

Narrative Infinitives, Narrative Gerunds, and the Features of the C-T System

Answers to suggestions and comments in Times New Roman font, immediately following Editor and Reviewers' comments

The Editor's recommendations:

-Reviewer B (point 1) calls into question the claim that root/historical infinitives tend to disappear. Some engagement with the literature here is called for.

CORRECTED: Paragraph 2 in the Introduction has been rephrased.

-The empirical domain should be clarified (Reviewer B's point 2). B suggests that the construction in question is better termed the "historical infinitive" rather than "root infinitive", since there are other types of root infinitive construction. I agree, and think this should be acknowledged.

DONE: We gave up on the 'root infinitive' label and decided to use the label of 'narrative infinitive', as in Nikolaeva (2014), as we believe this label better captures the facts than the 'historical infinitive' label, given that our infinitives are not interpreted exclusively in the past tense. Note that we had, though, pointed out the variety of root infinitives in our footnote 1 and made this distinction since the first draft but, hopefully, the new label is clearer and will satisfy the reviewers.

-Is the claim that root/historical infinitives must *always* be coordinated (reviewer B, point 9)? This wasn't how I understood it. But if not, it is striking that so many of the examples in the article involve second conjuncts.

ANSWER: NO, we have several examples of non-coordinated constructions in the paper. We chose to emphasize the coordination with indicatives so that no objections arise as to the root status of the infinitives/gerunds: for independent occurrences, one may object that they are adjuncts or are under some type of selection, unless we provide a big chunk of text for context. Now we clarified this matter in the introduction, second paragraph, under example (2).

-The paper sometimes talks about C and T, and sometimes splits the C-domain into Fin and Force (Reviewer A). This makes life difficult for the reader. Since the Fin/Force split seems to be crucial, I'd recommend that it be adopted throughout. Particularly when the Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa typology is adopted, it is important to discuss how exactly this translates into cartographic terms.

DONE: We replaced C with Force or Fin or Top/Foc all over, although it is not always a good idea. Especially in the data description, it is not clear, without further testing, whether the verb is in Force or Fin, so C is more adequate to just mark the opposition to the T level. Anyway, we hope the replacements are acceptable. As for the Miyagawa's system, what counts is Top/Foc in the C domain for δ , while ϕ concerns Fin.

-5.2.1 is too brief. How exactly does V-to-T movement yield covert binding/Agree (reviewer B, point 11)? More generally, what are the relevant options, and how exactly is the variation featurally encoded? (e.g. what prevents long-distance Agree from being the preferred option in all cases, for instance?)

ANSWER: we introduce the strong/weak feature dichotomy and in general elaborate on this discussion in Sections 5.1 & 5.2.2.

-Reviewer B has a counter-theory which also occurred to me when reading the paper: the root/historical infinitive in AF has a truncated structure, without the functional head that cliticization attaches to (presumably T). Perhaps they are as small as vP: this would account for the lack of clitics, subjects, and auxiliaries. The only apparent counterevidence to this proposal is example (11), and arguably the questionable (13c). Since other readers are likely to have the same suspicion, it would be good to devote some space to consideration of this kind of analysis.

DONE: We discussed both vP and CP scenarios in section 4.2.2.1. and explained why a truncated vP analysis cannot be adopted.

-Reviewer A (point 1) suggests drawing on Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa (2014, *Lingua*) in the discussion of clitics.

DONE: We discussed this article in section 5.

-It seems like a major change to Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa's typology that some languages can be in more than one Category at once (e.g. C-to-T inheritance in root indicatives but not infinitives). This should be drawn out further, and some independent evidence would be useful (Reviewer A, point 1).

DONE: We pointed out that this article entails two different typological settings in the same class of constructions: one with δ transfer (familiar, contrastive topics), and one without δ transfer (aboutness topic). So seeing typological variation between finite versus non-finite clauses is not out of character with the predictions in JF-Miyagawa.

Both reviewers have a number of other suggestions which should be taken into consideration. In addition, a few more examples would be welcome at points in order to support certain claims (reviewer A), and there are a few more references which should probably be taken into account (reviewer B).

