
NARRATIVE INFINITIVES, NARRATIVE GERUNDS, AND THE FEATURES OF THE C-T SYSTEM

GABRIELA ALBOIU₁
York University

VIRGINIA HILL₂
University of New Brunswick

This paper discusses narrative infinitives (NIs) and narrative gerunds (NGs) in Romance by looking at Middle French (MF), Acadian French (AF) and Old Romanian (OR) data. The focus is on constructions where clauses with non-finite verb forms are coordinated with declaratives that contain indicative, hence finite, verbs. We show that NIs/NGs yield exclusively declarative (rather than interrogative) readings and argue that an Assert OP (Meinunger 2004) is mapped in Spec,CP/ForceP of these derivations thus recategorizing an otherwise non-finite derivation into a finite, *realis* clause. Conversely, we argue that root indicatives achieve the assertion reading in the absence of any clause typing operator. The paper identifies a series of shared properties in these derivations, as follows: (i) exclusive assertion semantics; (ii) projection to a phasal CP; (iii) verb movement outside of *v*P. By capitalizing on the two types of Agreement properties (i.e. φ -features and δ -features) and the 4-way language typology proposed by Miyagawa (2017), the paper discusses these core properties while also accounting for the empirical variation illustrated in the grammar of NIs/NGs in MF, AF, and OR (i.e. level of verb movement, presence versus absence of independent lexical subjects and clitics).

1 INTRODUCTION

Philological studies on Romance languages often debate the nature of the historical infinitive, which, as shown in (1), is attested in the corpora of almost every member of this language group (e.g. Lombard 1936; also Beardsley 1921 for Old Spanish; Marcou 1889a,b for Ancient and Middle French; Nedelcu 2013 for Old Romanian; Schnerr 1966 for Brazilian Portuguese; Shewring 1948 for Italian). This construction consists of a root clause that displays an infinitive verb instead of an indicative one, but it amounts to the same

declarative assertive reading as a regular root declarative with indicative verbs.

- (1) a. *Così disse; e tutti a rabbrividiere. E il povero*
so spoke; and all to cringe.INF and the poor
Geppetto a correrli dietro.
Geppetto to run.INF.HIM after.
'so he spoke; and everybody cringed. And poor Geppetto ran
after him.' (Italian; Collodi. apud [Shewring 1948](#): 18)
- b. *O grupo achava graça nos dois e aplaudia-os*
the group found fun in.the two and applauded-them
com gargalhadas. E o paratí a circular sempre
with laughter. And the cap to circulate.INF always
de mão en mão.
from hand to hand.
'The group found that the two (actors) were fun and applauded
them with laughter. And the cap (for money) was circulating
from hand to hand.'
(Brazilian Portuguese; Azevedo apud [Schnerr 1966](#): 72)
- c. *Manetraronlos luego como vinien fellones, Darles*
tied.them then as come.3PL felons, give.INF.them
grandes feridas con muy grandes bastones.
great wounds with very great clubs.
'They tied up their hands as they came as felons and caused
them injuries with big clubs.'
(Old Spanish; Mil 889 apud [Beardsley 1921](#): 85)
- d. *On se met à causer, et Flaubert de blaguer un*
we REFL.3 put to talk, and Flaubert to joke.INF a
peu grossement.
bit crudely.
'We were talking and Flaubert was joking a bit too crudely.'
(French; Goncourt, Journal 1, 303)
- e. *Preaîmblă Machiedonia și Ahaiia și a mearrge în*
wander.3 Macedonia and Ahaia and INF go to
Rusalim
Jerusalem
'Macedonia and Ahaia are off wandering and going to
Jerusalem' (Old Romanian; CV apud [Nedelcu 2013](#): 21)

For these types of infinitives, we adopt the label 'narrative infinitive' (henceforth, NI), following Nikolaeva (2014), in order to differentiate them

from other types of root infinitives, which either cannot have nominative subjects or do not express assertions. For example, infinitives are possible in interrogatives (e.g. It. *Che fare?* ‘What to do?’) where they get an impersonal reading, but the infinitive constructions in (1), and in (2) with gerunds, are personal and display independent nominative subjects. For analyses of different types of root infinitives we refer the reader to work by Kayne (1992), Rizzi (1994), Haegeman (1995), Grohmann (1999, 2000), Etxepare (2000, 2005), Grohmann & Etxepare (2003), Nikolaeva (2014) and references therein.

Philologists agree that NIs are rare in texts, having a more significant presence in Middle French than in other languages, and, where they may have survived, they continue to be infrequent in the modern versions of these languages. For instance, according to Grevisse & Goosse (2008), the NI in French is attested as early as Old French and was considered familiar in the 17th century, while today it sounds elegant and somewhat erudite.¹ Of the French diaspora, Acadian French still preserves this construction, so consulting native speakers for grammatical judgments is possible.

The indicative declarative also has a concurrent equivalent gerund in some of the Romance languages, as shown in (2), amounting to the same assertive effect as the NI. It also occurs rarely. We label this construction the ‘narrative gerund’ (henceforth, NG).

- (2) a. *Chegavam os moradores com as calças arregaçadas,*
arrived the residents with the pants rolled-up
pedindo semente de algodão para o roçado. E a
asking seed of cotton for the sowing and the
chuva caindo sem cessar.
rain falling.GRD without stop.

‘The residents were arriving with their pants rolled up, asking for cotton seeds for the sowing. And the rain was falling incessantly.’

(Brazilian Portuguese; Lins do Rego apud Schnerr 1966: 72)

- b. *Eber fiind de 31 de ani și rodi Peleg.*
Eber being.GRD of 31 of years and begot Peleg
‘Eber was 31 years of age and begot Peleg.’
(Old Romanian; PO 41,16)

From the perspective of formal grammar, NI and NG constructions are

¹ Note that the NI in modern French, while belonging mostly to the literary language, is still recognized by speakers and is still used in journalism; for example, see <http://www.languefrancaise.net/forum/viewtopic.php?pid=60473>. See also Iglesias & Trail (1989) for Mexican Spanish. We thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing out these facts.

challenging since they entail independent temporal readings, as well as independent lexical subjects, in a domain where the verb is uninflected for tense. There is no doubt that these constructions are interpreted as finite clauses since they can be explicitly coordinated with indicative declaratives (see the underlined coordinating conjunctions), although they may also occur by themselves, as in (1c), or may be the first term of coordination, as in (2b). Furthermore, they are propositional since they denote assertions. Hence, the question we address concerns the underlying featural make-up that allows a derivation with a non-finite verb form to converge as if it were finite.

This paper adopts the following working hypothesis: given that NIs and NGs yield exclusively declarative (but never interrogative) readings (see also Nikolaeva 2014), it follows that any explanation of these derivations must be linked to their forced declarative clause typing. Since, semantically, these declarative clauses are assertions, we suggest that an Assertion Operator (Assert OP) is syntactically mapped to an otherwise non-finite clause, with the effect of recategorizing the clause as finite.² This is in opposition to declarative indicatives, which we assume lack an Assert OP as the assertive interpretation arises here by default (i.e. from the principle of compositionality).

As the formal inquiry needs a variety of data for tests, we focus on Middle French (henceforth, MF), Acadian French (henceforth, AF) and Old Romanian (henceforth, OR) from the group of Romance languages allowing for non-finite forms in root clauses.³ The data cover both NIs and NGs.

AF is a conservative dialect mainly spoken in New Brunswick (Canada), which reflects 16th-century continental French, and gives us the opportunity to verify the NIs with native speakers. AF is also spoken by smaller groups in Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, Prince Edward Islands and areas of Eastern Quebec. Dialectal variation is attested from one region to another, but this paper focuses only on the New Brunswick variety. OR is the Romanian language attested in texts dating from the 16th to the end of the 18th century; these OR texts provide sufficient NGs (but not sufficient NIs) for a detailed inquiry.

The paper is organized as follows: section 2 introduces the sources for our examples and explains how we elicit grammatical judgements. In section 3 we argue that root indicatives achieve the assertion reading in

² An Assertion Operator is proposed in Meinunger (2004), from where we borrow the label, but the motivation and implementation differ in our approach.

³ Terminologically, Old Romanian is used interchangeably with Early Modern Romanian, as the body of texts they refer to is the same. The former label occurs in philological studies and some formal literature, whereas the latter was introduced in diachronic generative studies by Alboiu & Hill (2012), Alboiu, Hill & Sitaridou (2015).

the absence of any clause typing operator. In section 4 we show that NIs and NGs project to a CP phasal structure, have independent subjects and temporal readings, and require obligatory verb movement out of *v*P. Section 5 suggests that an Assert OP is syntactically mapped to the Spec,CP/ForceP of configurations with NIs/NGs and argues that the feature distribution within the C-T system plays a key role in the variation and diachronic changes discussed in these constructions. The conclusions in section 6 highlight the theoretical significance of our findings.

2 SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

The data we use in this paper come from three sources: (i) texts for MF and OR; (ii) naturalistic data and (iii) elicited grammatical judgements for AF. The MF texts range from *Cent nouvelles nouvelles*, a collection of narrated stories put together by Antoine de la Sale in the mid 15th century, to *Rabelais* (15th–16th centuries). This information is further supplemented with examples from the philological literature, as needed to garner clues for the syntactic structure. The OR texts consist of translations and original writings compiled in a corpus provided by the Romanian Institute of Linguistics in Bucharest. As there is no access to native speakers of MF and OR, we rely exclusively on the data available in texts for any testing.

