old Italian as well, with optionality/variation. In and con could select for an infinitive without the article
CHAPTER 6

CROSSLINGUISTIC EVIDENCE 2: PREPOSITIONAL FINITE CLAUSES IN GERMANIC LANGUAGES

6.1. Introduction

This chapter explores the syntax and history of prepositional finite clauses of some Germanic languages, namely English, the Scandinavian languages, Dutch and German. These languages are perfect because they are a group of non-Romance languages but not so far away so as to be too typologically different, that is they all have identifiable (theoretically agreed-upon) finite clauses and Ps.

English has been the focus of the study of prepositional finite clauses and in particular its lack thereof, which justifies our presenting it both in a contemporary state and with relevant glances into its history. The Scandinavian languages are surprising in themselves because, as will be shown, they resemble Spanish much more than English, or even French or Italian. Dutch and German are interesting because they, like French, make use of the pronominal alternative. Unfortunately, not much information about Middle Dutch and Old (High) German clauses was available in a language that I could read, so Dutch and German history remain open for future research.
In the following pages, I will show that, despite the important limitations for some languages, all these languages do accept the configuration P + finite clause in their grammar. At the same time, they do have diverging behavior and specific restrictions of several types that help build the discussion of this section and provide actual data for study and discussion in a crosslinguistic perspective. Variation/optionality in the presence of the Ps and infinitives are also explored and discussed.

The description and analysis of these languages emerges as a solid background to understand the syntax and history of Spanish prepositional finite clauses and put it into its crosslinguistic place. In addition, these data allow us to deepen and strengthen our comments and criticisms regarding the theoretical tools used to approach P + CPs and the implications coming from them. In this regard, it is necessary to find out whether any of these languages shows any total constraint against P + finite clauses on any type, whether all types of finite clauses and infinitives do indeed behave the same or not, whether the existence of the pronominal alternative (remember, something like “of it that”) is incompatible with direct selection.
6.2. English

6.2.1. Present-day English

6.2.1.1. Restrictions against P + finite CPs

Linguists generally agree that English does not allow prepositional finite clauses. This is proven with the following argument examples, whose Spanish or Portuguese translations would all be grammatical:

(1)  
a. *It depends on that you come

b. *I count on that she will come

c. *I am happy of that she got it

d. *We were speaking about that they should go there

e. *We are interested in that he studies here

f. *The fact of that she came means a lot

The same restriction applies to infinitives:

(2)  
a. *I count on to go

b. *I am happy of to go

c. *We were speaking about to go

d. *We are interested in to go

e. *The fact of to go means a lot
English finite clauses and infinitives contrast with NP/DPs and gerunds, as indicated by Emonds (1972) (cf. also Quirk et al. (1985: 659), among many others):

A clearcut indication that infinitives and sentences are not in the same category as gerunds and noun phrases is that the latter two but not the former two appear after the traditional class of prepositions. (Emonds (1972: 31))

The behavior of prepositions and finite clauses in English resembles French or Italian because the P must not be present:

(3)   a. He insisted on an adjournment

       b. He insisted that we adjourn

       Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1019)

       c. *He insisted on that we adjourn

Likewise French, English may resort to intervening pronouns, but only in very limited cases, denying any possible justification of the presence of the pronoun in terms of last resort strategy to allow for the P to combine with the finite clause:

(4)   a. I’ll see (to it) that it’s done on time

       b. *It depends on it that you come
c. *I am happy of it that she got it

d. *We are interested in it that he studies here

In conclusion, it seems that Ps cannot take finite clauses in English. However, there are several examples that challenge such assumption.

Andersson (1974: 6), Keyser (1975: 28, fn 5) other linguists have noted that the existence of several P + finite CPs in English, such as in that, except that, or but that, all adverbial P+ finite CPs. Consider the following examples:

(5) a. In that there’s nothing left to say, I’m leaving

                             Napoli (1993: 111)

b. He said not a thing except that he was sorry

                             Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 642)

This is the conclusion in Granath and Wherrity (2005), who collected the following examples from the Brown and LOB English corpora (cf. also Granath (1997)):

(6) a. … there is no question but that the process of washing fabrics involves a number of phenomena which are related … (Brown J05 0810)
b. **Considering that** Pietro was not above twenty-three years of age when he undertook a load of heavy responsibilities, his conduct reveals him as one of the most intelligent as well as the most sympathetic of Byron’s entourage in Greece. (LOB G07 39)

c. A fire wouldn’t have mattered **except that** it would cause Pops to be found sooner. (Brown L24 1080)

d. This was found to be particularly useful **in that** the rail was taken over the lock and along one side. (LOB E27 72)

Granath and Wherrity (2005: 1)

In addition, several other examples prove that even within the realm of argument clauses the constraint against prepositional finite clauses is not fully operative. Consider for instance the following example, where the P in selects for a finite clause:

(7) a. A more serious consequence **resides in that** said deposits clog the pores and hair follicles


Granath and Seppänen (2004) report more examples of argument P + finite CP (although not acceptable to all native speakers of English):
a. The discussions held between the two prime ministers on Saturday night did not pronounce a breakthrough… Their importance lies in that they took place at all…

(The Guardian, 2003)

b. We’re getting close, but all indications point to that discodermolide might be the next drug of choice for treatment of certain types of cancer. (CNN Science & Technology, June 26, 1997)

Granath and Seppänen (2004: 11)

Furthermore, some linguists such as Napoli (1993: 111), Rauh (1993: 102), and Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 600) find extra prepositional finite clauses in examples such as the following:

(9) a. I wouldn’t cry just on account of [his mother yelled]

Napoli (1993: 111)

b. He left after [he saw her]

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 600)

More locally, Dubinsky and Williams (1995: 126) mention that in certain dialects in South East USA sentences like the following are grammatical:
(10) a. The never came to church **without (that)** they brought their Bibles

b. Gene left **despite (that)** John said he wouldn’t

Dubinsky and Williams (1995: 126)

Notice that, obviously, the examples in (9) are syntactically different form the type of P + finite CP we have been dealing with so far. While *in that* or *except that* reflect the structure of P + CP, in sentences such as *after she came* we find a P introducing a finite clause, but arguably not a full C, only a TP/IP. If we extend our syntactic frame of study to include P + TP/IP, then we find that other Ps can be added to the group of those capable of selecting for a finite clause, namely *before, since* and *until*:

(11) a. **Before** she left the house

b. **Since** she left the house

c. **Until** we came to the party

6.2.1.2. Prepositional indirect interrogatives

Thus far we have seen that only certain Ps accept *that*-clauses in English. We could conclude that P + finite CPs are ungrammatical. Remember that the other type of finite clause that we are examining here is the indirect interrogative. In principle, we saw in the previous chapter that French does have limited argument prepositional indirect
interrogatives, in agreement with the syntax of its argument prepositional *que*-clauses. If there is any type of constraint against P + finite CPs, it is normal to expect the same restriction to apply to indirect interrogatives. However, Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1012) make it clear that “[t]raditional grammar accepts that prepositions can take finite interrogative clauses”. Therefore, it seems that the generally quoted and assumed statement that there are no prepositional finite clauses in English is false, as evidenced in this set of examples:

(12)  
a. He was worrying about [who he should trust]  

b. He raised the question of [why it had been concealed]  

Huddleston (1984: 340)  

c. We can’t agree on [whether we should call in the police]  

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 599)  

d. No one was consulted on [who should have the prize]  

Quirk et al. (1972: 735)  

Variation is also found in these examples. Notice the optional Ps in the following sentences:

(13)  
a. They gave us some advice (on/as to) [how it should be done]  

Rohdenburg (2006: 144)
b. We can’t agree (on) whether that stadium is the best choice

c. They are asking the question (of) why we should stay here

d. They did it without worrying (about) how much money they were spending

Interestingly, the role of the P in licensing the indirect interrogatives is optional just in part, since the P cannot be dropped in certain contexts such as the following:

(14) a. *This is my account *(of) who really won the war
    b. *This is my verdict *(of) who is guilty

Finally, the scheme becomes more regular once we find that interrogative infinitives can also be prepositional objects (15a, b), again in opposition to non-interrogative infinitives (15c, d):

(15) a. We can’t agree on [how much to charge]
    Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 641)
    b. He hesitated (about) [whether to do it]
    Rohdenburg (2006: 144)
    c. *We can’t agree on to buy a house
    d. *He hesitated about to do it
Thus, despite the fact that regular infinitives and interrogative infinitives are both non-finite CPs, only the latter can be selected for by Ps. Therefore, as happens with the finite clauses, and crosslinguistically, syntactic categorization does not help predict whether a given category will allow being the object of a P, or to what extent.

We have seen that indirect interrogatives seem to differ from *that*-clauses. A logical answer would be to eliminate the syntactic equality between *that*-clauses and indirect interrogatives. This was the conclusion reached by Yim (1984), who points out the paradox caused by the fact that Ps can indeed select for interrogative CPs and not *that*-CPs:

> We cannot expect to find an illuminating answer for this question as long as *that*-class words and *wh*-phrases are treated as the same category COMP, as they are in current linguistic theories. (Yim (1984: 192))

Consequently, Yim’s (1984) logical answer is to argue for a syntactic difference between *that*-clauses and *wh*-clauses:

> As opposed to a that-clause, a wh-clause is not an S but an S’, and ”an S’ or a wh-clause does not have an inherent Case-marker but is Case-marked either configurationally or by an appropriate preposition. It can be configurationally Case-marked, namely, Case—marked either by AGR or by V, when it appears in the subject position or the object position. In other positions, it is Case-marked by a preposition. In short, a wh-clause behaves just like an NP (Yim (1984: 195)).
Yim (1984) captures the idea that indirect interrogatives fit well in the classical definition of a nominal category, namely being able to be the object of a P; *that*-clauses do not. However, this solution faces some problems.

Firstly, the prepositional infinitives of other languages (Spanish or Italian, for instance) already question the generalization that the object of a P must be a nominal element. Thus the fact that the indirect interrogatives are objects of P may not be regarded as a sufficient test of its nominality.

Secondly, Yim’s discussion is reduced to English, but our goal is to consider the category C and its properties crosslinguistically, if COMP is to have any independently justified in the theory. With Yim’s hypothesis we would need to find proper amendments to explain the similar behavior shown by both *que*-clauses and indirect interrogatives in Spanish and other languages, or the fact that in French there are restrictions operative for both (argument) prepositional *que*-clauses and some indirect interrogatives. Needless to say, this would imply explaining one language at the expense of many others, jeopardizing any possible crosslinguistic generalizations; or multiplying the category CP to the point that it would be different for every language (and any comparison would be ineffective).

The third problem has to do with the coverage of Yim’s argument itself. The fact that *that*-clauses and *wh*-clauses do not share one syntactic environment is counterweighed by
the ones they do share. It is true that in English certain contexts discriminate between
\textit{that}-clauses and indirect interrogatives. Take, for instance, the following examples\(^1\):

(16)\begin{itemize}
\item a. *Is [that the world is round] obvious to you? Kuno (1973: 363)
\item b. Is [whether John wins or o not] of any great importance? Kuno (1973: 370)
\end{itemize}

Kuno (1973) studies these differences but without abandoning the assumption that both
belong to the same category: finite CPs, nominal CPs in particular, by the way. In
addition, Kuno is aware of the fact that “it is not possible to collapse some or all of these
constraints into a single generalization (...) as is indicated by the fact that crucial patterns
have different degrees of ungrammaticality” (Kuno (1973: 376), which forces an
immediate weakening of the line dividing the syntax of \textit{that}-clauses and indirect
interrogatives, apart from the fact that, once again, these constraints are found in English
but have no crosslinguistic applicability.

Notice that there are syntactic contexts where both types of CPs have the same
behavior. For example, both types of CPs can be the object of transitive verbs:

\(^{1}\text{Interestingly, some native speakers of English find (16a) grammatical. In such case, (16a) and (16b)
would add more evidence to the fact that \textit{that}-clauses and indirect interrogatives share many syntactic
contexts.}\)
a. The Mayas already knew [that the world is round]

b. I need to know [whether John wins or not]

Finally Adger (2003) discusses finite clauses in subject position by giving the following examples:

(18) a. [That Jason arrived] infuriated Medea

b. [Whether Agamemnon had triumphed] was unknown

Adger (2003: 300)

For Adger, both types of clauses are of the same nature: both are finite CPs. Therefore, separating *that*-clauses from indirect interrogatives has immediate theoretical consequences that must be properly accounted for.

### 6.2.2. Old English

The (partial) restriction operating in present-day English did not exist in older stages of the language. Consider the following examples of prepositional adverbial clauses:
(19)  a. Tha wakemenn to frofren for thatt hi wisste wel thatt tegg off him fordraedde waerenn (Ormulum, c. 1200)

Beal (1988: 50)

b. Efter that ure drihten hefde that folc adreint (Lambeth Homilies, c. 1175)

Beal (1988: 51)

c. It is solde rythe well aftyr that the wole was (OED I: 168; 1464)

Dubinsky and Williams (1995: 127)

d. Bifore that Abraham was made, I am (Wyclif, 1382)

Beal (1988: 51)

e. Bithat hit was middai hig (Floriz & Benchefleur, c. 1250)

Beal (1988: 51)

f. oð ðæt hi gehælede wurdon (Old Testament Joshua, Aelfric, 10th c.)

until they were healed

Rissanen (2007: 68)

g. to ðæt it gæde to þe hærnes (Peterborough Chronicle, 12th c.)

until they penetrated to the brains

Rissanen (2007: 74)

The existence of P + finite clause is not limited to Medieval English. Notice the following examples, which date back as recently as the 19th century:
(20)  a. I hate him for he is a Christian / But more for that in low simplicity / He lends out money gratis (*The Merchant of Venice*, Shakespeare, 1597)

b. Dick showed Bessie the letter, and she abused him for that he had never sent Torpenhow away and ruined her life (*The light that failed*, Kipling, 1890)

   Beal (1988: 63)

c. By that these pilgrims had been at this place a week, Mercy had a visitor (*Pilgrim’s Progress 2*, Bunyan, 1684)

   Beal (1988: 52)

d. Doth it not flow as hugely as the sea, Till that the seary very means do ebb? (*As you like it*, Shakespeare, 1623)

   Keyser (1975: 12)

e. Since that your worships have made me a rogue, I hope I shall have my money again  (*The recruiting officer*, Farquhar, 1706)

   Beal (1988: 52)

f. without that she (…) should have caught intimation of things extraordinary transpiring on her premises (*Villette*, C. Brontë, 1853)

g. The representatives of the majority, besides that they would themselves be improved in quality (…) would no longer have the whole field to themselves (*Considerations on representative government*, J.S. Mill, 1860)

   Dubinsky and Williams (1995: 127)
These direct combinations seem to have their origin in previous combinations with an intervening pronoun and a relative clause modifying the pronoun, as in *for þæm þe* (for that which), *after þæm þe* (after that which), etc. which, according to Fischer et al. (2000), “became fossilized [and] their form was often reduced” (Fischer et al. (2000: 89)), to later on find that “[t]hat begins to be used as a general indicator of subordination, used after original prepositions (*after that, for that, till that*)” (Fischer et al. (2000: 102)). These linguists establish a diachronic correspondence between the pronominal alternative and the later examples with direct selection. This type of diachronic link has been proposed also for Latin and Spanish (recall Moreno (1985-86)), although in the English examples what disappears is the relative pronoun *þe* instead of the intervening demonstrative pronoun.