DONE: We tried to address all of the reviewers' suggestions and provide more examples as requested. We also included the mentioned references, as well as some others. Lastly, we tried to fix typos and any other inconsistencies. Thank you for your continued interest in this!

Reviewer A:

1) The author of the paper refers to the last version by Miyagawa, but the history of this classification must be given credit, as it is in Miyagawa (2017).

DONE: We actually do refer to Miyagawa (2010), and made sure we have the reference included in this revision.

Actually, when the author uses this proposal it is to talk about CLLD and one way to make his/her proposal more robust is to discuss what Jiménez-Fernández & Miyagawa (2014) have said concerning CLLD.

DONE: We included this reference in the revised version of section 5. Note however that this paper does not help us much, since the location of topic phrases in Spec, TP cannot be argued for in French or in Romanian, although CLLD applies systematically. What this paper added to the analysis is that the typological settings are not clear-cut, but may vary from one class of constructions to another. Again, this is not unprecedented: consider the level of V movement in standard French which varies between finite and infinitive contexts (Pollock 1989).

MF and OR are claimed to have the parameter set as in Category I (Japanese). One of the reasons is clitics. In Japanese there are no clitics similar to Romance ones, so something else must be said about this. In this connection, I must say that This is impossible since otherwise, agreement features wouldn't trigger movement of V to T, option available in MF and OR.

DONE: We rephrased the typological presentation and hopefully this is clarified now.

Another problematic issue is that the author claims that in MF and OR V moves to Force, never to Fin. However, in previous paragraphs he/she says that if δ -features are retained in C, they are in Fin. Isn't this paradoxical? Also why do we need an A-head to motivate that delta features remain in Fin?

ANSWER: This is a misunderstanding. We never claim that MF or OR have V to Force: we show V-to-T in both MF and OR, with variation to V-to-Fin in OR. Anyways, this has no relation with δ , which is at Top/Foc, whereas ϕ is at Fin.

There are many, many conclusions that the author draw without really supporting theoretically what he/she is arguing for.

ANSWER: We have to disagree with that, as we provided examples and references for every claim.

(2) From the beginning the author says that there is Assertion Operator in root infinitives. The author intends to show some tests which tear apart the two constructions and can support the availability of the Ass Op only in infinitives, just to conclude that in indicatives the assertion interpretation is given by default. So why in other constructions do we need an explicit operator? Maybe this should be discussed in more detail.

DONE: We now elaborate on this operator in sections 5.1 and 5.2.

The author says: "we may consider (4a) as an assertion, but (4b) is a command, (4c) a commissive, (4d) an expressive, and (4e) an official declaration. This variety of readings would be impossible

to obtain if the Spec,CP of the declarative had an Assert OP:” Why not?
Maybe these readings are types of assertion.

DONE: We eliminated ex. 4 and the related discussion because answering these comments would side-track us from the main issue. We relate the change in interpretation to extra-syntactic operations (pragmatics), whereas the syntactic mapping remains constant, i.e., without a clause typing operator. The point was that the presence of a clause typing operator would have blocked the reading variations at the pragmatic level. E.g., the presence of ‘why’ or ‘who’, ‘whether’ constrains the reading possibilities in ways that declarative clauses do not. You can turn a declarative clause into a command, but you cannot turn an imperative clause into an assertion, because there is a clause typing operator in the imperative that blocks that reading. Nothing similar blocks the reading variations in former (4).

3) Experimental work has been carried out to get AF data. I’m sorry but 5 speakers are not enough to conclude anything solid and contribute to the theory. The surveys should be run again, recruiting at least 15 informants. The author should give all details about the survey, the type of sentences, if they were randomised, etc. I really need more instances of AF data to follow the reasoning and argumentation in the paper. Sometimes the author even says that it can be concluded from data that XXXX, but then no data are provided (p. 6 just before 4.2, and this is just one example out of many).