AF, on the other hand, provides native speakers. Although NIs are disappearing from the New Brunswick variety, the young generation has passive but solid grammatical judgements on these constructions: they do not use NIs themselves, but have heard them used by their elders. For AF, we use naturalistic data from two corpora (i.e. *Péronnet* – full corpus, and *Beaulieu/FANENB* – samples of the corpus), both of which cover the AF spoken in New Brunswick between 1980–1995. We supplement these data with examples from sociolinguistic studies.

Elicited data are available only for AF, and the approach adopted was to choose a sentence containing an NI from the corpus, then add or subtract an item, as needed for our tests, while keeping the rest of the context intact. For example, if the purpose was to find the level of verb movement, we introduced a temporal adverb before or after the infinitive verb leaving everything else unchanged. This gave us syntactic minimal pairs, thus enabling us to identify the location of the verb. Fifteen native speakers volunteered their judgments for each word order sequence.⁴ Elicited data for

⁴ Our AF consultants comprised eight women and seven men aged between 30–55. They are all nurses (so have equivalent education) working in similar health institutions. For the elicitation, we extracted a text containing an NI from the existing corpus. The consultant was first asked to read the text. Then they were shown the same text with the addition of an

tests are indicated through ‘authors’ test’ (henceforth, AT) added in brackets next to the respective example.

This study does not make use of statistics. Native speaker judgments of fifteen speakers are sufficient to indicate whether a certain construction is or is not possible in the language. There is undoubtedly considerable inter-language variation and it is clear that not all AF varieties behave in a uniform fashion. However, this is not significant for our purpose as any construction that is deemed grammatical even by a single native speaker needs to be syntactically accounted for, and that is what we strive to do here.

3 ASSERTION WITH ROOT INDICATIVES

The question we explore in this section is whether declarative indicative clauses could perhaps have a clause typing operator in Spec,CP, which would be responsible for the assertion reading (Meinunger 2004). We argue against such a hypothesis, at least for most Romance languages. Instead, we propose that the assertion reading comes as a default in root indicatives, due to the morphosyntactic properties of these clauses.

The first observation is that there is no visible evidence for a clause typing operator in declarative C in Romance, which led Rizzi (1997) to postulate that Romance declaratives are truncated insofar as they lack ForceP and end up at TopP. That is, assuming the cartographic mapping of the CP domain as in (3a), the structure of a declarative would be (3b).⁵

- (3) a. [_{CP} ForceP > (TopP) > (FocP) > FinP] > IP/TP > vP
 b. [(TopP) > (FocP) > FinP] > IP/TP > vP

Second, modality is constantly *realis* under an assertion reading, and *realis* is the default value of indicative finiteness (i.e. Fin head) in the absence

item (e.g. in (i)-(iii), the temporal adverb in bold) and were asked to answer the following question: *Which version of the following sentence is acceptable to you:*

- (i) *On avait une pelle pis **aut'fois** pelleyer devant le cheval.*
 we had a shovel and at.the.time shovel.INF in.front the horse.
 (ii) *On avait une pelle pis pelleyer **aut'fois** devant le cheval.*
 we had a shovel and shovel.INF at.the.time in.front the horse.
 (iii) *On avait une pelle pis pelleyer devant le cheval **aut'fois**.*
 we had a shovel and shovel.INF in.front the horse at.the.time.
 ‘We had a shovel and, at the time, we were shovelling in front of the horse.’

⁵ It should be noted that here we have in mind a *syntactic* operator in Spec,ForceP denoting illocutionary force, in the way an interrogative Spec,ForceP has an operator denoting interrogative force.

of operators signalling the contrary. This follows since all the information that amounts to a *realis* reading is encoded morphologically on the verb (i.e. mood, tense and aspect values). This empirical observation signals that the formal features supporting a *realis* modality are active in the inflectional layer rather than in the C domain of the clause.

Furthermore, when a complementizer occurs in a declarative clause, it is a ‘that’ element with no operator features. For example, when speech act heads in Romanian functionally select a ForceP root clause with an indicative verb, as in (4), Force may be optionally spelled out. The spell out for Force is *că* ‘that’ in these instances, as seen in (4a) under an evidential head, and in (4b) under an ostensive particle. However, *că* ‘that’ is incompatible with clause typing operators, as shown in (4c), which contains an interrogative operator: a *wh*-phrase is possible in this context, but not *că* ‘that’. Also, long distance extraction is possible across an embedded *că* ‘that’, as in (4d), indicating that Spec,ForceP is available as a transitional landing site in successive-cyclic movement, so cannot be occupied by another operator. For more information on the lack of clause typing operators in the presence of *că* ‘that’ in Romanian, we refer the reader to Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) and Alboiu (2002), among others.⁶

- (4) a. *Bineînțeles (că) Elena va sosi la timp.*
of.course that Elena will.3SG arrive at time
‘Of course that Elena will arrive on time.’
- b. *Na (că) ne-au sosit musafirii.*
PRT that to.us-have.3PL arrived guests.the
‘Blimey, the guests have arrived.’
- c. *Bineînțeles (*că) la cine altcineva vrei să
meargă?*
of.course that to whom other want.2SG SUBJ
go.3SG
‘Of course, to whom else do you expect her to go?’
- d. *Ce spunei [ForceP <ce> că voia <ce>]?*
what said.2SG what that wanted.3SG what
‘What did you say s/he wanted?’

Note that we do not discuss French data, despite the fact that equivalent constructions do exist, see (5), as there is homophony between French *que*

⁶ *Na* in 4a is an ostensive particle with no obvious structural English equivalent. For tests indicating a monoclausal structure in (4a,b) see Hill (2014).

'that' as complementizer and as interrogative or relative pronoun; the latter entail operators in Spec,CP/ForceP, which would confuse the evidence.

- (5) *Biensûr (que) je viendrais.*
 of.course that I come.1FUT
 'Of course, I'll come.'

Crucially, in Romanian, the complementizer *că* 'that' is distinct from the interrogative/relative *ce* 'what' or *care* 'which' that have operator features. This way it is clear that in root indicatives clause typing operators are not present in root indicatives, regardless of whether Force is projected or not.

Hence, we conclude that a declarative clause with an indicative verb converges to an assertion reading in the absence of an Assert(ion) clause typing operator, as all the necessary information for obtaining this reading is ensured through the morphosyntax of the TP domain. In light of this discussion, NIs and NGs, which also express assertions, must arise from a derivational mechanism that can recuperate the type of information that the morphosyntax of the TP provides in root indicatives.

4 PROPERTIES OF NARRATIVE INFINITIVES/GERUNDS

We next look at the defining properties of NIs and NGs in order to figure out their underlying structure. This is a prerequisite for understanding how these constructions converge to an independent assertion reading. The two key empirical properties we identify are: (i) possibility of lexical subjects, where available, indicating that T is finite (i.e. it has independent temporal reference) despite the non-finite inflection of the verb; and (ii) the fact that the verb, be it infinitive or gerund, always raises out of *v*P, which indicates a probe situated high in the clause hierarchy.

The framework for assessment is the cartographic representation of clauses in Rizzi (1997, 2004), where the CP field is split as shown in (3). We maintain a non-split analysis of TP and *v*P, as only the CP shows variation with respect to the level of verb movement.

4.1 Subjects

NIs and NGs allow for independent lexical subjects in MF and OR, on a par with their indicative counterparts. These subjects – underlined in (6) and (7) – occur irrespective of whether the NI/NG is coordinated with an indicative root clause in (6a) or whether it occurs independently in (6b, 7). Note that (7) is also an out-of-the-blue context opening a chapter in the book.

- (6) a. [*il estoit yvre et se laisse tomber,*] *et* [*chacun*
 he was drunk and REFL let fall.INF and everyone
de rire]
 DE laugh.INF
 ‘he was drunk and let himself fall and everyone laughed’
 (MF; Maupas 1625: 325)
- b. *Lors Oudart se revestir.*
 then Oudart REFL.3 cloth.INF
 ‘Then Oudart clothed himself.’
 (Rabelais B. ii, Le quart livre, Chap. xiv: 32)
- (7) *Traian întâiu, împăratul, supuinđu pre dahii*
 Trajan first emperor.the conquering.GRD DOM Dacians
Dragoș apoi în moldoveni premeninđu pre vlahi.
 Dragos then in Moldovans turning DOM Vlachs
 ‘First, Trajan, the Emperor, conquered the Dacians. Then, Dragos
 turned some Vlachs into Moldavians.’ (OR; Costin 11, 17th century)

These constructions do not qualify as ECM configurations since they are not selected, neither do they involve backward control. Nonetheless, they license Nominative subjects,⁷ as also noticed for French by earlier grammarians, such as Maupas (1625). In such contexts, the complementizer *de* situated in Fin, following Rizzi’s (1997, 2004) tests for French and Italian, may occur, as in (6a), but, crucially, is not obligatory, see (6b). It therefore cannot be assumed to be what licenses the subject (contra Mensching 2000). Furthermore, the OR equivalent in (7) lacks complementizers but displays lexical subjects. Since the licensing of subjects depends on the features of T, in turn determined by C as we discuss in Section 5, T must count in some sense as finite in NI/NG, despite the non-finite (i.e. uninflected) morphology of the verb.

On the other hand, AF seems to be deficient in this respect. The data show no evidence of lexical subjects in NIs, neither in the corpus nor in elicited judgments. For example, the lexical subjects in (8) received a strong ungrammatical mark from all our native speakers.

