

### Latin/Romance non-finite complementation:

Prepositional infinitives are an important type of clausal complementation in all Romance languages, especially the use of *de*-infinitive and *ad*-infinitive which are pan-Romance in their uses as non-finite clausal complements (Harris (1978:197-198), Vincent (1988:68-70), Ledgeway (2012a:179), cf Meyer-Lübke (1900:426ff)). However, although Romance prepositional infinitives are widely attested across time and space, their Latin/proto-Romance origins are as yet unknown, since prepositional infinitives do not exist in Latin, apart from some very late and dubious examples which cannot be taken for granted (Diez (1876:201-202), Beardsley (1921:97)). Nonetheless, there have been recent attempts to reconstruct proto-Romance prepositional infinitives, which are structurally equivalent to Latin prepositional gerunds/gerundives as suppletive markers of the oblique functions of the infinitive and the latter may be taken as precursors of the former (Schulte (2007:87ff)). This contribution proposes some Latin origins for Romance prepositional infinitives whose diachronic formation displays striking parallels and divergences from the famous English *to*-infinitive (Los (2005)), a comparison of which raises new questions not only for non-finite complementation but also for mechanisms of syntactic change.

### Romance prepositional complementation:

The two most common types of prepositional complementisers in Romance are *de*-infinitive and *ad*-infinitive which show different distribution with the former used with all types of verbs while the latter restricted mainly to verbs that imply purpose and futurity (Meyer-Lübke (1900:426ff, 435ff), Beardsley (1921:97-99, 106-108, 150-151), Vincent (1988:68, 1999:7)). This is illustrated in the following examples from Medieval Romance where *de*-infinitive is used with verbs of communication (*verba declarandi*), command (*verba praecipiendi*) and as prolatives (*verba prolativa*) whereas *ad*-infinitive is only attested with the latter two (prepositional complementiser in bold):

#### *Verba declarandi:*

Spanish:

- 1a) deneg-o                    **de**    enuia-r-les                    ayuda  
      deny-PRET.3SG        DE    send-INF-PRO.3PL        aid  
      ‘... he denied that he sent them help.’ (*La Primera Crónica General* 679a33)

Italian

- 1b) confess-a                    **d’**            aver-lo                    fa-tto  
      confess-PRES.3SG    DE    have-PRO            do-PERF.PTCP  
      ‘he confesses that he has done it...’. (*Rettorica* p. 108)

French

- 1c) qui            se                    dout-e                    **d’**    estre            blasmee  
      REL.PRO REFL.PRO    fear-PRES.3SG DE    be-INF        blame.PERF.PTCP  
      ‘... who fears that he is being blamed.’ (*La clef d’amors* 2584)

*Verba prolativa:*

Spanish:

- 2a) siempre contiend-e **de** val-er a cuitad-os  
always strive-PRES.3SG DE protect-INF AD victim-PL  
'He always strives to protect the victims.' (*La Estoria de Sennor Sant Millan* 623)

Italian:

- 2b) procaccia-ndo **di** riconcili-ar-si co-l Papa  
strive-GERUND DE reconcile-INF-REFL.PRO with-DEF.ART Pope  
'striving to reconcile with the Pope.' (*Cronica fiorentina*, p. 104)

French:

- 2c) desirroit **a** vivre d-u sien  
want-COND.3SG AD live-INF DE-ART.MASC.SG his.MASC.SG  
'... he would like to live with his.' (*Les miracles de saint Louis de Guillaume de St Pathus* 5554)

*Verba praecipendi:*

Spanish

- 3a) ell-os ordena-uan **de** pon-er  
PRO-3PL order-IMPERF.3PL DE place-INF  
'... they ordered to place them.' (*La Primera Crónica General* 87a47)
- 3b) pora esforç-ar **a** defend-er-se  
in.order.to force-INF AD defend-INF-REFL.PRO  
'in order to force them to defend themselves.' (*La Primera Crónica General* 560b31)

Italian:

