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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
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<tr>
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<td>Pre-Core Slot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
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<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
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</tr>
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<td>PSA</td>
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</tr>
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<td>PST</td>
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<td>Right-Detached Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
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<td>RFL</td>
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<td>RRG</td>
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<td>SCL</td>
<td>subject clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
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<td>Van Valin and LaPolla (1997)</td>
</tr>
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</table>
Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Split intransitivity: An introduction

Since the advancement of the Unaccusative Hypothesis (Perlmutter 1978), the idea that intransitive structures are not homogeneous, but rather divided into unaccusative and unergative classes, has fascinated linguists of all theoretical persuasions. Scholars have debated the syntactic or semantic nature of the split (see, among many others, Levin 1993; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Perlmutter 1978, 1989; Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2001; Rosen 1984; Van Valin 1990; Zaenen 1993), the desirability of a lexically principled or purely structural approach (Borer 1994, 2004; La Fauci 1984, 1988; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Sorace 2000), and the descriptive adequacy of the binary analyses as opposed to a gradient notion of intransitivity (Sorace 2000). Most treatments have capitalized on the syntactic notions of subject and object. Thus, in Relational Grammar, the split was conceived of in terms of the divide between final 1s which are not initial 1s, the subjects of unaccusative structures, and final 1s which are also initial 1s, the subjects of unergative structures (Perlmutter 1978 and subsequent work). In the Chomskyan tradition, unergative verbs require an underlying subject and no object, whilst unaccusative verbs only take an underlying object (Chomsky 1981; Burzio 1981, 1986, and subsequent work). The accounts which assume that unaccusativity is semantically determined but syntactically encoded also generally claim that the only argument of unaccusatives is syntactically comparable to the object of transitive (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Sorace 2000, 2004).

The bulk of the work on split intransitivity has focused on individual diagnostics, bringing to light a great deal of crosslinguistic regularity. Recent treatments, however, have seen a growing surge of interest in the discrepancies between the various manifestations of the split, known as unaccusativity mismatches (Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Everaert 2004; Aranovich 2005). These inconsistencies are puzzling in the light of Perlmutter’s (1978) original formulation of the Unaccusative Hypothesis,
which assumes that the unaccusative or unergative behaviour of a verb is related to its meaning. Perlmutter and Postal’s (1984) Universal Alignment Hypothesis, which states that the initial grammatical relation of each nominal in a given clause can be predicted from the meaning of the clause, would also appear to be challenged by the unaccusativity mismatches, since it predicts that a given semantic class of verbs requires the same grammatical relations across constructions and languages.

The advocates of the purely syntactic approach to split intransitivity have claimed that the unaccusativity mismatches invalidate the hypothesis that split intransitivity is semantically determined. Thus, Rosen (1984: 61–62) claimed that the fact that the subject of the Choctaw verb ‘die’ is marked as the subject of a transitive clause, unlike the subject of the Italian verb ‘die’, whilst the reverse holds true for the verbs meaning ‘sweat’ in the two languages, strongly suggests that initial grammatical relations cannot be derived from semantic roles. In response to Rosen (1984), Van Valin (1990: 253) pointed out that the subject of the Choctaw verb ‘die’ is only marked as the subject of a transitive clause by case, and, in languages with overt marking of split intransitivity, the case marking of the intransitive subject is often insignificant vis-à-vis the semantic role of this argument. Other grammatical criteria are more likely to have diagnostic power. Thus, the Choctaw verb ‘die’ suppletes for the number of its subject, and this type of marking associates the subject of this verb with the object of transitives.

