

## A ROMANCE CONSTRUCTION WITH CONSTRAINED COREFERENCE

ELISABETE RANCHHOD

*Universidade de Lisboa*

*Faculdade de Letras*

### 0. Presentation

The purpose of this paper is to present some syntactic structures containing pronominal forms where the position of the pronouns and that of their referents show syntactic restriction. Many of the pronominal items we have studied appear with predicative nouns resulting from verbal and adjectival nominalizations involving the support verbs *ser* and *estar* (to be) in Spanish and Portuguese. Associated to nominalized constructions we found certain prepositional phrases — *de N*, *de parte de N*, *hacia N* (of *N*, from *N*, towards *N*) in Spanish; *de N*, *da parte de N*, *para com N* (of *N*, from *N*, towards *N*) in Portuguese, which impose syntactic restrictions on the subject of the nominal predicate. Indeed, in subject syntactic position we can only find sentential subjects: *that S* subjects, infinitive subjects and nominal phrases derived from *that* sentences. The *N* of the prepositional complement holds a co-reference relation to one of the terms of the sentential subject. The co-reference relation entails the pronominalization of the  $N_s$ . We shall examine constructions of the type:

(1) Sp. *Que (tu) prosigas en esa actitud es un error de tu parte*<sup>1</sup>

Port. *Prossequires nessa atitude é um erro da tua parte*

(That you proceed, to proceed (2nd sing) in such attitude is a mistake of you)<sup>2</sup>

(1') Sp. \**Que (tu) prosigas en esa actitud es un error de parte*<sup>3</sup> *de Juan*

Port. \**Prossequires nessa atitude é um erro da parte do João*

(That you proceed, to proceed (2nd sing) in such attitude is a mistake of John)

- (2) Sp. *Está dentro de tus posibilidades estudiar este problema*  
 Port. *Está dentro das tuas possibilidades estudares este problema*  
 (It is within your (2nd sing) possibilities to study (2nd sing) this problem)
- (2') Sp. \**Está dentro de las posibilidades de Juan que (tu) estudies este problema*  
 (It is within John's possibilities that you study this problem)
- Port. \**Está dentro das possibilidades do João estudares este problema*  
 (It is within John's possibilities to study (2nd sing) this problem)

The unacceptability of sentences in (1') and (2') show that the possessive *tu, tua* (of you, your): *un error de tu parte, um erro da tua parte* of (19; *tus posibilidades, tuas possibilidades* of (2), is obligatorily co-referent to the subject of the sentential subject: Sp. *que tu prosigas en esa actitud*, Port. *prosequires nessa attitude* of (1) and Sp. *estudiar este problema*, Port. *estudares este problema* of (2).

Although the present study deals mainly with Spanish and Portuguese, we can consider that the analysis of these aspects, details of which we shall provide in following sections, also applies to other Romance languages, namely French and Italian. Maurice Gross 1982 described an identical situation for French and A. Elia (personal communication) further confirmed it for Italian.

M. Gross 1982 refers that, in French, in constructions like:

*Que Max soit venu est honteux de sa part*  
 (That Max came is shameful of him)

*Que Max soit venu est une honte de sa part*  
 (That Max came is a shame of him)

the possessive *sa* (of him) is obligatorily co-referent to *Max*, the subject of the *that*-sentence subject:

\**Que Max soit venu est honteux de la part de Luc*  
 (That Max came is shameful of Luc)

\**Que Max soit venu est une honte de la part de Luc*  
 (That Max came is a shame of Luc)

To Spanish and Portuguese constructions exemplified in (1) corresponds in Italian:

*Che tu continui in questo atteggiamento è un errore da parte tua*  
 (That you proceed in such attitude is mistake of you)

where there is an obligatory co-reference between the possessive *tua* (of you) and the *that*-sentence subject *tu* (you).

As well as in Spanish and Portuguese, the non-co-reference between the subject of the *that*-sentence and the possessive of the prepositional complement entails unacceptable sentences in Italian:

\**Che tu continui in questo atteggiamento è un errore da parte de Giovanni*  
 (That you proceed in such attitude is mistake of John)

Table 1, included at the end of this paper, outlines the matter considered in the present study. Its examination shows a great similarity in behaviour of the main Romance languages regarding the problem herein dealt with.

# 1. The inadequacy of traditional analysis

1.1 Traditionally, (Real Academia Española 1978:202; Marcos Marín 1980:216) pronouns have been considered as linguistic items which have “deictic” reference, that is to say, they point back to a previous noun — anaphoric reference — or forward — cataphoric reference — in the discourse. In both cases, it is supposed that pronouns supply a way of avoiding redundancy through mere reference to something previously or subsequently expressed.

