

UNIVERSITÀ CA' FOSCARI VENEZIA

**UNIVERSITY OF VENICE
WORKING PAPERS
IN LINGUISTICS**

VOLUME 11, 2001

edited by Laura Brugè

Dipartimento di Scienze del Linguaggio

Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

G.B. Giustinian - Dorsoduro 1453

30123 Venezia

Tel.: 39-412347908; Fax: 39-412347910

laurabrg@unive.it

cinque@unive.it

Stampato in Italia presso LCM Selecta Group, Milano

Table of Contents:

Against Optional and Null Clitics. Right Dislocation vs. Marginalization <i>Anna Cardinaletti</i>	7
“Restructuring” and Functional Structure <i>Guglielmo Cinque</i>	45
The Temporal Coordinates of Subject and Speaker: from Semantics to Morphosyntax <i>Alessandra Giorgi and Fabio Pianesi</i>	129
Splitting subject clitic-verb inversion <i>Nicola Munaro</i>	153

to appear in *Studia Linguistica*

Against Optional and Null Clitics. Right Dislocation vs. Marginalization*

Anna Cardinaletti

SSLMIT University of Bologna

This paper contains a discussion of (Italian) Right Dislocation, which seems to instantiate an optional anticipatory clitic pronoun. It will be shown that the distribution of the anticipatory pronoun is not free. When the clitic is absent, we do not have an instance of Right Dislocation, but of Marginalization. The structural analysis of Right Dislocation suggested here is similar to Kayne's (1994) analysis of English Right Dislocation, the structure of Marginalization contains an *in situ* destressed constituent. Depending on how optionality is interpreted, it is possible to conclude that clitic pronouns are neither optional nor null.

1. Introduction

This paper is a case study of apparent lexical optionality. The empirical basis is provided by Italian Right Dislocation, which seems to instantiate an optional anticipatory clitic pronoun. It will be shown that contrary to *prima facie* evidence, the distribution of the anticipatory pronoun is not free. When the clitic is present, we are dealing with Right Dislocation; when it is absent, we have an instance of Marginalization ("*emarginazione*", cf. Antinucci & Cinque 1977). The two sentence types can be differentiated syntactically, interpretively and prosodically. The structural

*. I should like to thank Carlo Cecchetto, Guglielmo Cinque, Mara Frascarelli and two anonymous reviewers of *Studia Linguistica* for their detailed comments on a previous version of this paper.

analysis of Right Dislocation suggested here differs from both Kayne's (1994) and Cecchetto's (1999) analyses of Romance Right Dislocation, but is similar to Kayne's (1994) analysis of English Right Dislocation. The structure of Marginalization contains an *in situ* destressed constituent (as in Cardinaletti 1998, 2001).

Depending on how optionality is interpreted, it is possible to conclude that clitic pronouns are neither optional nor null. The former conclusion complies with the principle of Full Interpretation (cf. Chomsky 1986, 1995), while support for the latter conclusion can be found at the syntax-phonology interface.

2. Optional clitic pronouns

2.1. *The problem*

In Italian, a left-dislocated object DP must co-occur with a resumptive clitic pronoun (1), while a right-dislocated object DP seems to be anticipated by a clitic pronoun only optionally (2):¹

- (1) a. Il giornale, l'ho già comprato.
 the newspaper, [I] it have already bought
 b.* Il giornale, ho già comprato.
- (2) a. L'ho già comprato, il giornale.
 [I] it have already bought, the newspaper
 b. Ho già comprato, il giornale.

Although the different distribution of the clitic pronouns in (1) and (2) has been observed on a number of occasions (see, for example, Benincà 1988:§1.4.1, Kayne 1994:79, Cecchetto 1997) and often added to the asymmetries between Left and Right Dislocation, the nature and source of this asymmetry is not yet understood.

¹. In both (2a) and (2b), the sentence-final argument, which is presupposed, has a low pitch intonation contour and can be separated from the clause by an intonational break (signalled by a comma). Although both constructions in (2) are also possible in Spanish, the investigation here is limited to Italian. For Spanish see Zubizarreta (1998).

Some attempts have been made, but they explain the paradigm only partially. In Cinque (1990:§2.3.5), the obligatoriness of the clitic pronoun in (1) is attributed to the fact that no empty category (specified by the feature system [\pm anaphoric; \pm pronominal]) could be associated with the left-dislocated DP. In this approach, it is unclear, however, why such a requirement is not operative in (2). Cecchetto (1997) analyses the empty category occurring in the base position differently in the two cases. In Left Dislocation, the empty category is an A'-bound *pro*, which Cecchetto characterises via the features [$-$ anaphoric, $+$ pronominal, $+$ variable]. Since *pro* is licensed only by the presence of overt morphology, a clitic pronoun must be inserted. This explains the contrast in (1). In Right Dislocation, the empty category occurring in the base position can be a NP-trace, i. e. [$+$ anaphoric, $-$ pronominal, $-$ variable]. Since no clitic is necessary for its licensing, a sentence like (2b) is grammatical. This explains the contrast between (1b) and (2b). Cecchetto's analysis is unable however to address the related question of why (2a) is also possible. If a clitic pronoun is unnecessary, we could expect (2a) to be ungrammatical. Why is (2a) grammatical with the unnecessary anticipatory clitic? The issue of optionality arises.

2.2. Two interpretations of optionality

The first question to be addressed is how to phrase the optionality of the clitic pronoun in (2). There are in principle two different interpretations of optionality:

- (i) the clitic pronoun is structurally present but not overtly realized, i.e. sentences like (2b) contain a null counterpart of the clitic pronoun in (2a), or:
- (ii) there is no anticipatory clitic pronoun at all, i.e. sentences like (2b) are Right Dislocations that contain no counterpart of the clitic pronoun in (2a).

Neither of these two hypotheses is innocent, and both have a number of unwelcome consequences. The hypothesis that (2b) contains a non-overt counterpart of the clitic pronoun in (2a) clearly raises the question as to why the null variant of the clitic is impossible in (1b). If (i) were a viable solution, (1b) should be grammatical, which it is not. With the second interpretation of optionality, not only does the question arise of the asymmetry between Left and Right Dislocation, but there is also a further problem if the principle of Full Interpretation is assumed (cf. Chomsky 1986, 1995). Since (2a) and (2b) have different numerations, how can they be considered as one and the same sentence? Given that Full Interpretation requires that no lexical element be disregarded,

it is unclear how the clitic pronoun in (2a) can be disregarded.

2.3. *The proposal*

The aim of this paper is to show that these problems do not arise if the sentences in (2) are analysed correctly. In spite of *prima facie* evidence, the optionality of the clitic pronoun in (2) is only apparent. (2a) and (2b) are not one and the same construction, but instances, respectively, of Right Dislocation and Marginalization.² Sentences like (2b) do not contain a null counterpart of the clitic pronoun in (2a), nor are they Right Dislocations that contain no counterpart of the clitic pronoun. I therefore follow Antinucci & Cinque's (1977) original intuition that (2a) is structurally different from (2b). I differ from these authors, however, in that I take the marginalized object in (2b) not to be moved rightwards, but to occur in its VP-internal position (cf. Cardinaletti 1998, 2001). The structure of the Marginalization sentence in (2b) is the one depicted in (3):³

(3) [IP *pro* ho [FP già [AspP comprato_i [VP t_i il giornale]]]]

In (3), the past-participle is moved to an aspectual head (Cinque 1999). This movement is empirically motivated by the observation that a (focused) subject, which I take to be in specVP, can occur between the verb and a marginalized object (cf. Cardinaletti 1998, 2001):⁴

(4) [IP ha [AspP comprato_i [VP Gianni t_i il giornale]]]

2. Other works have hinted at the need to differentiate (2b) from (2a): see Frascarelli (1997), (2000), and Cecchetto (1999:Appendix, 65).

3. In (3), I abstract away from the movement of the object to a functional projection above VP in order to check case because this movement does not distinguish between marginalized and non-marginalized *in situ* objects.

4. (4) is an instance of VSO with the subject in focus, i.e. VSO. Unlike Spanish, Italian does not allow the same word order with the object in focus: VSO. See Cardinaletti (1999:§6.2) for an account of the Spanish / Italian contrast in terms of the different properties of the "middle field" subject position that hosts the subject in VSO.

The analysis of Right Dislocation is different. Following Kayne's (1994:78) antisymmetric analysis of English Right Dislocation, the object is taken to occur outside of the clause containing the anticipatory clitic in a position that is structurally lower than this clause. The following structure is assigned to (2a):

(5) $[_{XP} [_{IP} \textit{pro} \textit{l}'ho} \textit{gi\`a} \textit{comprato}] X^{\circ} [_{DP} \textit{il} \textit{giornale}]]$

The two hypotheses in (3) and (5) immediately capture the data in (1) and (2):

- when the dislocated constituent is a DP, Left and Right Dislocation are alike in requiring the presence of a clitic pronoun (cf. Cinque's 1990 proposal in section 2.1), hence the similarity between (1a) and (2a).⁵ Marginalization does not contain any anticipatory clitic pronoun: the object DP occurs in its VP-internal position inside the clause, and no clitic doubling is possible in Italian;
- the contrast between (1b) and (2b) is due to the structural asymmetry between the left and right edges of the clause. Dislocation is possible at both edges (although instantiating different structures, i.e. a left-peripheral specTopicP, see Rizzi 1997, and the XP in (5) respectively).⁶ Marginalization is restricted to the right edge because

⁵. Left-dislocated PPs seem to co-occur with a resumptive clitic only optionally. Compare (1b) with (i):

- (i) a. A Gianni, (gli) abbiamo gi\`a parlato.
to Gianni [we] to-him have already talked
- b. Di questo, (ne) abbiamo gi\`a parlato.
about this [we] of-it have already talked

Rizzi (1997:322) arrives at the conclusion that the optionality of the resumptive pronoun with left-dislocated PPs is apparent. The presence or absence of the resumptive clitic pronoun corresponds to two different constructions, which he calls (Clitic) Left Dislocation and Simple Preposing respectively. Example (37) in section 5 below shows that the same conclusion holds for right-dislocated PPs.

⁶. Cecchetto (1997), (1999) has very convincingly demonstrated that Left Dislocation is not the mirror image of Right Dislocation. The analysis of Right Dislocation suggested here, though different, is consistent with his conclusions.

objects are postverbal.

2.4. Organisation of the paper

This paper is organized as follows: in section 3, several empirical arguments are discussed that support the structural analysis of the two sentences in (2) as it was presented in (3) and (5), respectively. Section 4 contains a discussion of some of the data in Cecchetto (1997), (1999) and shows that the present analysis can also account for these. Section 5 is devoted to a comparison between the “clause-external” analysis of Right Dislocation defended in this paper and the “clause-internal” hypothesis proposed in Kayne (1994) and Cecchetto (1997), (1999), and shows that neither Kayne’s nor Cecchetto’s analyses can be adopted for right-dislocated constituents. It further tries to establish the nature of the head X in (5) and includes discussion of another potential analysis of Right Dislocation, i.e. the double-topicalization analysis. Section 5 also addresses two different accounts of Marginalization that invoke clause-internal topicalization of the marginalized constituent. Section 6 contains a discussion on the consequences of the conclusions of this paper as regards the optionality issue. In section 7, the analysis is extended to subjects. Right-dislocated and marginalized subjects are assigned a structure parallel to right-dislocated and marginalized objects. The non-overt subject pronoun *pro* is shown not to be optional, on a par with overt object clitic pronouns. Section 8 contains the conclusions.

3. Right Dislocation vs. Marginalization

3.1. The distribution of accusative *a*

Marginalization can be distinguished from Right Dislocation on the basis of the following data from colloquial Central and Southern Italian: whereas a right-dislocated [+human] accusative object (in particular, proper names and personal pronouns) can be preceded by the Case-marking preposition *a*, the object in Marginalization cannot

(Cardinaletti 1988:20):

- (6) a. L'abbiamo invitato noi, a Gianni.
 him have invited we, to Gianni
 b. Vi abbiamo promosso, a voi, anche se non lo meritavate.
 [we] you have passed, to you, even if [you] not it deserved
- (7) a. Abbiamo invitato noi, (*a) Gianni.
 have invited we, to Gianni
 b. Ho promosso io, (*a) voi, anche se non lo meritavate.
 have passed I, to you, even if [you] not it deserved

In order to analyse (7) as a Right Dislocation, the ancillary hypothesis is necessary that the preposition *a* only appears if a(n overt) clitic pronoun is used as an anticipatory element. Given the *ad hoc* flavour of this constraint, (7) is analysed as an instance of Marginalization rather than of Right Dislocation. Since the marginalized object occurs in its base position, the sentences in (7) display the same pattern as the simple sentences in (8) where the object is not preceded by *a*:

- (8) a. Abbiamo invitato (*a) Gianni.
 [we] have invited (to) Gianni
 b. Ho promosso (*a) voi.
 [I] have passed (to) you

3.2. *Argument order*

Consider the different order of the objects in (9) and (10). While the order of arguments is free in (9), it is not in (10), where the b. sentence is much more marked than the a. sentence:⁷

⁷. Interestingly, Calabrese (1992:97) only provides examples parallel to (10a):

- (i) a. Ha guardato Piero, le montagne, con il binocolo.
 has looked Piero, at the mountains, with the binoculars
 b. Ha messo Sandro, il libro, nel cassetto.
 has put Sandro, the book, in the drawer

- (9) a. Ce l'ha nascosto il bambino, il libro, sotto il letto.
 there it has hidden the child, the book, under the bed
 b. Ce l'ha nascosto il bambino, sotto il letto, il libro.
- (10) a. Ha nascosto il bambino, il libro, sotto il letto.
 b.?? Ha nascosto il bambino, sotto il letto, il libro.

If (9) and (10) were both instances of Right Dislocation, it would be hard to attribute the contrast to the mere presence or absence of the clitic pronoun or to its being overt or non-overt. If (9) and (10) instantiate different constructions, the contrast can be described as follows. While the order of right-dislocated arguments is free (9), the order of the objects following the subject in Marginalization in (10) is the same as the unmarked order of arguments (11):

- (11)a. Il bambino ha nascosto il libro sotto il letto.
 b.?? Il bambino ha nascosto sotto il letto il libro. (with unmarked intonation)

(11) shows that a direct object cannot follow a PP in the unmarked order. This is also true in Marginalization (10b). In both (10a) and (11a), the order of the objects is thus the one provided by the syntax, whereas there is no such constraint on the order of right-dislocated arguments in (9) because they are clause-external. Both (12a) and (12b) are possible:

- (12) a. [_{YP} [_{XP} [_{IP} ce l'ha nascosto il bambino] X° [_{DP} il libro]] Y° [_{PP} sotto il letto]].
 b. [_{YP} [_{XP} [_{IP} ce l'ha nascosto il bambino] X° [_{PP} sotto il letto]] Y° [_{DP} il libro]].

A direct object can appear after a PP if it is heavy (13a). Again, Marginalization in

and Frascarelli (2000:§3.2.5.5) reports that no example parallel to (10b) is found in the corpus *Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato* (LIP, De Mauro 1993). The same contrast between (9) and (10) is found in Spanish. The different argument order is the only syntactic asymmetry between Right Dislocation and Marginalization that is discussed in Zubizarreta (1998:156ff).

(13b) behaves like unmarked, subject-initial sentences:⁸

- (13)a. Il bambino ha nascosto sotto il letto [il libro che abbiamo comprato ieri].
 the child has hidden under the bed the book that [we] have bought
 yesterday
- b. Ha nascosto il bambino, sotto il letto, [il libro che abbiamo comprato ieri].

3.3. *Objects co-occurring with complement clauses*

Calabrese (1982) discusses another contrast between Right Dislocation and Marginalization. When the direct object *Mario* is right-dislocated, as in (14a), it can be far away from the verb *convinto* by which it is selected and can follow the infinitival complement *a fare* of the verb *convinto*. If *Mario* is not anticipated by a clitic pronoun, as in (14b), the sentence is ungrammatical:

- (14)a. Che cosa l'hai convinto [a fare], Mario?
 what [you] him have convinced to do, Mario?
- b.* Che cosa hai convinto [a fare], Mario?
 what [you] have convinced to do, Mario?

Once more, the difference between the two sentences in (14) cannot be due to the mere presence or absence of the clitic pronoun or to its being overt or non-overt. Rather, the contrast in (14) can be captured under the structural hypothesis defended in this paper. In (14a) the object *Mario* occurs at the end of the whole sentence, as to be expected when it is right-dislocated outside of the clause. In (14b) the marginalized object *Mario* cannot occur after the infinitival clause because this is not its base position. Its VP-internal position is immediately after the verb *convinto*, as in (15):

- (15) Che cosa hai convinto Mario [a fare]?
 what [you] have convinced Mario to do?

Since they respect the word order of (15), the following sentences are grammatical, as expected. In (16a) the focused object *Mario* precedes the marginalized complement

⁸. I should like to thank Francisco Ordóñez for drawing my attention to this case.

clause *a fare*. In (16b-c) the marginalized object *Mario* precedes the marginalized clause *a fare*. In (16b) it is the verb which is focused, while in (16c) it is the postverbal subject:

- (16)a. Che cosa hai convinto Mario, [a fare]?
 b. Che cosa hai convinto, Mario, [a fare]?
 c. Che cosa hai convinto tu, Mario, [a fare]?
 what have convinced you, Mario, to do?

3.4. *Left-peripheral verbal constituents*

A further argument for the differentiation between (2a) and (2b) is provided by the distribution of the complements of left-peripheral past participles. Benincà (1988:§2.3.3) observes that the object of a preposed verb cannot be represented by a full DP (17a). The only admissible complement is a clitic pronoun or a right-dislocated DP (17b-c):⁹

- (17)a.* Finito, non ha la minestra.
 finished, [he] not has the soup
 b. Finita, non l'ha.
 finished_{fem}, [he] not it_{fem} has
 c. Finita, non l'ha, la minestra.
 finished_{fem}, [he] not it_{fem} has, the soup

⁹. (17a) is slightly different from Benincà's (1988:§2.3.3) original sentence in (i), which contains a feminine past participle, agreeing with the feminine DP *la minestra*:

- (i) * Finita, non ha la minestra.

As pointed out to me by Mara Frascarelli (p.c.), (i) is independently ungrammatical because in Italian past participle agreement only takes place with clitic pronouns and is ungrammatical with full DPs:

- (ii) a. Non ha finito / *finita la minestra.
 [he] not has finished / finished_{fem} the soup
 b. Non l'ha *finito / finita.
 [he] it_{fem} not has finished / finished_{fem}

The restriction against full DP complements in (17a) can be understood as a violation of constituency. If the past participle is moved from its base position to the left-peripheral position involved in Left Dislocation (specTopicP, Rizzi 1997), a complement DP cannot be left stranded since it builds a constituent with the past participle (cf. the grammatical sentence: *Finito la minestra, non ha* “finished the soup, [he] not has”). A clitic pronoun, as in (17b), does not interfere with the movement of the past participle since it is adjoined to the auxiliary; nor does a right-dislocated constituent, as in (17c), since, as suggested in (5), it occurs outside of the sentence.

The crucial observation is that in (17c) the clitic pronoun is not optional. The absence of the clitic yields an ungrammatical sentence:

- (18) * *Finito, non ha, la minestra.*
 finished, [he] not has, the soup

Once more, the contrast between (17c) and (18) would be unexpected if (18) were an instance of Right Dislocation with no anticipatory pronoun or with a null pronoun. If (18) is an instance of Marginalization of the object, as claimed here, the contrast between (17c) and (18) can be explained by the assumed structural difference between Right Dislocation and Marginalization. Since in (18) the object occurs in its VP-internal position, (18) represents a constituency violation on a par with (17a).

Something similar can be said as regards the case in which an infinitival verb appears in a sentence-initial position (sentences built on Benincà's 1988:§2.4 examples):

- (19)a.* *Volere, vorrei un caffè.*
 [to] want, [I] would-want a coffee
 b. *Volere, lo vorrei.*
 [to] want, [I] it would-want
 c. *Volere, lo vorrei, un caffè.*
 [to] want, [I] it would-want, a coffee
 d.* *Volere, vorrei, un caffè.*

Here, the movement analysis is less straightforward given that the lexical verb occurs both inside the clause and in the left-peripheral position. Whatever the correct analysis of (19), these sentences distinguish between Right Dislocation (19c) and Marginalization (19d), and show once more that the marginalized object in (19d)

behaves like the *in situ* object in (19a).

3.5. *Extraction*

As discussed by Belletti (1998:24), the quantitative clitic pronoun *ne* can be extracted out of a marginalized object. This supports the proposal made in this paper that a marginalized constituent occupies a VP-internal position:

- (20) Ne ha comprato Gianni, uno.
of-them has bought Gianni, one

(20) cannot be contrasted with a sentence containing a right-dislocated object. Although the following sentence is ungrammatical, the ungrammaticality may be due to the fact that the cluster *ne lo / lo ne*, formed by the anticipatory clitic pronoun *lo* and the extracted clitic *ne*, is excluded in Italian for independent reasons:

- (21) *Ne lo / *Lo ne ha comprato Gianni, uno.
of-them it has bought Gianni, one

Extraction possibilities can however be tested with the *wh*-movement out of embedded clauses. As shown by the following data, extraction is possible out of a marginalized clause, (22) and (23a), but it is impossible out of a right-dislocated clause (23b) (cf. Belletti 1988:10ff):

- (22) Che cosa_i hai convinto Mario, [a fare t_i]? (= (16a))
what [you] have convinced Mario, to do?
- (23)a. Che cosa_i ha detto, Gianni, [che avrebbe fatto t_i]?
what has said, Gianni, that [he] would do?
- b.* Che cosa_i l_k'ha detto, Gianni, [che avrebbe fatto t_i]_k?
what it has said, Gianni, that [he] would do?

If (22)-(23a) and (23b) were both instances of Right Dislocation, it would be hard to attribute the contrast to the mere presence or absence of the anticipatory clitic pronoun or to its being overt or non-overt. The pattern in (22)-(23) can be explained straightforwardly if the absence of the clitic pronoun, as in (22)-(23a), implies that the

clause is marginalized in its VP-internal position, while the presence of the clitic pronoun, as in (23b), implies that the clause is right-dislocated in a clause-external position, which counts as an island for extraction.

3.6. *Quantified expressions*

The contrast between (24) and (25) shows that quantified objects cannot be right-dislocated,¹⁰ but that they can be marginalized:

- (24)a.* Non l'ha invitato Gianni, nessuno.
 not him has invited Gianni, anybody
- b.* L'hanno incontrato i rappresentanti, ogni studente.
 him have met the delegates, every student
- (25)a. A: Ho sentito che Maria non ha invitato nessuno.
 [I] have heard that Maria not has invited anybody
 B: No, non ha invitato Gianni, nessuno.
 no, not has invited Gianni, anybody
- b. A: Il preside ha incontrato ogni studente.
 the dean has met every student
 B: No, hanno incontrato i rappresentanti, ogni studente.
 no, have met the delegates, every student

Quantified expressions must bind a variable at LF, but they do not do so in (24). Neither the clitic pronoun nor the clitic trace qualify as variables, nor does the trace in A'-position if the quantified expression is raised at LF (cf. Rizzi 1986b, 1997). Given that in Marginalization the object stays inside VP, the sentences in (25) are grammatical because the quantified constituents occur in a position from where they can be raised to the relevant LF-position to be interpreted.

¹⁰ See Calabrese (1992:93ff). Quantified objects cannot be left-dislocated either:

- (i) * Nessuno, Gianni non l'ha invitato.
 anybody, Gianni not him has invited

3.7. Binding phenomena

The postverbal subject of the main clause c-commands the subject of the marginalized embedded clause (Calabrese 1992:100; 102,fn.14). This is consistent with the analysis of Marginalization proposed in (3) and (4). Both the subject and the clausal complement occupy their VP-internal positions:

- (26)a. Ha detto Mario_i, che pro_i avrebbe fatto queste cose.
 has said Mario, that [he] would-have done these things
 b. Non ha detto nessuno_i, che pro_i avrebbe fatto queste cose.
 not has said nobody, that [he] would-have done these things

However, if the complement clause is anticipated by a clitic pronoun, i.e. it is right-dislocated, the postverbal subject cannot bind the subject of the embedded clause. In (27a) a co-reference reading, which does not imply c-command, is possible. In (27b), where c-command is required in order to establish the bound variable reading, ungrammaticality is produced:

- (27) a. L'ha detto Mario_i, che pro_i avrebbe fatto queste cose.
 it has said Mario, that [he] would-have done these things
 b.* Non l'ha detto nessuno_i, che pro_i avrebbe fatto queste cose.
 not it has said nobody, that [he] would-have done these things

Once more, the proposed structural hypothesis can explain the difference between Right Dislocation and Marginalization.

3.8. The interpretive and prosodic properties

The element that precedes a marginalized constituent is necessarily an instance of contrastive focus (28). It is very marginal as a noncontrastive focus, i.e. as an answer to a *wh*-question (29). The contrast is illustrated here with a focused subject preceding a marginalized direct object (sentence (28) from Frascarelli 1997:80):¹¹

¹¹. For a discussion of the two types of focus, see Zubizarreta (1998:1-7) and the references quoted there. Frascarelli (2000:§3.2.5.5) reports that the corpus *Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato* (LIP, De Mauro 1993) contains no examples like (29B). All attested cases are of the type (28B).

- (28) A: Posso guidare io durante il viaggio?
 can drive I during the trip?
 B: No, non mi piace come guidi: porterà Mara, la macchina.
 no, [I] not like how [you] drive: will-drive Mara, the car
- (29) A: Chi porterà la macchina?
 who will-drive the car?
 ?? B: Porterà Mara, la macchina.

If the object is right-dislocated, the subject can be an instance of noncontrastive focus:

- (30) A: Chi porterà la macchina?
 B: La porterà Mara, la macchina.
 it will-drive Mara, the car

The contrast between (29) and (30) is a further argument against analysing the object without an anticipatory clitic as right-dislocated.

The different interpretive properties of (29) and (30) follow from the different structures assigned to the two constructions and correlate with different prosodic properties.

If Right Dislocation has the structure in (5), the focused element that precedes the right-dislocated constituent – the subject in (30B) – counts as the lowest constituent in the clause. It can therefore be assigned phrasal prominence by the Nuclear Stress Rule (cf. Cinque 1993, Zubizarreta 1998:18-19).

In Marginalization, the focused element that precedes the marginalized constituent – the subject in (28B) – is not the most embedded constituent in the clause (the marginalized object is). This prevents it from being assigned phrasal prominence by the Nuclear Stress Rule. The subject in (28B) is assigned stress via the Emphatic/Contrastive Stress Rule (see Zubizarreta 1998:44-45 and the references quoted there), which overrides the Nuclear Stress Rule. The presupposed object, which is defocalized, is destressed or bears an echo stress, copied directly from the context (Zubizarreta 1998:46-49, 73-78).

The question as to whether the prosodic properties of a right-dislocated constituent are the same as those of an *in situ* destressed constituent must remain open here. For Spanish, Zubizarreta (1998:151-158) has observed that sentences containing a right-dislocated constituent have a different intonation from sentences containing an *in situ*

destressed constituent. In the latter case, “there is no prosodic boundary between the nuclear pitch-accented word and the material immediately following it. On the other hand, [...] the right-dislocated object constitutes a distinct prosodic phrase from the preceding material and it bears its own pitch accent. [...] I therefore conclude that (a) right-dislocated phrases, unlike focused phrases, constitute an independent prosodic unit and (b) this prosodic unit is the intonational phrase” (Zubizarreta 1998:154,156). If these observations also turn to be valid for Italian, the syntactic proposal made in this paper can readily predict the prosodic difference by locating the marginalized constituent in clause-internal position and the right-dislocated constituent in clause-external position. Only the latter forms an intonational phrase on its own (see Nespor and Vogel 1986).

4. Cecchetto’s data

In this section some of Cecchetto’s (1997), (1999) data are discussed. The phenomena he analyses do not distinguish between Right Dislocation and Marginalization, as is shown by (31)-(32), where the b. sentences with no clitic pronoun display the same pattern as Cecchetto’s a. sentences with the clitic pronoun. The structural analysis proposed here is able to account for these facts without any adjustment.

First, both in Right Dislocation and Marginalization, binding by the matrix subject yields an impossible result (sentence (31a) from Cecchetto 1999:44):

- (31)a.* *pro*_i lo smentisce sempre dopo poche ore, l’annuncio che [un politico]_i dà
 [he] it denies always after few hours the announcement that a politician
 gives
 alla stampa.
 to-the press
- b.* *pro*_i smentisce sempre dopo poche ore, l’annuncio che [un politico]_i dà
 [he] denies always after few hours the announcement that a politician gives
 alla stampa.
 to-the press

In (31b) the subject c-commands the clause-internal object and produces a principle C violation. (31a) is ungrammatical for the same reason: the matrix subject c-commands

the right-dislocated constituent (cf. Kayne 1994:22-27 for c-command of a specifier out of the phrase that it is the specifier of), and the same violation is produced.

Second, both Right Dislocation and Marginalization obey Ross's (1967) Right Roof Constraint (sentence (32a) from Cecchetto 1999:46):

- (32)a.* *Che gliela presti, mi sembra strano, la macchina.*
 that [you] to-her it lend, [it] to-me seems strange, the car
 b.* *Che le presti, mi sembra strano, la macchina.*

In (32b), the subject clause *che le presti* cannot be raised leaving the marginalized object *la macchina* behind since this violates constituency (this analysis of (32b) is the same as Cecchetto's analysis of (32a)). The ungrammaticality of (32a) suggests a similar analysis, under the hypothesis that the XP projection in (5) is embedded under the complementizer *che*, as shown in (33):¹²

- (33) *Mi sembra strano* [_{CP} *che* [_{XP} [_{IP} *pro gliela presti*] X° [_{DP} *la macchina*]]].

The sequence *che gliela presti* cannot be raised since it does not form a constituent. What can be raised is the whole CP, as in (34):

- (34) [_{CP} *Che pro gliela presti, la macchina*], *mi sembra strano* [_{CP} *t*].

5. The clause-internal vs. the clause-external analysis of Right Dislocation

Assuming the structure in (5), right-dislocated constituents occur outside of the clause that contains the anticipatory clitic pronoun. I have called this proposal the “clause-external analysis” of Right Dislocation:

¹². Frascarelli (p.c.) finds (32a) better than (32b). This might be considered another argument for distinguishing between the two constructions. This contrast is unexpected however given (33). Assuming (33), (32a) can be considered acceptable only if *la macchina* is analysed as an afterthought. This analysis is not possible for (32b): in the embedded clause *che le presti*, the internal argument of the transitive verb *prestare* is missing (cf. **Mi sembra strano [che le presti]*, *[*Che le presti*] *mi sembra strano*).

(5) [XP [IP *pro* l'ho già comprato] X° [DP il giornale]]

(5) differs from Kayne's (1994) and Cecchetto's (1997), (1999) "clause-internal analysis" of (Romance) Right Dislocation.¹³ Kayne (1994:78-83) suggests that in Romance, right-dislocated constituents occur in complement position (and enter a clitic-doubling structure with the clitic pronoun).¹⁴ Similarly to Kayne, Cecchetto (1997), (1999) takes right-dislocated elements to be clause-internal. Unlike Kayne, who analyses right-dislocated elements as being moved covertly to the Topic projection in the CP area, as shown in (35a,a'), Cecchetto suggests that right-dislocated elements are moved overtly to a Topic projection above VP, as shown in (35b):¹⁵

(35)a. [IP l'ho già [AspP comprato_i [VP t_i il giornale]]]
 a' [TopicP il giornale_k [IP l'ho già [AspP comprato_i [VP t_i t_k]]]]
 b. [IP l'ho già [AspP comprato_i [TopicP il giornale_k [VP t_i t_k]]]]

13. (5) is the structure proposed by Kayne (1994:78) for English Right Dislocation.

14. Kayne's analysis of Romance Right Dislocation is thus essentially the same as what is proposed in this paper for Marginalization (*modulo* clitic doubling).

15. As underlined by Benincà (1988:§1.4.1), there is a subtle semantic difference between the topic in Left Dislocation and the topic in Right Dislocation. The former can be present in the shared knowledge of speaker and hearer without being present in the preceding linguistic context, while the latter must be present in the immediate linguistic context (in Benincà and Poletto 2001:31, the former is called a *Topic*, the latter a *Theme*). In (i), the b. and c. sentences are ungrammatical because the right-dislocated object *il vino* is not present in the preceding discourse:

- (i) a. Il dolce, lo porto io; il vino, lo porti tu.
 the dessert, it bring I; the wine, it bring you
 b. * Il dolce, lo porto io; lo porti tu, il vino.
 c. * Lo porto io, il dolce; lo porti tu, il vino.

Cecchetto (1999:58,fn.23) explains this difference by assuming that the topic feature checked in the Topic projection above VP and the one checked in the Topic projection in the CP area are different, which in turn supports his proposal of two different Topic projections.

Comparing the two proposals, both (5) and (35) can account for the fact that the right-dislocated constituent cannot contain a DP co-referential with the matrix subject, as in (31a) above. The DP *un politico* is c-commanded by the matrix subject *pro* in both (5) (cf. Kayne 1994:22-27) and (35).

Evidence for the clause-internal analysis and against the clause-external analysis defended in this paper seems to come from the following ungrammatical sentence, discussed in Cecchetto (1999:51):

- (36) * Credo che un critico d'arte non lo_i restituirebbe mai, al miliardario
 [I] think that a critic of art not it would-give-back never, to-the millionaire
 che gli presta [un quadro di valore]_j.
 who to-him lends a picture of value

Cecchetto analyses (36) as a violation of principle C. The object clitic *lo* c-commands the right-dislocated constituent that contains the co-referential DP *un quadro di valore*.

The ungrammaticality of (36) is unexpected assuming the analysis proposed in this paper. Given the structure in (5), the clitic pronoun does not c-command the right-dislocated constituent, and grammaticality should be expected, but this is not the case.

Notice however that (36) is an instance of Right Dislocation without an anticipatory clitic pronoun. In this case, the right-dislocated constituent is a dative PP. If anticipatory dative clitics are optional, as currently assumed, the sentence should also be ungrammatical when the clitic is present. However, the sentence with the clitic pronoun is an improvement:

- (37) ? Credo che un critico d'arte non **gli**lo_i restituirebbe mai, al
 [I] think that a critic of art not to-him it would-give-back never, to-the
 miliardario che gli presta [un quadro di valore]_j.
 millionaire who to-him lends a picture of value

This means that (36) is not the same construction as (37). (36) is an instance of Marginalization, and (37) is an instance of Right Dislocation, which in turn implies that right-dislocated PPs also require anticipatory clitics (see fn. 5). Given the structure proposed in (3), (36), as expected, is a principle C violation.

While the ungrammaticality of (36) can be explained by both the present account and by the clause-internal account, the grammaticality of (37), predicted by my analysis, is unexpected following Cecchetto's analysis of Right Dislocation since the object clitic

lo c-commands the right-dislocated constituent that contains the co-referential DP *un quadro di valore*. On the basis of the contrast between (36) and (37), I conclude that the clause-external analysis of Right Dislocation is superior to the clause-internal one.

The two analyses of Right Dislocation are now further compared on the basis of the data discussed in the previous sections of this paper. While some of the data can also be derived from the clause-internal analysis of Right Dislocation, the phenomena discussed in sections 3.3, 3.4, and 3.8 cannot. Let us analyse each case in turn, focusing on Cecchetto's variant of the clause-internal analysis:

- section 3.3: if in (14a) the object *Mario* moves to the specTopicP position above VP, the embedded clause *a fare* that precedes it should be moved to some higher specTopicP position. If this analysis of (14a) is correct, the ungrammaticality of (14b) becomes surprising. Why should it not be possible to move the embedded clause to the same position in (14b) (while the object *Mario* is distressed *in situ*)?
- section 3.4: the contrast in (17) can be captured only if (17c) can be analysed as an instance of Remnant Topicalization (cf. den Besten & Webelhuth 1990 for German). The right-dislocated constituent is raised to a position that is outside of the verbal constituent moved to the sentence-initial position:

- (38)a. $[_{IP} \text{ non l'ha } [_{XP} \text{ la minestra}_k [_{AspP} \text{ finita}_i [_{VP} \text{ t}_i \text{ t}_k]]]]$
 b. $[_{\text{TopicP}} [_{AspP} \text{ finita}_i [_{VP} \text{ t}_i \text{ t}_k]]]_j [_{IP} \text{ non l'ha } [_{XP} \text{ la minestra}_k [_{AspP} \text{ t}_j]]]]$

But in Italian, this movement is never possible, otherwise:¹⁶

- (39) * L'ha, la minestra, finita.

¹⁶. In German, the DP movement assumed in the Remnant Topicalization in (ii) is independently needed to account for (i) (den Besten & Webelhuth 1990):

- (i) Ich habe das Buch_i nicht [t_i gelesen].
 I have the book not read
 (ii) [t_i gelesen]_k habe ich das Buch_i nicht t_k.

Unlike German, Italian allows Remnant topicalization in the case of clitic pronouns, as in (17b), but not with DPs, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (39).

This reasoning is confirmed by sentences containing adverbs. As shown in (40c-e), a right-dislocated object follows a manner adverb such as *bene* “well”, on a par with both the “normal”, accented object in (40a) and the marginalized object in (40b):¹⁷

- (40)a. Ha fatto bene i compiti.
[he] has done well the homework
- b. Ha fatto bene, i compiti.
- c. Li ha fatti bene, i compiti.
[he] them has done well the homework
- d.* Li ha fatti, i compiti, bene.
- e.* Li ha, i compiti, fatti bene.

Since the adverb *bene* is located at a very low level in the structure (Cinque 1999), the specTopicP position to which a right-dislocated constituent is moved in Cecchetto’s analysis must be immediately above VP. Notice now how if the verbal projection is moved to sentence-initial position, it can include the adverb and the object, accented or marginalized, (41a-b), or only the adverb, (41c-d):

- (41)a. Fatto bene i compiti, non ha di certo.
b. Fatto bene, i compiti, non ha di certo.
done well the homework, [he] not has for sure
- c. Fatti bene, non li ha di certo.
- d. Fatti bene, non li ha di certo, i compiti.
done well [he] not them has for sure, the homework

In order to get (41d), the right-dislocated object *i compiti* should move to a position that is higher than both the past participle and the adverb, a position to which an object cannot otherwise move (see (39) and (40d-e) above).

• section 3.8: the interpretive and prosodic contrast between (29) and (30) cannot be explained if the clause-internal analysis of Right Dislocation is adopted. In neither case would the post-verbal subject count as the last constituent in the clause (in both cases the object would). As a result, the subject should be an instance of contrastive focus in

¹⁷. (40d) is grammatical in the irrelevant reading in which the adverb *bene* is separated from the clause by a clear pause and gets some emphatic accent, which might suggest an analysis of it as an afterthought.

both cases, which is not the case.

In conclusion, unless independent analyses are found to account for these data, the clause-external analysis of Right Dislocation defended in this paper is superior to the clause-internal analysis proposed by Kayne (1994) and Cecchetto (1997), (1999).

