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Abstract
Spanish infinitives often display a mixed behaviour between verbs and nouns: morphosyntactically and semantically, nominal infinitives (e.g., el fluir del agua) resemble deverbal nominalisations, while verbal infinitives (e.g., el ver un artículo de gran calibre) behave like sentences. In addition, verbal infinitives are factive in the sense that they can be paraphrased with the fact that-sentences. In this article, factivity is analysed as a pragmatic phenomenon that correlates with the assertion of a proposition and relevance to discourse (informativity). Therefore, the non-factivity of nominal infinitives in Spanish is firstly explained by their referential properties: nominal infinitives often display indefinite determination. This corresponds to a presentation of the event in the irrealis mode, leading to an incompatibility with the factive interpretation. Secondly, a collostructional analysis of the verbs appearing as nominal infinitives reveals that nominal infinitives typically appear with verbs expressing events of low transitivity. Since transitivity is argued to correlate to informativity in discourse, and the presentation of an event as factive presupposes a high degree of informativity, nominal infinitives are less likely to receive a factive interpretation than verbal infinitives. The morphosyntactic differences between the two construction types are thus argued to derive from their distinct typical functions in discourse.

1. Introduction

Spanish infinitives often display a mixed behaviour between verbs and nouns (Hernanz 1999; Rodríguez Espiñeira 2008). The class of Spanish ‘eventive infinitives’ (Fábregas & Varela 2006) illustrates this categoriality problem: morphosyntactically and semantically, nominal infinitives (e.g., el fluir del agua) resemble deverbal nominalisations, while verbal infinitives (e.g., el ver un artículo de gran calibre) behave like sentences. In addition, verbal infinitives are factive in the sense that they occur as the complement of factive verbs and can be paraphrased with the fact that-constructions. In this article, it will be shown that contrary to traditional assumptions, factivity is a text-organisational phenomenon that implies assertion and informativity. On the level of the morphosyntactic properties of factive complements, this results in two restrictions: factive complements cannot be indefinite or display a low transitivity.

The distinction between Spanish nominal and verbal infinitives is thus treated as a case example of how information structure and morphosyntactic properties interact.

This paper is organised as follows: In section 2, a short overview concerning the morphosyntactic and semantic properties of nominal and verbal infinitives will be given.

---

1 This article would not have been possible without the constant help and guidance by Daniel Jacob and Marco García García. Moreover, I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for her/his valuable feedback.
In section 3, different approaches to factivity will be compared. Following Halliday & Hasan (1976), facts will be characterised as a text-organisational category. However, in order for a complement to be used factively it has to fulfil certain prerequisites. In section 4, the morphosyntactic structure of verbal infinitives is analysed as a reflex of these prerequisites: on the one hand, verbal infinitives preclude indefinite determination because facts are inherently asserted. On the other hand, verbal infinitives can display high transitivity while nominal infinitives cannot. A collosorical analysis shows that nominal infinitives are much more likely to occur with unaccusative than unergative verbs. It will be proposed that it is more probable for transitive relations to be treated as facts than intransitive relations because high transitivity also implies a higher degree of informativity and thus relevance to the discourse. In section 5, the main findings of the article are summarised.

2. Nominal and verbal infinitives in Spanish

Spanish infinitives display modification by determiners and adjuncts:

(1) Escucho cómo estira la cadena de la cisterna y el fluir del agua con un ruido continuo y breve (CdE).
   ‘I can hear how he pulls the small chain of the tank and the flow (lit. flowing) of the water with a continuous and short sound’

(2) Hoy día me causa satisfacción el ver un artículo de gran calibre en las mejores publicaciones de gente de la Universidad de Baleares o de Alicante (CdE).
   ‘Today it pleases me to see (lit. the seeing of) an article of great importance in the best publications from people from the Universidad de Baleares or Alicante’

(3) Todos estos escritores se preocupan por el hombre, en general ¿ah?... [...] por la situación del hombre en el mundo, por... eh... el estar el hombre en el mundo, el moverse en él, cómo vive este hombre (CdE).
   ‘All of these writers are worried about mankind, in general, ah?... [...] about man’s situation in the world, about... eh... man’s existence (lit. the man’s being in the world), his moving around in it, how this man lives’

On the basis of the different clustering of morphosyntactic properties in Spanish

deteminers + infinitive constructions, Varela (1979) argues for a division of these constructions into the classes of nominal and verbal infinitives. The agent of the event described by nominal infinitives is realised as an oblique noun phrase by means of the preposition de, as in (1), whereas in verbal infinitives as (2) and (3) participants can be realised without morphological markers. Nominal infinitives are restricted to

---

2 CdE refers to the Corpus del Español (Davies 2002- ). Examples not marked for sources are introspective.
3 The use of eventive infinitives seems to be most prominent in academic and poetic language use. The examples chosen for this article reflect these discourse features.
intransitive construals, while verbal infinitives are not. While verbal infinitives appear exclusively with the definite determiner *el*, nominal infinitives can take indefinite determiners (4), as well as possessive pronouns (5). Finally, only nominal infinitives allow for adjectival modification (6), whereas only verbal infinitives appear with auxiliaries and negation (7). The morphosyntactic features mentioned in the literature are summed up in Table 1 below.

(4) La puerta cedió con un chirriar de visagras [sic] oxidadas (CdE).
‘The door closed with a creak of rusty hinges’

(5) ...uno de los magistrados felicitó a los policías actuantes por la eficiencia de su accionar y recomendó la detención del sujeto apodado Batata (CdE).
‘...one of the magistrates congratulated the police men who had taken part for the efficiency of their actions (lit. their acting) and recommended the detention of the person nicknamed Batata’

(6) De repente, había sentido el crujir imperceptible del entablado, luego otro rumor, un silencio, y otro... (CdE).
‘All of a sudden, he had heard the imperceptible creak of the floorboards, later another sound, a silence, and another one...’