Evidently, these previous combinations of P and CP are not grammatical any longer. Dubinsky and Williams (1995: 127) argue that there was a change in English whereby Ps such as *after* and *before* became complementizers themselves, therefore occupying the C position and blocking the presence of *that*. Arguing for *after* and *before* as Cs in these contexts runs against the assumption held by other linguists, as exposed above, whereby these elements are always Ps even when selecting for a finite clause in present-day English. For Dubinsky and Williams (1995) sentences such as *after she came* are not prepositional finite clauses, while for Huddleston and Pullum (2002) or Rauh (1993) they are.
On the other hand, Warner (1982) documents the existence of argument finite P+CPs, both *that*-clauses and indirect interrogatives:

(21) a. Sire, we *penken on* [that] his gilour saide whan he was on lyve, *bat* he shulde ryse after *pre daies* (Sermons, Wyclif, c. 1400)

    Sir, we think on that this guiler said when he was on live that he should rise after three days

    Warner (1982: 62)

b. And disciplis of Crist *pouzten over* [how] it was wrettun] (Sermons, Wyclif, c. 1400)

    And disciples of Christ think over how it was written

    Warner (1982: 63)

Example (21b) seems to be at odds with Rohdenburg (2007), who claims that prepositional indirect interrogatives, both finite and infinite, “may be assumed to have started in the 16th and 17th centuries” (Rohdenburg (2007: 227)). Nevertheless, notice that Rohdenburg points to a previous stage of English where not even indirect interrogative finite CPs could be selected for by a P, thus emulating the Spanish situation.

Argument and adjunct (adverbial) prepositional infinitives are also documented throughout the history of English:
(22) a. And here men shulden *penken upon to do* worship to þe gospel (*Sermons*, Wyclif, c. 1400)

And here men should think about to do worship to the gospel

And here men should think about worshipping the gospel

Warner (1982: 63)

b. *gefraegn* ðone weligo *from tō byenna* lif éce (*Lindisfarne Gospels*, 7th c.)

asked man rich from to gain life eternal

the rich man asked about gaining eternal life

Warner (1982: 63)

c. *ine* god *to serui* and *to louie* (*Ayenbite of Inwyt*, 14th c.)

in god to serve and to love

in serving and loving God

d. bliss of herte þet comþ of god *to louie* (*Ayenbite of Inwyt*, 14th c.)

bliss of heart that comes of god to love

bliss of heart that comes from loving God

e. *wyp-oute to moche acsi* (*Ayenbite of Inwyt*, 14th c.)

without to much ask

without asking too much

Miller (2002: 367)

f. *wipp to letenn* swingenn him (*Ormulum*, c. 1200)

with to let swing him

by letting himself be scourged

Pak (2005: 6)
It is also relevant to call the attention to the fact that *to*-infinitives themselves have been described as purposive prepositional infinitives in the old language (cf. Miller (2002: 188), van Gelderen (1996), among many others), before being reanalyzed as –according to the general assumptions– a type of *I/T* for infinitives. Observe the following example of purposive *to*:

(23) Herodes secð þæt cild tō forsppellenne (*First West Saxon Gospel*, a. 1000)

Herod seeks that child to destroy
Herod is looking for that kid in order to kill him

Miller (2002: 189)

Another prepositional infinitive was *for-to*-infinitive, which could also have a purposive interpretation (cf. Miller (2002: 193-195)):

(24) And wente *for to doon* his pilgrimage (*Canterbury Tales-Prologue*, Chaucer, 14\textsuperscript{th} c.)

And went for to do his pilgrimage
And went to make his pilgrimage

Miller (2002: 193)
6.2.3. Conclusions

- Present-day English has some examples of prepositional finite *that*-clauses, although none of them in argument contexts. Nevertheless, it is true that there is no constraint against P + finite clause.

- Probably the most important conclusion that we extract from present-day English is the divergence between *that*-clause sand indirect interrogatives, both being CPs. The many examples of P + indirect interrogatives let us further reject the existence of any constraint against prepositional finite CPs in English, even if P + *that*-clauses are not as productive as with the interrogatives. Compare this situation with French, which seems to have a more homogeneous treatment of both *que*-clauses and indirect interrogatives, while at the same time we need to compare the English results with the ones of Spanish and Portuguese, where *que*-clauses and indirect interrogatives have a similar behavior.

- No constraint, such as Stowell’s CRP, holds in English. From a Case-ridden perspective, we must conclude that finite CPs, particularly the interrogative ones, can receive Case. Why many *that*-clauses cannot be prepositional cannot be due, consequently, to any constraint against any Case being assigned to finite CPs.

- Older stages of English prove that English was not foreign to prepositional finite clauses, both in argument and adjunct contexts. Recall that some examples are as recent as the 19th century.
• Transferring Barra’s (2002) study here, since P + finite CP was much more frequent and richer in older stages of English than in the present, we are forced to postulate the loss of some property, especially that the finite clause in English used to be nominal but stopped being so, but only asymmetrically, for the indirect interrogatives do perfect prepositional objects and combinations such as in that, except that or but that need to be accommodated too in the syntax of English subordination patterns.

6.3. The Scandinavian languages

6.3.1. Present-day Swedish

6.3.1.1. Prepositional clauses

Let us start first by looking at the syntactic selectional properties of Ps in Swedish. Observe for instance the following examples, where we find the P om (‘about’) selecting for different categories: an NP/DP, a finite clause and an infinitival clause:

(25) a. Han pratade om henne
    He talked about her

b. Han pratade om sitt hus
    He talked about his house
c. Han pratade om [att han hade bott i Kina]
   He talked about that he had lived in China
   He talked about the fact that he had lived in China

d. Han pratade om var han hade bott]
   He talked about where he had lived

e. Han pratade om [att fara till Kina]
   He talked about going to China
   He talked about going to China

Teleman (2005: 1619)

In contrast to the limitations found in English (and in Dutch and German; see below), this Germanic language seems to mirror the Romance Spanish and Portuguese. Argument prepositional finite clauses are perfectly grammatical in Swedish, and not just with a reduced number of prepositions. Observe the following extra examples, including both finite and infinitival CPs:

(26) a. Jag väntade på [att hon skulle komma]
    I waited for that she would come
    I waited for her to come

Andersson (1974: 7)
a. Vi protesterar mot [att vi inte har några job]  
   We protest about that we not have any job  
   We are protesting about not having any jobs  
   Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 325)

b. Kan jag räkna med / lita på att du hjälper mig i morgon?  
   Can I count on / rely on that you help me tomorrow?  
   Can I count on / rely on your helping me tomorrow?  
   McClean (1963: 212)

c. Han klagade över [att de hade lurat honom]  
   He complained over that they had cheated him  
   He complained that they had cheated him  
   McClean (1963: 212)

a. Är du säker [på att han hotade dig]?  
   Are you sure of that he threatened you?  
   Are you sure he threatened you?  
   Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 325)

As expected, the indirect interrogatives can also be selected for by a P:

(27)  a. Jag tvivlar på [om han vill hjälpa oss]  
   I doubt of whether he wants help us
I doubt if he will want to help us

Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 325)

b. Jag är osäker på hur vi klarar det
I am unsure of how we manage it
I am unsure how we will manage it

Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 488)

c. Frågan över om jag var nervös?
The question over whether I was nervous?
The question about whether I was nervous?

<pysselsidan.blogspot.com/2008/03/mssan-och-award-och-nytt-kort.html>

We find that required (functional) Ps are perfectly well equipped in Swedish to combine with a finite clause of any type. Once again, we find that that-clauses (att-clauses here) and indirect interrogatives behave the same in this language, as opposed to English, which proves that a division between the two is disqualified if we want to maintain any aspirations of crosslinguistic validity. On the other hand, non-finite CPs are also grammatical, as the following example with an argument infinitive proves (note that att is also the marker of infinitives (like English to)):

(28) Flickan var rädd för att gå ensam i skogen
The-girl was afraid of to walk alone in the-woods
The girl was afraid of walking alone in the woods

Andersson (1974: 7)

Prepositional finite clauses are not only found in argument positions. Lexical Ps can take a finite clause as their objects in adverbial clauses, as evidenced in the following examples:

(29)  a. Vi åkte till Ipswich after [att vi hade beslutat oss]

We traveled to Ipswich after that we had decided us

We traveled to Ipswich after we had made our decision

Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 423)

b. Jag skickade honom ett telegram, för [att han inte skulle göra resan förgäves]

I sent him a telegram so he didn’t have to make a trip in vain

I sent him a telegraph so he didn’t have to make a trip in vain

McClean (1963: 226)

c. utan [att någon oroas av utvecklingen]

without that anyone being-disturbed of developments

without anyone becoming uneasy about developments

Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 421)
The corresponding infinitival clauses are also grammatical:

(30) a. Han reste **utan [att betala sin räkning]**

He left without to pay his bill

He left without paying his bill

b. Pojken roade sig **med [att kasta stenar i dammen]**

The-boy amused himself by to throw stones into the-pond

The-boy amused himself by throwing stones into the pond

c. **Efter [att ha tillbringat tolv år i Fjärran Östern] återvände han till Sverige**

After to have spent twelve years in the-Far East returned he to Sweden

After having spent twelve years in the Far East he returned to Sweden

McClean (1963: 212)

In conclusion, the previous sets prove that Swedish Ps behave exactly like the Spanish ones, which is very surprising because neither English, German nor Dutch, not even French or Italian are so rich. As Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003) put it:

In Swedish a subordinate clause introduced by **att** or an interrogative word may be a prepositional complement. This is often the case with the prepositions **av, efter, för, genom, i, med, (e)mot, på, till, trots, utan, åt, över**. It is not possible always to use a preposition alone in this way in English, although, in many instances, an approximate English equivalent is the use of prepositions + ‘the fact that’. (Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 325))
6.3.1.2. Pronominal alternatives

Despite the grammaticality of P + finite CP, it is possible to find the pronominal alternative with the demonstrative pronoun *dett*, as in French, for instance. Therefore, along with *för att*, there are other options. As Andersson (1973) says,

> A number of subordinating conjunctions in Swedish consist of a preposition followed by *det att*, where *det* corresponds to English *it* and *att* to the English complementizer *that*. (Andersson (1973: 3))

See the following examples:

(31) a. efter (det att) after (lit. ‘after (that that)’)
    b. före (det att) before (lit. ‘before (that that)’)
    c. tills (det att) till (lit. ‘till (that that)’)
    d. sedan (det att) since (lit. ‘since (that that)’)
    e. för att because (lit. ‘for that’)
    f. därför att because (lit. ‘that-for that’)
    g. i och med (det) att by (lit. ‘in and with (that) that’)
    h. på det att in order that (lit. ‘on that that’)
    i. genom (det) att through, by (lit. through that that)
    j. under det att while (lit. ‘under that that’)

Andersson (1975: 51)
k. i dett att in so far as (lit. ‘in that that’)

Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 420)

Notice, however, that it is just an option in some cases, whereas in others the pronoun is mandatory. Observe the following examples:

(32) a. Efter det att han avslutat sin examen fick han ett jobb i Tromsö
   After that he finished his exam got he a job in Tromsö
   After finishing his exam, he got a job in Tromsö
   Andersson (1975: 51)

b. Robin läser inte lingvistik därför att Chomsky är söt
   Robin study not linguistics that-for that Chomsky is cute
   Robin does not study linguistics because Chomsky is cute
   Andersson (1975: 59)

c. Den svenska ekonomin har en stor svaghet i dett att makten är koncentrerad till ett fåtal stora företag
   the Swedish economy has a major weakness in that that power is concentrated to a few large companies
   The Swedish economy has a major weakness in that the power is concentrated in a few large companies
   Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 420)
This alternative is not exclusive of adverbial clauses. Argument clauses allow it as well, as McClean (1963) says:

A preposition which governs a following full clause is sometimes combined with *där-*, which represents a pronoun and serves as provisional object to the preposition (cf. German *darin, dass; darauf, dass*). (McClean (1963: 213))

For instance, in the following examples:

(33) Hans enda anspråk på ryktbarhet **bestod där**, att han en gang hade räddat ett drunknande barn

His only claim to fame consisted therein, that he one time had saved a drowning child

His only claim to fame consisted in his once having saved a drowning child

McClean (1963: 213)

We have seen that Swedish allows finite P + CPs. Accordingly, it should be read as a sign that Swedish Ps comply with all the necessary requirements to take a finite clause. Consequently, direct selection should be the only option because once the Ps can take CPs no other alternatives should be present. Swedish goes beyond Spanish and Portuguese in allowing both types, which proves that, in a synchronic snapshot of the language, the presence of the pronouns is not a last resort to avoid Ps from taking finite
clauses because that is actually widely grammatical. The features of the Ps cannot be at stake here because it is the same Ps that take finite clauses that can participate of the pronominal alternative. Needless to say, it is not an issue of the Swedish finite clause being barred from being selected for by a P, for obvious reasons. In the end, what we learn from Swedish is that after all prepositional direct selection and the pronominal alternative are not in complementary distribution.

A different way to look at these data and to try to keep the direct selection exclusivity could be to give a different analysis to det. Observe the following examples:

(34)  

a. ? Den gamla gundlagen och att kungen står utanför rättväsendet utgör en fara för den svenska demokratin

The old constitution and that the-king is outside the-justice makes a danger for the Swedish democracy

The old constitution and the fact that the king is outside the judicial system constitutes a danger for the Swedish democracy

b. Den gamla gundlagen och det att kungen star utanför…

c. Den gamla gundlagen och det faktum att kungen star utanför…

Andersson (1975: 161)

In (34a) we find that the att-clause may be coordinated with an NP/DP, which for Andersson (1975) is evidence of the nominal nature of the Swedish clause. However, the
important example is (34b). In this sentence the att-clause is accompanied by the element det, the same that we find in after det att and the others. Andersson (1975) translates det in (34b) as the pronoun it, and it indeed may be a pronoun, thus working as in French de ce que. However, if we look at (34c) we discover that det is also the article in modern Swedish. Zaring (1992) argues in favor of an article analysis for the ce element instead of that of a pronoun.