- 3c) ordin-arono **di** fa-r-gli fa-re incontinente...  
order-PRET.3PL DE make-INF-PRO do-INF incontinent  
'... they ordained him to be made to make him incontinent' (*Compagnia di S. M. del Carmine*, p. 66)
- 3d) era-no costr-ett-i ... **a** tagli-are selv-e  
be.IMPERF-3PL force-PERF.PTCP-NOM.PL AD cut-INF forest-PL  
'... they were forced... to cut forests...' (*Vègezio* 2, cap. 24)

French:

- 3e) il fust contrei.nz **a** renoi-er  
PRO be.PRET.3SG force-PAST.PTCP AD reject-INF  
la foy Jhesu Crist  
DEF.ART faith Jesus Christ  
'... he was forced to reject his faith in Jesus Christ.'  
(*L'histoire de Barlaam et Josaphat* 1.1.46)

The main difference between *de* and *ad*, therefore, is that *de* marks both realis and irrealis

clausal complements whereas *ad* only marks irrealis complements, which may be projected back to proto-Romance. In the next section, I look at some Latin attestations which bear striking similarities to these Romance examples and may be taken as their precursors.

Latin prepositional complementation:

Both Latin *de* ‘about, regarding’ and *ad* ‘to, towards’ are lexical prepositions and there are numerous examples from pre-classical and classical times where these prepositional gerunds/gerundives are construed directly with verbs which are compatible with their lexical meanings (Johndal (2012)). In the case of *de*, it denotes the content of propositions and is attested with numerous types of verbs that express indirect statements (prepositions in bold):

*Verba declarandi:*

In this category, these are examples of verbs of saying and thinking (*dicendi et putandi*) that take *de*-gerund/gerundive expressing the content of the proposition, which can be reanalysed as indirect statements:

- 4a) Primum tibi **de** nostr-o amico  
 First PRO.2SG.DAT DE our-ABL.SG.MASC friend-ABL.SG.MASC  
 Placa-nd-o aut etiam plane  
 appease-GERUNDIVE-ABL.SG.MASC or even altogether  
 restitue-nd-o pollice-or  
 restore-GERUNDIVE-ABL.SG.MASC promise-PRES.1SG  
 ‘First I promise you about appeasing or even restoring our friend altogether.’ > ‘I promise you that I shall appease or even restore our friend’ (Cicero *ad Atticum* 1.10.2)
- 4b) Qui **de** virgine capienda  
 REL.PRO.MASC.NOM.PL DE girl-ABL.SG capture-GERUNDIVE-ABL.SG  
 Scrip-s-erunt...  
 ‘who wrote about capturing the girl’ > ‘who wrote that they would capture the girl’  
 (Gellius *Noctes Atticae* 1.12)
- 4c) tu **de** alter-o consulat-u  
 PRO.2SG.NOM DE another-MASC.ABL.SG consulship-MASC.ABL.SG  
 gere-nd-o te dice-re-s  
 run-GERUNDIVE-MASC.ABL.SG PRO.2SG.ACC say-IMPERF.SUBJ-2SG  
 cogit-are  
 consider-INF  
 ‘you said that you were considering about running another consulship’ > ‘you said that you were considering running another consulship.’ (Cicero *In Vatinius* 11)
- 4d) Nam vell-e se cum eo  
 For want-INF REFL.PRO with PRO.3SG-ABL  
 Conloqu-i **de** parti-end-o regn-o  
 Converse-INF DE divide-GERUNDIVE-ABL.SG kingdom-ABL.SG



marker of purpose/intention is only used with verbs that express command and purpose. These developments are strikingly similar to English *to*-infinitives, especially from a formal perspective, as discussed in the next section.

Prepositional phrases > prepositional infinitives:

English *to*-infinitives are the prototypical example of non-finite complementation and it is widely held that *to*-infinitives are reanalysed in Old English (OE) from being purposive adjuncts to clausal complements (cf Latin *ad*-gerund/gerundive), which are particularly frequent with verbs of purpose and command (Los (2005:chapter 3)):

7a) tiligen we us **to** gescild-enne and us to gewarnig-enne  
Strive we us TO shield-DAT and us to guard-DAT  
'we should try to shield ourselves and guard ourselves...' (HomS 44,158)

7b) On hwilcum godum tihst pu us to gelyf-enne ?  
In which gods urgest thou us to believe-DAT  
'Which gods do you urge us to believe in?' (AELS (George) 148)

