

**verbs
movement
and
prepositions**

edited by
António Leal

| | |
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| TÍTULO | Verbs, movement and prepositions |
| COORDENADOR | António Leal |
| EDITOR | Centro de Linguística da Universidade do Porto Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto |
| CONCEÇÃO GRÁFICA | Invulgar - Artes Gráficas, S.A. |
| ANO DE EDIÇÃO | 2018 |
| TIRAGEM | 150 exemplares |
| ISBN | 978-989-54104-5-3 |
| DEPÓSITO LEGAL | 442271/18 |

Esta publicação é financiada pela Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, no âmbito do projeto “Verbos e Preposições em Português Europeu” (referência 139614).

On Source Prepositions and their Relationship to Paths¹

Ignacio Bosque

Universidad Complutense, Madrid

Abstract

Source prepositions are two-place predicates. They are interpreted as relational concepts because they are identified as components of Paths. These may be thought of as linear, oriented spaces, as in displacement or propulsion verbs, but also as much more abstract concepts, as Paths characterizing verbs of perception, communication, ruling and other forms of action at a distance. Two central problems of Source prepositions are addressed in this chapter: (i) the same prepositions are used in Romance in temporal and spatial contexts, what naturally calls for a unification analysis; and (ii), a considerable variation among Source prepositions systems in Romance is attested, since languages may choose between two, three or four different prepositions expressing Source. A set of grammatical criteria is then needed in order to account for the relevant choices. As regards (i), a number of parallelisms between temporal and spatial Sources are introduced, including the view of duration as a Temporal Path. As regards (ii), variation in the Romance systems of Source preposition is centered in two parameters: (in)visibility of the full Path after the initial point, and (un)boundedness of the Path itself.

Keywords

Source, Path, prepositions, semantic verb classes

¹ I am very grateful to Ana Bravo, Ángela Di Tullio, Luis García Fernández and Yuko Morimoto for their comments and remarks on some of the previous versions that this chapter has gone through. My deep gratitude extends to Antonio González, António Leal, María Lozano Zahonero and Fátima Oliveira for providing me with examples from various Romance languages. Needless to say, all possible errors or misinterpretations are my own.

1 - Introduction. Temporal and spatial Source

The notion of SOURCE has received much less attention in the literature than its direct opposite: GOAL. In principle, there is a good reason for this: since basic aspectual distinctions crucially hinge on (a)telicity and (im)perfectivity, one expects richer lexical and grammatical consequences on the ways events finish than on the ways they start up, and this expectation is certainly met. Source complements come in two main varieties, at least: temporal Source (TempS), as in (1a), and spatial Source (SpaS), as in (1b):

- (1) a. *Desde enero.* [Spanish]
‘Since/ From January’
b. *Desde París.* [Spanish]
‘From Paris’

TempS and SpaS prepositions may simply be distinguished as in (2):

- (2) a. A TempS preposition is a Source preposition taking a temporal complement.
b. A SpaS preposition is a Source preposition taking a spatial complement.

To these two main Source classes, one may add other meanings, as it is often done in most grammatical descriptions. Source prepositions may introduce means or resources interpreted at metaphorical extensions of this notion, as in (3):

- (3) a. *Ele perdeu a memória, mas conseguiu recuperá-la a partir de alguns dados dispersos.* [Portuguese]
‘He lost his memory, but he was able to recover it from some unrelated data’
b. *Le molybdène s’obtient à partir du cuivre.* [French]
‘Molybdenum is obtained from copper’
c. *Desde nuestro más profundo agradecimiento.* [Spanish]
‘From our deepest gratitude’

These concepts are close to that of “cause”, one of the well-known interpretations of the very notion of “origin” or “provenance”, as standardly assumed in classical Philosophy. In fact, the English preposition *since* unsurprisingly means ‘because’ in one of its standard readings. Languages substantially differ in these

potential extensions of Source. For example, Julien & Garbacz (2014) notice that one may say in Norwegian the equivalent of “I’m sick since McDonalds” to express that the food that I ate in McDonalds is the cause of my illness:

- (4) *Eg bler dårli av McDonalds-mad* [Norwegian]
I become sick from McDonald-food
‘I am sick because of (something I ate in) McDonald’s’

Similar extended interpretations exist in other languages. I will have very little to say here on the various connections that the notion of Source maintains with causality, a topic worthy of cross-linguistic research. In this chapter I will mainly concentrate on SpaS and some of its natural extensions. SpaS—it seems to me—is a notion still poorly understood, as compared to TempS. In fact, my impression is that our current level of understanding of TempS is not too bad: the licensing of TempS PPs crucially depends on predicates able to express duration on lexical or compositional grounds. On French, see Rohrer (1976, 1981), Lysebraate (1982), Asic (2008) and Lagae (2012); on Spanish, see García Fernández (2000) and Martínez-Atienza (2007, 2014); on English, see Heinämäki (1978), Brée (1985), and many others. Duration may be achieved on compositional grounds through event quantification in the main predicate. This is accomplished through tense adverbials, distributive and measure quantification, copulative coordination and similar resources (Móia 2000, 2001, 2006). Durative aspect is also provided by the perfect, affecting the licensing of Source adverbials (Iatridou & von Stechow 2005). The complement of TempS prepositions is subject to important variation among close languages (Schaden 2005, 2007). If this complement is sentential, other meaning differences are obtained (on Spanish, see Lope Blanch 1997, Bosque 2006, and García Fernández & Camus Bergareche 2011). Finally, at least some Romance TempS prepositions, such as *a-à partir de / a partire de* ‘from... onwards’, are licensed in intensional environments (Bosque & Bravo 2016), among other contexts.

But how about SpaS? In principle, one might expect SpaS to be a simpler or more basic notion than TempS, if only because other well-known uses of temporal particles are extensions of spatial ones. But this, I believe, is not correct. An interesting property of Romance Source prepositions is the fact that almost all of them allow for either TempS or SpaS readings. Here are some examples to be added to the pair in (1):

- (5) a. *A partire de {quel momento / quella linea}*. [Italian]
‘From that {moment / line} onwards’
- b. *Dalla {stanza / primavera}*. [Italian]
‘From {the room / Spring}’
- c. *Desde {o ano passado / a cidade velha}*. [Portuguese]
‘From {last year / the old city}’
- d. *A partir de {segunda feira / determinada localização geográfica}*. [Portuguese]
‘From {Monday / some specific geographical point}’
- e. *Depuis {lundi / ma fenêtre²}*. [French]
‘From {Monday / my window}’
- f. *Dès {10 ans / son premier article}*. [French]
‘Since s/he was 10 years old / From his very first article’

Counterexamples to (5) are not too numerous in Romance, but some may be attested.³ In any case, they do not contradict the fact that the pattern in (5) naturally calls for a unified analysis. Needless to say, many other prepositions allow for temporal and spatial uses in many languages, as has been repeatedly observed: Bennett (1975), Traugott (1978), Lindstromberg (1998), Levinson (2003), among others. For good overviews of this double-sided nature of prepositions, see Haspelmath (1997) and Kemmerera (2005). Notice that these associations —often considered to be metaphorical— do not relieve us of the task of approaching unification of contexts on strictly grammatical bases, whenever this is possible, as Piñón (1993) and Zwarts (2005) have emphasized.

As regards Source, most licensing conditions for TempS prepositions are aspectual requirements on their external argument. The natural question may, thus, be put as in (6):

² Often considered incorrect in prescriptive grammars, but overwhelmingly present in texts, as in *Depuis la porte, on ne voyait rien* ‘You couldn’t see anything from the door’, from Lagae (2012).

³ For instance, Sp. *de* is a TempS preposition, but only if inserted in *de...a...* ‘from... to...’ complex PPs (Xiqués 2015):

- (i) a. *Viví aquí de 1980 a 1989*. [Spanish]
‘I lived here from 1980 to 1989’
- b. *Vivo aquí {*de / desde} 1980*. [Spanish]
‘I have lived here since 1980’

(6) THE UNIFICATION PROBLEM OF SOURCE PREPOSITIONS:

Given that many prepositions of TempS are also appropriate in spatial contexts (SpaS), in which specific patterns should one formulate their licensing conditions in order to naturally match both sets of environments?