⁷ Note that the underlined subjects in (7) are proper nouns with a [+human] feature which trigger an obligatory Differential Object Marker (i.e. DOM *pe* or *pre*; Hill & Tasmowski (2008) among others) with accusative Case. Since these subjects do not display DOM, the Case on these DPs is nominative. See also Hill & Alboiu (2016).

- (8) a. *Vous les nettoyez comme i faut pis vous prenez*
 you the clean.2 as it needs and you take.2
*des foies, pis de la farine et pis des ègnons pis (*vous)*
 livers and some flour and onions and you
mettre ensemble, pis vous les remplissez, pis vous
 put.INF together and you them fill.2 and you
les mettez à bouillir.
 them put.2 to boil.INF
 ‘You clean them properly, then you take some livers and some flour and some onions and you put them together, and stuff them, and you let them boil.’ (AT following Brasseur 1998: 86)
- b. *Ben dans les maisons c’était pas chaud. On brûlait*
 well in the houses it.was not hot we burned
*du bois. (*nous/*la mère) Faire du feu pis*
 wood we/the mother make.INF fire
*(*nous/*la mère) avoir des couvertes pour s’abrier. Se*
 we/the mother have.INF blankets to cover REFL
levait le matin i faisait pas chaud <hm> fallait
 woke up the morning it made not hot had
que la mère faise de feu dans le poêle là
 that the mother make fire in the stove there and
*pis (*nous/*les enfants) manger des crêpes.*
 we/the children eat.INF pancakes
 ‘Well, it was not hot in houses. We burned wood. We made fire and had blankets to cover ourselves. We woke up in the morning, it wasn’t hot, the mother had to make fire in the woodstove and we ate pancakes.’
 (AT following Wiesmath 4, M365/p. 78)

The NIs in (8) do not allow for lexical subjects, despite the fact that these subjects are present and repeated in the text in the coordinated indicative clauses. Although the examples in (8) show the ungrammatical subjects only in preverbal position (for visual clarity), the speakers were also consulted for post-verbal and clause final placement of such subjects. The judgments were unanimously negative.

Thus, descriptively, the following conclusions arise from the data in this section:

- (a) In NI/NG, T licenses independent, nominative subjects in MF and OR;
 (b) T in NI is defective for subject licensing in AF.

4.2 *Verb movement*

The general observation is that, in root contexts, the infinitive or gerund verb systematically moves out of the *vP*, although an embedded infinitive may remain inside the *vP* in all French dialects (and when it raises it never moves above negation; Pollock 1989).⁸ Verb movement in root contexts targets either T or Fin or Force, a fact that we show depends on dialect and/or time period.

4.2.1 *V-to-T in MF and OR*

V-to-T occurs in MF NIs and infrequently in OR NGs, as shown in examples (9) to (12) – this configuration is rare in OR texts. First, the tests verify that V is not in Fin, but somewhere lower in the hierarchy. The assessment criteria consist of lexical complementizers, preverbal pronouns (clitics or weak pronominal forms⁹) that are T-oriented in Romance (Kayne 1991), including OR (Alboiu et al. 2015), and non-clitic negation. If the verb is lower than these elements, then it is in the TP domain.

- (9) *Ha! ribault prestre, estes-vous tel? Et bon prestre à soy retirer.*
 REFL retire.INF
 ‘Ha! you debauched priest, are you so? And the good priest was withdrawing.’
 (Cent Nn B. II, N. 76)

- (10) a. *Iar cuconŭ mirele cu ochi negri le privind.*
 and mister groom.the with eyes black them watching.GRD
 ‘The groom watched them [the earrings] with black eyes’
 (Gabinschi 2010: 83)
- b. *Ce nu lăsându în voia căpăteniilor de Ardeal împăratul nemțescu, au socotit și cu Ardeal emperor.the German has decided and with*

⁸ See the position of the infinitive verb (underlined) in relation to *souvent* (Pollock 1989): *le fait de ne pas souvent se voir* versus *le fait de ne pas se voir souvent* (English, ‘the fact that they don’t see each other often’).

⁹ “In Old French, the object pronoun appears as a weak form before the main verb in the infinitival non-prepositional structures [...] but most often it appears as a strong form before the infinitival verb when the structure is prepositional.” (Martineau 1991: 235)

abiia să-i supuie, avându tocmeli cu Bator.
 sword.the SUBJ-them repress having deals with Bator
 ‘But the German Emperor, not leaving things at the will of
 Ardeal’s captains, decided to repress them by sword, having
 arrangements with Bator.’ (Costin 19)

In (9), the MF infinitive verb is lower than the complementizer *à* ‘to’ and the preverbal reflexive pronoun *soy*. Similarly, in OR, the gerund verb is lower than the clitic pronoun *le* ‘them’ in (10a), and also, as seen in (10b), is lower than the non-clitic negation *nu* ‘not’, which selects T in Romance (Zanuttini 1997). Hence, V is lower than Fin.

The second round of tests aims to show that the same type of verb is moved out of *vP*. The assessment criteria are temporal adverbs, which necessarily merge directly in the TP field; and, for OR, the possibility of VS with lexical subjects in situ (i.e. in Spec,*vP*), which indicate verb raising.

Accordingly, the infinitive verb has undergone verb raising in MF, since it is higher than the temporal and aspectual adverbs related to the TP field, such as *auparavant* ‘previously’ in (11a) and *soudain* ‘suddenly’ in (11b) – see hierarchy in Cinque (1999).¹⁰

- (11) a. *j’avons vu les deux hommes tout a plain, qui nous*
 we have seen the two men all in clear who to.us
faisiant signe de les aller querir; et moi de
 made sign DE them go fetch and I DE
tirer auparavant les enjeux.
 get.out.INF in.advance the bets
 ‘[...] and I previously got my bets out’ (Molière; Festin II, 1)
- b. *Moi de dire soudain que sa bonne fortune Ne*
 I DE say.INF suddenly that his good fortune not
lui pouvoit offrir d’heure plus opportune;
 him could offer hour more favourable

¹⁰ Note that the verb moved out of *vP* in Old French NIs as well, as shown in (i), where it occurs above the sentence adverb *toutefois* ‘though’, which can never be merged in *vP*.

- (i) *Quant il vit ce, et il dou combatre toutevoies come huem*
 when he saw this, and he DE fight.INF though as man
desesperez
 desperate
 ‘When he saw this, he fought, however, like a desperate man.’
 (Li fet des romains: 308, 21)

'I suddenly said that his good fortune could not offer him a better opportunity.' (Corneille, *L'Illusion comique*, IV. 2, 1085)

For OR, NGs allow for subjects in situ, as in (12), where the subject *nemții* 'the Germans' precedes the direct object *oaste cu turcii* 'war with the Turks'. The gerund verb *având* 'having' is to the left of, so higher than, the in-situ subject, hence it has raised out of the *vP*. However, the gerund follows the temporal adverb *atuncea* 'then', so it resides in T.

- (12) *Atuncea având* [_{vP} *nemții oaste cu turcii*] *încă*
 then having Germans.the war with Turks.the already
de la Beci, și tot bâte nemții și să
 from at Beci and relentlessly hit Germans.the and REFL
lăție.
 spread

'By then the Germans had already had war with the Turks since Beci, and the Germans were hitting relentlessly and were spreading themselves.'
 (Neculce 95)

The conclusion is that, with both MF infinitives and with some OR gerunds, the verb is between Fin and *v*, so in T (or in a head of the TP field if a split TP cartography is used).

4.2.2 V-to-Fin or Force in AF and OR

The same kind of word order tests indicate that NIs in AF and the productive NGs in OR display verb movement higher than T.¹¹ In particular, the location of the verb in relation to temporal adverbs is leftward, as seen in (13) and (14); this indicates that the verb is higher than TP (to which these adverbs adjoin) for both AF NIs and OR NGs.

- (13) a. *On avait une pelle pis pelleyer aut' fois devant*
 we had a shovel and shovel.INF yore in.front
le cheval.
 the horse
 'We had a shovel and at that time we used to shovel in front of the horse.'
 (AF)

¹¹ In OR, V-to-Fin is the default option with gerunds, although V-to-T is also concurrently attested up to a point.

- b. *Pis là asteure quand c'était toute tchuit, y avait*
 and there now when it-was all cooked there were
presque pas d'eau là, pis là i le bouillaient, faire
 almost not water and they it boiled make.INF
asteur une sauce dedans.
 now a sauce in.there
 'Then, now that all was well cooked, there was almost no water
 there, and they boiled it, and now made a sauce with it'
 (AT adapted from Brasseur 1998: 87)

- (14) *Ștefăniță-vodă vrând odată să scoată fumărit*
 Stefanita-king wanting.GRD once SUBJ impose smoking.tax
pe țară
 on country
 'King Stefanita wanted *at one time* to impose a smoking tax...'
 (Neculce 120)

Nonetheless, as we show in the next section, verb movement behaves differently in AF than it does in OR, a fact we attribute to different landing sites in the CP field.

4.2.2.1. V-to-Force in AF

NIs in AF stand out as being systematically V1. A set of properties, as listed below, concur for yielding the V1 configuration.

