

The Com(p-)position of DP-internal infinitival clauses*

Petra Sleeman

University of Amsterdam

1. Introduction

Since the publication of Pollock's seminal paper (1989) on the splitting of Infl into two distinct functional projections, TP and AgrP, generative linguists have tried to find evidence for the splitting of the left periphery or the middle field of the clause or the DP in several functional projections. Rizzi (1997) claims that the C-domain consists of four functional projections: ForceP, TopicP, FocusP and FinP. Cinque (1999) argues for the existence of a fixed universal hierarchy of a myriad of clausal functional projections in the middle field of the clause, based on the distribution of adverbs among others. On the basis of the distribution of adjectives, Cinque (1994) splits the middle field of the DP in discrete functional projections. Along the lines of the cartographic approach, Giusti (2002) and Aboh (2004) assign a split structure to the left periphery of the DP.

In this paper, I defend Rizzi's (1997) split structure of the left periphery of the clause, and more specifically the existence of the functional projection FinP. In Rizzi's system, the presence of FinP in the C-system is motivated by the fact that the choice of the complementizer reflects certain properties of the verbal system of the clause, e.g. in English *that* co-occurs with a finite verb and *for* co-occurs with an infinitive. Rizzi shows that while the finite complementizer *che* in Italian can be followed by a left-dislocated phrase, which he claims to be in TopP, the infinitival complementizer *di* can only be preceded by a left-dislocated phrase, which suggests that whereas *che*

* Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for the useful comments. Any remaining errors are my responsibility.

manifests the force position, *di* manifests the finiteness position. In this paper, I will claim that DP-internal subordinate clauses can be introduced by an infinitival complementizer in FinP. Whereas Rizzi bases the evidence for the location of *che* in ForceP and *di* in FinP mainly on word order data, I will adduce evidence for the position of complementizers from extraction facts. I will base my argumentation on French, although the construction that will be discussed also exists in e.g. other Romance languages and English.

The infinitival complementizer that I will claim to be located in FinP is the French prepositional complementizer *à* occurring in an infinitival construction that seems to be an equivalent of the relative clause:

- (1) a. Il a été le seul Français à avoir atteint les sommets.
 ‘He has been the only Frenchman to have reached the tops.’
 b. Il a été le seul Français qui ait atteint les sommets.
 ‘He has been the only Frenchman who has reached the tops.’

However, although *à* + infinitive seems to be an equivalent of the relative clause, Siloni (1995) shows that they behave differently with respect to extraction:

- (2) a. les sommets_i qu’il a été le seul Français à atteindre t_i
 ‘the tops that he was the only Frenchman to reach’
 b.*les sommets_i qu’il a été le seul Français qui ait atteints t_i
 the tops that he was the only Frenchman who has reached

Although *à* + infinitive behaves differently from the full relative clause, I will analyze both as a complement, adopting for both Kayne’s (1994) raising analysis of relative clauses. The difference in syntactic behavior between *à* + infinitive and the full relative clause will be attributed to a difference in the left periphery of the clause. One of the arguments in favor of the idea that both *à* + infinitive and relative clauses are complements will be the dependency of both on antecedents that favor the subjunctive mood, although it will be shown that there can be differences between the two types of clauses with respect to the position of the antecedents in syntax. These differences will also be attributed to a difference in the left periphery of the clause.

The paper is organized as follows. I will first show that although in a framework such as Kayne’s Antisymmetry Theory both relative clauses and *à* + infinitive are analyzed as complements (section 2), they behave differently with respect to extraction (section 3). In sections 4 and 5, I will show that both types of clauses depend on the same set of antecedents,

which trigger the subjunctive mood in the finite relative clause. I will furthermore show in section 5 that the antecedent of *à* + infinitive can be located within the infinitival clause in syntax. In section 6, I will relate the difference with respect to extraction and the possible difference with respect to the position of the antecedent in syntax to a difference in the left periphery of the subordinate clause within DP: in the relative clause the complementizer occupies Force^o whereas as a prepositional complementizer it occupies Fin^o in the infinitival clause. Finally, in section 7, I will summarize the results.