Certainly, the correct answer might perhaps be “in none” (then rejecting unification attempts, as Kemmerera 2005 seems to do on psycholinguistic grounds). But massive cross-linguistic temporal-spatial prepositional matches are found, as emphasized by Haspelmath (1997), suggesting that a positive response is possible. Support for this position also comes from the attested fact that non-native speakers must learn exceptions to these associations on individual bases (as in the case of Eng. *since*, inappropriate for SpaS).

At first sight, there is a straightforward answer to (6); namely, Path unification. We may assume that Source Ps are two-place predicates. They select for Paths as external arguments, and force their internal argument to be interpreted as their initial point (*beginning of path*, BP). We may then suppose that we get TempS if Paths are intervals, and we obtain SpaS if Paths are longitudinal spaces. That is, Paths might be different, but they are always lineal entities with parallel BPs and similar serial integrity, since duration is just a name for Temporal Path. The grammar is, thus, expected to be sensitive to the parallelism between TempS and SpaS by allowing for similar lexical choices in prepositions. If Paths are temporal, the external argument of the TempS preposition denotes a durative event, as in (7a); if they are spatial, a displacement predicate provides a locational BP in some trajectory as in (7b).

- (7) a. *Vivo en Madrid desde enero.* [Spanish]
‘I am living in Madrid since January’
b. *Viajé a Madrid desde París.* [Spanish]
‘I traveled to Madrid from Paris’

We may reasonably argue that punctual events do not provide temporal Paths, so that no BP for a potential TempS preposition could be licensed by them. At the same time, since these very events may be displacement predicates, they are expected to be compatible with a spatial Path, and license a SpaS PP. This easily accounts for contrasts such as the one in (8a). We may also account for the inverse contrast, as in (8b): *esperar* ‘wait’ denotes an activity, which licenses TempS; but it is not a displacement predicate, and it rejects SpaS.

I believe that this analysis is not exactly wrong, but rather rough or incomplete. Notice that it gives us no explanation for the two options in (8c), since *trabajar* ‘work’ is not a displacement verb.

- (8) a. *Saldré desde {*las ocho/ su casa}*. [Spanish]
‘I will be out since 8 o’clock / I will leaving his/her home’
- b. *Te esperó desde {las ocho / ?*su casa}*. [Spanish]
‘S/he waited for you from {8 o’clock / home}’
- c. *María trabaja desde {las ocho / su casa}*. [Spanish]
‘María works from {8 o’clock / home}’

More generally, an obvious limitation of an approach along these lines is its inability to account for SpaS PPs modifying non-displacement predicates. This is a quite standard situation, as I will explain below, and it shows that Paths are not just temporal or spatial linear entities, but also much more abstract concepts.

The connections between TempS and SpaS extend to the complement of the preposition. In fact, TempS complements may be derived from other types. For example, the French preposition *dès* ‘since, from the very moment of’ is supposed to select for temporal complements (that is, NPs denoting events and temporal points), but the truth is that non-temporal NPs are allowed as well, provided they are adapted to a temporal interpretation. For instance, the French nouns *article* ‘article’ and *gare* ‘station’ are not temporal nouns, but the sentences in (9) are fully grammatical.

- (9) a. *Dès son premier article, elle s’est positionnée clairement contre cette idée*. [French]
‘From her very first article, she clearly stood against that idea’
- b. *Le bus était plein dès la gare de départ*. [French]
‘The bus was full from the departure station’

A plausible solution to the paradox is coercion of the NP complement into a free relative sentence denoting a temporal point. The PP in (9a) would then mean ‘Since she wrote her first article’ (see Lagae 2012 for a similar proposal). The predicate *write*, absent from (9a), could be provided by Pustejovsky’s (1995) telic *qualia*, given that the relationship between *article* and *write* (or *publish*) is lexical. A similar process might apply to (9b), so that the SpaS PP would be interpreted as ‘Since the bus left the departure station’. The Path obtained in these cases is, no doubt, a durative one, but at the same time it suggests a series of publications in

(9a), and a bus route starting at some station in (9b); that is, the hearer is able to decompose a temporal Path by figuring out a series of consecutive landmarks within it which do not necessarily constitute temporal points.⁴

Other Romance prepositions are sensitive to a similar process. Notice that (10a) is an ambiguous sentence. If *desde Roma* means ‘since we were in Rome’ (or ‘since an event x, related to Rome’), it is interpreted as a TempS PP, but if it means ‘from Rome’, a SpaS reading is obtained. The former interpretation is licensed by the durative nature of the predicate, whereas the second is possible because *hablar* ‘talk’ is a communication verb (see below). Schaden (2007) points out that English *since* is only possible in SpaS PPs when a temporal reading is inferred or deduced, as in (10b).

- (10) a. *No he hablado con María desde Roma.* [Spanish]
‘I haven’t talked to Mary since/from Rome’
b. *John hasn’t said a word since Strasbourg.*

An argument in support of the coercion process sketched above comes from the fact that the preposition’s complement may naturally be substituted by temporal wh-words. For example, Port. *golo* ‘goal’ is not a temporal noun, but the Source PP in (11) could be substituted by *a partir de quando* or *a partir de que momento* ‘from what moment on’:

- (11) *O treinador mudou de estratégia a partir do segundo golo.* [Portuguese]
‘The coach changed his strategy from the second goal (onwards)’

As it is obvious, the coercion strategy will turn some SpaS PPs into TempS PPs, provided it is able to solve the lexical problem related to the recovery of the appropriate missing verb in the temporal free relative. But, even if this problem is properly solved, the TempS vs. SpaS dilemma must inevitably face another unescapable difficulty in Romance:

- (12) THE LEXICAL CHOICE PROBLEM OF SOURCE PREPOSITIONS: Romance systems for source prepositions may be...
a. BINARY, as in Italian: *da, a partire da*;

⁴ As L. García Fernández points out to me, Fr. *dès* is close to Sp. *ya desde* ‘already from’, in which the presence of the adverb *ya* implies the existence of a previous phase in which the situation obtains.

b. THREE-FOLD, as in Spanish, Portuguese or Catalan: *de, desde* (Cat. *des de*),
a-à partir de; or

c. FOUR-FOLD, as in French: *de, dès, depuis, à partir de*.

Given that Source is a conceptual primitive, on what specific lexical and/or grammatical bases do speakers make the right choices among these items?

This chapter could not possibly cover all aspects of Source prepositions in Romance, especially so since a number of monographs exist on just a few of their temporal variants, as I have just recalled. I will thus limit myself to provide a tentative—and, I have to admit, fragmentary—answer to some aspects of problems (6) and (12) in the pages to follow. I will argue that the understanding of Source crucially depends on that of Path; and, more specifically, on the idea that Paths constitute abstract and—somehow surprisingly—multiform conceptual primitives. The unification problem may be solved if duration is reinterpreted as one of the possible manifestation of Paths. I will show that SpaS PPs may be licensed on lexical (§ 3) or compositional (§ 4) grounds, and I will provide some clues to address the variation displayed by SpaS PPs in Romance. But before going into that, I will briefly address (§ 2) the issue of why Sources are not the exact conceptual opposites of Goals.

2 - Source-Goal (a)symmetries

Source and Goal are parallel in some respects, but not in others. The natural question is to what extent we are able to derive both situations. Both Source and Goal prepositions allow for similar alternations in incorporation processes. The Source preposition may not be incorporated at all into its predicate, as in (13a). When it gets incorporated, either a subsequent lexical change may be obtained, as in (13b), or may not be necessary, as in (13c,d).

- (13) a. *Salir de la ciudad* > **Salir la ciudad* ('To leave the city'). [Spanish]
b. *Sortir de la ville* > *Quitter la ville*. ('To leave the city'). [French]
c. *Exit from the city* > *Exit the city*.
d. *Flee from the country* > *Flee the country*.

The situation in (13c,d) is not common in Romance with Source PPs, but some examples exist. The Source preposition *de* is optative in (14), and it somehow reproduces the meaning of the prefix, as in the English examples (13 c,d).