1.2. Usually, the studies on pronominal reference, i.e., on the syntactic relations holding between pronouns and nouns they replace, have been achieved in syntactic conditions where the pronouns and their referent(s) were in different but neighbouring clauses. These clauses may be in coordinate or subordinate relation. Thus, in a sentence like (Celso Cunha 1975:208):

- (3) Port. *Álvaro disse a Paulo que ele chegaria primeiro*<sup>4</sup>  
 (Alvaro said to Paulo that he would arrive first)

the antecedent of the pronoun *ele* (he) can be either *Álvaro* or *Paulo* or even someone else non present in the discourse:

- (4) Port. *O Álvaro disse ao Paulo que o João chegaria primeiro*  
 (Alvaro said to Paulo that John would arrive first)

But in:

- (5) Port. *O João disse do Pedro que ele é um tipo de primeira*  
 (John said about Peter that he is first class)

we no more find such possibilities of interpretation. In fact, *ele* (he) in the subordinate clause is obligatorily co-referent to *Pedro*:

- \* *O João disse do Pedro que o Paulo é um tipo de primeira*  
(John said about Peter that Paul is first class)

Similarly:

- (6) *O João declarou ao Pedro que ele era um ótimo pianista*  
(John declared to Peter that he was an excellent pianist)

allows that *ele* (he) may be interpreted as pertaining to either *João* or *Pedro*, even to someone else. However,

- (7) *O João declarou acerca do Pedro que ele era um ótimo pianista*  
(John declared about Peter that he was an excellent pianist)

has the only interpretation where *Pedro* is the antecedent of *ele*.

- \* *O João declarou acerca do Pedro que o Paulo era um ótimo pianista*  
(John declared about Peter that Paul was an excellent pianist)

Thus, we see that the prepositional complement *acerca de N* (about *N*), as well as the complement *de N* of sentence in (6), impose syntactic restrictions to the subject of the sentential direct object, and, it must be co-referent to the *N* of the prepositional complement. The complement *acerca de N* (about *N*) 'projects' semantically and syntactically inside *that S* complement (Gross 1968, 1982).

Formal description of this phenomenon sounds complex. Indeed, this type of constraint appears associated to certain lexical items entering into particular syntactic forms. We could think that we face an exceptional situation. However, the amount of *Ns* involved is so important that they cannot be considered exceptional. We have, for instance:

- (8) *O João comunicou ao Pedro a sua opinião*  
(John reported to Peter his opinion)

where the possessive *sua* (his) refers to *João* or to a third party — the discourse context will favour either interpretation. Conversely, in:

- (9) *O João pediu ao Pedro a sua opinião*  
(John asked Peter (for) his opinion)

the possessive *sua* (his) is obligatorily co-referent to *Pedro*. Now, this situation would be hardly foreseen since structural analysis of both (8) and (9) is

superficially identical. The linear order of the constituents is in both sentences:

Subject – Verb – Indirect object – Direct object

and neither (8) or (9) are semantically ambiguous in normal discourse context.

So the qualitative and quantitative importance of this situation lead us to adopt a theoretical framework that attaches to lexicon a fundamental role and integrates it in grammar.

We adopted this approach (Ranchhod 1983) in analysing verbal and adjectival nominalizations with support verbs *ser* and *estar*. Below we shall shortly mention the main lines of that analysis.

## 2. Nominalizations involving support verbs *ser* and *estar*

### 2.1. Complements of the shape (*de, da*) *parte de N* (of *N*)

2.1.1. The analysis of verbal and adjectival nominalizations with support verbs *ser* and *estar* (to be) in Portuguese pointed out that associated with verb *ser* prepositional phrases of the shape *da parte de N* (of *N*, form *N*) are found. The occurrence of *estar* in such context is excluded as illustrated by the unacceptability of (10) and (10'), (11) and (11') below:

- (10) *Que o Pedro faça isso (é, \*está) estúpido da sua parte*  
(That Peter does that is stupid of him)
- = (10') *Que o Pedro faça isso (é, \*está) uma estupidez da sua parte*  
(That Peter does that is a stupidity of him)
- (11) *Que o Pedro tenha dito essas coisas (é, \*está) contraditório da sua parte*  
(That Peter said such things is contradictory of him)
- = (11') *Que o Pedro tenha dito essas coisas (é, \*está) uma contradição da sua parte*  
(That Peter said such thing is (a) contradiction of him)

These complements exhibit referential constraints of the type exemplified above: *O Pedro* (Peter) is obligatorily linked by co-reference to the possessive pronoun *sua* (of him). The non-co-reference entrains the unacceptability of these sentences:

- \**Que o Pedro faça isso é estúpido da minha parte*  
(That Peter does that is stupid of me)

\* *Que o Pedro tenha dito essas coisas é contraditório da minha parte*

(That Peter said such thing is contradictory of me)

In the case that the subject of the *that S* subject is a pronoun it will refer cataphorically to the noun of the prepositional phrase *da parte de N* (of N):

*Que ele faça isso é estúpido da parte do Pedro*

(That he does that is stupid of Peter)