- Absence of complementizers. NIs in MF show free alternation between the option without complementizer and the option with complementizer (i.e. *à*, but mostly *de*). However, AF systematically displays the option without a complementizer, which, in conjunction with other word order restrictions (see below), amount to a V1 word order.
- Absence of preverbal negation. Consider (15):

- (15) a. *I jouiont aux cartes, [(*)pas boire de la bière]*
 they played at.the cards not drink.INF of beer
 Intended: 'They were playing cards, they did not drink beer'
 (AT)
- b. *Ah ben j'ai peur [de pas réussir.]*
 ah well I-have fear DE not succeed.INF
 'Ah, well, I'm scared of not succeeding.' (FANENB, 2:016)

- c. *I jouïent pas aux cartes, [(*)pas boire (?pas)*
they played not at.the cards not drink.INF not
de la bière]
of beer
‘They were not playing cards, they did not drink beer’ (AT)

In (15a), preverbal negation is ruled out in the NI, although it is grammatical with embedded infinitives, as attested in (15b), taken from Beaulieu’s corpus. The native speakers consulted had no hesitation concerning (15a), but showed hesitation and variability for (15c), where the negation is introduced in both the indicative and the NI.¹² For speakers that allowed negation in both clauses, only the postverbal position for *pas* ‘not’ in the NI was deemed acceptable. Following Zanuttini (1997), clausal negation (i.e. Neg) in Romance selects TP; hence, at first sight, its absence would indicate that the relevant T features are not available or that T is absent altogether. T absence would account for (15a) but not for (15c) where *pas* ‘not’ is allowed in NI by some speakers. In addition, even for speakers that fail to allow for the overt presence of *pas* ‘not’ in the NI of (15c) the situation can be recovered at LF given the negative interpretation of the NI. In that case, the negation would still have to be merged in the syntax and select a TP. Crucially, the overt location of *pas* ‘not’, when permitted, indicates that the infinitive verb is higher than T, so in Fin or Force.

In sum, the data in (15) show two important properties of AF NIs: (i) T cannot be selected by Neg unless Neg is present in the matrix, which amounts to saying that T in NI is present but inactive for independent negation; (ii) the infinitive verb in NI is above the TP field.

- Auxiliaries are ruled out. Notably, AF infinitives do not generally show auxiliaries, but that is a matter of preference, whereas with NIs, it becomes a matter of grammaticality; this is shown in (16).

- (16) a. *I regrettïent avoir fait ça.*
they regretted have done this
‘They regretted to have done this.’ (AT)
- b. **I avïent joué aux cartes, avoir bu de la*
they had played with cards have.INF drunk of the
bière.
beer
Intended: ‘They had played cards, they had drunk beer.’ (AT)

¹² In particular, nine out of the fifteen speakers allowed for (15c) with *pas* ‘not’ in both clauses.

Native speakers accept an auxiliary with the embedded infinitive in (16a), but not with a NI, as in (6b). As verbal functional heads, auxiliaries merge in the Infl/T domain, so their absence potentially denotes something about the properties (or lack thereof) of this level in AF.

- There is no fronting to the left periphery. This is shown in (17b) where constituent fronting rules out the NI introduced in (17a). Compare (17b) to (17c) with an embedded infinitive.

- (17) a. *I alliont veiller dans les maisons, pis i*
 they went keep.vigil in the houses and they
contiont des contes et i chantiont, i jouiont
 told stories and they sang they played
aux cartes, [boire de la bière, du home-brew].
 cards drink.INF beer some home-brew
 ‘They went to keep vigil in houses, and they told stories and sang, they played cards and drank beer, home-brewed.’
 (Brasseur 1998: 87)
- b. *I jouiont aux cartes, [(*[tout l’temps]) boire*
 they played cards all the time drink.INF
de la bière...]
 beer
 Intended: ‘They were playing cards, they drank beer all the time.’ (AT)
- c. *Ah ça peut pas [[tout l’ temps] y aller ben.]*
 ah it can not all the time go.INF well
 ‘Ah, it can’t go well all the time.’ (Beaulieu/FANENB, 1:006)

The example in (17a) comes from Brasseur’s (1998) study of AF infinitives. While maintaining the coordination of root indicative and NI clauses as in the original, we introduced the fronted constituent *tout l’temps* ‘all the time’, which is attested in Beaulieu’s corpus for embedded infinitives, as shown in (17). This fronted constituent is ruled out (17b), which indicates that the infinitive verb must occupy the first position in the NI.

The tests in (15) to (17) indicate a sharp contrast between the behavior of the verb in NIs versus in embedded infinitives. More precisely, embedded infinitives keep the verb low in the structure (i.e. lower than complementizers, negation, auxiliaries and proclitics), as also discussed by (Pollock 1989) for standard French, whereas NIs are systematically V1.

Two analyses of NIs may arise from the AF data: one is to assume that the NI is a truncated structure that does not project beyond *v*P. The second is to consider that the NI is a ForceP, with V-to-Force and inactive T.

The following properties rule out a truncated *v*P structure for AF NIs:

- i *Coordination*. As shown in many of our examples, NIs can be coordinated with root indicatives, which are CPs (Chomsky 2008 and subsequent work). It is well known that coordinated members must be of identical category and size (i.e. DP with DP; NP with NP; etc.; Johannessen 1998 among others) both syntactically and semantically.¹³ Hence, AF NIs must have CP status.
- ii *Negation*. Although negation is not a default option in NIs, it may be lexicalized for some speakers in some contexts, as seen in (15c). Furthermore, when it is, it is constrained to a postverbal position. As discussed, this indicates the presence of a TP, which automatically rules out a truncated *v*P structure, because, as discussed, Neg selects TP, and not *v*P.¹⁴
- iii *Subjects*. Some root *v*P's contextually allow for lexical subjects with default Case (so not licensed by finite T). This holds in child language (Rizzi 1994) or in adult grammars with truncated structures (Progovac 2008). Lexical subjects are completely disallowed in AF NIs. This would be difficult to account for under a *v*P analysis where a subject with default Case would be expected.¹⁵

13 The semantic identity is essential as some categorial/syntactic exceptions are apparently permitted in certain contexts as long as the semantics is identical; consider (ia), with DP and AP, or (ib), with AP and PP seemingly coordinated. In fact, what is being coordinated are either two semantic predicates (ia), or two semantic adjuncts (ib), quite possibly indicating *v*P coordination and AdjunctP coordination, respectively.

- (i) a. He is [_{*v*P/DP} an unpleasant person] and [_{*v*P/AP} unlikely to find any friends soon].
b. [b] She arrived, [_{AdjunctP/AP} flustered] and [_{AdjunctP/PP} in a fit].

Since root indicatives are assertive propositions, the same holds of coordinated NIs (see also Nikolaeva 2014), which crucially indicates a CP status as *v*P's are not propositional.

14 Even if we want to assume that the negation is somehow inserted post-syntactically – which should be ruled out given the Principle of Full Interpretation, anyway – its post-verbal position is left unaccounted for as negation should be above *v*P, not inside it.

15 Examples from Progovac (2008):

- (i) Peter retire?! Him worry?!

Note, furthermore, that, in English, truncated root infinitives crucially never allow for nominative lexical subjects, *Me/(*)I say something like that?* This indicates that the default subject is not licensed by T.

- iv *Adverbs*. As shown in (13), adverbs related to the T domain are possible in AF NIs, as long as these occur in post-verbal position. This is a clear indication that the TP domain is present, and, given linearization facts, that the infinitive verb is higher than TP.

In conclusion, empirical and theoretical properties of AF NIs rule out a *vP*, truncated analysis. Rather, these constructions involve propositional CPs, with V-to-C/Force (given the V1 requirement), but an inactive T. Section 5 argues that V moves to Force to check the null AssertOP in Spec,ForceP. Last but not least, from a diachronic perspective, V-to-C/Force is more plausible than a truncated *vP* analysis because V1 is reminiscent of V2 configurations with null operators in Spec,CP shown to occur at earlier stages of French (Labelle & Hirschbühler 2011).

4.2.2.2. *V-to-Fin in OR*

Section 4.1 provided data showing that OR sometimes displays V-to-T in NGs. This option is not productive, and competes with higher V movement, as in (18) and (19), which texts show to be the preferred option by far. This suggests that V-to-T was disappearing by the 16th century (see also arguments in Hill & Alboiu 2016).¹⁶

- (18) *Și Ștefan vodă tocmişă puțini oameni preste lunca*
 and Stefan king organized few men over valley
Bârladului, ca să-i amăgească cu buciune și
 Birlad.the.GEN that SUBJ-them tease with oboes and
cu trâmbițe, dându semnū de războiū; atuncea
 with trombones giving sign of war then
oastea turcească întorcându-să la glasul buciunelor
 army.the Turk turning.GRD-REFL at voice.the oboes.the.GEN
și împiedicându-i și apa și lunca și
 and blocking.GRD-them and water.the and valley.the and
negura acoperindu-lu-i, tăindu lunca și
 fog.the covering.GRD-them cutting.GRD valley.the and
sfărâmându, ca să treacă la glasul bucinilor.
 crushing.GRD that SUBJ cross to sound.the oboes.the.GEN
 ‘King Stefan organized a few men across the Bîrlad valley in order to
 tease them [the enemy] with oboes and trombones, by emitting the
 signs of war; then the Turkish army turned towards the sound of
 oboes, but the water delayed them, and the valley and the fog

¹⁶ In modern Romanian gerunds display exclusively high V-movement to Fin.

covered them when they were cutting through the valley trampling it, trying to cross towards the sound of the oboes.’ (Ureche 100)

- (19) *Decii* *Roman vodă* ***neputându*** *să-și* *îngăduiască*
 so Roman king not.being.able.GRD [TP SUBJ.REFL put.up
cu văru-său, cu Pătru, ficiorul lui Ștefan vodă, pentru
 with cousin-his with Petru son.the of Stefan king for
domnie, că cerea Roman să omoară pe Pătru,
 throne] because asked Roman SUBJ kill DOM Petru
de i-au căutat a fugi lui Pătru vodă la
 so.that to.him-has sought to run to Petru king to
unguri.