- (14) *La cuestión excede (de) sus competencias.* [Spanish]
'The matter goes beyond his/her competence'

On the other hand, the Spanish adverb *donde* 'where' is known to derive from Lat. *unde* 'from where', preceded—in a largely redundant way—by the preposition *de*. Until at least the xvii century one finds examples in which Sp. *donde* means 'from where', as Eng. *whence* (see NGLE, § 22.8a and 22.8t for attested evidence), sometimes in alternation with *de donde*. But this is not a generalized pattern in English and modern Romance languages, in which locational complements are known to allow for either Goal or Place interpretations. The following examples, from Svenonius (2010), are ambiguous in these two readings:

- (15) a. *The plane flew behind the trees.*
b. *The rabbit jumped inside the cage.*
c. *The submarine sailed below the ice.*
d. *The marathoners ran beyond the city limits.*

That is, (15a) is about a flying process that takes place behind the trees, or about one ending in that place. Various lexical and grammatical solutions are able to account for this ambiguity, but—whatever we might pick up—we must explain why the ambiguity does not extend to Source complements. I agree with a number of authors—including Jackendoff (1983, 1990, 1996), Tenny (1994), and Gehrke (2007, 2008)—on the idea that syntactic solutions to these problems are preferable to lexical ones, in principle, and I have adopted them myself for Spanish somewhere else (Bosque 2015). If we introduce a null (\emptyset) preposition for Goals in the grammar, a simple incorporation process is able to explain why the same locational PPs may express both meanings:

- (16) a. John lives [_{PLACE} across [_{THING} the river]]
b. John moved [_{GOAL} across the river]
(17) a. John moved [_{GOAL} \emptyset] [_{PLACE} across the river]
b. John moved [_{GOAL} \emptyset + across]_i [_{PLACE} t_i the river]

Present-day Spanish displays this very situation in relative and interrogative adverbs, since *dónde* 'where' and *adónde* 'to where' freely alternate in goal complements, as in *¿Dónde vas?* / *¿Adónde vas?* 'Where do you go?'. As it is well-known, English *where* and *there* are also ambiguous in these very interpretations (as

against this conclusion by dwelling on Dutch data, but also on the idea that the English prepositions selected by *run* (such as *towards* or *away*) may change the diagnosis, as in *John ran away from the car in ten minutes*. Morimoto (2001) and Romeu (2014) argue, with Spanish examples, that implicit goals provide telicity, just as overt ones, as in (22a). A consequence of this asymmetry is the fact that Sources, unlike Goals, are not bound to telicity, as (22b) confirms.

- (22) a. *Los niños vinieron de su casa {en/ *durante} dos horas.* [Spanish]
b. *He ran from the station (*to his house) for ten minutes*
[iterative reading disregarded]

Pantcheva (2010) supports the Source-Goal asymmetry. She claims that a number of languages built Source Paths on top of Goal Paths, rather than the reverse. Lakusta (2005) argues that Goal-Source asymmetries extend to the acquisition of spatial notions beyond language. I will conclude —limiting myself to the Romance area— that Source and Goal are relatively symmetric components as regards incorporation processes, but asymmetric in their contribution to the characterization of Paths. The latter property follows from the basic semantic components of *Aktionsarten* classes and the specific relation of Goal to telicity, but also from the idea that Source has a lexical status, whereas Goal displays a peculiar mixture of grammatical and lexical properties.

3 - Lexical restrictions on Source complements

3.1 - Sources and lexical structure

Source is a relational concept because Sources are the initial components of Paths. This implies that Paths are not just linear spaces, given that the very existence of a Source point implies an oriented process. In other words, if “a path has a starting point” (Zwarts 2008), something has necessarily to be started. So-called “fictive movement predicates” (as in the *The Arabian Peninsula extends from Iraq to Yemen*) provide an apparent counterexample. However, these are generally taken to be metaphorical extensions from the corresponding active readings (Gawron 2005; Koontz-Garboden 2011). In fact, dictionaries do not regularly assign separated senses to these interpretations, then suggesting that they do not constitute different lexical readings.

At the same time, providing a Path for every instance of Source is not straightforward. The task becomes more complex when one becomes aware of the

many differences that may be attested among possible Paths, on purely descriptive grounds, in spite of the basic conceptual unity that all these varieties display. Although relevant differences among authors exist, it is not hard to find a certain consensus on the idea that arguments focalize conceptual aspects of lexical meaning by highlighting information already present in the lexical structure of predicates. On different aspects of this idea see Jackendoff (1983, 1990), Zwarts (2005), Ramchand (2008), Pantcheva (2011), Marantz (2013), Williams (2015), and Müller & Wechsler (2015), among many others. In fact, adjuncts often make parts of the lexical information provided by the predicate overt, as well as redundant in various degrees. Examples of this redundancy are particularly transparent in Goal and Source complements: Sp. *emerger* ‘emerge’ implies ‘to the surface’, but *emerger a la superficie* ‘emerge to the surface’ is a natural expression. Similarly, Sp. *zarpar* ‘shove off, leave a harbor’ implies ‘from some harbor’, but *zarpar de este puerto* ‘leave this harbor’, with a Source PP, is, again, well-formed. Many other similar cases exist. In the pages to follow I will apply a similar strategy to other predicates selecting for SpaS PPs.

Since we cannot freely add Source adjuncts to predicates (ex. **She is happy from her home*), the natural question is on what grounds they are grammatically restricted. But, as pointed out above, this is a subsidiary issue of other, more fundamental, questions, namely “How are Paths detected?” and “How exactly are they obtained from the predicate’s meaning?”. There are various forms of gathering semantic classes of verbs which coincide in allowing for Source complements. I will pick up a somehow unusual criterion here:

- (23) A. Semantic classes of verbs which show a consistent variation in the Romance preposition chosen for Source complements.
- B. Semantic classes of verbs which show very little variation, or no variation at all, in the Romance preposition chosen for Source complements.

On A, see sections 3.2. to 3.4; on B, see section 3.5.

3.2 - Source PPs with displacement verbs

SpaS PPs are licensed by DISPLACEMENT verbs, as in (7b). This means that in displacement contexts, the external argument of Source prepositions provides a movement event taking place along a Path. For example, the displacement to what

(7b) refers covers a physical Path starting in Paris.

Romance ternary Source prepositional systems are generally split as in (12b). In a number of analyses of the *de-desde* (both ‘from’) alternation in Spanish, the choice of *de* has been argued to focalize the BP (so that Path is not accessible, even if it is conceptually necessary), whereas *desde* has been associated to the presence of an implicit Goal. See Morera (1988) and Romeu (2014); see also Asic (2008) and Lagard (2012) on *de* vs. *depuis* in French. According to this account, the presence of *hasta* ‘until’ in displacement predicates is implied if *desde* is picked up, so that *desde... hasta...* is interpreted as a complex preposition which externally delimitates an atelic event. As a result, a complete path is visualized. This is rather close to Piñón’s (1993) and Zwarts’s (2005) concept of BOUNDED PATH, adapted by Pancheva (2010) for several languages, and more recently for Xiqués (2015) for Catalan.

I will take the interpretation of the *de/desde* alternation along these lines to be basically correct as regards displacement, not necessarily in relation to other classes. Even so, two qualifications are in order. First, it is worth recalling that external delimitation of events requires durative predicates, what implies that “from...to...” complex PPs cannot possibly be licensed with punctual verbs denoting displacement, regardless of whether *de* or *desde* are picked up:

- (24) a. *Este tren {*sale / va} de Madrid a Barcelona.* [Spanish]
‘This train {*departs / goes} from Madrid to Barcelona’
b. *Este tren sale desde la Estación Central (*hasta Barcelona)* [Spanish]
‘This train departs from Madrid (*until Barcelona)’
c. *Me caí desde la escalera (*hasta el suelo).* [Spanish]
‘I fell down from the top of the staircase (*until the ground)’

Second, *de...a...* and *desde... hasta...* are not fully parallel, since *de* is able to focalize BPs with no external delimitation. The opposite distribution of Source Ps in (25) is thus expected:

- (25) a. *No te muevas {de / *desde} aquí.* [Spanish]
‘Don’t you move from here’
b. *Caminé {*de / desde} mi casa.* [Spanish]
‘I walked from home’

Desde is rejected in (25a) because *moverse* ('move', pronominal) is a punctual predicate, in the relevant reading, as opposed to *mover* ('move', non-pronominal),⁵ so that no external delimitation is possible. *De* is allowed in this sentence because this preposition focuses the BP and does not visualize the full Path. On the contrary, external delimitation is provided by *desde* in (25b)—implying '...to a certain place, recoverable from context'—, and not by *de*. External delimitation is, thus, the only possibility for *caminar* 'walk' to accept a Source PP in (25b), since this is a durative predicate of displacement. The choice of *desde* implies that an implicit Goal is visible, so that a full Path is licensed.