*ele* (he) and *Pedro* (Peter) are co-referent:

\* *Que tu faças isso é estúpido da parte do Pedro*

(That you do that is stupid of Peter)

The syntactic and semantic relations existing between sentences (10) and (10') on one side, and (11) and (11') on the other, allow us to consider that (10') and (11') are nominalizations of (10) and (11) respectively. The predicative term of (10') and (11') is constituted by verb *ser* (to be) and abstract nouns *estupidez* (stupidity) and *contradição* (contradiction). The syntactic properties of *ser* in such context are similar to those of morphemes carriers of time-aspect-person-number (Z.S. Harris 1964, M. Gross 1981). The elements that in fact possess the predicative function are the abstract nouns associated to verb *ser*. To *ser* and other verbs alike whose function is that of supporting a predicate, we shall denominate *support verb* (*Vsup*). From the analysis of more than 1,000 abstract nouns which can enter in a predicative construction supported by verb *ser*, we could observe a systematic co-reference relation between the *N* of the prepositional phrase *da Parte de N* (of N) and one term of *that* sentence.<sup>5</sup>

2.1.2. Preliminary observations we made on Spanish have led us to think that a similar situation was occurring. Further systematic examination of the syntactic behaviour or prepositional complements associated with nominalized constructions with support verbs *ser* and *estar*, in Spanish, has shown that the syntax of both Spanish and Portuguese runs very close in this respect. Subsequently, in this paper we shall consider both languages together. Thus, to Portuguese sentences in (10) and (11) correspond in Spanish respectively:

Sp. *Que Pedro haga eso (es, \*está) estúpido de su parte*

(That Peter does that is stupid of him)

*Que Pedro haga eso (es, \*está) una estupidez de su parte*

(That Peter does that is stupidity of him)

- Sp. *Que Pedro haya dicho esas cosas (es, \*está) contradictorio de su parte*  
 (That Peter said such thing is contradictory of him)  
*Que Pedro haya dicho esas cosas (es, \*está) una contradicción de su parte*  
 (That Peter said such things is a contradiction of him)

The *N* of the prepositional phrase *de parte de N* (Spanish), *da parte de N* (Portuguese) must be a 'human' noun or some metaphorical or metonymical extension of this notion, such as *university, press, newspaper*, etc. In:

- (12) Sp. *Que (los periódicos, los estudiantes, \*estas actitudes) planteen así ese tema es una provocación de su parte*  
 Port. *Que (os jornais, os estudantes, \*estas atitudes) tratem assim esse assunto é uma provocação da sua parte*  
 (That (the newspapers, the students, these attitudes) envisage this subject in this manner is a provocation of them)

*periódicos, jornais* (newspapers) exhibit the same characteristics of human noun. In (12) the co-reference between the possessive of the prepositional complement and the human subject of the *that* sentence is obligatory. A statement like:

- Sp. *Que los (periódicos, estudiantes) planteen así el tema es una provocación de parte de Pedro*  
 Port. *Que os (jornais, estudantes) tratem assim o assunto é uma provocação da parte do Pedro*  
 (That the (newspaper, students) envisage the subject in this manner is a provocation of Peter)

is nonsensical unless the situational context, known to both speaker and hearer, allows the interpretation 'Peter compelled the (newspapers, students) to envisage the subject in this manner and this is a provocation of him'. That is, the referent of the possessive pronoun is not mentioned in the preceding discourse but it is known to both speaker and hearer. The anaphorical relation in this sense seems to be synonymous with 'identifiable'. Nevertheless such an interpretation is rather unnatural with nouns such as *provocación, provocação* (provocation), *arbitrariedad, arbitrariedade* (arbitrariness), *imprudencia, imprudência* (imprudence), etc. However, in adequate context, predicative nouns such as *exageración, exagero* (exaggeration), *convicción, convicção* (conviction), *conjetura, conjectura* (conjecture), etc. can appear in sentences like:

Sp. *Que los periódicos no hayan dado relieve a esa noticia es una exageración de parte de Pedro*

Port. *Que os jornais não tenham dado relevo a essa notícia é um exagero da parte do Pedro*

(That the newspapers did not highlight that news is exaggeration of Peter)

whose interpretation is close to:

Sp. *Pedro exagera al decir que los periódicos no han dado relieve a esa noticia*

Port. *O Pedro exagera ao dizer que os jornais não deram relevo a essa notícia*

(Peter exaggerates in saying that the newspapers did not highlight that news)

This has led us to believe that this interpretation is inferred from a base performative sentence of the type:

Sp. *Que Pedro diga que los periódicos no han dado relieve a esa noticia es una exageración de su parte*

Port. *Que o Pedro diga que os jornais não deram relevo a essa notícia é um exagero da sua parte*

(That Peter says that the newspapers did not highlight that news is exaggeration of him)

Hence, the referent of the possessive *su, sua* (of him) would not be the subject of the apparent *that S* but the subject of the deleted performatif.