In defence of the view that aspects of the morphosyntax of clauses are determined by their semantics, Van Valin (1990) argued that the semantic parameters of split intransitivity vary crosslinguistically in interesting ways. Whereas, in Italian, the semantic basis of split intransitivity is the inherent lexical aspect of verbs, or Aktionsart (Vendler 1967), in Acehnese, an Austronesian language (Sumatra, Indonesia), it is agentivity or volitionality. In Italian, there are a number of constructions with an agentive subject which pattern with the unaccusative side of the split by virtue of the Aktionsart properties of the predicate. In Acehnese, on the other hand, many verbs can appear with both agentive and non-agentive subjects and are marked accordingly. Any simplistic analysis of split intransitivity based on the contrast between agent and theme/patient subjects cannot capture mismatches like the one between the morphosyntax of Italian and Acehnese. Contrastingly, such mismatches do not run counter to a sophisticated theory of split intransitivity which is based on the view that
this is semantically determined, but the relevant semantic factors vary parametrically across languages.

The scope of this work is to provide a detailed account of the principal diagnostics of split intransitivity in Italian. Thus, the variation across genetically unrelated languages will not be the focus of the analysis. At various points, however, it will be appropriate to consider comparative evidence from other Romance languages, in particular, the subgroup called Italo-Romance, to which Italian belongs. As well as remarkable similarities, the crossdialectal analysis reveals numerous apparent inconsistencies. These mismatches are significant both with respect to the appreciation of the single diagnostics and inasmuch as the theory of split intransitivity is concerned.

To give but a few examples, the scope of a given diagnostic may not be the same across the Romance languages. This is clearly the case with the selection of the perfective operators derived from Latin HABERE ‘have’ and ESSE ‘be’, since the domains of ‘be’ in French constitute a subset of the domains of ‘be’ in Italian (Vincent 1982):

(1)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Marco è uscito.} \\
& \text{Mark be.3SG go.out.PP.MSG} \\
& \text{‘Mark has gone out.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Marco è arrossito.} \\
& \text{Mark be.3SG blush.PP.MSG} \\
& \text{‘Mark has blushed.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(2)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Marc est sorti.} \quad \text{(French)} \\
& \text{Mark be.3SG go.out.PP.MSG} \\
& \text{‘Mark has gone out.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Marc a rougi.} \quad \text{(French)} \\
& \text{Mark have.3SG blush.PP} \\
& \text{‘Mark has blushed.’}
\end{align*}
\]

In addition, some Romance languages only have one perfective operator. Spanish and Sicilian only exhibit ‘have’, whilst Terracinese, a dialect spoken in Lazio (central Italy), only exhibits ‘be’. The perfective operator which figures in (3a) and (3b) is not the same as the one which figures in the corresponding Italian structure (cf. (1a)), since neither Spanish nor Sicilian have perfective ‘be’. In turn, the perfective operator is ‘be’ in (4a),
since Terracinese does not exhibit perfective ‘have’, by contrast with Italian (cf. (4b)):

(3) a. Ha *salido* dos veces. (Spanish)
    ‘S/he has gone out twice.’

b. Ha *nisciuttu* du voti. (Sicilian)
    ‘S/he has gone out twice.’

(4) a. È *candato* (na canzóna). (Terracinese)
    ‘S/he has sung (a song).’
    (Tuttle 1986: 267)

b. Ha cantato (una canzone).
    ‘S/he has sung (a song).’

Some of the languages with one perfective operator provide other evidence of split intransitivity. For instance, in the absence of a topical location, Spanish bare plural subjects in postverbal position are allowed by the correlates of verbs which select perfective ‘be’ in Italian, but are problematic if they follow the correlates of verbs which select perfective ‘have’ in Italian (Conti Jiménez 2005; Torrego 1989):

(5) a. *(Aquí) han dormido animales.* (Spanish)
    ‘Animals have slept (here).’

b. *(Aquí) han pasado camiones.* (Spanish)
    ‘Trucks have passed by (here).’

Finally, within individual languages, there are inconsistencies in the distribution of the various manifestations of the split. In Italian, all *si*-constructions, including clitic reflexives, select the perfective operator *essere* ‘be’, whereas the results of a survey (see section 6.5) suggest that only a subclass of clitic reflexives is compatible with another diagnostic of split intransitivity, namely *ne*-cliticization:
(6) a. *Due si sono bruciati.*
   Two RFL be.3PL burn.PP.MPL
   ‘Two have burned.’

   b. *Se ne sono bruciati due.*
   RFL QCL be.3PL burn.PP.MPL two
   ‘Two *ne* have burned’, ‘One has burned two *ne*.’

