

# Variation in the grammar of adult root infinitives

Kleanthes K. Grohmann & Ricardo Etxepare

*University of Cyprus & CNRS/LEHIA*

*kleanthi@ucy.ac.c ; retxepare@euskalnet.net*

## Abstract

Infinitival structures in root contexts are a property of colloquial registers in many languages. This paper addresses variation in such adult root infinitives (ARIs) within Romance and argues for a split into two groups. One group exhibits the same properties as ARIs in Germanic, the English-type group; the second is illustrated with Spanish. Interestingly, only Spanish-type languages allow temporal modification with an adverb of deictic past, a property that is argued to follow from a difference in verb raising: English-type languages don't raise the verb beyond T. The paper also investigates semantic aspects of ARIs, in particular the role of the RI-part and the Coda.

**Keywords:** adverbial modification, event variable, exclamative, operator, verb raising

## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we will investigate a construction typical of colloquial registers in adult grammars, which we will refer to as *adult root infinitives (ARI)*: an infinitival structure employed in root contexts. We will pursue a cross-linguistic approach contrasting several Romance languages and exploring various syntactic and semantic restrictions holding of ARIs that had previously gone unnoticed. By so doing, we point out some problems that our previous analysis encounters (Grohmann & Etxepare 2003) and suggest an alternative approach thereby extending earlier stages of our research.

The phenomenon at hand is illustrated below by English (1) and Spanish (2), where the verbal predicate of an independent root clause appears in infinitival form, even in the presence of an overt subject. However, the subject is not canonically Case-marked (as can be witnessed in English), and the infinitival part of the construction must be followed by what we call the Coda. Other Romance languages exhibit the phenomenon as well, such as Italian (3a), Catalan (3b), Galician (3c), European Portuguese (3d), Brazilian Portuguese (3e), and French (3f).

- (1) Me go to that party?! I would never do such a thing!
- (2) Yo ir a esa fiesta?! Jamás!
- (3a) Io andare alla festa?! Mai!
- (3b) Jo anar al cinema?! Vinga, hombre!
- (3c) Eu ir ao cinema?! Antes morto!
- (3d) Eu ir a la festa?! Que piada!
- (3e) Eu ir a la festa?! Que piada!
- (3f) Moi aller au cinema?! Jamais!

'Me go to the party/cinema?! Never!'

## 2. An analysis for ARIs

## *2.1 Basic structure of ARIs*

We will begin with some considerations concerning the syntactic structure of ARIs. In Grohmann & Etxepare (2003), we note the (im)possibility of certain adverbs to occur in ARIs. In particular, while aspectual, root modal, subject-oriented, and temporal adverbs are possible modifiers of RIs, epistemic, consecutive, and factive ones are not:

- (4a) \*María probablemente / quizá ir allí?!
  - (4b) \*Mary probably / perhaps go there?!
  - (5a) \*El Athletic afortunadamente ganar la liga?!
  - (5b) \*Athletic [Bilbao] luckily win the league?!
  - (6a) \*Los aficionados entonces apiñarse en la ría?!
  - (6b) \*The hooligans then get together at the riverside?!

On this basis, we assume that some projections (such as TP, ModP, and AspP, or the relevant counterparts that license adverbial modification) must be present. Functional structure beyond TP is either completely absent or severely impoverished.

This conclusion is supported by the fact that left-peripheral phenomena in ARIs are extremely limited. In Spanish, only clitic left dislocation and derived topics are possible: left dislocations, focalizations, or *wh*-questions within the RI itself are excluded, a situation which is generalized in Romance and beyond. (For full discussion, see Etxepare & Grohmann, in progress).

- (7) Las elecciones ganarlas Schröder?!
   
*lit. ‘The elections, Schröder win?!*
  - (8) De Juan, reirse Pedro?!
   
*lit. ‘At Juan, Peter laugh?!*
  - (9) \*Juan, el tío comprarse un Ferrari?!
   
*lit. ‘John, that guy buy a Ferrari?!*
  - (10) \*BROCCOLI comprar él?!
   
*lit. ‘BROCCOLI, him buy?!*
  - (11) \*Quién comprar un Volkswagen?!
   
