

Clause Typing Features of Root Declaratives: Indicatives versus non-finites

Gabriela Alboiu (York University) and Virginia Hill (University of New Brunswick-SJ)

Clause typing (Cheng 1997) of root declaratives remains murky in generative grammar. One view is that declarative readings arise by default from the morphology of indicative verbs, which provide inherent valuation for [+tense] and [realis], due to phi-feature transfer from C-to-T (Chomsky 2008). Den Besten (1983) links the root - embedded asymmetry in Germanic verb movement to the hypothesis that something akin to Rizzi's (1997) ForceP is either missing or is inert (Roberts 2001) in declaratives. Conversely, Meinunger (2004) argues that an Assert(ion) Operator in Spec,CP is required for declarative clause typing.

We propose a clarification which capitalizes on the cross-linguistic presence of non-finite forms in such contexts. We focus on root infinitives in Acadian/Middle French (AF/MF) and on root gerunds in Old Romanian (OR), which occur in coordination with declarative root indicatives, as in (1)-(3).

- (1) [*il s'éloigna tout honteux*] et [*nous de rire*] **MF**
 he departed very embarrassed and we to laugh
 'he was receding very embarrassed and we were laughing' (Luker 1916: 174)
- (2) *On brûlait du bois.* **Faire** *du feu* pis **avoir** *des couvertes pour s'abrier.*
 we burned of wood make of fire and have covers for refl cover
 'We burned wood. We made a fire and had blankets to cover ourselves.' **AF**
- (3) [**Postindu-mă**] și *voiï dezlega a mânca, și nu mă voiï arăta.*
 fasting=REFL and will.1SG stop to eat and not me=will.1=show
 'I will fast and will stop eating and will not show myself.' (Coresi EV {4}) **OR**

We argue that an Assert(ion) OP maps to syntax in non-finite root clauses, but not in declarative indicatives. Root indicatives in AF and OR transfer ϕ -features to T, thus ensuring clause-typing; on the other hand, non-finite forms lack ϕ -features altogether so the Assert OP needs to project in order to equate the [+tense]/[realis] values of an indicative C/T system.

Independent evidence for the presence of the Assert OP in these root non-finites comes from their inability to occur in interrogative contexts: the Assert OP blocks an Interrog OP, an incompatibility not found with indicatives, which have ϕ -features.

We further discuss the syntactic differences between AF root infinitives and OR root gerunds via Miyagawa's (2010) feature typology at C. Cross-linguistically, C has both δ -features and ϕ -features but languages differ as to whether they transfer these features to T or not. Typologically, both French and Romanian indicatives are of Category II: C δ , T ϕ . However, with non-finite forms only the δ -features are at stake. The root infinitives in AF lack properties associated with δ -feature transfer to T and its activation (e.g. no clitics, no subject lexicalization, no temporal deixis), which explains V-to-C, while root gerunds in OR allow for independent subjects and independent temporal deixis and only show V-to-T, so δ -feature transfer must be assumed. Interestingly, construction specific C feature transfer to T (i.e. δ -gerunds vs ϕ -/indicatives) is also proposed elsewhere (see Lochbihler & Mathieu, to appear).

In sum, this analysis relates the occurrence of non-finite forms in root declarative clauses to the presence of a null Assert OP. It has the advantage of providing a systematic account for C root features and the cross-linguistic asymmetries that occur with non-finite forms in root declaratives.

References:

- den Besten, Hans. 1983. On the interactions of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In W. Abraham (ed.), *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, 47-132. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen. 1997. On the Typology of Wh-Questions. New York: Garland.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In R. Freidin, C. P. Otero & M. L. Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roget Vergnaud*, 133-167. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lochbihler, Bethany & Eric Mathieu. To appear. Clause typing and feature inheritance of discourse features. *Syntax*.
- Meuninger, André. 2004. Verb position, verbal mood and the anchoring (potential) of sentences. In H. Lohnstein & S. Trissler (eds.), *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*, 313-341. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why Agree? Why Move? Unifying Agreement-based and Discourse Configurational Languages*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 281-339. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Roberts, Ian. 2001. Head Movement. In Mark Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, 113-148. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.