5.1. The double-topicalization analysis of Right Dislocation

Assuming (5) as the representation of Right Dislocation, the question arises as to the nature of the X head. An intriguing possibility is that X is a Topic head in the Comp area (Rizzi 1997), and that (5) arises through a sort of double topicalization (Kayne, class lectures 1995, quoted in Cecchetto 1999: 48ff) . First, the DP *il giornale* is moved to specTopicP; second, the entire clause is moved to a higher specTopicP:¹⁸

(42) $[_{\text{TopicP}} [_{\text{IP}} \textit{pro} \textit{l'ho} \textit{gi\`a} \textit{comprato} \textit{t}_k]_j \textit{Topic}^\circ [_{\text{TopicP}} [_{\text{DP}} \textit{il} \textit{giornale}]_k \textit{Topic}^\circ$
 $[_{\text{IP}} \textit{t}_j \textit{ }]]]$

Notice that (42) is a clause-external analysis of Right Dislocation and does not display the problems of the clause-internal analysis discussed above in section 5.

Cecchetto (1999:§3) highlights how the derivation in (42) contains both theoretical and empirical problems. Firstly, it entails a massive violation of the Proper Binding Condition since the clause in the highest specTopicP contains an unbound trace, and, secondly, it cannot account for (32a) and (36). It can be added that the semantic difference between Left and Right Dislocation mentioned in fn. 15 also seems to be unaccounted for if (42) is assumed.

As for (32a), I have shown in (33) above that the sequence *che gliela presti* cannot be moved because it is not a constituent. There is another derivation that should be blocked: the one in which the object *la macchina* is left-dislocated in front of the matrix clause and the entire clause is then moved to the left, providing the intermediate step in

¹⁸. The clause cannot move to specCP, as assumed in Frascarelli (1997), (2000), because it can also follow a complementizer (see (33) above):

- (i) a. Mi sembra strano $[_{\text{CP}} \textit{che} [_{\text{TopicP}} [_{\text{DP}} \textit{la} \textit{macchina}]_k [_{\text{IP}} \textit{pro} \textit{gliela} \textit{presti} \textit{t}_k] \textit{ }]]]$.
 b. Mi sembra strano $[_{\text{CP}} \textit{che} [_{\text{TopicP}} [_{\text{IP}} \textit{pro} \textit{gliela} \textit{presti} \textit{t}_k]_j \textit{Topic}^\circ [_{\text{TopicP}} [_{\text{DP}} \textit{la} \textit{macchina}]_k \textit{Topic}^\circ [_{\text{IP}} \textit{t}_j \textit{ }]]]]]$.

(43a) and the final structure in (43b):

- (43)a. [_{TopicP} [La macchina]_k [_{IP} *pro* mi sembra strano che gliela presti t_k]].
 b. [_{TopicP} [_{IP} *pro* mi sembra strano che gliela presti t_k]_j Topic° [_{TopicP} [_{DP} la macchina]_k Topic° [_{IP} t_j]]].

In (43b), the embedded clause *che gliela presti t_k* is a constituent. It cannot however be further moved to get the ungrammatical sequence in (32a) because, contrary to what is assumed in Cecchetto (1999:53, fn.14), there is no landing site for its movement. No Topic projection is available (note how in (43b) the topicalized constituent is an IP), and adjunction to IP is excluded under antisymmetric assumptions. Contrary to Cecchetto's conclusion, (32a) can be accounted for even if (42) is assumed.

As for (36), the sentence is not ungrammatical if the anticipatory dative clitic pronoun is inserted, as I have shown in (37). The double-topicalization analysis thus correctly predicts that (37) is not ungrammatical.

As for the semantic difference between Left and Right Dislocation discussed in fn. 15, this seems to be predicted by (42). Notice that given two familiar elements in the left-periphery of the clause, the first can be an element present in the shared knowledge of speaker and hearer, but not present in the preceding linguistic context (a *Topic*), while the second must be present in the immediate linguistic context (a *Theme*) (cf. fn. 15):

- (44)a. Hai spedito le mie lettere?
 [you] have sent the my letters?
 b. Sì, a Gianni, le tue lettere, gliel'ho già spedite. (Devo ancora spedire quelle per Maria.)
 yes, to Gianni, the your letters, [I] to-him them have already sent. I have still to send those for Maria
 c.?? Sì, le tue lettere, a Gianni, gliel'ho già spedite. (Devo ancora spedire quelle per Maria.)
- (45)a. Hai scritto a Gianni?
 [you] have written to Gianni?
 b. Sì, le tue lettere, a Gianni, gliel'ho già spedite. (Io gli devo ancora scrivere.)
 yes, the your letters, to Gianni, [I] to-him them have already sent. I to-him have still to write

c.?? Sì, a Gianni, le tue lettere, gliel'ho già spedite. (Io gli devo ancora scrivere.)

Since in (42), the right-dislocated constituent is moved to the lowest of the Topic projections of the CP area, it is predicted that it can only be a *Theme* and cannot be a *Topic*.

The only criticism of (42) that remains is a theoretical one, i.e. the fact that (42) entails a violation of the Proper Binding Condition, but this is not the appropriate place to discuss this issue. I conclude by saying that X is either identified in (5) with a Topic head, as in (42), with the issue raised by Cecchetto remaining as an open question, or maintain like Kayne (1994:78) that an antisymmetric account of Right Dislocation requires “as novel an analysis” as in (5), where the nature of the X head has still to be established.

5.2. *The internal-topicalization analysis of Marginalization*

I have suggested that a marginalized object stays *in situ* like a non-marginalized object. Two competing analyses are found in literature, which invoke a sort of clause-internal topicalization of the marginalized constituent. Both are discussed here.

According to Frascarelli (1997), (2000), marginalized objects are adjoined to VP, as shown in (46):

(46) [_{FP} ha comprato_i [_{IP} Gianni_j t_i [_{VP} il giornale_k [_{VP} t_j t_i t_k]]]]
 has bought Gianni the newspaper

While nothing changes substantially in our argumentation if string-vacuous VP-adjunction of the marginalized constituent is assumed, questions arise as to the location of the focused subject and the verb. In (46) the focused subject occurs in specIP and the verb occupies a F head above IP. Neither of these assumptions can be adopted. As for the former, if a focused subject were in its canonical specIP position, it should always agree with the verb, but this is not the case (see section 7.1 below for discussion). As for the latter, the lexical verb and the auxiliary cannot be analysed as a single head moved together to F°. If this were so, sentences like (17b,c) would be ungrammatical. This analysis is also implausible for those cases in which adverbs intervene between the auxiliary and the lexical verb: *Ha sempre comprato Gianni, il giornale* “has always bought Gianni, the newspaper”. If adverbs occur in designated functional projections (Cinque 1999), they cannot occur in one and the same head together with the auxiliary

and the lexical verb (see Frascarelli 1997:190ff for discussion). Unless the assumptions regarding the subject and the verb are abandoned, (46) cannot be adopted.

Another internal-topicalization analysis of Marginalization is proposed by Belletti (1998), (1999). Marginalized constituents are taken to occur in a Topic position above VP, as shown in (47):¹⁹

- (47) [IP ha [AspP comprato_i [FocusP Gianni_j [TopicP il giornale_k [VP t_j t_i t_k]]]]]

(47) does not have the same problems as (46). The focused postverbal subject is taken to occur in a Focus position immediately above the Topic projection, and the verbal forms occur in their canonical positions.

If this analysis of Marginalization is adopted, nothing substantially changes in our argumentation.²⁰ I have not adopted it here, however, because it seems to raise the question of the ordering of the Focus and Topic projections. While in (47) it is assumed that in the clause-internal area above VP topics follow focused constituents, in the CP area topics can only precede focused constituents. As suggested by Benincà and Poletto (2001), Rizzi's (1997) proposal that the focus projection in the CP area is surrounded by Topic projections, as in (48a), should be partially rephrased as in (48b), where the Topic projection only precedes the Focus projection:

- (48)a. [ForceP [TopicP [FocusP [TopicP [... [IP]]]]]]
 b. [ForceP [TopicP [FocusP [... [IP]]]]]

¹⁹. Belletti's analysis of Marginalization is essentially the same as Cecchetto's analysis of Right Dislocation (*modulo* clitic doubling). As the data in the preceding sections have shown, the specifier of the Topic projection in (47) cannot host right-dislocated objects (*pace* Cecchetto 1997, 1999), otherwise the asymmetries between marginalized and right-dislocated objects would remain mysterious.

²⁰. Notice that in order to account for the fixed order of marginalized arguments (section 3.2), the Topic projections above VP should reproduce the VP-internal order of non-marginalized arguments (unlike the Topic projections in the CP area, where the argument order is free). Secondly, in order to account for the ungrammaticality of (18), the movement of the past participle to the Aspectual head (see section 2.3) must be made obligatory. Otherwise the preposing of VP, which contains the unmoved past participle and the trace of the marginalized constituent, would be possible.

If the CP area and the area above VP are symmetric, as currently assumed, the ordering of the projections in (47) cannot be correct.

In conclusion, since (3) does not raise any of the above questions, I keep the analysis of Marginalization as in (3).

6. Against lexical optionality

If the absence of the clitic pronoun implies that a structure different from Right Dislocation is used, i.e. Marginalization, the conclusion can be drawn that clitic pronouns cannot be optional, nor can they be null.

As for the former conclusion, it complies with the principle of Full Interpretation. Since superfluous lexical elements are not allowed, lexical optionality cannot exist. A sentence with a clitic pronoun cannot be the same syntactic entity as a sentence without one, and this is shown by the data presented.

The latter conclusion has yet to be fully understood. A possible understanding of the restriction that clitic pronouns cannot be null comes from the analysis of the syntactic and phonological properties of clitic pronouns. Cardinaletti & Starke (1999:192-197) suggest that the derivation of clitic pronouns should be decomposed into two steps: XP-movement followed by X° movement. While the XP-movement step has a merely syntactic motivation (i.e. the need for the pronouns to be associated with case-features), the head-movement step is motivated by considerations relevant at the syntax-phonology interface. Via head-movement, a clitic pronoun, which has no prosody-related features, ends up in the prosodic domain of a non-clitic element. If this analysis is correct, it seems plausible to assume that something that is phonologically null does not need to, and hence cannot, undergo this type of movement. This means that null clitic pronouns do not exist, which in turn confirms the current assumption that null pronouns are not clitic, but weak (cf. Rizzi 1986a, Cardinaletti & Starke 1999:§3.4).

7. Right-dislocated vs. marginalized subjects

The previous discussion regarding objects can be extended to subjects. If in the Right Dislocation of subjects, an anticipatory null subject *pro* were optional, a sentence such as

(49) could be freely analysed as (50a) or (50b):

(49) Non ha ancora telefonato, Gianni.
not has yet called, Gianni

(50)a. *pro* non ha ancora telefonato, Gianni.
b. Non ha ancora telefonato, Gianni.

As in the case of objects, it is possible to show that (50a) and (50b) have different syntactic properties, which can be captured structurally by assuming two different representations, parallel to the ones proposed for right-dislocated and marginalized objects respectively:²¹

(51) [XP [IP *pro*_{arg} non ha ancora telefonato] X° [DP Gianni]]

(52) [IP *pro*_{expl} non ha [FP ancora [A_{sp}P telefonato_i [VP Gianni t_i]]]]

Before proceeding, it is necessary to note that a marginalized subject can follow a focused verb, as in

(49), or a focused adverb, as in *Ha parlato bene, Gianni* “has spoken well, Gianni”. However, an unstressed subject that follows a focused object, as in (53a), is necessarily right-dislocated and must thus be assigned the structure (51), as shown in (53b):

²¹. As in the case of objects (see section 5.2), nothing in our argumentation changes if a marginalized subject occurs in a Topic position above VP, as in Belletti (1998), (1999):

(i) [IP non ha [FP ancora [A_{sp}P telefonato_i [TopicP Gianni_j [VP t_j t_i]]]]]

However, as noted above for objects, this position cannot host right-dislocated subjects, which must be clause-external.

- (53)a. Vuole il caffè, Gianni.
 [he] wants the coffee, Gianni
 b. [XP [IP *pro*_{arg} vuole il caffè] X° [DP Gianni]]

This is so because there is no VP-internal post-object position for the subject (cf. Cardinaletti 1998, 2001 for detailed discussion). A marginalized subject can only precede a marginalized object, as in (54), where the verb is focused on a par with the verb in

(49):

- (54)a. Vorrebbe, Gianni, il caffè (ma non può berlo).
 would-want, Gianni, the coffee (but [he] cannot drink it)
 b. [IP *pro*_{expl} vorrebbe_i [VP Gianni t_i il caffè]]]]

7.1. Agreement phenomena

In some Italian varieties (e.g. the Central Italian variety spoken in the area of Ancona), a marginalized subject, as in (55b), behaves like a focused postverbal subject, as in (55a), in that it may fail to agree in number with the finite verb:

- (55)a. Questo disegno l'ha fatto quei bambini lì.
 this drawing it has done those children there
 b. È arrivati, i mobili.
 has arrived, the pieces of furniture

Whatever the reason for the lack of verbal agreement with postverbal subjects (see Guasti & Rizzi 1999 for discussion), the fact that a marginalized subject behaves like a focused subject confirms the structural proposals made in (52) and (4), respectively. In both cases, the subject is VP-internal.

Right Dislocation differs from Marginalization in that it always requires verbal agreement. This is shown in (56), where the subject is clearly right-dislocated as it follows a right-dislocated object:

- (56) L' *ha / hanno fatto ieri, il disegno, quei bambini lì.
 [they] it *has / have done yesterday, this drawing, those children there

The necessary agreement in (56) depends on the presence of preverbal *pro*

(57) and on the fact that agreement is obligatory with preverbal subjects

(58) (see Cardinaletti 1997:§2.3):

- (57)a. *pro*_{arg} l'hanno fatto ieri, il disegno, quei bambini lì.
 b. [YP [XP [IP *pro*_{arg} l'hanno fatto ieri] X° [DP il disegno]] Y° [DP quei bambini lì]].

- (58) Quei bambini *ha / hanno fatto questo disegno.
 those children *has / have done this drawing

7.2. *Extraction*

As in the case of VP-internal focused subjects (59a), *ne*-extraction is possible out of marginalized subjects of unaccusative verbs (59b), which confirms their VP-internal location. Extraction out of right-dislocated subjects, on the other hand, is impossible. This is shown by (59c), where the subject follows another right-dislocated constituent:

- (59)a. Ne è venuto uno.
 of-them has come one
 b. Ne è venuto ieri, uno.
 of-them has come yesterday, one
 c.?? Gliene è stato regalato, a Gianni, uno.
 to-him of-them has been given, to Gianni, one

7.3. *Quantified expressions*

If a marginalized subject occurs in the VP-internal position, it can, as expected, be a quantified expression. The sentences in (60) are grammatical. If the subject is right-dislocated outside of the clause, then, as expected, it cannot be a quantified constituent. The sentences in (61) are ungrammatical and are parallel to (62), where the subject *nessuno* is clearly right-dislocated since it follows the right-

dislocated object *Maria*:²²

- (60)a. Può già andare, ogni ragazzo.
can already go, every boy
- b. Può già ritirare, ogni ragazzo, la (sua) macchina.
can already go-and-take, every boy, the (his) car
- (61)a. A: Che cosa non ha fatto nessuno?
what not has done anybody?
- * B: Non ha fatto questo, nessuno.
[he] not has done this, anybody
- b. A: Chi ha incontrato, ogni studente?
whom has met, every student?
“Who has every student met?”
- * B: Ha incontrato il preside, ogni studente.
[he] has met the dean, every student
- (62) * Non l’ha invitata, Maria, nessuno.
[he] not her has invited, Maria, anybody

The ungrammaticality of (61) and (62) is due to the fact that the quantified constituent cannot be adequately interpreted. The quantified subject cannot be raised to the relevant specifier position to get its interpretation at LF, and a violation of Full Interpretation occurs.

²². See Calabrese (1992:93ff). Subject quantifiers cannot be left-dislocated either:

- (i) * Nessuno, Maria, (non) l’ha invitata.
nobody, Maria, [he] (not) her has invited

Notice that (61b) is marginally possible if the quantified subject has a partitive reading, similarly to *ognuno di quegli studenti* “each of those students”.

7.4. *Subjects in interrogative and exclamative sentences*

The above observations have some consequences for the analysis of interrogative and exclamative sentences, which very often contain clause-final, unstressed subjects (cf. Antinucci & Cinque 1977). These behave like marginalized subjects and differ from right-dislocated subjects in that:

- they may fail to trigger verb agreement in the Central Italian variety that allows lack of agreement (see section 7.1 above):²³

- (63)a. Cosa ha fatto, i bambini?
 what has done, the children?
- b. Cosa ha fatto, i bambini, a scuola?
 what has done, the children, at school?

²³ Belletti (1998:25) notes that in some Northern Italian dialects, here exemplified by Fiorentino, subject agreement is optional with (focused) postverbal subjects in declarative sentences (as shown by the non-agreeing masculine subject clitic *gl'* in the a. sentence), but obligatory with postverbal subjects in interrogative sentences (as shown by the agreeing feminine subject clitic *l'* in the c. sentences, which contrast with b.) (examples from Brandi & Cordin 1981):

- (i) a. Gl'è venuto le su' sorelle.
 it has come the his sisters
- b. * Icché gl'ha portato, la Maria?
 what it has brought the Maria?
- c. Icché l'ha portato, la Maria?
 what she has brought the Maria?
- c'. Quando l'è venuta, la Maria?
 when she has come, the Maria?

These dialects thus differ from the Central Italian variety exemplified in (63). We tentatively suggest that Northern Italian dialects do not allow the Marginalization of subjects. In interrogative sentences they only allow right-dislocated subjects, which obligatorily trigger agreement of the verb (see section 7.1 and (70)-(71)). The reason for this language variation is unclear, but it is very likely that it correlates with the fact that the dialects discussed by Belletti have subject clitics, while the variety exemplified in (63) does not.

- (64) Che bel disegno ha fatto, quei bambini!
 how nice drawing has done, those children!

The fact that lack of agreement in the Central Italian variety is not just a hallmark of focused postverbal subjects, but is also a possibility for marginalized subjects, is confirmed by (65b), where a marginalized, non-agreeing subject does not induce weak crossover, which is only induced by a focused subject, (65a):²⁴

- (65)a.*? Attualmente, in un loro_i appartamento vive i ragazzi_i.
 at present, in one their apartment lives the boys
 b. Attualmente, in quale loro_i appartamento vive, i ragazzi_i?
 at present, in which their apartment lives the boys?

- they allow *ne*-extraction:

- (66) Quando ne è arrivato, uno?
 when of-them has arrived, one?
- (67) Come ne è arrivato presto, uno!
 how of-them has arrived early, one!

- they can be quantified expressions:

- (68)a. Quando è partito, ogni ragazzo?
 when has left, every boy?
 b. Quando è andato, ogni ragazzo, in montagna?
 when has gone, every boy, to the mountains

²⁴. The sentences in (65) are parallel to the sentences in (i), discussed in Belletti (1998:26):

- (i) a.*? Attualmente, in un suo_i appartamento vive Gianni_i.
 at present, in one his apartment lives Gianni
 b. Attualmente, in quale suo_i appartamento vive, Gianni_i?
 at present, in which his apartment lives Gianni?

- (69)a. Che bella casa ha comprato, ogni tuo parente!
 what a nice house has bought, every your relative!
- b. Che bella casa ha comprato, ogni tuo parente, ai propri genitori!
 what a nice house has bought, every your relative, to-the his parents!

Nothing of course prevents a subject from being right-dislocated in interrogative and exclamative sentences. Subject-verb agreement is obligatory, as in the case of a right-dislocated subject following a right-dislocated object (70b) and (71b) (see also (56)):

- (70)a. Cosa hanno fatto, i bambini?
 what [they] have done, the children?
- b. Quando li hanno finiti, i compiti, i bambini?
 when [they] them have finished, the homework, the children?
- (71)a. Che bel disegno hanno fatto, quei bambini!
 how nice drawing [they] have done, those children!
- b. Come l'hanno fatto bene, il disegno, quei bambini!
 how [they] it have done well, the drawing, those children!

7.5. *Interpretive and prosodic properties*

The interpretive and prosodic properties of marginalized subjects mirror those of marginalized objects. The material preceding a marginalized subject is necessarily an instance of contrastive focus, (72a) vs. (72b), while this restriction does not hold for right-dislocated subjects, which can be preceded by noncontrastive focus, (73). Since the anticipatory element of a right-dislocated subject is null, in order to differentiate (72b) from (73) I use data with quantified subjects and *ne*-extraction. See section 3.5 above for the reason why *ne* is possible in (72) and impossible in (73):

- (72)a. A: Ne è arrivato oggi, uno?
 of-them has arrived today, one?
- B: No, ne è arrivato ieri, uno (non oggi).
 no, of-them has arrived yesterday, one (not today)
- b. A: Quando ne è arrivato, uno?
 when of-them has arrived, one?

?? B: Ne è arrivato ieri, uno.
of-them has arrived yesterday, one

(73) A: Quando ne è arrivato, uno?
B: (*Ne) è arrivato ieri, uno.

7.6. On the non-optionality of *pro*

The preceding sections have shown that the non-overt pronoun *pro* behaves like clitic pronouns in that it cannot be optional. Depending on whether it is present or absent, two different constructions are found: Right Dislocation and Marginalization respectively. Consequently, the principle of Full Interpretation applies to non-overt constituents as well.

This conclusion is not surprising. Grammar should not be sensitive to the overtness of the elements that undergo the syntactic derivation. Non-overt constituents need to be computed and interpreted at the syntax-semantics interface on a par with their overt counterparts, and differ from their overt counterparts only at the syntax-phonology interface. *Pro* in the Italian sentence *pro ho mangiato* has the same syntactic and semantic properties of *I* in the English sentence *I have eaten*, but the phonological content is different.

8. Conclusions

In this paper, alleged cases of Right Dislocation without an anticipatory pronoun have been analysed as Marginalization. The two constructions have different syntactic, interpretive and prosodic properties, which have been accounted for by assuming the structures proposed in (3) and (5) respectively. Specifically, the structure proposed by Kayne (1994) for Romance Right Dislocation has been shown to be better able to analyse Marginalization than Right Dislocation. A marginalized constituent occurs in its base position inside the clause; it is defocalized and destressed. Right Dislocation, on the other hand, should be analysed as involving a clause-external constituent, occurring in the complement position of a functional head in whose specifier the clause containing the anticipatory clitic is found, as in Kayne's (1994) analysis of English Right Dislocation.

In the second part of the paper, the analysis has been extended to right-dislocated and marginalized subjects. Similar properties have been found, which support the different structural hypothesis proposed here. Postverbal subjects occurring in interrogative and exclamative sentences have proved to be marginalized and not necessarily right-dislocated.

If the absence of the clitic pronoun implies that a structure different from Right Dislocation is used, the conclusion can be drawn that clitic pronouns cannot be optional, nor can they be null. The former conclusion also holds true for non-overt *pro* in the Right Dislocation of subjects, which is not optional.

The conclusion that clitic pronouns and *pro* cannot be optional complies with the principle of Full Interpretation. The conclusion that clitic pronouns cannot be null can be explained as a restriction applying at the syntax-phonology interface. This in turn confirms the current assumption that null pronouns are not clitic, but weak.

References

- ANTINUCCI, F. & CINQUE, G. 1977. "Sull'ordine delle parole in italiano: l'emarginazione". *Studi di grammatica italiana* 6, 121-146.
- BELLETTI, A. 1988. "The Case of Unaccusatives". *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.1, 1-34.
- BELLETTI, A. 1998. "'Inversion' as focalization". Ms., University of Siena.
- BELLETTI, A. 1999. "Aspects of the Low IP Area", Talk given at the *Workshop on the Cartography of Syntactic Positions and Semantic Types*, Certosa di Pontignano, November 1999.
- BENINCÀ, P. 1988. "L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate". *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, ed. L. Renzi, vol.1: 115-194. Bologna: il Mulino (New edition 2001).

- BENINCÀ, P. & POLETTO, C. 2001. "Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers". Ms., University of Padua and CNR.
- den BESTEN, H. & WEBELHUTH, G. 1990. "Stranding". *Scrambling and Barriers*, ed. G. Grewendorf & W. Sternefeld, 77-92. Amsterdam: Academic Press.
- BRANDI, L. & CORDIN, P. 1981. "Dialetti e italiano: un confronto sul parametro del soggetto nullo". *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 6, 33-87.
- CALABRESE, A. 1982. "Alcune ipotesi sulla struttura informazionale della frase in italiano e sul suo rapporto con la struttura fonologica". *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 7, 3-78.
- CALABRESE, A. 1992. "Some remarks on focus and logical structure in Italian". *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, 91-127.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 1988. "Sul riordinamento postverbale dei costituenti in italiano". *ATI Journal* 53, 12-30.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 1997. "Subjects and clause structure". *The New Comparative Syntax*, ed. L. Haegeman, 33-63. London: Longman.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 1998. "A second thought on *Emarginazione*: Destressing vs. "Right Dislocation"". *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 8.2, 1-28.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 1999. "Italian "emphatic" pronouns are post-verbal subjects". *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 9, 59-92.
- CARDINALETTI, A. 2001. "A second thought on *Emarginazione*: Destressing vs. "Right Dislocation"". *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, ed. G. Cinque & G. Salvi, 117-135. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- CARDINALETTI, A. & STARKE, M. 1999. "The typology of structural deficiency. A case-study of the three classes of pronouns". *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, EALT/EUROTYP 20-5, ed. H. van Riemsdijk, 145-233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- CECCHETTO, C. 1997. "Clitic Right Dislocation is not the Mirror Image of Clitic Left Dislocation". Ms., DIPSCO, Milan.
- CECCHETTO, C. 1999. "A comparative analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance". *Studia Linguistica* 53(1), 40-67.
- CHOMSKY, N. 1986. *Knowledge of Language. Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- CHOMSKY, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- CINQUE, G. 1990. *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- CINQUE, G. 1993. "A null theory of phrase and compound stress". *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 239-298.
- CINQUE, G. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DE MAURO, T. 1993. *Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato*. Milano: Etaslibri.
- FRASCARELLI, M. 1997. *L'interfaccia sintassi-fonologia nelle costruzioni di focalizzazione e topicalizzazione dell'italiano*. PhD Dissertation, University of Roma Tre.
- FRASCARELLI, M. 2000. *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- GUASTI, M. T. & RIZZI, L. 1999. "Agreement and Tense as distinct syntactic positions: Evidence from acquisition". Ms., University of Siena.
- KAYNE, R. S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- NESPOR, M. & VOGEL, I. 1986. *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- RIZZI, L. 1986a. "Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*". *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 501-557.
- RIZZI, L. 1986b. "On the status of subject clitics in Romance". *Studies in Romance Linguistics*, ed. O. Jaeggli & C. Silva-Corvalán, 391-419. Dordrecht: Foris.
- RIZZI, L. 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery". *Elements of Grammar*, ed. L. Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- ROSS, J. R. 1967. *Constraints On Variables in Syntax*. PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- ZUBIZARRETA, M.-L. 1998. *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

“Restructuring” and Functional Structure

Guglielmo Cinque

University of Venice

1. Introduction
2. The constituency issue
 - 2.1 Cleft Sentence Formation
 - 2.2 Right Node Raising
 - 2.3 Heavy NP Shift
 - 2.4 Aux-to-COMP
3. Monoclausality vs. biclausality
 - 3.1 Prohibition against using the same adverb twice
 - 3.2 The relative order of “restructuring” verbs
 - 3.3 Apparent cases of transparency effects across CP
4. The functional status of “restructuring” verbs in the presence of transparency effects
 - 4.1 The unavailability of internal arguments
 - 4.2 Some apparent cases of object control “restructuring” verbs
 - 4.3 The unavailability of external arguments
5. The optional character of transparency effects in Standard Italian
 - 5.1 The optionality of Clitic Climbing
 - 5.2 The optionality of Long Object Preposing and *Loro* Climbing
 - 5.3 Auxiliary Change
6. The functional status of “restructuring” verbs in the absence of transparency effects
 - 6.1 Again on the relative order of “restructuring” verbs

- 6.2 “Imperfect” (partial) vs. “strict” (exhaustive) Control
- 6.3 Apparent lexical usages of *volere* and aspectual verbs
- 6.4 “Restructuring” and lexical usages of motion verbs and *sembrare*

- 7. Presence vs. absence of transparency effects: syntactic contrasts
 - 7.1 The special status of *volere*, *sembrare*, and motion verbs
 - 7.2 Right Node Raising contrasts and ellipsis with “restructuring”
 - 7.3 Cleft Sentence contrasts

- 8. Some residual issues
 - 8.1 “Restructuring” and null subjects
 - 8.2 “Restructuring” and negation
 - 8.3 Variation in the class of “restructuring” verbs
 - 8.4 The prepositional “complementizers”

1. Introduction

In what follows I would like to show how the articulated functional structure of the clause suggested in Cinque (1999) may shed new light on the “restructuring” phenomenon (Rizzi 1976a,b; 1978) and perhaps afford a deeper understanding of it.

In the past 25 years, numerous analyses have been proposed to explain why certain phenomena which are otherwise clause-bound (such as Clitic Placement – see (1)) appear to be able to span over two clauses when the matrix verb is either a *modal*, an *aspectual* or a *motion* verb and the complement is non-finite (see the ‘climbing’ of the clitic in (2)):¹

¹. Besides structure simplification approaches like Rizzi’s (1976,1978), and, in a different framework, Aissen and Perlmutter’s 1976,1983 (cf. also Rivas 1977 and Luján 1978), one may mention two other major families of analyses: the “double (Sentence/VP) subcategorization” analyses of Strozer (1976,1981), Fresina (1980/81,1982,1997), Picallo (1985, 1990), Moore (1989,1990,1996), Pearce (1990), Rochette (1988,1990), Rosen (1990a,b), Bošković (1994), Wurmbrand (1998), among others, and the (embedded-)I-to-(matrix-)I biclausal analysis of Kayne (1989b), adopted, in different forms, by

- (1) a ***Lo** detesto [vedere **t** in quello stato] ‘(I) him detest seeing in that state’
 b ***Lo** ammetto [di conoscere **t** appena] ‘(I) him admit to barely know’
 c ***Lo** rinuncio [ad avere **t** per me] ‘(I) it give up having for me’
- (2) a **Lo** volevo [vedere **t** subito] ‘(I) him wanted to see immediately’ (*modal*)
 b **Lo** finisco [di vedere **t** domani] ‘(I) it finish to see tomorrow’ (*aspectual*)
 c **Lo** vengo [a prendere **t** domani] ‘(I) it come to fetch tomorrow’ (*motion*)

Even if each of the proposed analyses captures one or another aspect of “restructuring”, it is fair to say that none of them manages to answer the two most basic questions that the phenomenon raises; namely, why it should exist at all, and why it should exist with those particular verb classes (modal, aspectual and motion). The fact that one finds transparency phenomena comparable to Clitic Climbing language after language, and with the same set of verbs (or subsets thereof), suggests that the phenomenon is universal, and should thus follow from some general property of UG.² Here I would like

Martineau (1991), Rivero (1991), Terzi (1992,1994,1996), Rooryck (1994), Bok-Bennema and Kampers-Manhe (1994), Bonneau and Zushi (1994), Roberts (1993,1997). Other analyses that have been proposed for the “restructuring” phenomenon are the biclausal analyses of Burzio (1981, 1986), Baker (1988), Haverkort (1990, 1993), Sabel (1995a,b, 1996, 1999) in terms of VP raising to the left of the embedded subject; the double structure analyses of Zubizarreta (1982), Manzini (1983), Hageman and Riemsdijk (1984), Goodall (1987), and Di Sciullo and Williams (1987,97ff). “Restructuring” has also received treatments in more recent minimalist terms (Watanabe 1993, Martins 1995), as well as in LFG (Andersen 1987), in Tree-adjoining Grammar (Bleam 1994, and Kulick 1997), in HPSG (Miller 1992, and Monachesi 1993,1995,1998), and in Categorical Grammar (Nishida 1991).

². Besides Romance, transparency effects have been reported to exist (with roughly the same verbs) in Germanic (see Evers 1975; Haider 1986,1987,1992; Grewendorf 1988; Fanselow 1989; Bayer and Kornfilt (1990), Koopman and Szabolcsi 1998, among many others), in Slavic (George and Toman 1976,241ff; Dyla 1983; Spencer 1991,357f; Progovac 1993; Sabel 1995a,b,1996,1999, Przepiorkowski and Kupš 1997, Medová 2000, among others); in the African languages Abe (Tellier 1987) and Bete (Sportiche 1983; Haverkort 1990,1993); in Eskimo (Baker 1988,204ff); in Basque (Ortiz de Urbina 1989,26ff); in Turkish (Kornfilt 1996); in Japanese (Miyagawa 1986, Nishigauchi 1993; Zushi 1995; Wurmbrand 1998); in Malayalam (Baker 1988,204ff); in Chamorro (Chung 1988); in Tagalog (Kroeger 1993,167-207); in Hungarian (Choe 1998, 1989; Farkas and Sadock 1989, Koopman and Szabolcsi 1998); in Choktaw (Broadwell and Martin 1993,5ff); in Ancash Quechua (Cole 1984); in Chukchee

to propose an analysis which derives its universality, and answers at the same time the two basic questions just mentioned. The analysis is a natural extension of proposals made in Cinque (1999), where, on the basis of the relative order of functional morphemes in head position, and of the corresponding classes of AdvPs, I suggested that the functional portion of the clause, in all languages, is constituted by the same, richly articulated and rigidly ordered, hierarchy of functional projections, as shown in (3) (in first approximation).³

- (3) MoodP_{speech act} > MoodP_{evaluative} > MoodP_{evidential} > ModP_{epistemic} > TP(Past) > TP(Future) > MoodP_{irrealis} > ModP_{alethic} > AspP_{habitual} > AspP_{repetitive(I)} > AspP_{frequentative(I)} > ModP_{volitional} > AspP_{celerative(I)} > TP(Anterior) > AspP_{terminative} > AspP_{continuative} > AspP_{retrospective} > AspP_{proximative} > AspP_{durative} > AspP_{generic/progressive} > AspP_{prospective} > ModP_{obligation} > ModP_{permission/ability} > AspP_{Completive} > VoiceP > AspP_{celerative(II)} > AspP_{repetitive(II)} > AspP_{frequentative(II)}

The verbs that enter the “restructuring” construction appear to correspond to distinct heads of (3), in the sense that each seems to lexicalize the content of one or another functional head. This is obvious for the various modal and aspectual verbs, but it is true for motion verbs as well.⁴

(Spencer 1991,361; Baker 1999,369); in Hindi (Mahajan 1989,233ff; Zushi 1995); in Kashmiri (Wali and Koul 1994,988), among many other languages. The long distance agreement of Godeberi (Caucasian - Haspelmath 1993) has all the characteristics of “restructuring” too. For the claim that French, to which I return later, also displays “restructuring” effects, see Taraldsen (1983,299f), Kayne (1989), and Bok-Bennema and Kampers-Manhe (1994). Goodall (1991), and Roberts (1997) claim that restructuring effects are even detectable in English. Also see Haïk’s (1985,76,fn49) observation that the wide scope reading of *everyone* in *Someone wants to meet everyone* is only possible out of infinitive complements of “restructuring” verbs.

³. ‘XP>YP’ should be interpreted as ‘YP is the complement of the head of XP’.

⁴. In many languages, ‘andative’ (‘itive/ventive’), or ‘distantive’, morphemes are attested which can be glossed in English as ‘go/come and..’ For example, the derivational suffix, *-oy-*, of Fula/Fulfulde (West Africa) has exactly this function (cf. Fagerli 1994,53):

variant with and the variant without transparency effects in a different manner (section 7).⁵

2. The constituency issue

The analysis whereby, when transparency effects obtain, “restructuring” verbs are ‘functional’ verbs (directly inserted under the corresponding functional heads) leads one to expect a constituent structure quite different from that of Rizzi (1976a, 1978). According to Rizzi’s analysis, modal, aspectual and motion verbs can trigger a process of structural simplification (Restructuring), which turns an original biclausal configuration into a monoclausal one, forming a complex verb out of the complement and matrix verbs, as shown in (5):

- (5) a [CP io [verrò [CP a parlarti di questi problemi]]] RESTRUCTURING --->
 (I will come to talk-to-you about these problems)
 b [CP io [V ti verrò a parlare] di questi problemi]

As a result of this complex verb formation, the embedded verb is taken to no longer form a constituent with its own complements (cf. (5)b).

In the present analysis, instead, the expected constituent structure is (6), with the embedded verb still forming a constituent with its complements:

- (6)[CP io [AndativeP ti verrò ([FP] [VP a parlare [di questi problemi]](I)]]

This requires reassessing the arguments brought forth by Rizzi (1976a, 1978) in support of the constituency in (5)b. He shows, for example, that, when transparency effects obtain, a number of operations apparently cease to apply to the sequence formed by the

⁵. The approach taken here differs from most analyses of “restructuring”, which assume the phenomenon to be lexically governed and optional; but also from such analyses as Wurmbrand’s, which share with ours the idea that it is universally based, but take it to depend on a cluster of different semantic and syntactic properties of the “restructuring” verbs (for her, the semantic properties [-tense] and [-subject], and the syntactic property [-structural case] of their complement).

embedded verb and its complements, taking this to support the derived structure (5)b. Let us consider these cases in turn.

2.1. *Cleft Sentence Formation*

As shown by the contrast between (7)a and b, when the clitic has climbed to the matrix verb the embedded verb cannot be clefted with its complement:

- (7) a E' proprio a parlarti di questi problemi che verrà
 'It's just to talk to-you about these problems that he'll come'
 b *E' proprio a parlare di questi problemi che ti verrà

As noted, this would seem to follow from the constituency in (5)b. Notice, however, that with other fronting rules (such as Focus Movement and Topicalization) no such restriction exists:

- (8) a A PARLARE DEI SUOI PROBLEMI, **ti** verrà! Vedrai. ⁶
 'To speak about his problems (focus), he'll to-you come! You'll see'
 b PORTARE A CASA, **lo** voleva! 'Take home (focus), he it wanted'
 c Leggere a tutti, non **lo** potevo 'Read to everybody, I it couldn't'

As the latter constructions are no less valid constituency diagnostics than Cleft Sentence Formation, we must conclude that the embedded verb *does* form a constituent with its complement, just as (6) implies, and that the ungrammaticality of (7)b is due to some other reason (not dependent on constituency). Note that quite severe restrictions exist on what can be clefted (cf. (9) and (10)) which do not affect the Focus Movement or Topicalization of the same sequence (cf. (11) and (12)). These same restrictions, then, might be at the basis of the ungrammaticality of (7)b vs. (8) (see section 7 below for discussion of a possible reason).

⁶ Capital letters indicate focussed constituents. Incidentally, the grammaticality of (8) shows that the ungrammaticality of (7)b cannot be due to the fact that the clitic fails to c-command its trace (contra Zubizarreta 1980, 148ff). For the same conclusion, see Fresina (1981, chapter 2, fn2), Burzio (1981, chapter 6, fn2).