2. The equivalents of the relative clause

Kayne (1994) shows that the demonstrative pronoun *celui* ‘the one’ (fem.sg. *celle*, masc.pl. *ceux*, fem.pl. *celles*) necessarily has to be followed by a relative clause (3) or an equivalent. Kayne mentions three equivalents of the relative clause: a past participial phrase (4), a possessive PP (5) and the particles *ci* ‘here’ and *là* ‘there’ (6):

- (3) *celui que j’ai envoyé à Jean*
‘the one that I have sent to Jean’
- (4) *celui envoyé à Jean*
‘the one sent to Jean’
- (5) *celui de Jean*
‘John’s’
- (6) *celui-ci ou celui-là*
‘this one or that one’

In Kayne’s raising analysis of relative clauses, *celui* has to be interpreted in the Spec of CP or another clausal structure such as D/PP for the possessive phrase:

- (7) [_{DP} D^o [_{CP} *celui*_i [_{C'} *que* [_{IP} *j’ai lu t_i*]]]]
- (8) [_{DP} D^o [_{D/PP} *celui*_i [_{D/P'} *de* [_{IP} [*Jean I^o t_i*]]]]]]

As Sandfeld (1965) shows, *celui* can furthermore be combined with present participles (9), *à* + infinitive with a “passive” meaning (10), and adjectives followed by a complement (11):

- (9) ceux parlant quatre langues
'those speaking four languages'
- (10) toutes celles à commettre
'all those to commit'
- (11) celui capable de sacrifier sa vie
'the one able to sacrifice his life'

Sandfeld shows that *celui* can even be followed by adjectives ending in one of the suffixes *-able*, *-ible*, or *-uble*:

- (12) les bouteilles en plastique non recyclables et aussi celles recyclables
'the plastic bottles that cannot be recycled and also those than can be recycled'
- (13) Nous préférons ceux réutilisables.
'We prefer those that can be used again.'

Sleeman and Verheugd (1998) analyze all equivalents of the relative clause as reduced relative clauses. This means that in their analysis all these equivalents have a clausal structure.

In the next section, I show that, although in Kayne's analysis both the full relative clause and all its equivalents are analyzed as complements, *à* + infinitive behaves differently with respect to extraction than the full relative clause or the other equivalents.

3. Differences with respect to extraction

I have shown, in the previous section, that *à* + infinitive with a "passive" meaning can follow the demonstrative pronoun *celui*. *À* + infinitive can also follow certain adjectives such as *seul* 'only', *premier* 'first' or *dernier* 'last' and also superlatives. In this case *à* + infinitive can also have an "active" meaning:

- (14) Elle est la seule à avoir participé à six éditions des Jeux Olympiques d'hiver.
'She is the only one to have participated in six editions of the Olympic Wintergames.'
- (15) Il fut le premier à atteindre le pôle Nord.
'He was the first one to reach the North pole.'

- (16) Ce sont les derniers à avoir rendu visite à la Lune.
 ‘They are the last ones to have visited the moon.’
- (17) Elle est la plus jeune à avoir publié un roman.
 ‘She is the youngest one to have published a novel.’

Siloni (1995) observes that whereas extraction from the infinitival constituent in the “active” reading is possible, extraction from a relative clause or its other equivalents is not:

- (18) Qu’est-ce qu’il est le seul à avoir fait?
 ‘What is he the only one to have done?’
- (19) * Qu’est-ce qu’il est le seul qui ait fait?
 what is he the only one who has done
- (20) Quel rallye a-t-il été le premier à couvrir?
 ‘Which rally was he the first one to finish?’
- (21) * Quel rallye a-t-il été le premier qui ait couvert?
 which rally was he the only one who has finished
- (22) * A qui_i Jean est-il le seul parlant régulièrement?
 to whom is Jean the only one speaking regularly

The following examples involve a relative pronoun instead of an interrogative pronoun:

- (23) ces paroles épouvantables que je fus le seul à entendre
 ‘these horrible words that I was the only one to hear’
- (24) le sommet qu’il fut le premier à atteindre
 ‘the top that he was the first one to reach’
- (25) * le prix_i qu’elle est la seule personne fière d’avoir gagné t_i
 the prize that she is the only person proud to have won

Siloni adopts a traditional analysis of relative clauses. She claims that the ungrammaticality of (19) and (21) results from a Subjacency violation, since Spec,CP of the relative clause is filled by an empty operator. A similar analysis would apply to (22) and (25):

(26) *Qu'_i est-ce qu'il est le seul [_{CP} *OP* qui ait fait t_i]?