(7) Desde el punto de vista de la investigación básica, ha sido un poco frustrante el no haber podido dilucidar el mecanismo responsable de la superconductividad (CdE).
‘From the point of view of the basic investigation, it has been a little frustrating that we have not been able to explain the mechanism responsible for superconductivity’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oblique agent</th>
<th>Transitive construal</th>
<th>Possessive pronoun</th>
<th>Indefinite article</th>
<th>Adjectival modification</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal infinitives</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal infinitives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Morphosyntactic features of nominative and verbal infinitives

According to Varela (1979), these mutually exclusive morphosyntactic features mirror the fact that the nominal and verbal infinitives are different constructions: while nominal infinitives can basically be regarded as nominalisations, verbal infinitives seem to have retained their sentential value to a much greater extent. However, Hernanz (1999) adduces determiner + infinitive constructions that to a certain extent debase Varela’s (1979) claim of mutual exclusiveness of the given morphosyntactic features:

(8) Asistiendo a su infatigable tomar el rábano por las hojas (Hernanz 1999).
‘Attending his tireless being at a fault (lit. grabbing the radish at its leaves)’

In (8), the presence of a possessive pronoun and an adjectival point to an interpretation as a nominal infinitive. Yet the direct object is governed by the verb, rather than connected by adnominal case, thus ruling out the criterion of ‘transitive construal’. However, one might ask whether (8) actually is an example of transitive construal, since
the expression *tomar el rábano por las hojas* can be taken to be a lexicalised idiom with
the opaque meaning ‘to be at a fault’ (literally: ‘to grab the radish at its leaves’). For now,
it will be assumed that nominal and verbal infinitives occupy different positions on the
following nominalisation cline:

SENTENCE > VERBAL INFINITIVE > NOMINAL INFINITIVE > DEVERBAL NOMINALISATION > NOUN

The construction types further to the right of the cline resemble nouns, while the
construction types further to the left resemble sentences. This nominalisation cline will
receive further motivation in chapter 4.2.

A number of authors argue that in addition to the different morphosyntactic features
attested by Varela (1979), the two infinitive constructions also display a different
semantics (Demonte & Varela 1996; 1997; Fábregas & Varela 2006). Thus, nominal
infinitives are restricted regarding verb aspect: assuming a Vendlerian event typology,
nominal infinitives are almost exclusively activities, whereas verbal infinitives do not
show any aspectual restrictions (cf. table 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>activity</th>
<th>Nominal infinitives</th>
<th>Verbal infinitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>*El saber inglés de Paula (fue presenciado) (Fábregas &amp; Varela 2006)</td>
<td>El haber esperado yo allí tanto tiempo resultó inútil (Varela 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish-</td>
<td>*el reconvalescer de Juana el ir y venir de la juventud estudiantil (CdE)</td>
<td>Al principio el mismo no saber francés me servía para disimular mi ignorancia en mecánica (De Bruyne &amp; Gütschow 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement</td>
<td>*el nacer del niño</td>
<td>El nacer el niño tan temprano nos asustó.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Aspectual restrictions of nominal and verbal infinitives

It seems to be the temporal structure of the event described by the nominal infinitive
construction that conditions these aspectual restrictions: nominal infinitives need to be
temporally unbounded, while verbal infinitives can be temporally bounded (De Miguel
1996; Demonte & Varela 1996; 1997). Accomplishment predicates like *ir y venir* (‘to
come and go’) are therefore interpreted as iterative in nominal infinitives. This
observation seems to lend further support to the interpretation of nominal infinitives as
nominalisations: while in sentences aspectual distinctions are typically marked with
morphological means, nominalisations lack this morphology and are therefore more
restricted regarding aspect (Hopper & Thompson 1984: 737-738).
Moreover, the two construction types display a contrast of semantic sorts. As described above, nominal infinitives can be interpreted as atelic processes or results of an action. Verbal infinitives, by contrast, are factive: they can be paraphrased with a sentence including a *the fact that*-construction and regularly occur in the context of predicates expressing psychological attitudes:

(9) Desde el punto de vista de la investigación básica, ha sido un poco frustrante {el no haber podido dilucidar el mecanismo responsable de la superconductividad (CdE) / el hecho de que no hubiéramos podido dilucidar el mecanismo responsable de la superconductividad}.

By contrast, a nominal infinitive in combination with such predicates results in what Varela (1979) calls ‘modal meaning’: the psychological state expressed by the predicate is not caused by a global fact, but by the manner in which a specific event has come to be realised:

(10) Me molestó {el cantar de Juana / el modo de cantar de Juana / #el hecho de que cantara Juana⁴}. ‘{Juana’s singing / Juana’s way of singing / the fact that Juana sang} bothered me’

In Vendler’s (1967) sorted logic, entities, events, and facts are distinguished by their relationship to the world. While the primary domain of conceptualisation of entities is space, the chief defining characteristic of events is their temporal extension. By contrast, facts have neither a spatial nor temporal existence (Vendler 1967: 144-145). Lyons (1977) characterises facts as ‘third-order entities’: while entities and sometimes events are assumed to have referents (Davidson 1967), facts as linguistic propositions are not (Lyons 1977). This accounts for the incompatibility of verbal infinitives with perceptual verbs or spatial or temporal adverbials:

(11) El escribir el hombre la carta no causará ningún perjuicio (Varela 1979: 536). ‘The man’s writing the letter will not cause any harm’
(12) *Me enteré del escribir el hombre la carta. ‘I found out that the man wrote the letter’
(13) *El escribir el hombre la carta tuvo lugar en Atenas. ‘The man’s writing the letter happened in Athens’
(14) *El escribir el hombre la carta duró toda la tarde. ‘The man’s writing the letter lasted all evening’

In the light of the differences in morphosyntactic and semantic features of the two constructions, most authors have followed Varela’s (1979) claim that nominal infinitives should be treated as nominalisations, whereas verbal infinitives basically behave like

---

⁴ Varela’s intuition has been confirmed by my Spanish informants.
sentences. Hence, De Miguel (1996) notes that nominal infinitives like *el cantar de Juana* can actually receive two interpretations: either as activities (*Juana’s singing*) or results (*Juana’s song*). Crucially, this semantic ambivalence has also been attested for deverbal nominalisations (De Miguel 1996: 41). A deverbal nominalisation like *construction* can either be interpreted as the result of a construction process (an object), or the construction process itself (Grimshaw 1990). In both cases, pluralisation precludes the activity interpretation:

\[\text{(15) Las construcciones fueron \{derribadas / *paralizadas\} (De Miguel 1996: 42).}\]