On equal terms, the *de-desde* alternation with displacement verbs is in accordance with the general lines suggested by the authors mentioned above. I will present some arguments in their support.

1) The distinction offers a meaning difference for subtle contrasts such as (26). The choice of *desde* suggests 'to the ground' more transparently, whereas only the beginning of the dropping process is captured if *de* is picked up.

(26) *La maceta cayó {del / desde el} quinto piso.* [Spanish]
'The flower pot fell from the fifth floor'

2) If some Path cannot be visualized for pragmatic reasons, *desde* is likely to be rejected. The prediction is, again, met, as attested in (27):

(27) a. *Se cayó de {un árbol/ un trapecio/ un quinto piso/ un caballo/ una bicicleta/ una silla}.* [Spanish]
'S/he fell from {a tree/ a trapeze/ the fifth floor/ a horse / a bike / a chair}'
b. *Se cayó desde {un árbol/ un trapecio / un quinto piso/ ?un caballo/ ??una bicicleta/ ??una silla}.* [Spanish]
'= (27a)'

3) The "intentional effect" associated with *desde* in some contexts may be derived from the spatial extension implicated by the mere conceptualization of a Path. Speakers coincide on the idea that some special effort, intention, merit or credit

⁵ Again, in some of its readings: *mover la pelota* 'move the ball' [atelic] vs. *mover la escalera* 'move the staircase' [telic]. Many well-known differences between pronominal telic verbs vs. non-pronominal atelic verbs are attested in the literature, as in *dormir* 'sleep' vs. *dormirse* 'fall sleep', or *irse* 'leave' vs. *ir* 'go'.

is implicated by the choice of *desde* in pairs such as (28). This implication is not necessarily conveyed if the other alternative is chosen, since it merely expresses the point of departure of some displacement:

- (28) *Había venido {de / desde} Tokio.* [Spanish]
'S/he had come from Tokio'

A very similar effect is obtained in the pairs in (29). *Desde* is expected to be awkward in (29a), but also natural in (29b), since only in the latter example the existence of a full Path (from the ground to the upright position) is implied:

- (29) a. *¿Todavía no te has levantado {de / ?*desde} la cama?* [Spanish]
'You haven't got up from bed yet?'
b. *En los ejercicios difíciles cuesta un poco más levantarse {del / desde el} suelo.* [Spanish]
'In the hard exercises, it takes more effort to get up off the floor'

4) Complex predicates may contain relevant information able to trigger the visualization of some Path. The choice of *desde* is a bit strange in (30a), since there is no reason for the speaker to focus on the full Path, instead of its beginning. But the Path followed by the train is quite relevant in (30b), what makes the opposite preposition choice to be expected.⁶

- (30) a. *El tren que viene {de / ?desde} París está entrando por la vía 5.* [Spanish]
'The train from Paris is entering platform 5'
b. *El tren viene lleno {?de / desde} París.* [Spanish]
'The train is full from Paris'

⁶ In any case, some problems remain. For example, the *de/desde* alternation extends in Spanish to TRANSFER verbs (akin to *translate, transport, transmit, move*, etc.), somehow causative variants of displacement predicates. However, many speakers of Spanish alternate the prepositions *de* and *desde* in some verbs of this group, as in *traducir {del / desde el} ruso* 'to translate from Russian' with no clear semantic differences. These contrasts require further investigation.

The third choice in ternary Source prepositional systems is *a partir de/ à partir de/ a partire da*, a complex preposition with not direct English equivalent (approximately, ‘starting, from x onwards’). It is built out of the Romance descendants of the Latin verb *partire* ‘depart’, and it provides a straightforward instance of a “V > P” grammaticalization process, given that the verb *partire* denotes the event of initiating a displacement (Rohrer 1981, Lagae 2012, Bosque & Bravo 2016). The variant *a contar de* (lit. ‘counting from’, as in French *a compter de*) is used in Chile, and a few other American countries, as a TempS P, as in *a contar de enero* ‘from January onwards’.

Bosque & Bravo (2016) argue that the Spanish TempS preposition *a partir de* and its French and Italian counterparts take telic external arguments and license unspecific temporal points in open intervals. They argue that this preposition parallels indefinites in modal contexts, such as free-choice items, in the sense that they pick up unspecific points in some interval. According to this analysis, the approximate meaning of (31a) is: “The train departs at some unspecific point included in an interval of unknown end which starts at three o’clock”. One may address the question of why this analysis does not extend to SpaS; that is, how come we do not have sentences such as (31b):

- (31) a. *El tren sale a partir de las tres.* [Spanish]
‘This train departs sometime after three o’clock’
b. **El tren sale a partir de Madrid.* [Spanish]
‘This train departs from Madrid’

Interestingly, example (31b) is ungrammatical whether it means (i) “The train departs from Madrid”, or (ii) “The train departs from some unspecific location after Madrid”. Some of my Portuguese informants admitted the (i) reading in examples similar to (31b), such as (32a), which makes the attested example (32b) entirely expected.

- (32) a. *O comboio sai a partir da estação central.* [Portuguese]
‘The train departs from Central Station’
b. “*O trem sai a partir de qualquer estação*” [retrieved from the Internet]
‘The train departs from any station’ [Portuguese]

But, crucially, none of my informants (for any Romance language) accepted the reading in (ii), which I will take to be universally excluded for SpaS. In fact, its

very inexistence is relevant on theoretical grounds, and cannot simply be dismissed of functional or communicative assumptions. On the contrary, it shows us that in certain cases the parallelism between TempS and SpaS might not be as close as the pairs in (5) suggest. Ultimately, the fact that unspecific temporal points may be licensed by modal operators (see Bosque & Bravo 2016 for details) may simply be the natural consequence of modal projections' being located higher than temporal and aspectual ones in most syntactic configurations, an idea somehow reminiscent of the traditional subordination of tenses to mood distinctions. As it is obvious, no "locative projection" is expected to have any intervening role in this relationship, and no "locative inflection" exists in Romance languages.⁷

As we have seen, there is some cross-linguistic variation on the (i) reading of (31b). I suggest that the reason why Sp. *a partir de* is not appropriate in this pattern, as opposed to *desde*, lies in the fact that departure verbs do not provide unbounded paths. As we have seen, *desde* is admitted in these cases because it implies a Goal, then closing a Path as in the cases in (27) to (30). The preposition *de* is accepted as well, because it only focalizes the departing point required by the very meaning of departure predicates.

Sp. *a partir de* is accepted as a SpaS preposition with a few telic predicates. Bosque & Bravo (2016) suggest that atelic predicates are coerced into their inceptive readings, so that (33a) means 'We started to walk...'. If this is correct, it allows us to partially reduce this pattern to the situation in (13); that is, to cases in which Source prepositions partially reproduce the meaning of the predicate that selects for them.

- (33) a. *Caminamos varios 10 kms. a partir del cruce.* [Spanish]
'We walked for several kms. from the crossroad'

⁷ Even so, parallelisms between TempS and SpaS persist in some of these cases. For example, Bosque & Bravo (2016) point out that an open interval is licensed by the future, but not by the preterit, in (ia). This property of TempS *a partir de* coincides with Lagae's (2012) observation on its SpaS counterpart in French, which she takes to be a prospective preposition. Most native speakers of French, she argues, interpret *Lyon* in (ib) as a point located after the position of the speaker (on some road) if *a partir de* is chosen, but before the place in which he or she is standing on this very road if *depuis* is picked up.

- (i) a. *Te {llamaré / *llamé} a partir de las diez.* [Spanish]
'I {will call / called} you sometime after 10 o'clock'
b. *Cette route bouchonne {depuis / à partir de} Lyon.* [French]
'There are traffic jams in this road {from / starting in} Lyon'

The unification of TempS and SpaS *a partir de* in such cases is yet to be accomplished.