Thus, in spite of Andersson’s analysis of det as a pronoun, it is legitimate to wonder – although I cannot go any further here- whether this det might not be better analyzed as an article and therefore what we have in (34b) and in the combinations like after det att is actually the finite clause with an article, as in Spanish. In favor of this analysis lies the fact that in modern syntactic analysis the functional D may well be an article or a pronoun, which effectively erases the categorial differences between pronouns and determiner (cf. also Andersson (12975: 164) for an early analysis similar to this). However, I am also aware that this option may be more of a theoretical trick than a descriptive, solid argument. Note that accepting an analysis of det as an article poses another interesting question in that in Swedish Ps would be able to select for finite clauses with article while in Spanish, which is so similar to Swedish in this respect, the same is ungrammatical.
6.3.1.3. Preposition optionality

Another striking similarity between Swedish and Spanish (and Portuguese) is that Swedish allows preposition optionality. As Ralph (1975) claims:

Many verbs and still more adjectives may be provided with a preposition when they take complements, e.g. tänka på ‘think of’, lycklig över ‘happy about’. In some contexts, the preposition is optional, as in Jag är lycklig (över) att han skall komma ‘I am happy that he will come’ (where parentheses around the preposition mark optionality). In other contexts, the preposition is obligatory. (Ralph (1975: 670))

First of all, we find that optionality is reduced to clauses, for Ps are mandatory when the object is an NP/DP:

(35) a. Jag är lycklig över hans brev
    I am happy over his letter
    I am happy to have received his letter

b.*Jag är lycklig Ø hans brev

Ralph (1975: 670)

On the one hand, Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 325) indicate that preposition optionality occurs after common verbs such as be (om) att ‘ask/request that’, hoppas (på) att ‘hope that’, varna (för) att ‘warn that’, etc. Observe the following example:

(36) Tänk (på) vilka faror du utsätter dig för!
Think (on) what dangers you expose you for!

Think what dangers you are exposing yourself to!

Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 325)

However, as happens with Spanish (remember that *depen der de* or *contar con* cannot drop their Ps) some verbs do not allow the P to drop with finite complements, such as *njuta av* (enjoy) or *mis stycka till* (mind) (Ralph (1975: 678)). This is not to say that there are not cases, as in Spanish, where the presence or absence of the P is meaningful. In fact, there are aspectual differences (telic/atelic) in some cases (as in Spanish *pensar/pensar en*):

(37)  

a. Ja, jag läste **boken** (i går)

Yes, I read the-book (yesterday)

Yes, I read the book – Aorist/Perfective

b. Jag läste **i boken**

I read at the-book

I was reading the book – Imperfect/Imperfective

Teleman (2005: 1622)

A second context is with adjectives. According to Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 325), optionality happens after common adjectives such as *rädd (för)* (afraid), *beredd (på)*
(prepared to), etc. Consider also the following examples, including an indirect interrogative:

(38)    a. Jag är säker (på) att du kommer att vinna
         I am sure (on) that you come to win
         I am sure you will win

    b. Vi är oroliga (för) att hon misslyckas
         We are worried (for) that she fails
         We are worried that she will fail

    c. Jag är osäker (på) hur vi klarar det
         I am unsure (on) how we manage it
         I am unsure how we will manage it

         Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 488)

    d. Han blev glad (över) att vi kom
         He was happy (over) that we came
         He was happy that we came

         Teleman (2005: 1619)

However, as with verbs, optionality is not always possible, or not always to the same degree. Consider the following examples (Ralph (1975: 670 ff)):
(39)  a. Hon är **stolt över att** han skall befordras

   She is proud over that he will be-promoted

   She is proud that he will be promoted

b. Hon är **stolt över hur fort** han befordrades

   She is proud over how fast he was-promoted

   She is proud how fast he was promoted

c. Hon är **stolt Ø att** han skall befordras

d. ?Hon är **stolt Ø hur fort** han befordrades

   Ralph (1975: 671)

The preposition is only optional in declarative clauses, and only partially acceptable with indirect interrogatives. Any other type of complement requires the presence of the P. Once again, like Spanish. Another adjective with the same grammaticality results is **besviken på** (disappointed with) (Ralph (1975: 672)).

However, in the case of **nöjd med** (content with) the P happens to be almost mandatory. The absence of the P **med** results in (highly) unacceptable sentences:

(40)  a. ?Hon är **nöjd Ø att** han skall befordras

   She is content that he will be-promoted

b. ?*Hon är **nöjd Ø hur fort** han befordrades

   She is content how fast he was-promoted
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Both *intresserad av* (interested in) and *negativ till* (negative to) represent a step further in that both require the P in all contexts:

(41)  
   a. *Hon är interesserad Ø att* han skall befordras  
       She is interested that he will be-promoted  
   b. *Hon är interesserad Ø hur fort* han befordrades  
       She is interested how fast he was-promoted  
   c. *Hon är negativ Ø att* han skall befordras  
       She is negative that he will be-promoted  
   d. *Hon är negativ Ø hur fort* han befordrades  
       She is negative how fast he was-promoted

Ralph (1975: 673)

In Swedish, Ps may also be omitted with infinitives, with the same results in terms of grammaticality as with the finite complements:

(42)  
   a. Hon är stolt Ø att bli befordrad  
   b. ?Hon är nöjd Ø att bli befordrad  
   c. ??Hon är intresserad Ø att bli befordrad

Ralph (1975: 673)
d. *Hon är **negativ Ø att** bli befordrad

Ralph (1975: 675)

Notice that the seemingly perfect harmony between Spanish and Swedish breaks here. While Swedish allows the P to be absent even with infinitives, Spanish does not go that far. What is more, Askedal (2002: 178) mentions that this Swedish feature is not shared by its sister languages Norwegian and Danish. Observe the following extra examples of Swedish non-prepositional infinitives:

(43)  

a. Jag tvekar inte Ø att använda ordet

I think not to use the-word

I don’t hesitate to use the word

c. Hon var rädd Ø att möta honom

She was afraid to meet him

She was afraid of meeting him

e. Han hade ingen befogenhet Ø att saga detta

He had no authority to say this

He had no authority to say this

Askedal (2002: 178)
Nouns have a special behavior. As Ralph (1975: 678) mentions, “[t]he preposition cannot normally be deleted when following a noun. However, it seems less awkward in some cases than in others”. Some examples are:

(44)  tvivel på (doubt about)
      glädje over (joy at)
      oro för (uneasiness about)
      missnöje med (discontent with)
      stimulans av (stimulation by)
      tillit till (confidence in)

Ralph (1975: 678)

Observe the following examples:

(45)  a. **Frågan Ø om** vi borde gå med i facket har diskuterats mycket
      The-question whether we should go with the union has been discussed much
      The question whether we should join the union has been discussed a lot
      Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 491)

b. **Risken Ø att** vi skulle förlora matchen var mycket liten
      The-risk that we will lose the-match was much little
      The risk that we might lose the match was very small
      Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003: 490)
Again, there are divergences as to the degree of grammaticality of the absence of the P. For instance, according to Ralph (1975: 678), missnöje med (discontent with), stimulans av (stimulation by), and tillit till (confidence in) do not admit P-dropping at all.

In comparison with adjectives and verbs, we find that the optionality and licensing of the object may not depend on the (functional) Ps per se, because the same Ps that may drop with verbs must be present with Ns. At the same time, the features of finite and infinitival clauses cannot be responsible for the differences in degree between optionality with nouns vs. optionality with verbs and adjectives. Given that Swedish is so similar to Spanish, it is surprising to find that Ps are almost obligatory with Ns, which contrasts with the higher degree of optionality with Spanish nouns, thus another asymmetry. Ralph (1975) concludes:

Thus, not only do the complements make a squish with respect to their ability to trigger deletion of the preposition in front of them, but (...) [also] different prepositions show different degrees of tendency towards being deleted. (Ralph (1975: 676-677)).

6.3.2. Present-day Norwegian

6.3.2.1. Prepositional clauses

The situation in Norwegian is very clear: “Norwegian prepositions can take clausal complements as objects” (Lødrup 2004: 69). That is, finite P + CP also exists in Norwegian, including indirect interrogatives, which have “exactly the same distribution as at-clauses” (Lødrup (1991: 109)). Observe the following examples:
(46) a. De *pekte på* [at det ikke var helt riktig]

They pointed on that it not was quite right

They pointed put that it wasn’t quite right

Strandskogen (1986: 136)

b. De *argumenterte mot* [at vi skulle varsle politiet]

They argues against that we should tell the-police

They argued against our telling the police

Taraldsen (1984: 243)

c. Han *insisterte på* [at han jobber for en våpenhvile]

He insisted on that he works for a cease-fire

He insisted that he works for a cease-fire

Lødrup (2004: 69)

d. jeg *regner med* [at du har hørt den nye cd til coldplay]

I assume with that you have heard the new CD of Coldplay

I assume that you have listened to Coldplay’s new CD

<www.last.fm/user/donotrepeat/shoutbox>

Nouns and adjectives can also combine with prepositional finite clauses:

(47) a. *vissheten om* [at vi ville tape]

The-certainty about that we will lose
the certainty that we should lose

Lødrup (1991: 127)

b. Jeg er **sicher på** [at] du har hørt…

I am sure on that you have heard…

I am sure you have heard…

<nymulighet.org>

c. jeg var **red for** [at] hun skulle dra fra stallen]

I was afraid for that she should drag from the-stall

I was afraid that she should pull from the stable

<www.hest.no/blogg/?bid=23320&blid=152131>

As expected, indirect interrogatives can also be introduced by Ps:

(48)  a. Jeg **lurer på** [om] han kommer

I wonder on whether he comes

I wonder if he is coming

b. Han **undret seg på** [om] han kunne klare det]

He wondered himself on whether he could manage it

He wondered whether he could manage it

Strandskogen (1986: 137)
Infinitives are also grammatical when selected for by a P. Here we have some examples of argument infinitives:

(49) a. et forsøk på [å avslutte i tide]
    an attempt on to finish in time
    an attempt to finish on time

    Lødrup (1991: 127)

b. stolt over/ivrig etter [å gjøre dette]
    proud over/eager after to do this
    proud/eager to do this

    Lødrup (2004: 82)

c. Jeg nøler ikke med [å anvende ordet]
    I hesitate not with to use the-word
    I don’t hesitate to use the word

d. Hun var red for [å mote ham]
    She was afraid for to meet him
    She was afraid of meeting him

e. Han hadde ingen myndighet til [å si dette]
    He had no authority to to say this
    He had no authority to say this

    Askedal (2002: 178)
Not only required (functional) Ps can take clauses in Norwegian. As happens in all the languages that we have examined, adverbial prepositional clauses are also in use:

\[(50) \quad \text{a. Etter [at vi hadde spist], gikk vi en tur} \]

After that we had eaten, went we in walk

After eating, we went for a walk

Strandskogen (1986: 139)

\[\text{b. De så på slåskampen uten [at de løfte en finger]} \]

They saw on the-fight without that they lifted a finger

They watched the fight without lifting a finger

Strandskogen (1986: 142)

\[\text{c. Snekkeren arbeidet dag og natt for [at huset skulle bli ferdig til jul]} \]

The-carpenter worked day and night for that the-house would be ready by Xmas

The carpenter worked day and night so that the house would be ready by Xmas

Strandskogen (1986: 143)

As expected, their infinitive counterparts are not missing:

\[(51) \quad \text{a. Per leste diikt uten [å le]} \]

Per read poems without to laugh

Per read poems without laughing

Lødrup (1991: 126)
b. Han gjemte seg for [ikke å bli funnet]

He hid himself for not to be found

He hid himself so as not to be found

Strandskogen (1986: 144)

c. En person omkommet etter [å ha kjørt i sjøen i Sunde i Hordaland] (Kristoffer Furberg, 10/19/08)

A person died after to have driven in lake in Sunde in Hordaland

A person died after having driven into the lake in Sunde (Hordaland)

<arkiv.nettavisen.no/Nyhet/330260/Kjørte+i+sjøen.html>

To sum up, it is clear that Norwegian behaves like Spanish and Swedish in allowing extensive usage of both functional and lexical Ps introducing finite (and infinitival) clauses.

6.3.2.2. Prepositional optionality

In standard Norwegian, it seems that optionality of the P is very limited, at least more limited than in Swedish. In particular, Ns and As require the presence of the P to select clauses:
(52)  a. **Resultatet *(av)* at man spiser mye er overvektighet**

The-result of that one eats much is overweight

The result of eating much is being overweight

b. **Resultatet *(av)* å spise mye er overvektighet**

The result of eating much is being overweight

c. *påstanden Ø at Knighton var le Marquis, forferdet oss*

the-claim that Knighton was le Marquis stunned us

d. **Jeg er glad *(for)* at du er her**

I am glad for that you are here

I am glad you are here

e. **Jeg er glad *(for)* å være her**

I am glad for to be here

I am glad to be here

Christensen (1984: 79)

There seem to be some exceptions to this norm, as the following example proves:
Interestingly, Lødrup (1991: 127) argues that examples such as (53a) might be grammatical without the expected P because they may be adjuncts and not arguments. This is exactly the type of differentiation between prepositional clauses to Ns that Leonetti (1999) establishes for Spanish. Notice that the absence of the P does not mean that these nouns such as tanke are not regularly used with the P, and consequently, once again, we find that sentential adjuncts to Ns are perfectly grammatical when they are introduced by Ps, which brings back into the discussion the conclusion reached in chapter 3 that prepositionality does not mean argumenthood.

While standard Norwegian seems to restrict optionality, colloquial Norwegian seems to reflect a different reality, as Lødrup (2004) studies. For instance, consider the following prepositional example:

(54)  a. Han insisterte på at han jobber for en våpenhvile

He insisted on that he works for a cease-fire

He insisted that he works for a cease-fire

Lødrup (2004: 69)
Now compare it to the colloquial examples listed below, extracted from the internet by Lødrup (2004):

(55)  a. Sharon insisterte Ø at han jobber for en våpenhvile

        Sharon insisted that he works for a cease-fire

    b. (Han) insisterer Ø å spille profetien

        He insists to play the-prophecy

        He insists on playing the prophecy

        Lødrup (2004: 67)

Adjectives are also open to optionality in colloquial Norwegian, with finite clauses and infinitives:

(56)  a. Jeg er flink Ø å lage pizza

        I am clever to make pizza

        I am clever at making pizza

    b. Jeg er glad Ø at jeg var først

        I am happy that I was first

        Lødrup (2004: 83)
Surprisingly, the movement towards optionality in colloquial Norwegian does not reach nouns, which tend to require the presence of the P. In addition, the absence of the P is not an option when the complement is an NP/DP. Notice that with this change Norwegian is moving closer to Swedish. What is more, it looks as if Norwegian were walking the opposite path Spanish walked by the end of the Middle Ages: while Spanish Ps extended to finite clauses, Norwegian seems to be moving in the direction of self-licensing (i.e., non-prepositional) of sentential arguments.

