

## Temporal and Aspectual Variation in Root Infinitival Constructions

Adult root infinitival constructions (henceforth, Root Infinitives/RIs), as represented by some Romance and Germanic languages in (1) and (2), present an interesting variation in temporal modification in the Romance area: whereas RIs in Spanish (1a), Italian (1b), Portuguese (1c), and Galician (1d) allow adverbial modification by past deictic temporal adverbs, their French counterpart doesn't (2a), and patterns in this regard with English (2b) and German (2c):

- (1) a. Yo ir a la fiesta ayer?! (2) a. \*Moi aller à la fête hier?!  
 b. Io andare a la festa ieri?! b. \*Me go to the party yesterday?!  
 c. Eu ir a la festa ontem?! c. \*Ich gestern zur Party gehen?!  
 d. Ir de chea eu onte con Lendoiro?! Quen me vira!  
*go to dinner me yesterday with Lendoiro?! Who CL see-me!*  
 'Me go to dinner yesterday with Lendoiro!? That would have been great!'

There are two other related properties that further distinguish the languages in (1) and (2): (i) those languages which allow the RI to be modified by a past deictic adverb also have infinitival raising past the temporal head (see Kayne 1991, Uriagereka 1995, among others) and (ii) they all have a low C-projection FP that is targeted (cf. Uriagereka 1995, Rizzi 1997).

Building on the proposal advanced in Grohmann & Etxepare (2003), we offer an explanation of this phenomenon that relies on the raising of the infinitival to F and on the complex structure of RIs. In effect, we claim that RIs are bi-clausal structures related by an exclamative operator whose semantic import is similar to the focus operator *even* (in the analysis of Portner & Zanuttini 2001). We note that RIs are necessarily followed by a clause that provides the assertoric force of the whole construction:

- (3) a. Yo fregar los platos otra vez?! Ni hablar!  
*I do the dishes again no say*  
 b. Me do the dishes again?! No way!

We show that there are clear connectivity effects between these two clauses concerning e.g. the licensing of negative polarity items, which can be shown very well in Spanish, and take this fact to show that the two clauses are attached to a single root:

- (4) a. ?? Comprar yo nada en esa tienda?! Por sequesto!  
*buy-INF I anything in that shop for course*  
 b. Comprar yo nada en esa tienda?! Lo dudo!  
*buy-INF I anything in that shop it I-doubt*  
 'Me buy anything in that shop?! ??Of course! / √I doubt it!'

This root is the exclamative operator, which has as a restriction the RI (orthographically signaled by '?!'), and as its predicate the assertoric clause (what we call the "Coda" of the RI), which we represent as a tripartite quantificational structure (cf. Partee 1991, 1995, 1998):

- (5) [ Excl [ Root Infinitive ] [ Coda ] ]

The exclamative operator binds an event variable in both conjuncts. The structure in (5) thus presents a quantificational configuration akin to that of "donkey-sentences." At this point, the relative position of the infinitival (which we take to be the bearer of the event variable) in the restriction of the event quantification becomes relevant. We claim, following Baker & Travis (1997), that deictic tenses are similar to determiners and define a domain which is opaque for quantification. In languages where the infinitival remains below deictic T, the event variable is not accessible for quantification, and the structure is semantically deviant. In languages where the infinitival raises beyond T, the event variable carried by the infinitival is free to be bound by the exclamative operator, and the sentence is good. This explanation of the adverbial parameter makes very clear comparative predictions, that we show are fulfilled. (6a) illustrates the basic pattern for Spanish and (6b) for English/German:

- (6) a.  $[_{ExclP} [_{FP} \mathbf{V+F} \text{ TP} ] \text{ Excl}^0 [ \text{Coda} ] ]$   
 b.  $[_{ExclP} [_{TP} \dots \mathbf{V} \dots ] \text{ Excl}^0 [ \text{Coda} ] ]$

But apart from this variation in temporal anchoring between the languages in (1) (where we concentrate on Spanish) and those in (2) (where we pick out English and German), we can also observe apparent variation in aspectual properties. Take the perfective, which is bad in all three languages:

- (7) \* Juan haber fumado marijuana?! Lo dudo!  
*Juan have-INF smoked marijuana it I-doubt*  
 (8) \* Hans Marijuana geraucht haben?! Das glaube ich nicht!  
*Hansmarijuana smoked have-INF that believe I not*  
 (9) \* John have smoked marijuana? I don't think so!

Perfective forms in Spanish (of the sort *haber* + participle) become good in a slightly different type of RI-construction. This further type presents a different intonation: instead of the rising intonation associated with the kind of structures considered above, it exhibits a falling intonation. The coda then has the general meaning of “how could you ever think of anything like that.” Compare (7) with (10):

- (10) Haber intentado Juan algo?! Vamos hombre!  
*have-INF tried Juan something come-on man*  
 ‘Juan have tried something?! Come on, man (what stupid ideas you have)!’

Unlike the RIs considered above, this structure is possible with perfective aspect. Note also that this type of RI can either precede or follow the coda (or more generally, the exclamative expression):

- (11) a. Si hombre!, comer yo en ese restaurante.  
 b. Comer yo en ese restaurante, si hombre!  
*eat-INF I in that restaurant yes man*  
 ‘Sure, me eat in that restaurant! (~ no way will I do that)’

This latter RI also shows connectivity effects, suggesting it is somehow structurally linked to the exclamatory expression.

- (12) Haber intentado Juan nada de eso?! Vamos hombre!  
*have-INF tried Juan anythingof that-sort come-on man*  
 ‘Juan have tried anything of that sort?! Come on, man!’

This RI-variety looks at first glance incompatible with Grohmann & Etxepare’s (2003) account for “standard” RIs (where the event variable is “trapped,” since the auxiliary appears high, not the lexical verb bearing it). However, this need not be so. The facts indicate that RIs in this case are in fact not under the scope of the exclamatory operator. Given the connectivity effects displayed in (11), this must mean that the RI has been extracted out of the exclamatory phrase, leaving a copy behind. The indifferent right-/leftward position of the RI suggests that it has been topicalized. In this regard, the phenomenon is akin to right-/leftward topicalization of infinitival phrases in Spanish, which also shows connectivity effects:

- (12) a. Comprar nada de ese estilo, nunca quisimos.  
 b. Nunca quisimos, comprar nada de ese estilo.  
*never we-wanted, buy-INF anything of that style*  
 ‘Buy any of that style, we never wanted [it].’

Outside the scope of the exclamatory operator, the event variable may not be bound by it, and the perfective form exerts no blocking. This analysis will open doors for a cross-linguistic consideration of aspectual expression in RIs, where blocking properties of event variables/temporal expressions depend on further syntactic properties of the entire tripartite structure.