*lit. ‘Who buy a Volkswagen?!*

In earlier work, we assumed the clausal structure for the infinitival clauses in (12), which we adopt here in the same deliberately rough form:

- (12) [<sub>FP</sub> TOPIC F<sup>0</sup> [<sub>TP</sub> SUBJ T<sup>0</sup> [<sub>ModP</sub> [<sub>Asp1P</sub> [<sub>Asp2P</sub> [<sub>y/VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> V OBJ ]]]]]]]]

We provide two aspectual projections to host different types of aspect-related adverbs (here called ModP, Asp1P, and Asp2P, where we are drawing to some extent on Cinque (1999)), but the exact number and nature of the projections up to TP (or IP) do not play a role here. What will be important is the relation between the lexical verb, tense (T), and the left-peripheral FP. This position is one that is present in Spanish and able to host clitic-left dislocated elements and derived topics (cf. (6)-(7)), but absent in English altogether (which does not allow any CP-related position in RIs). We take FP to be related to the projection Uriagereka (1995) proposed for Spanish (and Galician): above TP, below CP proper, thus (in the spirit of Rizzi 1997), a low projection within an

articulated CP-layer (see also, e.g. Cardinaletti & Roberts (2002) and Haegeman (2002) for a low syntactic position of clitic left-dislocated topics).

## 2.2 The semantics of ARIs

### 2.2.1 The exclamative operator

Akmajian's (1984) intuition concerning RIs was that they represent a hypothetical event. That is, in no case is there a claim to truth or a claim to existence regarding the event expressed by the RI. All the speaker does is raise a consideration towards that event, the assertoric force being conveyed by the next clause. Consider (13):

- (13) John read a book?! I doubt it!

(13) conveys something more than just an implicit negation of an event. What it says is that any event of that sort, given our knowledge of John, is very unlikely as far as John is concerned. We call this the *exhaustive reading* of ARIs. We propose that the exhaustive reading of the RI is provided by the exclamatory mood that underlies ARIs, which is manifest in its intonational contour. One of the crucial functions of exclamatory mood is what Portner & Zanuttini (2003) call “widening”: exclamatives introduce a conventional scalar implicature to the effect that the proposition/ situation they denote lies at the extreme end of some contextually given scale.

Portner & Zanuttini consider that the widening function is performed by an operator R, which has the semantics of a quantifier. The function of this operator R is to widen the domain of quantification. This can be illustrated with an exclamation such as (14):

- (14) He eats everything!

An exclamative operator takes a set of situations that we can consider normal and maps that set of situations into a bigger set, which includes the previous set of situations plus some more which are not normal. In the case of (14) we would include situations where the eating event comprises things that we would not normally eat.

For RIs, such as (15), we widen the domain representing the typical things that John does to a bigger domain, including an abnormal situation where he reads a book:

- (15) John read a book?!

The relevant definition is provided in (16). Here  $\llbracket S \rrbracket_{w,D2,\prec}$  is the set of situations of the form “John reads x,” where x is drawn from the new domain D2, while  $\llbracket S \rrbracket_{w,D1,\prec}$  is the corresponding set for the old domain D1. That the difference between D1 and D2 must be non-empty just means that new situations are added in the new domain.

- (16) *Widening* (Portner & Zanuttini 2003: 52)

For any clause S containing  $R_{\text{Widening}}$ , widen the initial domain of quantification for  $R_{\text{Widening}}$ , D1, to a new domain, D2, such that

- (i)  $\llbracket S \rrbracket_{w,D2,\prec} - \llbracket S \rrbracket_{w,D1,\prec} \neq 0$  and
- (ii)  $\forall x \forall y [(x \in D1 \text{ and } y \in (D2 - D1)) \rightarrow x \prec y]$

In the case of (15), D1 is the set of situations involving the kinds of reading in which

John typically engages: the newspaper, the comic strips, the horoscope, and so on. D2 is a domain which includes at least the abnormal situation of John reading a book. Unlike typical exclamatives (Grimshaw 1979; Obenauer 1994), RIs are not factive, however. There is no presupposed book-reading in these cases. This may be related to the fact that RIs are not CPs, and hence do not denote propositions, but entities of a lesser complexity, such as situations, to which truth (and therefore presupposed truth) cannot be attributed (Ormazabal 1995).