In the infinitival construction there would be no empty operator in Spec,CP but PRO as the subject of the infinitive:

(27) Qu'_i est-ce qu'il est le seul à [_{CP} PRO avoir fait t_i]?

Siloni is not explicit about the structure of the sentence containing the infinitival clause. Probably the infinitival clause is not an adjunct, i.e. a kind of relative clause, but rather the complement of a preposition. The PP itself is probably the complement of the adjective *seul*:

(28) le seul [_{PP} à [_{CP} [_{IP} PRO avoir fait]]]

However, the adoption of such a structure becomes problematic if we consider the next sentences:

(29) Il est le seul homme à avoir fait cela.
'He is the only man to have done that.'

(30) Il a été le premier journaliste à couvrir le rallye Paris-Dakar.
'He was the first reporter to finish the Paris-Dakar rally.'

(31) Il est le plus jeune joueur à avoir remporté déjà sept titres majeurs.
'He is the youngest player to have already won seven major titles.'

In (29-31), the infinitival constituent cannot be the complement of the adjective, but rather must be a relative clause, which is adjoined to the DP in Siloni's framework, see (26). However, (32) shows that extraction from the infinitival constituent in (29-31) is possible just as in (24):

(32) le sommet qu'il a été le seul Français à atteindre
'the top that he has been the only Frenchman to reach.'

If *à* + infinitive is the complement of *le seul* in this sentence, it becomes difficult to explain that they can be separated by a noun. If one admits that *à* + infinitive is a relative clause rather than a complement, however, it has to be explained why extraction is allowed in (32).

In Kayne's analysis of relative clauses and reduced relative clauses, the presence of the noun between the adjective *seul* and *à* + infinitive can easily

be accounted for. The noun moves from a position within the relative clause, the complement of *seul* in (33), to Spec,CP:¹

- (33) [DP le seul [_{CP} Français_i à t_i atteindre le sommet]]

In line with Kayne's analysis, I analyze *à* + infinitive as a complement, which is also in line with Siloni's analysis. However, contrary to Siloni, I also analyze relative clauses as complements, in line with Kayne's analysis.

An argument in favor of an analysis as a complement in all cases, is that at least *le seul* necessarily has to be followed by a relative clause (or one of its equivalents). If the relative clause is an adjunct instead of a complement, this is unexpected:²

- (34) Les seuls livres *(qui me plaisent) sont là.
'The only books (that please me) are there.'

Another argument in favor of the idea that the relative clause is a complement and not an adjunct, is the possibility to use the subjunctive mood in the relative clause after an antecedent containing e.g. a superlative, *seul*, *premier* or *dernier* (Carlsson 1969, Kampers-Manhe 1991):

- (35) Le roi était fier d'avoir pour épouse la plus belle femme qui soit_{subj} au monde.
'The king was proud of having as his wife the most beautiful woman in the world.'
- (36) Elle est la seule (femme) qui ait_{subj} vraiment compté pour lui.
'She is the only (woman) that has really been important to him.'

¹ In fact, the noun must even move to a position outside the (reduced) relative clause, probably to NumP, raising over "postnominal" adjectives (Cinque 1994):

- (i) Elle est la femme_i la plus âgée [_{CP} t_i à t_i avoir eu un enfant].
'She is the oldest woman to have had a child.'

² In Kayne's (1994) analysis, the relative clause is the complement of a determiner. The dependency relation between *seul* and the relative clause in (34), however, shows that the relative clause can also be the complement of an adjective, cf. (28-29). I assume that some other adjectives, such as ordinals and superlatives (30-31) can also take a clausal complement.

- (37) La première chose que l'on doive_{subj} posséder, c'est une maison et c'est aussi la dernière chose que l'on doive_{subj} vendre.
 'The first thing that one has to own is a house and it is also the last thing that one has to sell.'

Besides its use in relative clauses, the subjunctive is only used in sentential (substantive or adverbial) complements introduced by the complementizer *que*. If the relative clause is analyzed as a complement, it is possible to give a more uniform explanation of the use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses. Furthermore, the fact that the relative clause containing a subjunctive can be replaced by *à* + infinitive might also plead in favor of an analysis of the relative clause as a complement:

- (38) Elle est la femme la plus âgée qui ait_{subj} gagné un prix.
 'She is the oldest woman who has won a prize.'
- (39) Elle est la femme la plus âgée à avoir gagné un prix.
 'She is the oldest woman to have won a prize.'