‘The constructions {were demolished / came to a standstill}’

\[\text{(16) Los cantares de Juana \{me emocionaron / *cesaron\}.}\]

‘Juana’s singings {moved me / stopped}’

However, treating nominal infinitives as nominalisations inevitably leads to two descriptional problems. On the one hand, in Spanish deverbal nominalisations are created using derivational morphology like the –ción-suffix. By contrast, no overt derivational morphology can be found in nominal infinitives. Therefore, De Miguel (1996) claims the existence of two homophonous suffixes in nominal and verbal infinitives, respectively: in nominal infinitives, -r is a nominalisation marker, while in verbal infinitives -r has to be treated as an inflectional suffix:

The data examined up to now seem to confirm the hypothesis that [...] there are two kinds of infinitival forms, depending on the nature of the infinitive morpheme in every case. I propose, then, that there are two homophonous morphemes. One of them is derivational [...]. This nominalizing affix attaches to a verbal stem and recategorizes it as [+N] [...]. The other –r is an inflectional affix. Hence, it does not impose any semantic constraint on the verbal stem and does not recategorize it as [+N] (De Miguel 1996: 44-45).

This argumentation does not transcend the intuition that nominal infinitives are, effectively, more nominal than verbal infinitives, and thus seems circular. Instead of simply posing this difference, it seems more reasonable to argue that the distinct positions of nominal and verbal infinitives on the nominalisation cline are motivated by the differences in terms of their morphosyntax, and especially the distinct ways the participants are coded: in the case of nominal infinitives, the realisation of the sole participant with the adnominal case marker *de* leads to a nominal interpretation. By

---

5 Varela (1979) argues that plural infinitives like (16) are ‘false infinitives’: historically, they underwent a lexicalisation to nouns. However, this does not invalidate De Miguel’s (1996) observation. Be it from a historical or synchronic derivational perspective, pluralisation seems to coerce a nominal interpretation and thus inhibit an interpretation of the infinitive / noun as process.
contrast, in the case of verbal infinitives the realisation of the participant as a subject leads to a sentential interpretation.

On the other hand, to treat nominal infinitives as nominalisations yields only limited insight as to the question of the factivity of verbal infinitives. The accounts mentioned until now in this article rightly predict that only sentence-like constructions (i.e., verbal infinitives) can assume a factive interpretation. However, it will be shown in chapter 4 that the factivity of Spanish verbal infinitives does not arise haphazardly from a similarity to sentences but correlates with a very specific set of morphosyntactic properties of this construction. To this end, different approaches to the factivity will be evaluated in the next chapter.

3. Factivity: verbal or textual category?

In many accounts, factivity is claimed to be the presupposition of the truth of a proposition (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1971; Lleó 1976; Zubizarreta 2001). Thus, according to Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1971), “the speaker presupposes that the embedded clause expresses a true proposition, and makes some assertion about that proposition” (348). Furthermore, the authors assume a distinction between factive and non-factive predicates, depending on whether these predicates presuppose the truth of a dependent sentence or not (355-356). However, this assumption leads to syntax-semantics-mismatches, as the authors themselves acknowledge: Verbs like know, realize, though semantically factive, are syntactically non-factive, so that *I know the fact that John is here and *I know John’s being here are ungrammatical, whereas the propositional constructions are acceptable: I know him to be here. (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1971: 348).

Moreover, there seem to exist predicates that are ambiguous with regard to their factivity. Depending on their complement, verbs like explain seem to be polysemous:

(17) I explained Adam’s refusing to come to the phone (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1971: 361).
(18) I explained that he was watching his favorite TV show (ibid.).

Crucially, English gerund constructions like the complement in (17) have been taken to be factive (Lees 1963; Vendler 1967; Heyvaert 2003a; 2003b). By contrast, in (18) the explanation refers to another state of affairs (e.g., that he will not answer the phone), justifying a non-factive interpretation of the complement. The same factivity contrast can be construed with Spanish verbal infinitives:
This can be taken to imply that factivity can arise without truth-presupposing matrix predicates. Thus, in the context of a factive complement even non-psychological predicates like *servir* (‘make use of’) are compatible with the factive interpretation:

(21) Al principio el mismo no saber francés me servía para disimular mi ignorancia en mecánica (De Bruyne & Gütschow 2002).

‘In the beginning I made use of the very fact that I did not know French in order to hide my ignorance regarding mechanics’

If factivity is not an exclusive property of the matrix verb, where is it to be situated? An alternative approach would be to assume for factivity to be a property of propositions. In this line of thought, factivity is a pragmatic phenomenon. Halliday & Hasan (1976) and Halliday (1994) have argued that factivity is determined by discourse structure and, more specifically, by the dichotomies between *embedding* and *taxis*, as well as *projection* and *expansion*, regarding complement clauses. On the one hand, complement clauses display different behaviours with respect to their structural connection to the matrix clause. While (22) can be characterised as an embedded constituent of the matrix clause, (23) seems to be a clausal complement since it is connected to the matrix clause by (hypo)-taxis. The different structural scope of the two complements can be illustrated by the fact that in English they are referred to with different anaphoric particles (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 132-133). Thus, embedding seems to be an important corollary to factivity. Moreover, it can be related to nominalisation processes (cf. Heyvaert 2003a, 2003b).

(22) I regret that it is raining (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1971: 348).

I regret {*it/*so}.

(23) I suppose that it is raining (ibid.).

I suppose {*it/*so}.

On the other hand, the projection/expansion- dichotomy concerns the relationship between the semiotic statuses of two sentences in discourse. When two sentences are connected by expansion, both are situated on the plane of “direct representation of (non-linguistic) experience” (Halliday 1994). Projection, by contrast, involves a qualitative difference in the semiotics of the clauses: “Expansion relates phenomena of being of the same order of experience, while projection relates phenomena to phenomena of higher order of experience (‘semiotic phenomena – what people say and think’)” (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 377). The projection criterion of Halliday and his
collaborators thus is ontological: A projection is a ‘saying through others’, and thus some kind of pre-packaged information. Both facts and ‘reports’ viz. (in)direct speech are projections (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 132). However, reports are connected to the matrix clause by taxis, while facts are necessarily embedded complement clauses.

Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) interpretation of factivity is supported by the observations that Davidse (2003) makes about the problematic authorship of factivity. Following Delacruz (1976), she distinguishes between ‘speaker’ and ‘processer’ factivity, depending on which speech participant is affirming that the event described is true. Hence, a sentence like (24) that is factive under a Kiparskyan analysis can actually be interpreted in two ways. The proposition that John resigned is either a fact to both the speaker and to Bill, or only to Bill (Davidse 2003: 116):

(24) Bill regrets that John resigned (ibid.).

She then goes on to find examples that exclusively show one of these types of factivity. While in (25) both the speaker and the processer (the council) regard the embedded proposition to be a fact, in (26) the speaker need not coincide in the processer’s (the 37 year-old) opinion:

(25) The council have woke [sic] up to the fact that Glasgow and a lot of areas are slums (Davidse 2003: 122).
(26) What the 37 year-old finds most soul destroying about Haiti is the fact that things have not changed since his childhood (ibid.).

Moreover, Davidse (2003) shows that the different types of factivity are typically correlated to certain discourse contexts (121-124), thus lending support to the hypothesis that factivity is a discourse-organisational phenomenon. The uncertainty of the authorship of facts is further evidence for the relative autonomy of factive complements vis-à-vis their matrix clauses.

In this section, objections against a definition of factivity rooted solely in the matrix predicate have been raised. It has been argued that, instead of assuming that linguistic elements impose a factive interpretation, they have to be regarded as a reflex of semantic restrictions that follow from the presentation of an event as factive in discourse. Consequently, it will be shown in the following chapters that the morphosyntactic features of Spanish verbal infinitives are motivated by two conceptual

---

6 Davidse (2003) moreover claims that there exist factives which are assumed to be facts by the speaker alone (124-125).
properties of factivity. On the one hand, facts are necessarily asserted. This leads to restrictions in the (in)definiteness of verbal infinitives. On the other hand, factivity interacts with informativity: the high transitivity of verbal infinitives is claimed to result from factivity because of the triangular correlation between factivity, informativity, and transitivity.

4. Assertion and informativity as prerequisites of factivity

4.1. Assertion and definiteness

While nominal infinitives quite often display indefinite determination, verbal infinitives are constrained to definite determination:

(27) Lo devuelve a la realidad un crujir de hojas sueltas y una sombra amenazadora que se acerca (CdE).
'A crackle of loose leaves and a menacing shadowing approaching returns him to reality'

(28) *Un escribir el hombre la carta no causará ningún perjuicio.
Lit. 'A writing the man the letter will not cause any harm'

In order to explain this contrast, the question of the determination of atypical nouns has to be addressed. The concept of grounding, which has been developed in the framework of Cognitive Grammar (CG), allows for the characterisation of the communalities of (noun-specific) determination and (sentence-specific) finiteness (Langacker 1987; 2002a; 2002b). In CG, the ground represents the knowledge structures of all the participants of the speech event: the conceptualisations of the speech event, of the speech participants themselves, and the situational context (Langacker 2002b: 7). By relating a linguistic element to the ground via grounding, its referent becomes identifiable:

The aim of grounding a predication is to establish mental contact with, or direct someone's attention to, a referent which discourse participants are presumably able to determine, given 1) the semantic content of the „phrase“ to which the grounding predication attaches, and 2) the nature of the grounding relation proper (Brisard 2002b: xv).

Hence, grounding is an important prerequisite for the act of communication itself to be successful:

It is of great cognitive and communicative utility to the conceptualizers to relate a situation to their own circumstances, whereas merely contemplating a situation type in the abstract, with no indication of its epistemic status, is essentially pointless (Langacker 2002b: 20).
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As will be shown later on, non-grounded entities are therefore either unidentifiable or at best receive a generic interpretation. Langacker’s commentary already implies that the concept of grounding is wide enough to accommodate the fact that both noun phrases and sentences can be grounded. Both entities and events have a particular pragmatic status in a given world of discourse (Rijkhoff & Seibt 2005: 97). This presupposes an extensional view on event structure: events behave like entities and thus have a cognitive representation, and consequently a referent (Davidson 1967). However, grounding is assumed to have a different locus in nominal groups and sentences. On the one hand, the function of the determiner in nominal groups has long been considered to be the coding of the identifiability or accessibility of the referent to the hearer:

Speakers encode a nominal referent as definite when they assume that it is identifiable or accessible to the hearer. Definiteness is thus a profoundly pragmatic affair from the word go, having to do with the speaker’s assessment of the hearer’s current state of knowledge at a given point in the communication (Givón 2001: 459).

On the other hand, in sentences grounding seems to be realised by finiteness. Resuming a distinction made by Halliday (1994), Kristin Davidse argues that the finite verb morphology determines the relative temporal and epistemic distance of the speech participants to the ground (1997: 424-425). Non-finiteness has a similar effect as lack of definiteness: the type of event or entity expressed by the verb or noun will not be connected to the speech event, and thus usually be interpreted generically. By contrast, when a verb is finite, the event can be marked either as existent (realis) or not existent (irrealis). An event marked as irrealis has not (yet) been introduced to the discourse world, exactly like an indefinite noun. By contrast, an event marked as realis does have a place in the discourse world, in the same manner a definite noun does. Rijkhoff & Seibt (2005) summarise these two symmetries as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun Phrase (thing)</th>
<th>Occurrence in world of discourse</th>
<th>Clause (event)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>Grounded in discourse world</td>
<td>Realis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonspecific-indefinite</td>
<td>Not grounded in discourse world</td>
<td>Irrealis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The symmetry between the grounding of noun phrases and clauses (Rijkhoff & Seibt 2005: 102)

When reconsidering the question of the role of determination in Spanish nominal and verbal infinitives in the light of these assumptions, it becomes clear that determiners in those constructions ground the event expressed by the infinitive in the discourse world. With respect to determination, nominal infinitives basically behave like prototypical
nouns: indefinite nominal infinitives are typically used to introduce atelic events that until then have not been mentioned. Example (27), repeated for convenience as (29) below, illustrates this fact nicely. By contrast, definite nominal infinitives will be used when an event has already been mentioned or is motivated by the discourse. Hence, in (1), repeated as (30), *fluir del agua* has already been anticipated by the action of flushing the toilet (*estira la cadenilla de la cisterna*):

(29) Lo devuelve a la realidad un crujir de hojas sueltas y una sombra amenazadora que se acerca (CdE).
(30) Escucho cómo estira la cadenilla de la cisterna y el fluir del agua con un ruido continuo y breve (CdE).