- (9) a *Era bella che sembrava
It was beautiful that she seemed
b *E' completamente che l'ha rovinato
It is completely that he ruined it
c *E' tutti che li ha visti
It is all that he saw them
- (10) a *E' parlato di questo che (gli) avrà
'It's spoken about this that he (to-him) will have'⁷
b *Era parlando di questo che (gli) stavo
'It's speaking about this that I (to-him) was'
c *E' stato portato a casa che è
'It's been taken home that he has'
- (11) a BELLA, sembrava 'Beautiful (focus), she seemed'
b COMPLETAMENTE, l'ha rovinato 'Completely (focus), he ruined it'
c Tutti, non li ha visti 'All, he hasn't seen them'
- (12) a PARLATO DI QUESTO, (gli) avrà!
'Spoken about this (focus), he (to-him) will have'
b PARLANDO DI QUESTO, (gli) stavo!
'Speaking about this (focus), (to-him) I was '
c Portato a casa, non era stato, ancora 'Taken home, he hadn't been yet'
d ?Stato portato a casa, non era, ancora 'Been taken home, he hadn't, yet'

All in all, we have no reason to interpret (7)b as showing that the embedded verb and its complement do not form a constituent. If anything, (8) shows just the opposite.⁸

⁷. Similar cases are noted in Napoli (1981,864), who concludes from that (incorrectly, given (12)) that the past participle forms a constituent with the auxiliary rather than with its complement. That the ungrammaticality of (7)b should be seen as related to that of sentences like (10) is also suggested in Fresina (1981,119 fn.62; 1982,289), and Moore (1996,48f).

⁸. Rizzi (1976a,fn8; 1978; 1982,fn14) notes that, under special conditions, a bare infinitive can sometimes be clefted in the presence of Clitic Climbing. Such conditions appear to crucially involve a contrastive phrase (*E' ringraziare che lo dovremmo*, *(*non rimproverare*) 'It's thank that we him should,

2.2 Right Node Raising

As Rizzi (1976a,1978) also notes, the embedded verb and its complement can be Right Node Raised only in the absence of transparency effects. See the contrast between (13)a and b:

- (13) a Piero voleva - ma francamente adesso non so se vorrà ancora - parlare **ne** con Gianni
 ‘P. wanted to - but frankly now I don’t know if he still will - speak about it with G.’
- b *Piero **ne** voleva - ma francamente adesso non so se **ne** vorrà ancora - parlare con Gianni
 ‘P. about it wanted to - but frankly now I don’t know if he still will - speak about it with G.’

Once again this would seem to follow from the assumption that in the presence of Clitic Climbing the embedded verb and its complement do not form a constituent. But this

not scold’); a context which also improves the clefting of an infinitive plus its complement (?E’ ringraziare per ciò che ha fatto che lo dovremmo, *(non per ciò che non ha fatto) ‘It’s thank for what he did that we him should, not for what he didn’t do’). The cases mentioned in Napoli (1981,fn7) also involve either an explicit, or an implicit, contrastive phrase. These exceptions remain to be understood. The contrast in (i), noted in Rizzi 1982b, and attributed by him to the Empty Category Principle (ECP), may also have to do with the selective character of Cleft Sentence Formation:

- (i) a E’ avere più fortuna che vorrei ‘It is to have more luck that I would like’
 b *E’ avere più fortuna che sembra ‘It is to have more luck that he seems’

The fact that no such contrast is found under Focus Movement or Topicalization would be hard to understand in terms of ECP:

- (ii) a AVERE PIU’ FORTUNA, sembra! ‘To have more luck (focus), he seems’
 b Avere più fortuna di noi, non sembra ‘To have more luck than us, he doesn’t seem’

I thank Richard Kayne for pointing out to me this implication.

conclusion is not necessary. Another possibility exists which is compatible with the idea that the embedded verb continues to form a constituent with its complements.⁹

In the framework in which Rizzi (1976a,1978) was working, Right Node Raising was considered a rightward movement rule (cf. Postal 1974,125-28). More recently, Kayne (1994,67f), following Wexler and Culicover (1980,298ff), has proposed to reinterpret it as a deletion rule deleting under identity the lefthand copy of the "raised" phrase: *Piero voleva ~~parlarne con Gianni~~ - ma francamente adesso non so se vorrà ancora - parlarne con Gianni*. The following contrasts between Italian and English appear to support this reinterpretation. As noted in Napoli (1981,846), Right Node Raising of the complement of an auxiliary is impossible in Italian. See (14):

- (14) a *Mario ha - ma dirà di non avere - capito la lezione
 ‘M. has - but he will say he hasn't - understood the lesson'
 b *Gianni allora era - ma non so se ancora oggi sarebbe - apprezzato per il suo
 autoritarismo
 ‘G. then was - but I don't know whether today still would be - appreciated
 for his authoritarianism’

Right Node Raising of the complement of an auxiliary is instead possible in English:

- (15) Tony should have - and Pete probably would have - called Grace
 (Postal 1974,126)

Now, the two languages also differ with respect to the deletion of the complement of an auxiliary, as shown in (16):

⁹. On the basis of examples such as (i), it has sometimes been claimed that also non-constituents can be Right Node Raised, hence that the phenomenon is not a reliable diagnostic for constituency (Abbot 1976):

- (i) Mary baked and George frosted, 20 cakes in less than one hour

Note, however, that in Larson's (1988) and Kayne's (1994) analyses even such Right Node Raised sequences qualify as constituents.

- (16) a Have you called John? Yes. I have ___
 b Hai chiamato John? *Sì. Ho ___

If Right Node Raising involves deletion, the first contrast reduces to the second. No such reduction is instead possible under the Movement analysis. In the more restrictive deletion analysis, which crucially relates (16b) to (14), the ungrammaticality of (13)b can, then, be attributed not to lack of constituenthood but to the impossibility of deleting an infinitival complement in the presence of transparency effects. See (17), noted in Radford (1977,113) (whatever the right analysis of this fact is - see Depiante (1998) and section 7 below):

- (17) a Gianni voleva parlare di questo, ma Piero non (*ne) voleva ___
 G. wanted to talk about this, but P. not (about-it) wanted
 b *Certe cose si possono fare, ma queste non si possono ___
 Certain things one can do, but these not one can
 c Gianni poteva andare a casa, ma non ha/*è voluto ___
 G. could go home, but not has/is wanted

2.3 Heavy NP Shift

Another rule considered in this context by Rizzi is Heavy (or Complex) NP Shift, which at the time was taken to move a heavy/complex constituent rightward, deriving for example (18)b from (18)a by moving the constituent *ad esporti la mia idea* to the right of the PP *a Firenze*.

- (18) a Fra qualche giorno, verrò ad esporti_{ti} la mia idea a Firenze
 ‘In a few days, I’ll come to explain to-you my idea in Florence’
 b Fra qualche giorno, verrò a Firenze ad esporti_{ti} la mia idea
 ‘In a few days, I’ll come to Florence to explain to-you my idea’

Rizzi notes that this movement is no longer possible if Clitic Climbing has applied (cf.(19)), taking this to suggest that *ad esporre la mia idea* in (19)b cannot be moved because after Restructuring it is no longer a constituent:

- (19) a Fra qualche giorno, **ti** verrò ad esporre la mia idea a Firenze
 b *Fra qualche giorno, **ti** verrò a Firenze ad esporre la mia idea

More recently, the existence of rightward movement rules has been called into question (Kayne 1994). Kayne reanalyses Heavy NP Shift as involving the leftward movement of what in the previous analysis was crossed over by the rightward moved phrase. Within such an analysis there is a natural account for the ungrammaticality of (19)b which does not depend on the non-constituenthood of *ad esporre la mia idea*. (19)b is bad for the same reason that (20) is, namely because a locative PP has been moved (scrambled) to an illicit position in the lower functional field between a functional head and its complement:¹⁰

¹⁰. The ungrammaticality of (20) is noted by Rizzi himself (1978,126, note 16), who analyses it as derived by leftward movement of the adverbial PP into the auxiliary structure.

There is another potential derivation of (19)b which does not derive it from (18)a via Heavy NP Shift (or its leftward analogue). In (18)a the PP *a Firenze* either modifies just the embedded infinitive (and is interpreted as a locative), or both *venire* and the embedded infinitive (in which case it is interpreted as directional). In (18)b, instead, the PP *a Firenze* can only be interpreted as a directional complement of *venire*, used as a lexical verb (cf. section 6.4), with *ad esporre la mia idea* an adjunct purpose clause rather than a CP complement. The adjunct status of *ad esporre la mia idea* in (18)b is shown by the fact that no complement or adjunct can be extracted from it (which would be unexpected if it were a complement CP). Compare (i) with (ii), which contains restructuring *venire* (and a complement CP following it):

- (i) a *A chi è venuto a Firenze ad esporre la sua idea? ‘Whom did he come to F. to clarify his idea?’
 b *Come_k è venuto a Firenze ad esporre la sua idea t_k? (Molto chiaramente)
 ‘How has he come to Florence to illustrate his idea to you? (Very clearly)’
- (ii) a A chi è venuto ad esporre la sua idea? ‘Whom did he come to clarify his idea?’
 b Come ti è venuto ad esporre la sua idea? (Molto chiaramente)
 How has he come to illustrate his idea to you? (Very clearly)

If so, Clitic Climbing out of the adjunct is (a fortiori) impossible.

Contrasts such as those between (iii)a and b, noted in Fresina (1981,285) also cast doubt on the presence of a systematic relation between (18)a and b:

- (iii) a Vengo da te a riportarti i libri ‘I come to you to bring back the books’
 b ?*Vengo a riportarti i libri da te ‘I come to bring back the books to you’

- (20) *Lo ho a Firenze messo al corrente della nostra decisione
 ‘I him have in Florence notified of our decision’

Thus it seems that there is no reason to abandon the idea that the embedded infinitival and its complements form a constituent when transparency effects obtain; hence no particular reason to assume that the “restructuring” and the infinitival verb come to form a complex predicate (cf. Hinterhölzl 1998 for a similar conclusion concerning the “restructuring” construction of Germanic).¹¹

Benucci (1990,19) notes the grammaticality in older stages of French of the equivalent of (19)b (*Un de ces jours, on me viendra chez moi couper la gorge* (Molière, L’avare 151) ‘One of these days, they will come to my place to cut my throat’). We conjecture that scrambling between auxiliary and past participle was equally possible then.

¹¹ Rizzi (1976a, 1978) also notes that the infinite and its complement appear not to pied pipe under wh-movement when transparency effects obtain. See the contrast in (i):

- (i) a Questi argomenti, a parlarti dei quali verrò al più presto,...
 These topics, to talk to-you about which I will come soon, ...’
 b *?Questi argomenti, a parlare dei quali ti verrò al più presto,...
 ‘These topics, to talk about which I will to-you come soon, ...’

While there is some contrast between (i)a and b, there are cases just like (i)b that sound to me quite acceptable. See (iii):

- (iii) Maria, presentare alla quale non lo vorrei,..
 ‘M., to introduce to whom I him wouldn’t like ,..’

Secondly, there are auxiliary + past participle cases where a clitic cannot be easily left behind under pied piping:

- (iv) *?Il conto, trasferita nel quale la somma non ti verrà,..
 ‘The account, transferred to which the sum to-you will not be,..’
 (vs. Il conto, trasferita nel quale la somma non verrà,..)

2.4 Aux-to-COMP

I mention here a possible additional piece of evidence in favor of the structure [_{FP} V_{restruct} [_{VP} V ZP]] and against the idea that the “restructuring” verb and the embedded infinitive come to form a constituent which leaves out the infinitive's complements. Consider the behavior of a “restructuring” verb and its embedded infinitive in the Aux-to-COMP construction studied in Rizzi (1981, 1982a). Even in the presence of Clitic Climbing, only the “restructuring” verb can raise to C, never both, which is unexpected if the two verbs form a complex V (unless *obligatory* excorporation of the matrix verb is posited):

- (21) a Non potendolo [egli restituire a nessuno]
 ‘Not being able it he to give back to anybody’
 b *Non potendolo restituire [egli a nessuno]
 ‘Not being able it to give back he to anybody’
- (22) a Ritenevamo non doverne [egli parlare neanche con voi]
 ‘We thought not to have he to talk not even with you’
 b *Ritenevamo non doverne parlare [egli neanche con voi]
 ‘We thought not to have to talk he not even with you’

3. Monoclausality vs. biclausality

In this section I examine some potential evidence (in addition to that recently discussed in Wurmbrand 1998) for the monoclausal nature of the construction when transparency effects obtain (sections 3.1-3.2), and consider some of the apparent evidence for its biclausality (section 3.3), concluding that it is unconvincing.

So, it seems that the phenomenon needs to be better understood before any conclusions can be drawn from it.

3.1. Prohibition against using the same adverb twice

Adverbs that in a simple clause can occur only once (like *già* 'already', and *sempre* 'always')¹², in contexts with *volere* appear to be able to occur twice if no transparency effects obtain (and there is a pause after the first adverb). They no longer can when transparency effects obtain:

- (23) a Maria vorrebbe **già** averlo **già** lasciato
 Mary would already want to have already left him
 b *Maria **lo** vorrebbe **già** aver **già** lasciato (Clitic Climbing)
- (24) a Si vorrebbe **sempre** aver **sempre** esperienze come queste
 One would always want to always have experiences like these
 b *Esperienze come queste si vorrebbero **sempre** aver **sempre** (Long NP-Movement)
- (25) a Maria vorrà **già** esser **loro già** stata presentata
 M. will already want to have to-them already been introduced
 b *Maria vorrà **loro già** esser **già** stata presentata (*Loro Climbing*)
- (26) a Gianni **avrebbe sempre** voluto arrivare **sempre** tra i primi
 G. would always have liked to always arrive among the first
 b *Gianni **sarebbe sempre** voluto arrivare **sempre** tra i primi (Auxiliary Selection)

The contrast becomes understandable if the a. variants contain two clauses while the b. variants are strictly monoclausal.¹³

¹² Many adverbs can occur more than once in the same simple clause (e.g. *Gianni spesso vede le stesse persone spesso* 'G. often sees the same persons often'; *Gianni rapidamente alzò il braccio rapidamente* 'G. quickly lifted his arm quickly'; etc. - cf. Cinque 1999, chapter 1). These, of course, would not discriminate between the two variants, with and without, transparency effects.

¹³ Another potential argument for monoclausality involving adverbial modification is suggested in Napoli (1981,873ff). In the absence of transparency effects, certain adverbs appear capable of modifying either the matrix or the embedded verb. *Voglio di nuovo imprigionarli* 'I want again to imprison them' is compatible with a context where I never imprisoned them before though I had the intention (here, *di*

3.2. The relative order of “restructuring” verbs

If more “restructuring” verbs occur, their relative order appears to be quite rigid when transparency effects obtain (cf. (27)-(30)). While this is unexpected under biclausal analyses, it is to be expected in a monoclausal one in which “restructuring” verbs are ‘functional’ verbs directly inserted into the corresponding functional heads. This is because functional heads are themselves rigidly ordered.

So, for example, when the “restructuring” verb *solere* ‘use’ (cf. *Lo soleva dire anche mio padre* ‘it my father too used to say’), related to the Habitual Aspect head, cooccurs with the “restructuring” verb *tendere* ‘tend’ (cf. *Lo tendo a credere anch’io* ‘it I tend to believe myself’),¹⁴ the only possible order for most speakers is *solere* > *tendere* (suggesting the order of heads **Asp_{habitual}** > **Asp_{predispositional}**):¹⁵

- (27) a ?Certe cose, le si suole tendere ad evitare
 ‘Certain things, them one uses to tend to avoid’
 b *Certe cose, le si tende a soler evitare
 ‘Certain things, them one tends to use to avoid’

When *tendere* and *volere* ‘want’ cooccur, the order is rigidly *tendere* > *volere*, in turn suggesting the order **Asp_{predispositional}** > **Mod_{volitional}**:

- (28) a Lo tenderebbe a voler fare sempre lui
 ‘He would tend to want to always do it he himself’

nuovo ‘again’ modifies just *voglio* ‘I want’); but is also compatible with a context where I imprisoned them before (though I may not have wanted to), and now I want to send them to prison again (*di nuovo* in this case modifies the embedded verb). Napoli claims that when Clitic Climbing obtains (**Li voglio di nuovo imprigionare** ‘them I want again to imprison’) *di nuovo* ‘again’ can only modify the two verbs together (as in a simple sentence with an auxiliary and a non finite form). Although I tend to share this intuition, the judgment is not very sharp, and speakers disagree. For critical discussion, see Wurmbrand (1998,214ff).

¹⁴. This “restructuring” verb appears to correspond to the so-called Predispositional Aspect (head) found in American Sign Language (Klima and Bellugi 1979), and to the ‘tendency’ aspect suffix found in Southeastern Tepehuan (Willet 1991).

¹⁵. For the apparent case of speakers also accepting (27)b, see the discussion in Cinque (1997a,fn4).

- b *Lo vorrebbe tendere a fare sempre lui
 ‘He would want to tend to always do it he himself’

When *volere* and *smettere* 'stop' (related to what in other languages is a Terminative Aspect suffix or particle) cooccur, the order is *volere* > *smettere*, suggesting the order of heads: **Mod**_{volitional} > **Asp**_{terminative}

- (29) a Non vi vuole smettere di importunare
 ‘He you doesn't want to stop bothering’
 b *Non vi smette di voler importunare
 ‘He you doesn't stop wanting to bother’

A final example here (see Cinque 1997a for a more systematic investigation of these orderings) is the relative order of *smettere* and *continuare* 'continue', which appears to correspond to the Continuative Aspect head morphology found in many languages. When they cooccur the order is *smettere* > *continuare*, once again suggestive of the order of heads: **Asp**_{terminative} > **Asp**_{continuative}.¹⁶

- (30) a La smise di continuare a importunare
 ‘(He) stopped continuing to bother her’
 b *La continuò a smettere di importunare
 ‘(He) her continued to stop bothering’

¹⁶ The adverbs which correspond to **Asp**_{terminative} and **Asp**_{continuative} are *più* 'no longer' and *ancora* 'still'. As expected, their relative order is also fixed, and matches that found with the corresponding functional verbs (cf. Cinque 1999,95):

- (i) a ?Spero che tu non sia **più ancora** arrabbiato con me!
 I hope that you are no longer still angry at me
 b *Spero che tu non sia **ancora più** arrabbiato con me!
 I hope that you are still no longer angry at me

Putting together the various relative orders one arrives at the order of verbs in (31), corresponding to the order of functional heads shown in (32):¹⁷

(31) *solere* > *tendere* > *volere* > *smettere* > *continuare*

(32) **Asp**_{habitual} > **Asp**_{predispositional} > **Mod**_{volitional} > **Asp**_{terminative} > **Asp**_{continuative}¹⁸

¹⁷. The order in (31) implies by transitivity a number of other relative orders among “restructuring” verbs; for example, *solere* should precede *volere*, *smettere* and *continuare*; *tendere* should precede *smettere* and *continuare*; etc. These expectations appear to be confirmed quite generally. Here, I only give a couple of relevant examples:

- (i) a Certe cose si sogliono voler fare subito ‘Certain things si use to want to do imediately’
 b *Certe cose si vogliono soler fare subito ‘Certain things si want to use to do imediately’
- (ii) a La tenderebbe a continuare a vedere ‘(He) would tend to continue to see her’
 b *La continuerebbe a tendere a vedere ‘(He) would continue to tend to see her’

¹⁸. Another potential argument for monoclausality would seem to come from Rizzi’s (1976a,39; 1978,155f) observation that transparency phenomena are blocked by an Aux V_{participle} Aux V_{participle} sequence. See, for example:

- (i) a Avrei voluto avervi conosciute prima
 I would have liked to have met you earlier
 b *Vi avrei volute aver conosciute prima
 They you would have liked to have met earlier

The marginality of (i)b would seem to follow (in contrast to *Gli avrei voluto esser presentato prima* ‘To-him I would have liked to be introduced earlier’, where the two Aux V_{participle} sequences express different heads) from the fact that in a single clause only one Perfect Aspect head is available. Things, however, are more complex. Fresina (1981, 309,315; 1997,111,115) notes that some cases similar to (i)b are in fact possible:

- (ii) a Maria l’avrebbe dovuta aver letta
 M. it would have had to have read

3.3 Apparent cases of transparency effects across CP

A strong case for the biclausal character of “restructuring” would seem to come from two instances of Clitic Climbing across what looks like a CP boundary.

The first is already discussed in Rizzi (1978,151f), where such cases as (33) are noted:

- (33) a [...] non **ti** saprei che dire
 ‘I you wouldn’t know what to tell’
 b ?Mario, non **lo** saprei a chi affidare, [...]
 ‘M., I him wouldn’t know to whom to entrust’
 c ??[...] proprio, non **lo** saprei come risolvere
 ‘Really, I it wouldn’t know how to solve’

As Rizzi himself (fn.38) observes (cf. also Napoli 1981,855, Moore 1994,fn3, Rooryck 1994, 420ff, among others), the productivity of the construction is however severely limited. Among the predicates which take embedded interrogatives, only *sapere (come)* ‘know (how)’ allows it (compare (33) with (34)), and even it with various limitations (cf. (35)):

- (34) a *Me lo chiedevo come fare ‘I myself it wondered how to do’
 b *Gli si domanda che cosa dare ‘He himself to-him asked what to give’
 c *Me lo ha detto a chi dare ‘He to-me it told to whom to give’
- (35) a *Non ne saprei quando parlare
 ‘Of-it I wouldn’t know when to speak’ (cf. Rizzi 1978,fn38)

-
- b La somma prestata da Mario gli sarebbe potuta esser già stata resa se la contabilità fosse stata buona
 ‘the sum loaned by M. to-him could have already been given back if the accounting had been fine’

Boysen (1977,289) reports another such case with Auxiliary Change rather than Clitic Climbing: *Un’ora più tardi sarebbe dovuto esservi arrivato, ma nessuno lo vide* (Silone) ‘After one hour, he should be had to be-there come, but nobody saw him’.

This may suggest that (active) Aux $V_{\text{participle}}$ can actually correspond to two distinct functional heads (Asp_{perfect} and T_{anterior}). See Cinque (1999) for some discussion, but more work is needed on this question.

- b *[...] non lo saprei se consigliare o no
 ‘I him wouldn’t know whether to advise or not’ (Rizzi 1978,fn38)
- c *Non lo saprei perché fare ‘I it wouldn’t know why to do’

The generalization appears to be that Clitic Climbing is allowed across a wh-phrase with *sapere* if either *sapere* means ‘know how’ ((33)c), or if the sentence allows for a rhetorical reading without the wh-phrase, and with *sapere* meaning ‘be able’ ((33)a is equivalent to *Non ti saprei dire niente* ‘I to-you wouldn’t be able to say anything’; (33)b to *Non lo saprei affidare a nessuno* ‘I him wouldn’t be able to entrust to anybody’).¹⁹

In either case, the verb embedding a wh-phrase is interpreted as a modal of mental ability (a notion often distinguished from physical ability in the languages of the world). This makes the verb a natural candidate for direct insertion under the root modal head of ability, like other “restructuring” verbs; an option not open to the verbs in (34) and (35), whose interpretation is not one of mental ability. The only auxiliary assumption that needs to be made is that the root modal head of *mental* ability can take a single wh-CP layer above its ordinary functional XP complement (without full recursion of the extended functional projection).²⁰

In sum, the very selective nature of Clitic Climbing across a wh-CP in mental ability contexts (and the interpretation of it just sketched) render the argument based on (33) for the biclausal character of “restructuring” very doubtful. If anything, the properties of

¹⁹. This may suggest a reason for the often made observation that the presence of negation is crucial for the well-formedness of (33). On the special status of the locution “know how”, also see Chomsky (1973,fn.26).

The same limitations appear to hold for the analogous cases of Clitic Climbing out of wh-phrases in Serbo-Croatian (cf. (i)a-b, Nedzhad Leko and Ljiljana Progovac, p.c.):

- (i) a ?Ja **mu** to ne bih znao kako da objasnim
 I him it not would know how to explain ‘I wouldn't know how to explain it to him’
- b *Ja sam ih pitala (Milana) kako da predstavim
 I have them asked (M.) how to introduce ‘I asked (M.) how to introduce them’

²⁰. A similar assumption (a single CP layer over the functional XP complement of the deontic modal) might be appropriate for Spanish *Los tiene que ver* ‘(He) them has to see’ if *que* is a complementizer.

(33) point, once again, to the functional nature of the verb, a modal (and to the monoclausal character of the construction).

More problematic would seem to be the apparent case of Clitic Climbing out of finite complements of “restructuring” verbs in certain varieties of Salentino, discussed in Calabrese (1993) and Terzi (1992,151ff;1994;1996), and in the varieties of Serbo-Croatian discussed in Progovac (1991, 1993) and Terzi (1996,289ff) (also see Stjepanović 1998).

In the Salentino of Brindisi, for example, when the mood particle *ku* is missing, a clitic can climb out of the apparently finite complement and cliticize to the “restructuring” verb (cf. (36)b, from Terzi 1992,159):²¹

- (36) a Voggyu (ku) lu kkattu
 (I) want (I) it buy ‘I want to buy it’
 b Lu voggyu (*ku) kkattu
 (I) it want (I) buy

A similar situation (modulo the non deletability of the mood particle *da*) is found in Serbo-Croatian (Progovac 1993,119):

- (37) a Milan □eli da **ga** vidi
 M. want-3sg particle him see-3sg
 b ?Milan **ga** □eli da vidi
 M. him want-3sg particle see-3sg
 'M. wishes to see him'

²¹. *Ku* can (but need not) be missing when the matrix and embedded subjects are coreferential - Terzi 1992,1994,1996). When *ku* is present no clitic climbing is possible (differently from what happens in Serbo-Croatian - see below):

- (i) a Voggyu ku **lu** kkattu
 want-1sg particle it buy-1sg
 b ***Lu** voggyu ku kkattu
 It want-1sg particle buy-1sg
 ‘I want to buy it’

Despite appearances, there is some reason to doubt that (36) and (37) involve the extraction of a clitic from a finite clausal complement.

First, in both Salentino and Serbo-Croatian the apparently finite embedded verb displays severe restrictions on its form: it can only appear in the ‘present tense’, which is equal to the verb stem plus person/number agreement. In particular, no past (or periphrastic) tense forms are possible: ²²

- (38) a ***Lu** vulia kattavu (Salentino - Andrea Calabrese, p.c.)
 It wanted-1sg bought-1sg ‘I wished I bought it’
 b ***Ja** bih **ga** voleo da sam posetio (Serbo-Croatian - Lijljana Progovac, p.c.)
 I would him like PART be-1sg visited ‘I would like to have visited him’
 (Cf. Ja bih voleo da sam **ga** posetio ‘I would like to have visited him’)

This is unexpected under a biclausal analysis of such structures. But it makes sense under an analysis in which “particle + stem-agreement” is treated as a surrogate form of infinitive (itself absent, or highly restricted, in these varieties). In fact, it is tempting to view agreement here as nothing other than a way to render the stem a well-formed morphological word. If so, the possibility arises again of viewing the sequence “(particle +) stem-agreement” as part of one and the same clause with the “restructuring” verb (in which case the observed unavailability of past tense on the “embedded” verb would follow from the fact that this is already marked on the “restructuring” verb, or higher up).

The monoclausal nature of such structures (when they display Clitic Climbing) may be glimpsed from the following property of Serbo-Croatian. As (39)a shows, when no Clitic Climbing is present, the subject of the embedded verb can be expressed by an overt (focussed) pronominal even when it is coreferential with the matrix subject. This possibility is however lost in the presence of Clitic Climbing (Lijljana Progovac, p.c.). See (39)b:

- (39) a Milan □eli da ga ON vidi ‘M. wishes HE HIMSELF to see him’

²² Cf. Terzi (1996,fn15): “The verb of the embedded clause can only occur in the present Tense [...]”. Furthermore, as Terzi (1994,116f) herself notes, “Salentino subjunctive subordinates appear to demonstrate fewer Tense dependences than their standard Romance counterparts - i.e. they are not subject to the usual Tense dependencies of Romance subjunctives”.

- b **Milan ga □eli da ON vidi* ‘M. wishes HE HIMSELF to see him’

While unexpected under a biclausal analysis of “restructuring”/Clitic Climbing, the contrast follows from the monoclausal one proposed in the next section, where evidence is provided that even apparently ‘control’ verbs such as ‘want’ inherit, in “restructuring” contexts, their subject from the embedded lexical verb (as happens with auxiliaries). Under such a monoclausal analysis, (39)b is bad because either *Milan* or *ON*, but not both, can be generated in the subject position of the embedded verb *vidi*.²³

4. The functional status of “restructuring” verbs in the presence of transparency effects

One first consequence of the idea that (when transparency effects obtain) “restructuring” verbs are “functional” verbs directly inserted under the corresponding functional heads is that, like auxiliaries (cf. Pollock 1989), they should have no thematic roles to assign, hence no arguments of their own.²⁴ Despite certain appearances, this will prove a welcome (and correct) consequence.

²³. Another transparency phenomenon which appears to cross a finite (subjunctive) CP boundary is *L-tous* in French (for many, though not all, speakers). See (i), from Kayne (1977, §1.11), and (ii):

- (i) a *Il faut toutes qu’elles s’en aillent* ‘it is necessary that they all go’
 b *Il faut tous qu’on se tire* ‘it is necessary that we all shoot’
- (ii) a *Il faut tout qu’on lui dise* ‘it is necessary that we tell him everything’
 b *Il veut tout qu’on lui fasse* ‘he wants that we make him everything’

Such cases have quite peculiar restrictions (Kayne 1977, 69f), which led Déprez (1997, fn18) to conclude that “they do not seriously threaten the generalization that *tous à gauche* is essentially clause-bounded”. They, however, remain a challenge to the present analysis as they are limited to (a subset of) “restructuring” verbs (*falloir, vouloir, ...*).

²⁴. This recalls Fresina’s (1981, 1982, 1997), Napoli’s (1981) and Rochette’s (1988) idea that in their “restructuring” use these verbs act much like auxiliaries (cf. also Ledgeway 2000, chapter 5). It is also reminiscent of Rosen’s (1990a,b) notion of “light verb” (without the need for an unspecified argument

4.1 The unavailability of internal arguments

Kayne (1989b,248) observes that "[v]irtually all the standard cases of clitic climbing are cases of subject control or raising. What is conspicuously absent is object control."²⁵ He takes his analysis of "restructuring" in terms of INFL raising from the embedded to the matrix clause (via COMP) to provide the required explanation. As INFL is coindexed with its Spec (containing the subject DP), the embedded INFL raising to the higher INFL will force coindexation of the lower with the higher subject. In object control structures, however, there would be "two AGR whose respective subjects are themselves not essentially coindexed."²⁶

structure, and a process of argument structure "merger" with the arguments and event specification of the embedded verb). Cf. also Emonds' (1999) idea that verbs in "restructuring" contexts lack semantic features.

²⁵. See section 4.2 for discussion of the few apparent cases of object control "restructuring" verbs which Kayne conjectures (correctly, I will argue) to be hidden causatives.

²⁶. This would either lead to conindexing or, with identical indices, to a violation of principle B or C, depending on whether the object controller is a pronominal or an R-expression, respectively:

- (i) a *Gianni_{i/k} lo INFL_k ha costretto lui_k a PRO_k t_k fare
 G. it has forced him to do
 b *Gianni_i lo ha costretto il poveretto_i a fare
 G. it has forced the poor guy to do

The only permissible case would be one with an anaphor as object controller. But in a structure like (ii) no clitic climbing is possible either (cf. (iii)):

- (ii) Gianni ha costretto se stesso a farlo

 (iii) *Gianni lo ha costretto se stesso a fare
 G. has forced himself to do it

It could be that this is too restricted a case to warrant a "restructuring" use of *costringere* 'force', but this is not obvious given the restricted "restructuring" use of *sembrare* 'seem' documented below in the text.

The analysis developed here instead takes the absence of object control restructuring verbs to be a special case of a more general phenomenon; namely, the fact that no verb with an object complement (i.e. assigning a thematic role) can be used as a functional verb. This more stringent condition indeed appears to predict the non existence of cases which the I to (C to) I hypothesis does not exclude.

Consider the case of a raising verb which can optionally take a complement. *Sembrare* 'seem' in Italian is such a verb:

- (40) a Gianni non sembra apprezzarlo 'G. does not seem to appreciate it'
 b Gianni non **ci** sembra apprezzarlo 'G. does not seem **to-us** to appreciate it'

For many speakers, myself included, *sembrare* allows Clitic Climbing (cf. (41)a),²⁷ but, crucially, not if it takes a (dative) complement (cf. (41)b):²⁸

²⁷. *Sembrare* allows Clitic Climbing for Radford's (1976), Napoli's (1981,883) and Ledgeway's (2000,299fn15) informants, and for Burzio (1986,354), but not for Rizzi (1976b,173, and fn12), nor for Fresina (1981,49). My own judgment is that it allows it selectively; i.e. with 3rd pers. Clitics (as in (41)a, or in *Non gli_i sembra essere fedele t_i* 'not to him (she) seems to be faithful', but not with 1st and 2nd pers. Clitics (**Non mi_i/ti_i sembra essere fedele t_i* 'not to me/you (she) seems to be faithful', nor *si* (impersonal or other): **Quelle case si sembrano poter costruire con poche spese* 'those houses *si* seem to be able to build inexpensively' (Rizzi 1976b,173). *Sembrare* followed by a small clause appears to pattern alike (suggesting that it too is a case of "restructuring" - cf. Stowell 1991): *Ne_i sembra contento t_i* 'he of-it seems glad' vs. **Ce_j ne_i sembra t_j contento t_i* 'he to-us of it seems glad'; *Non gli_i sembra fedele t_i* 'he to-him does not seem faithful' vs. **Non mi_i/ti_i sembra fedele t_i* 'he tome/you does not seem faithful'. Other "restructuring" verbs apparently allowing 3rd person, but not 1st, 2nd person clitics and *si* are (for me): *preferire* (*?Lo preferì fare Gianni* 'It preferred doing G.' vs. **Se ne preferì andare* 'Away (he) preferred to go'), *scordare* 'forget' (*Lo scordò di fare* 'It (he) forgot to do' vs. **Mi scordai di presentare all'esame* 'I forgot to appear at the exam'), *stentare* 'to be hardly able' (*Lo stento a credere* 'I am hardly able to believe it(?him)' vs. **?Vi stento a credere* 'I am hardly able to believe you'), *sperare* 'hope' (*?Lo spera di poter fare anche lui* 'He it hopes to be able to do himself' vs. **Ce la spera di fare anche lui* 'He hopes to succeed himself'), among others. The phenomenology in question could have to do with the kind of empty category which 3rd person, on one side, and 1st, 2nd person clitics and *si*, on the other, cooccur with, pro or trace, respectively, as proposed in Kayne (1999b).

²⁸. The contrast in (41) is noted in Radford (1976). See also Napoli (1981,875).

- (41) a Gianni non lo sembra apprezzare abbastanza
 ‘G. does not it seem to appreciate enough’
 b *Gianni non **ce** lo sembra apprezzare abbastanza
 ‘G. doesn’t **to-us** it seem to appreciate enough’

A comparable contrast concerning ‘long’ *L-tous* in French (also found only with “restructuring” verbs) is noted in Pollock (1978,97f) (I thank Richard Kayne for pointing this out to me):²⁹

- (42) a ?Elle a tous semblé/paru les avoir lus
 ‘She seemed/ appeared to have read them all’
 b *Pierre **m**’a tous semblé/paru les avoir lus
 ‘She seemed/ appeared **to-me** to have read them all’

These contrasts, which are very sharp, seem to indicate that it is the presence of the dative complements of ‘seem’, *ce* ‘to us’, *me* ‘to me’, which inhibits Clitic Climbing and ‘long’ *L-tous*, respectively. For such contrasts the I to (C to) I account has nothing to say, as in neither case would there be conraindexing as a result of I raising.³⁰

²⁹. Raising *menacer* ‘threaten’ and *promettre* ‘promise’ (roughly ‘(unpleasantly) appear to..’ and ‘(pleasantly) appear to..’) behave analogously, as noted in Pollock (1978,84f):

- (i) a Pierre avait **tous** menacé (*Marie) de les importer
 P. had threatened (M.) to take them all away
 b Pierre avait tout promis (*à Marie) de lire
 P. had promised (M.) to read everything

Likewise, Wurmbrand (1998,306) notes that Scrambling is only possible with *versprechen* ‘promise’ when it has no dative argument. Sabel’s (1999) observation that Scrambling out of the infinitival complement of *versprechen* is possible even in the presence of a dative can perhaps be reconciled with Wurmbrand’s if his is a control usage of *versprechen* falling in the same category as hidden causatives.

³⁰. Fresina (1981,164ff) also notes that *andare* ‘go’ and *venire* ‘come’ cease to allow Clitic Climbing when they take an internal directional complement. See:

- (i) a Li andiamo (*alla stazione) a ricevere ‘(We) them go (to the station) to receive’
 b Lo venne (*a casa) a prendere ‘(He) it came (home) to fetch’

In conclusion, there are no object control “restructuring” verbs because being 'functional' (directly inserted under a functional head) such verbs can have no complements. Nor can there be any unaccusative subject control “restructuring” verb (with the subject originating in object position), natural candidates being motion verbs. As the ill-formedness of (43)b shows, this expectation is also confirmed. Whenever the subject of *venire* remains in the 'inverted' subject (i.e., structural object) position, which in the present analysis excludes its “restructuring” use, the downstairs clitic cannot climb to *venire*.³¹

Again this is expected if functional verbs cannot take arguments. For evidence that the infinitival constituent following *andare* and *venire* is an adjunct clause when these take a directional complement, see note 10 above.

A potential problem is however constituted by the possibility of Clitic Climbing out of the infinitival complement of certain impersonal verbs taking a dative argument in certain varieties of Catalan noted in Rigau (2000, section 6):

- (i) No vos hi cal anar ‘Not to-you (pl.) there is necessary to go’

³¹. For this reason I do not share Burzio's (1981, sect.6.2.1; 1986,333f - cf. also Schrotten 1986) conclusion that "matrix ergative verbs do not 'lose' their direct object when restructuring applies" (Burzio 1981,555). His argument based on small clause relatives (in which only structural direct objects can be relativized) actually gives contradictory results. While 1st and 2nd person clitics, and *si*, are (marginally) possible (cf. (i)), (accusative) 3rd pers. clitics are to my ear ungrammatical (cf. (ii)a and (iii)a, which contrast with the potentially non-“restructuring” (ii)b and (iii)b, possible because the relative head can originate in the structural object position of the motion verb):

- (i) a ?Le uniche persone venute**vi** a salutare.. ‘the only persons come-you to greet..’
 b ?(G.C.)Un vicino venuto**mi** a chiedere un favore... (Burzio 1986,334)
 ‘A neighbor come-to-me to ask a favor..’
 c ?L’unico ragazzo venuto**si** a presentare.. ‘the only boy *si* come-himself to introduce’
- (ii) a *?L’unico ragazzo andato**lo** a prendere.. ‘the only boy gone-it to fetch..’
 b L’unico ragazzo andato a prender**lo**.. ‘the only boy gone to fetch-it..’
- (iii) a *Le sole persone venute**lo** a raccogliere.. ‘the only persons come-it to gather..’

- (43) a Ne sono venuti molti a portarti un regalo
 Of-them are come many to bring to-you a present
 ‘Did many come to bring you a present’
 b *Te ne sono venuti molti a portare un regalo
 To-you of-them are come many to bring a present
 ‘Did many come to bring you a present?’

Again, under the I to (C to) I analysis it is not clear why Clitic Climbing should be blocked in this case, as the matrix and the embedded subjects are coindexed.³² The intervention of material between the “restructuring” and the embedded verb in (43)b should not matter. Various cases of intervening material are documented in the literature

-
- b Le sole persone venute a raccoglierlo.. ‘the only persons come to gather-it..’