(7) a. *Due si sono arrabbiati.*
   Two RFL be.3PL get.angry.PP.MPL
   ‘Two have got angry.’

   b. *??Se ne sono arrabbiati due.*
   RFL QCL be.3PL get.angry.PP.MPL two
   ‘Two *ne* have got angry.’

It has been claimed that the unaccusativity mismatches signal syntactic differences between constructions of the same or different languages. Thus, according to the decompositional analysis of perfective operators (Kayne 1993), the two perfective operators shown in (1) to (4) are different spell-outs of the same universal abstract auxiliary BE. Unlike ‘be’, ‘have’ signals the syntactic incorporation of an abstract complementizer into BE. It follows that the syntax of (1a), (1b), (2a) and (4a) must be different from that of (2b), (3a), (3b) and (4b). Working on the semantics-syntax interface, others have proposed, in contrast with the Universal Alignment Hypothesis, that the unaccusativity mismatches are determined by different patterns of syntactic encoding of the same semantic classes of verbs (Randall et al. 2004; Sorace 2000, 2004). These approaches capture the crosslinguistic mismatches in the selection of the perfective operator. However, it is to be noted that evidence like (7b) poses a serious challenge to the assumption that the various diagnostics of split intransitivity are mere spell-outs of the same type of syntactic structure.

Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Everaert (2004: 9) have pointed out that a number of diagnostics of split intransitivity do not yield clear-cut results, and thus cannot be said to produce unaccusativity mismatches, in comparison with other diagnostics. An example of this is provided by post-verbal bare plurals in Spanish, which are not subject to the same set of restrictions when there is a specified location in preverbal position as when there is none (see *aquí han dormido animales* ‘animals have slept here’, which is acceptable, in contrast with its counterpart without the locative adverb).
A possible solution to the issue of morphosyntactic phenomena which do not define two clear-cut domains of intransitivity is to deny that they are determined by the same factors which are the basis of the intransitivity split, and that they have any diagnostic power. Whereas, in some instances, this may be an inevitable conclusion, it is clearly not an ideal solution in the light of robust evidence to the contrary, as is the case with the selection of perfective essere ‘be’ and ne-cliticization. Furthermore, to claim that morphosyntactic phenomena like the Spanish one illustrated in (5) are not diagnostics of split intransitivity simply begs the question why they overlap – albeit defectively – with such diagnostics.

I take the view that, although split intransitivity in Italian is ultimately determined by the contrast between two types of Aktionsart (Van Valin 1990), each diagnostic results from a unique set of well-formedness conditions. In addition to Aktionsart, these conditions may concern construction-specific aspects of focus structure or of the mapping of semantics with syntax. Thus, the selection of the perfective operator in Italian is primarily concerned with the semantic status of the argument with the privileged syntactic function of subject of the clause, and it is not possible to account for this phenomenon in purely semantic terms. Ne-cliticization, which encodes the contrast between a focal quantifier and its topical head, targets the rightmost or lowest argument in the semantic representation of any stative predicate (see section 1.4 for a treatment of the semantic representation of predicates). The semantic condition on ne-cliticization is more restrictive than the one on the selection of essere ‘be’. The syntactic status of the quantified argument, on the other hand, is irrelevant to ne-cliticization. The mismatch between (6) and (7) is explained by the assumption that the subject of all reflexives has the semantic status which is signaled by perfective essere ‘be’, but only the argument of (6) satisfies the stricter semantic constraint on ne-cliticization, for reasons which will be disclosed in due course.

The sets of well-formedness conditions which are relevant to each diagnostic vary parametrically across languages. When this variation affects languages of the same family, this is usually the result of diachronic change which has altered the relevant conditions to different extents in the various sister languages. This is the case with the perfective operators in Italian, French and the other languages cited above (Bentley and Eythórsson 2003; La Fauci 1988; Vincent 1982).