6.3.3. Present-day Danish

Danish behaves like Swedish and Norwegian in admitting prepositional finite clauses and prepositional infinitives. Consider the following examples:

(57)  a. Jeg venter på [at han skal komme]
      
      I  wait on that he shall come
      
      I’m waiting for him to come

      Spore (1965: 209)

      b. Peter tvivlar på [at Maria ofte ryger disse cigarer]
      
      Peter doubts on that Maria often smokes these cigars

      Peter doubts that Maria often smokes these cigars

      Haslinger (2001: 3)
c. Hun var **sicker på** [at hun havde ret]
   She was sure on that she had right
   She was sure that she was right

   Allan et al. (2000: 113)

d. Jeg er **bange for** [at han kommer for sent]
   I am afraid for that he comes for late
   I am afraid he will arrive late

   Spore (1965: 202)

e. Hun er **bange for** [at gå ud alene]
   She is afraid for to go out alone
   She is afraid of going out alone

   Allan et al. (2000: 113)

Indirect interrogatives accept being introduced by Ps as well:

(58)  

   a. Jeg **undrer mig over** [hvem der kan have ringet]
      I wonder me over who he can have ringed
      I wonder who he may have phoned

   b. Jeg **spekulerer på** [om jeg har husket at lukke vinduet]
      I wonder on whether I have recalled to close the-window
      I wonder whether I remembered to close the window
c. Hun er **bange for [hvad der vil ske]**

She is afraid for what that will become

She is afraid of what will happen

Allan et al. (2000: 113)

As expected, P + CP is also found with adverbial clauses, both finite clauses and infinitives:

(59) a. De gjorde meget **for [at han skulle føle sig hjemme]**

They did much for that he should feel himself home

They did a lot to make him feel at home

Allan et al. (2000: 113)

b. **Efter [at han var rejst], blev der stille i huset**

After that he was gone, remained in calm the house

After leaving, the house calmed down

Spore (1965: 200)

c. **uden [at han tænker over det]**

without that he thinks over it

without him thinking about it

<www.sentura.dk/merete_pryds_helle_uddrag.html>
d. Han gik **uden** [at sige noget]

He left without to say nothing

He left without saying anything

Allan et al. (2000: 113)

A striking feature of Danish is that the complementizer *at* can be deleted even if the subordinate clause is introduced by a P, leaving the P somehow stranded, evidence in favor of the prepositional analysis of these traditionally called ‘subordinating conjunctions’:

(60) *Jeg tvivler på (at) han har ret*

I doubt about (that) he has right

I doubt he is right

Hansen (2005: 1818)

Regarding optionality, the only information that I have been able to gather comes from Spore (1965), who indicates in a footnote that the P *til* may be dropped when it takes an infinitive, as in the following example:

(61) *Han har ikke lyst (til) at komme*

He has not wish to to come

He is not looking forward to coming
To sum up, Danish belongs to the same group as Swedish, Spanish or Portuguese in admitting a variety of P + CP. However, it appears that Danish disallows the absence of the P more than Spanish or Swedish, which in principle calls for a difference in the licensing properties of these languages. Notice that the differences are hardly found in the properties of the Ps, which completely fulfill the requirements to select for clauses as in Spanish or Swedish, or in the properties of the finite clause (and the infinitives) for that matter, because they can be the object of both functional and lexical Ps. Therefore, we are left once more with another impasse in that the theoretical tools that may help us understand Spanish or Swedish cannot account for a language such as Danish, which a priori looks like a copy of Swedish but turns out to include its own set of several important differences.

6.3.4. Present-day Icelandic

Another language of interest is Icelandic. Vs and other categories can select for a prepositional argument finite clauses, both \( a\theta\)-clauses (\( that\)-clauses) and indirect interrogatives:
(62)  

a. Jón var að hugsa um [að María væri líklega farin]  
John was to think about that Maria was likely gone  
John was thinking about that Mary had probably gone

b. Ólafur beið aftir [að Helga kæmi]  
Olaf waited after that Helga came  
Olaf waited for Helga to come

c. Jón langar til [að María komi hingað]  
John wants to that Maria comes here  
John wants Mary to come here

d. Jón var að hugsa um [hvort María mundi koma]  
John was to think about whether Maria would come  
John was thinking about whether Mary would come

Thráinsson (1979: 25)

e. Ég minni nemendur á [að prófið er aftir mánuð]  
I remind the-students on that the-proof is after month  
I remind the students that the examination is in a month

f. Ég legg til [að við kaupum kaffivél]  
I propose to that we buy coffeemaker  
I propose that we buy a coffeemaker

Árnason (2005: 1572)
As can be seen, infinitives too can be selected for by Ps (Icelandic infinitives are introduced by *að*):

(63) a. Þeir *hættu við* [að leggja veginn]

They refrained from to build the-road

They decided not to build the road

Thorainsson (1979: 25)

a. Jón *langar til* [að fara]

Jon longs to go

Jon wants to go

Thorainsson (1979: 26)

c. Þeir *töludu um* [að lækka kaupið]

They talked about to lower the-salary

They talked about lowring the salary

d. Hún hefur *gaman af* [að dansa]

She has fun from to dance

She is fond of dancing

e. Þeir *bíða eftir* [að komast í Bessastaði]

They wait after to come to Bessastaðir

They await the opportunity to go to Bessastaðir

Thorainsson (2007: 411)
Icelandic also has adverbial P + CPs, with different degrees in terms of the obligatoriness or not of an intervening pronoun (a demonstrative pronoun). Notice that infinitives are also included into his group:

(64)  

a. Ég fer úr *(því) [að hann er kominn]  
I leave from that that he is arrived  
I’ll leave since he has arrived  
b. Ég kom til (bess) [að þú gætir farið]  
I came to that you could go  
I came so you could go  
c. Hún kom eftir [að þú varst farinn]  
She came after that you were left  
She came after you had left  
d. Við fórum eftir [að hafa sópað gólfð]  
We left after to have swept the-floor  
We left after having swept the floor  

e. til bess [að komast inn í háskóla]  
to that to come in to university  
in order to get into the university  

Thráinsson (2007: 432)
f. Ég kemst ekki af því [að ég er veikur]
   I come not from that that I am sick
   I can’t come because I am sick

Therefore, it is obvious that the pronominal alternative is in effect:

(65) a. Helga kemur ekki vegna þess að Jón er á staðnum
    Helga comes not because that Jon is in there
    Helga won’t come because John is there
b. Hann les mikið til (þess) að hann fái góða einkunn
    He studies hard to that he gets good mark
    He studies hard in order to get a good mark

Árnason (2005: 1572)
c. en það er undir því komið [að yfirlöð sýni...]
   but that is under that dependent that the-authorities show...
   <www.laeknabladi.is/2003/6/umraeda-frettir/nr/1320>
d. komið undir því [að ég...]
   dependent under that that I...
   (it) depends on my...
   <sienna.blogcentral.is/blog/2006/6/21/hmmm>
In principle, we may accept an analysis with the P selecting for the pronoun and the clause in adjunction to the pronoun. However, Árnason (2005: 1572) proves that the internal structure of (at least some of) these pronominal conglomerates is actually more unitary than it might seem, for the whole PP, including the finite clause, must displace in block. Moving the finite clause on its own, which should be perfectly grammatical if it were an adjunct, is barred, as the following examples prove:

(66)  
a. [Vegna þess að Jón er á staðnum] kemur Helga ekki  
Because that that Jon is in there comes Helga not

b. *[Að Jón er á staðnum] vegna þess kemur Helga ekki  
That Jon is in there because that comes Helga not

Because John is there, Helga won’t come

This syntactic behavior will prove interesting once we add German, and compare both Icelandic and German to French or Dutch.

It is necessary to highlight that the existence of the pronominal construction does not preclude the existence of P + CP, like in Swedish. Notice that any type of recategorization of the pronoun in terms of determiner is impossible because pronouns in Icelandic are morphologically inflected, and thus are clearly pronominal in nature.
6.3.5. Present-day Faroese

In this language there are also some examples of P + CPs. As Thráinsson et al. (2004: 301, fn 67) mention, “Faroese ‘that’-complements can easily be the objects of prepositions, as can their counterparts in Icelandic”. Let us observe first the following examples of argument clauses, including an infinitive:

(67) a. Vit tosðu um, [at hon skuldi koma]
    We talked about that she should come
    We talked about the fact that she should come

b. Eg eri keddur av, [at hon er burturstødd]
    I am sorry of that she is away
    I am sorry that she is away

c. Hann iðraði seg um, [at hann hevði gjørt hetta]
    He regretted refl over that he had done this
    He regretted having done this

Thráinsson et al. (2004: 301)

d. Hann er ikki førur fyri [at koyra bil]
    He is not fit for to drive car
    He is not able to drive a car

Thráinsson et al. (2004: 301)
Prepositional finite clauses are also found in adverbial clauses. For instance, *uttan (at)* (without, unless), *til tess (at)*, *til at* (so that), *eftir (tað) at* (after), *av tí at*, *vegna tess at* (because), etc., as can be seen in the following examples (cf. Lockwood (1955: 86-89), Thráinsson et al. (2004: 198-200)):

(68)  
a. Stutt *eftir* [at hann var borin til hús], *doyðy hann*  
Shortly after that he was born to house, died he

Shorty after being carried home, he died  

Lockwood (1955: 86)

b. Hetta var eitt reiðiligt bragd, *av tí* [at Hammershaimb, til tess at koma ávegis, mátti smíða eitt nýtt rættskrivingarlag]
This was a real tour-de-force, from that that Hammershaimb, to it to come progress, must create a new orthographical-form

This was a real tour de force, for Hammershaimb, in order to make progress, had to create a new orthographical form

Lockwood (1955:87)

c. Hann fekk sær eina byrsu, *við tað at* hann var ræddur fyri spökilsun
He got him a gun, with that that he was afraid of ghosts

He got himself a gun because he was afraid of the ghosts

Thráinsson et al. (2004: 199)
Adjunct (adverbial) infinitival P + CPs are also possible, as can be seen in the following sentences. Notice that some of them require intervening pronouns, as in Icelandic:

(69) a. Eg skrivi fyri [at fáa at vita], um Eirika kemur skjótt aftur
    I write for to get to know if Eirika comes soon back
    I am writing to find out if Eirika is coming back soon

b. Hetta var eitt reiðiligt bragd, av tí at Hammershaimb, til tess [at koma ávegis], mátti smiða eitt nýtt rættsskrivingarlag
    This was a real tour-de-force, from it that Hammershaimb, to that to come progress, must create a new orthographical-form
    This was a real tour de force, for Hammershaimb, in order to make progress, had to create a new orthographical form

Lockwood (1955:87)

6.3.6. Old Norse

This section will be devoted to the description and commentary of the syntax of prepositional clauses in Old Norse. As the Scandinavian scholars indicate, the term Old Norse has been applied to two different linguistic realities. On a wider perspective, Old Norse applies to Old Scandinavian in general. On a narrower perspective, it refers to only one of the branches of Old Scandinavian: Old Western Scandinavian, that is Old
Icelandic and Old Norwegian (Schulte (2002: 873)) or, in other words, Medieval West Nordic, from the 9th to the 14th century (Faarlund (2004: 1)). The latter usage is the one adopted here for forceful reasons, since that is the data I could access. I was incapable of using any information on Old Swedish or Old Danish, because the relevant resources are not available in a language I can read.

6.3.6.1. Prepositional finite clauses

Faarlund (pc) indicates that the construction P + finite clause is very rare in Old Norse. On the other hand, what Old Norse documentation shows us is that this Old Scandinavian language made extensive use of the pronominal construction. Thus we find demonstrative pronouns morphologically inflected with case functioning as cataphores for the finite clause, exactly what we find in Old Spanish prepositional constructions (cf. also Kossuth (1980: 218 ff) and Fernández (1999: 208)):

(70)  a. því eru allir skyldir at trúa, at Þórr er mátkastr
That-DAT are all obliged to believe that Thor is greatest
Everybody has to believe that Thor is the greatest

b. jarl fýsti þess, at Þorkell skyldi fara til Noregs
earl wanted that-GEN that Thorkel should go to Norway
The Earl wanted Thorkel to go to Norway
not hope was you that-GEN, that I hand-over husband my to man villain your
There was no hope for you that I would hand over my husband to your villain
man

Fernández (1999: 213)

Well might you boast about the fact that no none man has probably ever sailed

Kossuth (1980: 221)

Cataphoric pronouns may also appear with indirect interrogatives:

(71) seg mér betta gersamliga, hvat ek skal síðan gera (Barlaams ok Josaphats saga, 1275. Norway)

tell me this completely, what I shall since do
Tell me exactly what I shall do afterwards

Faarlund (2004: 257)
Pronouns are not attested across the board, which Faarlund (2002: 945; 2004: 254) interprets as pronoun omission. In this sense, we could understand this as support for a diachronic correspondence –familiar to us at this point- going from the pronominal alternatives to those with direct selection, whereby the pronoun disappears and then the P ends up selecting for the finite clause directly may be omitted (recall Moreno Cabrera’s analysis). Observe the following examples of direct selection:

(72) a. nú skulum vér varask víð at eigi taki oss þau dæmi (Gamal norsk homiliebok, 1200. Norway)
    now shall we beware with that not take us those incidents
    Now we should take care that such incidents do not befall us

b. skal ek nauðga þeim til at þeir segi mér it sanna (Brennu-Njálssaga, 1300. Iceland)
    shall I force them to that they tell me the true
    I will force them to tell me the truth

Faarlund (2004: 117)

Adverbial clauses show the same behavior: “Clauses with other adverbial functions in Old Norse are headed by an oblique case of þat ‘that’, sometimes governed by a preposition” (Faarlund (2005: 1160)). Observe the following examples:
(73) a. **til **at hann kom fyrir ondveigt  (*Reykdæla saga ok Víga-Skútu*, 1400. Iceland)

    until that he came for the-high-seat

    until he came before the high seat

    Haugen (1982: 176)

b. Þorsteinn tók við stýrimanninum, *fyrir bvi* at hann beiddist þangat

    Thorstein took with the skipper, for that that he asked-refl thither

    Thorstein received the skipper because he wanted to come there

    Faarlund (2002: 945)

c. **med bvi at** recalld er við þetta tac marc fyrir vtan… (*AM DI LXVI*, c. 1245. Iceland)

    with that that flotsam is with this boundary around outside

    in case that a piece of flotsam is, according to this boundary, outside of it

    Blaisdell (1959: 52)

Notice that example (73b) is syntactically the same as Old Spanish *por aquello que*, and the like in other languages.