### 2.2.2 The Coda

ARIs are incomplete without a Coda (Grohmann & Etxepare 2003). We note that ARIs are necessarily followed by a clause that provides the assertoric force of the sentence:

- (17a) Yo fregar los platos otra vez?! Ni hablar!
- (17b) Me do the dishes again?! No way!

For example, connectivity effects hold between these two clauses:

- (18a) ??Comprar yo nada en esa tienda?! Cualquier día de estos!  
‘Me buy anything in that shop?! ??Any day!’
- (18b) Comprar yo nada en esa tienda?! Lo dudo!  
‘Me buy anything in that shop?! I doubt it!’

Only a Coda such as (18) is able to license the negative polarity item *nada* ‘anything’ within the RI — which contains the type of predicate that licenses negative polarity items in other root contexts. We take this fact to show that the two clauses are attached to a single root. As mentioned above, ARIs also have exclamative intonation. Let us tentatively propose that an Exclamative Phrase holds the two parts of the ARI construction together (see Etxepare & Grohmann 2005 for more discussion):

- (19) [XP [ RI ] X<sup>0</sup> [ Coda ] ]

### 3. Temporal modifiers in ARIs

Next we would like to address a particular type of variation that can be observed across languages, namely as to the kind of temporal modification root infinitival constructions admit. Grohmann & Etxepare (2003) note the following difference between English and Spanish. As can be observed, a deictically anchored adverb of the past such as *yesterday* is inadmissible in English (unlike a non-deictic past adverbial expression, such as *back in the old days*, as employed here), but perfectly acceptable in Spanish.

- (20a) John read that sort of thing back in the old days?! No way!
- (20b) \*John read that sort of thing yesterday?! No way!
- (21a) Juan leer eso en aquellos tiempos?! De ninguna manera!
- (21b) Juan leer eso ayer?! De ninguna manera!

As noted there (and shown to hold for more languages in Etxepare & Grohmann (2005)), Spanish and English also differ as to how far the infinitival raises. As Kayne (1991) and Uriagereka (1995), among others, argue, in Spanish, but not in English, the infinitival raises past the temporal head T to target the head of a low C-related

projection that Uriagereka calls FP - F<sup>0</sup>. Capitalizing on this difference, Grohmann & Etxepare offer an explanation of this phenomenon that relies on raising of the infinitival to F and on the complex structure of ARIs.

Grohmann & Etxepare follow Baker & Travis (1997) in assuming that perfective tenses (which denote in the factual domain) are similar to definite determiners and argue that they define domains which are opaque for outside quantification. This assumption paves the way for the following hypothesis: in languages where the infinitival remains below (past) T, the eventuality variable carried by the infinitival is not accessible for quantification, and the structure is semantically deviant. In languages where the infinitival raises beyond T, the eventuality variable is free to be bound by the exclamative operator, and the sentence is good.

Putting our structural assumptions together, the relevant structures are given in (22), with (22a) as the relevant structure for English and the structure in (22b) representing the relevant part of the Spanish derivation (where the lexical infinitive moves to F, which is not present at all in English):

- (22a) [ExclP [TP *yesterday* T<sup>0</sup> [AspP ... V... ]] [ExclP Excl<sup>0</sup> [ Coda ] ]]  
 (22b) [ExclP [FP [V+F<sup>0</sup>] [TP *ayer* T<sup>0</sup> [AspP ... tv... ]]] [ExclP Excl<sup>0</sup> [ Coda ] ]]

Assume that TP looks roughly as sketched in (12) above. Then the aspectual domain renders the structure below it opaque for quantification if perfective, as implied by a deictic temporal adverb such as *yesterday* (where the operator R in Excl<sup>0</sup> or its Spec must bind the eventuality variable contained on the lexical verb) — but only if the verb is in its v/VP-internal base position (as in English). If V is in F, beyond the Tense-Aspect domain [TP ... AspP ... v/VP], it escapes the opaque domain and the eventuality variable can be bound.