In order to support the analysis of both *à* + infinitive and the relative clause as complements, I will show in the next two sections that there is a relation between the two constructions. What remains to be done then, in the last section, is to account for the differences between the two types of complements, e.g. the difference with respect to extraction mentioned above.

4. Subjunctive relative clauses

The adjectives and determiners that combine with a relative clause in which the subjunctive mood can be used are the superlatives, *premier* 'first' and *dernier* 'last', *principal* 'principal', *seul* 'only' and *unique* 'unique', and (*un des*) *rare* '(one of the) rare' or *peu de* 'few':

- (40) C'est la meilleure chose qui puisse_{subj} arriver.
 'It is the best thing that can happen.'
- (41) Le premier homme qui ait_{subj} volé dans un avion à vapeur fut Ader.
 'The first man who flew in a steam aeroplane was Ader.'
- (42) La dernière chose qu'elle ait_{subj} vue c'est un pare-brise lui broyant la boîte crânienne.
 'The last thing that she saw was a windshield shattering her skull.'

- (43) Le principal péril que nous courions_{subj} aujourd’hui, c’est de ne pas écrire assez clair.
 ‘The main risk that we run nowadays is not to write clearly.’
- (44) C’est la seule possibilité que nous ayons_{subj}.
 ‘It is the only possibility that we have.’
- (45) Mais elle avait cette excuse, c’est qu’il était le premier, l’unique des jeunes hommes à qui elle eût_{subj} jamais fait attention dans sa vie.
 ‘But she had this excuse that he was the first, the only one of the young men she had ever paid attention to in her life.’
- (46) Philip K. Dick est une des rares personnes qui aient_{subj} compris que la bonne science-fiction est en fait la science-fiction sociale. La technologie est un reflet ou un écho de ce qui se passe dans la société.
 ‘Philip K. Dick is one of the rare persons who have understood that good science fiction is indeed social science fiction. Technology is a reflection or an echo of what is going on in society.’
- (47) Il y a bien peu de personnes qui sachent_{subj} aimer.
 ‘There are really few persons who know how to love.’

What are the semantic properties of the adjectives or determiners permitting the use of the subjunctive in the relative clause, and possibly also the use of *à* + infinitive?

Fauconnier (1980: 134) observes that subjunctive relative clauses depending on a superlative, *seul* etc. are ideal environments for the use of negative polarity items. They are in the domain of a monotone decreasing operator, the superlative element, which can reverse polarity (Zwarts 1981):

- (48) Ce cadeau est le plus beau qu’on m’ait_{subj} jamais fait.
 ‘This gift is the most beautiful ever given to me.’
- (49) Gustave est l’homme le plus compétent qui soit_{subj} le moins intéressé par ce travail.
 ‘Gustave is the most competent man who is somewhat interested in this work.’
- (50) Ce sont les derniers récitals qu’elle ait_{subj} donnés de sa vie.
 ‘Those were the last recitals that she has given in her life.’

Kampers-Manhe (1991) analyzes subjunctive clauses as clausal complements that are in the domain of a negation provoking the use of the subjunctive (May 1985). The reason for this is that apart from superlatives, *seul* etc., a negative antecedent also provokes the use of the subjunctive and of negative polarity items:

- (51) Je ne vois pas de voiture qui ait_{subj} *la moindre* tache de rouille.
 ‘I see no car that has any rust spots.’

According to Carlsson (1969), the superlative has this negative meaning if it is followed by a subjunctive clause. The meaning of (52) is: there is no other work that you can do than this one. In (53), in which the indicative mood is used, *seul* has a more positive meaning:

- (52) C’est le seul travail que vous puissiez_{subj} (jamais) faire.
 ‘It is the only work that you can (ever) do.’

- (53) C’est le seul travail que vous pouvez_{ind} faire.
 ‘It is the only work that you can do.’

I suggest that the more negative meaning of *seul* in (52) is due to focalization, implying the exclusion of a complement set (cf. Kiss’ 1998 definition of identificational focus).