However, verbal infinitives only allow for definite determination. After introducing Halliday & Hasan’s (1976) criteria for factivity, this constraint can be explained straightforwardly. Since facts are projections, viz. pre-packaged information units the author of which is not always obvious, they necessarily have to be treated as grounded in the discourse world. Regardless of the matrix predicate or internal negation, factive complements are intrinsically asserted. It is interesting to note that the fact that-clauses behave in the same way as Spanish verbal infinitives in that they do not allow for indefiniteness:

(31) The fact that all of this happened without my knowledge irritated me
(32) *A fact that all of this happened without my knowledge irritated me

Heyvaert (2003a) claims that the fact that-clauses are “reified and construed as an abstract entity [...]. Like proper names, factive that-clauses establish an entity which is definite in itself and can therefore function as a fully grounded nominal” (210). Since affirmation seems to be a prerequisite for factivity, the definiteness of Spanish verbal infinitives is a strong predictor of their factivity.

However, it is clear from the discussion that definite determination cannot be the only corollary to factivity, since there do exist examples of nominal infinitives with definite determination (examples involving the definite determiner *el* or a possessive determiner like *su*) which nonetheless do not receive a factive interpretation, as in (30). Therefore, in the following two sections the typical contrast in factivity for nominal and verbal infinitives will be motivated by the relationship between the degree of transitive construal expressed by these construction and their informativity in discourse.
4.2 Nominal and verbal infinitives: a contrast in transitivity

In addition to the difference in definiteness, Spanish nominal and verbal infinitives also differ with respect to their argument structure. It has been noted above that in nominal infinitives the agent of the atelic process denoted by the verb is realised by a noun group with adnominal case. By contrast, in verbal infinitives the agent of the event is coded as a nominative subject (cf. table 1). The distinct realisation of the event’s participants seems to have implications as to the preferred argument structure of the two constructions. It is striking that in nominal infinitives, the primary participant’s semantic role is highly restricted. The sole argument of nominal infinitives is typically a theme argument (as in *el crujir imperceptible del entablado, el fluir del agua*). Hence, it does not have control over its actions, and shows a high degree of affectedness. Moreover, nominal infinitives with unergative verbs coerce a non-agentive semantics on their argument. By contrast, verbal infinitives frequently appear with agentive subjects.

Given that the subjects of unaccusative verbs have been frequently argued to behave like the objects of transitive verbs (among others, Perlmutter 1978; Burzio 1986; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995), it seems plausible to assume a high percentage of unaccusative verbs in nominal infinitive constructions. In order to confirm this hypothesis, a collostructional analysis was conducted for all nominal infinitives in the Corpus del Español. Collostructional analysis (Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003; Gries & Stefanowitsch 2004; Gries 2007) use the frequencies of a word within a certain construction, all other words in that construction, all instances of the word attested in the corpus and the corpus size to compute the expected frequency of the word in that construction. This expected frequency of the word in a construction is then compared to its attested frequency in the construction using the statistical tool of the Fisher-Yates-exact test. The result of this operation is the relative binding strength of a word to a construction, which has been termed *collocational strength* (see the last column of table 4). A collocational strength value higher than 1.3 indicates that the relation (attraction or repulsion) between lexical item and construction attested by the analysis is statistically significant. Table 4 shows the ten infinitives with the highest probability of appearing in the nominal infinitive construction:

---

For the whole table including the frequency measures and further information on the statistical tests involved in the collostruction analysis, please compare the appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Collostructional strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORRER</td>
<td>'to run'</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>46,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESURGIR</td>
<td>'to resurrect'</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>45,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESPERTAR</td>
<td>'to wake up'</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>27,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLUIR</td>
<td>'to flow'</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>25,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECHINAR</td>
<td>'to creak, grind'</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>21,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETUMBAR</td>
<td>'to resound, thunder'</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>20,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENACER</td>
<td>'to grow again, be reborn'</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>18,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULULAR</td>
<td>'to howl, hoot'</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>16,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRONAR</td>
<td>'to thunder'</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>16,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAJINAR</td>
<td>'to hustle about'</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>16,11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Collostructional analysis of nominal infinitives: Ten highest rating verbs

Under the ten verbs most attracted to nominal infinitives, we find verbs of emission (*rechinar, retumbar, tronar*), verbs of manner of motion (*correr, fluir, trajinar*), and verbs of externally and internally caused change of state (*resurgir, despertar, renacer*). The verbs of these verb classes are usually analysed as unaccusatives, since its sole arguments are interpreted as themes (e.g., Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995, Pustejovsky 1995). Likewise, the activity verb *ulular* typically involves non-human, and thus less agentive participants.

*Correr* is an interesting case. As is well known in the literature on unaccusativity, verbs like *correr* alternate systematically between an interpretation as an activity and a manner of motion verb. In the context of nominal infinitives, however, the ‘manner of motion’-interpretation is clearly predominant. Hence, in the 54 instances of nominal infinitives with *correr* found in the 20th century in the CdE, its by far most frequent arguments are inanimate-theme nouns like *tiempo* ('time', 17 instances) and *años* ('years', 13 instances). The only animate participant found with *correr* is *caballos* ('horses', 1 instance) (cf. table 8 in the appendix). Moreover, in unergative nominal infinitives like *el cantar de Juana*, the event will not be interpreted as a controlled activity, as the verb class of *cantar* would suggest. Rather than being treated as the agent of the event, the use of the preposition *de* seems to favour an interpretation of *Juana* as the possessor of a certain quality of singing. This relates closely to Varela’s (1979) observation that nominal infinitives have a ‘modal meaning’. The analysis of the arguments of ambivalent and unergative verbs in nominal infinitive constructions thus

---

8 The verb classes are taken from Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995).
supports the hypothesis that the nominal infinitive construction coerces a non-agentive interpretation on the verb argument.