The relative *er* (that) may be used instead of *at* (cf. Faarlund (2004: 256), Fernández (1999: 214)): 
(74)  a. Kári hljóp til þess er hann kom at løk einum

Kari ran to that that he came to brook one

Krai kept running until he came to a brook

Faarlund (2004: 256)

b. síðan er Eiríkr konungr gerði þik útlægan (Egils saga Skalla-Grímssonar, 1330. Iceland)

since that Eirikr king made you exile

Since the king Eirikr forced you into exile

Fernández (1999: 214)

Pétursson (2005: 1267) mentions how later on, during the 16th century, other so-called conjunctions were formed; for instance, þó að >…> þótt (lit. ‘though that’, although), or síðan að (lit. ‘since that’).

6.3.6.2. Prepositional infinitives

The at-infinitive can be selected for by a P:

(75) áttu enga ætt til at vera konungr

Own-you no family for to be king

You do not have the (necessary) family background to be a king.

Faarlund (2002: 944)
b. þú ept annarr maðr skyldastr til at hefna Helga (*Droplaugarsona saga*, 1330. Iceland)

You are other man most-obliges to to avenge Helga

You are the other man most obliged to avenge Helga

c. nema nokkurr verði virðing af at hafa þessu máli (*Bandamanna saga*, 1330. Iceland)

Unless some honor might come from taking this case

Unless some honor might come from taking this case

Kossuth (1980: 221)

a. en allir aðrir váru fýsir til at herja (*Heimskringla: Noregs konunga sögur af Snorri Sturluson*, 1300-1700. Iceland)

But all others were eager to pillage

But all the others were eager to pillage

b. gerðist Óláfi forvitni á at reyn spáðóm manns þess (*Heimskringla: Noregs konunga sögur af Snorri Sturluson*, 1300-1700. Iceland)

made Olaf curiosity on to test prophecy man that

Olaf was curious to test that man’s prophecy

Faarlund (2004: 117)

It was also possible to have pronouns referring to an infinitival clause:
(76) þa hætta þeir til þess at eiga at honum (Bandamanna saga, 1330. Iceland)

Then stop they to that to pester to him

Then they stop pestering him

Kossuth (1980: 222)

6.3.7. Conclusions

- All the Scandinavian languages allow both argument and adjunct (adverbial) prepositional finite clauses, including indirect interrogatives.
- The Scandinavian languages question the attempts such as Yim’s (1984) to separate that-clauses and indirect interrogatives because in these Nordic languages both behave the same once again.
- Prepositional infinitives are also grammatical.
- A point of high theoretical and comparative interest that we learn from the observation of the Scandinavian languages is that the existence of P + CP does not preclude the pronominal alternative, which cancels any last resort value for the presence of the pronoun. CPs in Swedish and the other languages can be prepositional and avant la lettre need not be adjunct to any type of pronoun to prevent any Case-assignment, etc. (contra Barra’s (2002) hypothesis for Old Spanish).
• The fact that Ps can take clauses in these languages has led linguists to postulate
the nominal character of the clause in Swedish (cf. Andersson (1975: 193), among
many others). However, we have already seen in previous chapters that being the
object of a P does not imply nominality.

• Notice also that the similarity disappears when it comes to optionality of the P,
although I have shown that Norwegian speakers are joining the trend already in
use in Swedish (and in Spanish). The optionality in Swedish in particular is
interesting in that, despite looking syntactically like a twin of Spanish regarding P
+ CPs, Swedish goes beyond in allowing optionality of the P with infinitives. It is
important to add that it appears that the P must always be present when its object
is an NP/DP, so optionality is not across the board.

• Bošković (1995: 49) argues that optionality in Swedish can be explained if we
assume that there are two different types of complementizer (and CPs). There is
one att which bears Case and another one which does not. This explanation seems
too ad hoc because we have seen that it is difficult to predict what type of
adjective or even noun allows the absence of the P or not.

• We have also seen that the degree of optionality seems to be dependent on each P.
If all these required Ps are functional Ps, then they should be easily discarded
because they add no meaning and have no selectional properties of their own.

• Danish does not allow the absence of the P as much as Spanish or Swedish, but
such differentiation cannot be caused by the properties of the Ps, which
completely fulfill the requirements to select for clauses as in Spanish or Swedish, or by the properties of the finite clause (and the infinitives) for that matter, because they can be the object of both functional and lexical Ps.

- From Old Norse we learn that prepositional finite clause were already present in the Medieval period, and especially that the presence of the pronominal alternative was more frequent. As mentioned above, some linguists see the origin of the modern direct selection in the pronominal alternatives, after the pronoun disappears, which is reminiscent of Moreno’s (1985-86) hypothesis. Notice also that some of the examples above show the pronoun ‘that’ morphologically inflected being selected for by verbs, which shows how case could realize the functions that later on will come to be materialized by a functional P.

- Now this correspondence does not answer the actual question, which is why and by which mechanism did the Ps began to accept finite clauses and why did the pronouns become obsolete but only partially, because, as I have already discussed, the Scandinavian languages have both direct selection and the pronominal alternative.

6.4. Dutch

Dutch is another language in the group of languages assumed to lack argument prepositional finite clauses. Rather, the pronominal alternative –similar to what is found
in French and to a lesser extent in English or Swedish—must be activated. Observe the following example:

(77)  a. Ik reken *rop [dat je blijft eten]

I count thereon that you stay eat

I count on your staying to eat

Haslinger (2001: 1)

b. *dat wij op [dat hij kwam] rekenden

That we on that he came counted

c. dat wij er op rekenden [dat hij kwam]

That we there on counted that he came

Hoekstra (1984: 110)

Notice that (77b) shows that the P op cannot take the finite clause directly as its complement. Traditionally, the previous examples have sufficed to conclude that Dutch does not allow argument finite P + CP at all. However, once again we find that the data contradict the general assumption. On the one hand, Hoekstra (1984: 109) remarks the presence of P + finite CPs in adverbial clauses:

(78)  a. voor [dat we gingen eten] dronken we eerst een glas sherry

Before that we went eat drank we first a glass sherry
Before starting the meal, we first drank a glass of sherry

Hoekstra (1984: 109)

b. **Na dat** Jan binnenkwam, ging de telefoon

After that John entered rang the phone

After John entered, the phone rang

Haslinger (2007: 171)

c. **Om [dat Jan binnenkwam], hield iedereen z’n mond**

For that John entered, held everyone his mouth

Because John entered, everyone fell quiet

Haslinger (2007: 172)

Donaldson (1981: 192) also mentions *tot(dat)* (lit. ‘until that’), *opdat* (lit. ‘on that’, so that), *doordat* (lit. ‘by that’, by, because), *zonder dat* (lit. ‘without that’), or *in plaats van dat* (lit. ‘in place of that’, instead of). Thus for Hoekstra (1984) there is no use in claiming that Dutch finite clauses are subject to constraints of the type of Stowell’s CRP because:

With temporal prepositions, NP and S’ [CPs] have an overlapping distribution, which makes it difficult to claim that S’ [CPs] may not occur in Case-marked positions. (Hoekstra (1984: 110))
Furthermore, van Kerckvoorde (1993: 72, 75) cites several adverbial P + finite CP already attested in Middle Dutch, such as *omdat/omme dat* (lit. ‘for that’), *bi dat* (lit. ‘by that’), *dore dat* (lit. ‘through that’), *sedert dat* (lit. ‘since that’), or *tote dat* (lit. ‘to, until that’), which prove that the prepositional pattern was active. Observe the following examples:

(79) a. Elegast quam eerst int crijt, **omme [dat hi aen leggher was]**] *(Van Sente Brandane, 12th c.)*

    Elgast came first into ring, for that he accuser was

    Elgast was the first to enter the ring, since he was the accuser

    van Kerckvoorde (1993: 75)

b. **tot [dat die spise is neder ghegaen]**] *(Boec van medicinen in Dietsche, Thomas Broeder, c. 1300)*

    till that the food is down gone
    until the food has gone down

    Burridge (1993: 15)

Infinitives in adverbial clauses can also be introduced by Ps, as the following examples illustrate:
(80) a. Hij ging naar huis om [zijn fiets te halen]

He went to house for his bike to fetch

He went home in order to fetch his bike

b. Door [dat te doen] bereik je niets

By that to do accomplish you nothing

By doing that, you will accomplish nothing

c. Na [urenlang gewerkt te hebben], ben ik naar de bioscoop gegaan

After hour-long worked to have, I went to the cinema

After having worked for hours, I went to the cinema

Donaldson (1981: 202)

Hoekstra (1984) indicates that P + finite CPs are limited to adverbial clauses, on the basis of the ungrammaticality of examples such as (77b) above. However, Haslinger (2007) provides extensive evidence of the existence of argument prepositional finite clauses in present-day colloquial Dutch which calls into question the grammaticality judgments coming from standard data, as is the case with Hoekstra. Observe the following examples (all from spoken Dutch):

(81) a. Iedereen zat te rekenen op [dat jij ‘m zou nemen]

Everybody sat to count on that you him would take

Everybody was convinced that you would take it
b. Ik weet niet of dat het te **maken** heeft **met** [dat de jongens weg zijn gegeven]  
I know not whether that it to make has with that the boys away are given  
I don’t know whether it is related to the fact that the boys have been given away  

c. **Die** zitten op te **scheppen over** [dat ze zo weinig aan hun studie doen]  
They sit on to brag about that they so little on their study do  
They are braggin about the fact that they spend so little time studying  

d. Het **ligt aan** [dat ik veertig ben]  
It lies on that I forty am  
It is because I am forty years old  

Haslinger (2007: 165)  

It is not only colloquial Dutch where argument P + finite CPs are grammatical. Standard Dutch examples can also prove that prepositional direct selection is possible. Consider the results from right dislocation (82a) and coordination (82b):  

(82)  
a. **Jan heeft** daar nooit **aan getwijfeld aan** [dat Maria de waarheid sprak]  
John has there never on doubted, on that Mary the truth spoke  
John has never doubted that Mary told the truth  

Haslinger (2007: 165)
b. Ik had noch op [dat Chris zou komen] noch op [dat Maria zou komen]
gerekend
I had neither on that Chris would come nor on that Mary would come counted

Haslinger (2001: 3)

Notice also that the fact that certain syntactic movements reveal that there is no constraint against P + finite CP in standard Dutch proves that the nature of P + CP does not depend on the syntactic properties of Ps or the finite clause, because otherwise not even in those movement related contexts would P + finite clause be grammatical. Rather, the availability of P + finite CP must be determined by reasons other than the features of P and the finite CP in Dutch.

As expected, Haslinger (2007: 154) concludes that “the CP in the P + CP pattern is more appropriately viewed as being a DP”, because she is assuming that Ps take nouns, but let us recall that this description is not problematic, for instance in the case of Spanish infinitives and infinitives and finite clauses with articles.

Evidently, these colloquial examples do not preclude the co-existence of the standard pronominal alternative. In contrast to the French examples, Dutch pronominal alternatives really do not form a constituent, as evidenced by the fact that the finite clause can be separated and displaced on its own (Haslinger (2007: 160)). Observe the following
example, which proves that moving both the P + pronoun and the finite clause results in an ungrammatical sentence:

(83) *[Erover dat het weer zo slecht was] heeft ze constant lopen klagen
    Thereabout that the weather so bad was has she constantly walk complain
    She has constantly been complaining about the bad weather

Haslinger (2007: 160)

Interestingly, Haslinger (2007: 161) finds that the opposite behavior occurs with the P + finite CP alternative, where the P + finite CP is indeed a true prepositional constituent and consequently can be displaced accordingly:

(84) [Over dat het weer zo slecht was] heeft ze constant lopen klagen
    About that the weather so bad was has she constantly walk complain
    She has constantly been complaining about the bad weather

Haslinger (2007: 161)

Finally, the other type of finite CP also participates in the direct prepositional construction, as the following (standard) examples illustrate:
To sum up, the conclusion is that, as Haslinger (2001: 3) puts it, “[f]rom these facts we can derive the descriptive generalization that P+CP patterns in Dutch are allowed”, contrary to the standard assumptions. Notice that P + finite CP is not only reduced to colloquial Dutch: recall the adverbial clauses cited above and the examples where P + CP is the result of several syntactic processes.
6.5. German

German grammarians point out that argument prepositional finite clauses require the pronominal alternative, a PP proform, which in this language consists of the morphological fusion of the pronoun \textit{da}/\textit{ss}/ and the corresponding P. Indirect interrogatives show the same behavior. Observe the following examples, with Vs, Ns, and As:

(86)  a. Ich \textit{verlasse mich} \textit{darauf, dass} ich ihn zu Hause finde

\begin{align*}
\text{I} & \quad \text{rely} & \quad \text{refl} & \quad \text{that-on, that} & \quad \text{I him at home find} \\
\text{I rely on finding him at home} & \\
\end{align*}

\textit{Durrell (2002: 286)}

b. Sie hat ihm \textit{dafür} \textit{gedankt, dass} er ihr geholfen hatte

\begin{align*}
\text{She has him that-for thanked, that he her helped had} \\
\text{She thanked him for having helped her} & \\
\end{align*}

\textit{Durrell (2002: 393)}

c. Er ist \textit{davon} \textit{abhängig, dass} ihm sein Bruder hilft

\begin{align*}
\text{He is that-of dependent, that him his brother helps} \\
\text{He is dependent on his brother’s helping him} & \\
\end{align*}

d. Sie war \textit{darüber} \textit{froh, dass} sie ihn noch sehen würde

\begin{align*}
\text{She was that-about pleased, that she him still see would} \\
\text{She was pleased that she would still see him} & \\
\end{align*}
Durrell (2002: 141)

e. Die **Angst davor, dass** er vielleicht nicht entkommen könnte

The fear that-for that he perhaps not escape could

The fear that perhaps he could not escape

Durrell (2002: 405)

f. ich **erinnere mich** nicht **daran**, [ob es vielleicht anders herum gewesen war]