Furthermore, both Latin/Romance and English prepositional infinitives are the results of morphophonological erosion in the nominal paradigm, since the Germanic dative ending *-enne* following OE *to* is argued to be obsolete in OE (Los (2005:3-5)) and likewise the Romance infinitive, in contrast to Latin gerund/gerundive, does not inflect for morphological case. In both cases, the nominal properties of the clausal complement are practically eliminated which severely weakens the agreement between the preposition and its nominal complement (Roberts and Roussou (2003:105)), which leads to their reanalysis as non-finite clauses. Furthermore, Latin/Romance *de*-infinitive represents a new pathway of syntactic change since, in contrast to English *to*-infinitive and Latin/Romance *ad*-infinitive.

Latin/Romance *de* does not express purpose but is more semantically general in expressing the content of propositions, which not only yields its wider distribution in Romance but also reveals two distinct types of non-finite complementisers, one more purpose-oriented (*to/ad*) while the other more neutral (*de*). Since non-finite complementisers are traditionally held to be low in the cartography of C-elements (Rizzi (1997)), it may be argued that there are two functional projections for in the non-finite domain ( $M_{\text{realis}}/M_{\text{irrealis}}$ ), which parallels the dual complementiser system in Romance finite complementation (Ledgeway (2012b)). The Latin/Romance evidence, therefore, reveals a more sophisticated C-system, especially in the non-finite domain.

Conclusion:

The use of Latin prepositional gerund/gerundive represents a new topic in Latin/Romance historical syntax which opens many avenues to the formation of Romance non-finite complementation, since although prepositional infinitives, which are plentiful in Romance, are not attested in Latin, their historical structural equivalents, namely prepositional gerund/gerundive, are widely attested in examples where they are reanalysable

as clausal complements. It is therefore possible to account for the pan-Romance distribution of prepositional infinitives by expanding our search and analysis to Latin prepositional gerunds/gerundives.

References:

Beardsley, Winfred, A., 1921, *Infinitive Constructions in Old Spanish*, New York, Columbia University Press.

Diez, Frédéric, 1876, *Grammaire des Langues Romanes*, vol III. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, Paris, Libraire-Éditeur.

Harris, Martin, 1978, *The evolution of French syntax: a comparative approach*, London, Longman.

Johndal, M. (2012): *Non-finiteness in Latin*. DPhil dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Ledgeway, A. (2012a): *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, A. N. (2012b): 'La sopravvivenza del Sistema dei doppi complementatori nei dialetti meridionali', in Del Puente, P. (ed): *Atti del II Convegno internazionale di dialettologia-Progetto A.L.Ba*. Rionero in Vulture: Calice, pp. 151-176.

Los, Bettelou, 2005, *The Rise of the To-infinitive*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm, 1900, *Grammaire des Langues Romanes. Tome Troisième: Syntaxe*, Paris, H. Welter.

Panchón, Federico, 2003, 'Les complétives en *ut*'. In: Bodelot, Colette, 2003, *Grammaire Fondamentale du Latin. Tome X: Les propositions complétives en latin*, Louvain/Paris/Dudley, Peeters: 335-481.

Reenan, Pieter, van. / Schøsler, Lene, 1993, 'Les indices d'infinitif complément d'objet en ancien français'. In: Lorenzo, Ramón (ed), *Actas do XIX Congreso Internacional de Lingüística e Filoloxía Románicas, Vol V*, La Coruña: 523-545.

Rizzi, L. (1997): 'The fine structure of the left periphery', in Haegeman, L. *Elements of Grammar*, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 281-337.

Roberts, I. and Roussou, A. (2003): *Syntactic Change. A Minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schulte, Kim, 2007, *Prepositional infinitives in Romance: a usage-based approach to syntactic change*, Oxford, Peter Lang.

Vincent, Nigel, 1988, 'Latin'. In: Vincent, Nigel / Harris, Martin (eds), *The Romance Languages*, London, Croom Helm: 26-78.

Vincent, Nigel, 1999, 'Non-finite complementation in Latin and Romance', Paper presented at the *Indo-European Seminar*, Department of Classics, University of Cambridge, October 1999.