- b. *Continuaremos a partir del décimo compás.* [Spanish]
'We will go on from the tenth bar'
- c. *A partir de este punto, la carretera se hace más estrecha.* [Spanish]
'From that point onwards, the road narrows'

This restrictive group includes displacement verbs which focus the Path covered by movement, such as *caminar* 'walk', *desplazarse* 'move, scroll' or *recorrer* 'go through, travel all over', as in (33a). *A partir de* is also compatible with verbs denoting some event phases (*comenzar* 'begin', *seguir* 'continue, keep', *continuar* 'continue'), as in (33b). Finally, gradual completion verbs are also allowed, provided the changes they denote may be associated to an initial physical point, as in (33c).

Other Romance languages, and particularly Portuguese, associate *a partir de* with the starting point of a physical Path which may be bounded (see below). For a detailed analysis of *a partir de* and its Romance counterparts as TempS prepositions, I refer to Bosque & Bravo (2016).

Displacement predicates allow for other varieties. SpaS PPs with JUMPING and LAUNCHING verbs (*jump*, *throw*, *launch*, *shoot*, etc.), sometimes called PROPULSION verbs, are interesting because they focus on the departure point of some displacement, but they license full Paths. The *de-desde* alternation analyzed above extends to them, so that a meaning difference akin to those attested in (25)-(31) is expected here, as in (34).

- (34) *Saltó {de / desde} la ventana.* [Spanish]
'S/he jumped from the window'

Even so, some lexical preferences exist.⁸ Among the Romance languages addressed here, Portuguese is the only one allowing for the SpaS preposition *a partir de* to designate the Source point of these physical Paths, often in alternation with

⁸ Present-day European Spanish prefers *desde* in these cases, as in (ia), although *de* is not rejected. In any case, both options have a grammatical justification, as in the contrasts above. The presence of *de* with jumping and launching verbs is more frequent in present-day American Spanish ("% stands for 'subject to dialectal variation'):

- (i) a. *Han disparado {[%]de / desde / *a partir de} allí.* [Spanish]
'They were shooting from there'
- b. "...*los militares se lanzaban de los helicópteros con paracaídas*"
[Proceso, Méx. 02/02/1997, CREA]
[Spanish]
'Soldiers were jumping from the helicopters with their parachutes on'

de. Again, this is a natural extension of the behavior of this preposition in (32). It is relevant to point out that the direct equivalents of Port. *a partir de* in other Romance languages are strongly rejected in these contexts (“%” stands for ‘subject to dialectal variation’, as in fn. 8):

- (35) a. “...saltou a partir de um helicóptero, voando em direção ao vulcão”
 (24 Horas News [Brazil], 06/08/2017)
 [Portuguese]
 ‘S/he jumped from a helicopter flying towards the volcano’
- b. “...foi morto por homens armados que dispararam a partir de uma carrinha”
 (Público [Portugal], 08/10/2012)
 [Portuguese]
 ‘He was killed by some armed man firing from a truck’
- (36) a. *Il giornalista è saltato giù {da / *a partire da} un elicottero* [Italian]
 ‘The journalist jumped from a helicopter’
- b. *Le journaliste a sauté {d’ / *à partir d’} un hélicoptère.* [French]
 ‘The journalist jumped from a helicopter’
- c. *Le dispararon {%de / desde / *a partir de} un camión.* [Spanish]
 ‘He was shot from a truck’

Verbs of jumping and launching are also interesting as regards the way in which they lexicalize Goal. This semantic component may appear as a PP denoting place (introduced by *at* in English and by similar prepositions in Romance), but also as an indirect object, as *le* in (36c). I will return to this alternation below. The important point to remember by now is that Port. *a partir de* differs from its counterparts in other Romance languages in being appropriate to head a SpaS PP which focalizes the initial point of a bounded path.⁹

c. “...ya que el enemigo disparando de las ventanas mantenía a distancia a los asaltantes”
 [J. R. Ponce, *El asalto de Concepción*, Chile; Google Books]
 [Spanish]

‘...since the enemy was holding off the attackers by shooting from the windows’

d. “Enrique queda inconsciente al ser lanzado de su caballo”
 [I. Hernández, *La novela criolla en las Antillas*, Puerto Rico, CREA]
 [Spanish]

‘Enrique became unconscious when thrown from his horse’

⁹ I have not been able to find a clear answer in the literature to the natural question of why some movement verbs do not license Source PPs. Change of position verbs (*sit down*, *lie down*, *bend down*, *stand up*, *duck*, etc.) belong to

3.3 - Source PPs with perception verbs

Variation in the choice of preposition in Romance SpaS PPs is also attested with PERCEPTION verbs (equivalent to *see, look, observe, hear, listen, smell, contemplate, spot, perceive*, etc.). These verbs select for Source PPs in many languages, including English:

- (37) a. *I can see the bay from my window.*
b. *We could smell the roses from the lounge.*

To my knowledge, the first account of the compatibility of Source with perception predicates was proposed by Lakoff (1995), developing an idea by Charles Fillmore. As in the cases above, the presence of Source prepositions in (37) is possible because perception verbs involve Paths. More precisely, perception events are linguistically conceived as taking place along abstract Paths, even if these are rather different from those characterizing displacement predicates. The reason why a goal-PP (ex. *to the garage*) could be added to (38a), but not to (38b),

- (38) a. *I moved the car from the entrance.*
b. *I saw the car from the entrance.*

follows from the fact that the direct object in (38b) is semantically interpreted as the Goal of the perception process, implying that Goal is already saturated. As a consequence, the Path in (38b) is an abstract track going from the viewer to the perceived object, whereas in (38a) it is the linear space covered by the vehicle. Differences in the semantics of the Source-PPs in (38) thus follow from their respective Paths, but their very existence also follows from the fact that a Path is conceptualized in both situations.¹⁰

this restricted paradigm, with a few exceptions, as in (29b). I suggest that the exclusion of SpaS PPs with these verbs lies in the difficulty of obtaining a locative Path, maybe because this semantic group is interpreted by the speaker as a subclass of change of state predicates. In fact, many change of state predicates reject Source PPs as well, as in Sp. **Mi ropa se secó de su humedad* ‘Lit. My clothes dried from their moisture’.

¹⁰ Mass nouns are known to be able to incorporate into the predicate in so-called *non-quantized interpretations*. The direct object does not provide a Goal in these cases, and a double PP is available to represent the full Path, as expected:

- (i) a. *Veó el mar desde mi ventana (*hasta el horizonte).* [Spanish]
‘I can see the sea from my window (to the horizon)’

The widespread use of Source prepositions in many languages with nouns such as *point of view*, *perspective*, *angle*, etc. are natural figurative extensions of the physical Paths just described. As in other cases involving figurative meanings, perception Paths are lineal entities, but at the same time they cannot be properly defined as sets of points or other similar conceptual primitives. As regards the preposition's choice, again Romance's solutions turn out not to be as straightforward as English's, which systematically picks up *from*. Portuguese seems to be the only Romance language which allows for the alternation of *de* and *a partir de* in these cases, which parallels the behavior of the latter preposition attested above with other predicates involving a physical Path:

- (39) a. *Posso ver toda a rua {da / *desde a / a partir da} minha janela.* [Portuguese]
'I can see all the street from my window'
b. [Picture's caption at a restaurant] "*Vista da Plaza Mayor a partir da minha mesa*" [Retrieved from the Internet] [Portuguese]
'A view of the Plaza Mayor from my table'

Present-day Spanish clearly prefers *desde* in these contexts; Italian chooses *da*; whereas present-day French shows an alternation of prepositions. The distribution obtained is as follows:¹¹

- (40) a. *From my window I can see the sea.*
b. *{*Desde / Da} minha janela vejo o mar.* [Portuguese]
c. *{Depuis / De} ma fenêtre je vois la mer.* [French]
d. *{Desde / *De} mi ventana veo el mar.* [Spanish]

Other predicates selecting for Source prepositions are grammatically integrated in this group, regardless of the fact that dictionaries place them in other categories.