This divide in clitic types is reminiscent of that found with present participles in Italian, which allow for 1st and 2nd person clitics and *si*, but disallow (accusative) 3rd person clitics (cf. Beninca’ and Cinque 1991,609; also see fn. 27 above).

As for Burzio’s argument based on auxiliary selection, which is *essere* ‘be’ even in the presence of Clitic Climbing (*Lo è venuto a prendere* ‘(He) it has come to fetch’, we do not have a clear answer. It may prove to depend on the proper analysis of Auxiliary Change (which is still missing); or it may depend on the ‘semi-functional’ character of motion verbs, which, like causatives (cf. Cinque 1997b,fn19), contribute an argument even if entering a specific slot of the functional hierarchy. The different interpretation of the PP *da Torino* ‘from Turin’ in (iv)a vs. (iv)b, below, indeed shows that it must be *venire* ‘come’ which contributes a ‘source’ argument to *venire a operare* ‘come to operate’:

- (iv) a Lo verranno a operare da Torino ‘Him (they) will come to operate from Turin’
 b %Lo opereranno da Torino ‘Him (they) will operate from Turin’

On the notion of ‘semi-functional’ predicates, also see Cardinaletti and Shlonsky (2000), some of whose judgments, and conclusions, however, we do not share.

³² The account sketched in Kayne (1989,fn52) of the similar contrast between **Lo è andato Gianni a prendere* ‘It has gone G. to fetch’ and *Lo è andato a prendere Gianni* ‘It has gone to fetch G.’ (cf. Burzio 1986,333, and 386,fn11) is incompatible with the antisymmetric framework as it crucially rests on rightward extraposition of *a prendere* around *Gianni*.

which do not block Clitic Climbing (see Aissen and Perlmutter 1983,395f, and Napoli 1981,865f), one being floating quantifiers: *Ti sono venuti tutti a portare un regalo* 'To-you are come all to bring a present'). It thus seems plausible that the unavailability of Clitic Climbing in (43)b depends on the fact that *venire* has an internal argument.³³

4.2 Some apparent cases of object control “restructuring” verbs

If the general unavailability of object control “restructuring” verbs is derived from the fact that functional verbs cannot take internal arguments, something needs to be said about the few cases claimed in the literature to be object control “restructuring” verbs. Luján (1978,123), Suñer (1980,318), and Gonzalez (1994,10ff), for example, analyse cases like the following, containing Clitic Climbing, as cases of “restructuring”:³⁴

³³ As a matter of fact, there is evidence that when *venire* 'come' has an inverted subject (as in (4)a), the infinitival clause is an adjunct; an even stronger reason why Clitic Climbing fails (cf. note 10 above). This is shown by the impossibility of extracting an argument PP from it: **A chi ne sono venuti molti a portare un regalo?* 'To whom of-them are come many to bring a present?'. Acceptable sentences are *Molti ti sono venuti a portare un regalo;* (?)*Ti sono venuti a portare un regalo molti* 'Many to-you are come to bring a present', for which the absence of *ne* 'of-them' makes it possible for *molti* to originate not as the internal subject of unaccusative *venire* 'come', but as the external subject of the unergative *portare* 'bring', with *venire* functional. *Ne* is licit when the embedded verb is unaccusative, which is again compatible with *venire* being a complementless functional verb. Cf.: *Te ne sono venuti a morire vicino molti* 'To-you of-them are come to die near many'.

The same reason may account for the non-“restructuring” nature of *mettersi a* 'start' (vs. *cominciare a*) (see (i)), and other verbs with ('inherent') *si*, if this *si* betrays a necessarily unaccusative origin of the subject (namely, its generation in an internal argument position):

- (i) a Maria *si* mise a legger**lo**
 b *Maria **lo** *si* mise a leggere
 ‘Maria started reading it’

Ledgeway (1998,531), however, lists *mettersi a* among the “restructuring” verbs of Neapolitan.

³⁴ The “restructuring” nature of verbs of this kind is also assumed in the literature on Germanic. See, for example, Wurmbrand (1998,39), and Sabel (1999).

- (44) a **Me** permitió tocar**la**
 b **Me la** permitió tocar ‘She allowed me to play it’ (Luján 1978,123)
- (45) a **Nos** ordenaron ver**la**
 b **Nos la** ordenaron ver ‘They ordered us to see it’ (Suñer 1980,318)

Although sentences corresponding to (44)b and (45)b are impossible in Italian (**Me la permise di suonare; *Ce la ordinarono di vedere*) (and Portuguese - cf. Martins 1995,228), a comparable case of an apparently object control verb allowing Clitic Climbing in Italian is *insegnare* ‘teach’.³⁵ See (46):

- (46) a **Gli** ho insegnato a far**lo** io ‘I him (DAT) taught to do it’
 b **Gliel**'ho insegnato a fare io ‘I him it taught to do’

Kayne (1989b,248), observing the general non existence of object control “restructuring” verbs, conjectures that the few existing cases (like (44)-(46) above) are

³⁵ This is a case of indirect object control, as are the Spanish cases discussed in the text. As far as I can tell, Italian (but the same is true for other languages – Bordelois 1988.73, Sabel 1999) does not allow Clitic Climbing with any *direct* object control verb (see, for example, **Me lo invitarono/ aiutarono a leggere* ‘They me it invited/helped to read’; **Me lo costrinsero/ obbligarono/forzarono a leggere* ‘They me it forced to read’; **Me lo convinsero/persuasero a leggere* ‘They me it convinced to read’, etc.); a fact plausibly related to the hidden causative nature of such verbs, for which see the text below.

An exception appears to be *mandare* ‘send’, as in *Me lo mandarono a prendere* ‘They sent to get it for-me’. This, however, is not related to *Mi mandarono a prenderlo* ‘They sent me (ACC) to get it’ (via Climbing of *lo*), for *mi* must be dative (cf. *Glielo mandarono a prendere* ‘They him (DAT) it sent to get’). Rather, it seems related to *Mandarono a prendermelo* ‘They sent (scilicet: someone) to get it for me’, though climbing is impossible if the implicit object of *mandare* (‘someone’) is present: **Me lo mandarono qualcuno a prendere* ‘They for-me it sent someone to get’. *Mandare* ‘send’ appears to be the causative of ‘go’, but can also render ‘cause to go (by saying)’: *mi ha mandato al diavolo* ‘He sent me to hell (lit. to the devil)’ can be used to report someone saying to the speaker *vai al diavolo!* ‘go to hell’.

actually hidden instances of the causative construction (which also has Clitic Climbing).³⁶

Indeed there is evidence supporting his intuition. These putative “restructuring” verbs appear to be subject to restrictions which typically hold of the combination of a causative verb and its infinitival complement, and are not found with ordinary “restructuring” cases. For example, as noted in Suñer (1980,316), where the observation is attributed to Bordelois (1974), and Luján (1978), in Spanish, “causative verbs permit Clitic Promotion provided that the object of the infinitive is [-animate]”. See the contrast between (47) and (48):

- (47) a Juan **le** dejó/hizo/vio/oyó armar**la** ‘J. let/made/saw/heard him assemble it’
 b Juan **se la** dejó/hizo/vio/oyó armar ‘J. let/made/saw/heard him assemble it’
- (48) a Juan **le** dejó/hizo/vio/oyó llamar**la** ‘J. let/made/saw/heard him call her’
 b *Juan **se la** dejó/hizo/vio/oyó llamar ‘J. let/made/saw/heard him call her’

Now, exactly the same restriction has been observed by Luján (1978,180f), Contreras (1979,181,fn11), Pizzini (1982), Moore (1990,321ff) to hold with *permitir* ‘allow’, and the other hidden causatives. Compare (44) with (49), and (45) with (50):

- (49) a **Me** permitieron saludar**la** ‘(they) me permitted to greet her’
 b ***Me la** permitieron saludar ‘(they) me her permitted to greet’
- (50) a **Nos** ordenaron saludar**la** ‘(they) us ordered to greet her’
 b ***Nos la** ordenaron saludar ‘(they) us her ordered to greet’

Crucially, no such restriction holds for the ordinary (subject control and raising) cases of “restructuring”. Similarly, in Italian, a restriction found with overt causatives is also found with *insegnare* ‘teach’. The subject of a transitive verb embedded under causative *fare* (syntactically a dative) cannot cliticize to the causative if it is a reflexive or a reciprocal pronoun coreferent with the causative subject:

³⁶. In a decomposition analysis à la Hale and Keyser (1993), *allow*, *order* and *teach*, for example, would closely correspond to something like ‘cause to be able to’, ‘cause to do (by saying)’ (cf. the previous note), and ‘cause to learn’ (or ‘cause to come to know’), respectively.

- (51) a Gianni e Mario fecero imparare la procedura a Carlo/l'uno all'altro
 G. and M. had C. each other learn the procedure
 b Gianni e Mario gli/*si fecero imparare la procedura
 G. and M. had him/each other learn the procedure

Analogously, the dative of (the hidden causative) *insegnare* ((52)), as opposed to the dative of an ordinary verb ((53)) cannot cliticize to the verb if it is a reflexive or reciprocal pronoun coreferent with the subject:

- (52) a Gianni e Mario insegnarono la procedura a Carlo/l'uno all'altro
 G. and M. taught C./each other the procedure
 b Gianni e Mario gli/*?si insegnarono la procedura
- (53) a Gianni e Mario regalarono un disco a Carlo/l'uno all'altro
 G. and M. gave a disk to C./to each other
 b Gianni e Mario si regalarono un disco

If so, the conclusion that there exist object control “restructuring” verbs finds no justification.

4.3 The unavailability of external arguments

The idea that “restructuring” verbs in “restructuring” contexts do not assign thematic roles has the even stronger consequence that they cannot have an external argument either. Put it differently, there cannot be subject control, but only raising, “restructuring” verbs, as auxiliaries (in this respect).³⁷

³⁷. This is, of course, orthogonal to the question whether (obligatory) control reduces, or not, to movement (local raising from and into a theta-position), as in O’Neil (1995,1997), Hornstein (1999), Manzini and Roussou (2000) (cf. also Bošković 1994). For critical discussion of this possibility, see however Landau (1999, forthcoming). The evidence below concerning control “restructuring” verbs argues for movement into a non-theta position, as in classical raising configurations.

This appears at first glance to be an unwelcome result. Even though most of the “restructuring” verbs, like ordinary (non-“restructuring”) raising verbs (as *rivelarsi* ‘to manifest oneself’), fail to impose selectional requirements on the subject of their clause (cf. (54)), some do, e.g. *volere* ‘want’, *osare* ‘dare’, *sapere* ‘know how’, and *provare* ‘try’ (cf. (55)):

- (54) a La casa gli doveva piacere
 ‘The house him had to please’
 b La casa non gli poteva piacere
 ‘The house him could not please’
 c La casa gli tendeva ad apparire piccola
 ‘The house to-him tended to appear little’
 d La casa gli smise di piacere, da allora
 ‘The house him stopped pleasing, since then’
 e La casa non gli riusciva ad apparire bella
 ‘The house him did not manage to appear nice’
 f La casa gli stava per piacere
 ‘The house him was almost pleasing’
 g La casa gli stava dando molti dispiaceri
 ‘The house him was giving a lot of troubles’
 h La casa gli seguì ad apparire piccola
 ‘The house him continued to appear small’
 i La casa gli cominciò a piacere
 ‘The house him started to please’
 l La casa gli finì per piacere
 ‘The house him ended up pleasing’
 m La casa gli finì di apparire piccola
 ‘The house him finished to appear small’
- (55) a *La casa gli voleva appartenere ‘The house to-him wanted to belong’
 b *La casa non gli osava piacere ‘The house him did not dare to please’
 c *La casa non gli sapeva piacere ‘The house him didn't know how to please’
 d *La casa gli provò a piacere ‘The house him tried to please’

If we abstract momentarily from the problem raised by (55), to which we return, the bulk of the evidence indeed appears to support the conclusion that “restructuring” verbs take no external arguments.

The first piece of evidence comes from an observation of Burzio's (1986,390), who notes that extraction of *ne* ‘of-them/it’ from the inverted subject of an apparently transitive/unergative “restructuring” verb is possible just in case the embedded infinitival verb is unaccusative. See (56), containing the “restructuring” verb *volere* ‘want’, and (57), showing the same with the “restructuring” verbs *osare* ‘dare’, *sapere* ‘know how’, and *provare* ‘try’:

- (56) Ne vorrebbero intervenire molti ‘*Ne* wanted to intervene many’
(Burzio 1986,390)
- (57) a Ne osarono rimanere solo due
 ‘*Ne* dared to stay only two’
 b Ne seppero risalire ben pochi
 ‘*Ne* knew how to climb up really few’
 c Ne provarono a intervenire solo un paio
 ‘*Ne* tried to intervene only a couple’

Similar facts are noted for Catalan in Picallo (1985,210). Also see Rosen (1990b, 483):

- (58) N'hi volien entrar alguns ‘Of-them there wanted to enter some’

The fact that *ne*-extraction in Italian (and Catalan) is only possible from an object position, or the ‘inverted’ subject position of an unaccusative, passive, or *si*-passive verb (namely from a structural object position – Burzio 1986,20-42), suggests that *molti*, *solo due*, *ben pochi*, *alguns*, etc. are indeed in the structural object position of the embedded unaccusatives *intervenire* ‘intervene’, *rimanere* ‘remain’, *risalire* ‘climb up’, and *entrar* ‘enter’ in (56), (57) and (58).

This is confirmed by the fact that *ne* can also appear on the infinitive (cf. (59)) and by the fact that replacing the embedded unaccusative with an unergative verb leads to ungrammaticality (cf. (60)):

- (59) a Vorrebbero intervenirne molti
 ‘Wanted *ne* to intervene many’

- b Osarono rimanerne solo due
'Dared *ne* to stay only two'
- c Seppero risalirne ben pochi
'Knew how *ne* to climb up really few'
- d ?Provarono a intervenire solo un paio
'Tried *ne* to intervene only a couple'

- (60) a *Ce ne vorranno mangiare ben pochi 'There *ne* will want to eat really few'
- b *Non ne osò piangere nessuno 'Ne dared to cry nobody'
- c *Non ne seppe rifiutare nessuno 'Ne knew how to refuse nobody'
- d *Gliene provarono a parlare due 'To-him *ne* tried to talk two'

This means that what looks like the (inverted) subject of the matrix “restructuring” verb is actually generated (and remains) in the object (inverted subject) position of the embedded infinitival verb (with nothing, as a consequence, being generated in the external argument position of the “restructuring” verb).³⁸

³⁸. The possibility found in (56) to (59), though, is apparently restricted to unaccusative verbs whose subject can receive a volitional interpretation. See the contrast between the latter sentences and (i)a-c:

- (i) a *Ne sarebbero voluti morire molti 'Many would have liked to die'
- b *Ne vorrebbero essere feriti pochi 'Few would like to be wounded'
- c *Ne vorrebbero esser noti molti 'Many would like to be well-known'

The contrast is plausibly an effect of the selectional requirement of *volere* ‘want’, and the ability/inability of the ‘inverted’ subject to be interpreted volitionally.

The same requirement can perhaps account for why purely presentational contexts like *ce ne sono molti* ‘there are many of-them’ are unacceptable in this construction (vs. the one with raising *dovere* ‘must’, which does not impose any volitional requirement). See (ii)a-b, from Burzio (1986,362), which under this view no longer instantiate a control vs. raising contrast:

- (ii) a *Ci vorrebbe essere molta gente alla festa
'there would like to be many people at the party'
- b Ci dovrebbe essere molta gente alla festa
'there should be many people at the party'

Another piece of evidence that transitive/unergative “restructuring” verbs take no external argument (when used as functional verbs) comes from a property of the impersonal(-passive) *si* construction of Italian.

The contrast between (iii)a and b (also from Burzio 1986, 389) can analogously be attributed not to control vs. raising, but to a failure in complying with the volitionality requirement on the subject (theme of the embedded passive verb):

- (iii) a *Un interprete ciascuno_i vorrebbe essere assegnato a quei visitatori_i
 ‘One interpreter each would want to be introduced to those visitors’
 b Un interprete ciascuno_i potrebbe essere assegnato a quei visitatori_i
 ‘One interpreter each could be introduced to those visitors’

When such subject is more easily interpretable as volitional, the contrast indeed tends to disappear:

- (iv) ?A quei visitatori_i vorrà forse andare incontro un interprete ciascuno_i
 ‘To those visitors will want to go up one interpreter each’

Rizzi (1976b, 172ff) mentions the existence of another Control vs. Raising contrast in the “restructuring” construction. Raising, but not Control, verbs would seem to allow for impersonal *si* on the embedded infinitival. See (v) (given with his judgment):

- (v) a Queste case devono/possono costruirsi alla svelta
 ‘These houses must/can *si* build quickly’
 b *Queste case vogliono costruirsi alla svelta
 These houses want to *si* build quickly

I (and other speakers), however, find such cases as (v)b not to be impossible, and actually quite natural with other moods and lexical choices: *Certe esperienze vorrebbero potersi fare subito* ‘Certain experiences would want to be able to do *si* immediately’. The (near-) impossibility of the other case given by Rizzi (the one with *andare*: **Queste medicine vanno a comprarsi in farmacia* ‘These medicines go to *si* buy at the chemist’s’) can perhaps be due to the fact that impersonal *si* is located higher than the functional head hosting motion verbs (indeed a very low one – cf. Cinque 1997b). Similar considerations may apply to the (near-) impossibility of ??*Certe esperienze vorrebbero/dovrebbero poter farsi subito* ‘Certain experiences would want to/should be able to *si* do immediately’, where the clitic is found on the lexical verb.

In non-finite contexts under a raising verb, *si* is found with verbs that assign an external theta-role (transitive and unergative), but not with those that fail to assign one (unaccusative, passive, psych-, copular and raising verbs). See (61) and (62) (and the discussion in Cinque 1988):

- (61) a *Sembra essersi finalmente trovato il colpevole*
 seems to be *si* finally found the culprit
 ‘the culprit seems to have been found’
 b *Non sembra essersi lavorato a sufficienza*
 Not seems to be *si* worked sufficiently
 ‘One does not seem to have worked sufficiently’
- (62) a **Sembra essersi arrivati troppo tardi*
 Seems to be *si* arrived too late
 ‘One seems to have arrived too late’
 b **Sembra non essersi stati apprezzati*
 Seems not to have been appreciated
 ‘One seems not to have been appreciated’
 c **Sembra essersi preoccupato solo un genitore*
 Seems to be *si* worried only one parent
 ‘One seems to have worried only one parent’
 d **Sembra non essersi benvenuti qui*
 Seems not to be *si* welcome here
 ‘One seems not to be welcome here’
 e **Sembra risultarsi ignorare il problema*
 Seems to appear *si* to ignore the problem
 ‘One seems to appear to ignore the problem’

Whatever the account is for this contrast (cf. Cinque 1988, and Dobrovie-Sorin 1998), it constitutes a diagnostic for external-theta-role-assigning verbs.

Now, if there were subject control (hence transitive or unergative) “restructuring” verbs, one would expect them to allow *si* in non-finite contexts (like those of (61)). Yet, whether they allow it or not depends entirely on the nature of the verb of their infinitival complement. They do if the latter is transitive or unergative. Otherwise they don’t. In other words, they appear to inherit their status from that of the embedded verb, which again suggests that they do not have an external argument of their own but are

transparent to the arguments of the embedded verb, much like auxiliaries. See (63) and (64), with the “restructuring” verb *volere* ‘want’:³⁹

- (63) a (?)Non sembra esserglisi voluto dare sufficiente credito
Not seems to be to-him *si* wanted to give sufficient credit
b (?)Non sembra essersene voluto parlare molto, di questi problemi
Not seems to be of-it *si* wanted to talk much, of these problems
- (64) a *Non sembra esserglisi voluto/i venire in aiuto⁴⁰
Not seems to be him *si* wanted to come in support
b *Non sembra esserglisi voluto/i essere presentati
Not seems to be to-him *si* wanted to be introduced
c *Non sembra esserglisi voluto/i essere fedeli
Not seems to be to-him *si* wanted to be faithful

³⁹. Analogous cases of transparency of ‘want’ in various languages are noted in the relational grammar literature. Frantz (1976,182f), for example, notes that in MicMac (Algonkian) the complex verb formed by ‘want’ and the embedded verb retains the valency properties of the embedded verb (it shows transitive or intransitive inflection depending on the transitive or intransitive nature of the embedded verb). Similarly, Gerdtz (1988,845f) notes that in Eskimo and Halkomelem Salish the subject of ‘want’ receives absolutive Case if the embedded verb is intransitive and ergative Case if it is transitive (thus apparently inheriting the status of the latter). Gonzales (1986, 1990) reports that with *querer* ‘want’ (and more marginally *tratar* ‘try’), in certain varieties of Spanish the “Inversion property of an embedded predicate like *gustar* can in effect “transfer” to the matrix” (1990,87). In *A Juan le quieren gustar las matematicas* ‘J. wants to like mathematics’, it is Juan who “wants” even if *querer* does not normally take a dative subject. This suggests that the selectional requirement of *querer* can be satisfied under “restructuring” by the dative argument of the embedded psych-verb *gustar*. For more general discussion of the optional “inheritance” property of desideratives across languages, see Gerdtz (1988).

⁴⁰. The presence of Clitic Climbing is meant to exclude the “lexical” use of *volere* (for which see section 6.4 below). Plural number agreement on *volere* also appears to exclude it (**Sembra essersi voluti andare volentieri* ‘Seems to be *si* wanted to go willingly’). This is because ‘lexical’ *volere* is followed by an abstract predicate taking an object clause (cf. section 6.4), whence 3rd person singular agreement on the participle. 3rd person singular agreement indeed is acceptable in the same context: *Sembra non essersi voluto andare incontro a nessuno* ‘Seems to be *si* wanted to go towards nobody’.

- d *Non sembra esserglisi voluto/i risultare simpatici
 Not seems to be to-him *si* wanted to appear nice

From the evidence reviewed, the conclusion that (when transparency effects obtain) “restructuring” verbs do not take external arguments thus seems inescapable, though it is in conflict with the evidence based on (55) above, where some such verbs appeared to impose selectional restrictions on the subject (giving the appearance that they take a subject of their own). A possible solution to the paradox (in the spirit of Zubizarreta's 1982, chapter 3, proposal that such predicates assign not primary, but adjunct, theta-roles) would consist in taking their selectional requirements to be a consequence of their semantics. If verbs like ‘want’, just like volitional adverbs such as *willingly*, *voluntarily*, etc. (cf. **The house willingly belonged to Bill*), or, for that matter, manner adverbs (cf. **The house hid the horizon carefully*), must be predicated of a sentient being, the ungrammaticality of (55) vs. (54) follows without having to assume that they take an external argument of their own.

5. The optional character of transparency effects in (Standard) Italian

5.1 *The optionality of Clitic Climbing*

It is widely assumed that Clitic Climbing obtains *obligatorily* in the “restructuring” configuration. Cf. Rizzi (1976a, 1978 - but see his notes 18 and 26, respectively); Burzio (1986, 393fn44); Rochette (1988, 96); Rosen (1990a, 144), among others. Evidence for that assumption primarily comes from the interaction of Long Object Preposing and Clitic Climbing. When Long Object Preposing obtains (indicating the presence of the “restructuring” configuration) Clitic Climbing must apparently also obtain. See the ungrammaticality of (65)b, adapted from Rizzi (1978, 132):

- (65) a Si vorrebbe vender**gli** queste case a caro prezzo
 Si (one) would like to sell him these houses at a high price
 b *Queste case si vorrebbero vender**gli** a caro prezzo
 These houses si would like to sell him at a high price
 c Queste case **gli** si vorrebbero vendere a caro prezzo

The evidence, however, is less solid than it appears. First of all, as already noted in Rizzi (1976a,fn18;1978,fn26; also see Longobardi 1978,fn5) clitics may fail to climb in the presence of Auxiliary Change. See (66)a, from Rizzi (1978), and (66)b, from Boysen (1977,289):

- (66) a Maria è dovuta venir**ci** molte volte ‘M. is had to come-there many times’
 b Un’ora più tardi sarebbe dovuto esser**vi** arrivato, ma nessuno lo vide
 (Silone)
 ‘After one hour he should be had to have-there arrived, but nobody saw him’

This would seem to indicate that Clitic Climbing is optional, in contrast with what (65)b appears to show. The paradox, however, is only apparent as (65)b turns out to be ill-formed for a distinct reason.

In Italian, when an unergative or transitive verb (which takes auxiliary *avere* ‘have’ in the perfect) is in the impersonal(-passive) *si* form, the perfect auxiliary shifts to *essere* ‘be’ (Rizzi 1978,fn22). See (67) and (68):⁴¹

- (67) a Gianni **ha**/*è lavorato molto ‘G. has/is worked a lot’
 b Si è/***ha** lavorato molto ‘One is/has worked a lot’

- (68) a Gianni **ha**/*è perso molti soldi ‘G. has/is lost a lot of money’

⁴¹. In addition to impersonal(-passive) *si*, which absorbs the external theta-role and Accusative Case (thus forcing a direct object, when present, to become subject), another *si* exists (cf. Cinque’s 1988 –arg *si*) which absorbs no external theta-role, nor Accusative, but only Nominative, and which can thus render impersonal those predicates that have no external theta-role nor Accusative Case (unaccusative, passive, psych-, copular and raising verbs). When this *si* applies to transitives, there is no object promotion to subject (Cinque 1988, Dobrovie-Sorin 1998):

- (i) a Si è perso molti soldi ‘One has lost (sing.) a lot of money (pl.)’
 b Li si è persi ‘them one has lost’

This construction (which is somewhat marked with transitive verbs, giving rise to a special interpretation in specific time reference contexts) is the only possible one when there is no agreement (as in (i)a), or the object is cliticized (as in (i)b), or contains the *ci si* form (replacing an impossible *si si*), or has floating *tutti* ‘all’ (cf. Cinque 1988; also see the next note).

b Si **son**/***hanno** persi molti soldi ‘A lot of money was/has been lost’

This also holds in infinitive contexts (cf. Cinque 1988,524ff):

(69) I colpevoli non risultano **essersi**/***aversi** ancora trovati

‘The culprits do not seem yet to *si* be found’

When the higher verb is a “restructuring” verb, Object Preposing, as noted, can apparently span over two clauses:

(70) I colpevoli *si* vorrebbero trovare subito

‘the culprits *si* would want to find immediately’

In such cases, a surprising instance of auxiliary shift is found on the embedded infinitival verb when this is in the perfect. In spite of the fact that the impersonal(-passive) *si* is on the “restructuring” verb, the perfect auxiliary of the embedded infinitival must be *essere* ‘be’. Consider (71):

(71) a Questi libri gli *si* vorrebbero **esser** già dati

These books to-him *si* (one) would like to be already given

b ***Questi** libri gli *si* vorrebbero **aver** già dato

These books to-him *si* (one) would like to have already given

As there is no other reason why the auxiliary should be *essere* in (71)a except for *si*, we can infer that *si* must have originated with the embedded verb. In turn this means that its appearing in front of the “restructuring” verb in (71)a must be due to Clitic Climbing.⁴²

⁴². The contrast in (71) in fact provides additional evidence for the already discussed non argument-taking nature of *volere* ‘want’ in “restructuring” contexts. If it could assign an external theta-role and thus license impersonal(-passive) *si*, it is not clear why it should require the embedded transitive verb to select *essere* when Long Object Preposing occurs. In the absence of such preposing, no *avere* --> *essere* change on the embedded verb can in fact take place (cf. (i) - Fresina 1981,335), even in the presence of other transparency effects (like *Loro*-climbing – cf. (i)b):

(i) a Si vorrebbe averle (***esserle**) vendute a un prezzo più alto

‘Si (one) would have liked to (be) have sold them at a higher price’

If so, we have a reason for the ungrammaticality of (65)b, which is an instance of impersonal(-passive) *si* (see the agreement with the object). It is the same reason that

-
- b Si vorrebbe loro averle già vendute
 ‘Si (one) would like them (DAT) to have them already sold’

These examples, however, would seem to show that *si*, after all, can originate directly with *volere*; hence that the modal assigns an external theta-role. But (i)b, and the Clitic Climbing variant of (i)a (*Le si vorrebbe aver vendute a un prezzo più alto*), show that the *si* of (i) is not the impersonal(-passive) one (i.e., the +arg one of Cinque 1988, which absorbs the external theta-role and Accusative Case), but the pure impersonal one mentioned in the previous note (the -arg of Cinque 1988, which only absorbs Nominative Case, and which renders impersonal unaccusative, passive, psych-, copular and raising verbs. (i)b also suggests that, in one and the same clause, -arg *si* is higher than complement clitics. Now, the following facts indeed suggest that such *si* is higher in the functional structure of the clause than impersonal(-passive) *si* (and the other types of *si*) See, for example, the contrast between (ii)b, with the pure impersonal *si* of note 41, and (iii)b,(iv)b, with impersonal(-passive) *si*:

- (ii) a **Si** stava convincendolo tutti a restare ‘We were convincing him all to stay’
 b ****Stava convincendosi** tutti a restare
- (iii) a Questi articoli **si** stanno vendendo a prezzi stracciati
 ‘These items are being sold very cheap’
 b ?Questi articoli stanno vendendosi a prezzi stracciati
- (iv) a Loro **si** stanno scrivendo dei biglietti ‘They are writing cards to each other’
 b Loro stanno scrivendosi dei biglietti

Examples (72),(74) in the text below show that the progressive periphrasis in Italian, like other contexts, does not allow split clitics. (ii) is not exceptional in our analysis as *si* actually originates higher than all other complement clitics. As Richard Kayne pointed out to me, (ii) recalls such Friulian examples as *Si vjodilu* ‘One sees it/him’ (cf. Benincà 1989,572), with such cases as *Si lu vjodi* (Beninca’, *ibidem*) and *Lo si stava convincendo* cases of Clitic Climbing.

rules out (72) and (73), where only one of the two clitics has climbed (vs. (74) and (75), in which the clitics have not split):⁴³

- (72) a ***Mi** sta dicendolo
 (He) to-me is saying it
 b ***Lo** sta dicendomi
 (He) it is saying to-me
- (73) a ***Mi** sta per dirlo
 (He) to-me is about to say it
 b ***Lo** sta per dirmi
 (He) it is about to say to-me
- (74) a Sta dicendomelo
 (He) is saying to-me it
 b **Me lo** sta dicendo
- (75) a Sta per dirmelo
 (He) is about to say to-me it
 b **Me lo** sta per dire

If the ill-formedness of (65)b indeed reduces to that of (72)-(73), it becomes possible to maintain Clitic Climbing in “restructuring” contexts as “optional” (with the two options possibly depending on factors distinct from the “restructuring” configuration). The optionality of Clitic Climbing is already indicated by (66), as noted, and by such alternations as (74) and (75), for which no (literally) biclausal source appears plausible.

⁴³. The requirement of “uniform cliticization” found in Italian in “restructuring” contexts (Rizzi 1976a,fn18), in the progressive and prospective periphrasis of (74), (75), and in negative imperatives (Kayne 1992,fn5 – cf. **Non gli datelo* vs. *Non dateglielo* or *Non glielo date* ‘Don’t give it to-them’) remains to be understood, especially given the fact that it is not found in other Romance varieties (Kayne 1989b,248,256,fn34), nor in Serbo-Croatian (Stjepanović 1998). The presence/absence of the requirement could turn out to depend on whether clitics form a cluster (i.e. each one is adjoined to the next), or not. That the ill-formedness of (65)b may have to do with one but not the other clitic climbing up is also found in Longobardi (1979,fn7), and Burzio (1981, chapter 6,fn4).

It is also indicated by the fact that clitics may fail to climb in the presence of the climbing of the weak pronominal *loro* ‘to-them’ (for which see Rizzi 1978,138ff; Cardinaletti 1991):⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Taraldsen (1982,273) gives *Maria deve loro averlo già dato* ‘M. must to-them have it already given’ as ungrammatical, but this and similar sentences seem to me quite acceptable.

The optionality of Clitic Climbing in ‘long’ *tough*-movement contexts (also a diagnostic for the “restructuring” configuration - Rizzi 1978,140ff) is not easy to check. Although examples like *Questa tavola è difficile da poter venderti* ‘this table is difficult to be able to sell to-you’ are, according to Zubizarreta (1980,154,175) accepted by some native speakers on a par with *Questa tavola è difficile da poterti vendere* ‘this table is difficult to be able to-you to sell’, for others, myself included, clitics (in either position) are quite marginal. In this connection, also see Radford (1977,109), Napoli (1981,850f), Rizzi (2000,101).

Additional evidence for the optionality of Clitic Climbing is provided by the paradigms in (i) (prompted by an observation of Anna Cardinaletti’s), and (ii), adapted from Longobardi (1980,fn.5):

- (i) a Gianni **lo** tornò a salutare ‘G. greeted him again’
 b Gianni tornò a salutar**lo** ‘G. greeted him again’ or ‘G. came back to greet him’
- (ii) a ??Dovrebbe detestare studiare questa materia ‘he should detest studying this subject’
 b ??Vorrebbe potere fare questo anche lui ‘Even he would like to be able to do this’
 c **Lo** vorrebbe poter(??e) fare anche lui ‘Even he it would like to be able to do’
 d Vorrebbe poter(??e) far**lo** anche lui

In (i)a, with Clitic Climbing (which forces the “restructuring” configuration), *tornare* ‘(lit.) go/come back’ is unambiguously interpreted as a marker or ‘iterative aspect’ (= ‘do again’). In (i)b, where the clitic is on the embedded infinitival, *tornare* is ambiguous between the literal meaning ‘go/come back’ and ‘do again’. This suggests that the “restructuring” option is available even when the clitic does not climb.

(ii)a-b exemplify a constraint against the sequence of two infinitives, one of which is the complement of the other (Longobardi 1980). (ii)c shows that with “restructuring” verbs displaying Clitic Climbing the constraint becomes inoperative, provided that the final vowel of the first infinitive is deleted. But the same is true of (ii)d, even though the clitic has not climbed. This suggests that (ii)d is a case of “restructuring” despite the lack of Clitic Climbing (note that deletion of the ‘e’ of *detestare* in (ii)a does not improve its status; Retention of the –e in (ii) is better than the retention of the –e with enclitics: ***Farelo sarebbe difficile* ‘To do it would be difficult’).

- (76) Ho **loro** cominciato ad insegnar**lo** più di un anno fa
I have to-them begun to teach it more than a year ago

All of this suggests that clitics may appear in the same clause either on the finite verb or on the non-finite one (infinitive or gerund). From this point of view, it is past participles (the other non-finite form of Italian) that are surprising in not allowing clitics to attach to them in the presence of a finite verb. See the impossible **Ho mangiatolo* ‘I have eaten it’ (vs. *L’ho mangiato*).⁴⁵ Differently from Italian, which in “restructuring” configurations allows clitics to appear in either position, one finds Romance varieties where the clitic can only appear in the *higher* one - i.e. varieties in which Clitic Climbing, hence “restructuring”, looks obligatory, like most Central and Southern Italian dialects (Beninca’ 1986,131f, Monachesi 1995,200ff; Ledgeway 1998,2000), and Sardinian (Jones 1993) - and varieties where the clitic can appear only in the *lower* position. This is the case of (Modern) French, which displays no Clitic Climbing (except for the marginal climbing of *y* ‘there’ and *en* ‘of it/them’ in more careful styles – cf. Kayne 1977,chapter2,fn7; Pollock 1978,fn18; Taraldsen 1983,308), nor Auxiliary Change, but has other “restructuring” effects (*Tout/tous* Climbing, and manner adverb Climbing - Kayne 1975, Pollock 1978, Taraldsen 1982,1983, Haik 1985, Bok-Bennema and Kampers-Manhe 1994, Bonneau and Zushi 1994;⁴⁶ Long *Tough*-movement - Kayne 1989b,250ff; and ‘Long Passive’ – see Rochette 1988,245fn23, and the examples given in the next note). Still other varieties display a clitic in both positions (i.e., a copy in the lower one- Beninca’ 1986,130; Kayne 1989, fn37). See, for example, Chilean Spanish *Los vamos a verlos* ‘Them (we) are going to see them’ (from Uriagereka

Also see Monachesi (1999) for experimental evidence that “restructuring” verbs and their infinitival complement form a prosodic unit whether or not Clitic Climbing is present.

⁴⁵. “*Ho mangiatolo*” is possible in other Romance varieties (cf. the references cited in Rizzi 2000,100). When no finite verb is present, a clitic can attach to the past participle even in Standard Italian: (*Una volta mangiatolo, si alzò e se ne andò* ‘(Once) eaten it, (he) stood up and left’. On such ‘absolute’ usages of the past participle, see Belletti (1981,1990), Kayne (1989a), and Cinque (1990, section 4.1).

⁴⁶. Though, apparently, only with a subset of the verbs that allow Clitic Climbing in Spanish and Italian.

1995,86,fn21), and Neapolitan *L’amu pruvatu a ru vida* ‘Him (we) tried to him see’ (from Ledgeway 1996, chapter 3,fn6).⁴⁷

⁴⁷. One context where Clitic Climbing appears *obligatory* is ‘Long Passive’, a construction only possible with “restructuring” verbs (Rizzi 1976a,fn21; Aissen and Perlmutter 1983, postscript; Burzio 1986,373ff; Cinque 1997b). Here, a clitic cannot remain on the infinitive. See (i)b (a similar observation is made in Rizzi 2000,101):

- (i) a I pezzi **gli** furono finiti di consegnare l’anno dopo
 ‘The parts were finished delivering to him a year later’
 b *I pezzi furono finiti di consegnargli l’anno dopo

But even this obligatoriness may prove illusory. As noted in the above references, ‘Long Passive’ in Romance is restricted to “restructuring” verbs of ‘finishing’, ‘beginning’, and (more marginally) ‘motion’ and ‘continuation’, in fact, a subset of these – cf. Cinque 1997b. In that paper, I already argued that such limitations could be understood if “restructuring” verbs are functional verbs inserted directly under the corresponding functional heads. For in such cases it is to be expected that only those “restructuring” verbs which correspond to aspectual heads lower than Voice (completive, inceptive, continuative, and motion) will be able to be passivized (in addition to the lexical verb). All other aspectual, modal and mood heads higher than Voice instead cannot be passivized as lowering is barred. If that is correct, the ungrammaticality of (i)b could be due, then, not to the obligatory character of Clitic Climbing, but to the fact that no clitic position is available (in Italian) under Voice.

While the same generalization concerning ‘Long Passive’ in “restructuring” Romance languages appears to hold in French (The only cases cited in Grevisse 1993,1124f are with ‘finish’-type verbs: *Le chateau n’était pas achevé de meubler* ‘the castle was not finished furnishing’; *..une boite qui n’était pas tout à fait finie d’installer* ‘.a box which was not at all finished installing’), and Japanese (Nishigauchi 1993), Wurmbrand (1998,34f,119ff) notes that in German ‘Long Passive’ is not as restricted as in Romance. For example, it is also found with such “restructuring” verbs as ‘try’, ‘manage’, ‘dare’, etc. Rather than taking the contrast to depend on the different location of these aspectual heads, I conjecture it may depend on the higher location of passive morphology in German, which corresponds more to an ‘impersonal’ than to a ‘personal’ Voice (it can, for example, affect unergative verbs, like Italian *si*, which, interestingly, also “passivizes” ‘try’, ‘manage’, ‘dare’, etc.).