By contrast, in verbal infinitives no bias regarding the argument structure of the verbs was found. Thus, unergative verbs (as in el escribir el hombre la carta) as well as unaccusative verbs (as in el nacer el niño tan temprano) are possible in the verbal infinitive construction, and the construction does not seem to influence the semantics of the verb arguments.

Until now, it has been shown that nominal and verbal infinitives display differences as to the aspectual properties of the verbs, their argument structure, determination, and certain other semantic and morphosyntactic properties like negation and auxiliation. Crucially, these differences can be correlated to the list of transitivity parameters set up by Hopper and Thompson (1980):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. PARTICIPANTS</td>
<td>2 or more participants, A and O</td>
<td>1 participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. KINESIS</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>non-action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ASPECT</td>
<td>telic</td>
<td>atelic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. PUNCTUAILITY</td>
<td>punctual</td>
<td>non-punctual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. VOLITIONAILITY</td>
<td>volitional</td>
<td>non-volitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. AFFIRMATION</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. MODE</td>
<td>realis</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. AGENCY</td>
<td>A high in potency</td>
<td>A low in potency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. AFFECTEDNESS OF O</td>
<td>O totally affected</td>
<td>O not affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. INDIVIDUATION OF O</td>
<td>O highly individuated</td>
<td>O non-individuated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Transitivity parameters (Hopper & Thompson 1980: 252)

When comparing the relevant criteria for the distinction between the two infinitive constructions, nominal infinitives consistently display low transitivity (right column) while verbal infinitives can be highly transitive (left column). Thus, verbal infinitives allow for two or more arguments, while nominal infinitives typically only allow for one (parameter A). Nominal infinitives are restricted to atelic processes, while verbal infinitives are not (parameter C). This also entails differences in punctuality (parameter D). In section 4.1, it has been shown that verbal infinitives necessarily display realis mode, while nominal infinitives do not (parameter G). Finally, the differences in argument structure established in this chapter point towards an interpretation of the
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9 I owe this observation to Marco García García.
arguments of nominal infinitives as non-volitional and low in potency (parameters E and H), while these restrictions do not apply for verbal infinitives.

The difference in degree of transitivity displayed by nominal and verbal infinitives can be taken to motivate the terminology used until this point. On the nominalisation cline sketched in chapter 2, the linguistic items further to the right resemble nouns, are lower in transitivity, and thus more restricted regarding the parameters mentioned until now than items further to the left. To motivate the different positions of the two constructions on the nominalisation cline by their differences in transitivity overcomes the circular argumentation that nominal infinitives are nominal because they display nominalisation morphology. Moreover, this assumption also accounts for the fact that verbal infinitives do not preclude auxiliation and negation.

The results from this chapter could be taken to imply a correlation between the degree of transitive construal and the factivity of Spanish infinitive constructions: verbal infinitives typically fulfil more of the transitivity parameters by Hopper & Thompson (1980) and are more liable to receive a factive interpretation. That is, the possibility of interpreting verbal infinitives as facts seems to be a result of their resemblance to sentences. However, this idea does not yet allow for an explanation of this correlation, since high transitivity seems to be a necessary, but not exhaustive requirement for factivity. This explanatory gap will be closed in the following chapter by arguing that that a second prerequisite for factivity is informativity, and that informativity correlates with high transitivity.

4.3 Informativity and factivity

A defining property of transitive relations compared to intransitive relations is that the former are able to impose order on their two arguments (Brandt & García García 2010a). In the sentence Anna hits Otto, an asymmetrical situation is depicted. This asymmetry results in some of the transitivity parameters set up by Hopper & Thompson (1980): Anna has control over Otto, Anna is agentive, the situation is highly kinetic, etc. By contrast, intransitive relations are always symmetrical. In set theory, an example like Anna sleeps and Otto sleeps could be paraphrased as The predicate sleeps is true of Anna and Otto. This amounts to showing a symmetry between Anna and Otto. The two types of relations can be typified as follows:
On the interplay between transitivity, factivity and informativity

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & xRy \supseteq yRx & \text{symmetric} \\
\text{b. } & xRy \supseteq \neg(yRx) & \text{asymmetric (Brandt & García García 2010a)}
\end{align*} \]

As the formal representation from Brandt & García García (2010a) illustrates, by negating a formal symmetry between the two participants of the situation two-place transitive relations allow for a much higher number of other states of affairs (control, agentivity, affectedness) to be true than one-place intransitive relations. Consequently, transitive relations can be assumed to have a higher potential of being relevant to a discourse situation than intransitive relations.

In the following, the term *informativity* will be used to describe the relevance of a proposition in a given discourse context: Some propositions have a higher potential to be predictable from the context than others. Since intransitive relations are more restricted as to the number of states of affairs they can express, they can be said to be more predictable from the context, and thus less informative than transitive relations. Consider a sentence involving an example like (4), repeated here as (33). The nominal infinitive *un chirriar de visagras [sic] oxidadas* is relatively predictable from the context since *creaking* is an activity frequently realised by hinges. The nominal infinitive in (33) thus addresses background knowledge presupposed by the hearer, leading to a relatively low degree of informativity:

(33) La puerta cedió con un chirriar de visagras [sic] oxidadas (CdE).
‘The door closed with a creak of rusty hinges’

The reason for the low informativity of nominal infinitives can thus be said to reside in that the predicate expressed by a nominal infinitive will usually be interpreted as a property of its sole argument. This follows from its low transitivity, and especially the realisation of the argument with adnominal case marking. The genitival *de* seems to imply presupposed relationships. Therefore, the noun-verb-pairs in nominal infinitives could be expected to be natural collocates: *creak* will often appear in the context of *door*. Hence, nominal infinitives can be argued to refer to states of affairs that are presupposed in the speech participants’ background knowledge and are thus not very relevant to the discourse. Effectively, paraphrasing *el chirriar de bisagras oxidadas* as the factive sentence (34) yields a proposition that in comparison to the paraphrase (35) of the verbal infinitive *el haber andado el niño por allí* as a factive sentence gives less new information, and will with a greater probability be judged as true by hearers:
Resuming the discussion of nominal infinitives involving activity verbs in chapter 4.2, a nominal infinitive like *el cantar de Juana* thus seems to present this activity as inherent to its argument *Juana*. The depiction of *cantar* as an inherent quality of *Juana* reflects a rather low degree of informativity: presumably, this nominal infinitive will be used when the speech participants share the knowledge that *Juana* habitually sings.