The restrictions imposed by the complement (*de, da*) *parte de N* to the *that* sentence in subject position, stand even though the sentences undergo transformations. Starting with

(13) Sp. *Que (tu) me hayas prestado tu coche ha sido una amabilidad de tu parte*

Port. *Que (tu) me tenhas emprestado o carro foi uma gentileza da tua parte*

(That you lend me your car was kindness of you)

by reduction of *that* clause, we have:

(13') Sp. *Habermé prestado tu coche ha sido una amabilidad de tu parte*

Port. *Teres-me emprestado o carro foi uma gentileza da tua parte*

(To lend me, To lend (2nd sing) me your car was kindness of you)



Sp. \**Haberme prestado tu coche ha sido una amabilidad de mi parte*

Port. \**Teres-me emprestado o carro foi uma gentileza da minha parte*  
(To lend me, To lend (2nd sing) me your car was kindness of me)

By subject inversion, we have:

(13'') Sp. *Ha sido una amabilidad de tu parte haberme prestado tu coche*

Port. *Foi uma gentileza da tua parte teres-me emprestado o carro*  
(It was kindness of you (to lend me, to lend (2nd sing) me your (2nd sing) car)

Sp. \**Ha sido amabilidad de mi parte haberme prestado tu coche*

Port. \**Foi uma gentileza da minha parte teres-me emprestado o carro*  
(It was kindness of me to lend me, to lend (2nd sing) me your (2 sing) car)

The infinitive sentences resulting from the reduction of *that* sentences as well as sentences with extraposed subject are generally better accepted by Portuguese speakers. Sentential subjects of the form *that S* are considered "high-flown style" and therefore more adequate to literary discourse. The inflected infinitives reduce the size of the sentences without losing information, due to person-number morphemes they contain; the subject of an inflected infinitive sentence is always clearly explicit. Spanish does not have inflected infinitives at least in standard use. Nevertheless we can find sentences like (V. Demonte 1977:186):

*Atender ella al cartero era lo que Petra más ansiaba*

(To attend she to the postman was what (that) Petra was looking forward to the most)

where the subject of the infinitive *Atender ella al cartero* (To attend she to the postman) and the subject of the *that* clause are co-referent. This co-reference relation would be responsible for the appearance of the person pronoun *ella* (she) which lead V. Demonte 1977:186 to suppose "this nominative is not a primitive element but it moved there as a *SN* copy which appears on its right. Taking into account all these elements of judgement, I believe somewhat clearer the hypothesis that the subject of infinitives is function of assignment of value resulting from co-reference nets".

The situation in Spanish and Portuguese is then similar because "if there is full referential elements on the left of infinitives their subject is undoubtedly, one of these full elements" (V. Demonte 1977:182).

For all possibilities we have in Spanish to attribute a subject to infinitives in the mentioned syntactic conditions, Spanish speakers accept better *that* clause subjects. Thus, whereas sentences like:

- (14) Port. *Omitirmos essa referêcia foi um descuido da nossa parte*  
(To omit (1st pl) that reference was negligence of us)

and

- (15) Port. *Foi um descuido da nossa parte omitirmos essa referêcia*  
(It was negligence of us to omit (1st pl) that reference)

have a better acceptability in Portuguese than

- (16) Port. *Que (nós) tenhamos omitido essa referêcia foi um descuido da nossa parte*  
(That we omitted that reference was negligence of us)

On the contrary, in Spanish, sentence (17), corresponding to (16),

- (17) Sp. *Que hayamos omitido esa referencia ha sido un descuido de nuestra parte*  
(That we omitted that reference was negligence of us)

or

- (18) Sp. *Ha sido un descuido de nuestra parte que hayamos omitido esa referencia*  
(It was negligence of us that we omitted that reference)

have better acceptability than:

- (19) Sp. *Haber omitido esa referencia ha sido un descuido de nuestra parte*  
(To omit that reference was negligence of us)

But, what matters here is to stress that co-reference relation between the possessive of the complement (*de, da*) *Poss parte* (of Poss) and the embedded subject of the sentential subject.

We often find sentences of the type:

- (20) Sp. *Ser discreto es una virtud*  
Port. *Ser discreto é uma virtude*  
(To be discreet is a virtue)

where the non-finite clause *ser discreto* (to be discreet) is constructed without a subject. If we add a prepositional complement of the form *para N* (for *N*):

- (21) Sp. *Ser discreto es una virtud para Maria*  
 Port. *Ser discreto é uma virtude para a Maria*  
 (To be discreet is a virtue for Mary)

the complement *para N* (for *N*) can produce ambiguity: it can be interpreted as the subject of the infinitive, but it can also be considered as an adverbial semantically equivalent to "from the point of view of *N*":