5.2 *The optionality of Long Object Preposing and Loro Climbing*

The optionality of Clitic Climbing in “restructuring” contexts in Italian is not unique. Long Object Preposing (as noted in Rizzi 1978,132) and *Loro Climbing* are likewise optional. See (77), where the presence of Clitic Climbing does not force Long Object Preposing, and (78)-(80), where the presence of Clitic Climbing, Auxiliary Change and Long Object Preposing, respectively, does not force *Loro Climbing*:

(77) Gli si vuole vendere queste case a caro prezzo
 To-him si wants to sell these houses at a high price
 (Cf. Queste case gli si vogliono vendere a caro prezzo)

(78) a Le ho dovute consegnar loro in ritardo
 Them (I) have had to give to-them late
 b Le ho loro dovute consegnare in ritardo

(79) a Mi chiedo come sia potuta andar loro incontro
 I wonder how she could go to-them toward
 b Mi chiedo come sia loro potuta andare incontro

(80) a Si sarebbero dovute consegnar loro subito
 They *si* would have to give to-them immediately
 b Si sarebbero loro dovute consegnare subito

5.3 *Auxiliary Change*⁴⁸

The case of Auxiliary Change appears to be more complex. On one side, the ungrammaticality of (81)a (vs. (81)b), from Rizzi (1978,136), would seem to suggest that it is obligatory:

⁴⁸. Auxiliary Change is possible only from *avere* ‘have’ to *essere* ‘be’ (not viceversa), and with a subset of the “restructuring” verbs (*volere* ‘want’, *potere* ‘can’, *dovere* ‘must’, and *cominciare, iniziare* ‘begin’, *continuare* ‘continue’) for reasons that remain to be understood. Cf. Kayne (1989b,253) and references cited there.

- (81) a *?Maria **ci ha** dovuto venire molte volte
 ‘M. has had to come there many times’
 b Maria **c’** è dovuta venire molte volte

On the other, the acceptability of (82)a (alongside (82)b) would seem to point to its optionality (in that Auxiliary Change fails to apply even in the presence of *Loro Climbing*):⁴⁹

⁴⁹. Burzio (1986,365) also attributes equal status to the variant with Auxiliary Change and to that without in (i) a and b, and (ii) a and b, in the presence of Clitic Climbing. (I in fact find the variant without Auxiliary Change better):

- (i) a Giovanni le ?sarebbe dovuto essere fedele ‘G.would have had to be faithful to her’
 b Giovanni le ?avrebbe dovuto essere fedele ‘G.would have had to be faithful to her’
- (ii) a Giovanni ne ?sarebbe dovuto essere il presidente
 ‘G. would have had to be the president of it’
 b Giovanni ne ?avrebbe dovuto essere il presidente
 ‘G. would have had to be the president of it’

In more colloquial styles of Italian Auxiliary Change may in fact fail to apply even in the presence of Clitic Climbing. See (iii), and the case in (iv), given by Rizzi (1978,136). The same is true in Occitan (see (v), from Hernanz and Rigau 1984,47):

- (iii) a Maria c’ha (*ci ha) dovuto venire molte volte ‘M. there had to come many times’
 b ?Non c’hai (*ci hai) potuto entrare? ‘You not there could enter?’
 c Gli hai per caso potuto andare incontro? ‘him could you by chance go towards?’
 d Non ne ha mai voluto venir fuori ‘he from-it has never wanted to get out’
- (iv) ??Laura ci ha cominciato ad andare un mese fa ‘L. has begun to go there a month ago’
- (v) a Me **son** volgut venjar ‘I wanted to take revenge’
 b M’**ai** volgut venjar

Concerning the contrast **ci ha* vs. *c’ha* [t♣a] in (iii), note that (81)b and the like also degrade considerably with *ci è* in place of *c’è*.

- (82) a. Avremmo loro potuto rimanere più vicini
 ‘We could have to-them remained closer’
 b. Saremmo loro potuti rimanere più vicini
 ‘We could have to-them remained closer’

I tentatively interpret this paradox as showing that in Standard Italian Auxiliary Change is *per se* optional (like all the other transparency effects), but is favored by Clitic Climbing in more careful styles of Italian. This could be made sense of if in these styles clitics climb via adjunction to the head which, raising, effects the change *avere* → *essere* on the “restructuring” verb (whence the implication “Clitic Climbing → Auxiliary Change”, in a language which has both, though not viceversa – cf. (66)).⁵⁰

6. The functional status of “restructuring” verbs in the absence of transparency effects

So far, following the traditional opinion, I have been assuming that the presence of one or more transparency effects is an unequivocal indication of the presence of a monoclausal configuration, while the variant without transparency effects indicates a biclausal one. Given their optionality, however, the variant without transparency effects tells us nothing about sentence structure. A “restructuring” verb could well be functional (directly inserted under a functional head, in a monoclausal configuration) even when the clitic is on the embedded verb, or *loro* has not climbed, or Long Object Preposing has not applied.

This opens up the theoretical possibility that “restructuring” verbs are always ‘functional’, even in the absence of transparency effects.

The existence of varieties where transparency effects are obligatory (such as most Southern Italian dialects) would already seem to suggest that “restructuring” verbs indeed are only ‘functional’. In this section, I consider some evidence supporting this first indication. We shall see that except for *sembrare* ‘seem’ and motion verbs (which

⁵⁰. Interestingly in this connection, Pierce (1990,21) reports that Auxiliary Change was lost in the history of French more or less at the same time (early 17th century) that Clitic Climbing was lost (which is also the same time when Aux-to-COMP was apparently lost – Roberts 1993a,203).

also have genuine lexical usages), “restructuring” verbs are always ‘functional’; hence necessarily entering a monoclausal configuration. This has the conceptual advantage that such verbs do not need to be marked in the lexicon as either lexical or functional, with the ensuing problem of having to account for the complete synonymy of the two uses, and for what looks like a single subcategorization option (the uniform selection of either *di* ‘of’, *a* ‘to’, or θ - cf. Rizzi 1978,150). They need only be marked as functional. In addition to this conceptual argument, there is some empirical evidence for their exclusively functional nature (see sections 6.1-3).

6.1 Again on the relative order of “restructuring” verbs

In section 3.2 above, we observed that “restructuring” verbs come in a rigid order when transparency effects obtain. The same rigidity is however found even in the absence of transparency effects. See (83)-(84) (and Hernanz and Rigau 1984,fn6 for the similar rigid ordering of “restructuring” verbs in the absence of transparency effects in Catalan):

- (83) a **Suole provare a farle/provarle a fare** da solo
 ‘He uses to try to do them by himself’
 b ***Prova a soler farle/ solerle fare** da solo
 ‘He tries to use to do them by himself’
- (84) a **Soleva smettere di vederla/ ?smetterla di vedere** ogni sei mesi
 ‘He used to stop seeing her every six months’
 b ***Smetteva di soler vederla/solerla vedere** ogni sei mesi
 ‘He stopped using to see her every six months’

This suggests that such verbs are only ‘functional’. If they were (also) lexical, taking a fulfilled CP complement, it would not be clear how they could determine the choice of the verb of their sentential complement. Note that the reason for the ill-formedness of (84)b can hardly be “semantic”. It would make perfect sense to “stop having the habit of doing something”. Yet, the sentence is unacceptable.

6.2. “Imperfect” (partial) vs. “strict” (exhaustive) Control

Further evidence for the exclusive functional character of “restructuring” verbs appears to come from a property of (obligatory) Control recently discussed by Wurmbrand (1998, chapter 4) and Landau (1999, forthcoming, chapter 2). Wurmbrand (1998, 163ff) observes that the class of Control infinitives splits into two distinct subclasses: one in which the infinitive subject is referentially strictly identical to the controller, and one in which it only needs to include the reference of the controller (what she terms “imperfect” Control). This can be seen in the contrast between (85) and (86):

- (85) a *(They said that) John tried to meet in front of the Post Office
 b *(They said that) John managed to gather at 6

- (86) a (They said that) John had planned to meet in the castle
 b (They said that) John had regretted meeting in the castle

The latter, but not the former, are grammatical because only the latter allow the infinitive subject (which is plural, given the semantics of the verb) to partially overlap with (include) the controller (which is singular). The former, instead, require strict referential identity between controller and controllee; a condition violated in (85).⁵¹

Wurmbrand further argues that the class requiring strict identity coincides with the class of “restructuring” infinitives while the class allowing “imperfect” Control coincides with that of non-“restructuring” infinitives, and suggests that the difference follows from a difference between restructured and non-restructured configurations. The latter have a subject PRO (which can be “imperfectly” controlled). The former have no syntactic subject, their understood subject being “semantically controlled”. I think Wurmbrand’s generalization is correct, but I would like to suggest that the strict referential identity between controller and controllee in the “restructuring” case requires no additional semantic mechanism. It is simply a consequence of the fact, already discussed, that “restructuring” configurations involve *raising* even in the few apparent

⁵¹. Landau (1999, forthcoming) draws a comparable distinction between what he calls “exhaustive” Control (with implicative, aspectual, and modal predicates), and “partial” Control (with factive, propositional, desiderative, and interrogative predicates). I’ll come back to his analysis, as he explicitly claims that exhaustive Control does not coincide with “restructuring” (contrary to what I am proposing below).

Control cases. In this view, (obligatory) Control comes to coincide with “imperfect” Control, and what looks like strict Control is nothing but raising.⁵²

Now, if the strict referential identity of the two subjects, in “restructuring” contexts, necessarily follows from their raising character, the fact that the two subjects are also strictly identical in the variant without transparency effects is a direct argument for the raising (and monoclausal) character of the configuration which lacks transparency effects, hence for the exclusively functional character of the “restructuring” verbs

⁵². Landau (forthcoming, chapter 2, section 6) explicitly claims that exhaustive Control does not reduce to raising (due to the Control character of some of the modal and aspectual verbs), nor does it coincide with “restructuring” (given that exhaustive control is a property of modal, aspectual, and implicative verbs, irrespective of whether they are in a “restructuring” context or not, and given that some of the implicative verbs which show exhaustive control are not “restructuring”). In the context of our analysis, none of these arguments are compelling. For one thing, we saw above evidence for the raising character of even apparent Control “restructuring” verbs like ‘want’. As to the second claim, we are suggesting that “restructuring” verbs enter a “restructuring” (monoclausal) configuration even in the absence of transparency effects; i.e. only enter “restructuring” contexts (whence their exclusively raising character, which derives their “exhaustive Control” property in all situations). Finally, the claim that there are non-“restructuring” implicative verbs, which still display exhaustive Control, does not seem to us to be substantiated by the facts. Among implicative verbs, we find that only the “restructuring” ones (*riuscire* “manage”, *dimenticare* “forget”, *mancare* ‘fail’, *osare* ‘dare’) display exhaustive control. (cf. (i)). Non-“restructuring” ones (all the others) appear to us to allow (in Italian) partial Control –cf (ii):

- (i) *Loro dissero che Gianni non riuscì a (/dimenticò di/mancò di/osò) incontrarsi alle 5
 ‘They said that G. did not manage (/forgot/failed/dared) to meet at 5’
- (ii) Loro dissero che Gianni fece in modo/ritenne opportuno/accondiscese a/evitò di andare insieme al cinema
 ‘They said that G. made sure/saw fit/condescended/avoided to go to the movies together’.

“Weak implicatives” (Pesetsky 1991) (which are plausibly hidden causatives – cf. Kayne 1989b, 248, and section 4.2 above) also seem to me to allow partial Control. Cf. (iii) (at any rate (ii) and (iii) sharply contrast with (i), which indeed makes it plausible that exhaustive Control and “restructuring” coincide):

- (iii) Gianni costrinse/convinse/forzò Maria ad andare insieme al cinema
 ‘G. compelled/ convinced/forced M. to go together to the movies’

involved. If the variant without transparency effects involved a biclausal structure with PRO, “imperfect” Control would be expected to be possible, contrary to fact (**Ho provato a incontrarsi davanti alla Posta* ‘I tried to meet in front of the Post Office’).

6.3 *Apparent lexical usages of volere and aspectual verbs*

The idea that “restructuring” verbs are always functional would seem to be contradicted by certain *prima facie* lexical usages of *volere* ‘want’, and of some of the aspectual verbs. See (87)-(88):

- (87) Gianni vuole una bicicletta ‘G. wants a bicycle’
- (88) a Maria ha cominciato il romanzo ‘M. began the novel’
 b Mario ha finito il vino ‘M. finished the wine’
 c Il concerto sta cominciando/sta finendo/continua
 ‘The concert is beginning/finishing/continuing’

In all such cases, the verb, unlike what happens with functional verbs, does not take a non-finite verbal complement, but a DP, object or subject, thus apparently qualifying as a simple transitive, or unaccusative, lexical verb. The appearances, however, are misleading, as there is evidence that (87)-(88) are structurally more complex than they look. Den Dikken, Larson and Ludlow (1996), following earlier proposals by McCawley and Ross, provide syntactic arguments that in (87) ‘want’ does not directly take the DP as its object, but takes an abstract verbal complement, whose head, roughly paraphrasable with HAVE, takes the DP as its object:⁵³

- (89) Gianni vuole [_{XP} HAVE [_{DP} una bicicletta]]

⁵³ Here, I in fact assume, immaterially for the argument, that the abstract understood verb is something like OBTAIN (= [COME [TO HAVE]]). ‘*Vorrei DP*’, as opposed to ‘*Vorrei avere DP*’ cannot be interpreted as ‘I would like to be in the state of having DP’. Cf. *Vorrei *(avere) vent’anni* ‘I would want (to have) 20 years’.

If this is so, *vuole* in (87) continues to be the functional verb seen so far, with *Gianni la vuole* 'G. wants it' a case of Clitic Climbing.⁵⁴

Similarly, Pustejovsky (1995) and Jackendoff (1997,60ff) (cf. also Rochette 1999,159ff), in order to account for the variable, and highly restrictive, interpretations that aspectual predicates show depending on the nature of the object,⁵⁵ have argued that they actually select an abstract verbal complement of activity, whose head is interpreted on the basis of the *qualia structure* of the object (differently from them, here I assume that they actually take an abstract *syntactic* verbal complement).⁵⁶

Although such special usages of 'want' and of "phasal" aspectuals deserve more careful investigation, it seems that they can be rendered compatible with the idea that such verbs are exclusively functional, part of the extended projection of another, overt or abstract, lexical verb.

⁵⁴. As pointed out to me by Dominique Sportiche, this also means that the *che*-clause following *volere* in *Gianni vuole che Maria resti* 'G. wants that M. stays' is not directly a complement of *volere*, but of HAVE (or OBTAIN):

- (i) Gianni vuole [_{VP} OBTAIN [_{CP} che Maria resti]]

This introduces a systematic ambiguity in infinitival cases such as (ii)a, which can thus instantiate either the structure in (ii)b, or that in (ii)c:

- (ii) a Gianni vuole restare 'G. wants to stay'
 b Gianni_i vuole.. [_{VP} t_i OBTAIN [_{CP} PRO_i restare]]
 c Gianni_i vuole.. [_{VP} t_i restare]

Evidence supporting such structural ambiguity is discussed in section 7.1 below.

⁵⁵. That is, *Mary began the novel* can be interpreted as '..began to read/write', but not '..*to hate/*to appreciate/etc. '); similarly, *John finished the beer* can be interpreted as '..finished drinking', but not '..*pouring/*canning/etc. '.

⁵⁶. In the case of (88)c, the abstract verbal complement must be one of existence, presumably.

6.4 “Restructuring” and lexical usages of motion verbs and *sembrare*

Different is the case of motion verbs and *sembrare* ‘seem’, which appear to have genuine usages as lexical verbs, in addition to their functional usage. We have seen above that when these verbs take an internal argument (either a directional PP, or a subject, for the former, and a dative PP for the latter) they do not behave as “restructuring” verbs any longer (for example, they do not allow Clitic Climbing). See in particular (43), fn10, fn30, and (41),(42), respectively.

These data are still compatible with the idea that “restructuring” verbs are *always* functional if, when they take a complement, motion verbs and *sembrare* are actually different verbs, in fact, genuine *lexical* verbs. This is confirmed by the fact that the case with and the case without a complement display a subtle difference in meaning.

Motion verbs, when they take a complement of their own (and an optional adjunct clause – cf. fn10), are interpreted literally as verbs of locomotion, part of whose meaning is the means of transportation (cf. (90)a below). When they are used as “restructuring” verbs, instead, they are not verbs of locomotion for which one can ask the means of transportation (whence the ungrammaticality of the answer to (90)b, where *come* ‘how’ can only ask ‘the way he will (come to) paint the door’). They merely indicate that some distance is traversed before the action depicted by the lexical verb is carried out (much as with the so-called “distantive” suffix of Fula/Fulfulde seen in fn4 above):⁵⁷

- (90) a A: Come verrà da te a dipingere la porta?
 ‘How will he come by you to paint the door’
 B: In bicicletta
 ‘With his bicycle’

⁵⁷. As is perhaps to be expected, motion verbs without an overt directional PP are still ambiguous between the lexical and the “restructuring” use. This can be seen from the double possibility they allow under *fare* (cf. Rizzi 1978,153; Burzio 1986,388,fn26):

- (i) a Gianni lo farà andare a prenderlo ‘G. him will make go to fetch it’
 b Gianni glielo farà andare a prendere ‘G. to him it will make go to fetch’

In the first, causativization treats *andare* as intransitive, assigning Accusative to its subject (cf. also the split clitics); in the second, it takes the “restructured” *andare a prendere* as a transitive configuration, assigning Dative to its subject.

- b A: Come ti verrà a dipingere la porta?
 ‘How will he come to paint your door?’
 B: *In bicicletta
 ‘With his bicycle’

Similar considerations hold for *sembrare* when it takes a dative argument vs. “restructuring” *sembrare* without one. The former literally means that a certain state of affairs seems true to someone (hence the perfectly non contradictory status of (91)a). The latter is instead an evidential functional verb, which (mildly) commits the speaker to the truth of a certain state of affairs (whence the contradictory status of (91)b):⁵⁸

- (91) a Gianni sembra a tutti apprezzarlo molto, ma io non credo che lo apprezzi
 ‘G. seems to everybody to appreciate it much, but I don’t believe he appreciates it’
 b #Gianni lo sembra apprezzare molto, ma io non credo che lo apprezzi
 ‘G. seems to appreciate it much, but I don’t believe he appreciates it’

This, of course, does not exclude the possibility that the functional (“restructuring”) usage of motion verbs, and *sembrare*, have their ultimate basis in the lexical usages of these verbs (owing to their semantics). But it shows that their functional and lexical usages should be kept distinct.

7. Presence vs. absence of transparency effects: syntactic contrasts

We have argued so far that “restructuring” verbs are always functional, appearing in a monoclausal configuration with their infinitival complement whether or not they show

⁵⁸. That the commitment on the part of the speaker in the evidential, “restructuring”, usage of *sembrare* is not due to the presence of an optionally deleted dative *a me/mi* ‘to me’ is shown by the fact that no “restructuring” use is possible any longer when *a me/mi* is actually present:

- (i) a *Non me lo sembra apprezzare molto ‘He doesn’t seem to me to appreciate it much’
 b *Non lo sembra a me apprezzare molto ‘He doesn’t seem to me to appreciate it much’
 c *A me, non lo sembra apprezzare molto ‘To me, he doesn’t seem to appreciate it much’

transparency effects. This requires reassessing the syntactic contrasts noted in the literature between the variant with and the variant without transparency effects; and in particular, requires explaining them in ways that have nothing to do with constituency differences (such as the monoclausal vs. biclausal distinction).

Before attempting that (sections 7.2-3), we should put to the side the few genuine (and irrelevant) cases of actual alternation between a monoclausal and a biclausal configuration, when a “restructuring” verb also has lexical usages.

7.1 *The special status of volere, sembrare and motion verbs*

As seen above (fn54), such cases as *Gianni vuole restare* ‘G. wants to stay’ are structurally ambiguous even if *volere* is exclusively functional. That depends, as seen, on the additional possibility for *volere* to be followed by an abstract verb (OBTAIN), which itself takes the infinitival phrase as a complement:

- (92) a *Gianni_i vuole..* [_{VP} *t_i restare*]
 b *Gianni_i vuole..* [_{VP} *t_i OBTAIN* [_{CP} *PRO_i restare*]]

This, we take, is at the basis of the contrasts in (23)-(26) above, found with *volere* but no other modal or aspectual verb.⁵⁹

The case of *sembrare* and motion verbs is different as they actually enter either a monoclausal or a biclausal structure depending on whether they are used as functional or lexical verbs (section 6.4). We have already seen (section 2.3 and fn10) that such “Heavy NP Shift” contrasts as (18)b-(19)b, repeated below as (93)a-b, are not imputable to a constituency difference, but derive either from an illicit application of scrambling, or from an illicit extraction of the clitic out of the adjunct *ad esporre la mia idea* in (93)b:

⁵⁹. The peculiar pause required in the a. cases of (23)-(26) (noted in section 3.1) is perhaps a reflex of the more complex, biclausal, structure. Replacement of *volere* with other modals or aspectuals (which have no access to the biclausal option) leads to ungrammaticality. See, for example:

- (i) a **Maria deve già averlo già lasciato* ‘M. already must have already left him’
 b **Maria comincia già ad esserci già antipatica* ‘M. already begins to already be unpleasant’

- (93) a ..verrò a Firenze ad esporti la mia idea
 ‘..I’ll come to F. to explain-to-you my idea’
 b *..ti verrò a Firenze ad esporre la mia idea
 ‘..to-you I’ll come to F. to explain my idea’

7.2. *Right Node Raising contrasts and ellipsis with “restructuring”*

We have also already seen that under a deletion analysis of Right Node Raising (Kayne 1994), such contrasts as (13)a-b, repeated here as (94)a-b, and in particular, the ungrammaticality of (94)b, reduce to the independent ungrammaticality of such cases as (17), repeated here as (95):

- (94) a Piero voleva - ma francamente adesso non so se vorrà ancora - parlarne
 con Gianni
 ‘P. wanted to - but frankly now I don’t know if he still will - speak about it
 with G.’
 b *Piero **ne** voleva - ma francamente adesso non so se **ne** vorrà ancora - parlare
 con Gianni
 ‘P. about it wanted to - but frankly now I don’t know if he still will - speak
 about it with G.’
- (95) a *Gianni voleva parlare di questo, ma Piero non ne voleva __
 G. wanted to talk about this, but P. not (about-it) wanted
 b *Certe cose si possono fare, ma queste non si possono __
 Certain things one can do, but these not one can
 c *Gianni poteva andare a casa, ma non *è voluto __
 G. could go home, but not has/is wanted

It is worthwhile examining more closely the ungrammaticality of (95) as it appears to play a role in such Cleft Sentence contrasts as (7)a-b above. Depiante (1998), following Zubizarreta (1982), suggests that it is due to the kind of null anaphora licensed by “restructuring” verbs, which is a form of “deep anaphora”, in Hankamer and Sag’s (1976) sense: namely, an empty category with no internal syntactic structure. “Deep anaphors” (pronominals, the pro-form *do it* and “null complement anaphora” (NCA)), as opposed to “surface anaphors” (like VP deletion, Gapping, Sluicing,..), i) do not need an identical syntactic antecedent ; ii) can be pragmatically controlled; iii) cannot host

“missing antecedents”; and iv) eliminate scope ambiguities (see Hankamer and Sag 1976, Depiante 1998). Bošković (1994,266f) and Depiante (1998) show that the null complement which follows “restructuring” verbs indeed behaves like a deep anaphor with respect to these properties. If so, the contrasts in (96) follow from the fact that the clitic cannot be paired with a trace within the (unstructured) elliptical constituent:⁶⁰

- (96) a A: La può tenere per sé? B: No. Non può/*Non la può
 A: Can he keep it for himself? B: No. He can't
- b A: Pensi di riuscirlo a tradurre? B: No. Non riuscirò/*Non lo riuscirò
 A: Do you think you will manage to translate it? B: No. I will not manage.
- c A: Gianni la vede? B: Sì. Ha ricominciato/*L'ha ricominciata
 A: Does G. see her? B: Yes. He started again
- d A: Gianni la vede ancora? B: Sì. Continua/*La continua
 A: Is G. still seeing her? B: Yes. He continues
- e A: L'hai provato a riparare? B: Sì. Ho provato/*L'ho provato
 A: Have you tried to repair it? B: Yes. I have tried

Bošković (1994, 266f) takes the deep anaphor status of the null complement of “restructuring” verbs to show that they must be able to assign an external theta-role (as their subject cannot enter any antecedent-trace relation with a category ‘inside’ the null complement).⁶¹ But this is not necessarily so. It depends on the precise analysis of the deep anaphor involved in NCA, which since Hankamer and Sag (1976) has been left rather vague.

Deep anaphors are (beside pronominals) the *do it* pro-form, and our NCA. I take this to be no accident, and suggest that the NCA following “restructuring” verbs is literally the null counterpart of *do it* (with agentive predicates; and perhaps *be it* with stative predicates). Thus *...ma io non posso 0* will have the structure *..ma [io_k non posso...[VP*

⁶⁰. *Non (*la) può [0]* ‘He (it) cannot’ of (96)a thus contrasts with *Mangiare fredda, non la può* ‘eat cold, he it cannot’, which has a structured empty category ($[_{XP} \text{Mangiare } \bar{a} \text{ fredda}] \text{ non la può } [-\text{mangiare } \bar{a} \text{ fredda}]$) under the copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1995,3.5).

⁶¹. This conclusion, coupled with the evidence for the raising nature of “restructuring” verbs (‘want’ included), leads him to suggest that movement can be from a theta-position to another theta-position. If our analysis of NCA below is correct, no such conclusion is warranted.

t_k [[~~V_{far}~~] [~~DP_{to}~~]], with the subject *io* ‘outside’ of the pro-form *farlo* ‘do it’; an analysis also compatible with our previous conclusion that “restructuring” verbs all involve raising.⁶²

7.3 Cleft Sentence contrasts

Recall the different behavior of the variant with transparency effects and the variant without under Cleft Sentence Formation (ex. (7), repeated here as (97)):

- (97) a E’ proprio a parlarti di questi problemi che verrà
 ‘It’s just to talk to-you about these problems that he’ll come’
 b *E proprio a parlare di questi problemi che ti verrà

⁶². The *partial* visibility of the internal structure of the null complement in NCA (the subject, but not the verb and its complements, “covered” by *do it*) is also shown by the possible appearance of benefactive PPs (and other adjuncts) modifying the understood predicate (problematic in an opaque ‘[_{CP/IP} 0]’ pro-form). See: (Porterai da mangiare?) *Non potrò per tutti* ‘(Will you bring something to eat?) I will not be able [to do it] for everybody’.

NCA appears not to be reducible to an abstract *do it* in all cases. In addition to “restructuring” verbs, many other predicates allow null complements. See (i), adapted from Grimshaw (1979,288ff):

- (i) A: John is telling lies
 B: I know/ I have already found out/ I am not surprised/ It’s too bad/..

For these, the analysis must be different. The understood complement is not *do it*, but a pronominal DP or PP, as also suggested by the obligatory presence in Italian of a clitic for direct object DPs, though not for PPs, which recalls the English/Italian contrast between empty operators and resumptive clitics in Topicalization/CLLD:

- (ii) A: Dice bugie (He tells lies)
 B: *(Lo) so/ *(L’)ho già scoperto/Non (ne) sono sorpreso
 ‘I know/ I already found out/I’m not surprised’

What all the different types of NCA appear to have in common is some kind of pronominal element (‘it’, pro-PPs, ‘do it’,...): the ‘deep anaphor’.

On the basis of the well-formedness of the Focus Movement and Topicalization cases corresponding to (97)b (cf. (8) above), we concluded that the contrast in (97) cannot be due to constituency, but has probably to do with the selective character of Cleft Sentence Formation (which is less free than Focus Movement and Topicalization). We explore here what property of the construction may be responsible for such contrasts. If “restructuring” verbs are always functional (whether transparency effects are present or not), the acceptability (or near-acceptability) of the sentences in the lefthand side of (98)a-e suggests that the unacceptability of the sentences in the righthand side of (98)a-e and (97)b, cannot be attributed to the fact that some illicit constituent (say, a functional XP, rather than DP, PP, or CP) has been clefted:

- (98) a E’ tenerla per sé che **non può**/*E’ tenere per sé che **non la può**
It’s to keep it for himself that he cannot
- b ?E’ a tradurlo che **non riuscirò**/*E’ a tradurre che **non lo riuscirò**
It’s to translate it that I will not manage
- c ?E’ a vederla che **ha ricominciato**/*E’ a vedere che **l’ha ricominciata**
It’s to see her that he started again
- d ?E’ a vederla che **continuerò**/*E’ a vedere che **la continuerò**
It’s to see her that I will continue
- e ?E’ a ripararla che **ho provato**/*E’ a riparare che **l’ho provata**
It’s to repair it that I have tried

The generalization underlying all such contrasts appears to be that Cleft Sentence Formation is possible just in case the stranded predicate supports NCA. Compare (97)b and (98)a-e with (99) and (100)a-e, respectively:

- (99) A: Non credo che mi verrà a parlare di questo.
B: Vedrai che verrà/*Vedrai che **ti** verrà
I don’t think he will come to talk to me about this. B: You’ll see that he will come’
- (100) a A: La può tenere per sé? B: **No. Non può**/***Non la può**
A: Can he keep it for himself? B: No. He can’t
- b A: Pensi di riuscirlo a tradurre? B: **No. Non riuscirò**/***Non lo riuscirò**
A: Do you think you will manage to translate it? B: No. I will not manage.

- c A: Gianni la vede? B: **Si. Ha ricominciato/*L’ha ricominciata**
 A: Does G. see her? B: Yes. He started again
- d A: Gianni la vede ancora? B: **Si. Continua/*La continua**
 A: Is G. still seeing her? B: Yes. He continues
- e A: L’hai provato a riparare? B: **Si. Ho già provato/*L’ho provato**
 A: Have you tried to repair it? B: Yes. I have already tried

The generalization appears to be supported by the existence of a number of predicates which can neither be stranded under Cleft Sentence Formation (cf.(101)), nor support NCA (cf. (102)):

- (101) a *E esser ubriaco che sembrava (*sembrare*)
 ‘It is to be drunk that he seemed’
- b *E’ essergli caro che deve (*epistemic dovere*)
 It’s be dear to-her that he must
- c *E comprandolo che stava (*progressive stare*)
 It’s buying it that he was
- d *E’ per comprarla che sta (*prospective stare per*)
 It’s to buy it that he is about
- e *E per aiutarlo che finirà (*‘delayed aspect’ finire per*)
 It’s helping him that he will end up
- (102) a A: Era ubriaco? B: ***?Sembrava.**
 A: Was he drunk? B: He seemed
- b A:Pensi che gli sia caro? B: ***Si, deve**
 A: Do you think he is dear to him? B: Yes, he must
- c A: Sta comprandolo? B: ***Si, sta**
 A: Is he buying it? B: Yes, he is
- d A: Sta forse per comprarlo? B: ***Si, sta**
 A: Is he about to buy it? B: Yes, he is
- e A: Finirà per accettarlo? B: ***Non finirà**
 A: Will he end up accepting it? B: He won’t end up

Note that the contrast between (98) and (100), on one side, and (101)-(102), on the other, is not one between Control vs. Raising predicates. This is shown by the fact that certain

unmistakably raising predicates can be stranded under Cleft Sentence Formation (cf. (103)), and can be followed by NCA (cf. (104)):

- (103) a (Forse è un imbroglio) E' trattarsi di un errore che **non può**
 (Maybe it's a fraud) It's be a mistake that it cannot
 b E' piovere in abbondanza che **deve** (se si vuole che le piante sopravvivano)
 It's rain abundantly that it must (if one wants the plants to survive)

- (104)a A: Forse si tratta di un errore. B: No. **Non può**
 A: Maybe it's a mistake B: No, it cannot
 b A: Pioverà? B: **Deve!**, se si vuole che le piante sopravvivano
 A: Will it rain? B: It must, if one wants the plants to survive

Furthermore, even *sembrare*, when negated, appears to become strandable under Cleft Sentence Formation, and capable of supporting NCA (thus strengthening the generalization about Clefts and NCA). Compare (101)a/(102)a with (105):

- (105)a (Sembrava assonnato) ?E' essere ubriaco che **non sembrava**
 (He seemed sleepy) It's to be drunk that he didn't seem
 b A: Era ubriaco? B: **Non sembrava**
 A: Was he drunk? B: He didn't seem

If the generalization connecting the strandability of certain predicates under Cleft Sentence Formation and their ability to support NCA is correct, it becomes tempting to say that it derives from the fact that the empty category following the stranded predicate in Clefts is nothing other than an instance of NCA, whether the empty counterpart of *do it* or of an empty DP or PP (cf. fn62). More accurately, the empty counterpart of *(do) it*, and the empty DP or PP, is perhaps what allows the correct operator-variable structure accompanying the "base generated" phrase in focus (in Chomsky's 1977,44ff analysis of Cleft Sentence Formation). Such cases as (106)a-c under this analysis would receive the derivation indicated in (107)a-c:

- (106) a E' tenerla per sé che non può
 It's to keep it for himself that he can't
 b E' di ripararla che non ha ancora finito
 It's to mend it that he has not yet finished

- c E’ a ripararla che ho provato/non sono riuscito
It’s to mend it that I tried/did not manage

- (107) a DP è [_{CP} PRO tenerla per sé] 0_i che non può FARE (‘DO’) t_i
(cf. E’ tenerla per sé ciò che non può fare ‘It’s to keep it for himself what he can’t do’)
- b DP è [_{CP} PRO di ripararla] 0_i che non ha ancora finito t_i
(cf. E’ di ripararla ciò che non ha ancora finito ‘It’s to mend it what he has not yet finished’)
- c DP è [_{CP} PRO a ripararla] 0_i che ho provato/non sono riuscito [_{PP} P t_i]
(cf. A ripararla, non ci ho provato/non ci sono riuscito ‘to mend it, there I did not try/I did not manage to’)

If something along these lines is correct, then, the contrast between (97)a and b (and the like) follows from the impossibility of construing the clitic with an appropriate trace in (97)b. See (108)b:

- (108) a E’ [_{CP} proprio a parlarti di questi problemi] 0_i che verrà [_{PP} P t_i]
(cf. A parlarti, non ci verrà ‘To talk to you, he won’t come to it/there’)
- b E’ [_{CP} proprio a parlare di questi problemi] 0_i che t_{ik} verrà [_{PP} P t_i]

8. Some residual issues

8.1 “Restructuring” and null subjects

Kayne's (1989b) analysis, in making both depend on the strength of INFL, formally related Clitic Climbing to the null subject character of the language (a relation originally conjectured in Kayne's 1980).⁶³ The present analysis of “restructuring” instead establishes no necessary link between the two. It is thus important that subsequent work has shown the relation between Clitic Climbing and null subjects not to hold

⁶³. As the strength of INFL is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for Clitic Climbing (Kayne 1989b,251), only the presence of Clitic Climbing implies, for Kayne (1989b), the presence of null subjects, not viceversa.

systematically. Haverkort (1993,76f) and Martins (1995,229) both point out that in Seventeenth Century French Clitic Climbing is still a robust phenomenon while null subjects had already been lost one century before. Haverkort (1993,77) also discusses the case of Kru languages, which have Clitic Climbing but no null subjects, referring to Koopman (1994,56) (See also Sportiche 1983, and Tellier 1987).

8.2 “Restructuring” and negation

It is generally assumed (cf. the references cited in Kayne 1989,fn.14) that negation blocks Clitic Climbing (and other transparency effects). This in turn is often taken to depend on the minimality violation caused by the crossing of the head of NegP by another head - arguably overt in the case of Clitic Climbing, and covert (INFL- or T-raising) in the case of Long Object Preposing, *L-tous*, and the climbing of manner adverbs (which are all instances of XP movement). See, for example, Bok-Bennema and Kampers-Mahe (1994,209).⁶⁴ Although in principle compatible with the present approach, modulo the occurrence of head-movement within a single extended projection, that conclusion appears in need of further scrutiny. Alongside often cited examples like (109), there are others where Clitic Climbing (and other transparency effects) appear to cross over negation. See (110), and Napoli (1981,853):⁶⁵

- (109) a *Gianni lo smise di non mangiare (più)
 ‘G. it stopped not eating it (any longer)’

⁶⁴ Kayne (1989b,243) attributes the blocking effect of negation to the inability of the NegP head to L-mark VP.

⁶⁵ Note that (107) do not require the special intonation discussed in Rizzi (1976a,fn.9), which rescues even the negation between an auxiliary and a participle. It remains to be determined whether Long Object Preposing and Auxiliary Change are less sensitive to the intervention of negation than Clitic Climbing (as claimed in Watanabe 1993,366, and Kayne 1989b,253, respectively). I do not find any appreciable difference between Watanabe’s ex. (30) (?)*Quei libri si potrebbero non leggere subito* ‘these books SI would-be-able not read immediately’ and *Li potresti non leggere subito* ‘Them you could not read immediately’, or between Kayne’s ex. (45) ??*Sarebbe voluto non andare al mare* ‘(He) would-be wanted NEG to go to the seaside’ and ?*Ci sarebbe voluto non andare subito* ‘There (he) would-be wanted NEG to go immediately’.

- b ??Lo sta per non amare (più)
‘(She) was about not to love him (any longer)’
- c *?Lo tornò a non apprezzare (affatto)
‘(He) once again did not see him (at all)’
- d *Gianni li vuole non vedere
(Kayne 1989b,243) (for me “?”, if *vorrebbe* replaces *vuole*)
‘G. them wants not to see’
- (110) a Lo sembra non apprezzare affatto
‘(He) it seems not to appreciate at all’
- b Lo vorrei non dover rivedere più
‘Him I would like not to have to meet anymore’
- c Per stare meglio, la dovesti non rivedere più per un po’
To feel better, her (you) should not see any longer for a while
- d La potrebbe anche non rivedere mai più
(He) her could even not see ever again

The contrast between (110) and the much more marginal (109) could have to do (in a monoclausal analysis of “restructuring” where “restructuring” verbs are always functional) with the (canonical, or unmarked) locus of sentential negation, which in Italian is lower than the head hosting *sembrare* ‘seem’, plausibly Mood_{evidential} (hence (110)a), but higher than most aspectual heads (hence (109)), with scope elements like modals activating different positions of negation (hence (110)b-d). Cf. Cinque (1999, sect.5.4) for evidence that sentential negation can occupy more than one position in the presence of scope bearing elements.

8.3 Variation in the membership of “restructuring” verbs

The often made observation that the membership in the class of “restructuring” verbs varies across languages, and, within one language, even among speakers, would seem to go against the UG approach taken here, and argue for an essentially lexical approach. This impression however is quite misleading. Consider first variation across languages. The idea that “restructuring” verbs correspond to distinct functional heads of a universal functional hierarchy does not *per se* entail that all languages should have a verb (a free morpheme) corresponding to *each* such head. It could well be that a language expresses

a certain functional head via a bound morpheme (say, a suffix), or no head category at all (but rather via an AdvP, arguably in the specifier of that head). Italian, for example, appears to instantiate the latter case when compared to Spanish (or French). Spanish has a “restructuring” usage of *acabar de* ‘(lit.) finish’ which seems to correspond to so-called Retrospective Aspect (cf. Cinque 1999,96-98, and references cited there):

- (111) Lo acabo de ver
 (Lit.) Him (I) finish to see ‘I have just seen him’

The same aspect is rendered in French by the verb *venir de* (*Je viens de le voir* ‘I have just seen him’).⁶⁶ In Italian, however, (and English, for that matter) the only way to render such aspect is by using the AdvP *appena* ‘just’ (in one of its uses) combined with the verb in the perfect form: *L’ho appena visto* ‘I have just seen him’. Such lexical variation between Spanish *acabar de*, French *venir de* and Italian 0 (or rather *appena*) is of little significance from a UG point of view. It only obscures the fact that the three languages express one and the same functional head through different “morphological” means.