DONE: We do not understand why 5 speakers are not sufficient for the survey, since for the old languages we have only one or two “speakers”, as authors, to give us the same kind of information. However, we went again in search of AF native speakers through hospitals and got the 15 required. There is no difference in the results, which was to be expected, beyond some of the speakers declining to participate because they lost the ability to judge this construction. We also consulted three linguists who are AF native speakers and they confirmed the trends we found in the data. We added footnote 7 with an example of how we elicit grammatical judgments for our sentences. We also added an ungrammatical example above 4.2 (we had not done that before since we had no evidence of any lexical subject in AF NIs – negative evidence).

-Also for OR, there are conclusions with no empirical support: p.4, Selected *ca* ‘that’ is incompatible with clause typing operators. Can you illustrate more by giving examples?

DONE: We provided an example in (3c, d). We also inserted some references regarding this matter, since the incompatibility of *ca*/*that* and clause typing operators has been well documented in the studies of Rom syntax (e.g., *wh*-phrases can be extracted across ‘*ca*/*that*’ because there is no operator to block their movement).

-Sometimes the author adopts a minimalist approach to T and C, and sometimes he/she adopts a cartographic approach. I do believe in this fusion, but the author should be more coherent in that movement to C and movement to Fin or Force are the same and from the text this is not clear at all.

DONE: We replaced C with Force or Fin as suitable.

Reviewer B:

1.- The article presupposes that HIs “tend to disappear towards the modern versions of these [= the Romance] languages” (p.2, on the same page: “why does it disappear from most modern languages?”). This is a bit vague and some references would be recommendable, but, most of all, I think this is not really correct [...].

DONE: We rephrased this matter starting with the Introduction.

2.- The label “root infinitive” (RI) introduced by the authors on p. 1 is not appropriate to refer to the HI interrogative HIs), the statement “that root infinitives [...] yield exclusive declarative (versus interrogative) readings” (p. 2) is not correct, as the latter are only on type of RIs.

DONE: We relabeled them as ‘narrative infinitives’.

3.- P. 2: “[...] their interpretation is finite” – I think ‘finite’ is rather a morpho-syntactic term and should possibly be avoided when speaking of (semantic) interpretations.

3.- P. 2: “[...] their interpretation is finite” – I think ‘finite’ is rather a morpho-syntactic term and should possibly be avoided when speaking of (semantic) interpretations.

DONE: We rephrased in terms of temporal readings.

4.- P. 2: “Of the French diaspora, we found that only Acadian French still preserves this construction.” – Is the absence of the HI in French outside Europe mentioned in studies on these varieties or did the authors consult speakers? Maybe this sentence should just be mitigated somehow.

DONE: We mitigated it.

5.- I could not well follow the third paragraph of Section 3 (“Assertion with root indicatives”) and suggest to add some more clarity here. For the next paragraph, I wonder why we could not say that each illocution in the examples in (4) has another (covert) operator?

DONE: We eliminated the example to avoid conflicting views (we make a distinction between semantic and syntactic operators, as not all semantic operators map to syntax).

6.- Example (5b): If the prepositional element is the realization of a T head (as assumed by Mensching 2000), the lack of this element in this example could possibly be explained by the presence of the independent temporal adverb/conjunction *lors*. In general, the status of the prepositional element should be discussed somewhat more. On p. 6, the authors call it a “particle/complementizer” and then seem to consider

it as a complementizer throughout the rest of the article.

DONE: We clarified that status of ‘de’ by referring to its Fin status as in Rizzi (1997). There is no obligatory spell out for Fin, so it is expected that ‘de’ may or may not be present.

7.- Example (9): *auparavant* is not of the same type as the ‘frequentative’ low adverb *souvent* mentioned in note 9. In principle, according to Cinque’s (1999) hierarchy, *auparavant* should be located higher in the tree structure, which would show even more clearly that the infinitive has moved out of the vP. However, the data are maybe not conclusive, at least when we consider Modern French, as this adverb does not appear in the regular position in selected infinitives either (*Il m’a demandé d’y aller auparavant* / **Il m’a demandé d’auparavant y aller*). But even if the MF example is valid, one sole example would not suffice to derive a general statement on MF.