Hungarians

‘Therefore, King Roman was not able to put up with his cousin, Peter, King Stefan’s son, in their co-reigning, because Roman was asking for Petru to be killed, so that it occurred to Petru to run away to Hungary.’ (Ureche 84)

In (18), the gerund (in bold) displays enclitics, which indicates V movement above the T level. However, preverbal constituents (underlined) are still available: both the adverb *atuncea* ‘then’ and the subjects *oastea turcească* ‘the Turkish army’ and *negura* ‘the fog’ precede the gerund-enclitic sequence. Similarly, in (19), the lexical subject, *Roman vodă* ‘King Roman’, is preverbal. Preverbal subjects in OR are topics, so the gerund is higher than T, but lower than TopP. This indicates Fin as the landing site of V movement in gerund clauses. The negation *ne-* occurring on the gerund in (19) is a verbal prefix, so it does not block V-to-Fin movement. Compare with (10), where the non-clitic negation *nu* blocks verb movement and keeps the gerund lower, in T. V-to-Fin gerunds allow only for affixal negation (Hill & Alboiu 2016).

We conclude this section by pointing out that grammars that allow for NIs and NGs display obligatory verb movement of various types in these contexts, be it V-to-T, V-to-Fin or V-to-Force. The next task is to identify the features that uniformly trigger verb movement in these constructions, as well as the features that account for the variation in the level of movement and the other observed syntactic properties.

5 CLAUSE TYPING FOR ASSERTIONS

This section starts by arguing for an Assert OP in the Spec,ForceP of NIs/NGs (versus root indicatives). It then discusses the observed variation arising within the ForceP field containing an Assert OP (i.e. presence or absence

of subjects; different levels of verb movement). This discussion involves the feature distribution within the C-T system, which we consider to be the key trigger of variation and diachronic change in these constructions.

5.1 *Common Core and Assert OP*

In this subsection, the focus falls on the properties that are systematically and cross-linguistically present in NIs and NGs. These constitute the common core of the syntactic structure that allows for such derivations to converge.

In this respect, one common property of NIs/NGs in MF, AF, and OR is their **CP/ForceP structure**. That is, although complementizers, as well as other constituents associated with the CP field (e.g. topic or focus), may be missing, these derivations always project structure up to the ForceP/phase level. This is indicated by several properties, as already discussed: (i) the propositional nature of these constructions; (ii) when independent lexical subjects occur, these are nominative (versus default accusative), which denotes a property of CP phases; (iii) the fact that coordination may take place with root indicatives, which are indubitably CP phases; and (iv) the fact that infinitive/gerund verbs reside higher than the *v*P phase – hence, the structures cannot involve truncated *v*P domains.

For the sake of clarity, we offer the examples in (20)-(22) which again illustrate the similar behaviour of NIs/NGs and root indicatives. In (20), the NI in MF is coordinated with a root indicative. In (21), in AF, the entire second sentence consists of two coordinated NIs which count as root clauses. In (22), the NG in OR occurs as the first term of the coordination involving a root indicative so cannot depend on the root indicative for its convergent derivation, while in (7), repeated as (23), there is no coordinated indicative that the NG could derive its features from.

- (20) [*il s'éloigna tout honteux*] *et* [*nous de rire*]
 he departed very embarrassed and we DE laugh.INF
 'he was receding very embarrassed and we were laughing'
 (MF; [Luker 1916](#): 174)

- (21) *On brûlait du bois. Faire du feu pis avoir*
 we burned of wood make.INF of fire and have.INF
des couvertes pour s'abrier.
 covers for REFL-cover.INF
 'We burned wood. We made a fire and had blankets to cover
 ourselves.' (AF; [Wiesmath 2007](#): 78; 4, M365)

- (22) [*Postindu-mă*] și *voi* *dezlega a mânca*, *și nu mă*
 fasting.GRD.REFL and will.1SG stop INF eat and not me
voi *arăta*.
 will.1 show
 'I will fast and will stop eating and will not show myself.'
 (Coresi EV 4)

- (23) *Traian întâiu, împăratul, supuindu pre dahii. Dragoș*
 Trajan first emperor.the conquering DOM Dacians Dragos
apoi în moldoveni premenindu pre vlahi.
 then in Moldovans turning DOM Vlachs
 'First, Trajan, the Emperor, conquered the Dacians. Then, Dragos
 turned some Vlachs into Moldavians.' (Costin 11, 17th century)

Another cross-linguistic property of NIs/NGs is that their clause coordination is **restricted**. That is, coordination is allowed either between NIs, see (21), or NGs, see (23), or with declarative root indicatives, as in (20), (22), but never with an interrogative clause. This restriction is shown in (24), with data obtained from AF native speakers. Insofar as texts are concerned, we can only rely on negative evidence in this respect.

- (24) a. **I jouiont-ti aux cartes et boire-(ti) de la bière?*
 they played-Q cards and drink.INF.Q beer
 (AT)
- b. **Où jouiont-i aux cartes et boire-(t-i)*
 where played-they cards and drink.INF-they
de la bière?
 beer
 (AT)

In (24a-b), coordination is ruled out between a root interrogative with an indicative verb and a NI, irrespective of the type of interrogative (i.e. yes-no in (24a) versus *wh*-interrogative in (24b)). However, AF infinitives are nonetheless compatible with indirect interrogatives, as seen in (25), so something other than infinitive status must be the blocking factor in (24).

- (25) *J' m' demande quoi boire là.*
 I REFL ask what drink.INF
 'I wonder what to drink.' (AT)

This confirms the contrast between NIs and embedded infinitives already observed in the previous section, while also indicating competition between the interrogative operator and some other operator in the Spec,ForceP of AF NIs.

Crucially, as previously mentioned and as also observed elsewhere for NIs (e.g. Nikolaeva 2014), NIs and NGs have an **obligatory *realis/assertion reading***, which explains exclusive coordination with root declaratives that have a similar reading.

Finally, despite variation seen in other properties, all NIs/NGs show verb movement out of *vP*, either to T or to Force or Fin. This is a non-trivial matter especially considering that infinitive verbs need not (or cannot) raise in embedded contexts in Romance.

In sum, all NIs/NGs share the following four core properties: (i) CP/ForceP phasal structure; (ii) restricted coordination: (a) never with interrogative CPs; (b) always with assertions; (iii) V movement outside of *vP*. We take these four shared properties to support our working hypothesis which postulates an Assert OP in the Spec,ForceP of NIs/NGs. The relevant configuration is shown in (26).¹⁷

(26) [_{ForceP} AssertOP Force [_{FinP} Fin_{[+realis]/[+finite]} [_{TP} T [_{vP} ...]]]]

The structure in (26) indicates that the assertion force is formally mapped as an operator that clause-types NIs/NGs. This operator is inherently *realis*, so its Fin will have compatible features; that is, the Fin of infinitives and gerunds is recategorized as having *realis* modality and finite features in the presence of an Assert OP, thus enabling it to felicitously coordinate exclusively with declarative indicatives. The latter are semantic assertions where Fin is by default [+*realis*]/[+finite]. In infinitives and gerunds, an Assert OP is required in order to encode the *realis* modality and finiteness. Since the Assert OP requires licensing, it triggers feature checking, which, following Miyagawa's (2010: 12) Strong Uniformity principle, requires overt manifestation, which explains verb movement out of *vP*. Once the verb has moved to T, thus signalling overt manifestation of relevant features, further movement to a C head is a parametrized option depending on whether the

¹⁷ An anonymous reviewer asks how the morphology knows, for configurations such as (26), that the verb must be an infinitive or a gerund, especially given that Fin is [+finite]. It does not. The spellout of the verb depends on the frequency clues. For instance, in OR, either the infinitive or the gerund are candidates for the same configuration (narrative/root infinitives are also attested in OR), but the gerund was the preferred spellout option. The important point is that the presence of an Assert OP in the derivation forces a non-finite verb form to be semantically interpreted as a finite assertion.

feature(s) in C are ‘strong’ or ‘weak’ (i.e. locus of feature-checking depends on parametrized properties).¹⁸

This analysis can also account for the contrast between NIs and embedded infinitives, which often shows up in tests. In particular, the Assert OP ‘binds’ infinitive T and allows it to function as finite, whereas in embedded contexts, where an Assert OP does not apply, infinitive T is bound by matrix T as an anaphor (e.g. through a Zeit OP as proposed in Bianchi 2007).

The next section refines the feature-checking mechanisms that license these structures and accounts for the empirical variation noticed in the data.

5.2 Variation in feature-checking and locus of features

If the previous subsection looked at the shared core properties of NIs/NGs cross-linguistically, in this subsection, the focus falls on cross-linguistic variation observable in these contexts, namely, the level of verb movement and other differences such as presence/absence of independent lexical subjects. We aim to show that these can be accounted for as a result of the parametrized cross-linguistic options relating to the feature transfer mechanisms between C and T alongside feature-checking options. We first introduce the relevant theoretical background and then provide an analysis for the NI and NG derivations.