Another case in point is the “restructuring” verb *faillir* in French (*J’ai tout failli gâcher* ‘I almost ruined everything’), which renders the grammatical notion of “action narrowly averted”, variously expressed in the languages of the world (see Kuteva 1998), and to which in Italian and English no “restructuring” verb corresponds, but rather an AdvP (*quasi/almost*).

One could easily multiply such examples. The fact that Spanish *seguir* ‘(lit.) follow’ (Zagona 1986,236), or Catalan *procurar* ‘(lit.) procure’ (Hernanz and Rigau 1984,45), behave as “restructuring” verbs while the corresponding verbs of Italian do not is only of historical interest, of how a certain functional notion (Aspect_{continuative}, Aspect_{conative}) has come to be “grammaticalized”. The same is true of the “restructuring” verb *cuidar* ‘(lit.) believe’, in Middle French, also used with the (prospective) aspectual meaning of ‘be about to’ (Martineau 1991,242f), or of *prendere* ‘(lit.) catch’ in colloquial Italian, which is also a “restructuring” verb with the meaning of ‘start (suddenly)’: *lo prese ad insultare* ‘him (he) started (lit. ‘caught’) to insult’. Again, such cases obscure the fact

⁶⁶ For Marie Christine Jamet, and other speakers from Southern France, *venir de* allows Quantifier Climbing: *Je viens tous de les voir* ‘I have just seen them all’.

that the same set of functional notions across languages come to be expressed via different lexical means.

Apparently more serious for a UG approach is the fact that the same verb, with essentially the same meaning, is a “restructuring” verb in one language but not in another, or, within one and the same language, for some speakers, but not others.

One case in point is ‘seem’, which is taken not to be a “restructuring” verb in Spanish (Zagona 1986,232), nor in Portuguese (Quicoli 1976,215; Pizzini 1981,427fn24), but is a “restructuring” verb, at least for many speakers, in Italian (cf. note 27 above). Even if true, this fact is not necessarily troublesome. It could mean that in Spanish and Portuguese *parecer* has only the lexical usage seen in section 6.4 above (alternatively, it could be that the speakers Zagona and Pizzini based their conclusion on, as opposed other speakers, are like the Italian speakers that do not have *sembrare* as a “restructuring” verb).

Much of the cross-linguistic and inter speaker variation involves verbs which belong to certain classes (typical is the class of ‘desideratives’), which are related to particular functional heads without being the prototypical, or basic, exponent of the class (*volere* ‘want’). Thus, many accept *desiderare* ‘desire’, *amare* ‘love’, *intendere* ‘intend’, *preferire* ‘prefer’ as “restructuring” verbs, while others find them marginal, or outright impossible.⁶⁷

⁶⁷. For example, Fresina (1981,49) does not accept Clitic Climbing with *desiderare*, while Monachesi (1998,362fn9) does. For Spanish, Roldán (1975,344) does not allow Clitic Climbing with *preferir*, while Luján (1978,105) does. Some Italians have *pensare* ‘think’ as a “restructuring” verb; interestingly not in its propositional meaning (cf. (i)a), but in its volitional one, of intending/planning to (cf. (i)b) (for an analogous contrast in Spanish, see Suñer 1980,314):

- (i) a *Lo penso di aver trattato male ‘It (I) think to have treated badly’
 b Lo penso di vedere domani ‘Him (I) think to see tomorrow’

Similarly, *dimenticare* ‘forget’ is “restructuring”, for some speakers, in the implicative sense of *manicare di* ‘fail to’, but not in its propositional sense (for the analogous behavior of German *vergessen*, see Wurmbrand 1998,222ff):

- (ii) a Lo dimenticò di spegnere ‘It (he) forgot to switch off’
 b *Lo dimenticò di aver spento ‘It (he) forgot he had switched off’

These verbs appear to add specific nuances of meaning to the basic sense of ‘volition’; hence complying to a lesser degree with the semantics of the corresponding functional head ($\text{ModP}_{\text{volition}}$): a probable cause of their oscillating status. If so, such variation is not incompatible with the general UG approach taken here.

8.4. The prepositional “complementizers”

The prepositions (*di* ‘of’, and *a* ‘to’; less commonly *per* ‘for’, and *da* ‘from’: *lo sto per fare* ‘it (I) am about to do’; *lo finì per accettare* ‘it (he) ended up accepting’; *lo avrà da riconsegnare entro domani* ‘it (he) will have to give back by tomorrow’) which introduce the non-finite complement of many “restructuring” verbs are generally taken to be complementizers (one of the lowest, in the split CP field of Rizzi 1997). In the present analysis, in which “restructuring” verbs are always functional, they must be reinterpreted as introducers of smaller portions of the extended projection of the lexical VP, namely as introducers of the complement of one of the functional heads that make up that extended projection: ...F...[PP P [INFP Inf [FP F.....[VP]]]]. Much as Kayne’s (1993) participial projection (a nominal type of projection) is not directly the complement of (auxiliary) BE, but is contained in a PP/DP projection, so the infinitival complement of many “restructuring” verbs (also a nominal type of projection) is contained in a PP lexicalized by *a* or *di* (or *per* and *da*).⁶⁸

⁶⁸. We abstract here from the possibility, argued for in Kayne (1999a), that such prepositions are in fact higher than the selecting verb, and act as attractors of the infinitival phrase to their Spec, then raising to the next higher head, and attracting the remnant to the higher Spec (cf. also the roll-up derivation proposed in Koopman and Szabolci 1998 for “restructuring” verbs in Hungarian and Dutch).

We also abstract from additional projections which may make up such “small clauses”, which include the agreement heads discussed in Kayne (1993), and possibly Topicalization and Focalization projections (if such “restructuring” cases with “middle field” Focalization and Topicalization are possible: *?Avrebbero loro voluto I SOLDI riconsegnare al più presto (non i vestiti)* ‘(they) would have to-them wished the money (focus) hand back immediately (not the suits)’; *Avrebbero loro voluto, i soldi, poterli riconsegnare più avanti* ‘(they) would have to-them wished the money to be able to hand back later’.

References

- Abbot, Barbara (1976) "Right Node Raising as a Test for Constituenthood", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 7.639-642.
- Aissen, Judith and David Perlmutter (1976) "Clause Reduction in Spanish", in *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp.1-30.
- Aissen, Judith and David Perlmutter (1983) Postscript to republication of "Clause Reduction in Spanish", in D.Perlmutter (ed.) *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 383-396.
- Andersen, Peggy M. (1987) "Restructuring in Italian: an LFG Analysis", in *Proceedings of the Third Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, The University of Pittsburgh, pp.13-24.
- Baker, Mark (1988) *Incorporation. A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing.*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Baker, Mark (1999) "Clitic climbing and the boundedness of head movement", in H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, pp.369-373.
- Bayer, Joseph and Jaklin Kornfilt (1990) "Restructuring Effects in German", in E.Engdahl, R.Cooper, M.Mellor and M.Reape (eds.) *Parametric Variation in Germanic and Romance. Proceedings from the DYANA Workshop, September 1989*. Center for Cognitive Science, University of Edinburgh, pp.21-42.
- Belletti, Adriana (1981) "Frase ridotte assolute", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 6.3-32.
- Belletti, Adriana (1990) *Generalized Verb Movement*. Turin, Rosenberg e Sellier.
- Beninca', Paola (1986) "Punti di sintassi comparata dei dialetti italiani settentrionali", in G.Holtus and K.Ringger (eds.) *Raetia antiqua et moderna. W.Th.Elwert zum 80. Geburtstag*. Tübingen, Niemeyer, pp.457-79 (cited from republication in Beninca' 1994).
- Beninca', Paola (1989) "Friaulisch", in G.Holtus, M.Metzeltin, and C.Schmitt (eds.) *Lexicon der romanistischen Linguistik. 1.Grammatik*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, pp.563-585.
- Beninca', Paola (1994) *La variazione sintattica. Studi di dialettologia romanza*. Bologna, Il Mulino.

- Beninca, Paola and Guglielmo Cinque (1991) "Il participio presente", in L. Renzi e G. Salvi (eds.) *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, vol. II, Bologna, Il Mulino, pp. 604-609.
- Benucci, Franco (1990) *Destrutturazione. Classi verbali e costruzioni perifrastiche nelle lingue romanze antiche e moderne*. Padova, Unipress.
- Bleam, Tonia (1994) "Clitic Climbing and the Power of Tree Adjoining Grammar", to appear in A. Abeillé and O. Rambow (eds.) *Tree Adjoining Grammars: Formalism, Interpretation and Linguistic Analysis*. Stanford, CSLI.
- Bok-Bennema, Reineke (1981) "Clitics and Binding in Spanish", in R. May and J. Koster (eds.) *Levels of Syntactic Representation*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp. 9-32.
- Bok-Bennema, Reineke and Brigitte Kampers-Manhe (1994) "Transparency effects in the Romance Languages", in M. L. Mazzola (ed.) *Issues and Theory in Romance Linguistics*, Washington (D.C.), Georgetown University Press, pp. 199-217.
- Bonneau, José and Mihoko Zushi (1994) "Quantifier Climbing, Clitic Climbing and Restructuring in Romance", *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics*, 8, 1-37.
- Bordelois, Ivonne (1974) *The Grammar of Spanish Causative Constructions*, Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Bordelois, Ivonne (1988) "Causatives: From Lexicon to Syntax", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 6, 57-93.
- Bošković, Željko (1994) "D-Structure, Theta-Criterion, and Movement into Theta-Positions", *Linguistic Analysis*, 24, 247-286.
- Boysen, Gerhard (1977) "L'emploi des verbes auxiliaires **essere** et **avere** avec les verbes modaux en italien", *Studia Neophilologica*, 49, 287-309.
- Broadwell, George Aaron and Jack Martin (1993) "The Clitic/Agreement Split: Asymmetries in Choctaw Person Marking", in *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (Special Session on Syntactic Issues in Native American Languages)*, Berkeley, Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp. 1-10.
- Burzio, Luigi (1981) *Intransitive Verbs and Italian Auxiliaries*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT
- Burzio, Luigi (1986) *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht, Reidel.
- Calabrese, Andrea (1993) "The Sentential Complementation of Salentino: A Study of a Language without Infinitival Clauses", in A. Belletti (ed.) *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*. Turin, Rosenberg e Sellier, pp. 28-98.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (1991) "On Pronoun Movement: The Italian Dative *Loro*", *Probus*, 3, 127-153.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Giuliana Giusti (2000) "'Semi-lexical' motion verbs in Romance and Germanic", to appear in N. Corver and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *Semi-lexical*

- categories. *On the function of content words and content of function*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Ur Shlonsky (2000) "Restructuring in Italian, clitic positions and clausal strata", University of Bologna and Venice and University of Geneva.
- Choe, Hyon-Sook (1988) *Restructuring Parameters and Complex Predicates. A Transformational Approach*. MIT Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Choe, Hyon-Sook (1989) "Restructuring in Korean and Hungarian", in L.Maràcz and P.Muysken (eds.) *Configurationality*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.267-292.
- Chomsky, Noam (1977) "On Wh-movement", in P.Culicover, T.Wasow and A.Akmajian (eds.) *Formal Syntax*. New York, Academic Press, pp.71-132.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press.
- Chung, Sandra (1988) "Restructuring, Passive and Agreement in Chamorro", talk given at Stanford, July 1988.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1988) "On *si* Constructions and the Theory of Arb", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19.521-581.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1990) "Ergative Adjectives and the Lexicalist Hypothesis", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 8.1-39.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1997a) "Restructuring and the order of aspectual and root modal heads", ms. Univ. of Venice, to appear in G.Cinque e G.Salvi (eds.) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, Amsterdam, Elsevier.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1997b) "The interaction of passive, causative, and "restructuring" in Romance, ms. Univ. of Venice, to appear in C.Tortora (ed.) *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1998) "On Clitic Climbing and Other Transparency Effects", talk given at NYU and MIT, February/March 1998.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-linguistic Perspective*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Cole, Peter (1984) "Clause Reduction in Ancash Quechua", in E.-D. Cook and D.B.Gerdts (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 16: The Syntax of Native American Languages*. New York, Academic Press, pp.105-121.
- Contreras, Heles (1979) "Clause reduction, the Saturation Constraint, and clitic promotion", *Linguistic Analysis*, 5.161-182.
- Depiante, Marcela (1998) "On the Interaction between "Ellipsis" and Restructuring in Spanish and Italian", ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Déprez, Viviane (1997) "Two Types of Negative Concord", *Probus*, 9.103-143.

- Dikken, Marcel den, Richard Larson, and Peter Ludlow (1996) "Intensional 'transitive' verbs and concealed complement clauses", *Rivista di Linguistica*, 8.331-348.
- Di Sciullo, Anna-Maria and Edwin Williams (1987) *On the Definition of Word*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1998) "Impersonal *se* Constructions in Romance and the Passivization of Unergatives", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 29.399-437.
- Dyła, Stefan (1983) "Evidence for S'-Deletion in Polish", *Folia Linguistica*, 17.327-337
- Emonds, Joseph (1999) "How clitics license null phrases: A theory of the lexical interface", in H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, pp.291-367.
- Evans, Nicholas D. (1995) *A Grammar of Kayardild*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Evers, Arnold (1975) *The Transformational Cycle of Dutch and German*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Fanselow, Gisbert (1989) "Coherent Infinitives in German: Restructuring vs. IP-Complementation", in C.Bhatt, E.Löbel and C.Schmidt (eds.) *Syntactic Phrase Structure Phenomena in Noun Phrases and Sentences*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp.1-16.
- Farkas, Donka and Jerrold M. Sadock (1989) "Preverb Climbing in Hungarian", *Language*, 65.318-338.
- Frantz, Donald G. (1976) "Equi-Subject Clause Union", in *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp.179-187.
- Fresina, Claudio (1981) *Aspects de la grammaire transformationnelle de l'italien*. Thèse de troisième cycle. Université de Paris VIII.
- Fresina, Claudio (1982) "Les verbes de mouvement et les aspectuels en italien", *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 6.283-331.
- Fresina, Claudio (1997) "L'auxiliation en italien", *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 21.97-138.
- George, Leland and Jindrich Toman (1976) "Czech Clitics in Universal Grammar", *Papers from the 12th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society, pp.235-249.
- Gerds, Donna B. (1988) "Semantic Linking and the Relational Structure of Desideratives", *Linguistics*, 26.843-872.
- Gonzalez, Nora (1986) "Interaction of Inversion and Clause Reduction in Spanish", *Proceedings of the Second Eastern States Conference of Linguistics*, Dept. of Linguistics, Ohio State University, pp.80-91.

- Gonzalez, Nora (1988) *Object and Raising in Spanish*, New York, Garland.
- Gonzalez, Nora (1990) "Unusual Inversion in Chilean Spanish", in Paul M. Postal and Brian D. Joseph (eds.) *Studies in Relational Grammar 3*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp.87-103.
- Goodall, Grant (1987) *Parallel Structures in Syntax. Coordination, causatives, and restructuring*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Goodall, Grant (1991) "Wanna-contraction as Restructuring", in C. Georgopoulos and R. Ishihara (eds.) *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language. Essays in Honor of S.-Y. Kuroda*. Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.239-254.
- Grevisse, Maurice (1993) *Le bon usage (Grammaire française refondue par André Goosse. 3e édition revue)* Paris, Duculot.
- Grewendorf, Günther (1987) "Kohärenz und Restrukturierung", in B. Asbach-Schnitker und J. Roggenhofer (hrsg.) *Neuere Forschungen zur Wortbildung und Historiographie der Linguistik*, Tübingen, Narr, pp.123-144.
- Grimshaw, Jane (1979) "Complement Selection and the Lexicon", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 10.279-326.
- Haegeman, Liliane and Henk van Riemsdijk (1986) "Verb Projection Raising, Scope, and the Typology of Rules affecting Verbs", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 17.417-466.
- Haider, Hubert (1986) "Fehlende Argumente: Vom Passiv zu kohärenten Infinitiven", *Linguistische Berichte*, 101.3-33.
- Haider, Hubert (1987) "Nicht-sententiale Infinitive" *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik*, 28.73-114.
- Haider, Hubert (1992) "Fakultativ kohärente Infinitivkonstruktionen im Deutschen", *Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340, Nr. 17*, Universität Stuttgart.
- Haik, Isabelle (1985) *The Syntax of Operators*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Hale, Ken and S. Jay Keyser (1993) "On the Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relations", in K. Hale and S. J. Keyser (eds.) *The View from Building 20*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, pp.53-109.
- Hankamer, Jorge and Ivan Sag (1976) "Deep and Surface Anaphora", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 7.391-426.
- Haspelmath, Martin (1999) "Long distance agreement in Godoberi (Daghestanian) complement clauses", *Folia Linguistica*, XXXIII (1-2), pp.131-151.
- Haverkort, Marco (1990) "Clitic Climbing and Barrierhood of VP", in J. Hutchinson and V. Manfredi (eds.) *Current Approaches to African Linguistics*, 7, Dordrecht, Foris
- Haverkort, Marco (1993) *Clitics and Parametrization*. Eurotyp Working Papers, VIII, (University of Tilburg).

- Hernanz, Maria L. and Gemma Rigau (1984) "Auxiliaritat i reestructuració", *Els Marges*, 31.29-50.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland (1999) *Restructuring Infinitives and the Theory of Complementation*, Ph.D. Dissertation, USC.
- Hornstein, Norbert (1999) "Movement and Control", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 30.69-96.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1997) *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo and Nina Hyams (1993) "On the Independence and Interdependence of Syntactic and Morphological Properties: English Aspectual *come* and *go*", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 11.313-346.
- Jones, Michael (1993) *Sardinian*. Routledge, London.
- Kayne, Richard (1977) *Syntaxe du franHais*. Paris, Editions du Seuil.
- Kayne, Richard (1980) "Vers une solution d'un problème grammatical: **Je l'ai voulu lire, j'ai tout voulu lire*", *Langue française*, 46.32-40.
- Kayne, Richard (1989a) "Facets of Past Participle Agreement", in P.Benincà' (ed.) *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.85-103.
- Kayne, Richard (1989b) "Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing", in O.Jaeggli and K.Safir (eds.) *The Null Subject Parameter*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.239-261.
- Kayne, Richard (1991) "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22.647-686.
- Kayne, Richard (1992) "Italian Negative Infinitival Imperatives and Clitic Climbing", in L.Tasmowski and A. Zribi-Hertz (eds.) *Hommages à Nicolas Ruwet*. Ghent, Communications et Cognition, pp.300-312.
- Kayne, Richard (1993) "Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection", *Studia Linguistica*, 47.3-31.
- Kayne, Richard (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard (1999a) "Prepositional Complementizers as Attractors", *Probus*, 11.39-73.
- Kayne, Richard (1999b) "Clitic Doubling and pro", class lecture, University of Venice, May 1999.
- Klima, Edward and Ursula Bellugi (1979) *The Signs of Language*, Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Press.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi (1995) *Phrase Structure in Minimalist Syntax*, Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Koopman, Hilda (1984) *The Syntax of Verbs*. Dordrecht, Foris.

- Koopman, Hilda and Anna Szabolcsi (1998) *The Hungarian verbal complex: Complex verb formation as XP-movement*. Ms., UCLA.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin (1996) "NP-Movement and 'Restructuring'", in R.Freidin (ed.) *Current Issues in Comparative Grammar*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.120-147.
- Kroeger, Paul (1993) *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Stanford, CSLI Publications.
- Kulick, Seth (1997) "Generalized Transformations and Restructuring in Romance", in J.Austin and A. Lawson (eds.) *Proceedings of the 14th Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, pp.103-114.
- Kuteva, Tania (1998) "On Identifying an Evasive Gram: Action Narrowly Averted", *Studies in Language*, 22.113-160.
- Landau, Idan (1999) *Elements of Control*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Landau, Idan (forthcoming) *Elements of Control. Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions*. Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- LaPolla, M. (1988) "Clitic Movement in Spanish and the Projection Principle", in D.Birdsong and J-P.Montreuil (eds.) *Advances in Romance Linguistics*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.217-231.
- Larson, Richard (1988) "On the Double Object Construction", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19.335-391.
- Ledgeway, Adam (1996) *The Grammar of Complementation in Neapolitan*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Manchester.
- Ledgeway, Adam (1998) "La ristrutturazione in napoletano", in Giovanni Ruffino (ed.) *Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza*. Centro di Studi filologici e linguistici siciliani. Università di Palermo 18-24 settembre 1995. Sezione 2 Morfologia e sintassi delle lingue romanze. Tübingen, Niemeyer, pp.529-541.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2000) *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: a Minimalist Approach*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, Claire and Pieter Muysken (1982) *Mixed Categories. Nominalizations in Quechua*, Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe (1978) "Doubl-inf", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 3.173-206.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe (1979) "Postille alla regola di ristrutturazione", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 4.213-228.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe (1980) "Remarks on Infinitives: A Case for a Filter", *Journal of Italian Linguistics*, 5.101-155.

- Luján, Marta (1978) "Clitic Promotion and Mood in Spanish Verbal Complements", *Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics*, 10.103-190 (also in *Linguistics*, 18 (1980) pp.381-484).
- Mahajan, Anoop (1989) "Agreement and Agreement Phrases", in I.Laka and A.Mahajan (eds.) *Functional Heads and Clause Structure*. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, vol.10, pp.217-252.
- Manzini, M. Rita (1983) *Restructuring and Reanalysis*, Ph.D.Dissertation, MIT.
- Manzini, M.Rita and Anna Roussou (2000) "A Minimalist Theory of A-movement and Control", *Lingua*, 110.409-447.
- Martineau, France (1991) "Clitic Climbing in Infinitival Constructions of Middle French", in D. Wanner and D.A.Kibbee (eds.) *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp.235-251.
- Martins, Ana Maria (1995) "A Minimalist Approach to Clitic Climbing", *Proceedings of the 31st Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society (vol. 2: The Parasession on Clitics), pp.215-233.
- Medová, Lucie (2000) *Transparency Phenomena in Czech Syntax*. Hovedfagsoppgave, University of Tromsø.
- Miller, Philip H. (1992) *Clitics and Constituents in Phrase Structure Grammar*, New York, Garland.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru (1986) "Restructuring in Japanese", in T.Imai and M.Saito (eds.) *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.273-300.
- Monachesi, Paola (1993) "Restructuring Verbs in Italian HPSG Grammar", in *Proceedings of the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society, pp.281-295.
- Monachesi, Paola (1995) *A Grammar of Italian Clitics*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Tilburg University.
- Monachesi, Paola (1998) "Italian Restructuring Verbs: A Lexical Analysis", in E.Hinrichs, A.Kathol and T.Nakazawa (eds.) *Complex Predicates in Nonderivational Syntax*. New York, Academic Press, pp.313-368.
- Monachesi, Paola (1999) "Phonological Phrases in Italian", in *Recherches de linguistique française et romane d'Utrecht*, 18.79-89.
- Moore, John (1989) "Spanish Restructuring and Psych Verbs: A Case for VP-Complementation", in E.J.Fee and K.Hunt (eds.) *Proceedings of the 8th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, pp.262-275.

- Moore, John (1990) "Spanish Clause Reduction with Downstairs Cliticization", in K.Dziwirek, P.Farrell, and E.Mejías-Bikandi (eds.) *Grammatical Relations. A Cross-Theoretical Perspective*, Stanford, CSLI, pp.319-333.
- Moore, John (1994) "Romance Cliticization and Relativized Minimality", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 25.335-344.
- Moore, John (1996) *Reduced Constructions in Spanish*, Garland, New York.
- Munro, Pamela and Dieynaba Gaye (1997) "Introduction", *Ay Baati Wolof. A Wolof Dictionary*. UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics, 19, pp.iii-xiii.
- Myhill, John (1988) "The Grammaticalization of Auxiliaries: Spanish clitic climbing", *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp.352-363.
- Myhill, John (1989) "Variation in Spanish Clitic Climbing", in Thomas J. Walsh (ed.) *Synchronic and diachronic approaches to linguistic variation and change (Georgetown University Roundtable '88)*. Washington (D.C.), Georgetown University Press, pp.227-250.
- Napoli, Donna J. (1981) "Semantic Interpretation vs. Lexical Governance: Clitic Climbing in Italian", *Language*, 57.841-887.
- Nishida, Chiyo (1991) "A non-transformational analysis of clitic climbing in Spanish", in A. Halpern (ed.) *Proceedings of the Ninth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Stanford, pp.395-409.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke (1993) "Long Distance Passive", in N.Hasegawa (ed.) *Japanese Syntax in Comparative Grammar*, Tokyo, Kuroshio Shuppan, pp.79-114.
- O'Neil, John (1995) "Out of Control", *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society*, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, pp. 361-371.
- O'Neil, John (1997) *Means of Control: Deriving the Properties of PRO in the Minimalist Program*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. (1989) *Parameters in the Grammar of Basque*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Pearce, Elisabeth (1990) *Parameters in Old French Syntax. Infinitival Complements*. Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- Pesetsky, David (1991) *Zero Syntax II: An Essay on Infinitive*, ms., MIT.
- Picallo, Carme (1985) *Opaque Domains*.Ph.D. Dissertation, CUNY.
- Picallo, Carme (1990) "Modal Verbs in Catalan", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 8.285-312.
- Pizzini, Quentin A. (1981) "The Placement of Clitic Pronouns in Portuguese", *Linguistic Analysis*, 8.403-430.

- Pizzini, Quentin A. (1982) "The Positioning of Clitic Pronouns in Spanish", *Lingua*, 57.47-69.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves (1978) "Trace Theory and French Syntax", in Samuel Jay Keyser (ed.) *Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press, pp.65-112.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989) "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 10.365-424.
- Postal, Paul (1974) *On Raising*. Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press.
- Progovac, Lilijana (1991) "Polarity in Serbo-Croatian: Anaphoric NPIs and Pronominal PPIs", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22.567-572.
- Progovac, Lilijana (1993) "Locality and Subjunctive-like Complements in Serbo-Croatian", *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 1.116-144.
- Przepiórkowski, Adam and Anna Kupš (1997) "Verbal Negation and Complex Predicate Formation in Polish", *Texas Linguistic Forum*, 38.247-261.
- Pustejovsky, James (1995) *The Generative Lexicon*. Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press.
- Quicoli, Carlos (1976) "Conditions on Clitic-Movement in Portuguese", *Linguistic Analysis*, 2.199-223.
- Radford, Andrew (1976) "Constraints on Clitic Promotion in Italian", ms., Oxford University.
- Radford, Andrew (1977a) *Italian Syntax: transformational and relational grammar*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Radford, Andrew (1977b) "La teoria della traccia, la condizione del soggetto specificato e la salita dei pronomi nelle lingue romanze", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 2 (2).241-315.
- Rigau, Gemma (2000) "Number Agreement Variation in Catalan Dialects", ms., UAB, Barcelona.
- Rivas, Alberto (1974) "Impersonal Sentences and their Interaction with Clitic Movement in Spanish", unpublished ms., MIT.
- Rivas, Alberto (1977) *Clitics in Spanish*. Ph.D.Dissertation, MIT.
- Rivero, Maria Luisa (1991) "Clitic and NP Climbing in Old Spanish", in H.Campos and F.Martínez-Gil (eds.) *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*, Washington (D.C.), Georgetown University Press, pp.241-282.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1976a) "Ristrutturazione", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 1.1-54.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1976b) "La MONTEE DU SUJET, le *si* impersonnel et une règle de restructuration dans la syntaxe italienne", *Recherches Linguistiques*, 4.158-184.

- Rizzi, Luigi (1978) "A Restructuring Rule in Italian Syntax", in S.J.Keyser (ed.) *Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press, pp.113-158 (also in Rizzi 1982a).
- Rizzi, Luigi (1981) "Nominative marking in Italian infinitives and the Nominative Island Constraint", in F.Heny (ed.) *Binding and Filtering*, London, Croom Helm, pp.129-157.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1982a) *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1982b) "Comments on Chomsky's Chapter 'On the Representation of Form and Function'", in J.Mehler, E.C.T.Walker and M.Garrett (eds.) *Perspectives on Mental Representation*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, pp.441-451.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery", in L.Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.281-337.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2000) "Some Notes on Romance Cliticization", in L.Rizzi *Comparative Syntax and Language Acquisition*, London, Routledge, pp.96-121.
- Roberts, Ian (1993a) *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Roberts, Ian (1993b) "Restructuring, Pronoun Movement and Head-Movement in Old French", ms. University of Wales, Bangor.
- Roberts, Ian (1997) "Restructuring, Head Movement and Locality", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28.423-460.
- Rochette, Anne (1988) *Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Romance Sentential Complementation*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Rochette, Anne (1990) "On the Restructuring Classes of Verbs in Romance", in A.Di Sciullo and A.Rochette (eds.) *Binding in Romance. Essays in Honour of Judith McA'Nulty*. Special Publication of the Canadian Linguistic Association. Ottawa, pp.96-128.
- Rochette, Anne (1999) "The Selection Properties of Aspectual Verbs", in K.Johnson and I.Roberts (eds.) *Beyond Principles and Parameters. Essays in Memory of Osvaldo Jaeggli*. Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.145-165.
- Roldán, Mercedes (1975) "Clitic Climbing and Unrelated Matters", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 6.342-346.
- Rooryck, Johan (1994) "Against Optional Movement for Clitic Climbing", in M.L.Mazzola (ed.) *Issues and Theory in Romance Linguistics*, Washington (D.C.), Georgetown University Press, pp.417-443.
- Rosen, Sara T. (1990a) *Argument Structure and Complex Predicates*. New York, Garland.

- Rosen, Sara T. (1990b) "Restructuring verbs are light verbs", *Proceedings of the Ninth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Stanford, pp.477-492.
- Sabel, Joachim (1995a) "A Unitary Account of Long Scrambling and Clitic Climbing in restructuring contexts: Parallels between German, Polish and Spanish", in *ConSOLE II*, pp.210-226.
- Sabel, Joachim (1995b) "On Parallels and Differences between Clitic Climbing and Long Scrambling and the Economy of Derivations", *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society*, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, pp 405-423.
- Sabel, Joachim (1996) *Restrukturierung und Lokalität*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag (Studia Grammatica 42).
- Sabel, Joachim (1999) "Coherent Infinitives in German, Polish, and Spanish" *Folia Linguistica*, XXXIII (3-4), pp.419-440.
- Schroten, Jan (1986) "Ergativity, Raising and Restructuring in the Syntax of Spanish Aspectual Verbs", *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 10.399-465.
- Spencer, Andrew (1991) *Morphological Theory*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Sportiche, Dominique (1983) "Bete Reciprocals and Clitic Binding", in J.Kaye, H.Koopman, D.Sportiche and A.Dugas (eds.) *Current Approaches to African Linguistics*, vol.2. Dordrecht,, Foris, pp.297-316.
- Sportiche, Dominique (1996) "Clitic Constructions", in J.Rooryck and L.Zaring (eds.) *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.213-276.
- Stjepanović, Sandra (1998) "On the Placement of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: Evidence from Clitic Climbing and VP Ellipsis", in, Ž.Bošković, S.Franks and W.Snyder (eds.) *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. The Connecticut Meeting 1997*, Ann Arbor, Michigan Slavic Publications, pp.267-286.
- Stowell, Tim (1991) "Small Clause Restructuring", in R.Freidin (ed.) *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, pp.182-218
- Strozer, Judith (1976) *Clitics in Spanish*, Ph.D.Dissertation, UCLA.
- Strozer, Judith (1981) "An Alternative to Restructuring in Romance Syntax", in H.Contreras and J.Klausenburger (eds.) *Proceedings of the Tenth Anniversary Symposium on Romance Linguistics (Papers in Romance, Supplement II, vol.3)*. Published by the University of Washington, Seattle, pp.177-184.
- Suñer, Margarita (1980) "Clitic promotion in Spanish revisited", in F.Neussel (ed.) *Contemporary Studies in Romance Languages*, Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club, pp.300-330.

- Taraldsen, Tarald (1982) "Remarks on Government, Thematic Structure and the Distribution of Empty Categories", in R.May and J.Koster (eds.) *Levels of Syntactic Representation*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.253-291.
- Taraldsen, Tarald (1983) *Parametric Variation in Phrase Structure: A Case Study*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Tromsø.
- Tellier, Christine (1987) "Restructuring and Complement Order in Abe infinitives", in D.Odden (ed.) *Current Approaches to African Linguistics*, vol.4, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.369-381.
- Terzi, Arhonto (1992) *PRO in Finite Clauses. A Study of the Inflectional Heads of the Balkan Languages*, Ph.D. Dissertation, CUNY.
- Terzi, Arhonto (1994) "Clitic Climbing from Finite Clauses and Long Head Movement", *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics*, 3 (2).97-122.
- Terzi, Arhonto (1996) "Clitic climbing from finite clauses and tense raising", *Probus*, 8.273-295.
- Tsujimura, Natsuko (1993) "Adjuncts and Event Argument in Restructuring", in S.Choi (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 3*, Stanford, CSLI, pp.121-136.
- Uriagereka, Juan (1995) "Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 26.79-123.
- Van Tiel-Di Maio, M.Francesca (1975) "Una proposta per la sintassi dell'italiano: V - Raising", in *La grammatica. Aspetti teorici e didattici*, Roma, Bulzoni, pp.445-477.
- Van Tiel-Di Maio, M.Francesca (1978) "Sur le phénomène dit du déplacement 'long' des clitiques et, en particulier, sur les constructions causatives", *Journal of Italian Linguistics*, 3 (2).73-136.
- Wali, Kashi and Ashok Kumar Koul (1994) "Kashmiri clitics: the role of case and CASE", *Linguistics*, 32.969-994.
- Watanabe, Akira (1993) "The Role of Equidistance in Restructuring Verbs: Italian vs. French", *Proceedings of the 10th Eastern State Conference on Linguistics*, pp.360-371.
- Wexler, Ken and Peter Culicover (1980) *Formal Principles of Language Acquisition*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- Willet, T.L. (1991) *A Reference Grammar of Southeastern Tepehuan*, Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne (1998d) *Infinitives*. Ph.D.Dissertation, MIT.
- Zagona, Karen (1986) "Las Perífrasis de gerundio y la restructuración", *Revista Argentina de Lingüística*, 2.232-244 (Mendoza, Arg.).

- Zubizarreta, Maria-Luisa (1980) "Pour une restructuration thématique", *Recherches Linguistiques*, 9.141-187.
- Zubizarreta, Maria-Luisa (1982) *On the Relationship of the Lexicon to Syntax*, Ph.D.Dissertation, MIT.
- Zushi, Mihoko (1995) *Long-distance Dependencies*, Ph.D. Dissertation, McGill University.

The Temporal Coordinates of Subject and Speaker: from Semantics to Morphosyntax *

Alessandra Giorgi and Fabio Pianesi

University of Venice - IRST Trento

Introduction

In this work we argue that the subject's temporal point of view –namely, the one *internal* to the sentence –and the speaker's point of view –namely, the *external*, or better, *indexical*, temporal perspective –are actually both represented in the morphosyntactic structure of the sentence. We show that this hypothesis can account for the Sequence of Tense properties of the various contexts and, in particular, for the presence/absence of the Double Access Reading.¹

* This work is a preliminary version of the paper discussed at the SALT Conference, NYU, 2001.

¹. The Double Access Reading is the crucial phenomenon to be accounted for, because it is the main property distinguishing languages obeying the “traditional” *consecutio temporum* (Sequence of Tense) – i.e., languages such as English and Italian – from languages which are said – somewhat erroneously, however - to have no *consecutio*, such as Russian and Japanese.

To recall what the DAR is, consider the following example:

- i. John said that Mary is pregnant

This sentence means that the state of pregnancy holds both at the time of the *saying* and at utterance time, *now*.

We develop here the theory originally discussed in Giorgi & Pianesi (2001) which crucially distinguishes between the contexts complements of propositional attitude predicates, such as *believe*, *wish*, etc, and the complements of non-propositional attitudes, such as *dream*, which belongs to the class of *fictional* predicates. In particular, we will derive the fact that temporal anchoring is obligatory in contexts of propositional attitude (beliefs, wishes, etc.), whereas this is not the case in fictional ones.²

In particular, we propose that clauses which are the object of propositional attitude predicates must represent the attitude episode itself, in this following Higginbotham (1995), and that the Complementiser plays an important role in the temporal interpretation of the embedded clause, as already suggested in Giorgi & Pianesi (2000).

This perspective on temporal anchoring phenomena has important consequences for a theory of the Double Access Reading (DAR). It will be argued that: a) the DAR actually involves double temporal anchoring of the embedded event, to both the matrix event and the utterance; b) this, in turn, involves an attitude by the speaker too, towards the content of the complement clause; and c) such an interpretive outcome relies on certain syntactic configurations in which the complementizer plays a major role.

1. The *missing* language type

In this section we are going to illustrate some well-known data which, when considered in a typological perspective, are rather surprising. On the basis of what is known by now, about the temporal interpretation of utterances and temporal anchoring, in principle *three* language types would be expected, whereas only *two* actually seem to exist. Let us consider the following very simple case:

(1) John is sleeping

The temporal interpretation of this sentence, under normal conditions, is based on the coordinates of the speakers. In other words: temporal relations are computed starting from a temporal point which is *now* –i.e., an indexical. The interesting problem is the following: why do tenses behave differently in complement clauses and in matrix one?

². The contexts created by verbs of *saying* can be treated exactly on a par with propositional attitude predicates.

That is, why there are no mere indexical readings of tenses in complement clauses? To exemplify, consider (2):³

- (2) a. John said that Mary is sleeping.
 b. Gianni ha detto che Maria dorme.

Examples (2), both in Italian and English, have only a double access reading (DAR). Roughly, in both cases the (sleeping) state depicted by the subordinate clause is perceived as holding both at the speaker's time and at John's/Gianni's. Consider now example (3):

- (3) a. John said that Mary was sleeping.
 b. Gianni ha detto che Maria dormiva(IMPV).

In both languages, the sleeping time is perceived as being either past (backwards shifted reading), or simultaneous to the sayers's.⁴

Many languages have this temporal interpretation for the embedded clause. Interestingly, a group of languages does not, such as for instance Russian and Japanese. In these languages the sentence corresponding to (3) yields a reading equivalent to the simultaneous one of (2). The counterpart of (3a) or (3b) only gives a backward shifted reading.

This crosslinguistic variation exhausts the range of possible temporal interpretations. Thus, there is no language in which the subordinate tense of (the

³. See Higginbotham (2001), where he argues that the solution follows from the fact that tenses (in subordinate contexts) are anaphoric.

⁴. Actually, as we have shown at length in Giorgi and Pianesi (1997; 2000), the Italian example admits a backward shifted reading when the contexts makes available a suitable temporal/eventive entity. Indeed, such an entity provides a referent for the anaphoric imperfect tense found in (3b). For the time being, however, we ignore these peculiarities and treat (3a) and (3b) on a par.

counterpart of) (2) can be interpreted as a mere indexical – namely, “John said *then* than Mary is sleeping *now* (and *only now*)”.