By contrast, verbal infinitives typically display high transitivity and consequently can be argued to be more informative. Effectively, the realisation or inferability of the event’s agent participant seems to be indispensable to a factive interpretation of verbal infinitives:

(36) ...por la cual la combinación de fumar en exceso y *el tener un colesterol bajo* ponen al individuo en un riesgo mucho mayor comparado con otros... (CdE)  
‘...which is why the combination of smoking excessively and having low cholesterol levels exposes the individual to a much greater risk compared to others’

(37) Desde el punto de vista de la investigación básica, ha sido un poco frustrante *el no haber podido dilucidar el mecanismo responsable de la superconductividad* (CdE)  
‘From the point of view of the basic investigation, it has been a little frustrating that we have not been able to explain the mechanism responsible for superconductivity’

(38) *El escribir la carta* fue un gran alivio.  
Lit. ‘The writing the letter was a great relief’

Verbal infinitives without an overtly realised subject as (36) are likely to be interpreted as generic. In this context, genericity seems to exclude factivity. By contrast, the verbal infinitive in (37) is interpreted as a fact since the agent of the action denoted by the verbal infinitive can be inferred from the context. Example (38) is not adequate without a specific context since the agent participant is neither realised overtly nor inferable from the context. In the light of the considerations on transitivity and factivity proposed in this chapter, it can be argued that the realisation or inferability of an agent participant is an especially salient indicator of high transitivity and thus high informativity.

The view that factivity is dependent on informativity entails a definition of factivity as a gradient phenomenon. The example of nominal and verbal infinitives seems to corroborate this assumption to some extent. Hence, a nominal infinitive in which both a participant realising an action and a theme are present can be argued to be more acceptable in factive contexts than prototypical intransitive nominal infinitives. Hence,
the nominal infinitive (39) seems slightly more acceptable in factive contexts than the nominal infinitive (40):

(39) Me molestó su continuo crujir de dientes.
    Me molestó {el hecho de que crujiera los dientes / cómo crujía los dientes}
    ‘His continuous grinding his teeth bothered me’

(40) Me molestó el fluir del agua.
    Me molestó {el hecho de que fluyera el agua / cómo fluía el agua}
    ‘The flow of the water bothered me’

Finally, the gradience of factivity results from its status as a discourse-induced property. More precisely, what is gradient is not factivity itself but the listener’s interpretation of factivity. This interpretation is guided by at least three of the criteria for factivity that have been mentioned in the course of this article: the availability of a psychological (‘factive’) matrix predicate, the assertion of the proposition, and a high informativity value of that proposition in the specific discourse situation.

5. Conclusion

In this article, it has been argued that the distinction between Spanish nominal and verbal infinitives is less rigid than hitherto assumed. Nominal and verbal infinitives occupy different positions on a nominalisation cline, with nominal infinitives closer to deverbal nominalisations than verbal infinitives. Rather than assuming the existence of two homophonous derivational morphemes –r, the difference between nominal and verbal infinitives is a result of their being used in different contexts. Nominal infinitives resemble nouns in that their referents are presupposed in the discourse. This is reflected in the use of adnominal case. By contrast, verbal infinitives are used to introduce new or highly relevant information into the discourse.

Consequently, in this article factivity has been defined as an essentially pragmatic phenomenon: Facts are facts because they are presented as facts. Halliday & Hasan’s (1976) definition of facts as embedded projections implies that facts are a ‘saying through others’ whose authors are not always easy to discern. Therefore, factivity is neither solely induced by the matrix predicate of a factive complement nor by the semantics of a factive complement. On the contrary, it has been argued that complements treated as facts are usually asserted and informative (and thus relevant to the discourse).
These assumptions have been confirmed by the discussion of the morphosyntactic features of nominal and verbal infinitives. On the one hand, determination seems to assume a grounding function in nominal and verbal infinitives in that it indicates the accessibility of the denoted event and thus relates it to the common ground of the speech participants. Therefore, the observation that verbal infinitives necessarily display definite determination reflects their being factive: facts cannot be presented in irrealis mode. On the other hand, it has been shown that many of the morphosyntactic and semantic differences between the two infinitive constructions point towards a difference in their degree of transitivity. This interaction of transitivity and factivity was explained by taking into account the notion of informativity: since transitive relations are more informative than intransitive relations, they are much more likely to be treated as facts by the speaker.

The discussion in this article has thus revealed the importance of assuming an interplay of information structure and morphosyntactic properties in Spanish nominal and verbal infinitives. Firstly, future research could thus get a more precise grip on the notion of ‘informativity’ as proposed here. Secondly, the gradience of the interpretation of factivity poses a great challenge for accounts of this phenomenon. It seems promising to take a variationist approach to the question of the hearer interpretation of factivity. Thirdly, nominal infinitives seem to be prone to being lexicalised (cf. footnote 5 and chapter 6.2 in the appendix). It would be interesting to investigate the diachronic development of possessive and plural nominal infinitives. A possible hypothesis would be that as nominal infinitives have been argued to correspond to typical collocations of linguistic items and thus be more predictable than verbal infinitives, this high frequency of co-occurrence is at the heart of their proneness for lexicalisation.
6. Appendix: a collostructional analysis of Spanish nominal infinitives

6.1 Data collection

The nominal infinitives in the Corpus del Español were collected with the following two commands: Firstly, with the command "del/el/un [VR] de/del", all infinitives modified by "el" or "un" and followed by "de" or "del" were collected. Secondly, with the command "del/el/un [J]" and the context parameter "[VR]" (distance in the text: 0/2) all nominal infinitives involving an adjective were collected. Moreover, the frequency of every infinitive in the whole corpus was evaluated.