5.2.1 Theoretical background and C-T features

The paper has discussed variation that goes beyond the landing site of V movement. For example, AF does not license lexical subjects in NIs, nor does it allow for clitics, although MF and OR display both items in these same contexts (see section 4.1). Ungrammaticality with lexical subjects in AF was shown in (8). In (27), we further illustrate the extent to which AF also avoids clitics in NIs, be it in pre- or post-verbal position.

- (27) a. *Pis là asteure quand c’était toute tchuit, y avait*
 and there now when it.was all cooked there was
presque pas d’eau là, pis là i le bouillaient, [faire une
 almost not water and they-it-boiled make.INF a
sauce dedans], fallait que je rempliais une cuillère ou
 sauce inside needed that I filled a Tbsp or

¹⁸ We use Chomsky’s (1995) ‘strong’ versus ‘weak’ feature distinction as a generic labeling for a feature setting that triggers movement into its domain versus one that can be checked long distance under Agree and c-command. Chomsky (2000, 2001) updates this labelling to presence versus absence of an EPP feature (i.e. ‘selectional’ versus ‘non-selectional’ feature, respectively).

deux de farine de blé, là, dans, avec de l'eau là,
 two of flour of wheat inside with water
[mettre ça plein], pis vous vidiez dedans là, tandis
 put.INF it full then you poured inside while
que ça bouillait, là.
 that it boiled there

'Then when all was well cooked, there was almost no water there, and they boiled it, made a sauce with it, I had to fill one or two spoons with wheat flour and some water, I put (the flour) in until full (pasty), then you empty this inside (the pot) while it's still boiling.'
 (Brasseur 1998: 87)

- b. *Pis là asteure quand c'était toute tchuit, y avait*
 and there now when it.was all cooked there was
presque pas d'eau là, pis là i le bouillaient, [()y] faire une*
 almost not water and they-it-boiled in-make.INF a
sauce], fallait que je rempliais une cuillère ou deux de
 sauce needed that I filled one Tbsp or two of
farine de blé, là, dans, avec de l'eau là, [()en] mettre*
 flour of wheat in with water of.it put.INF
ça plein], pis vous vidiez...
 it full and you poured
 (AT)

- c. *ça va finir par y aller mieux*
 this will end by go better
 'this will end up by being better' (Beaulieu/FANENB 16.3)
- d. *j' commence plus à en faire.*
 I start more A of.it do
 'I start to not do it more.' (Beaulieu/FANENB 1: 163)

As a general rule, on a par with other Romance languages, AF has T-oriented clitic pronouns. These are excluded from NIs, as seen in (27b), although, as shown in (27c,d), clitic pronouns such as *y* and *en* are attested as proclitics on embedded infinitives more generally. Instead, in NIs, constituents such as AdvPs and DP demonstratives must be used, which in (27a) correspond to *dedans* and *ça*, respectively. Absence of clitics in AF NIs cannot be attributed to verb head movement, as AF imperatives show that clitics do not interfere with V-to-Force movement. Consider (28) where the AF imperative allows for enclitics (see also Kayne 1994).¹⁹

¹⁹ Léger (2018) argues that AF reanalysed *voir* (originally meaning 'to see') as a pragmatic marker for injunctions in imperative contexts.

- (28) *Regardes-les voir, mes dessins!*
 look.2IMP-them PART my drawings
 ‘Look at my drawings!’ (from Léger 2018: 16)

Furthermore, in section 4.2.2.2 clitics were equally shown to occur in OR NGs in the presence of V-to-Fin head movement, so some property beyond head-movement constraints must be responsible for blocking clitics in AF NIs.

In sum, on the one hand, the restriction on clitics in (27) needs to be related to something other than V-to-Fin or to V-to-Force, and on the other hand, in Romance, both lexical subjects and clitics are licensed at T. We suggest that both issues concern the interplay of features in the C-T system given that T inherits these licensing properties from the CP phase.

In particular, we adopt the following two theoretical proposals put forth in current literature, with the relevant symbiosis and adaptation in Miyagawa’s (2010, 2017) work:

- (i) The feature inheritance/transfer theory introduced in Chomsky (2000, 2007, 2008) etc. whereby all A-features are a property of the C phase head that then transfers them to a selected head (i.e. to T).
- (ii) The treatment of clitic pronouns in Delfitto (2002): clitic pronouns are defined as Agr spellouts (versus verb arguments) for the discourse relation between a [topic] feature at C and the comment provided in the TP.

These two proposals are implicitly unified in Miyagawa (2010, 2017), where the main tenet is that C is the site where two sets of features are merged: φ -features, which reflect the relation between subjects and verbs; and δ -features, which reflect the relation between topic/focus and comment/presupposition. While this is a universal property of the C phase, Miyagawa shows that there is cross-linguistic variation with respect to feature transfer possibilities from C to T (see also Lochbihler & Mathieu 2016). In particular, both these two feature sets may be transferred to T, or only one of them, or neither one. Accordingly, Miyagawa (2017) (also following Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa 2014) establishes the cross-linguistic typology in (29).

(29) **Miyagawa’s (2017) typology:**

- Category I: $C\varphi, T\delta$ Japanese
- Category II: $C\delta, T\varphi$ English

- Category III: C, T φ/δ Spanish
- Category IV: C φ/δ , T Dinka

In light of (29), Romance languages fall under Category III, on a par with Spanish, since they display subject-verb agreement (i.e. φ at T) and T-oriented clitics, which are a reflection of [topic] features - hence, there is also transfer of δ to T in these languages, on a par with the transfer of φ .

Nonetheless some refinements are in order.

First, under the cartographic mapping we are working with, it needs to be made clear that the C phase head is equivalent to Force in (3a), repeated here as (30). Following Rizzi (1997, 2004), Fin is the location of φ -features in C, together with modality.

(30) [CP ForceP > (TopP) > (FocP) > FinP] > IP/TP > vP

Second, the data from most Romance languages indicate that the δ transfer to T is too strong an analysis if δ stands for [topic]/[focus]: although clitics do occur at T, fronted constituents with topic/focus readings remain in the CP domain. Consider, for example, (31), with the word order in a typical OR root subjunctive clause (preserved in modern Romanian):

- (31) a. *Pre acestu omu iară să-l aduceți la mine.*
 DOM this man again SUBJ-him bring.2PL to me
 ‘Bring this man to me.’ (Costin 95)
- b. *Scrisă amu iaste că îngerilor tăi zis-ai*
 written now is that angels.the.DAT your told-have.2SG
 [de tine] să te păzească și [pre mâni] să
 from you SUBJ you guard.SUBJ.3PL and by hands SUBJ
 te ia
 you take.3
 ‘It is written now that you told your angels to guard you from
 yourself and to take you by the hand’
 (CT, 120v apud Dimitrescu 1963)

In (31), the subjunctive marker *să* is in Fin (Hill & Alboiu 2016, Nicolae 2015). A direct object DP is fronted to contrastive TopP in (31a) and a PP is fronted to FocP in (31b). In both examples, the fronted constituents are higher than Fin-*să*; hence, they occupy TopP > FocP between Force and Fin. However, they cooccur with clitics on T (i.e. necessarily CLLD for Delfitto 2002). Hence, a distinction must be drawn between the [topic]/[focus] features that probe for XPs, and the discourse agreement relation of these

features with the predication, which is reflected through clitics at T. Thus, we must nuance Miyagawa's terminology, and point out that what δ transfer to T involves in Romanian (and probably for all the languages of Category III) is discourse Agr, not the discourse features themselves.

Overall, the discourse fronting described for Romanian in (31) was also shown to apply in Italian (Rizzi 2004) and even in Spanish. For the latter, Demonte & Fernández-Soriano (2009) show that all types of topic constituents are in the CP domain since they can occur between *que ... que* (i.e. Force and Fin respectively) in recomplementation constructions, although the resumptive clitics are systematically in T. Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa (2014) argue for a topic position in Spec, TP in some instances (i.e. familiar and contrastive topics). This means that the [topic] feature itself is transferred to T in these instances, and that Spanish is either of Category I (for aboutness topic) or of Category III (for contrastive and familiar topics). This type of distinction does not apply to French, Italian or Romanian finite clauses, which rather follow the discourse hierarchy in Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007), where, although TopP can be further split into more discrete functional projections, it remains in the CP field, above Fin.²⁰

In view of this theoretical background, we can now examine the φ -feature and δ -feature sets in NIs/NGs, as these derivations systematically project to a CP/ForceP phase.

5.2.2 φ -feature and δ -feature sets in NIs/NGs

It is important to understand that, given the non-finite form of the verb (i.e. infinitive and gerund), the φ -feature set cannot be assumed to reside in T in NIs/NGs (otherwise these derivations would be spelled out with an inflected V, as indicatives). In fact, since infinitives and gerunds are inherently non-finite domains, their Fin heads lack any intrinsic φ -features to transfer to T. This is where the Assert OP plays a crucial role. It is an obligatory ingredient of an NI and NG derivation as it provides the necessary *realis* modality and finite features (i.e. φ -features) to allow for matrix clause status and coordination with declarative indicatives. So, in NIs/NGs, φ -features are introduced by the presence of the Assert OP and not because they intrinsically reside on C/Fin. So, crucially these features stay in C. In effect, Assert OP is licensed by feature-checking of Fin φ -features and [modal].