-
- b. *Vejo mar desde mi ventana hasta el horizonte.* [Spanish]
'The sea can be seen from my window all the way to the horizon'

¹¹ The choice of *depuis* in (40c) is not recommended by prescriptive grammars (recall fn. 2). Even so, for many speakers it implies that the whole Path (from the viewer to the perceived entity) is focused and becomes visible or accessible, an idea that recalls the basic contrasts in § 3.2. As regards Spanish, the preposition *de* is ungrammatical in (40d), but this pattern is attested in Old Spanish, as in (i):

- (i) "...*de aquí veo yo más de cuatro [pelos]*" [Anonymous, *El hospital de los podridos*, 1611, CORDE]
'From here, I can see more than four [hairs]'

Spanish examples include verbs such as *presenciar* ‘witness, attend’, nouns such as *testigo* ‘witness’, morphologically unrelated to the former, and adjectives such as *opaco* ‘opaque’:¹²

- (41) a. *Presenció el partido desde la tribuna.* [Spanish]
‘I attended the match from the gallery’
b. *Fue testigo de los acontecimientos desde un balcón.* [Spanish]
‘He witnessed the events from a balcony’
c. *El vidrio es totalmente opaco desde el exterior.* [Spanish]
‘The glass is totally opaque from the outside’

Perception verbs naturally extend to those denoting VIGILANCE or SURVEILLANCE, such as *monitor*, *supervise*, *keep an eye on*, *oversee*, etc., which also select for SpaS PPs. In fact, predicates such as *watch* correspond to both groups (perception and surveillance) with equal legitimacy. As in perception verbs, the Goal in surveillance verbs is lexicalized as a direct object, and a similar Path is conceived in both classes (from the agent-experiencer to the Goal), the main difference lying in the notion of attentiveness or care involved in the latter class. As expected, preposition alternations for Source PPs are similar in perception verbs and surveillance predicates. Portuguese alternates *de* and *a partir de* in the latter group, which naturally extends the alternations we attested in the former verb classes:

- (42) a. *Vigiavam os prisioneiros de uma torre.* [Portuguese]
‘They used to watch the prisoners from a tower’
b. “...um edifício com celas onde os doentes mentais eram vigiados a partir de um ponto central” (*TSF Rádio Notícias*, 24-11-2017) [Portuguese]
‘...a building with cells in which mental patients were watched from a central point’

¹² A standard definition of the verb *presenciar* in Spanish dictionaries is “estar presente” ‘be present’. Nevertheless, this predicate rejects SpaS complements, which confirms that *presenciar* properly belongs into the class of perception verbs:

- (i) {*Presenció* / ?**Estuve presente en*} *el partido desde la tribuna.* [Spanish]
‘I {witnessed / ?*was present at} the match from the grandstand of the stadium’

As regards the adjective *opaco* ‘opaque’, standard definitions in Spanish dictionaries (“not letting the light pass through”) license Source PP because they contain a verb of movement (*pasar* ‘pass’). Interestingly, most definitions of *opaque* in English dictionaries contain a verb of perception (“not able to be seen through”).

3.4 - Source PPs with predicates of action at a distance

Variation in source PPs extends to another class, not far from the latter group on conceptual grounds. It is constituted by predicates denoting ACTION AT A DISTANCE. I will further subdivide these verbs in three subgroups.

a) The first one includes a large number of COMMUNICATION verbs (akin to *speak, call, shout, phone, write, respond, broadcast*, and many more), some of which are morphologically derived from nouns denoting instruments of communication (Levin's 1993 class 37.4). The Path they lexically contain is to be understood as a physical distance covered in the communication process. A Source PP is possible in sentences such as *John phoned me from New York* because the phoning event involves a Path going from New York to me. An interesting property of most verbs in this group is the fact that they allow for a particular sort of "Goal-Doubling": the PP-goal in (43a) is predicated from the direct object (*him* in that sentence), what gives rise to paraphrases such as *John called him_i when he_i was at the office*. This strongly reminds of a similar property of kicking verbs, restricted to parts of the body (Levin 1993, Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2013), as in (43b). The "doubling property" extends to some launching verbs as well (*launch, throw, shoot*, etc.), as in (43c), but not to perception verbs:

- (43) a. *John called him at the office.*
b. *John kicked him in the face.*
c. *John shot him in the leg.*
d. **John saw him in the face.*

As in other predicates which provide bounded Paths, variation in the preposition's choice is attested in this pattern as well. The contrast between Portuguese and Spanish is as follows (the sentences in (44) have the same meaning; the sign "%" stands for dialectal or idiolectal variation, as in other examples above):

- (44) a. *Mary wrote me a postcard from Rome.*
b. *A Maria escreveu-me um cartão postal {de / *desde/ %a partir de} Roma.*
[Portuguese]
c. *María me escribió una postal {*de / desde / *a partir de} Roma.* [Spanish]

Although only some of my Portuguese informants admitted *a partir de* in (44b), it is not hard to attest examples (most of them, from Brazilian Portuguese) which prove that this pattern is fully grammatical for many speakers. Again, it seems that no other Romance language parallels with Portuguese in this respect:

- (45) a. “*Marcelo ligou a partir de Braga para dizer ao radialista que...*”
(*TV Media*, 17-02-2017) [Portuguese]
‘Marcelo called from Braga to tell the radio host that...’
b. “*Me telefonou a partir de Itália para me tranquilizar*”
(*TVi24*, 9-02-2017) [Portuguese]
‘S/he phoned from Italy to reassure me’
c. “*Escrevo-lhe a partir de Leça da Palmeira para dar-lhe os parabéns pela...*”¹³
‘I am writing to you from Leça da Palmeira to congratulate you for...’

b) The second subgroup consists of verbs denoting external control or guidance over situations, including RULING verbs such as *lead*, *direct*, *run*, *control*, and similar predicates. Some verbs, such as *safeguard*, might belong to this group or to the perception group above. Again the distribution of Source prepositions is close in both classes. As in the case of communication verbs, no *de / desde* alternation is observed in Spanish (which amounts to say that the SpaS Ps must attest the existence of a closed Path), but Portuguese displays a *de / a partir de* alternation again. The sentences in (46) are synonyms:

- (46) a. *He rules his company from a beach in Miami.*
b. *Ele dirige a sua empresa {de / *desde / %a partir de} uma praia em Miami.*
[Portuguese]
c. *Dirige su empresa {*de / desde / *a partir de} una playa de Miami.*
[Spanish]
d. *Dirige la sua azienda {da / *a partire da} una spiaggia di Miami.* [Italian]
e. *Il dirige son entreprise {*d' / depuis / *à partir d'} une plage de Miami.*
[French]

As in perception verbs, UNTIL-PPs or TO-PPs are disallowed in this group, but a Path is lexically licensed in both cases: it is opened by the Source PP, and closed by the direct object.

¹³ Retrieved from a Blog at the Internet: <http://umtaldeblog.blogspot.fr/2010/>

c) The final subgroup may only be characterized on pragmatic grounds, since actions able to cause an effect at some distance do not always constitute a lexical paradigm. Notice that a country may destroy another one from some nuclear arsenal, and also that you can work from home, buy something or pay for it from a computer, or check your flight online from your mobile phone. This “pragmatic paradigm” is a natural extension of the lexical paradigms in “a” and “b”. In all these cases, Source prepositions are licensed because the actions they deal with are linguistically characterized as involving particular Paths. Their Source coincides with the place or the instrument that originates the effect to be caused at some distance, and their Goal is provided by the verb’s direct object. The variation attested in this paradigm is rather similar to the one presented in the former semantic groups. Again, all the sentences in (47) have the same meaning.

- (47) a. *Today you can buy whatever you want from a tablet.*
b. *Atualmente podes comprar o que queres {[%]de / *desde / a partir de} um tablet.* [Portuguese]
c. *Hoy puedes comprar lo que quieras {*de / desde / *a partir de} una tableta.* [Spanish]
d. *Oggi puoi comprare quello che vuoi {da / *a partire da} un tablet.* [Italian]
e. *Aujourd’hui, on peut tout acheter {*d’ / depuis / %à partir d’} une tablette.* [French]

One should keep in mind that the very fact that verbs such as *buy* involve a spatial Path is unexpected. I take this to be one of the linguistic shapes that this action may adopt, and it is fully compatible with other argumental structures of the same verb which entirely lack such a participant, as in *Yesterday, I bought this computer at a department store.*¹⁴

¹⁴ Building on the undeniable grammaticality of sentences such as *I wish you a merry Christmas from the bottom of my heart*, one might perhaps want to conclude that verbs of will (*want, wish, expect, hope, long*, etc.) provide abstract Paths, somehow similar to those of perception or communication verbs. However, it is not quite clear that other members of this group are equally compatible with Source phrases (recall (8b), for example). For this reason, I will leave the question open.