I recall me not that-in, whether it perhaps different around been was

And I don’t remember whether it was perhaps the other way around

<jetzt.sueddeutsche.de/texte/anzeigen/429640>

g. In der Folgezeit kam das **Gespräch** zweimal **darauf**, [ob ich wieder in Bayreuth inszenieren würde]

In the next-time came the conversation twice that-about whether I again in Bayreuth stage would

In the following days we ended up twice talking about whether I would again stage an opera in Bayreuth

<www.nordbayerischer-kurier.de/nachrichten/1274430/details_8.htm>

h. Ich **erinnere** mich nicht **daran**, **wann** ich es hörte

I recall me not of-it, when I it heard

I don’t remember when I heard it

Durrell (2002: 405)
i. **Ungeachtet dessen** [ob der Bericht nun wahr ist oder nicht]

Irrespective of-that whether the story now true is or not

Regardless of whether the story is true or not

<http://www.dict.cc/german-english/>

i. Der Investor ist **daran interessiert**, [ob sein Investment auch sicher ist]

The investor is that-in interested, whether his investment also safe is

The investor is interested in whether his investment is really safe

<www.oenb.at/de/img/newsletter_basel_ii_q1_2005_tcm14-25576.pdf>

Contrary to English, in German both the *dass*-clauses and the indirect interrogatives seem to be subject to the same restrictions. The direct selection is ungrammatical in these cases:

(87) *Wir sprachen seit Tagen über dass Hans krank war*

We talked for days over that Hans sick was

Webelhuth (1992: 100)

The PP proform is also available for argument infinitives:

(88) Er ist **davon abhängig**, das Geld **zu erhalten**

He is there-of dependent, the money to receive
He is dependent on receiving the money

Durrell (2002: 141)

Ebert (1976) proves these constructions with infinitives (Ebert’s work is only on infinitives) are already attested in Early New High German:

(89)  a. vn ob wol der will das selbig och fasset vn **darauf falt** [das zutun…] (*Predigen teütsch*, Johan von Kaisersperg, 1508)
    and if well the will the same also contains and there-on falls that to-do
    and although the will understands that and strives to do it
  b. oder dich **dar zu bereitest** [got zu dienen] (*Seelenparadies*, Johannes Geiler von Kaisersberg, 1510)
    or you there to prepare god to serve
    or [that] you prepare yourself to serve God

Ebert (1976: 163)

In principle, we could conclude that there is an operative constraint in German against any type of P + CP. However, this generalization is false.

First, as happens with other languages, it turns out that adverbial prepositional finite clauses are grammatical, as the following examples prove:
Neither ausser nor ohne may create a PP proform (cf. Durrell (2002: 57)), which may initially explain why there is no PP proform in the previous examples. However, notice that this has nothing to say about the fact that nevertheless these Ps, instead of being barred from any clausal complementation, as happens with French contre for instance, do in fact accept direct selection.

Prepositional finite clauses date back to Old High German. Lockwood (1968: 224-225) mentions the prepositional group ohne dass (lit. ‘without that’), as the following example proves:

(91) Salomo (…) wandelte nach den Sitten seines vaters David, **On das er auff den Höhen opfferte** (Luther 1546)
Salomon followed the customs of his father David, even though he did not sacrifice on the hills.

Lockwood (1968: 224) notes the appearance of two other prepositional groups: *auf dass* and *bis dass*, both dating back from the middle period. Others appear in the 18th century, such as *anstatt dass* (lit. ‘instead that’), *ausser dass* (lit. ‘except that’), and *während dass* (lit. ‘during that’).

In addition, infinitives in adverbial clauses also accept being selected for by Ps. Observe the following examples:

(92) a. Ich konnte nichts tun um ihn zu beruhigen
    I could nothing do for him to reassure
    I couldn’t do anything to reassure him

    Durrell (2002: 270)

b. Er verliess das Haus ohne [gesehen zu werden]
    He left the house without seen to be
    He left the house without being seen
c. Er hat gespielt \textit{(an)}statt \textit{zu arbeiten} \\
He had played instead to work \\
He played instead of working \\
d. Was konnten sie tun \textit{ausser \textit{zu protestieren}?} \\
What could they do except to protest \\
What could they do except protest? \\

Durrell (2002: 271)

Since infinitives and finite clauses can be the object of Ps, we might wonder whether both of them behave the same regarding the presence of the article. As it turns out, only the infinitive admits it:

(93) a. \textbf{Bei[m Erwachen am Morgen]} erschrak ich eine Sekunde lang (Frisch) \\
By-the wake-up in-the morning frightened I one second long \\
When I woke up in the morning, I was frightened for a second \\
b. Bitte bewahren Sie den Fahrschein \textbf{bis zu[m Verlassen des Bahnhofs]} \\
Please retain you the ticket until-to-the leave of-the station \\
Please retain your ticket until leaving the station \\

Durrell (2002: 279)
Notice that we find the same problems in German that we have been facing before: while some infinitives with articles do show nominal properties, as in (93b) where the regular transitive verb *verlassen* takes a genitive-object instead of the expected accusative one, in (93a) the verb keeps its verbal properties since it can take adverbial/temporal modification (in the morning). Historically, prepositional infinitives and infinitives with articles are also attested in Early New High German (15-16th c.) (Ebert (1976: 16-17)).

Given the previous data, we could try to differentiate between argument clauses and adjunct/adverbial clauses because the latter accept P + CP while the former do not. However, in order to do so, we will need to offer proper accounts of the following problems for such generalization.

First, it turns out that some dialects of German already show some tolerance for direct selection, as the following examples of Swiss German show (Dieter Wanner, pc). Each example features direct selection, the pronominal alternative, and lack of P, in that order:

(94)  a. Ich bin überzüügt ??yo/drvo/ Ø das sie daas scho rächt mache wird
      I am convinced of/ it-of/ Ø that she this already right make will
      I am convinced that she will do this all right

      b. Du sötsch nüd rächne ?mit/ drmit/ ??Ø das dr daas sowisoo glinge wird
      You should not reckon with/ it-with/ Ø that you that anyway succeed will
      You should not rely on it that you will succeed in it anyway
c. Er zellt *uf/druuf/*Ø das er sis gält wider überchoo wird

He counts on/it-on /Ø that he his money again receive will

He counts on getting his money back

Dieter Wanner (pc)

Notice that nevertheless the level of grammaticality/acceptability of P + finite CP in the previous examples varies: while (94a) is highly unacceptable, (94b) is more acceptable, and finally (94c) is grammatical.

Second, if we are to conclude that the presence of the pronoun in the argument clauses is due to any restrictions against direct selection of a CP by a P in German, we are left without an adequate description for the fact that some Ps introducing adverbial clauses require the pronominal alternative as well, therefore grouping together with the (functional) Ps in the argument clauses:

(95)  a. Der Mann erhielt das Brot dazu, dass er seine Kinder damit ernähre

The man got the bread that-to, that he his kids with-it feeds

The man got the bread in order to feed his children

b. Der Mann gab dem Jungen das Geld dafür, dass er seiner Mutter ein Geschenk kaufen konnte

The man gave the kid the money that-for, that he to her mother a gift buy could
The man gave the kid the money so he could buy her mother a gift

Esau (1973: 250)

As can be seen, the Ps requiring the pronoun are not the same ones that accept direct selection. On the theoretical side, notice that these are all lexical Ps, all meaningful and with θ-assignment. Therefore, the fact that some of them can take a finite clause while other still need a pronoun cannot be reduced to a differentiation between functional and lexical Ps but crucially neither can it be in response to the properties of the finite clause in German, since in that case we would expect all these Ps to accept finite clauses or the exact opposite, but not a mixed situation which makes it very hard to isolate the one factor that is telling apart the grammatical cases of prepositional finite clauses from the ungrammatical ones.

Add to the previous examples the fact that the pronominal alternative can coexist on the same sentence with the same meaning with direct selection, as the following adverbial clauses illustrate:

(96) a. Ich brauche den Hammer dazu, um den Nagel einzuschlagen

   I need the hammer that-to, for the nail to nail
   I need the hammer to nail a nail

Esau (1973: 249)
b. Er hat es **darum** gemacht, **damit** du ihn endlich in Ruhe lässt

He has it that-for done, for-that you him finally in peace leave

He did it so you would leave him in peace

Esau (1973: 250)

A second problem has to do with constituency tests and the actual nature of the pronominal alternative. Let us remember that in Dutch the pronominal alternative was a syntactic combination of P + pronoun to which the finite clause was adjoined. This was proven by the fact that under displacement the movement of the P + pronoun along with the finite clause resulted in an ungrammatical sentence, as can be seen on this example, previously mentioned in the section on Dutch:

(97)  *[Erover dat het weer zo slecht was] heeft ze constant lopen klagen

Thereabout that the weather so bad was has she constantly walk complain

She has constantly been complaining about the bad weather

Haslinger (2007: 160)

Regarding the syntactic constituent structure of the German pronominal alternative, Haslinger (2007: 160) shows that they may move together when displacement to the left takes place, as example (98a) shows. This is impossible in Dutch. Nevertheless, Dieter Wanner (pc) points to example (98b), where German looks more like Dutch:
(98) a. [Damit dass du kommen würdest] hatte ich nicht gerechnet

Therewith that you come would had I not counted

I had not counted on it that you would come

Haslinger (2007: 160)

b. [Dass du kommen würdest], damit hatte ich nicht gerechnet

Dieter Wanner (pc)

Nevertheless, (98a) shows that the obligatory presence of the pronoun does not preclude that the pronoun and the finite clause may form a syntactic unit, exactly as in Icelandic, but in contrast to Dutch. This is reminiscent of Zaring’s (1992) analysis of French. Both the Icelandic case and the first German example above are evidence against last resort value of the pronoun. What is more, the proform may be dropped, which makes the German clauses resemble their French counterparts:

(99) a. Ich freue mich, dass er kommt

I am-pleased relf, that he comes

I am pleased he is coming

b. Ich freue mich darüber dass er kommt

I am-pleased refl it-over that he comes

I am pleased he is coming

Büring (1995: 374)
c. Ich ärgerte mich (darüber), dass er so wenig getan hatte

I got angry refl it-over, that he so little done had

I got angry about his having done so little

Durrell (2002: 394)

d. Ich bin mir (dessen) bewusst, dass ich ihn strafen sollte

I am me (of-it) aware, that I him punish should

I am aware that I should punish him

Durrell (2002: 405)

Optionality is also possible with infinitives:

(100) a. Sie hofft, ihn wiederzusehen

She hopes him again-to-see

She hopes to see him again

b. Sie hofft darauf, ihn wiederzusehen

She hopes it-about, him again-to-see

She hopes to see him again

Esau (1973: 253)

Webelhuth (1992) argues that the non-pronominal examples show a CP as the complement of the selecting category, without any empty P. Only when the CP is moved,
as in left dislocation, will the P appear, to license a DP trace left by the CP, almost as a last resort strategy. Since English but not German allow prepositional stranding, only the former will materialize this option (Webelhuth (1992: 1000)):

(101)  

a. That John was sick we talked \([\text{PP about \([\text{DP e}]\)]}\) for days  

b. *Dass Hans krank war sprachen wir seit Tagen \([\text{PP über \([\text{DP e}]\)]}\]  

Webelhuth (1992: 100)  

Again, for Webelhuth the only reason why (101b) is ungrammatical is that there is no prepositional stranding in German. This syntactic analysis aims at capturing the fact that those predicates that normally require a P with their argument forbid it with CPs, unless the CP is not occupying the basic object position, in which case the P must be present. Notice however that the existence of the DP is a post hoc phenomenon, meaning that for Webelhuth there is no (necessary) equivalence between CP and the DP, among other reasons because these predicates are prepositional in nature and do not select for a DP but rather for a PP. The P only comes to the rescue because the CP leaves a trace which happens to be categorially different from it and such trace being a DP needs to be licensed by the P because the selecting predicates involved, like I said, do not take DPs but PPs and therefore cannot license a DP on their own.

Webelhuth’s analysis seems to hinge crucially on a differentiation between the regular PP-complements of the selecting categories under study and the CP-not-PP-complements
of the same categories. Notice that this generalization does not hold crosslinguistically, beginning with Spanish, where the equivalent categories may take either a prepositional CP or a bare CP. Webelhuth’s analysis does not offer as proper account of Spanish (and Portuguese) because the optional absence of the P in, for instance, Me acuerdo (de) que… (I remember that…) does not imply that the P de is barred from appearing (that is why it is only optional in the first place). Finally, Webelhuth’s analysis does not explain the syntax of the examples with the PP-proforms.

In response to Webelhuth (1992), Büring (1995) maintains the prepositional analysis for the pronoun-less alternatives as well, although he argues for an empty N mediating between the P and the finite clause, which blocks the direct selection of the P (cf. Büring (1995: 374-375)):

(102) Ich freue mich [PP e [NP e t]], [CP dass er kommt],

I assume that the PP must be full in the cases with the PP proform, and that probably the NP would be occupied by the da- part of the PP proform, which would end up moving to the PP, etc. (but see Berman (2003) for a critical review of both Webelhuth (1992) and Büring (1995)). Notice that this analysis does not allow us to call all these examples into our group of P + finite CP but at least is compatible with the fact that the PP proform and the finite clause actually form a constituent, arguably a PP. In addition, the analysis as PP with a nominal element intervening between the P and the finite clause adds up to the
crosslinguistic data coming from languages with such strategy, such as French, Dutch, Old Italian, Old Spanish, etc., even if, at the same time, the German examples confirm that the proform cannot be taken as a last resort preventing P + finite CP from occurring.

To sum up, as happened with Dutch, the most important conclusion here is that there is no constraint banning P + finite CP in German either, nor was there any in previous stages of the language.

6.6. Conclusions

- All the Germanic languages examined permit the construction P + finite CP; therefore there is nothing special in Spanish in pure theoretical terms. Obviously, the degree to which these languages allow P + CP varies.

- A very important crosslinguistic implication is that these languages add much information confronting the supposition that P + pronoun + CP is indeed a last resort strategy to avoid Ps from taking a finite clause and assign Case to it. Notice too that lexical Ps, consistently accepting sentential complements crosslinguistically, do accept (or even require) a pronoun in the Scandinavian languages. Lexical Ps are meaningful, carriers of thematic content, and, in the Case Theory, able to assign/check Case features to/of their nominal complements, which makes them, a priori, the least needy for any type of pronoun. The fact that
some of these same Ps accept direct selection is more evidence in favor of this 
criticism.