DONE: We did not know what to do about this comment. First, we establish no relation between ‘*auparavant*’ and the footnote with ‘*souvent*’. In the footnote we only point out that the infinitive verb in French may or may not move out of vP, this is optional on a regular basis, and the reviewer’s example with ‘*d’y aller auparavant*’ shows an instance of verb movement. We have no intention of equating the location of ‘*souvent*’ with the location of ‘*auparavant*’ – we are aware of Cinque’s hierarchy. We added another example, with ‘*toutefois*’, in (9b), which is a concession adverb and as such cannot merge in the vP domain, it has to be higher. The infinitive precedes it, so it is out of vP.

8.- Ex. (14b): I think that HIs show temporal anchoring in the past and are thus compatible with perfect and imperfect tenses (Nikolaeva 2014 discusses such things). Thus the non-availability of the auxiliary could also be due to semantic reasons (but see below, n° 12). This would at least need to be discussed. With respect to temporal and aspectual constraints, it should also be mentioned (and possibly explained) that Romance HIs very often convey an ingressive (incipient) aspect.

ANSWER: We did not do anything about this, because auxiliaries are allowed in these constructions crosslinguistically – so why would semantics block auxs just in AF? Also, the problem is that, in the corpora, the speakers are required to tell stories, so the context forces a past tense orientation. But for (1e), for example, the reading is that of (narrative) present tense. Also, for the AF ex below, the aspect is habitual, not incipient – it is a description of repeated events, including a stative verb ‘*avoir*’.

“ben dans les maisons c’était pas chaud. **on brûlait** du bois. **faire** du feu pis **avoir** des couvertes de laine pour s’abrier. **se levait** le matin i faisait pas chaud là i faisait pas chaud <hm> **faulait** que la mère faise du feu dans le poêle là [**mânze**] des crêpes (4, M365/p. 78)”

9.- Pp. 11-12: Maybe it should be made clear before in the article that HIs are always coordinated (if this is correct).

DONE: No, it is not correct. We clarified that in the Intro section. The possibility of coordination is important to verify that an infinitive has a root status, and also it signals a CP

level of projection for this infinitive. But we have examples with uncoordinated infinitives (see also ex above).

10.- Pp. 12: Number (22): How does morphology know that the verb must be an infinitive or a gerund, especially given that Fin is [+finite]?

DONE: See footnote 15.

11.- Section 5.2.1: It is not clear to me how V-to-T movement can yield covert binding/agree with the operator in ForceP.

DONE: The Assert OP recategorizes non-finites as finite clauses by introducing a *realis* modality and ϕ -features in Fin. These, however, must be checked (this is no different than in indicatives; however, in that case, all edge features are transferred to T and checked there). Since ϕ -features remain in C and require licensing there, v must raise out of vP or else would not be accessible to C. This explains the consistent verb movement we see in NIs/NGs cross-linguistically. Once v moves out of its initial phase to T, it is accessible to Force & Fin for probing and feature-checking. Whether further movement is required is a matter of parametrization and feature strength (as with any feature-checking mechanism). These matters are discussed in various points of Section 5 (primarily in 5.2.2 where schemas are also provided).

12.- Section 5.2.2: The fact that clitics cannot occur with the HI in Acadian French is interesting and can be explained by the theory that the authors adopt. Another line of reasoning could be that the HI has a somehow reduced/deficient structure (see the observed absence of auxiliaries), lacking the functional head where cliticization usually occurs. In this section, the reader may get the impression that the lack of lexical subjects is explained as the lack of lexical subject clitics, although it seems that the authors do not want to say this (which became clear to me only at the end of the section). In fact, the absence of subjects in the HI of Acadian French cannot be linked to the absence of clitics. This is because Standard French does not have a clitic subject in the HI (and in other infinitive structures that allow lexical subjects, as those mentioned by Vinet 1985) but a full pronoun: [...] et moi de rires / * [...] et de je rire.

DONE: We explained the rationale for a CP analysis in revised section 4.2.2.2. We also rephrased 5.2.2. to emphasize that we do not equate subjects and clitics, we just want to say that both items indicate an active TP domain, so their absence is to be related to an absent/inactive TP domain. Nothing else. We are aware of the situation of subject clitics in French.