- (22) Sp. *(Para, desde el punto de vista de) Maria, ser discreto es una virtud*  
 Port. *(Para, do ponto de vista de) a Maria, ser discreto é uma virtude)*  
 ((For, from the point of view of) Mary, to be discreet is a virtue)

In contrast, when we associate to (20) a prepositional complement of the shape *de N*, (*de, da*) *parte de N* (of, from *N*) we find a different situation:

- (23) Sp. *Ser discreta es una virtud (de, de parte de) Maria*  
 Port. *Ser discreta é uma virtude (de, da parte de) a Maria*  
 (To be discreet (fem) is a virtue of Mary)

In (23), the *N* = *Maria* of the complement (*de, da*) *parte de N* (of *N*) is clearly the subject of the infinitive: it determines concord with the predicative adjective *discreto*:

- Sp. \**Ser discreto es una virtud de Maria*  
 Port. \**Ser discreto é uma virtude da Maria*  
 (To be discreet (masc) is a virtue of Mary)

So it seems that we should formulate a rule linking the pronoun (or the noun) of the prepositional complement to the embedded subject of the sentential subject. However, in sentences such as:

- (24) Sp. *Que mi mala suerte divierta a Pedro es una crueldad de su parte*<sup>6</sup>  
 Port. *Que a minha pouca sorte divirta o Pedro é uma crueldade da sua parte*  
 (That my bad luck amuses Peter is naughtiness of him)

or

- (25) Sp. *Que esta música le guste a Pedro es una prueba de su mal gusto*

- Port. *Que esta música agrade ao Pedro é uma prova do seu mau gosto*  
 (That this music pleases (to) Peter is a proof of his bad taste)

the referent of the possessive *su*, *seu* is *Pedro* in both sentences:

- Sp. *Que mi mala suerte divierta a Pedro es una crueldad de mi parte*  
 Port. *Que a minha pouca sorte divirta o Pedro é uma crueldade da minha parte*  
 (That my bad luck amuses Peter is naughtiness of me)

and

- Sp. *Que esta música le guste a Pedro es una prueba de tu mal gusto*  
 Port. *Que esta música agrade ao Pedro é uma prova do teu mau gosto*  
 (That this music pleases (to) Peter is a proof of your bad taste)

are nonsensical. The co-reference relation holds the possessive and the direct object in (24); the possessive and the indirect object in (25).

## 2.2. Complements of the shape Sp. (*para con*, *hacia*) *N* (towards *N*); Port. *para com N* (towards *N*)

We further observed an identical constraint concerning complements of the shape: Sp. (*para con*, *hacia*) *N*; Port. *para com N* (towards *N*) also associated with nominalized sentences involving support verb *ser*. Support verb *estar* is not allowed with these complements:

- (26) Sp. *Que omitas la verdad a Maria (es, \*está) una deslealtad (para con, hacia) ella*  
 Port. *Qomitires a verdade à Maria (é, \*está) uma deslealdade para com ela*  
 ((That you omit, to omit (2nd sing) the truth to Mary is unfairness towards her)

In (26) the co-reference relation links the indirect object (*Maria*) of the sentential subject to the personal pronoun *ella*, *ela* (she):

- Sp. *\*Que omitas la verdad a Maria es una deslealtad (para con, hacia) él*  
 Port. *\*Omitires a verdade à Maria é uma deslealdade para com ele*  
 ((That you omit, to omit (2nd sing) the truth to Mary is unfairness towards him)

It may also occur that the indirect object is a personal pronoun with cataphoric reference. At such event, there is co-reference between the pronoun and the *N* of the prepositional complement (*para con, hacia*) *N*; *para com N* (towards *N*):

(27) Sp. *Que le hayas omitido la verdad ha sido una deslealtad para con Maria*

Port. *Teres-lhe omitido a verdade foi uma deslealdade para com a Maria*

((That you have omitted, to have omitted (2nd sing)) her the truth was unfairness towards Mary)

In (27) the indirect personal pronoun *le, lhe* (to her) points forward to Mary:

(27') Sp. \**Que nos hayas omitido la verdad ha sido una deslealtad para con Maria*

Port. \**Que nos tenhas omitido a verdade foi uma deslealdade para com a Maria*

((That you have omitted us the truth was unfairness towards Mary))

Note that (27') would become acceptable if the pronoun *nos* (us) comprised a reference to *Maria* (Mary), that is, if *Maria* belonged to the group of persons covered by *nos* (us).

These complements can follow complements of the form (*de, da*) *parte de N* (of *N*) mentioned earlier. This eventuality depends on predicative *Ns*: some accept both complements; others only accept (*de, da*) *parte de N*. Sentence (28) exemplifies the co-occurrence of both complements:

(28) Sp. *Que hayas llamado separatista a Pedro ha sido una groseria de tu parte para con él*

Port. *Que tenhas chamado separatista ao Pedro foi uma grosseria da tua parte para com ele*

((That you have call Peter a separatist was roughness of you towards him))

In (28) the referential constraints are those mentioned in 2.1. and herein.