- Scandinavian linguists describe the clauses as nominal because they can be the 
  object of Ps, among other reasons. However, it is necessary to do so once we 
come up with a proper definition of what being nominal means, what the 
properties of a nominal category are, etc. taking into account that infinitives, CPs 
too, can be introduced by Ps but show mixed features (cf. Spanish, Italian, 
German). Ross’s (1972) paper on “squishy” categories, in my view, reflects the 
problems in trying to understand the real nature of the categories used in 
Linguistics (cf. Newmeyer (2005)). Furthermore, it is well known that PPs can 
take other PPs as their objects, and we may not want to claim that a PP 
complement to another PP becomes an NP/DP for the sake of it (this affects 
complex Ps to, such as outside of, where the of component is a functional P but a 
P nonetheless, not an N).
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

7.1. A historical and crosslinguistic view on prepositional finite clauses

The tables below summarize the presence or absence of these constructions, including finite indirect interrogatives and infinitives (Old is to be interpreted as ~ 16\textsuperscript{th} c.):

Table key:

- ✓ extensive grammatical use
- × / ✓ limited number but there exist grammatical uses
- × ungrammatical or unattested
- blank no data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Argument P+<em>que/che</em>-clause</th>
<th>Argument P+indirect interrogative</th>
<th>Argument P+infinitive</th>
<th>Adjunct P+finite CP</th>
<th>Adjunct P+infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colloquial examples</td>
<td>de, à</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a che</td>
<td></td>
<td>di, a, da Article required with the rest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Prepositional clauses in present-day Romance languages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Spanish</th>
<th>Argument P+que/che-clause</th>
<th>Argument P+indirect interrogative</th>
<th>Argument P+ infinitive</th>
<th>Adjunct P+finite CP</th>
<th>Adjunct P+ infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗ / ✓</td>
<td>✗ / ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some early examples; ~16th on</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some early examples; ~16th on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Portuguese</td>
<td>✗ / ✓</td>
<td>✗ / ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~16th on</td>
<td></td>
<td>~17th on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old French</td>
<td>✗ / ✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗ / ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de quoi</td>
<td></td>
<td>de, à</td>
<td></td>
<td>ce / Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Italian</td>
<td>✗ / ✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a che (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Prepositional clauses in Old Romance languages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Argument P+that-clause</th>
<th>Argument P+indirect interrogative</th>
<th>Argument P+ infinitive</th>
<th>Adjunct P+ finite CP</th>
<th>Adjunct P+ infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colloquial examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faroese</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colloquial examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swiss German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Prepositional clauses in present-day Germanic languages
Table 4. Prepositional clauses in Old Germanic languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Argument P+that-clause</th>
<th>Argument P+indirect interrogative</th>
<th>Argument P+ infinitive</th>
<th>Adjunct P+ finite CP</th>
<th>Adjunct P+ infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old English</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Norse</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16th c.</td>
<td>15-16th c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2. Crosslinguistic conclusions and theoretical questions

From the previous chapters in this dissertation, we can extract the following main points and dilemmas of special interest:

A. The existence of \(<P + \text{ finite CP}>\)

- \(P + \text{ CP}\) is actually available in all of the languages examined, even if in different degrees and contexts. Observe the following examples of the modern languages (the numeration here and thereafter is that of the example in its original chapter):
Chapter 4:

(70)  a. Me acuerdo de que viniste a mi casa

Sp

Chapter 5:

(2)  a. propter quod dedi ancillam meam uiro meo

La

(5)  a. Os miúdos lembram-se de que os pais lhes prometeram uma bicicleta

Po

(44)  a. Pierre a tout prévu pour que ce voyage se passe sans ennui

Fr

(66)  a. Ada bada a che tutto riesca

It

Chapter 6:

(5)  b. He said not a thing except that he was sorry

En

(26)  a. Jag väntade på att hon skulle komma

Sw

(46)  a. De pekte på at det ikke var helt riktig

No

(57)  a. Jeg venter på at han skal komme

Da

(62)  a. Jón var að hugsa um að María væri líklega farin

Ic

(67)  a. Vit tosaðu um að hon skal komme

Fa

(78)  a. voor dat we gingen eten dronken we eerst een glas sherry

Du

(90)  a. Er bot uns seine Hilfe an, ohne dass wir ihn darum bitten mussten

Ge

- All of them allow adverbial prepositional finite clauses; any restrictions typically affect argument clauses (i.e., French, German or English). The prepositional nature of these adverbial prepositional clauses is undeniable because they can also take other complements, including full NP/DPs and pronouns. Therefore, constituent tests prove that these P + finite CPs are not units. Once this phrasal
status has been proved, there is no reason to maintain that P + CP is banned. There is no constraint in the feature make-up of the finite clause in any of these languages preventing finite CPs from being selected for by Ps.

- The fact that Spanish and Portuguese allow not only argument prepositional infinitives but also argument prepositional finite clauses with the same Ps (de, a, etc.) forces a revision of the concept of “prepositional complementizer” and its explanatory power. The common description of prepositional complementizers categorizes them as Cs because they are in complementary distribution with another C, que/che (cf. Rizzi (1988), Vincent (1997), for instance). However, Spanish and Portuguese de and a introduce both infinitives and finite clauses with their corresponding C que, therefore P is not in complementary distribution with que (cf. sections 4.3.2., 4.3.1.1. for Spanish, and 5.3.1.1. for Portuguese):

  (5) a. Os miúdos lembram-se de que os pais lhes prometeram uma bicicleta

  (7) a. Alguém já se lembrou de fazer isto?

- Italian a che and Old French de quoi also challenge that description (cf. sections 5.5.1.1.1.1. for Italian, and 5.4.2.1.2. for Old French):

  (66) a. Ada bada a che tutto riesca

  (52) f. Si le monde se plaint de quoi je parle trop de moy, je me plains de quoi il ne pense seulement pas à soy
The more extended existence of adjunct prepositional clauses (adverbial clauses) may be interpreted as a sign that what is at stake is the nature of the P. Functional Ps are (said to be) banned from taking finite CPs in several languages, while (at least some) lexical Ps are perfectly grammatical. However, such classification does not stand up to a crosslinguistic analysis, beginning with the many languages that accept extensive argument P + CP, where the P is functional (Spanish, Portuguese, Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, even English, colloquial Dutch, etc.). If the nature of Ps were at stake, the expectation is that whatever limitations exist must be applicable across the board. This is not the case:

a. We do not expect only some of the Italian interrogative clauses to be ungrammatical: What in the properties of the functional Ps predicts and explains that P + se is ungrammatical, while P + wh-phrase is not? It would seem that the problem here lies in the CP, not in the P (cf. section 5.5.1.1.1.2.):

(72)  b. *Dubitava su se gli fosse permesso

(74)  a. Dubitava su che cosa gli fosse veramente permesso
b. We would lose the opportunity to understand the grammaticality of Old French *de quoi* (cf. section 5.4.2.1.2.), with a functional P, which coexisted with both *de ce que* and adverbial P + CPs:

(52)  f. Si le monde se plaint *de quoy* je parle trop de moy, je me plains

      *de quoy* il ne pense seulement pas à soy


c. Old French poses another problem to the supposed restrictions on functional Ps. If, as is usually claimed, the *ce* element in Old French is indeed a strategy to save an otherwise ungrammatical sentence (that is to prevent the P from directly taking the finite clause), we must accommodate the many examples of the pronominal alternative with adverbial clauses, all of them featuring lexical Ps which could at the same time directly select for a finite clause (cf. section 5.4.2.1.3.):

(58)  b. Que *devant ce que* Jhesus Criz Venist en terre

(61)  e. *devant que* la mort le retiengne

Obviously, this situation also speaks against the last resort value of such pronouns.
The following figure visualizes the crosslinguistic problems for the hypothesis that functional Ps are barred from taking CPs:

Figure 1. Crosslinguistic inconsistencies 1

B. A unified CP

- The examination of the English data yields some remarkable results regarding the differentiation between subtypes of finite CPs. In principle, English could be better explained by accepting a categorial differentiation between argument that-
clauses and indirect interrogatives since the latter permit prepositionality more freely than the former:

a. Indirect finite interrogatives are finite CPs as well. Indirect interrogative clauses in English can be prepositional; consequently, there is no full constraint against argument prepositional finite clauses in this language (cf. section 6.2.1.2.):

(12)  

a. He was worrying about who he should trust

b. Now, that-clauses can be prepositional in English as well, although they must be adverbial clauses (except that, but that, in that, etc.) except some attested examples of argument clauses (cf. section 6.2.1.1.):

(6)  

b. Considering that Pietro was not above twenty-three years...

(7)  

a. A more serious consequence resides in that said deposits clog the pores and hair follicles

c. In addition, there are some properties that that-clauses and indirect interrogatives share in English. For instance, we saw that both types of CP can be in subject position (or in the same displaced position if we do not accept subject clauses; cf. section 6.2.1.2.):
(18) a. [That Jason arrived] infuriated Medea

b. [Whether Agamemnon had triumphed] was unknown

d. We would have to find proper categorial readjustments for those many languages where *that*-clauses and indirect interrogatives have the same behavior, which adds to the categorization of both types as finite CPs. In Spanish, Portuguese, the Scandinavian languages or even Old English *that/que*-clauses and indirect interrogatives can both be prepositional (cf. sections 4.2.3.3.2. for Old Spanish, 4.3.3.1.2. for present-day Spanish, 5.3.1.1. for present-day Portuguese, 5.3.2.1. for Old Portuguese, etc.).

The following figure visualizes the crosslinguistic inconsistency of the hypothesis that *that/que/att/dass*-clauses are categorically different from indirect interrogatives:
C. Direct selection vs. pronominal alternatives

- French *de ce que* may be interpreted as a strategy to avoid P + CP, but this assertion does not hold true either internally in French or crosslinguistically:
a. The fact that adverbial clauses in Old French allowed the optional presence of *ce* questions the last resort function of the pronoun as a barrier against Case-assignment (cf. section 5.4.2.1.3.).

b. There is no *ce* available for indirect interrogatives or infinitives, although this could have been very useful for Old French indirect interrogatives, or present-day French infinitives (for those Ps which do not accept an infinitive, such as *sur*).

c. By assumption, the fact that the pronominal alternatives do not work as last resorts against P + finite CPs forces a radically different analysis of French *de ce que* and *à ce que*, or else we risk ad hoc explanations.

d. If Zaring (1992) is right, the *ce* in *de ce que* and *à ce que* is not a pronoun but a determiner (cf. section 5.4.1.1.1.). As a result the P takes a DP where the finite clause is the object of D, not an adjunct any more.

e. Old French is not the only language where there is coexistence of pronominal and non-pronominal alternatives. Old Italian, Old English, Old Spanish, the Scandinavian languages, colloquial Dutch, have it too (cf. sections 4.2.3.4. for Old Spanish, 5.5.2.1.1. for Old Italian, 6.3.1.2. for Swedish, etc.). Observe the following examples:

(44)  …*por aquello que* siempre le uieran yazer encerrado en su alcazar

(96)  b. *per ciò che* ella amava ben lui

(32)  a. *Efter det att* han avslutat sin examen fick han ett jobb i Tromsö
All of these Ps allow(ed) direct selection in the same period of time. This abundance of languages gives us ample margin to call into question the assumption that the pronouns are introduced to avoid direct selection.

The following figure visualizes the crosslinguistic inconsistency of the hypothesis that P + pronoun + CP is a strategy to avoid P + CP:

![Diagram showing crosslinguistic inconsistencies](image)
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D. Nominality and articles

- There are problems to define nominality due to unclear verbal/nominal properties of infinitives. Observe the following example of an infinitive in Spanish, where the presence of the article and an adjective does not block the presence of a direct object (cf. section 4.3.2.):

(62)  a. El *continuo* dar dinero de María

- Assuming Ps take nominal complements, it is surprising that P + el *que* in Spanish is ungrammatical (cf. section 4.3.3.4.):

(84)  a. *Me acuerdo* del *que* viniste a mi casa

- The article is not grammatical with finite clauses in languages whose finite clauses can be objects of Ps. For instance, in Portuguese (cf. section 5.3.1.3.):

(13)   *O que* ele fale português

- CPs could be prepositional in Old Spanish, Old French, Old Italian, etc., and none of these languages allowed finite clauses with articles.

- Italian allows the article with the infinitive, but despite *a che* there is no *il che* (cf. section 5.3.1.1.2.).
• What is more, indirect interrogatives in Italian can be accompanied by an article, but the same is not possible in English or Swedish.

• Extra evidence of these asymmetries comes from German, where infinitives with articles are attested but not finite clauses (cf. 6.5.):

(93)   a. **Beim Erwachen** am Morgen erschrak ich eine Sekunde lang

• Other PPs can be objects of a P, which is evidence that the complement of a P needs not be nominal (cf. Culicover (1999: 96) for these categorial mismatches).

The following figure visualizes the crosslinguistic inconsistency of the hypothesis that the presence of the article and nominality imply each other:
7.3. Crosslinguistic implications for the syntax and history of Spanish prepositional finite clauses

After examining the syntax and history of prepositional clauses (both finite and infinitival) in several related languages, we can now reach several conclusions regarding the case of Spanish prepositional finite clauses, especially the crosslinguistic implications on the validity of certain assumptions from previous works.
A. The role of Case

- All the previously studied languages include or have included P + finite CP in their grammars. If Case is accepted, we must suppose Case-assignment in those contexts too, including the examples of Old Spanish adverbial clauses. Therefore, the hypothesis that argument prepositional finite clauses are due to any type of nominal feature deficiency in Old Spanish finite clause is falsified.

- Once adverbial clauses are brought back into the discussion, we find P + finite CP in many other languages. Even the a priori exceptionality of Spanish (and Portuguese) in allowing argument prepositional finite clauses vanishes once the Scandinavian languages, Old Norse, Old English, etc. are added (cf. sections 6.3.1.1. for Swedish, 6.3.2.1. for Norwegian, 6.3.3. for Danish, 6.3.4. for Icelandic, 6.3.5. for Faroese, 6.2.6.1. for Old Norse, and 6.2.2. for Old English). French and Italian allow at the very least adverbial prepositional finite clauses, but in addition Italian a che is a modern example of argument P + finite CP (cf. 5.5.1.1.1.1.). Old French de quoi proves the lack of constraints against argument P + finite CP (cf. 5.4.2.1.2.).

- Since infinitives are described as CPs, P + infinitives qualify as examples of P + CP. Thus all the languages studied in this dissertation allow prepositional CPs.

- As widely exposed in chapter 3, recent works have challenged the existence of abstract Case as a licensing property (cf. section 3.4.3.). Such criticism adds up to the problems in identifying infinitives or finite clauses as nominals. The relevance
of morphological case in syntax is very reduced, and the feature Case (or its equivalent, the functional category Kase (KP)) has been substituted by other means, for instance the EPP feature. If Asbury (2008) is indeed right in claiming that case is an epiphenomenon, the whole discussion of abstract Case becomes irrelevant, in particular for finite clauses, because these do not express any type of overt morphology.