In order to avoid hapaxes, all verbs with a frequency of occurrence < 5 as nominal infinitives in the CdE were excluded.

While all nominal infinitives with periphrastic realisation of the sole argument have been included in the analysis, nominal infinitives with possessives like su mirar ('his watching') have been excluded. This is due to the fact that a high percentage of this type of nominal infinitives has undergone a process of lexicalisation, thus distorting the results. For instance, in the 19th and 20th century CdE there are 77 Tokens of su mirar, or su [ADJ] mirar. Mirar would thus figure as a top item in the collostructional analysis performed here. However, in the majority of these cases mirar can be analysed straightforwardly as a full noun. As noted above, the question of lexicalisation of nominal infinitives is thus an issue that needs further research. The pronoun su seems to trigger a possessive and thus "modal" interpretation of nominal infinitives. It may be necessary to argue for a further division of the class of nominal infinitives according to their mode of determination.

Only examples from the 20th century were included in the present analysis. Interestingly, from a diachronic perspective the nominal infinitive construction in general displays a strong decrease in frequency. For instance, in Siglo de oro writing, and especially in novelistic texts like the Quijote, nominal (and verbal) infinitives are used very frequently. Sleeman (2010) has shown that a similar decline of the use of verbal and nominal infinitives has taken place in French.

Lastly, the four items pilar, auxiliar, ejemplar, titular that are wrongly tagged as infinitives in the CdE have been excluded from the analysis.

6.2 Technical settings of the collostructional analysis

The collostructional analysis was performed using the statistical program R and Stefan Gries’ Coll.analysis3.2a program (Gries 2007). The statistic index of association strength was set to the $-\log_{10}$ parameter (Fischer-Yates-exact test, one-tailed). The frequency of nominal infinitives in the CdE was set to 735 (the sum of all occurrences of nominal infinitives found). The “size of the corpus” parameter was set to 170960 (the sum of all occurrences of those infinitives which are attested as appearing in nominal infinitive constructions). Hence, schematically the collostructional analysis for “correr” looked like follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>infinitives</th>
<th>nominal infinitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>correr</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>54 (3.293)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\neg$ correr</td>
<td>170194</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Collostructional analysis for correr

On the basis of these data, the collostructional analysis computed the expected frequency of “correr” as a nominal infinitive (number in brackets) and found the deviation between the expected and observed frequencies to be statistically significant (collostructional strength value higher than 1.30103). This operation was performed for all investigated verbs. All values have been rounded.
### 6.3 Further tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Frequency of infinitive</th>
<th>Observed frequency in nominal infinitives</th>
<th>Expected frequency in nominal infinitives</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Collostructional strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORRER</td>
<td>'to run'</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3,42</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>46,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESURGIR</td>
<td>'to resurrect'</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>45,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESPERTAR</td>
<td>'to wake up'</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,85</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>27,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLUIR</td>
<td>'to flow'</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0,34</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>25,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECHINAR</td>
<td>'to creak, grind'</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>21,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETUMBAR</td>
<td>'to resound, thunder'</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>20,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENACER</td>
<td>'to grow again, be reborn'</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0,26</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>18,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULULAR</td>
<td>'to howl, hoot'</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0,08</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>16,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRONAR</td>
<td>'to thunder'</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0,08</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>16,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAJINAR</td>
<td>'to hustle about'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,13</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>16,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUJIR</td>
<td>'to creak'</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0,20</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>15,97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCIONAR</td>
<td>'to act'</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,29</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>15,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSCURRIR</td>
<td>'to pass, go by'</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0,26</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>12,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROAR</td>
<td>'to croak'</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>11,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATIR</td>
<td>'to beat'</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0,26</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>9,57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATIR</td>
<td>'to beat'</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0,18</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>9,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUGIR</td>
<td>'to roar'</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,06</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>8,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIRRIAR</td>
<td>'to squeak'</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>8,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCURRIR</td>
<td>'to wander, flow'</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,16</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>7,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALOPAR</td>
<td>'to gallop'</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,11</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>7,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALPITAR</td>
<td>'to beat'</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,15</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>6,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACONTECER</td>
<td>'to take place'</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,34</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>5,89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RODAR</td>
<td>'to roll'</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,56</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>4,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIVIR</td>
<td>'to revive'</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,40</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>4,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLPEAR</td>
<td>'to beat'</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>3,86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANTAR</td>
<td>'to sing'</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,71</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>2,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRAR</td>
<td>'to watch'</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,46</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>0,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER</td>
<td>'to be'</td>
<td>26244</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>117,07</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>49,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACER</td>
<td>'to make'</td>
<td>15297</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68,23</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>22,69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECIR</td>
<td>'to say'</td>
<td>12599</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56,20</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>15,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HABER</td>
<td>'to possess'</td>
<td>6297</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28,09</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>5,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>'to go'</td>
<td>4980</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22,21</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>2,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIR</td>
<td>'to leave'</td>
<td>2936</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13,10</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>2,04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HABLAR</td>
<td>'to talk'</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18,46</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>1,66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PODER</td>
<td>'to be able to'</td>
<td>8346</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37,23</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>1,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENSAR</td>
<td>'to think'</td>
<td>2498</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,14</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>1,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABER</td>
<td>'to know'</td>
<td>3340</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14,90</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>1,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASAR</td>
<td>'to pass'</td>
<td>2877</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,83</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>0,58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAER</td>
<td>'to kill'</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,84</td>
<td>repulsion</td>
<td>0,33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Collostructional analysis for 20th century nominal infinitives in the CdE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tiempo</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>años</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>días</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minutos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mañana</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sangre</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acontecimientos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arroyo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caballos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cerrojo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murmuraciones</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noches</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluma</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rounds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Arguments of *correr* in nominal infinitives in the CdE
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