This type of statement is felt as very redundant. The particular semantic and syntactic properties of predicative nouns such as *amabilidad, amabilidad* (kindness), *deslealtad, deslealdade* (unfairness), *groseria, grosseria* (roughness), and several hundreds more always denote a constant semantic relation: *N de Nhum para con Nhum* (*N* of *Nhum* towards *Nhum*).

Under such circumstances, a statement such as:

- (28') Sp. *Que hayas llamado separatista a Pedro ha sido una groseria*  
 Port. *Que tenhas chamado separatista ao Pedro foi uma grosseria*  
 (That you called Peter a separatist was roughness)

has the same interpretation of (28) and can be regarded as an elliptical construction. The following form, corresponding to (28'):

$$(N_0 V Adj_1 Prep N_1)_0 \text{ ser } N$$

has to be considered as a sub-structure of:

$$N_0 V Adj_1 Prep N_1)_0 \text{ ser } N Prep N_1^0 Prep N_2^1 =: (28)$$

### 2.3. Nominalizations involving *Vsup* =: *estar* (to be)

2.3.1. Regarding nominalizations with support verb *estar* (to be) the situation is not so clear. Nevertheless, we observed that some nouns also demand a sentential subject. This is the case of  $N =: \text{propósitos}$  (purposes):

- (29) Sp. *Leer de nuevo el Quijote está dentro de nuestros propósitos actuales*  
 Port. *Lermos novamente o Quixote está dentro dos nossos actuais propósitos*  
 (To read, to read (1st pl) again the Quixote is within our present purposes)  
 Sp. \**El Quijote está dentro de nuestros propósitos actuales*  
 Port. \**O Quixote está dentro dos nossos actuais propósitos*  
 (The Quixote is within our present purposes)

The nouns involved in this situation appear to accept only an infinitive subject like in (29). The following sentences having a *that S* subject are rejected:

- Sp. \**Que leamos de nuevo el Quijote está dentro de nuestros propósitos actuales*  
 Port. \**Que leamos novamente o Quixote está dentro dos nossos actuais propósitos*  
 (That we read again the Quixote is within our present purposes)

Constructions like (29) can be noted:

$$(N_0 Vinf-pn W)_0 \text{ estar } Prep N Prep N_1$$

and there is a co-reference relation between  $N_0$  (the embedded subject) and  $N_1$ :

- (30) Sp. *Ayudar a Pedro está dentro de mis posibilidades*<sup>7</sup>  
 Port. \**Ajudares o Pedro está dentro das minhas possibilidades*  
 (To help, to help (2nd sing) Peter is within my possibilities)

These sentences are more natural after subject permutation which does not modify the observed constraints:

- (30') Sp. *Está dentro de mis posibilidades ayudar (yo, \*tu) a Pedro*  
 (It is within my possibilities to help (I, you) Peter)  
 Port. *Está dentro das (tuas, \*minhas) possibilidades ajudares o Pedro*  
 (It is within (your, my) possibilities to help (2nd sing) Peter)

2.3.2. We observed, as well, frozen sentences with *estar* (to be) showing a co-reference relation between  $N_o$  and *Poss*:

- (31) Sp. *Pedro está en (sus, \*mis) trece*  
 (Peter is in (his, my) thirteen  
 = Peter stands firm in (his, my) opinion)  
 (32) Sp. *Pedro está en (su, \*mi) elemento*  
 Port. *O Pedro está no (seu, \*meu) elemento*  
 (Peter is in (his, my) element  
 = Peter is at his pleasure)  
 (33) Sp. *Pedro está en (su, \*tu) sano juicio*  
 Port. *O Pedro está no (seu, \*meu) perfeito juízo*  
 (Peter is in (his, my) sound mind)

The source for the possessif is not clear but it seems not possible to derive it from a relative clause as it is the case in:

- (34) Sp. *Maria está en su casa de campo*  
 Port. *A Maria está na sua casa de campo*  
 (Mary is in her country house)  
 = (34') Sp. *Maria está en la casa de campo que ella tiene*  
 Port. *A Maria está na casa de campo que ela tem*  
 (Mary is in the country house that she has)

Regarding (31), (32) and (33) we do not find such relation:

- (32') Sp. \**Pedro está en el elemento (que el tiene, en el que está)*  
 Port. \**O Pedro está no elemento (que ele tem, em que está)*  
 (Peter is in the element (that he has, where he is))

Nevertheless if we use a modal item such as *bien*, *bem* (well), semantically close with the general meaning of the sentence, we get a better acceptability:

Sp. ?*Pedro está en el elemento en el que está bien*

Port. ?*O Pedro está no elemento em que está bem*

(Peter is in the element where he is (feels) well)