#### 4. Cross-linguistic predictions

The Romance language family provides an excellent testing ground for checking the purported correlation between the availability of a perfective Tense and the position of the infinitival. The clausal position of the infinitival has been well studied in the Romance area, and we can capitalize on that work to put our hypothesis to test. We can anticipate that the correlation between the position of the infinitival and the availability of past deictic adverbs is strengthened in the comparative arena. The Romance languages seem to divide into two groups which respectively show the properties of Spanish on the one hand, and English on the other: on the Spanish side Galician, Catalan, and Italian line up; whereas European and Brazilian Portuguese, as well as French, seem to exhibit the properties shown by English. For lack of a better term, we will bundle these languages into two groups, Group I and Group II:

- Group I: Spanish, Galician, Catalan, Italian
- Group II: European Portuguese, Brazilian Portuguese, French

We concentrate on the following four properties of ARIs in these languages (but note that not all Italian speakers accept *ieri* in the relevant contexts, a matter we address in more detail in Etxepare & Grohmann, in progress): (i) availability of deictic temporal modifiers; (ii) quantificational restrictions on the RI-subject; (iii) the relative position of the infinitival and aspectual/temporal adverbs; and (iv) co-occurrence of an overt complementizer and the infinitive in control structures.

#### 4.1 Availability of deictic temporal modifiers

ARIs as represented by some Romance languages in (23)-(24) present the already familiar variation in temporal modification: whereas ARIs in Italian, Spanish, Catalan, and Galician, respectively, allow adverbial modification by past temporal adverbs (23a-d), their European and Brazilian Portuguese counterparts do not, and pattern in this regard with French (24a-c) as well as English, as we have seen above:

- (23a) Io andare alla festa ieri?! Stai scherzando!
- (23b) Yo ir a la fiesta ayer?! Estás de broma!
- (23c) Jo anar al cinema ahir?! Vinga, hombre!
- (23d) Ir de chea eu onte?! Toleas!  
‘Me go to the party/cinema yesterday?! You are kidding!’
- (24a) \*Eu ir á festa ontem?! (...)
- (24b) \*Eu ir á festa ontem?! (...)
- (24c) \*Moi aller à la fête hier?! (...)  
‘Me go to the party yesterday?! (You must be joking!)’

#### 4.2 Quantificational restrictions on the subject

Some languages show quantificational restrictions in their pre-infinitival position. Those restrictions are identical to the kind of restrictions imposed on quantifiers in topic position. We propose that those languages that don't permit DP subjects preceding the infinitival don't place the preverbal DPs in the canonical subject position ([Spec,TP]), but in a higher topic position (such as ([Spec,TopP])). This suggests that the relevant position is beyond TP, and therefore that the infinitival itself must have raised beyond T. The same quantificational expressions are possible after the infinitival. As it turns out, the languages identified as Group I exhibit restrictions on quantificational subjects (in the same order as above: Italian, Spanish, Catalan, and Galician):

- (25a) \*Ognuno / Tutti / Nessuno comprare una macchina?! Impossible!
- (25b) (Non) comprare ognuno / tutti / nessuno una macchina?! (...)  
‘Everyone / All / No one buy a car?! Impossible!’
- (26a) \*Cada uno / Todo el mundo / Nadie comprar um coche?! Impossible!
- (26b) (No) comprar cada uno / todo el mundo / nadie un coche?! (...)  
‘Each one / Everyone / No one buy a car?! Impossible!’
- (27a) ??Cada professor / Tothom / Ningú comprar un cotxe?! Impossivel!
- (27b) (No) comprar cada professor / tothom / ningú un cotxe?! (...)  
‘Every professor / All / No one buy a car?! Impossible!’
- (28a) ??Cada um / Todo o mundo / Ninguem comprar um carro?! (...)
- (28b) (Nao) comprar cada um / todo o mundo / ninguem um carro?! (...)  
‘Everyone / All / No one buy a car?! Impossible!’

These restrictions do not apply to the languages from Group II (with the exception of French *personne* and *tout le monde*, here presented in the order as above: European Portuguese, Brazilian Portuguese, and French, as well as English for comparison):

- (29) Cada um / Todo o mundo / Ninguém comprar um carro?  
‘Everyone / All / No one buy a car?! Impossible!’