5. À + infinitive

Kampers-Manhe (1991) observes that relative clauses containing the subjunctive mood can be replaced by *à* + infinitive:

- (54) Lucie est la seule de mes soeurs qui se soit_{subj} mariée.
 ‘Lucie is the only one of my sisters who has got married.’

- (55) Lucie est la seule de mes soeurs à s’être mariée.
 ‘Lucie is the only one of my sisters to have got married.’

Apart from *seul*, all other adjectives and determiners that can be followed by a subjunctive relative clause can be followed by *à* + infinitive. The infinitival clause can also contain a negative polarity item, as in (56):

- (56) Il était le seul à avoir jamais osé la contredire.
 ‘He was the only one to have ever dared to contradict her.’

- (57) Elle est la première femme à occuper ce poste.
‘She is the first woman to occupy this post.’
- (58) La dernière femme à avoir reçu la peine de mort en Angleterre était Ruth Ellis.
‘The last woman to have been executed in the U.K. was Ruth Ellis.’
- (59) Elle était l’unique femme à avoir pris part à cette compétition.
‘She was the only woman to have taken part in this competition.’
- (60) Il fut l’un des principaux hommes à affréter le navire.
‘He was one of the principal men to prepare the ship.’
- (61) Les rares hommes à avoir marché sur la lune étaient revêtus de scaphandres.
‘The rare men to have walked on the moon wore diving-suits.’
- (62) des conditions dont il est très peu d’hommes à vouloir entendre parler
‘conditions of which very few men want to hear’

On the Internet, but not in the literary database Frantext, I also found examples of *à* + infinitive following ordinals other than *premier* and *dernier*, and following cardinal numbers, after which the subjunctive is never used in the normal case:

- (63) Elle est la quatrième femme qui a_{ind} été élue à l’Académie française en 2000.
‘She is the fourth woman who has been elected at the Académie française in 2000.’
- (64) Elle est la quatrième femme à avoir été élue à l’Académie française en 2000.
‘She is the fourth woman to have been elected at the Académie française in 2000.’
- (65) Elle est l’une des trois femmes à jamais avoir accompli cet exploit au Canada.
‘She is one of the three women who have ever succeeded to do this in Canada.’

It might be that *à* + infinitive is used here because the numerals have a focalized interpretation excluding others: there was almost no one before these women who had done this. This explanation is supported by the use of the negative polarity item *jamais* ‘ever’ in (65).

A more intriguing case is the use of *à* + infinitive (with an “active” meaning) after *celui*, of which I found many examples on the Internet but not in the literary database Frantext:

- (66) C’est celui à avoir posé la dernière carte.
‘It is he who has played the last card.’
- (67) Celle à avoir survécu le plus longtemps fut Lilith.
‘The one who survived the longest was Lilith.’
- (68) Le vainqueur est celui à avoir le plus de cartes.
‘The winner is the one who has the most cards.’
- (69) Celui à avoir posé la première brique de cet assemblage sonore se nomme Third Eye Foundation.
‘The one who has laid the first stone of this sound assembly is called Third Eye Foundation.’

Instead of *celui* I also found examples of *determiner* + noun followed by *à* + infinitive:

- (70) Il est le joueur à avoir gagné le plus de matches cette année .
‘He is the player who has won most matches this year.’
- (71) Charles de L’Ecluse reste le personnage du 17^{ème} siècle à avoir le plus contribué à l’introduction de la tulipe en Europe.
‘Charles de L’Ecluse remains the person from the 17th century who has most contributed to the introduction of the tulipe in Europe.’

After *celui* or *determiner* + noun, a relative clause containing a subjunctive cannot be used:

- (72) *C’est celui qui ait_{subj} posé la dernière carte.
‘It is him who has played the last card.’
- (73) *Il est le joueur qui ait_{subj} gagné le plus de matches.
‘It is the player who has won most matches.’

What is striking in the examples of the use of *à* + infinitive after *celui* or determiner + noun, is that most of them contain a superlative, *premier* or *dernier* within the infinitival clause. There seems thus to be a difference between subjunctive relative clauses and *à* + infinitive clauses. Whereas the first group is only licensed by a real antecedent with a focalized interpretation, the second group is not only licensed by a real antecedent with a focalized interpretation but also by an adjective or an adverb with a focalized interpretation inside the *à* + infinitive clause.