In-depth analysis of split intransitivity reveals that, although the intuition which is the basis of the Universal Alignment Hypothesis can be
deemed to be correct, in the light of the vast amount of language-specific and crosslinguistic regularity, the results predicted by this hypothesis are not necessarily obtained because of the macro- and micro-variation of the semantic parameters of split intransitivity, as well as other conditions which constrain the individual manifestations of the split.

Above I pointed out that most treatments of split intransitivity hinge on the syntactic notions of subject and object, and assume that the subject of unaccusative structures is underlingly an object. I believe that split intransitivity in Italian results from the tension between two types of argument marking, which are concerned with grammatical relations and semantic functions, respectively. The grammatical relation subject, or Privileged Syntactic Argument (see section 1.4), is relevant, and in fact crucial, to the understanding of some manifestations of split intransitivity in Italian. However, this syntactic notion is insufficient or even immaterial in the explanation of other diagnostics. To capture the type of argument marking which is concerned with semantic functions, I draw upon Van Valin and LaPolla’s (1997) notions of actor and undergoer (see also Foley and Van Valin 1984; Van Valin 1993, 2005), which are ultimately defined in terms of the position of arguments in the semantic representation of the predicate (Jackendoff 1976), and thus in terms of Aktionsart.

1.2 Split intransitivity in Italian

The foundation of my treatment of split intransitivity in Italian is La Faucı’s (1984, 1988) claim that the development of Romance morphosyntax from Latin was characterized by the advancement of active alignment, i.e., a type of alignment that is different from accusative alignment. In La Faucı’s (1984, 1988) syntactic account, which rests on the theoretical tenets of Relational Grammar, active alignment is a system of argument marking which distinguishes between subjects that have the same grammatical relation throughout the syntactic derivation of the clause (subjects of non-middle constructions) and subjects that have the grammatical relation direct object at some point in the derivation (subjects of middle constructions). Accusative alignment does not differentiate between these two subclasses of subjects, thus failing to indicate the relatedness of a subclass of subjects with direct objects.

The tension between accusative and active alignment is discernible in Classical Latin: case marking represents accusative vs. nominative align-
ment, but the verbal diathesis, which opposes active constructions to passive and deponent ones, signals the contrast between the two subclasses of subjects. Finally, the inflection on the past participle cross-references both the object of HABERE, in structures like *pecunias magnas collocatas habent* (Cicero) ‘they have great capital.\text{FPL} invested.\text{FPL}’, where the past participle is an adjectival modifier of the object, and the subject of deponents (*profecta est* ‘she has (lit. is) set.\text{FSG} off’) and passives (*amata est* ‘she has been loved.\text{FSG}’). In Relational Grammar, these are subjects which initially hold the relation direct object.

According to La Fauci (1988), active alignment gains ground in the historical phase of transition from Latin to Romance. A striking manifestation of this typological shift is the development of a system of perfective-operator selection in Romance, which has its roots in the divide between the domains of HABERE ‘have’ and ESSE ‘be’ in Latin (La Fauci 1997, 2005; Vincent 1982). After the temporary advancement of active alignment, however, this marking system declines, and accusative alignment re-establishes itself as the most successful type of argument marking. To mention just a few relevant facts, past-participle agreement and the selection of the perfective operator are subject to regression and, in some cases, loss, in a great number of Romance languages, as accusative alignment moves forward. The differential marking of the object in some Romance languages is another important manifestation of the renewed success of accusative alignment, since it contrasts objects with subjects (Bossong 1991; Comrie 1981a: 134; Fiorentino 2003; La Fauci 1988; Sornicola 1997). This phenomenon does not affect Standard Italian, though, and, therefore, it will not be subject to scrutiny in this work.