3.5 - Source PPs in Romance with little or no variation

Let me say something now on the group of predicates which display little variation, or no variation at all, as regards the choice of SpaS P (= group (23B) above). Here is an example: the Romance preposition heading SpaS PPs selected by verbs denoting MOVEMENT AWAY is *de* as the only option:

- (48) a. *Não te afastes {de / *desde / *a partir de} mim.* [Portuguese]
‘Don’t go away from me’
b. *Sganciarono {dal / *a partire dal} treno l’ultimo vagone.* [Italian]
‘They unhooked the last wagon from the train’
c. *Il faut éloigner la table {du / *depuis/ *a partir du} mur.* [French]
‘The table must be separated from the wall’
d. *No te separes {de / *desde / *a partir de} mí.* [Spanish]
‘Don’t go away from me’

The same conclusion extends to other members of group (23B), which basically includes the following semantic notions:

- A) MOVEMENT AWAY (*separate, remove, divorce, retire, etc.*),
- B) GRABBING (*grab, hold, grip, secure, etc.*).
- C) DEMAND (*ask, demand, require, etc.*).
- D) OBTAINING (*obtain, inherit, learn, etc.*).
- E) PROTECTION (*protect, shelter, hidden, etc.*).
- F) RECOVERING (*recover, heal, cure, etc.*).
- G) AVOIDING (*disengage, shirk, sidestep, etc.*).

See specifically classes 10 to 13 in Levin’s 1993 classification of English verbs. One detects almost no variation in predicates in these semantic classes: *de* (Italian *da*) is the only preposition selected, with only a few exceptions.¹⁵ The natural

¹⁵ For example, some alternations of *de / a partir de* are related to the strong relationship which holds between the latter and the notion of “cause”, as pointed out as regards (3). The Spanish verb *aprender* ‘learn’, which belongs to group D, admits alternations as the following:

- (i) *Lo que aprendí {de / a partir de} tu experiencia.* [Spanish]
‘What I learned {from / on the basis of} your experience’

As the English glosses suggest, *de* directly introduces a Source, whereas *a partir de* implies a broad causal

question, then, is why there is no variation as regards the choice of Source Ps within this set of predicates, as opposed to the situation we found in (23A).

One might argue that predicates in (23A) select for SpaS PP adjuncts, whereas those in (23B) select for arguments (often called *complementos de régimen* in the Spanish grammatical tradition). But, since both groups are heavily constrained on semantic grounds, as we have seen, the “argument vs. adjunct” distinction seems to be scarcely enlightening as regards these contrasts. I will suggest that the main difference relies on another factor, namely the way in which Path is conceptualized. More specifically, the reason why a Goal PP can be added in (49a), but not in (49b), is related to the fact that a *de / desde* alternation is possible in the former, but not in the latter.

- (49) a. *Emigró de Irlanda (a EEUU).* [Spanish]
‘S/he immigrated to USA from Ireland’
b. *Se independizó de sus padres (*a un pequeño apartamento).* [Spanish]
‘S/he gained independence from their parents (and moved) to a small apartment’

In other words, verbs in the (23B) group, which point towards more abstract concepts, do not make whole Paths visible, but just their initial point. Since Paths are not accessible, Goals are not either. English grammar introduces no lexical difference as regards these two groups (23A-B), as pointed out above, but other languages may go beyond the distinctions introduced for Romance, and might provide even more complex systems of Source prepositions. An interesting consequence of an account along these lines is the fact that it is able to explain why a single predicate may belong into either of the two main groups above (that is, 23A-B), depending on whether or not it conceptualizes a full Path. The verb *venir* ‘come’ shows this in minimal pairs such as (50):

- (50) a. *Su familia materna viene de Berlín.* (Ambiguous) [Spanish]
‘His/her mother’s family {comes / is coming} from Berlin’
b. *Su familia materna viene desde Berlín.* (Unambiguous) [Spanish]
‘His/her mother’s family is coming from Berlin’

relationship which allows for paraphrases such as “by building on”. The extent to which these alternations may be extended to other predicates on the A-G classification above is yet to be investigated.

That is, (50a) is about a group's trip or a group's ancestry, where only the first reading is available in (50b). When *venir* expresses somebody's origin, background or provenance, it is not able to focalize a full Path, and no alternation with *desde* is available. Needless to say, the more abstract reading is a metaphorical extension of the physical one, but the relevant point is that syntax is sensitive to the distinction.

4 - Compositional aspects of Source

In the preceding section a number of semantic classes licensing Source PPs have been introduced, together with some of the factors which trigger variation among them in Romance grammar. As it is evident, Path identification would be a simple task if Paths were directly provided by the lexical structure of predicates in all instances, even counting on the contingency that prepositions may focus different components of Paths.

But in many cases Paths are not provided by the lexicon, but rather built up or figured out by the speaker and the hearer by assembling scattered pieces of information, quite a different picture from the situation attested in the previous section. Notice that the Path to be built up in order to make sense of the complex nominal in square brackets in (51) involves a series of films, the first of which (that is, the BP) is *Viridiana*, a piece of information that the hearer might not know, but would be forced to assume. The full NP in (51) is, thus, about a series of films sharing a certain actor.

- (51) *El intérprete imprescindible de [las películas de Buñuel a partir de "Viridiana"]* (*La Vanguardia*, 10/03/1994) [Spanish]
'The indispensable actor of Buñuel films from *Viridiana* onwards'

Interestingly, the Path created in (51) is a temporal one, even if *Viridiana* is not a temporal noun, but just the name of the first film in a series of them. In this section I will briefly address two factors relevant for the understanding of the compositional relationship between Sources and Paths.

- (52) Two compositional factors of SpaS licensing:
A. Coercion processes giving rise to displacement predicates.
B. Mereological structures.

The factor in (52A) is necessary to account for some apparent mismatches between SpaS PPs and semantic classes of predicates. The SpaS PP provided by a ‘FROM...TO...’ complex PP may not be lexically licensed by the predicate. This is what we find in (53) with the verbs *silbar* ‘whistle’ and *leer* ‘read’.

- (53) a. *María silba a diario de su casa al trabajo.* [Spanish]
‘María whistles every day from home to work’
b. *Solo puedes leer un periódico desde Madrid hasta Sevilla, si viajas en tren.*
[Spanish]
‘You can only read a newspaper from Madrid to Seville, if you travel by train’

In order to account for these mismatches, we need a grammatical device to reinterpret *silbar* as “walk while whistling” or “go while whistling”, and *read* as “travel while reading”. That is, if a displacement predicate is introduced in the paraphrase, it will be able to provide the Path matched by the SpaS PP. No doubt, this account introduces a rather unconstrained device on predicate formation, i.e. “V while X-ing (V being an unmarked displacement verb) > X”. But the phenomena in (53) shows that syntactically overt physical Paths may count as grammatical evidence of the presence of displacement processes, even if they are not lexically licensed. It is worth recalling that a well-known property of many non-displacement action verbs is their ability to license Goal PPs in English and many other languages, giving rise to a resultative predication, as in *sweep the trash to the corner*.

The factor in (52B) involves mereological (i.e., part-whole) relations. The role of these relations in the grammar is beyond doubts nowadays (for a general overview, see Simons 1987, Miéville 1998, Chaffin et al. 1988, Kleiber 1999, Poesio et al. 2006, and Irmer 2011, among many others). Some SpaS PPs may only be licensed if interpreted as parts of the entity denoted by their antecedent. The sentence in (54) constitutes an example of this situation, since the verb *read* does not qualify as a predicate able to lexically license a SpaS PP:¹⁶

- (54) *I read the book from the preface to the end.*

¹⁶ Unless it is interpreted as a perception verb, and the SpaS P’s complement denotes the place from which the reading takes place, as in *I can’t read the sign from here*.

The *from... to...* complex PP provides a Path in (54), but —contrary to the situation in (53)— it is not licensed through an incorporation process, but rather introducing a secondary predicate of the object. The Source-Goal complex PP in (54) provides both a physical measure of the book itself and the Path followed in the reading action; that is, these PPs are licensed as adjuncts of some accomplishments, whilst providing the extension of the entity to which the action applies.