- (30) Cada um / Todo o mundo / Ninguém comprar um carro?!  
     ‘Everyone / All / No one buy a car?! Impossible!’
- (31a) Chacun achêter un / son vélo? Je crois pas!  
     ‘Each one buy a / his bicycle?! I don’t think so!’
- (31b) \*Tout le monde / Personne achêter un vélo?  
     ‘Everyone / No one buy a bicycle?! Impossible!’
- (32) %All / Everyone / No one buy a car?!

We now take these findings to support our analysis in the following sense: if in a language belonging to Group II the infinitival only raises to a TP-internal position, there is no reason for the pre-infinitival subject to behave as a topic. None of the quantificational restrictions operating in Group I languages in that same context should apply here, as seems to be the case.

#### 4.3 Position of the infinitival with regard to adverbs

Aspectual adverbs arguably occur relatively low in the clause structure (see e.g. Cinque 1999 for a recent comprehensive treatment) and thus give us an idea where the left edge of v/VP is situated — and whether V has raised or not. The languages that form Group I require aspectual adverbs to follow the infinitive:

(33a) Gianni	(*spesso)	comprare	(spesso)	mele	(spesso)?!
John	often	buy.INF		apples	
(33b) Gianni	(*qualche volta)	comprare	(qualche volta)	mele	(qualche volta)?!
John	sometimes	buy.INF		apples	
(33c) Gianni	(*sempre)	comprare	(sempre)	mele	(sempre)?!
John	always	buy.INF		apples	
(34a) Juan	(*a menudo)	comprar	(a menudo)	manzanas	(a menudo)?!
(34b) Juan	(*a veces)	comprar	(a veces)	manzanas	(a veces)?!
(34c) Juan	(*siempre)	comprar	(siempre)	manzanas	(siempre)?!
(35a) Juan	(??sovint)	comprar	(??sovint)	pomes	(sovint)?!
(35b) Juan	(??a vegades)	comprar	(?a vegades)	pomes	(sempre)?!
(35c) Juan	(??sempre)	comprar	(?sempre)	pomes	(sempre)?!
(36a) Juan	(*a miudo)	comprar	(a miudo)	manzanas	(a miudo)?!
(36b) Juan	(*a’s veces)	comprar	(a’s veces)	manzanas	(a’s veces)?!
(36c) Juan	(*siempre)	comprar	(siempre)	manzanas	(siempre)?!
(37a) Joao	(*as vezes)	ir	(*as vezes) a restaurantes caros?!		
John	sometimes	go.INF	to restaurants expensive		
(37b) Joao	(*as vezes)	ir	(*as vezes) ao cinema?!		
John	sometimes	go.INF	to.the movies		

Romance languages in Group II do not behave in this regard like Group I languages. The paradigms reflecting the varying orders of adverb and verb in this group is complex, with restrictions unlike Group I languages. For instance, for some informants of both European (37a) and Brazilian Portuguese (37b), certain adverbs are just impossible, such as *as vezes* ‘sometimes’.

Moreover, the judgments are by and large much more varying and insecure than in Group I languages. A possible interfering factor here could be the possibility of partial raising of the infinitival verb to T or some vP-external projection (see e.g. Laenzlinger (1998) for a brief discussion, and Ledgeway & Lombardi (2005) for wider typological

considerations in Romance). Etxepare & Grohmann (in progress) provide an exhaustive discussion of the relevant paradigms. (38) illustrates a common French paradigm, contrasting with those of Group I:

- |            |                     |      |                    |      |                   |
|------------|---------------------|------|--------------------|------|-------------------|
| (38a) Jean | (souvent)           | lire | (souvent)          | ce   | genre de choses?! |
| John       | often               |      | read.INF           | that | type of thing     |
| (38b) Jean | (habituellement)    | lire | (hab'ment)         | ce   | genre de choses?! |
| John       | normally            |      | read.INF           | that | type of thing?!   |
| (38c) Jean | (toujours)          | lire | (toujours)         | ce   | genre de choses?! |
| John       | always              |      | read.INF           | that | type of thing     |
| (38d) Jean | (*de temps à autre) | lire | (de temps à autre) | ce   | genre de choses?! |
| John       | from time to time   |      | read.INF           | that | type of thing     |

We thus leave the presentation at this point.