Therefore, in no language is it possible to report, by means of the equivalent of (3), on – say – Saturday at five o’clock sharp, about the following *dictum*, as said by John on Friday:

(4) Tomorrow at five o’clock Mary will be sleeping.

Analogously, in no language can the tenses of (3) behave as mere indexicals∠e.g., providing future oriented readings in which Mary’s sleeping is constrained to be past only with respect to the speaker.⁵

⁵. In the literature, it is possible to find suggestions that address at least some aspects of the problem we are considering. Thus, Ogihara (1996) and Higginbotham (1993) argue that the temporal orientation of clauses expressing the content of propositional attitudes must match that of the content they convey. Such a *temporal isomorphism* constraint can account for the non-availability of the intended reading of (3). That reading, in fact, would convey a future-oriented speech (as uttered by Gianni), by locating the relevant event in the speaker’s past. But this would infringe the constraint, hence the reading is ruled out. Similarly, the lack of a mere indexical reading of the embedded present tense of (2) stems from the fact that the result would involve a present-time perspective by the utterer, and a future-time perspective by the subject (as in his/her original speech/attitude). As noted by Higginbotham (2001), the temporal isomorphism constraint has some problems, though. For instance, it requires some further working out to account for the acceptability of the following sentence (=Higginbotham’s (23)):

i. Maria will say on Sunday that Mario was here on Saturday.

Suppose (5) is uttered on Friday. Then the reported speech is past-oriented, from the standpoint of the subject (Mario), but future-oriented from the standpoint of the speaker. As such, it doesn’t comply with temporal isomorphism, yet it is perfectly acceptable. Another possible, more conceptual, critique is that it is not clear why the contrasting perspectives of the speaker and the subject should matter.

Another relevant proposal can be found in Abusch (1997). Noticing the unavailability of the future-oriented reading of (3), she proposes that this is due a metaphysical (epistemic?) asymmetry between past and future times. The latter are intrinsically indeterminate, and this is reflected in a linguistic (interpretative) constraint to the effect that the local now, in Abusch’s terminology, is an upper limit for tense reference (her Upper Limit Constraint).

2. A first hypothesis

In this work we will start from the hypothesis that tenses are relational devices, connecting events, or better, eventualities, to temporal anchors. Such a starting point is not totally uncontroversial, however, but we think that what we are going to propose could also fit in different frameworks.

The observations in the previous section suggest that tenses behave differently in complement clauses than in (ordinary) matrix ones. In the latter, they manifest an indexical behaviour, choosing the very utterance as their temporal anchor. In complement clauses tenses primarily connect the embedded eventuality with the matrix one. So, it seems that the following generalisation holds:

- (5) a. The eventuality of an embedded clause is **temporally anchored** iff an explicit temporal relation between it and the eventuality of the embedding clause is available.
 b. Temporal anchoring is obligatory for embedded clauses.

Such a generalisation, on one hand, defines the notion of ‘temporal anchoring’, and, on the other, stipulates the way it is expected to apply in embedded contexts. In an Interpreted Logical Form (henceforth, ILF) framework (Higginbotham (1991); Larson and Ludlow (1993); Larson and Segal (1995)) (5a) can be taken to require the ILF of the embedded clause to include, as the value of the T node, a pair $\langle e, e' \rangle$ consisting of the embedded eventuality, e , and the matrix one, e' . This obviously predicts the facts observed above. Sentences (2a) and (2b) cannot have the readings we were discussing, because they would not comply with (5). The ILF for those readings, in fact, would feature a relation between the embedded event and the utterance, but nothing referring to the matrix event. Hence, the event of the subordinate clause would not be temporally

Irrespective of the merits or limitations of these works, the main point is that their perspective is different from ours. They consider (2), (3) along with other examples that need be accounted for, in the course of discussing their approaches to the semantics of tense. On the other hand, we believe that the phenomenon these sentences exemplify—namely, the unavailability of mere indexical readings in complement clauses—is worth being given priority in the construction a theory of tenses. That is, we believe that whatever motivates the behaviour we’ve just discussed, that must be a fundamental property of tense, upon which a full theory is to be construed. Such a property arguably explains also the very existence of sequence of tense.

anchored. Similarly, the sentences in (3) don't yield a future-oriented reading because that would correspond to an ILF in which the embedded eventuality is linked to the utterance, but not to the matrix events, this way, again, violating (5).

Thus, (5) seems to be capable to capture the general impossibility of embedded indexical tenses, thanks to the definition given for temporal anchoring, and by making it obligatory in embedded contexts. Mere indexicality is banned from embedded context because it results in non-anchored ILFs of the kind given in (6b). The possible readings, on the other hand, have the general form in (6a):

- (6) a. [...T, $\langle e, e^{\wedge} \rangle$]
 b. [...T, $\langle e, u \rangle$]

Promising as it is, this line of explanation collapses when confronted with facts concerning *dream* contexts, to which we now turn.

3. A problem: *dream*

Intuitively, a person narrating a *dream* does not report about an event which is temporally located in some specific portion of time, because the dreamed events do not *exist* outside the dream itself, in the same sense in which the events of a novel have no *existence* outside that novel. In other words, it is totally meaningless to try to locate the eventuality embedded under a fictional predicate in the portion of time preceding, or following, the fictional predicate itself.

In Giorgi and Pianesi (2001), we developed a formal framework in order to capture these basic intuitions, together with many empirical observations. We argued that dream contexts do not require the subordinated event to be temporally anchored. For instance, in (7) the dreamed event does neither precede nor overlap the matrix event (the dream itself), nor bear any particular temporal relation to the utterance:

- (7) a. Mario ha sognato che Carlo vinceva al totocalcio.
 Mario dreamed that Carlo won(IMPF) the lottery.
 b. John dreamed that Mary was sick.

On the contrary, utterances of both sentences are most naturally interpreted as presenting the winning as temporally un-related with respect to both the dream and the utterance.

Further support to the idea that in sentences such as (7a) there is no temporal anchoring comes from the observation that the imperfect is a past tense, hence not compatible with future-oriented temporal phrases:

- (8) a. *Domani Maria partiva.
Tomorrow, Maria left(IMPF).
b. *La settimana scorsa Gianni ha detto che ieri/oggi/domani Maria partiva.
Last week, Gianni said that yesterday/today/tomorrow Maria left(IMPF).

However, such a constraint disappears when the matrix predicate is *sognare* (dream):

- (9) La settimana scorsa Gianni ha sognato che ieri/oggi/domani Maria partiva.
Last week Gianni dreamed that yesterday/today/tomorrow Maria left(IMPF).

The lack of a connection between the embedded event and the dream can be given further support by showing that most of the phenomena normally associated with temporal anchoring are absent in dream contexts. Thus, in English a sentence like (10a) contrasts with (10b):

- (10) a. John dreamed that Mary ate a sandwich.
b. John said/believed that Mary ate a sandwich.

While in (10b) the eating cannot precede the saying/believing—i.e., it is backward shifted—the same does not happen in (10a). In other words, there is no sense in which the event of eating need precede that of dreaming.

4. A better hypothesis

The data of the previous section, along with those discussed in the quoted work show that temporal anchoring is not enforced in dream contexts.⁶ Thus, the generalisation in (5) cannot be maintained as it is. In particular, (5b) must be amended, since it wrongly makes temporal anchoring a property of all complement clauses, irrespective of the matrix predicate. The data just discussed, however, point towards the opposite direction: temporal anchoring seems to be required by *believe*, *say*, *fear*, etc. but not by *sognare/dream*.⁷

A fundamental difference between dream contexts and those enforcing temporal anchoring, is that the former don't, whereas the latter do, entail a propositional attitude by the subject with respect to the content of the subordinate clause. To clarify this point, consider that utterances of sentences with matrix predicates such as *say*, *believe*, *fear*,

⁶. Notice, they do not show that that it is not possible to construe mutual temporal orientation for events internal to dream reports.

- i. Mario ha sognato che sua madre mangiava. Era appena ritornata dal lavoro.
Mario dreamed that his mother ate(IMPF). She had(IMPF) just returned from work.

Here the mother's return from work is clearly past with respect to her eating. However, both are unordered with respect to the matrix event—namely, the dream.

⁷. Consider statements describing the content of fictions:

- i. In Moby Dick, Achab riesce/riusciva ad uccidere la balena bianca.
In Moby Dick, Achab manages/managed(IMPF) to kill the white whale.

Clearly, the killing of the whale, the fictional event, is not located with respect to the utterance, a fact stressed by the possibility of using both the imperfect and the present tense in these contexts.

This could suggest a line of explanation according to which the absence of temporal anchoring (=the normal behaviour of tenses) is somehow motivated by the fact that statements such as (i), and dream contexts report about non-actual situations. However, this strategy risks to neglect the fact that temporal anchoring is available in reports about beliefs, wishes, etc. which also involve non-actual situations concerning what is believed, wished, etc. Anticipating the theory to be developed, what seems relevant is not whether the situation is simply actual, but whether there is any given subject for which actuality is important.

etc. are understood as presenting the subject as either directly or indirectly having some kind of “concern” towards the truth of the embedded proposition. Thus, if *John said/believed/feared that p*, then *he said(and-believed)/believed/feared that p is true*. This is clearly not the case with *sognare/dream*. To say that *John dreamed that p* doesn’t entail that *John dreamed that p is true*; the dream report, as such, is silent about whether there is any concern by the dreamer towards the truth of the dream.

We take such a concern with the truth of the propositional content to be a constitutive property of true propositional attitudes—namely, beliefs, fears, wishes, etc. For someone to be the subject of a true propositional attitude, it is not enough that there be a mental state/event of his/hers, with a given propositional content. It is also necessary that he/she care about/ be concerned with the truth of that content. In a sense, true propositional attitudes have a tripartite structure: they comprise a mental eventuality, an associated (propositional) content, and a concern by the subject towards the truth of that content. If this is correct, *sognare/dream* is not a propositional attitude predicate: despite its involving a mental eventuality and a content, it fails to entail any concern by the subject towards the truth of that content.

In the language of possible world semantics, it could be said that a sentence with main predicate *wish* presents the wisher as wishing that the actual world, the one he/she lives in, comply with the content of the proposition expressed by the subordinate clause. Similarly, a subject believes that *p* iff he/she locates him/herself in a world where *p* is true, *believing* that that world is the actual world. Thus, propositional attitudes involve the subject, the actual world and the relevant proposition, in such a way that: a) the subject contemplates the possibility that the proposition is true in the actual world, and b) he/she either holds it (belief), or gets involved in further emotional labour (fear, wish). It seems to us that the (a) point—the concern of the subjects towards the truth of the propositional content—qualifies propositional attitudes.

Dreams are different. For a sentence such as *X dreamed that p* to be true it need not be the case that *X* dreams that the actual world is such that *p* is true in it. One might insist that dream sentences are true iff the dreamer dreams to be in a world where the given state of affairs obtains. This is questionable. However, even if this is accepted, it seems wrong to maintain that for those sentences to be true the dreamer needs to contemplate the truth of the proposition in the actual world. In this sense, the object of a dream does not necessarily involve the (actual) world, contrary to the object of propositional attitudes.

Given this characterisation of propositional attitude, and of their differences with respect to dream contexts, it can be suggested that the presence/ absence of temporal

anchoring depends on whether the relevant context is one of (true) propositional attitude, and modify (6b) accordingly. More precisely, we substitute (6) with (11):

- (11) a. Temporal anchoring amounts to the fact that the ILF of the embedded clause contains a temporal relations between the event of the embedded clause, and that of the embedding one.
 b. If a clause is the complement of a verb entailing a propositional attitude by the subject, then temporal anchoring obtains.

Such a move has an important conceptual consequence: temporal anchoring becomes the reflex of the expression of the concern (attitude) of a subject towards a propositional content. Empirical adequacy seems to be attained: *say*, in (1) and (2), is a predicate entailing a propositional attitude by the subject, hence temporal anchoring is obligatory and the mere indexical reading of the embedded clause is ruled out. At the same time, the facts concerning (7), which were problematic for (6), also follow: *dream* is not a predicate of propositional attitude, hence temporal anchoring is not enforced, and the event of the subordinate clause is free to float in an a-temporal realm.

We can simplify (11a), by removing the relational part and attributing it to the tense. After this move, temporal anchoring simply amounts to the requirement that the attitude eventuality be explicit represented in the ILF of the embedded clause. If we now merge this residue with (11b), we obtain (12):

- (12) If a clause expresses the content of an attitude by a subject, then its ILF contains the attitude's eventuality.

Temporal anchoring, as usually conceived, has now disappeared. What remains is a condition on the form and content of the ILFs of clauses that are the objects of propositional attitude predicates, requiring that they contain the very attitude's episode.

The general idea behind the present proposal is not foreign to a number of accounts. Thus, in the Reichenbachian (Reichenbach 1947) tradition of token reflexivity, Higginbotham's (1995) argues that by means of tense, thought contents make room for reference to their own episode (*tensed thoughts*). Similarly, though in a more indirect way, Stalnaker's (1984) diagonal construction is based on the claim that for there to be an attitude, the subject and the episode of his/her thought must exist in all possible worlds defining the attitude.

We understand these proposals, as well as (12), as focusing on the privileged role of subjects in propositional attitudes. Within an ILF framework, we take them to require that the ILF itself bear and appropriate mark of the subject, in order for it to express that subject's attitude. The appropriate mark is the subject's *temporal egocentric coordinate*—namely, the entity he/she uses to locate him/herself in time (Evans 1982)—which, in turn, is the attitude episode itself. Putting all this together, we have a (semi-)final formulation of what is now a condition on propositional attitude contexts:

(13) **Conditions on propositional attitudes** (first version):

- i) if a clause expresses the content of an attitude by a subject, then its ILF contains the subject's temporal egocentric coordinate;
- ii) the primary role of tense is to locate the event with respect to such a coordinate;
- iii) the temporal egocentric coordinate of the subject is the attitude's episode itself.

This condition preserves the suggested explanation for the impossibility of indexical readings of embedded tenses, while at the same time advancing our understanding of propositional attitudes. Indexical readings of tenses are unavailable in the object clauses of propositional attitude predicates because the corresponding ILF would contain the temporal coordinate of the wrong subject—namely, the speaker, instead of the attitude's bearer. As before, the account still accommodates for dream contexts: they are not propositional attitude contexts, hence they do not fall under the strictures of (13).

As observed, temporal anchoring dissolves. It reduces to the (interface) requirement that a clause *C* be 'marked' by the temporal coordinate of the right subject, in order for it to be usable to convey the content of a propositional attitude by that subject. Finally, the approach contributes a possible answer to the question of why do natural languages do have tenses at all, given that many other ways to temporally locate events (e.g., temporal phrases) are available. According to (13), the answer seems to be that what tenses contribute (their function) isn't simply a 'location' for events, but a way to appropriately mark propositional attitude contents according to the their bearers.⁸

⁸. One might venture that there's something irreducibly *de-dicto* in the embedded clause of a propositional attitude predicate—namely, the temporal coordinate of the subject, and, indirectly, the

5. Some details about the Interpreted Logical Form (ILF)

We now turn to sketching an ILF-based theory which incorporates (13). To this end, we modify the ILF approach to propositional attitude contexts of Larson and Ludlow (1993) in two respects. In the first place, to make room for (13i) and (13iii), we propose that:

- Assignment sequences for attitudes be relativised to the subject's coordinate. For our purposes we distinguish between a *speaker-oriented* assignments, σ_{sp} , and a *subject-oriented* one, σ_{sub} , where the subject is the bearer of the attitude.
- We are interested in values concerning the temporal coordinate of the subject, which we place at the 0-th position of the sequence. Hence, for a propositional attitude context we will distinguish between $\sigma_{sub}(0)$, the temporal coordinate of the attitude's subject, and $\sigma_{sp}(0)$, the temporal coordinate of the speaker. The former is assigned by the subject-oriented, and the latter by the speaker-oriented assignment sequence.
- $\sigma_{sub}(0)$ is whatever value σ_{sp} provides for the matrix event/state (the attitude episode). On the other hand, $\sigma_{sp}(0)$ will assign the 0-th variable the utterance event.⁹

Concerning (13ii), we stick to our initial hypothesis that (at least certain) tenses are relational devices, which relate the (value of the) 0-th variable to the (value of the) eventive one. Hence we can give the following lexical axioms for 'idealised' tenses:

subject him/herself. At the same time, it is important to notice that (13) does not rule out the possibility that the embedded clause features an independent reference to the utterance, as in *John said that Mary will be here tomorrow*—that is, it does not rule out *de-re* (speaker-oriented) reference. What (13) requires is that the needed *de-dicto* element be represented, and that this be done by the tense.

⁹ At least for our purposes, we take σ_{sub} to be like σ_{sp} except for the fact that the former assigns the matrix event as the value of the 0-th variable., whereas the latter assigns the utterance.

What presented in the text can be given a more precise form by resorting to the notion of *selection relation*. In (Larson and Segal 1995), this is an object, Σ , which relates utterances (of a sentence) to assignment sequences, to the effect that only if such a relation holds between utterance u and assignment σ , $\Sigma(u, \sigma)$, the latter is appropriate for the former. In our case, we can modify the definition of selection relation to extend to triples consisting of an attitude episode, a clause and an assignment sequence. With this, a sequence σ is appropriate for clause C in the context of attitude e iff $\Sigma(\sigma, C, e)$. We won't pursue such a course any further here.

- (14) a. $\text{Val}(\langle a, e \rangle, \text{Pres}, \sigma)$ iff $a \circ e$ and $\sigma(0) = a$
 b. $\text{Val}(\langle a, e \rangle, \text{Past}, \sigma)$ iff $e < a$, and $\sigma(0) = a$ etc.

Being sensitive to assignment sequences, the value of the distinguished 0-th variable will vary according to whether evaluation is performed by using the speaker-oriented or the subject-oriented sequence. To exemplify, consider (15a).

- (15) a. John said that Mary was sick.
 b. $[\dots[_T, \langle e, e \rangle \dots]]$ σ_{sub} is used, $\sigma_{sub}(0) = e'$, and $e \circ e'$
 c. $[\dots[_T, \langle e, e \rangle \dots]]$ σ_{sub} is used, $\sigma_{sub}(0) = e'$, and $e < e'$
 d. $*[\dots[_T, \langle e, u \rangle \dots]]$ σ_{sp} is used, $\sigma_{sp}(0) = u$, and...

Two possibilities are open for computing the ILF of the embedded clause: either by using σ_{sub} , or by means of σ_{sp} . In the first case the 0-th variable is assigned the same value the matrix eventive variable has been given by σ_{sp} , call it e' . This possibility underlies both the simultaneous, (15b), and the backward-shifted reading, (15c). If σ_{sp} is used, then we have (15d); an illegal ILF in view of (13), since it does not feature any reference to the attitude bearer's egocentric coordinate (the attitude episode). On the contrary, by referring to the utterance, it attributes the clause to the wrong subject.

Up to now, we have discussed and proposed a solution to the problem of why tenses behave differently in subordinate contexts than in matrix ones. We have argued that this is due to a general requirement about propositional attitude reports to the effect that the ILFs of their complement clause must feature a reference to the attitude subject's temporal coordinate. This restriction has been tied to a distinguishing property of propositional attitudes: for subject X to bear an attitude towards a propositional content it is necessary that X be concerned with the truth of that content. Only ILFs which bear the (right) subject's mark are amenable to function as a description of his/her attitude's content. Hence, the general ban against mere indexical readings in complement clauses is the effect of an interface condition aiming at securing that the ILFs expressing the content of propositional attitude be the right kind of objects.¹⁰

¹⁰ Following suggestions in the literature -notably Segal (1998)- it can be hypothesised that ILFs are fed into the module dealing with the Theory of Mind. In a speculative mood, the kind of restrictions on

6. A theory of the Double Access Reading (DAR)

It is everyone's intuition that in DAR sentences the embedded event is somehow connected both to the utterance and to the matrix event. Thus, an utterance of (16) is interpreted as suggesting that the pregnancy overlaps both the subject's and the speaker's time.

- (16) Gianni ha detto che Maria è incinta.
Gianni said that Mary is pregnant.

In this section, we discuss how the interface condition presented in the previous one can shed some light on the DAR phenomenon. We start by proposing to extend (13) by strengthening (13i) into a biconditional, this way yielding (17):

(17) **Conditions on propositional attitudes** (final version)

- (i) a clause is the object of an attitude by a subject iff the ILF of that clause contains the subject temporal egocentric coordinate;
- (ii) the primary role of tense is to locate the event with respect to such a coordinate;
- (iii) the temporal coordinate of the subject is the attitude's episode itself.

The hypothesis is that it is not only the case that the ILF of clauses expressing the content of an attitude contains the attitude's episode (the subject's temporal coordinate), but the converse holds as well: whenever the event of a clause is linked by tense to a subject's temporal coordinate, some attitude by that very subject must be at stake. Applied to (16), (17) suggests that the speaker has some kind of attitude of his/her own

ILFs we arrived at, could then be seen as due to requirement coming from such a module: in order for a representation to be processable as pertaining to X's mental contents, it must be appropriately marked by X itself.

towards (part of) the content of the subordinate clause, so that the truth conditions are something along the following lines:¹¹

- (18) $\exists e(\text{say}(e) \wedge \text{Agent}(e, \text{Gianni}) \wedge \text{Theme}(e, \exists e'(\text{pregnancy}(e') \wedge e \circ e' \dots))) \wedge \exists e''(\phi(e'') \wedge \text{Agent}(e'', \text{speaker}) \wedge \text{theme}(e'', P))$

That is, for an utterance u of (16) to be true it must be the case that a) there is an event of saying, e , performed by Gianni, such that what is said is appropriately described by an ILF whose truth conditions are as shown by the material within backslashes in (18); and b) there is an attitude episode e'' of understood type ϕ whose object is the ILF P .

In other words, an utterance of (16) doesn't present the content of the subordinate clause only as (part of) the subject's attitude, but of the speaker's too. To make the proposal viable, we need investigate what P consists of—namely, what is the content of the speaker's attitude in (16). We must also clarify how this can come about. Since the presence of the speaker's attitude is determined by the connection between the embedded event and the utterance, through the mediation of (17), and since such a connection is provided by the embedded tense, it must be shed light on how the tense can do the double work of linking the embedded event to both the matrix event and the utterance.

To understand what P is, consider the following scenarios:

- (19) Scenario: Mary is in the room.

John: Mary is in the room.

Scenario: Mary exits.

Speaker: #John said that Mary is in the room.

- (20) Scenario: There is noone in the room.

John: Mary is in the room.

Speaker: John said that Mary is in the room.

¹¹ Many scholars have investigated the problems related to the DAR. See, among the other works, Ogihara (1996), Abusch (1997), who propose a de-re theory. Our approach, however, is more similar to Higginbotham (2001), see also Giorgi and Pianesi (2000).

(21) Scenario: There is noone in the room.

John: Mary is in the room.

Scenario: Mary enters the room.

Speaker: #John said that Mary is in the room.

The speaker's utterance in (19) is not appropriate, and the reasons is not that the speaker has misrepresented John's thought/dictum. Rather, it seems to be traceable to the fact that he/she knows that things have changed since John said what he did, and have changed in respects which are relevant to the truth of John's utterance/thought. In particular, the speaker knows both that Maria was in the room when Gianni said what he said, and that she is no longer there, at the time of his/her own utterance. Eventually, the utterance is odd because the speaker has misrepresented the situation.

For similar reasons, even the speaker's utterance of (21) is not appropriate: he/she knows both that Mary was not in the room when John said what he said, and that she entered later. On the other hand, if Mary's staying in the room obtained at the subject's s and at the speaker's time, or at neither, then the speaker *is* entitled to say *John said that Mary is in the room* (cf. 20).

So, it seems to be part of what the speaker conveys by using the present-under-past sentences that at a certain point John talked as if Mary was in the room, and he/she *holds* that (in a sense) the situation has not changed since.

As a first approximation, we can attempt to capture the particular notion of a 'situation which has not changed in the meanwhile', by means of the following biconditional:

(22) $\forall e[\text{in-the-room}(e) \wedge \text{theme}(e, \text{Maria})] (e \circ e' \leftrightarrow e \circ u)$

where e' and u are, respectively, the subject's and the speaker's temporal coordinates. With this, an utterance of *John said that Mary is in the room* is true iff: (i) Gianni said something to the effect that Mary was in the room at his temporal coordinate, and (ii) the speaker holds that every state of being-in-the-room involving Maria is such that it holds at Gianni's temporal coordinates iff it holds at the speaker's.

If the speaker holds something whose truth conditions are as exhibited by (22), then his/her utterance will be appropriate in the considered scenarios only in case Mary has not been in the room as far as the relevant period is concerned, or has continuously been

there since John's saying. On the other hand, the cases in which Mary is in the room and then leaves, or is not in the room at John's time and then enters are excluded.

In our framework, in which ILFs and subject/speaker-oriented assignments play a major role, (22) is a very rough way to accommodate the idea of a situation which has not changed (in relevant respects). A more precise, and more interesting way to account for the idea that a speaker uttering a DAR sentence holds that the situation has not changed in the meanwhile, consists in hypothesising that he/she holds that the two assignments (his/her and the subject's) are sufficiently similar to yield coordinated truth values. If the subject-oriented assignment is such that it makes the subordinate clause true, so does the speaker-oriented assignment. On the other hand, if the clause is false under one assignment, then it is false under the other as well.

7.1 Deriving the truth conditions for the DAR

We turning now to the problem of how embedded tenses can do the double work of linking the embedded event to both the subject's and the speaker's temporal coordinate.

In Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) we proposed a split-C framework according to which two distinct complementisers can be singled out in embedded clauses: a lower one, called MOOD, related to the presence of an embedded subjunctive verb, and a higher one, C. In a successive work (Giorgi and Pianesi 2000) we argued in favour of a strict relationships between the DAR and the higher complementiser C, to the effect that the DAR is possible iff C is projected (irrespective of the specific tense chosen). To explain this relationship, we hypothesised that the complementiser C is endowed with temporal features (τ -features) entering a relation with those of the embedded T, by either movement or matching. As a result, when the ILF for the embedded clause of (16) is computed and the interpretive contribution of tenses is spelled out, the eventive variable is the same in C as in T:

- (23) a. [... [v said [CP[τ -C [XP ... τ -T ...]]]]]
 b. [...[C, $\langle e, x_\rho \rangle$ [T, $\langle e, x_\rho \rangle$ ]]]

We now hypothesise that C is associated with σ_{sp} —that is, that the complementiser C is invariably associated with the speaker-oriented assignment sequence.¹²

Finally, we introduce the following axioms:

$$(24) \quad \text{Val}(\langle e, x \rangle, [V [_{CP} C [_{XP} \dots]]], \sigma) \text{ iff for some } y, \text{Val}(\langle e, x, y \rangle, V, \sigma) \text{ and } y = /XP /_{\sigma_{sub}}$$

$$(25) \quad \text{Val}(t, [_{CP} \tau\text{-}C \text{ XP}], \sigma) \text{ iff for any } z, \text{Val}(z, [\tau\text{-}C], \sigma) \text{ and } \text{Val}(z, \text{XP}, \sigma_{sub})$$

Axiom (24), is used to compute the semantic value of phrases of the form $[V [_{CP} [_{XP} \dots]]]$, where V is a verb of propositional attitude, and $[_{CP} [_{XP} \dots]]$ is its complement. The axiom requires the ILF of the complement clause to be computed using the subject-oriented sequence, and skipping the C node. As a consequence, the T node of the embedded clause is assigned a pair consisting of the value for the embedded eventive variable, and the value for the matrix one, this way yielding ILFs of the following type:¹³

¹². As discussed in Giorgi and Pianesi (2000), this move is justified by the fact that, independently of the level of embedding, the DAR is always and uniquely related to the event of the immediately superordinate clause and to the utterance:

- i. Gianni ha detto che Mario ha affermato che Maria è incinta.
Gianni said that Mario stated that Maria is pregnant.

In this sentence the pregnancy is perceived to be simultaneous to the temporal coordinates of Mario and of the speaker.

¹³. Given the considerations in fn.9, it would be enough that (24) require the ILF of the subordinate clause to be computed with respect to an assignment which is appropriate for the clause according to the selection relation:

- (i) $\text{Val}(\langle e, x \rangle, [V [_{CP} [_{XP} \dots]]], \sigma) \text{ iff for some } y, \text{Val}(\langle e, x, y \rangle, V, \sigma) \text{ and } y = /XP /_{\sigma}$ where $\Sigma(\sigma', [_{XP} \dots], e)$.

$$(26) \quad [XP, t \dots [T, \langle e, e' \rangle \dots]]$$

As can be seen, this ILF accounts for the ‘normal’ subject-oriented, temporal anchoring; hence, it accounts for the attitude of the subject towards the content of the subordinate clause. Eventually, we can make sense of the fact that in order for an utterance of (16) to be true it must be the case that Gianni said something which is expressed by the ILF in (26), where the relevant event/action is presented as simultaneous to Gianni’s (=the subject’s) temporal coordinate.

Axiom (25) is meant to capture the intuition we discussed at the end of the previous section: by using a DAR sentence, the speaker commits him/herself to the idea that his/her assignment sequence, and the subject’s are basically similar, in that they can provide for coordinate truth conditions. (25) implements this idea by assigning the whole CP headed by τ -C the value t under the speaker-oriented assignment iff the two constituents, the τ -C node and its complement, have the same value truth value, the first under the speaker-oriented and the second according to the subject-oriented assignment.

It should be noticed that the ILF for XP is re-computed, according to (25). In particular, the variable x_0 of the embedded tense is re-assigned the value $\sigma_{sub}(0)=e$; the variable x_0 in C is assigned $\sigma_{sp}(0)=u$; and the eventive variables associated with C and T receive the same value. The result are two ILFs:

$$(27) \quad \text{a. ILF1} = [C, z, [C, \langle e, u \rangle \dots]]$$

$$\text{b. ILF2} = [XP, z, [T, \langle e, e' \rangle \dots]]$$

τ -C and T have corresponding sets of τ -features, hence express the same relationship. Because of this, ILF1 in (27a) is such that C is paired with value $z=t$ iff e and u (the speaker’s temporal coordinate) are in the appropriate relation specified by the τ -features, say R . As to ILF2, (27b) requires that e be in the same relation R to e' , the subject’s temporal coordinate. Finally, (25) requires that the whole CP be true just in case the two constituents, [τ -C] and [XP..], have the same semantic value, this way providing for the connection between the truth conditions of the two ILFs. Applied to example (16), (25) delivers the required truth conditions: the two ILFs, in fact, have the

In general, it seems that mention of the assignment sequence can be omitted, provided that we understand that semantic values are relativised to appropriate assignment sequences.

same event (a pregnancy) constrained to be simultaneous to the speaker's temporal coordinate (27a) and to the subject's (27b). Moreover, they are required to have the same truth value. As a result, a pregnancy obtains at the subject's temporal coordinate iff it obtains at the speakers.

As noticed, axiom (25) requires computing the ILF of the XP clause. This might seem strange, in view of the fact that application of (24) is already capable of delivering such an ILF. There are empirical reasons, though, which justify maintaining (24) and (25) as they are—namely, with (25) independently requiring that the ILF for XP be computed by using σ_{sub} . Those reasons come from the analysis of a phenomenon involving dream contexts.

We saw in the previous discussion that utterances of sentences such as (28) have readings in which the event mentioned in the embedded clause, the dreamed event, need not be temporally related to either the subject's temporal coordinate or the speaker's:

- (28) Gianni ha sognato che Maria mangiava.
Gianni dreamed that Maria ate(IMPF).

It is a striking fact that when the tense in the subordinate clause is changed to a non-imperfect one, temporal anchoring is again available:

- (29) La settimana scorsa Gianni ha sognato che ieri Maria vinceva /*ha vinto al totocalcio.
Last week Gianni dreamed that yesterday Maria won(IMPF/PAST)/*has won the lottery.

The sentence is perfectly acceptable with the imperfect, but not with the present perfect. The incompatibility of the present perfect with the future-oriented temporal phrase shows that with such a verbal form temporal anchoring is enforced. Thus, in (30a) the winning is perceived as past with respect to both the speaker and the dreamer, and in (30b) as in the future with respect to both:

- (30) a. Gianni ha sognato che Maria ha vinto al totocalcio.
Gianni dreamed that Maria has won the lottery.
b. Gianni ha sognato che Maria vincerà al totocalcio.
Gianni dreamed that Maria will win the lottery.

The DAR is also available. Hence, (31) is similar to (16) in all relevant respects:

- (31) Gianni ha sognato che Maria è incinta.
Gianni dreamed that Maria is pregnant.

These contexts, called *evidential dreams* in Giorgi & Pianesi (2001), have many other interesting peculiarities. We cannot discuss such properties here, being enough to our purposes to draw attention on the fact that the use of non-imperfect tenses in dream contexts requires temporal anchoring.

Now, if our characterisation of *sognare/dream* is correct, the fact that they are not verbs of propositional attitude cannot be viewed as a contingent property. That is, it is not limited to the particular tense arrangements we saw in section 3. On the contrary, it seems to be a defining property that the dreamer is not concerned with the propositional content of the dream.¹⁴ Thus axiom (24) is no more appropriate for sentences such as (30) than it was for (28). When the main verb is *sognare/dream*, what is needed is an axiom like (32):

- (32) $\text{Val}(\langle e, x \rangle, [V [_{\text{CP}} C [_{\text{XP}} \dots]]], \sigma)$ iff for some y , $\text{Val}(\langle e, x, y \rangle, V, \sigma)$ and $y = \text{XP}/_{\sigma^*}$

where σ^* is an assignment sequence that, differently than σ_{sub} and σ_{sp} , does assign the 0-th variable neither the speaker's nor the dreamer temporal coordinate. The result, of course, is an ILF for the subordinate clause which does not exhibit temporal anchoring. Putting all together, we obtain that the truth of both (28) and (29) requires that Mario dreamed something which is expressed by the relevant, non-anchored ILF. But, then, how can the temporal sensitivity of (29)—namely, the fact that in (29) the dreamed event must precede both the utterance and the dream—be explained?

It is at this juncture that (25) has an important role to play. Temporal anchoring in (29)-(31) is primarily towards the speaker, hence expected to be controlled by the same axiom that, in the general case of DAR, accounts for the speaker oriented portion of meaning. What is needed, for (25) to come into play, is that the LF structure of (29)-

¹⁴. It also certainly is a defining property of beliefs or wishes that believers/wishers do care about the truth of the relevant contents.

(31) be the same as that of (16), an axiom ruling the interpretive behaviour of clauses headed by a C endowed with τ -features. This seems to be the case, as argued in Giorgi and Pianesi (2001).

Our hypothesis, then, is that the temporal sensitivity of (29)-(31) is a side effect of (25): Among the things that axiom does there is the requirement that the XP clause be assigned an ILF computed with respect to σ_{sub} . Hence, (25) by itself suffices, and, as it turns out, is necessary to account for the facts we've just reviewed. The desired result is then obtained: It is a component of the meaning of an utterance of (31) that the speaker holds that for any state of the relevant kind, such a state overlaps his/her own temporal coordinates iff it does the so with the dreamer's ones.¹⁵

Conceptually, the conclusion is quite important. The temporal orientation towards the subject in (30) is secondary to (25). The latter, in turn, and the DAR tout court, depend on a specific syntactic configuration, in which the higher complementiser has τ -features entering in a relation with those of the embedded T.

Conclusion

The conceptual problem we addressed in this work was why languages need SOT at all, instead of resorting to what seems the most straightforward strategy—namely, allowing tenses to behave in complement clauses the same way they do in matrix ones.

¹⁵ This raises a problem with respect to (16), according to which as soon as an ILF is marked with the temporal coordinates of a given subject, that ILF expresses the content of an attitude by that subject.

At this point, the problem is empirical, and it is not clear to us whether attitudes of any kind by the dreamer towards the dream's content are entailed by, say, (30). At present, some data briefly discussed in Giorgi and Pianesi (2001) seem to point towards an answer in the affirmative. Obviously, should it turn out that this is not the case, (16) should be dropped, and we'd have to return to the weaker (13).

Whatever the conclusion of that investigation, however, it seems it's not going to hamper the hypothesis made in the text concerning the predicate *sognare* (dream). For, even if we were to embrace the thesis that in (30) there is a propositional attitude by the dreamer towards the dream's content, it would still be true that such an attitude is not the dream, hence does not depend on the verb *sognare*. As it seems plausible, that attitude of the dreamer towards the content of his/her own dream would be something external to the dream, possibly arising after it. It would not be specified linguistically, but through the context.

By comparing propositional attitude contexts with dream ones, we argued that SOT is the linguistic realization of a constitutive property of propositional attitude contexts: The representation expressing their contents requires the temporal coordinates of the attitude bearer, in the form of the very attitude episode. The labour of securing that these interface conditions are met is performed by a semantic machinery relying on interpreted logical forms as the representational means of attitude contents, and on assignment sequences which are sensitive to attitude bearers, this way incorporating their perspectives.

We also discussed an application of these ideas to the phenomenon of DAR. We proposed that the DAR expresses the direct concern of the speaker with respect to the content expressed by the subordinate clause—a possibility which is obtained by simply inverting the direction of implication between temporal anchoring and attitude contexts. We have then articulated our view again relying on an ILF framework.

It seems to us that the theory presented here might contribute to at least two research paths deserving further investigation. The first concerns the role of tenses in language. As already noticed, if our theory is correct, the possibility arises that their role is not that of locating eventualities, but that of satisfying abstracts requirements on the form and contents of the ILFs, to the effect that they are marked by the appropriate attitude bearer.

The second, more speculative, strand refers to a conception of the mind as consisting of interacting modules, among which the language module and that devoted to processing representations concerning other people's mental states can be found. It is then possible to hypothesise that the latter, Theory of Mind (TOM) module works on representations delivered by the former in the form of ILFs (Segal 1998). If so, the kind of constraints we have been concerned with in this paper could be related to the way the TOM module requires its input to be formatted. More precisely, the subject's mark (the attitude's eventuality) on ILFs would be needed to keep the mental representation of other people's mind mutually distinguishable, allowing the relevant processes to operate selectively on them.

References

- Abusch, D., (1997), "Sequence of Tense and Temporal De Re". In *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 20: 1-50.
- Evans, G., 1982. *The Varieties of Reference*. Oxford University Press.
- Giorgi, A. and F. Pianesi, 1997. *Tense and Aspect: from Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Giorgi, A. and F. Pianesi, 2000. "Sequence of Tense Phenomena in Italian: a Morphosyntactic Analysis". In *Probus*, 12, 1-32.
- Giorgi, A. and F. Pianesi, 2001. "Imperfect Dreams. The temporal dependencies of fictional predicates". In *Probus*, 13, 31-68.
- Higginbotham, J., 1991. "Belief and Logical Form". In *Mind and Language*, 6: 344-369.
- Higginbotham, J., 1995. "Tensed Thoughts". In *Mind and Language*.
- Higginbotham, J., 2001. "Why is Sequence of Tense Obligatory?". In G. Preyer and E. Lepore (eds.) *On Logical Form*. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Larson, R. and P. Ludlow, 1993. 'Interpreted Logical Forms'. In *Synthese* 95:305-355.
- Larson, R. and G. Segal, 1995. *Knowledge of Meaning*. The MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Ogihara, T., (1996). *Tense, Attitudes and Scope*. Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht.
- Reichenbach, H., 1947. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. Mac Millan, New York.
- Segal, G., 1998. 'Representing Representations'. In P. Carruthers and J. Boucher (eds.), *Language and thought*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stalnaker, R.C., 1984. *Inquiry*. The MIT Press, Cambridge CA.
- Stowell, T., 1996. 'The Phrase Structure of Tense'. In J. Roorick and L. Zaring (eds.), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, 277-291. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Splitting subject clitic-verb inversion

Nicola Munaro

University of Venice

0. Introduction

As is well known, a considerable number of North-Eastern Italian dialects display the morphosyntactic phenomenon defined in the descriptive literature on the topic as interrogative inversion: it consists in the encliticization of a pronominal element coreferent with the subject onto the inflected verb.