Concurrently, NIs and NGs display a set of modal features arising from the use of Assert OP, and which is not present in root indicatives. More

²⁰ Note that the presence of CLLD does not necessarily entail feature transfer of δ to T. Church Slavonic and its modern descendants have C-oriented clitics (Pancheva 2005), meaning that the δ agreement remains on C, together with the topic feature.

precisely, Assert OP triggers a *realis* [modal] feature in Fin, and this modal feature is chain related to the [mood] feature of T (for [mood] in T, see D’Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010).

φ -features and [modal] in Fin require licensing, and the presence of these features must be signalled overtly (Strong Uniformity, Miyagawa 2010). This explains the consistent verb movement we see in NIs/NGs cross-linguistically. Crucially, V-to-T is both necessary and minimally sufficient for feature checking, as checking of the [mood] feature signals presence of the *realis* [modal] feature in Fin. Whether checking of φ -features and modality in C requires further movement is a matter of parametrization and feature strength (strong vs weak), as with any feature-checking mechanism.

Interestingly, diachronic change seems to indicate a strong preference for lexicalization of the Fin head in order to license the Assert OP in Spec,ForceP.²¹ For example, an idiosyncratic tendency for regularization in Romanian was that [modal] in Fin had to be spelled out (e.g. *să* for subjunctive; *a* for infinitive). If no dedicated Fin complementizer existed, V-to-Fin would supply the lexical material. This involved not only gerunds but also supine clauses, which also lack a dedicated Fin complementizer (Hill & Alboiu 2016). Equally in Middle French, *de* in Fin becomes obligatory by the 17th century (i.e. it is optional in Rabelais but obligatory in La Fontaine). On the other hand, δ -features are not related to finiteness, so these may be present on T even in non-finite contexts (i.e. when φ -features are not transferred to T).

The configuration introduced in (26) for NIs/NGs is thus refined as in (32b–d); (32a) shows a root indicative, for contrast:

- (32) a. Root indicatives in Romance:
 C/Fin φ -feature (& δ -feature) transfer
 $[\text{ForceP Force } ([\text{TopP XP Topic}] [\text{FinP Fin } [\text{TP } \nu\text{-T}_{[\varphi]/[\text{mood}]/[(\delta)]} [\nu\text{P } \dots \langle \nu \rangle \dots]])](\text{I})]$
- b. V-to-T movement and long-distance checking of features in C
 (i.e. earlier MF NIs and some OR NGs):
 $[\text{ForceP AssertOP Force } ([\text{TopP XP Topic}] [\text{FinP Fin}_{[\varphi]/[\text{realis}]} [\text{TP } \nu\text{-T}_{[\text{mood}]/[(\delta)]} [\nu\text{P } \dots \langle \nu \rangle \dots]])](\text{I})]$
- c. V-to-T movement and lexicalized Fin (i.e. MF NIs):
 $[\text{ForceP AssertOP Force } ([\text{TopP XP Topic}] [\text{FinP de-Fin}_{[\varphi]/[\text{realis}]} [\text{TP } \nu\text{-T}_{[\text{mood}]/[(\delta)]} [\nu\text{P } \dots \langle \nu \rangle \dots]])](\text{I})]$

21 We can think of the tendency to lexicalize Fin as a Recoverability mechanism ensuring that a syntactic unit with semantics must be pronounced unless otherwise retrievable (*à la* Pesetsky 1998).

d. V-to-Fin movement (i.e. OR NGs):

$$\begin{array}{l} [\text{ForceP } \mathbf{AssertOP} \text{ Force } ([\text{TopP } \text{XP Topic}] [\text{FinP } v\text{-Fin}_{[\varphi]/[\text{realis}]} \\ [\text{TP } \langle v \rangle\text{-T}_{[\text{mood}]/[\delta]}] [v\text{P } \dots \langle v \rangle \dots])] \end{array}$$

Crucially, NIs/NGs display φ in Fin, checked by the V in T, in (32b); by lexicalization of Fin, in (32c); or by the V in Fin, in (32d). The presence of φ -features in Fin/T explains why root infinitives can license subjects. AssertOP is responsible for making this possible, since it selects for a finite Fin. The question then is why we only see lexical subjects in some NIs/NGs rather than across the board: recall that these are permitted in MF and OR but not in AF.

Unlike in MF NIs and OR NGs, V-to-Fin is insufficient to license the Assert OP in AF. Furthermore, not only are subjects lacking, but so are clitics, despite their presence in AF embedded infinitives (i.e. CLLD is allowed). This suggests that there is no Fin with φ -features and there is no δ on T. This in turn would explain the obligatory V-to-Force in the NIs of AF: lexicalization of Force is the only way to license the Assert OP in the absence of a split CP. This yields a configuration as in (33) for NIs in AF:

(33) V-to-Force (i.e. AF NIs):

$$\begin{array}{l} [\text{Force/FinP } \mathbf{AssertOP} v\text{-Force/Fin}_{[\varphi]/[\text{realis}]} [\text{TP } \langle v \rangle\text{-T}_{[\text{mood}]} \\ [v\text{P } \dots \langle v \rangle \dots]]] \end{array}$$

At this point we are not sure why CP fails to split in these configurations in AF. However, there are other cross-linguistic instances where C/ForceP phasal infinitives with φ -features fail to split into Force and Fin and require V-to-Force. Consider the Romanian example in (34), where the infinitive subject clause (obligatorily a CP phase) licenses an interrogative subject *cine* ‘who’ – so φ -features must be present – but lexicalization of Fin (i.e. *a*), which is otherwise always obligatory in Romanian infinitives (both embedded and adjuncts) is ruled out. Crucially this configuration is only possible in interrogative clauses which would be ruled out with NIs as these are assertions.

(34) *N-are* [_{C/ForceP} *cine* (**a*) *câștiga din asta*].
 not-have [who win.INF of this]
 ‘No one has anything to win from this.’

Lastly, there are two NI/NG properties that require comments in light of the above analysis. One is the absence of subjects in AF NIs, despite the presence of a CP phase and φ -features. Given that in-situ subjects are ruled

out in AF (Motapanyane 1997), this is likely due to the absence of a relevant specifier position to host this subject. The second one is the propensity of NI/NG for being associated with past tense. In light of the analysis proposed here, this is not a grammatical restriction but a pragmatic outcome. That is, NI/NG could refer to present or future events; see (35) for a future event. However, the context of use consists, generally, of stories, which entail past tenses.

- (35) *Șir de bună mirează izvorând dintr-însele și*
 string of good smell springing.GRD from-them and
nime să nu fie necredincios
 nobody SUBJ not be.SUBJ.3 unbeliever
 ‘A string of good smells will come out of them (saint’s bones) and
 nobody should behave like a non-believer’ (Dosoței VS IIIr)

With respect to the diachronic tendency of NIs/NGs to fall out of use (or, if kept, count as marked in some way), there are factors working to disfavour them. On the one hand, a derivation with an Assert OP is arguably more complex (i.e. less economical) than its indicative equivalent, so dispreferred by Ockham’s razor. On the other hand, these are marked typologically, as φ -features on C clash with the diachronic stabilization of the default setting for Category III in finite clauses.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper discusses NIs and NGs in Romance by looking at MF, AF, and OR data. That is, we focus on constructions with non-finite verb forms occurring in clauses that otherwise coordinate with declaratives that contain indicative, hence finite, verbs. We show that NIs/NGs yield exclusively declarative (rather than interrogative) readings and argue that an Assert OP is mapped in Spec,CP/ForceP of these derivations thus recategorizing an otherwise non-finite derivation into a finite, *realis* clause.²² Conversely, we argue that

²² Note that root infinitives occur outside of Romance as well, making the analysis here cross-linguistically relevant. Consider (i) from Korean where a bare infinitive form coordinates with an indicative:

- (i) *Minswu-ka sakwa-lul mek-ko Chelswu-ka mwul-ul*
 Minsoo-NOM apple-ACC eat.INF-and Chulsoo-NOM water-ACC
masi-n-ta
 drink-PRES-DECL
 ‘Minsoo eats apples and Chulsoo drinks water.’ (Michael Barrie, p.c.)

root indicatives achieve the assertion reading in the absence of any clause typing operator.

Aside from the shared *realis*/assertion semantics, the paper identified a set of common syntactic properties in NIs/NGs, as follows: (i) projection to a phasal CP, and (ii) verb movement outside the *v*P. The first property is in line with the requirement for identity between conjoined structures; the second was argued to fall out from the need to license the Assert OP.

In addition, there were a series of distinct empirical properties illustrated in the grammar of NIs/NGs in MF, AF, and OR. These concern: (i) the level of verb movement, (ii) the presence versus absence of a lexicalized independent subject, and (iii) the presence versus absence of clitics. In particular, it was shown that, if in MF and OR independent subjects and clitics are permissible in these constructions, they are totally ruled out in AF. Our analysis pointed out that properties (ii) and (iii) can be related to the two types of Agreement features proposed in Miyagawa (2010, 2017) as properties of the C phase head: φ -features, having to do with subject predicate agreement, and δ -features, having to do with topic/focus and comment/presupposition agreement. These features can remain in C or be transferred to T yielding the 4-way cross-linguistic typology introduced in (29). On a par with Spanish, MF, AF and OR are all languages of Category III (subject agreement and clitics are T-oriented). However, in infinitives and gerunds C/Fin lacks intrinsic φ -features (these are inherently non-finite). So, in NIs/NGs, φ -features and *realis* modality are introduced by the presence of the Assert OP and typically enable subject licensing; these φ -features remain in C and will require relevant licensing. δ , if present, is transferred to T as expected but has no direct impact on subject lexicalization.