#### 4.4 Position of the infinitival in control complements

This section expands on the findings first reported in Kayne (1991), who argued for a higher Infl-position in some Romance languages (Italian, Spanish), but not others (French). He proposed adjunction to T' for those languages. Uriagereka (1995) recasts this proposal in more regular phrase structural terms as adjunction to F<sup>0</sup> (arguably the lowest functional head in the C-domain). Kayne's proposal was based, among other facts, on the availability of sequences such as the ones in (39), where the infinitival seems to occupy a position immediately following the overt complementizer, but higher than the subject position, occupied by PRO (as indicated, where we reinterpret Kayne's analysis in light of Uriagereka's F<sup>0</sup>). Group I-languages all allow that configuration:

- |          |                                       |     |      |        |        |                   |
|----------|---------------------------------------|-----|------|--------|--------|-------------------|
| (39a) Io | non                                   | so  | se   | andare | PRO    | al cinema.        |
| (39b) Yo | no                                    | sé  | si   | ir     | PRO    | al cine.          |
| (39c) Jo | no                                    | se  | si   | anar   | PRO    | al cinema.        |
| (39d) Eu | no                                    | se  | si   | ir     | PRO    | al cine.          |
|          | I                                     | not | know | if     | go.INF | PRO to.the cinema |
|          | 'I don't know if to go to the movies' |     |      |        |        |                   |

Group II-languages, however, don't allow it at all (regardless of PRO's position):

- |           |                                       |          |         |       |        |       |               |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|----------|---------|-------|--------|-------|---------------|
| (40a) *Eu | nao                                   | sei      | si      | (PRO) | ir     | (PRO) | ao cinema.    |
| (40b) *Eu | nao                                   | sei      | si      | (PRO) | ir     | (PRO) | ao cinema.    |
| (40c) *Je | ne                                    | sais pas | si      | (PRO) | aller  | (PRO) | au cinema.    |
|           | I                                     | not      | knowNEG | if    | go.INF |       | to.the cinema |
|           | 'I don't know if to go to the movies' |          |         |       |        |       |               |

We take these differences to point to only one property: Group I languages exhibit verb raising to a high position, beyond T. This position we identify as F<sup>0</sup>, the lowest C-head. Group II languages raise the infinitival to a TP-internal position.

#### 4.5 Periphrastic forms

Our analysis also accounts for the fact that periphrastic perfects are generally out in ARIs:

- (41a) \*Juan haber comprado un libro?! Impossible!  
 (41b) \*John have bought a book?! Impossible!

In our terms, what raises to F in Spanish is the auxiliary *haber* ‘have’. But the eventuality variable carried by the infinitive remains under the perfective structure (that is, certainly below F) — and as such should be (and indeed is) inaccessible for quantification.

The ban against perfect auxiliaries has an exception in Galician, European Portuguese, and Brazilian Portuguese, where the auxiliary, unlike the general *habere* in Romance, is *ter*. *Ter*-periphrastic perfects are possible in ARIs: (42a) below is from Brazilian Portuguese, (42b) from Galician, and (42c) from European Portuguese.

- (42a) (?)Eu ter ido ao cinema?!  
 me have.INF gone to.the movies  
 (42b) Eu ter gañado a final?!  
 me have.INF won the final  
 (42c) Eu ter ido ao cinema?!  
 me have.INF gone to.the movies  
 ‘Me have gone to the movies / won the final?’

A possible account of this difference is that, unlike Spanish *haber*, Galician/Portuguese *ter* contributes its own eventuality variable, and is in this sense akin to Spanish *tener*:

- (43) Tener yo la partida ganada?! Qué más quisiera!  
 have me the match won that more I.wished  
 ‘That I should be already about to win the match?! I wish!'

This might be related to Giorgi & Pianesi’s (1997) claim that Portuguese *ter* is a lexical verb (but see Gonçalves 1995; Schmitt 2001). But if Portuguese *ter* is a lexical verb contributing an eventuality variable itself, then this eventuality variable should be free for quantification, since it is not buried under a perfective operator. That both *ter* and *tener* may carry an eventuality variable is suggested by the following contrast between *haber* and *tener* (in Spanish, where both structures should have the same interpretation):

- (44a) [ El tener para este domingo la liga ganada tres  
 the have.INF by this Sunday the league won three  
 meses antes ] parece un imposible.  
 months earlier looks an impossible  
 (44b) \*[ El haber ganado la liga para este domingo tres  
 the have.INF won the league by this Sunday three  
 meses antes ] parece un imposible.  
 months earlier looks an impossible  
*lit.* ‘Having won the league by this Sunday three months earlier looks like an impossible thing.’