### Conclusion

The analysis of verbal and adjectival nominalizations involving support verbs *ser* and *estar* in Spanish and Portuguese showed that associated to nominalized constructions we find certain prepositional phrases — *de N*, *de parte de N* (*hacia*, *para con*) *N* (of *N*, from *N*, towards *N*) in Spanish: *de N*, *da parte de N*, *para com N* (of *N*, from *N*, towards *N*) in Portuguese — which imposed syntactic restrictions to the subject of the nominal predicate (which can be a *V-n*, nominalized verb, and *Adj-n*, nominalized adjective, and also a non-derived noun). Indeed, in subject syntactic position, we can only find sentential subjects: *That S* subjects, infinitive subjects and nominal phrases derived from *that* sentences:

Sp.	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{Que tu te creas esos chismes} \\ \textit{Creerte esos chismes} \\ \textit{Tu creencia en esos chismes} \\ \textit{*El chisme} \end{array} \right\}$	<i>es una tontería de tu parte</i>
(	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{That you (reflex 2nd sing) believe such stories} \\ \text{To believe (reflex 2nd sing) such stories} \\ \text{Your belief in such stories} \\ \text{The story} \end{array} \right\}$	is nonsense of you)
Port.	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{Que acredites nessas histórias} \\ \textit{Acreditaress nessas histórias} \\ \textit{A tua crenca nessas histórias} \\ \textit{*A história} \end{array} \right\}$	<i>é uma tolice da tua parte</i>
(	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{That you believe in such stories} \\ \text{to believe (2nd sing) in such stories} \\ \text{Your belief in such stories} \\ \text{The story} \end{array} \right\}$	is nonsense of you)

The *N* of the prepositional complement (*de N*, (*de*, *da*) *parte de N*), *para* (*con*, *com*) *N*, holds a co-reference relation to one of the terms of the sentential subject. The *Ns* of the prepositional complements *de N* and *de parte de N* (of



*N*, from *N*) are co-referent to the *N* subject or to the *N* direct object of the *that*-clause; the *Ns* of the prepositional phrase *para com N* (towards *N*) are co-referent to *Ns* in indirect object position. The co-reference relation entails the pronominalization of the *Ns*. This situation is not specific of Spanish and Portuguese (see Table 1) since it can also be observed in French and Italian, and most probably in all Romance languages as well. The amount of predicative nouns involved in this syntactic, semantic (and referential) situation is of the order of hundreds. Contrary to what has been considered as being the common situation (*i.e.* the pronouns are regarded as "deictic" elements merely avoiding redundancy), we provided evidence that there is numerous situations where the pronouns refer to linguistic items having particular syntactic function, holding together an obligatory co-reference relation.

*Author's adress:*

Elisabete Ranchhod  
Av. de Madrid,3,1 D  
1000 LISBOA – Portugal

## NOTES

\* The paper of Maurice Gross 1982 on constrained reference in French has drawn my attention towards the existence of similar phenomena in Portuguese. Commenting my first manuscript on Portuguese, Maurice Gross suggested to further extend the analysis to Spanish. I would like to acknowledge him for that and many other suggestions which I attempted to develop within the scope of the present study. I am also indebted to Ch. Leclère and M. Salkoff for their corrections and editorial help.

- 1) Sp. and Port. are abbreviations of Spanish and Portuguese respectively.
- 2) The translations we provide for our Spanish and Portuguese examples are, in general, word for word translations aimed at making explicit the syntactic phenomena involved. If there is any difference between Spanish and Portuguese, we give first the Spanish translation followed by Portuguese translation. Thus: (That you proceed, to proceed (2nd sing)...) corresponds to Spanish *Que tu prosigas...* and to Portuguese *Proseguires...* of (1).
- 3) An utterance like: *Que tu prosigas en esa actitud es un error de parte de Juan* (That you proceed in such attitudes is a mistake of John) is nonsensical, unless existing an extra-linguistic relation between *tu* (you) and *Juan* (John). In that case it would have the interpretation "That John advises you to proceed in such attitude is a mistake of him". In our analysis we did not take into account the interpretations resulting from non-linguistic factors.
- 4) In this example of Celso Cunha the personal nouns *Álvaro* and *Pedro* are not preceded by definite article since this is the standard use in brasilian Portuguese.

5) Regarding predicative adjectives in Portuguese, Malaca Casteleiro 1981:238 observed an identical situation.

6) In Spanish a human direct object is often preceded by the preposition *a* (to). That is the situation in this example: *Pedro* is the direct object of *divertir* (to amuse).

7) In Portuguese, we can formally stress the co-reference relation due to person-number morphemes that the inflected infinitive contains. Such a possibility does not exist in Spanish, even though the subject of the infinitive sentence *Ayudar a Pedro* (To help Peter) is clearly felt as co-referent to *Poss* =: *mis* (my). On the other hand, the acceptability of the personal pronoun *yo* (I) in (30') and the rejection of *tu* (you) seems to confirm that intuition.