In this article, I will try to determine the range of possible interpretations which can be associated with sentences whose predicate has the relevant verbal morphology.¹

Within the relatively recent line of research adopting a split-CP approach (see Rizzi (1998) among many others)), it will be proposed that the presence of subject clitic inversion is the morphological reflex of a syntactic process; more precisely, that it entails raising of the inflected verb to the head position of one of the functional projections of the CP-layer which are argued to encode some aspects of the speaker's representation of the propositional content expressed..

The article is organized as follows: in section 1 the existence of an independent series of non-assertive subject clitic pronouns is briefly argued for; in section 2 the possible

¹. The leading ideas underlying the present article were first expressed in the second chapter of my PhD thesis (Munaro (1997)). Part of the issues addressed here have been dealt with in a paper which is going to appear in the proceedings of the conference *I confini del dialetto* (Sappada (Bl), 5th-9thJuly 2000): my thanks go to that audience as well as to the one of *Going Romance 2000* (Utrecht, 30thNovember-2ndDecember 2000) for helpful comments and suggestions; thanks are due to Paola Benincà for reading earlier versions of this work; I also benefitted from discussions with Cecilia Poletto. The usual disclaimers apply. Finally, I would like to thank the (mostly academic) native speakers of the varieties analyzed in section 3 for providing me with the relevant judgements.

contexts of use of non-assertive subject clitics in Friulian are presented; section 3 is devoted to identify the crossdialectal variation attested in some Veneto dialects with respect to the range of interpretive implications associated with inversion; in section 4 a finer semantic characterization of the different functional heads hosting the inflected verb is provided; in section 5 the proposed analysis is extended to subject clitic inversion in standard French and to the *tu-pas* construction in Quebec French; section 6 concludes the paper with some summarizing remarks.

1. The non-assertive series of subject clitic pronouns

In this section I will address the question of the status of the subject pronouns showing up in inversion contexts. The hypothesis that the series of subject clitics surfacing in interrogative contexts is largely independent from the one appearing in assertive contexts was first suggested in one of the earliest investigations about subject clitics in the Northern Italian domain, namely Renzi & Vanelli (1983); they tend to regard the interrogative conjugation as considerably independent from the assertive one on the basis of the two following arguments: firstly, they note that if a variety forms interrogatives through the inversion of the pronoun, then the number of the persons constantly displaying a pronoun is the same or superior with respect to the number of persons with pronoun in assertives; secondly, they point out that in most cases the pronoun following the verb in interrogatives is different from the one preceding the verb in assertives for the corresponding person.

The correctness of these two descriptive generalizations is confirmed by a quick look at the assertive and interrogative inflectional paradigm of the present indicative in Paduan and Agordino (a Central and a Northern Veneto variety) reported in (1) and (2) respectively:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------------|----|-------------------------|
| (1) | a. | 1. magno | b. | 1. magno(<i>i</i>) |
| | | 2. <i>te</i> magni | | 2. magni- <i>to</i> |
| | | 3. <i>el/la</i> magna | | 3. magne- <i>lo/la</i> |
| | | 4. magnemo | | 4. magnémo-(<i>i</i>) |
| | | 5. magnè | | 5. magnè- <i>o</i> |
| | | 6. <i>i/le</i> magna | | 6. magne- <i>li/le</i> |

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------------|----|------------------------|
| (2) | a. | 1. varde | b. | 1. varde |
| | | 2. <i>te</i> varde | | 2. varde- <i>to</i> |
| | | 3. <i>el/la</i> varda | | 3. varde- <i>lo/la</i> |
| | | 4. vardon | | 4. vardon- <i>e</i> |
| | | 5. vardé | | 5. vardé- <i>o</i> |
| | | 6. <i>i/le</i> varda | | 6. varde- <i>li/le</i> |

As one can easily see, proclitic subject pronouns differ from enclitic ones both in number and in form. Moreover, in some Northern Italian varieties a proclitic subject can cooccur with an enclitic one, as exemplified in (3a) with the Piedmontese variety of Turin and in (3b) with Western Friulian:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------------------------------|----|---------------------------------|
| (3) | a. | lon ch' a l' a- <i>lo</i> fait? | b. | cui a compri- <i>al</i> il pan? |
| | | what that scl-scl-has-scl done | | who scl-buys-scl the bread? |
| | | ‘what has he done?’ | | ‘who buys the bread?’ |

Furthermore, when a given variety displays an enclitic series of pronominal subjects, these must be obligatorily used in main interrogatives, as shown by the contrast between (4a) and (4b) in Paduan:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------------------------|----|------------------------------|
| (4) | a. | * <i>cossa</i> (el) fa? | b. | <i>cossa</i> fa- <i>lo</i> ? |
| | | <i>cossa</i> (scl) fa | | <i>cossa</i> fa-scl |
| | | ‘che cosa fa?’ | | ‘che cosa fa?’ |

Interestingly, the occurrence of the enclitic series of pronominal subjects seems to be limited to the structures in which the inflected verb raises higher than the agreement field, that is, in main contexts where the position C° is free, as in (4b), but not in embedded interrogatives, where C° is presumably occupied by the complementizer *che*, as shown again by the contrast between (5a) and (5b) in Paduan:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------------------------|----|--|
| (5) | a. | no so <i>cossa</i> che el ga fato | b. | *no so <i>cossa</i> che ga- <i>lo</i> fato |
| | | not know what that scl-has done | | not know what that has-scl done |
| | | I don't know what he has done' | | 'I don't know what he has done' |

Let us then adopt the following, adapting it from Poletto (2000), as a diagnostic paradigm to determine whether the series of enclitic subject pronouns has to be distinguished from the proclitic series:²

- (6) a. different number of persons in the verbal paradigm displaying pro- vs enclitic pronouns
 b. (partially) different morphological shape of pro- vs enclitic pronouns
 c. possibility of cooccurrence in some varieties

². Poletto (2000) proposes that subject clitic inversion implies raising of the inflected verb to a (low) position of the CP-layer; her assumption is based mainly on the following arguments:

(i) the position of the inflected verb displaying inversion with respect to the interrogative particle *pa* in the Raethoromance variety of Pera di Fassa:

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| a. ola pa tu vas? | b. ola vas-to pa? |
| where pa scl-go? | where go-scl pa? |
| ‘where are you going?’ | ‘where are you going?’ |

(ii) the similarities of syntactic behaviour between *fa*-support in the dialect of Monno and *do*-support in English:

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| a. come fa- <i>l</i> comportas? | b. qual è- <i>t</i> cercà fo? | c. che fa- <i>l</i> fa? |
| how does-scl behave-himself | which have-scl found out | what does-scl do |
| ‘how is he behaving?’ | ‘which one did you choose?’ | ‘what is he doing?’ |

(iii) the possibility, attested in the dialect of Rodoretto di Prali, of coordinating a verb displaying inversion with a second member introduced by the complementizer in main disjunctive *yes/no* interrogatives:

- l' achatà-*tu* ou qu' tu l' achatte pa?
 it buy-scl or that you it buy not
 ‘do you buy it or not?’

Poletto (2000) also analyzes the role of subject clitic inversion in optative, counterfactual and disjunctive clauses with respect to complementizer deletion phenomena, showing that, at least in some cases, an analysis in terms of verb raising to the C-domain is a viable hypothesis.

On the basis of the data discussed in this section, I suggest that enclitic pronominal subjects should be distinguished from proclitic ones and, more precisely, be analyzed as bound morphemes selecting the inflected verb: I will assume that the verbal form displaying encliticization of the subject pronoun is realized through left-adjunction of the verb to the clitic. Furthermore, I propose that the structural position inside which the finite verb merges with the enclitic subject is a relatively high functional head in the inflectional layer of sentence structure.³

2. The contexts of use of non-assertive subject clitics

As observed in section 1, the encliticization of the pronominal subject obtains primarily in main interrogatives, hence the label *inversione interrogativa* traditionally attributed to it. However, as pointed out in Munaro (1997), this phenomenon, unlike what is currently assumed, is not at all limited to interrogative sentences, but is attested in the North-Eastern Italian dialects in a variety of sentential types.

The relevant instances of subject clitic inversion have been described by Benincà (1989) in her analysis of the central variety of Friulian; she identifies the following syntactic contexts:

- a. main interrogative sentences (both yes/no and wh-questions);
- b. sentences structurally resembling interrogatives but having the pragmatic force of exclamatives, through which the speaker expresses an emotionally salient attitude;

³. In Munaro (1997) I located this position at the edge of IP (that is, at the border between the inflectional and the complementizer layer of the extended functional structure of the sentence) and labelled it *Type*^o to express the fact that it is crucially involved in the determination of the sentential type (as will become clear from the data discussed in section 2). The head position inside which the subject clitic merges with the inflected verb is identified with *IntForce*^o in Pollock et alii (1998), *AgrC*^o in Poletto (2000), *AgrS*^o in Hulk (1993).

Note that the discussion of the interpretive values expressible by inversion developed in the following sections is compatible with an approach analyzing the subject pronoun as a maximal projection first merged in [spec,IP] and viewing subject clitic inversion as the result of (remnant) phrasal movement, such as the one recently proposed by Pollock (2000) and adopted in Poletto & Pollock (2000).

- c. sentences where inversion is preceded by a negation, expressing the speaker's negative presupposition with respect to the propositional content, which is thus given as unexpected;
- d. optative sentences expressing the speaker's wish, in which the realization of a counterfactual propositional content is hoped for;
- e. the if-clauses of conditional sentences, defining the condition under which the event expressed by the main clause can be realized;
- f. disjunctive structures in which two alternative possibilities are taken into account and evaluated as irrelevant to the realization of the event expressed by the main sentence.

The various cases of inversion are instantiated in the following Friulian examples (taken again from Benincà (1989)):

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| (7) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. cui vegni-<i>al</i>?
who comes-scl
'who's coming?' b. ce mi toci-<i>al</i> di vjodi!
what me must-scl of see
'what I'm forced to see!' c. no mi toci-<i>al</i> di pajà la multe!
not me must-scl of pay the fine
'I even have to pay the fine!' d. ti vess-<i>jo</i> dit la veretât!
you had-scl told the truth
'if only I had told you the truth!' e. vinisi-<i>al</i> tjo pari, o podaresin là
came-scl your father, scl-could go
'if your father came, we could go' f. sedi-<i>al</i> pùar o sedi-<i>al</i> sior, no m' impuarte
be-scl poor or be-scl rich, not to-me matters
'I don't care whether he's rich or poor' | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a'. vegni-<i>al</i> Toni?
comes-scl Toni
'is Toni coming?' |
|-----|--|--|

So, beside the ordinary interrogative interpretation of (7a-a'), (7b) expresses the speaker's dismay for what he's forced to see, in (7c) the speaker realizes to his surprise that, against his expectations, he has to pay the fine, in (7d) he expresses the wish he

3. The crossdialectal variation

In this section I will outline a short comparative survey of the crossdialectal variation detectable among a few Veneto varieties with respect to the possible interpretations which can be associated with enclisis of the pronominal subject onto the inflected verb. Let us start by considering the variety spoken in the country hinterland of Venice, where inversion (which is fully productive only in the third person singular) is compatible with all the readings attested in Friulian:

- (8) a. *vegni-lo?*
comes-scl
'is he coming?'
- a'. *cossa magne-lo?*
what eats-scl
'what does he eat?'
- b. *quanti libri no ga-lo leto?!*
how many books not has-scl read
'how many books he read!'
- c. *no ga-lo magnà tuto!*
not has-scl eaten everything
'(surprisingly,) he ate everything!'
- d. *rivasse-lo in tempo, almanco!*
arrived-scl in time, at least
'if only he arrived in time!'
- e. *fusse-lo vegnùo anca Mario, gavaressimo podùo dirghelo*
were-scl come also Mario, could been able tell-him-it
'if Mario had come too, we could have told him'
- f. *magne-lo o no magne-lo, mi preparo lo stesso*
eats-scl or not eats-scl, I prepare the same
'whether he eats or not, I prepare in any case'

In (9) I report the corresponding examples in Paduan, where the only case in which inversion produces ungrammaticality is the disjunctive structure exemplified in (9f):

- (9) a. *vignì-o?*
come-scl
'are you coming?'
- a'. *cossa magni-to?*
what eat-scl
'what do you eat?'

- b. quanti libri no ga-*lo* leto?!
 how many books not has-scl read
 ‘how many books he read!’
- c. no ga-*lo* magnà tuto!
 not has-scl eaten everything
 ‘(surprisingly,) he ate everything!’
- d. rivàsse-*lo* in tempo!
 arrived-scl in time
 ‘if only he arrived in time!’
- e. füsse-*lo* vignù anca Mario, gavarissimo podùo dirghelo⁵
 were-scl come also Mario, have-cond been-able tell-him-it
 ‘if Mario had come too, we could have told him’
- f. *magne-*lo* o no magne-*lo*, mi parécio istéssso
 eat-scl or not eat-scl, I prepare the same
 ‘whether he eats or not, I prepare in any case’

Subject-clitic inversion seems to be equally incompatible with the disjunctive reading in the two varieties of Cereda di Cornedo and Loreo (spoken in the provinces of Vicenza and Rovigo, in Central and Southern Veneto respectively) exemplified in (10) and (11):

⁵. As pointed out to me by Paola Benincà, in Paduan the presence of inversion in clauses with a hypothetical reading is in general hardly acceptable with a simple tense, as in (ia); the structure can be rescued by adding an adverb such as *putacaso* (‘suppose’) (as shown in (ib)), whose function most likely consists in underlining the remoteness of the realization of the event expressed by the conditional clause:

- (i) a. ??vignisse-*lo* to papà, podarissimo partire
 came-scl your father, could leave
 ‘came your father, we could leave’
- b. vignisse-*lo* putacaso to papà, podarissimo partire
 came-scl suppose your father, could leave
 ‘suppose your father came, we could leave’

The same interpretive restriction holds for the Friulian example in (7e) above, which seems to indicate that such a structure conveys a counterfactual entailment. A recent analysis of the notion of counterfactuality aiming at investigating how the meaning of clauses interpreted counterfactually can be derived as a conversational implicature is provided by Iatridou (2000).

- (10) a. *vegnì-o?* a'. *cossa magni-to?*
 b. *quanti libri no ga-lo leto?!*
 c. *no ga-lo magnà tuto!*
 d. *rivasse-lo in tempo, almanco!*
 e. *fùsse-lo vegnù anca Mario, gavarissimo podùo dirghelo*
 f. **màgne-lo o no màgne-lo, mi parecio istéss*
- (11) a. *vegnì-o?* a'. *cossa magni-to?*
 b. *quanti libri ne ga-lo lezést?!*
 c. *ne ga-lo magnà tuto!*
 d. *rivasse-lo in tempo!*
 e. *fùsse-lo vignù anca Mario, a gavarissimo podesto dirghelo*
 f. **magne-lo o no magne-lo, mi, a ghe pronto istesso*

A different pattern is attested in the dialect of Illasi (spoken in the Western Veneto province of Verona), where the presence of inversion gives rise to ungrammatical outcomes in optative, hypothetical and disjunctive structures, as shown in (12):⁶

⁶. An intermediate position between the varieties discussed up to now and the dialect of Illasi is occupied by the Veneto variety spoken in Carmignano di Brenta (located between Padua and Vicenza), where inversion is accepted in optative contexts but not in hypothetical and disjunctive ones, as shown in (i):

- (i) a. *vignì-o?* a'. *cossa magni-to?*
 b. *quanti libri (no) ga-lo leto?!*
 c. *no ga-lo magnà tuto!*
 d. *rivasse-lo in tempo, 'na volta!*
 e. **fusse-lo vignùo anca Mario, gavarissimo podùo dirghelo*
 f. **magne-lo o no magne-lo, mi parècio istéss*

However, according to our informants, to obtain full acceptability in optatives it is preferable to add some lexical material at the end of the clause, such as the adverbial *'na volta* ('for once') in (id).

That the (un)grammaticality of the optative and hypothetical structures in (id-e) is independent of the simple vs compound nature of the tense is shown by the following contrast:

- (12) a. ven-*to*? a'. sa magni-*to*?
 b. quanti libri no à-*lo* leto?!
 c. no a-*lo* magnà tuto!
 d. *rivésse-*lo* in tempo!
 e. *fosse-*lo* vengù anca Mario, avareissimo podù dirghelo
 f. *magne-*lo* o no magne-*lo* mia, mi preparo istéss

Still different is the situation found in the variety of Pieve d'Alpago (spoken in the Northern Veneto province of Belluno), where inversion is compatible with the disjunctive reading, but not with the optative and the hypothetical one, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (13d-e):⁷

-
- (ii) a. fusse-*lo* vignù anca Mario, almanco!
 were-scl come also Mario, at least!
 'if only Mario had come too!'
 b. *rivasse-*lo* anca Mario, podarissimo partire
 arrived-scl also Mario, could leave
 'if Mario arrived too, we could leave'

⁷. Note that in this variety an example corresponding to (7f) above, where the pronominal subject encliticizes onto a subjunctive form of the verb *èser*, is ungrammatical, as shown in (ia); however, this does not seem to depend on the use of an auxiliary verb, as shown by the grammaticality of (ib) where an indicative form is used:

- (i) a. *sìe-*lo* sior o sìe-*lo* puarét, no me intarèsa
 be-scl rich or be-scl poor, not me interests
 'I don't care whether he is rich or poor'
 b. é-*lo* sior (o) é-*lo* puarét, no me intarèsa
 is-scl rich (or) is-scl poor, not me interests
 'I don't care whether he is rich or poor'

One should rather attribute the ungrammaticality of (i) to an incompatibility of the enclitic subject with the subjunctive mood.

It is noteworthy that in the North-Eastern Lombard varieties displaying *do-support* in interrogatives, inversion is compatible with the disjunctive reading, as exemplified in (iii) and (iv) with the dialects of Monno and Malonno:

- (iii) a. vègn-*el* o vègn-*el* mia, no m'ha da 'ndà
 comes-scl or comes-scl not, we scl-have to go

Recently, some authors have argued for a different landing site of *wh*-items when they occur in sentences which are not interpreted as standard questions, that is as genuine requests for information; if these works are on the right track, they provide a strong empirical argument for the assumption that at least one (and most likely more than one) specifier position is available above the one in which the standard interrogative interpretation is determined.⁹ Adopting Kayne (1994)'s framework (whose antisymmetric approach produces a single-specifier syntactic structure), we are led to postulate a functional head corresponding to the specifier position argued for above; I propose to assign to such position the label *Presup(ositional)°*, which is intended to cover here for simplicity the two cases exemplified in (7b-c) (namely apparent *wh*-interrogatives having the pragmatic force of exclamatives and sentences expressing the speaker's negative presupposition with respect to the propositional content), where some form of presupposition of the speaker is entailed. Applying this conclusion to the second portion of the sequence in (15), we obtain the following tripartite system:

- (16) *disjunctive-hypothetical-optative* > *Presup°* > *Int°*

Let us consider now more closely the upper part of this sequence. As witnessed by the examples from (9) to (13) in the previous section, crossdialectal variation concerns

⁹. See for example Benincà (1995) about *wh*-exclamatives, Munaro & Obenauer (1999) about *pseudo*-interrogatives, Obenauer & Poletto (2000) about rhetorical questions. For the purposes of the present study, the label *Pres(uppositional)P* introduced below is intended to cover the whole set of projections activated in this kind of structures.

The possibility of a further splitting of the projection encoding the standard interrogative reading is suggested by the contrast between (ia) and (ib) in Venetian (where subject clitic inversion is limited to a restricted class of predicates):

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| (i) | a. <i>el fa cussi?</i>
scl-does so
'does he behave so?' | b. <i>cossa fa-lo?</i>
what does-scl
'what is he doing?' |
|-----|---|--|

Inversion is present in the *wh*-question in (ib) but not in the *yes/no* question in (ia); this might suggest that (at least in some varieties) the projection encoding the latter interpretation is located lower than the one hosting the *wh*-item in standard *wh*-interrogatives.

more robustly the syntactic contexts in (d-f); within this second subset, the chart in (14) reveals a consistent solidarity between the optative and the hypothetical reading as opposed to the disjunctive one; this provides evidence for a splitting of the upper portion of (16) into at least two different positions, which will be labelled *Counterf(actual)*^o (under which I subsume both the optative and the hypothetical reading) and *Disj(unctive)*^o respectively;¹⁰ integrating these two positions with the ones identified in (16) gives us the following sequence of functional heads:

(17) *Disj*^o > *Counterf*^o > *Presup*^o > *Int*^o

However, under an account of the attested crossdialectal variation in terms of incremental reduction of verb movement, an obvious problem is posed by the data in (13): assuming a hierarchical order such as the one just sketched, one would expect that, on its head-by-head raising through the different functional heads up to *Disj*^o, the verb does not skip any head position; hence the unexpected ungrammaticality of (13d-e) involving the head *Counterf*^o. As it happens, in the dialect of Pieve d'Alpago one does indeed find an instance of inversion with very peculiar interpretive properties; the relevant structure is reported in (18):

(18) vien-*lo* (o) no vien-*lo*, no so dirte
 comes-scl (or) not comes-scl, not know tell-you
 'is he coming or not, I can't tell you = I can't tell you whether he's coming or not'

Here, what might be analyzed as a disjunctive yes/no question formed by two verbs displaying inversion (separated either by the disjunction *o* or by a slight pause) precedes the main clause, which contains a predicate selecting an embedded interrogative; I propose that the surface order might be determined by (obligatory) raising of the embedded clause to the specifier position of *CounterfP* (and possibly *DisjP*) of the main

¹⁰. Integrating into the picture the data of the dialect of Carmignano di Brenta discussed in footnote 6 would force us to a further splitting, distinguishing a *Counterf*^o proper, encoding the hypothetical interpretation, from a structurally lower *Opt(ative)*^o, responsible for the optative reading. I will assume that this hypothesis is essentially correct, awaiting further empirical evidence to substantiate it.

clause.¹¹ If the proposed analysis is correct, then the distribution of inversion in this variety of Northern Veneto does not represent a counterexample to the hierarchical

¹¹. As for the trigger of such movement, it is very plausible to assume that it consists in the necessity of checking the features associated with the heads *Counterj*^o and (most likely) *Disj*^o, selecting the hypothetical-disjunctive interpretation associated with the structure in (18).

Adapting the analysis of coordinated structures that Kayne (1994) suggests revising a proposal by Munn (1993), the two predicates of the alleged embedded clause can be taken to occupy the specifier and the complement position of a *Disj(unctive)P* (optionally) headed by *o*, as represented in (i):

- (i)
- $$\begin{array}{c} \text{DisjP} \\ \wedge \\ \text{vienlo} \quad \text{Disj}' \\ \wedge \\ \text{Disj}^o \text{ no vienlo} \end{array}$$
- (o)

It is noteworthy that fronting of the embedded clause in some cases produces an ungrammatical outcome, as shown by the contrast between (iia) and (iib):

- (ii)
- a. *vien-lo o no vien-lo, no me intarès*
comes-scl or not comes-scl, not me interests
'I don't care whether he's coming or not'
- b. **vien-lo o no vien-lo, i me à domandà*
comes-scl or not comes-scl, scl-me-have asked
'they asked me whether he's coming or not'

What opposes (18) and (iia) to (iib) is the fact that in the former the main clause expresses the speaker's mental attitude concerning the content of the embedded clause; if this is indeed the crucial factor, the contrast provides further support for the hypothesis that subject clitic inversion codifies some aspects of the speaker's knowledge and subjective representation of a specific event.

The obligatoriness of the raising of the embedded clause is shown by the ungrammaticality of (iii), where the two verbs displaying inversion follow the main clause:

- (iii) **no so dirte, vien-lo o no vien-lo*
not know tell-you, comes-scl or not comes-scl
'I can't tell you whether is he coming or not'

A similar contrast is attested in Paduan with *if*-clauses, which exhibit the following asymmetry:

- (iv) a. fusse-*lo* vignù, gavarissimo podùo dirghelo
 were-scl come, have-cond been able tell-him
 ‘had he come, we could have told him’
- b. *gavarissimo podùo dirghelo, fùsse-*lo* vignù
 have-cond been able tell-him, were-scl come
 ‘we could have told him, had he come’
- c. se el fusse vignù, gavarissimo podùo dirghelo
 if scl-were come, have-cond been able tell-him
 ‘if he had come, we could have told him’
- d. gavarissimo podùo dirghelo, se el fusse vignù
 have-cond been able tell-him, if scl-were come
 ‘we could have told him, if he had come’

The contrast between (iva) and (ivb) clearly indicates that, unlike what happens in *if*-conditionals (where the relative order of main and embedded clause is irrelevant), the conditional embedded clause containing inversion has to precede the main clause; the restriction on the relative order is exactly the same as the one holding in (18), hence it is very likely to depend on the same triggering factor, whatever it may be.

Note that in standard Italian a similar restriction holds between the conditional sentence introduced by *se* and the main clause: as shown by the example reported in (ie) in footnote 8 above, *se* can be omitted when the embedded clause precedes the main clause; however, when the order is reversed, omission of *se* gives a marginal result for some speakers, while for others an intonational break between the two clauses is required, as in (vb):

- (v) a. avremmo potuto dirglielo, se fosse venuto
 have-cond been able tell-him, if were come
 ‘we could have told him, if he had come’
- b. (??)avremmo potuto dirglielo / fosse venuto
 have-cond been able tell-him / were come
 ‘we could have told him, had he come’

This contrast suggests that raising of the embedded inflected verb to the head occupied by *se*, deleting it, triggers raising of the whole embedded clause across the main clause.

sequence identified in (17), but simply resorts to an alternative device in order to check the feature of the relevant head.

By carefully dissecting the summarizing scheme in (14) we obtain therefore the following sequence of functional projections, hierarchically organized in a fixed order, each of which codifying a particular type of mental attitude of the speaker with respect to the propositional content expressed:

(19) *Disjunctive* > *Counterfactual* > *Presuppositional* > *Interrogative*

Conceptually, such a sequence can be made sense of if interpreted as reflecting a (from right to left) decreasing degree of salience of the event's truth value for the speaker, along the following lines:

- *IntP* is associated with the interrogative reading in (7a), intended as real request for new information: in yes/no questions the speaker asks the addressee to assign a truth value to the event in question (and in wh-questions, to identify an adequate referent for the wh-phrase);
- *PresupP* is associated with the readings exemplified in (7b-c); in this case the truth value of the event is assumed as positive (and the referent of the wh-constituent is already known) but the event (or the degree expressed by the wh-word) is assigned by the speaker a certain relevance according to his (or to standard) expectations, the compatibility with such expectations depending on the presence of negation;¹²
- *CounterfP* is associated with the optative and hypothetical contexts exemplified in (7d-e), where the speaker takes into account the potential consequences of a given truth value for the event expressed by the main clause;
- *DisjP* is associated with the disjunctive reading exemplified in (7f): in this case the speaker takes into account both truth values for the same event (or, alternatively, two different events) evaluating them as irrelevant for the realization of the event of the main clause.

As for the precise location of the sequence of projections in (19), following the standard assumption that the projection codifying the interrogative interpretation is situated

¹². See Portner & Zanuttini (1996) on the relevance of the presence of negation, both in *yes/no* exclamatives and in *wh*-exclamatives, in triggering a presuppositional implication.

within the CP-layer, we are forced to the conclusion that the other projections considered here, being hierarchically above it, belong to the same structural layer.¹³

¹³. As pointed out by Marcato (1995) and Benincà (1996), in some varieties of the North-Eastern Italian area in the first and second plural person of some tenses an enclitic morpheme surfaces on the right of the inflected verb even in the assertive conjugation; in (i) I report the conjugation of the verb *sing* in Western Friulian, while in (ii) and (iii) are reported the conjugations of some tenses of the verbs *sleep* and *look* in Northern and Central Agordino respectively:

(i) imperfect indicative:

1.cantee 2.te cantea 3.l cantea 4.canten-*si* 5.cante-*si* 6.i cantea

(ii) a. imperfect indicative:

1.dormive 2.te dormive 3.el dormiva 4.dormià-*ne* 5.dormiè-*de* 6.i dormiva

b. imperfect subjunctive:

1.dormise 2.te dormise 3.el dormise 4.dormisa-*ne* 5.dormisè-*de* 6.i dormise

c. present conditional:

1.dormirave 2.te dormirave 3.el dormirave 4.dormisa-*ne* 5.dormisè-*de* 6.i dormirave

(iii) a. imperfect indicative:

1.vardàve 2.te vardàve 3.‘l vardàva 4.vardià-*ne* 5.vardià-*de* 6.i vardàva

b. imperfect subjunctive:

1.vardàse 2.te vardàse 3.‘l vardàse 4.vardesà-*ne* 5.vardesà-*de* 6.i vardàse

c. present conditional:

1.vardaràe 2.te vardaràe 3.‘l vardaràe 4.vardesà-*ne* 5.vardesà-*de* 6.i vardaràe

As one can see from these verbal paradigms, first and second plural person are morphologically marked with a special ending in the tenses which are characterized by a [-real] modality. I suggest that this peculiarity of verbal morphology may be due to the fact that these two persons, by their intrinsic semantics, entail a reduced commitment of the speaker in asserting the truthfulness of his statement; on the one hand, differently from what happens in the singular, a plural subject implies by definition a plurality of referents, hence a higher level of knowledge of the world is required, which may induce the speaker to warn the addressee of the potentially reduced degree of objectivity of his statement; on the other hand, unlike third person subject sentences (whose subject we assume to be absent from the discourse in the unmarked case), with first and second plural subjects the speaker's subjective representation of the event can in principle be questioned by the other co-referent subjects, which again may weaken the speaker's self-confidence.

would-come-scl or neg would-come-scl not I will-leave of all way
 ‘whether he comes or not, I’m going to leave in any case’

The marginality of (20f), that is, the fact that the only reading incompatible with inversion in French is the disjunctive one, confirms the correctness and the crosslinguistic validity of the linear-hierarchical order indicated in (17), where the disjunctive reading is located in the highest position.

Another instance of subject clitic inversion is attested in standard French in the structure reported in (21), where *-t-il pas* is enclitic on the defective verbal form *voilà*:

- (21) *ne voilà-t-il pas* que le loup revient
 neg seethere-scl not that the wolf comes back
 ‘and here the wolf returns’

Vinet (1998), in examining the similar construction with *tu-pas* attested in Quebec French, points out that it has a wide range of uses which all seem to bear some peculiar form of implication, as exemplified in (22):

- (22) a. *c’est-tu-pas* choquant!
 it-is-*tu-pas* shocking!
 ‘isn’t it shocking!’
 b. *ce serait-tu-pas* lui, le coupable?
 it would-be-*tu-pas* he, the culprit?
 ‘wouldn’t he be the culprit?’
 c. *penses-tu* que *ce serait-tu-pas* brisé?
 think-you that it would-be-*tu-pas* broken?
 ‘do you think it could not be broken?’

‘whether he comes or not, I’m going to leave in any case’

Jean-Marie Marandin has pointed out to me that subject clitic inversion obtains in standard French after some adverbs like *peut-etre* (‘maybe’), *sans doute* (‘without doubt’), *probablement* (‘probably’), which equally seem to be involved in a more effective characterization of the speaker’s representation of the event; I will however leave open for future research the question concerning the relation between the obligatoriness of inversion with these adverbs and the hierarchy of functional projections proposed by Cinque (1999).

- d. j'irai-*tu*? j'irai-*tu-pas*?
 I will-go-scl? I will-go-*tu-pas*?
 'should I go? should I not go?'

According to her, (22a) is an emphatic assertion expressing degree and implying a presupposition of the speaker; in (22b) the non-negative counterpart of the proposition expressed by the sentence is assumed in the discourse; (22c), attested in a subdialect of Quebec French, contains a hint of surprise or bewilderment concerning the event expressed by the embedded verb; finally, (22d), acceptable only if both sentences cooccur, is interpreted as expressing indeterminacy or doubt.¹⁵ Interestingly, the interpretive implications of the examples in (22) seem to be somehow reduceable to the semantic import of the heads in (17): (22a) to Presup°, (22b-c) to Counterf°, (22d) to Disj° respectively.

According to Roberts (1993a), *tu* in *tu-pas* can be analyzed as a phonological variant of *t-il* in standard French (or *ti* in many varieties of colloquial French); furthermore, Roberts (1993b) claims that in some dialects of contemporary Valdotain postverbal subject pronouns are developing into *ti*-morphemes and that this phenomenon is a consequence of the loss of inversion in interrogatives; the following example, from Roberts (1993b), is of the Valdotain variety of St.Nicholas:

- (23) *l' a-t- i vu son làon?*
 scl-has-scl seen his uncle
 'has he seen his uncle?'

If his hypothesis is correct, it looks plausible to relate the structures in (21) and (22) to erstwhile inversion structures where the verb used to raise to the relevant head position; such connection is strongly supported by the fact that, as shown in (20), in standard

¹⁵ More recently, Vinet (2000) has sketched an analysis of *-tu(pas)* in Quebec French in terms of feature composition; she proposes that the features of *-tu* are checked both at PF and LF and analyzes it as a Force operator identified in the CP domain at LF (while *pas* is analyzed as a negative marker interpreted with a reverse positive polarity when it scopes over a Force operator, such as *-tu*); she also points out that *-tu* has an LF reflex since it licenses certain types of illocutionary force structures with a finite tense. Interestingly, some of the features of *-tu* as a reinforcer of a mood force indicator can also be found with the *-t-il* form and its variants in standard French.

French inversion is compatible nowadays with most of the readings attested in the Northern Italian domain.

6. Conclusion

Through a crosslinguistic comparison of some North-Eastern Italian varieties it has been shown that clauses containing a verbal form with enclisis of the pronominal subject can be associated to different subsets of a given range of possible readings.

The various interpretations expressed by this class of enclitic morphemes can be characterized by a common feature: they imply a less objective representation of the propositional content than the one conveyed in assertive contexts; in other words, whenever subject clitic inversion obtains, the event is presented subjectively, that is, related to the speaker's observational perspective.

The range of variation detectable from the comparison among the different dialects examined is traced back to precise structural conditions, in the sense that each type of interpretation is triggered by the raising of the inflected verb to a different landing site inside the upper layer of the sentence structure; hence, the attested variation provides suggestive evidence for the existence of a few functional projections encoding some aspects of the speaker's relation to the propositional content expressed by the clause.

References

ASIS - Atlante Sintattico dell'Italia Settentrionale, Centro di Studio per la Dialettologia Italiana**“O. Parlangèli”, CNR/Dipartimento di Linguistica - Università di Padova**

- Benincà, P. (1989) “Friaulisch: Interne Sprachgeschichte I. Grammatik”, in *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol. III. Tübingen - Max Niemeyer Verlag, pp. 563-585.
- Benincà, P. (1995) “La struttura della frase esclamativa alla luce del dialetto padovano”, in *Italiano e dialetti nel tempo*, Rome - Bulzoni, pp.23-43.
- Benincà, P. (1996) “Agglutination and Inflection in Northern Italian Dialects” in *Aspects of Romance Linguistics: Selected papers from the XXIV Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, pp.59-72.
- Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads*, New York – Oxford University Press
- Hulk, A. (1993) “Residual Verb-Second and the Licensing of Functional Features”, *Probus*.5:127-154.
- Iatridou, S. (2000) “The Grammatical Ingredients of Counterfactuality”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 31.2:231-270.
- Kayne, R. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, LI Monographs 25, MIT Press.
- Marcato, C. (1995) “Morfologia verbale nelle parlate alto-italiane: una nota sul liventino”, in E.Banfi, G.Bonfadini, P.Cordin e M.Iliescu (eds.) *Italia Settentrionale: crocevia di idiomi romanzi*, Tübingen – Max Niemeyer Verlag, pp.69-72.
- Munaro, N. (1997) *Proprietà strutturali e distribuzionali dei sintagmi interrogativi in alcuni dialetti italiani settentrionali*, PhD Thesis, Universities of Padua/Venice.
- Munaro, N. (2000) “I correlati interpretativi dell’inversione tra verbo e clitico soggetto: la dialettologia come scienza di confine tra teoria e dati”, to appear in G.Marcato (ed.) *I confini del dialetto*, Padua-Unipress.
- Munaro, N. & H.-G.Obenauer (1999) “On Underspecified Wh-elements in Pseudo-interrogatives”, *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 9:181-253.
- Munn, A. (1993) *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Coordinate Structures*, PhD Thesis, University of Maryland.
- Obenauer H.-G. & C. Poletto (2000) “Rhetorical Wh-phrases in the Left Periphery of the Sentence”, *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 10.1:121-151.
- Poletto, C. (2000) *The Higher Functional Field*, New York - Oxford University Press.

- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. Pollock (2000), “On the Left Periphery of Some Romance Wh-Questions”, manuscript, CNR-Padua / Université de Picardie à Amiens.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (2000), “Subject Clitics, Subject Clitic Inversion and Complex Inversion: Generalizing Remnant Movement to the Comp Area”, manuscript, Université de Picardie à Amiens.
- Pollock, J.-Y., N. Munaro, C. Poletto (1998) “Eppur si muove! On Comparing French, Bellunese and Portuguese wh-movement, *Internet Celebration for Noam Chomsky's 70th birthday*, MIT Press.
- Portner, P. & R. Zanuttini (1996) “The Syntax and Semantics of Scalar Negation: Evidence from Paduan”, in *Proceedings of NELS XXVI*, pp. 257-271, University of Massachusetts – Amherst.
- Renzi, L. & L. Vanelli (1983) “I pronomi soggetto in alcune varietà romanze”, in *Scritti linguistici in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*, Pisa - Pacini, pp. 121-145.
- Rizzi, L. (1998) “The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery”, in P. Benincà & G. Salvi (eds.) *Romance Syntax*, Budapest Studies in Romance Linguistics, pp. 112-158.
- Roberts, I. (1993a) *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax*, Dordrecht – Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Roberts, I. (1993b) “The Nature of Subject Clitics in Franco-Provençal Valdostain”, in *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, Turin - Rosenberg & Sellier, pp. 319-353.
- Vicario, F. (1998) “Iussivo e ottativo: osservazioni contrastive tra friulano e italiano”, *Quaderni della grammatica friulana di riferimento*, 1:109-124.
- Vinet, M.T. (1998) “*Tu-pas* as a Modifier of Event Relations in a Narrative Discourse” in *Studies on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages*, Universitat de Girona, pp. 243-255.
- Vinet, M.T. (2000) “Feature Representation and *-tu(pas)* in Quebec French”, *Studia Linguistica* 54.3: 381-411.