We interpret this contrast as showing that Spanish *tener*, unlike *haber*, introduces a further eventuality variable which can be independently modified temporally. Galician and Portuguese *ter* allow identical cases, as illustrated here with Brazilian Portuguese:

- (45) No proximo domingo o seu time ja ter ganhado o campeonato  
 in next Sunday the his team already have.INF won the league  
 há tres semanas!  
 ago three months  
*lit.* ‘His team have already won the league next Sunday three months ago!’

But if Portuguese *ter* is a lexical verb contributing an eventuality variable itself, we would expect this eventuality variable to be free for quantification, since it is not buried under a perfective operator. We would also expect then that, unlike in the case of simple infinitives, repeated as (46b) for European Portuguese, the forms with *ter* should allow modification by a deictic temporal adverb of the past like *yesterday*. And they do:

- (46a) Eu ter ido a la festa ontem?!  
 me have.INF gone to the party yesterday  
 (46b) \*Eu ir a la festa ontem?!

## 5. Open issues and future research

Grohmann & Etxepare (2003) focus on perfect forms and perfective interpretations (where cross-linguistic variation is found). Our analysis can be extended, under certain assumptions, to the restriction on the presence of the copula in RIs (see Etxepare & Grohmann 2005). But RI-constructions are also very selective on the kind of aspectual periphrases they admit, well beyond the case of the periphrastic perfect or the copula — and this is something that our analysis does not predict. Consider the following contrasts in Spanish:

- (47a) \*Juan acabar de llegar?! Lo dudo!  
 John finish of arrive.INF CL I-doubt  
 (47b) \*Juan ir a venir?! Lo dudo!  
 John go.INF to come CL I-doubt  
 (47c) ??Juan estar llegando?! Lo dudo!  
 Juan be.INF arriving CL I-doubt  
 ‘John just arrive / be going to come / be about to come?! I doubt it!’  
 (48a) Juan echar a correr en una situación así?! Lo dudo!  
 John throw.INF to run.INF in a situation like-this CL I-doubt  
 (48b) Juan romper a llorar en una situación así?! Lo dudo!  
 John break.INF to cry.INF in a situation like-this CL I-doubt  
 ‘John start to run / cry in such a situation?! I doubt it!’  
 (48c) Juan acabar de leer esa novela? Lo dudo!  
 John finish.INF of read.INF that novel CL I-doubt  
 ‘John finish reading that novel?! I doubt it?’

The aspectual periphrases which make the RI bad are those which locate the topic time (the time about which an assertion is made) in the postime or the pretime of the situation time, to borrow Klein’s (1994) terminology. Those aspectual periphrases which are compatible with the RI focus on some part of the situation time. The topic time in those cases includes part of the situation time: the periphrasis *echar a* ‘to throw oneself + directional preposition’ and *romper a* ‘to break + directional preposition’ include the left boundary of the situation time denoted by *correr* ‘run’, and they focus on the initial stage of the running situation. They are inceptive periphrases. The

periphrasis *acabar de* ‘finish + genitive preposition’ is akin to the English periphrasis *finish V+ing*, and includes the right boundary of the situation time. It focuses on the transition between the situation time and the postime.

Other aspectual periphrases which do not focus on any part of the situation time are also bad. For instance *soler* ‘used to’. *Soler* can occur in prepositional infinitival clauses such as (49a), inducing a causal reading (see Rigau 1995 for discussion), but it is ungrammatical in the RI (49b):

- (49a) Al soler llegar él tarde, decidí no esperarle.  
 P.ART used-to.INF arrive.INF he late, I-decided not wait.INF.CL  
 ‘Since he usually comes late, I decided not to wait for him.’
- (49b) \*Juan soler llegar tarde?! Nunca!