I have shown that there is a close resemblance between subjunctive relatives and *à* + infinitive, both being used after antecedents with a “negative” meaning due to focalization, which motivates their analysis as complements, the noun being raised within the clausal complement. I have also shown that there is a difference between the two types. Whereas a focal element can also license an infinitival clause if it is inside the infinitival clause, this is not possible in the case of subjunctive relatives. In the next section, I investigate whether this difference can be related to the difference in extraction from the two types of clauses.

6. Analysis of the differences

I have shown in section 3 that whereas extraction from *à* + infinitive is possible, extraction from a full relative clause or an equivalent is not:

- (74) *Qu’_i est-ce qu’il est le seul à avoir fait t_i?*
 ‘What is he the only one to have done?’
- (75) *le sommet_i qu’il a été le seul Français à atteindre t_i*
 ‘the top that he has been the only Frenchman to reach’
- (76) **Quel rallye_i a-t-il été le premier qui ait couvert t_i?*
 ‘What rally was he the only one who has finished?’
- (77) **A qui_i Jean est-il le seul parlant régulièrement t_i?*
 to whom Jean is the only one speaking regularly
- (78) **le prix_i qu’elle est la seule personne fière d’avoir gagné t_i*
 the prize that she is the only person proud to have won

Whereas Siloni (1995) analyzes *à* + infinitive as a complement, but the relative clause and its equivalents as adjuncts, I have adopted Kayne’s (1995) analysis of relative clauses and reduced relative clauses and have analyzed all cases as complements. As an argument for this common

analysis, I have advanced the close resemblance between \grave{a} + infinitive and subjunctive relative clauses. I have shown that they both depend on antecedents with a “negative” meaning due to focalization, such as superlatives, *seul*, *premier* and *dernier*.

If the relative clause and all its equivalents are complements, another account for the difference in extraction than the one proposed by Siloni (1995) has to be given. I claim that the prepositional complementizer \grave{a} is located, within the C-domain, in Fin° , which reflects certain properties of the verbal system of the clause, such as mood. The relation between the subordinate clause and the DP is established by ForceP. The noun or empty pronoun moves to the Spec of FinP (and from there possibly out of the subordinate clause, cf. fn. 1), but, crucially, leaving Spec,ForceP empty so that another constituent can move through this position:³

(79) [_{ForceP} Qu’_j est-ce qu’il est le seul [_{ForceP} t_j [_{FinP} *pro*_i à t_i avoir fait t_j]]]]?

(80) les [_{ForceP} sommets_j qu’il a été le seul [_{ForceP} t_j [_{FinP} Français_i à t_i atteindre t_j]]]

I assume that participles or adjectives followed by a complement are not dominated by functional projections of the Force-Finiteness system. They are simply IPs to the Spec of which the noun or empty pronoun moves. Since there is no ForceP, there is no position through which a constituent can move out of the reduced clause:

(81) *A qui_i Jean est-il le seul [_{IP} *pro* parlant régulièrement t_i] ?

(82) *le prix_i qu’elle est la seule [_{IP} personne fière d’avoir gagné t_i]

The full relative clause is also dominated by ForceP, but this time the (empty) noun has to move to Spec,ForceP which contains the complementizer *que* in its head position (after agreement with *pro* in

³ Extraction is only possible from \grave{a} + infinitive with an “active” meaning, which suggests that \grave{a} + infinitive with a “passive” meaning has a different structure. I suggest that (ii) is ungrammatical, because the “antecedent” noun moves to Spec,ForceP. This blocks extraction of another constituent out of the clause:

(i) C’est la seule chose à demander aux parents.
‘It is the only thing to ask the parents.’

(ii) *A qui_j est-ce la seule [_{ForceP} chose_i à PRO demander t_i t_j]?
who is it the only thing to ask

Spec,ForceP in (83) *que* is spelled out as *qui*. This means that there is no empty Spec left that could be used for the extraction of a constituent out of the relative clause:

(83)**Quel rallye; a-t-il été le premier* [_{ForceP} *pro*_i [_{Force'} *qui* [_{FinP} *t_i ait couvert t_j]]]]?*

In the previous section, I showed that whereas subjunctive relative clauses always depend on a real antecedent with a focalized, “negative”, interpretation, *à* + infinitive can also be licensed by a focal element within the infinitival clause:

(84) Charles de L’Ecluse reste le personnage du 17^{ème} siècle à avoir le plus contribué à l’introduction de la tulipe en Europe.
 ‘Charles de L’Ecluse remains the person from the 17th century who has most contributed to the introduction of the tulipe in Europe.’