## REFERENCES

- Casteleiro, João M. 1981. *Sintaxe transformacional do adjetivo*, Lisboa: INIC.
- Cunha, Celso. 1975. *Gramática do português contemporâneo*, Belo Horizonte: Editora Bernardo Álvares.
- Demonte, Violeta. 1977. *La subordinación sustantiva*, Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra.
- Demonte, Violeta. 1979. Semántica y sintaxis de las construcciones con 'ser' y 'estar', *Revista Española de lingüística*, Año 9.Fasc.1, Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- Fernandes, Francisco. 1980. *Dicionário de regimes de substantivos e adjetivos*, 17<sup>th</sup> ed, Porto Alegre: Editora Globo.
- Gross, Maurice. 1975. *Méthodes en syntaxe*, Paris: Hermann.
- Gross, Maurice. 1981. Les bases empiriques de la notion de prédicat sémantique, *Formes syntaxiques et prédicats sémantiques*, Langages 63, Alain Guillet et Christian Leclère eds., Paris: Larousse.
- Gross, Maurice. 1982. Sur quelques types de coréférence contrainte, *Revue Romane*.
- Harris, Zellig S. 1964. The Elementary Transformations, T.A.D.P., University of Pennsylvania. Reprinted in *Papers in Structural and Transformational Linguistics*, Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1970.
- Harris, Zellig S. 1981. *Papers on syntax*, Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Marcos Marín, Francisco. 1980. *Curso de gramática española*, Madrid: Cincel.
- Ranchhod, Elisabete. 1983. On the support verbs *ser* and *estar* in Portuguese, *Linguisticae Investigationes*, VII:2, Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.
- Real Academia Española. 1979. *Esbozo de una nueva gramática de la lengua española*, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Vivès, Robert. 1982. Une analyse possible de certains compléments prépositionnels, *Lingvisticae Investigationes*, VI:1, Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

ANNEXE

Table 1

Romance Languages	Subject ( $N_0$ )					Subject inversion	$N_1 = \text{Poss}$	
	Que Find	Que Fsubj	V-inf <sup>1</sup> W	V-inf-flex <sup>1</sup> W	V-inf-reflex <sup>1</sup> W		Nhum	N-hum
French	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-
Italian	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-
Portuguese	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
Spanish	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-

Table 1 shows the similarity of syntactic behaviour of French, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish. The syntactic construction recorded has the following general form:

$$(Que\ Fsubj)_0\ Vsup\ Det\ N\ Prep\ N_1$$

To this general form can correspond sentences like:

- Fr. *Que nous ayons omis cette référence est une négligence de notre part*  
 It. *Che abbiamo omissso questo riferimento è stato una disattenzione da parte nostra*  
 Port. *Que tenhamos omitido essa referênciã foi um descuido da nossa parte*

Sp. *Que hayamos omitido esa referencia ha sido un descuido de nuestra parte*

(That we omitted that reference was negligence of us)

Syntactic nature of the subject ( $N_0$ ):

All Romance languages contrasted accept  $N_0 =$ : *Que Fsubj* (+) and reject *Que Find* (-);

The *that*-sentence in the subjunctive can be reduced to infinitive, having then the form:

$(V-inf^1 W)_0$

The subject of the infinitive is co-referent to the  $N$  of the prepositional complement *Prep*  $N_1$  (= Poss), or else it is a pronoun (zero) and it is co-referent to this  $N_1$ .

Concerning Portuguese, the infinitives present an inflected form, i.e. the verb in the infinitive has person-number morphemes:

$(V-inf-flex^1 W)_0$

In Spanish, a form of reflexive pronoun can appear associated with infinitive of certain verbs. This reflexive pronoun is co-referent to Poss:

$(V-inf-reflex^1 W)_0$

*Subject inversion*

The inversion of normal subject-verb order is often observed. The extraposition of the sentential subject gives sentences that usually have better acceptability of speakers.

*The syntactic nature of  $N_1$*

$N_1$  stands for the first complement of the predicative term *Vsup Det N*. In this syntactic position we only find human nouns (*Nhum*). Given the obligatory co-reference between these  $N$ s and  $N_0$  of sentential subject, the  $N$ s are always pronounced: *de N<sub>1</sub>* becomes Poss.

Received September 18, 1984.

## SUMMARY

Pronouns are commonly considered as linguistic items which supply a way of avoiding redundancy through mere reference to something previously (anaphoric reference) or subsequently (cataphoric reference) expressed in

the discourse. In this paper we provide evidence that there are numerous situations where the pronouns refer to linguistic items, having particular syntactic function, holding together an obligatory co-reference relation. Co-referential items occur as arguments of a predicative term =: *Vsup N* where *Vsup* is *ser* or *estar* (to be), and *N* a predicative noun. Although the present description mainly concerns Spanish and Portuguese, we believe that it also applies to other Romance languages.