The relevant generalization therefore concerns not so much the presence of an eventuality variable itself, but the role of an aspectual entity: the situation time. The aspectual periphrases which make RIs bad belong to the dimension of Viewpoint Aspect (Smith 1997; Laca 2004). Those which make the RI good belong to the inner layer where situation aspect is calculated. Etxepare & Grohmann (in progress) develop the following hypothesis: in order for an infinitival clause to restrict an operator ranging over situations, the situation structure (that portion of the clausal structure which denotes either the situation time or a part of it) must be visible. Visible, in our terms, means outside the scope of viewpoint aspect. In languages like Spanish (or Galician, Catalan and Italian, i.e. our Group I languages), an independent syntactic phenomenon — the raising of the infinitival — allows the most embedded part of the sentence to escape the intervening viewpoint aspect periphrases, which behave as opacity inducers.

## 6. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we looked at and provided an analysis of ARIs by presenting them as tripartite quantificational structures. The relevant binary operator in these cases is an exclamative operator with scalar properties. We explored some of the predictions that our original analysis of RIs makes in the area of Romance languages and showed that intriguing temporal differences which cut across a number of Romance languages can be keyed to the structural position of the infinitival in those languages.

## References

- Akmajian, A. (1984). “Sentence types and the form-function fit”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2: 1-23.
- Baker, M. & L. deMena Travis (1997). “Mood as verbal definiteness in a tenseless language”. *Natural Language Semantics* 5: 213-269.
- Cardinaletti, A. & I. G. Roberts (2002). “Clause structure and X-second”. In G. Cinque (ed.), *Functional structure in DP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures, vol. I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 123-166.
- Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Etxepare, R. & K. K. Grohmann (2005). “Properties of infinitival structures in Romance”. To appear in J. Doetjes & P. Gonzalez (eds), *Proceedings of Going Romance 18* [provisionary book title]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Etxepare, R. & K. K. Grohmann (in progress). *The grammar of root infinitival constructions* [provisionary book title]. Ms., CNRS/LEHIA & University of Cyprus.
- Giorgi, A. & F. Pianesi (1997). *Tense and aspect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Gonçalves, A. (1995). "Aspectos da sintaxe dos verbos auxiliares do português europeu". In A. Gonçalves, M. Colaço, M. Miguel & T. Móia (eds), *Quatro estudos em sintaxe do português europeu*. Lisboa: Edições Colibri, 7-50.
- Grimshaw, J. (1979). "Complement selection and the lexicon". *Linguistic Inquiry* 10: 279-325.
- Grohmann, K. K. & R. Etxepare (2003). "Root infinitives: A comparative view". *Probus* 15: 201-236.
- Haegeman, L. (2002). "Anchoring to speaker, adverbial clauses and the structure of CP". *Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics* 2, 117-180.
- Kayne, R. S. (1991). "Romance clitics, verb movement, and PRO". *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647-686.
- Klein, W. (1994). *Time in language*. London: Routledge.
- Laca, B. (2004). "Romance 'aspectual' periphrases: Eventuality modification versus 'syntactic' aspect". In J. Guéron & J. Lecarme (eds), *The syntax of time*. MIT Press: 425-440.
- Laenzlinger, C. (1998). *Comparative studies in word order variation: Adverbs, pronouns, and clause structure in Romance and Germanic*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ledgeway A. & A. Lombardi (2005). "Verb movement, adverbs and clitic positions in Romance". *Probus* 17: 79-113.
- Obenauer, H. (1994). *Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre: Effets d'intervention et mouvements des quantifiEURS*. Thèse Doctorat d'Etat, Paris.
- Ormazabal, J. (1995). *The syntax of complementation: On the connection of syntactic structure and selection*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Portner, P. & R. Zanuttini (2003). "Exclamative Clauses: At the syntax-semantics interface". *Language* 29: 39-81.
- Rigau, G. (1995). "Propiedades de FLEX en las construcciones temporales de infinitivo: la legitimación del sujeto". In P. Goenaga (ed.), *De grammatica generativa*. University of the Basque Country: Anejos del Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca Julio de Urquijo, 173-184.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). "The fine structure of the left periphery". In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281-337.
- Schmitt, C. (2001). "Cross-linguistic variation and the present perfect: The case of Portuguese". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19: 403-453.
- Smith, C. (1997). *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Uriagereka, J. (1995). "An F position in Western Romance". In K. É. Kiss (ed.), *Discourse configurational languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 153-175.