(85) *Charles de L’Ecluse reste le personnage du 17^{ème} siècle qui ait_{subj} le plus contribué à l’introduction de la tulipe en Europe.
 ‘Charles de L’Ecluse remains the person from the 17th century who has most contributed to the introduction of the tulipe in Europe.’

The adoption of a different structure for both types of clauses makes an account of this difference possible in terms of scope differences at LF. Normally, the subjunctive clause and the infinitival clause are the complement of focalized elements such as the superlative, *seul*, etc. and are therefore in their domain. I propose that for speakers who accept (84), an element with a “negative” meaning can also move out of the infinitival clause to a scope position, possibly Spec,FocP dominated by DP (cf. Aboh 2004), at LF and take scope over the clause.

(86) [_{DP} *le* [_{FocP} *le plus*_i [_{ForceP} *t_i* [_{FinP} *personnage du 17^{ème} siècle à avoir t_i contribué à l’introduction de la tulipe en Europe*]]]]].

Since only the infinitival clause contains an extraction site, viz. Spec,ForceP, but full relatives do not, focalized elements can only take scope over and license the infinitival clause, but cannot take scope over the subjunctive clause and hence cannot license it.

7. Conclusion

In this paper I have claimed that DP-internal subordinate clauses, such as French *à* + infinitive clauses occurring with a superlative antecedent, can be

introduced by an infinitival complementizer in FinP. I have argued that both *à* + infinitive clauses and their finite counterparts, subjunctive relative clauses, are complements of an adjective or determiner. Both types of clauses being complements, I have attributed the difference with respect to extraction to a difference in the left periphery of the clause. I have claimed that the prepositional complementizer *à* is located in Fin^o attracting the “antecedent” NP to its specifier position and leaving ForceP available for extraction, whereas in full relative clauses the “antecedent” noun raises to Spec,ForceP, blocking extraction. I have proposed that this difference can also account for a difference between the two types of clauses with respect to fronting of the superlative element at LF.

References

- Aboh, Enoch. 2004. *The Morphosyntax of Complement-head Sequences: Clause Structure and Word Order Patterns in Kwa*. New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Carlsson, Lennart. 1969. *Le Type 'C'est le Meilleur Livre qu'il ait Jamais Écrit' en Espagnol, en Italien et en Français*. Uppsala, Linquist and Wiksells.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1994. “On the Evidence for Partial N-Movement in the Romance DP”. In G. Cinque, J. Koster, J.-Y. Pollock, and R. Zanuttini (eds.) *Paths Towards Universal Grammar. Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*. 85-110. Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1980. *Etude de Certains Aspects Logiques et Grammaticaux de la Quantification et de l'Anaphore en Français et en Anglais*. Paris, Honoré Champion.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 2002. “The Functional Structure of Noun Phrases: a Bare Phrase Structure Approach”. In G. Cinque (ed.) *Functional Structure in DP and IP*. 54-90. New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Kampers-Manhe, Brigitte. 1991. *L'opposition Subjonctif/Indicatif dans les Relatives*. Amsterdam, Rodopi.
- Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
- Kiss, Katalin. 1998. “Identificational Focus versus Information Focus”. *Language*, 74.2:245-273.
- May, Robert. 1985. *Logical Form: its Structure and Derivation*. Cambridge MA, MIT Press.

- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery." In L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Grammar*. 281-339. Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- Sandfeld, Kristian. 1965 (reedition of 1928). *Syntaxe du Français Contemporain I: les Pronoms*. Paris, Honoré Champion.
- Siloni, Tal. 1995. "On Participial Relatives and Complementizer D⁰: a Case Study in Hebrew and French". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13.3:445-487.
- Sleeman, Petra and Els Verheugd. 1998. "Licensing DP-internal Predication". In A. Schwegler, B. Tranel, and M. Uribe-Etxebarria (eds.) *Romance Linguistics. Theoretical Perspectives*. 271-283. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Zwarts, Frans. 1981. "Negatief Polaire Uitdrukkingen". *Glott* 4:35-132.