The Assert OP in Spec,ForceP is licensed by checking of the *realis* [modal] feature and φ -features present in Fin, and, by extension, the [mood] feature of T. In order to overtly highlight the presence of these features, as is required by Miyagawa's (2010) Strong Uniformity principle, lexicalization of at least one of these heads is a must. In MF, and, rarely, in OR, there is just V-to-T movement with overt checking of [mood], while the Assert OP and Fin features check via long distance Agree, and later in MF, via de lexicalizing Fin. In AF and, by default in OR, there is V-to-C head movement. However, the landing site in C differs in AF and OR, with AF evidencing V-to-Force, and OR evidencing V-to-Fin. Obligatory absence of δ coupled with obligatory V-to-Force in AF NIs points to a merged Force/Fin. In sum, parametrization with respect to long-distance versus local licensing of the Assert OP seems intimately linked to whether the CP can split or not: in MF and OR, where it can, lexicalization of Fin (or T), either as a complementizer or via head

movement, is sufficient. In AF, where CP fails to split, V-to-C/Force is required.

REFERENCES

- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2002. *The features of movement in Romanian*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Alboiu, Gabriela & Virginia Hill. 2012. Early Modern Romanian and Wackernagel's law. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 25. 7–28.
- Alboiu, Gabriela, Virginia Hill & Ioanna Sitaridou. 2015. Discourse driven V-to-Focus in Early Modern Romanian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33. 1057–1088.
- Beardsley, Wilfred A. 1921. *Infinitive constructions in Old Spanish*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Beaulieu, Louise. 1995. Corpus FANENB. Shippagan: University of Moncton.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2007. *Wh*-infinitives and the licensing of “anaphoric tense”. In M. Cecilia Picchi & Alan Pona (eds.), *Proceedings of the XXXII Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, 35–47. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Brasseur, Patrice. 1998. De l’ellipse du pronom personnel aux formes verbales non marquées dans les parlers acadiens. In Patrice Brasseur (ed.), *Français d’amérique: variation, créolisation, normalisation*, 75–89. Avignon: CECAV.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by step: essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–156. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: a life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2007. Approaching UG from below. In Uli Sauerland & Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.), *Interfaces + recursion = language?: Chomsky’s Minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics*, 1–29. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero & Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational issues in linguistic theory in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 133–166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- D’Alessandro, Roberta & Adam Ledgeway. 2010. At the C–T boundary: investigating Abruzzese complementation. *Lingua* 120. 2040–2060.
- Delfitto, Denis. 2002. On the semantics of pronominal clitics and some of its consequences. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 1. 29–57.

- Demonte, Violeta & Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2009. Force and finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system. *Probus* 21. 23–49.
- Dimitrescu, Florica. 1963. *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi, Braşov, 1560–1561: comparat cu Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Mănăceşti, 1574*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1994. *The syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Etxepare, Kleanthes K., Ricardo & Grohmann. 2000. Conjunction of infinitival exclamatives and the Null Modal Hypothesis. In Kerstin Schwabe & Ning Zhang (eds.), *Ellipsis in conjunction*, 133–156. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Etxepare, Kleanthes K., Ricardo & Grohmann. 2005. Towards a grammar of adult root infinitives. In John Alderete, Chung-Hye Han & Alexei Kochetov (eds.), *Proceeding of the 24th west coast conference on formal linguistics*, 129–137. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Frascarelli, Mara & Roland Hinterhölzl. 2007. Types of topic in German and Italian. In Kerstin Schwabe & Susanne Winkler (eds.), *On information structure, meaning and form: generalizations across languages*, 87–116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gabinschi, Marcus. 2010. *Formele verbale nepredicative nonconjunctivale ale limbii române*. Chişinău: Institutul de filologie al AŞM.
- Grevisse, Maurice & André Goosse. 2008. *Le bon usage: Grammaire française*. Brussels: De Boeck & Larcier 14th edn.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 1999. Infinitival exclamatives. *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics* 8 8. 213–238.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2000. Null modals in Germanic (and Romance): Infinitival exclamatives. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 14. 43–61.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. & Ricardo Etxepare. 2003. Root infinitives: A comparative view. *Probus* 15. 201–236.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. *The syntax of negation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, Virginia. 2014. *Vocatives: How syntax meets with pragmatics*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hill, Virginia & Gabriela Alboiu. 2016. *Verb movement and clause structure in Old Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, Virginia & Liliane Tasmowski. 2008. Romanian clitic doubling: A view from pragmatics-semantics and diachrony. In Dalina Kallulli & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*, 133–163. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Iglesias, Marina Arjona & Elizabeth Luna Traill. 1989. *El infinitivo en el español hablado en la ciudad de México*. México: Universidad nacional autónoma de México.

- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel & Shigeru Miyagawa. 2014. A feature inheritance approach to root phenomena and parametric variation. *Lingua* 145. 276–302.
- Johannessen, Janne B. 1998. *Coordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1991. Romance clitics, verb movement and pro. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22. 647–687.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1992. Italian negative infinitival imperatives and clitic climbing. In Liliane Tasmowski & Anne Zribi-Hertz (eds.), *Hommages à Nicolas Ruwet: de la musique à la linguistique*, 300–312. Ghent: Communication & Cognition.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Labelle, Marie & Paul Hirschbühler. 2011. Topic and focus in Old French V1 and V2. Paper presented at the 13th Diachronic Generative Syntax (DiGS 13) conference, University of Pennsylvania, June 2011.
- Lochbihler, Bethany & Eric Mathieu. 2016. Clause typing and feature inheritance of discourse features. *Syntax* 19. 354–391.
- Lombard, Alf. 1936. *L'infinitif de narration dans les langues romanes*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Luker, Benjamin F. 1916. *The use of the infinitive instead of a finite verb in French*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Léger, Catherine. 2018. L'utilisation discursive de *voir* en français acadien: de la perception à l'évidence. In Laurence Arrighi & Karine Gauvin (eds.), *Regards croisés sur les français d'ici*, 87–111. Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Marcou, P. B. 1889a. The French historical infinitive. *Modern Language Notes* 4. 1–3.
- Marcou, P. B. 1889b. The French historical infinitive. *Modern Language Notes* 4. 41–44.
- Martineau, France. 1991. Clitic climbing in infinitival constructions of Middle French. In Dieter Wanner & Douglas A. Kibbee (eds.), *New analyses in Romance linguistics*, 235–251. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Maupas, Charles. 1625. *Grammaire et syntaxe française*. Paris: Adrian Bacot 2nd edn.
- Meinunger, André. 2004. Verb position, verbal mood and the anchoring (potential) of sentences. In Horst Lohnstein & Susanne Trissler (eds.), *The syntax and semantics of the left periphery*, 313–341. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mensching, Guido. 2000. *Infinitive constructions with specified subjects: A syntactic analysis of the Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University

- Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why Agree? Why Move? Unifying agreement-based and discourse-configurational languages*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2017. *Agreement beyond phi*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Molière, Jean-Baptiste P. 1665/1683. *Dom Juan ou le Festin de pierre*. Amsterdam: Henri Wetsein.
- Motapanyane, Virginia. 1997. *Acadian French: A grammatical sketch*. Munich: Lincom.
- Nedelcu, Isabela M. 2013. *Particularități sintactice ale limbii române în context romanic. Infinitivul*. Bucharest: Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române.
- Nicolae, Alexandru. 2015. *Ordinea constituentelor în limba română: o perspectivă diacronică*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Nikolaeva, Irina. 2014. The narrative infinitive construction in French and Latin. In Hans Boas & Francisco González-García (eds.), *Romance perspectives on Construction Grammar*, 139–179. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pancheva, Roumyana. 2005. The rise and fall of second-position clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23. 103–167.
- Pesetsky, David. 1998. Some optimality principles of sentence pronunciation. In Pilar Barbosa, Danny Fox, Paul Hagstrom, Martha McGinnis & David Pesetsky (eds.), *Is the best good enough?: Optimality and competition in syntax*, 337–383. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20. 365–424.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 2008. What use is half a clause? In Andrew D. M. Smith, Kenny Smith & Ramon Ferrer i Cancho (eds.), *The evolution of language: Proceedings of the 7th international conference (EVOLANG)*, 259–266. Singapore: World Scientific Press.
- Péronnet, Louise. 1988. *Acadian corpus*. Moncton: University of Moncton.
- Rabelais, Francois. 1552. *Le quart livre des histoires de Pantagruel*. Paris: Passion lettres.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1994. Early null subjects and root null infinitives. In Teun Hoekstra & Bonnie Schwartz (eds.), *Language acquisition studies in generative grammar*, 151–177. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, 281–337. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. Locality and left periphery. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and beyond*, vol. 3 *The cartography of syntactic structures*, 223–251. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Schnerr, Walter. 1966. Notes on the use of the infinitive in Brazilian Portuguese. *Luso-Brazilian Review* 3. 63–79.
- Shewring, Walter. 1948. *Italian prose usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiesmath, Raphaële. 2007. *Le français acadien*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. *Negation and clausal structure: A comparative study of Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gabriela Alboiu
Department of Languages, Literatures, and
Linguistics
Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies
York University
4700 Keele Street
Toronto, ON, M3J 1P3
Canada
galboiu@yorku.ca

Virginia Hill
University of New Brunswick
PO Box 5050
Saint John, NB
E2L 4L5
Canada
mota@unb.ca