- Abandoning Case makes it possible to study P + CP alongside other similar constructions, such as those where it is an adverb that combines with a CP, as in a\textit{unque} (lit. ‘even that’, although) or \textit{ya que} (lit. ‘yet that’, given that). Advs have not been described as Case-assigners.

- To sum up, abstract Case is irrelevant for finite clauses. Even assuming it, it would not explain the formation of argument prepositional finite clauses in Spanish or in other languages.

B. Nominal features

- Barra (2002) assumes a lack of nominal features in the finite clause in pre-16\textsuperscript{th} century Spanish. However, the fact that P + finite CP was already attested in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century (see section 4.2.3.3.1) is sufficient to falsify his hypothesis. At any rate, questioning the nominal features of the finite clause and the nominal nature of the prepositional objects makes this hypothesis simply irrelevant.
The nominal features of the category CP are challenged once we see that there are infinitives—categorically CPs—accompanied by an article which nevertheless keep their verbal properties intact (i.e., having a subject, a direct object, etc.). A possible way out could be to describe infinitives as a mixed category. This labeling does not provide a solution since it just hides the problem without actually solving it, and is difficult to justify where to set the boundaries differentiating mixed categories from non-mixed categories. For instance, “infinitives” such as los deberes (lit. ‘the musts’, the homework) are perfectly describable in present-day Spanish as nouns. They admit no subject, no objects, etc. The opposite is true in para encontrar un trabajo (in order to find a job), where no article or adjective is grammatical, which implies that this infinitive is (and must be) completely verbal (even though it is the object of a P, a theoretical problem in itself). Therefore speaking of mixed category for all infinitives is a wrong conclusion, which in its turn would force to subclassify some infinitives as mixed categories and others as non-mixed categories, and so on and so forth.

The existence of el que (finite clauses with article) as evidence of the nominality of the Spanish finite clause is insufficient (cf. section 4.3.3.4.). First, Portuguese does not have it (in spite of having argument P + finite CPs like Spanish). Second, it is striking that el que-clauses cannot be the object of a P. Third, the D is restricted to the definite article; no demonstratives, etc. are allowed, as opposed to the higher variety with infinitives (cf. section 4.3.2.). Fourth, if infinitives are
already problematic because they may keep their verbal features when accompanied by an article, finite clauses, which by definition must always include temporal inflection and a subject (both verbal features in the linguistic tradition), turn out to be always verbal, which makes them worse nominals than infinitives already are.

- Indirect interrogatives, also finite CPs, only partially accept the article in Spanish (cf. section 4.3.3.4.):

\[(86)\]
\[b. \text{*No sé el cuándo vendrán}\]
\[c. \text{Quería saber el por qué me había ido}\]

The same configuration is completely ungrammatical in English, in spite of having prepositional indirect interrogatives.

- To sum up, to claim that finite clauses are nominal does not offer any beneficial results. Even if they were, the problems would continue because many expected constructions simply do not exist. In addition, my search for clear definitions of categories and their properties is methodologically fair. For instance, to conclude that clauses are nouns we need a clear definition of what a noun is beforehand. Otherwise, any such comparison would be ill-founded.
C. Prepositionality and argumenthood

- Barra (2002) argues that finite clauses became arguments once they could be prepositional. This implies a link between argumenthood and prepositionality. Leonetti (1999) proves that this implication is false (cf. section 4.3.3.5.).

- This implication has crosslinguistic implications. For instance, Barra (2002: 399) suggests that the impossibility of argument prepositional finite clauses is evidence of the lack of argument clauses in French. However, once Barra’s hypothesis is falsified, it may not have any application to French. Moreover, French has adverbial P + finite CPs, and in older stages of French *de quoi* existed, thus the premises for concluding that French lacks argument clauses are false in and of themselves. The same argument is valid for Italian, English, Dutch or German.

D. Optionality and licensing

- In Old Spanish the absence of the P was more extended than in present-day Spanish (cf. section 4.2.1.2. for NP/DPs, 4.2.2.2. for infinitives, 4.2.3.1, 4.2.3.5. for finite clauses).

- The fact that certain prepositional verbs could select for their NP/DP objects without the presence of the P points to the availability of self-licensing of complements in that period. Observe the following example without the P (chapter 4):
The fact that NP/DPs could be licensed without the P means that the same type of non-prepositional licensing must have applied when the complement was not an NP/DP but rather a finite clause, as in *Me acuerdo Ø que*.

- The fact that certain Ps are mandatory in present-day Spanish (as in *contar con* or *depende de*) raises the same question about licensing but from a different perspective (cf. section 4.3.3.3.). Accepting that those Ps are functional, they should be optional, like *de* or *a*. Their obligatoriness is unexpected and poses a theoretical challenge in need of further research. Notice that the problem resides in answering what is gained or what is lost by the presence or absence of the P which controls when optionality is an option or not.

e. The pronominal alternative

- The pronominal alternative was grammatical in Old Spanish (to a limited extent). It might be understood as an indicator of the impossibility of Ps taking finite clauses. *De esto que*, for instance, would exist to avoid *de que*. However, I have already mentioned above that this implication lacks crosslinguistic support.

- Moreno (1985-86) claims that P + finite CP results from the loss of the pronominal alternative (cf. section 2.3.1.). Other linguists have made similar appreciations for other languages (for instance, Faarlund (2004) for Old Norse; cf.
section 6.3.6.1.). Notice however that these are just diachronic correspondences and not exactly explanations of the change or indications of the mechanisms of the changes (cf. Janda (2001: 268) and Joseph and Janda (2003 12-13)).

7.4. Brief notes on categories, change, and methodology

This dissertation has placed the study of the syntax and history of Spanish prepositional finite clauses in its corresponding crosslinguistic place among closely related languages. More generally, it has shown that several theoretical tools must undergo further revision to be really meaningful, and that theoretical argumentations valid for one language may have very limited explanatory power.

On the one hand, I have sought to demonstrate that whatever conclusions are reached, they have immediate internal and crosslinguistic implications that need to be considered. One of the pillars of such approach has to do with inter-linguistic coherence in the realm of categories and their features. Support for such theoretical position comes from Newmeyer (2005, 2007), who argues in favor of the existence of crosslinguistic formal categories.

Newmeyer reviews some of the current key points in (functional) typological studies, which coincide in eliminating the possibility of having any pre-established categories with crosslinguistic applicability. Under this view categories are deemed language-specific and cannot be compared among different languages. As Newmeyer notes, if
categories are considered to have no crosslinguistic value, in principle it could also be the case that categories may not be comparable among the different speakers of a language either (cf. Newmeyer (2007: 139, fn 7). Consider the following quotation from Newmeyer (2007):

The position leads to the conclusion that NO TWO SPEAKERS share formal categories. If there are no crosslinguistic formal categories, then by what rationale could one conclude that identical twins raised together in the same household share categories? (Newmeyer (2007: 146))

If everything is different and not comparable, the description of the natural human language –which lies on the basis of Linguistics as a discipline– turns into an unapproachable question. In the end, any human being can learn any language, so there must be some elements in common, or else we are left to think that everything linguistic is extremely complex and impossible to acquire, which is not the case.

On the other hand, I have shown that the syntax and history of prepositional finite clauses in Spanish and crosslinguistically cannot be properly accounted for by resorting to abstract Case, changes in nominal features or in argumenthood.

Regarding Case, several pieces of evidence support this conclusion. The existence of prepositional adjunct finite clauses (adverbial clauses) proves that Ps could select for a finite clause long before the emergence of their argument counterparts in Spanish. Assuming Case, both lexical and functional Ps would assign it, regardless of the exact nature of the functional Ps (Ps or Ks). Moreover, several works describe CPs as Caseless
categories (cf. Picallo (2002) and Demonte and Fernández (2005)). Other more recent works go beyond by arguing that abstract Case is not necessary in the theory (cf. McFadden (2004) or Asbury (2008)).

The nominality of CPs has proven to be a big problem. Independently of that debate, the argument goes in the same direction as with Case. Assuming that only nominal categories could the object of a P, the grammaticality of adverbial/adjunct prepositional finite clauses before the 16th century illustrates that the feature composition of the Old Spanish finite clause must have already included nominal features.

Leonetti (1999) proves that prepositionality does not imply argumenthood, even if the P is functional *de*. Thus, the possible function of the Ps in creating argument finite clauses is greatly weakened. In addition, I have tentatively suggested that the data do not seem to support a differentiation between non-prepositional and prepositional finite clauses in terms of mood selection. There is actually evidence coming form the opposite direction: Old Spanish shows that the presence of the P was not totally required to license even NP/DPs. If these nouns could be arguments without the required P, so could the finite clauses in the same period. That is to say, non-prepositionality with clauses did not mean non-argument either.

One of the principle conclusions so far, relevant both for Spanish and crosslinguistically, is that the role of the functional Ps in argument P + CPs seems to be syntactically negligible. A priori, this poses a theoretical problem since it would be much more elegant to find a reasonable justification for all elements in syntax. That is one of
the reasons why these functional Ps were deemed as Case-markers to begin with. However, once that function has been rejected, the data presented here do not point to any particular function. Looking at the data in Spanish, there seems to be no significant change between the state of affairs before the emergence of argument prepositional finite clauses and after their appearance. I believe such conclusion to be applicable in all the languages examined in this dissertation. I leave it for future research to find the syntactic relevance of the functional Ps in this construction.

For the moment, this leaves the entrance of the P in argument contexts to be a question of the surface. In Spanish, and other languages, there are several possible connections on the surface. On the one hand, the analogical approaches reviewed in chapter 2 concentrate on the extension of the P from other previously prepositional constructions, such as P + infinitive or P + NP/DP. Such possibility is open for many other languages. Obviously, Barra’s (2002) critical view of analogy holds true. It is true that analogy cannot account for all the examples either, but experts in analogy acknowledge and accept this limitation (cf. Wanner (2005)).

Moreover, analogy is a mechanism of change (cf. Harris and Campbell (1995: 97 ff), among many others) and not a mere diachronic correspondence. What analogy can explain, then, is the channel whereby speakers multi-copied the prepositional frame and spread it to more contexts. Such mechanism can also provide the explanatory basis for the diachronic correspondences established in Moreno (1985-86) with pro-dropping.
As it turns out, in logical terms analogy is compatible with other complementary explanations in terms of syntactic properties differentiating between two linguistic states. In this sense, analogy can be reconciled with formal syntactic approaches, which in general tend to disregard analogy in language. A well-known example is the formal syntactic framework followed throughout this dissertation. The Chomskyan tradition tends to put analogy aside on theoretical grounds. In the division between an invariant I-language (internal language, individual grammar) and a variable E-language (productions of language, language in use), only the former is the core locus of research.

This division has modeled their approach to Historical Linguistics: grammar change (i.e., changes in I-language, via abduction (cf. Andersen (1973)) and not language change (i.e., changes in E-language) constitutes the actual relevant focus of analysis, the innovation (Lightfoot (2006: 13), Hale (2007: 19-26)). As such, analogy is to be understood as an E-language phenomenon. Nevertheless, for historical studies the only available materials are all written E-language samples (cf. Matthews (2003) for criticism in favor of E-language change).

The inclusion of analogy in this discussion is not intended to preclude the validity of (well-delimited) functional categories and feature-driven analysis in change and syntax, as the current formal models propose. It is quite the opposite. Recent studies such as Roberts and Roussou (2003), van Gelderen (2004), Batllori et al. (2005), and Roberts (2007) have proven that formal historical syntactic studies can accommodate and formalize theories, etc. which seemed to belong only in non-formal frameworks. The
same attempt is found in Adger and Smith (2005), who formalize variation. Fischer (2007) argues in favor of a combination of both formal and functional perspectives on change. In the case of analogy, Kiparsky (2000) has already dealt with the formalization of morphological analogy. I believe that a formalization of the mechanism of syntactic analogy, in combination with proper crosslinguistic-valid descriptions of categories and features/properties/principles, can account for and explain the syntax and changes in the constructions examined in this dissertation.

7.5. Future research

The previous pages have shown that there is much work left to do to build a proper account of the history and syntax of prepositional finite clauses in Spanish and crosslinguistically.

As for Spanish, an immediate task is to concentrate on establishing the mechanisms and properties involved in the emergence (and diffusion or frequency increase) of argument prepositional finite clauses. On the comparative side, it is necessary to further explore the syntax of prepositional clauses, especially in the older stages. For instance, it is necessary to pay attention to Old Portuguese prepositional clauses, which are still understudied. Portuguese is the most obvious scenario to test whether the results from research on Spanish are applicable in such a close language. For the same reasons, I am very interested in the older stages of the Scandinavian languages, in particular Old
Swedish. In addition, it is necessary to work on a proper definition of the categories used in syntax, such as CP and other functional categories, P, nominal categories, etc.

The following bullets indicate several points of interest for future research in three main areas: work on Spanish, crosslinguistic studies, and theory-internal topics:

a. Spanish

- Research about the actual mechanisms behind the emergence of the argument prepositional finite clauses in Spanish. This requires going beyond diachronic correspondences and language-specific explanations

b. Other languages

- Further research on Old Portuguese prepositional clauses
- Further research on Old French *de quoi* and *de ce que, à ce que*
- Further research on Old Italian *accioché* and *di ciò che*
- Further research on Italian *a che*
- Further study on the history of the Germanic languages, especially the Scandinavian languages, and in particular (Old) Swedish
- Research about the mechanisms behind the emergence of the argument prepositional finite clauses crosslinguistically.
- Further study on the syntax of argument and adjunct prepositional clauses, both finite and infinitival (with gerunds this time), from a crosslinguistic perspective
• Further study on the syntax and conditions on prepositional optionality from a crosslinguistic view

c. Theoretical topics
• The features/properties of categories such as P, C (and CP), and nominals (especially, vis-à-vis clauses)
• The inventory of functional categories in human languages
• Deeper analysis of the nature of the functional Ps found in prepositional clauses
• The accommodation of the phenomena so far explained with abstract, syntactic Case by using the new advances on the subject in formal syntactic frameworks
• Syntactic analogy and formalization

These points delineate a comprehensive research agenda for an extensive period of time, which will benefit from the collection of more data and the application of current linguistic scholarship, for instance the current growing interest in prepositions. This line of research contributes to the understanding of sentential complementation and adjunction, and the properties of categories and other theoretical tools. It also contributes to both Spanish and comparative (historical) syntax.
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