Path reconstruction in these cases requires the necessary mereological relations to be properly identified. Consider the minimal pairs in (55):

- (55) a. *La serie televisiva me atrapó desde el primer episodio.* [Spanish]
‘The TV series caught me up from the first episode’
b. *?*La serie televisiva me atrapó desde el salón de mi casa.* [Spanish]
‘The TV series caught me up from my living room’
- (56) a. *La cantante desafinó en el aria desde las primeras notas.* [Spanish]
‘The soprano sang off-key the aria from the very first notes’
b. **La cantante desafinó en el aria desde el primer acto.* [Spanish]
‘The soprano sang off-key the aria from the first act’

A mereological relationship holds between *episodio* ‘episode’ and *serie televisiva* ‘series’ in (55a), and a similar picture is obtained in (56a). Notice that the numeral *first* introduces the Source PP in both cases, whereas the BP is identified in (54) by lexical means (prefaces being parts of books). Recall that Sources are only licensed if their proper Paths are grammatically constructed and identified. In order to license the Source PP in (55a) it is necessary to build up a Path out of the subject. Informally, this is possible because this PP reconstructs a whole paradigm of unmentioned episodes (second, third, fourth, etc.). We do not know about its end, but we know that it exists, and that it has to be a bounded Path. As in (54), the predicate applies to all components in the Path sequence, which gives rise to a series of consecutive events. In the absence of a mereological relationship, the Source PP in (55b) could only be licensed on lexical grounds. This forces a strange process of fishing or catching someone from his or her living room as the only possible interpretation of (55b). A parallel analysis accounts for the contrast in (56).

5 - Conclusions and remaining issues

The main difference between lexically and compositionally licensed SpaS PPs lies in the fact that the latter involve structures which are necessarily built out of pragmatic information, a property that Source identification unavoidably shares with anaphor, ellipsis and other syntactic patterns. As regards lexically licensed Source PPs, I have introduced to main problems in the outset, which I repeat now in (57):

- (57) A. THE UNIFICATION PROBLEM. Most Romance prepositions denoting Source are appropriate for both TempS and SpaS. Is it possible to reach grammatical generalizations which match both set of contexts?
- B. THE LEXICAL PROBLEM. Romance systems for Source prepositions are binary, ternary or quaternary. On what basis do speakers pick up the relevant option in each case?

Acknowledging that (57A) is not an exclusive problem of Source PP, I have argued that the natural answer to this question implies subordinating Source licensing to Path identification. Sources are licensed if their Paths are properly identified. TempS Ps require temporal Paths, and SpaS Ps require spatial Paths. Duration is often seen as an aspectual property of predicates, but we would achieve a better understanding of the picture if we saw it as one of the possible manifestation of Paths.

Spatial Paths may be obtained from durative predicates, just like temporal Paths may, but they may also be present in a number of punctual verbs which lack duration, such as departure and propulsion verbs, among others. I have argued that Paths may also be rather abstract entities, such as those involving verbs of perception, communication, ruling and other forms of action at a distance, which the grammar formally treats as if they consisted of similar linear components. Differences exist on the conceptual nature of these Paths, but also on the way their respective Goals are grammatically expressed. In fact, in the lexical classes considered above within group (23A), Goals may appear...

- (58) a. ...as OBLIQUE OBJECTS: verbs of displacement.
b. ...as DIRECT OBJECTS: perception verbs; verbs of surveillance; most ruling verbs and verbs denoting control over actions.
b. ...as INDIRECT OBJECTS: verbs of launching, verbs of communication (often in alternation with oblique objects).

As to question (57B), I have argued that it requires an analysis of Path components and the way they are lexicalized by prepositions. I have attested a consistent lexical variation, which centers around two main parameters; namely, (in)visibility of a full Path after the initial point, and (un)boundedness of the Path itself. In section 1, it was suggested that the quadripartite French system for SpaS Ps may be reduced to a three-fold system through a coercion process that converts SpaS to TempS for *dès* ‘since’ PPs (a similar process might perhaps apply to Brazilian Portuguese *desde*). Italian *da* combines *de* and *desde-depuis* contexts by making no lexical distinction among them. Since this has no consequences for the grammar of It. *a partire da*, the lexical problem of Source Ps distribution in the Romance languages considered here may be reduced to three-fold systems.

The preposition *de* focus the BP in Spanish, thus ignoring the Path itself, whereas *desde* implies a bounded Path, even if its Goal is left implicit. In any case, geographical and historical variation is attested for some semantic classes, particularly those of perception and propulsion verbs. If Paths are unbounded, *a partir de* is picked up in Spanish, what implies strong lexical restrictions on predicates in SpaS contexts. On the contrary, Portuguese picks up *de* and *a partir de* for bounded paths: the former preposition focuses the BP, whereas the second makes the Path visible. Port. *desde* is generally rejected with displacement, perception, communication or ruling verbs, in a sharp contrast with Spanish, but it may be licensed if the predicate contains grammatical information that makes the Path visible, as in *O comboio vinha *(cheio) desde Paris* ‘The train was full from Paris’.

As for French, no radical differences with Spanish are found as regards *à / a partir de*. The preposition *depuis* is extended to SpaS in present-day French, and it gives rise to alternations similar to the ones attested for Spanish, as in *Il a sauté {de / depuis} un balcon* ‘He jumped from a balcony’. However, Fr. *depuis* is more restricted than Sp. *desde*, since it shares its temporal complements with *dès* ‘since’.

Finally, predicates licensing SpaS with little or no variation in Romance have been shown to belong to semantic classes which not only focus the BP, but also hide or conceal the Path itself, even if it is conceivable on conceptual grounds (for example, separating an object x from a certain point might suggest that x occupies some exempt space).

Even if all this is on the right track, I will not hide or disguise the very fact that the grammar of Source still must face a number of challenges that require further investigation. I will mention just a few of them here in a rather schematic way. The first one is empirical: do the semantic groups of predicates distinguished above hold cross-linguistically? The answer is important because it would allow us to

know whether the conceptualization of Path is a cognitive process rooted in human language, or it is rather a cultural by-product, perhaps the result of metaphorical extensions of displacement expected to be subject to large crosslinguistic variation according to history and human experience.

The second challenge concerns our present uncertainty as to whether the failure of many durative predicates to provide SpaS comes from conceptual mismatches, or is rather to be derived from linguistic constraints. Notice that, if I buy a car in Lisbon, this city will be the place in which my owning of the car begins, but I cannot say **I have this car from Lisbon*, in either English or the languages I am familiar with. SpaS to TempS coercion processed are disregarded here, as the one mentioned above in relation to (10b). Maybe there are languages, or language families, in which access to SpaS points in states and activities is allowed on different grounds, just like TempS is licensed in them (universally, in principle).

The third challenge concerns Goal expression in abstract bounded Paths. We saw that internal arguments provide Goals which are parallel to the Sources lexically licensed by verbs of perception, communication or ruling, among other groups. The class of action-at-a-distance verbs gives rise to abstract bounded Paths starting in an agent or a location, and ending up in the entity denoted by the internal argument of the predicate. One may wonder whether or not the bounded Path that characterizes these predicates extends to the few unergative predicates that this class contains, as in *to work from home*. There is no doubt that the difference between working at home and working from home lies on the fact that the former VP provides a location, whereas the second provides a Path. One might argue that this Path is unbounded, since there is no grammatical indication of its possible endpoint. But our understanding of this phrase implies a connection between someone's home and the place to which his or her work is intended to be sent. If the Path is closed after all, it seems to be so throughout non-grammatical information. On similar grounds, recall that the constitution of the mereological dependences addressed above ultimately rest on pragmatic clues which are to be unveiled or deciphered on the basis of contextual information.

Finally, Paths are often assumed to force events to be decomposed, or rather be summed up in a concatenative operation which converts them into complex plural entities. Krifka's (1998) and Zwarts's (2005, 2008) "trace function" is intended to relate Paths to events in such a way. But maybe the abstract Paths depicted above do not exactly fit in this picture. Maybe the actions of seeing, phoning, ruling or working—which do not allow for stops along the way, unlike displacement events—are not to be decomposed into series of concatenated events, but rather conceptually

perceived as actions taking place on abstract Paths: we may recognize their Source and their Goal, but not truly the aligned components of the space which extends between them.