La Fauci’s (1984, 1988) claim about the typological implications of the transition from Latin to Romance is my working hypothesis. Starting from his observations on the agreement of the past participle and the selection of the perfective operator, I aim to ascertain what diagnostics of split intransitivity can be said to represent active alignment in Modern Italian, and to what degree. In this pursuit, I assume that alignment is construction-specific (La Fauci 1988; Moravcsik 1978; Van Valin and LaPolla 1997), rather than language-specific, even though, in synchrony, languages often display a preference towards one type of alignment.

My theory of split intransitivity departs from La Fauci (1984, 1988) in one significant respect. In particular, in accordance with Van Valin and LaPolla’s (1997: 242–316) claim that alignment can be based either on syntactic principles, which contrast grammatical relations, or on semantic
principles, which contrast semantic functions, I assume that the type of alignment which gains ground in the development of Romance morphosyntax is principled in semantic terms, in that it strives to oppose the semantic functions actor and undergoer, rather than two subclasses of the grammatical relation subject.

The semantic functions actor and undergoer are macroroles, i.e., generalizations across semantic types of arguments (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 139). In the theoretical framework adopted in this work, Role and Reference Grammar (see section 1.4), semantic relations are defined in terms of argument positions in the semantic representation of predicates (Jackendoff 1976; Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 82–138). As a result, semantic relations are not determined arbitrarily, but rather on the basis of the Aktionsart of the predicate, which, in turn, is ascertained by standard tests (Dowty 1979). The generalizations actor and undergoer are defined on the basis of the actor-undergoer hierarchy:

(8) The Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 146)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTOR</th>
<th>UNDERGOER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arg of</td>
<td>1st arg. of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>do´ (x, …)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[‘→‘ increasing markedness of realization of argument as macrorole]

Given the semantic representation of a bivalent transitive predicate, the leftmost argument is assigned the macrorole actor, whilst the rightmost one is the undergoer. Similarly, the status of the only argument of an intransitive predicate as an actor or an undergoer is defined on the basis of its position on the hierarchy illustrated in (8). Thus, the argument of the activity predicate of (9a) is an actor, since it is the first argument of do´ (x, …), whereas the argument of the state in (9b) is a undergoer, since it appears in the position pred´ (x):

(9) a. *Pietro canta.*
   Peter sing.3SG
   ‘Peter sings.’

b. *Il problema sussiste.*
   The problem exist.3SG
   ‘The problem exists.’
As is indicated by the hierarchy, the macrorole actor is associated with the two leftmost positions, but it can also be assigned to an argument in the middle position, if this is the highest macrorole of a transitive state (e.g., *Lucia in Lucia ama lo sport* ‘Lucy loves sport’). The macrorole undergoer is associated with the two rightmost positions, but it can also be assigned to an argument in the middle position, if this is the only argument of a bivalent state that is available for macrorole assignment (e.g., *quell’uomo* ‘that man’ in *quell’uomo è mio padre* ‘that man is my father’). For further discussion of macrorole assignment I refer the reader to section 2.2.

The marking of arguments according to whether they are actors or undergoers, rather than whether they are subjects or objects, represents active vs. inactive alignment (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 255–257). By contrast with this type of alignment, which is grounded on semantic principles, accusative alignment marks arguments according to their grammatical relation. Grammatical relations are restricted neutralizations of semantic relations for syntactic purposes. The examples in (9a) and (9b) indicate that the grammatical relation subject neutralizes the contrast between the macroroles actor and undergoer.

The essence of my view of split intransitivity in Italian is that this consists of a cluster of phenomena which result from the tension between a syntactically-motivated type of alignment, which opposes subjects and objects, and a semantically-motivated one, which strives to oppose actors and undergoers. To the extent that this second type of alignment is concerned with the opposition between actors and undergoers, it is based on Aktionsart. Whilst the syntactic alignment corresponds to accusative alignment, as defined above, the semantic alignment which is evidenced in Italian does not entirely coincide with active alignment. In particular, the actor of two types of construction behaves like an undergoer, with respect to some of the diagnostics of split intransitivity, for reasons which will be explored in due course. I call the actor of these two constructions *marked actor*, and I refer to this type of argument marking as active vs. non-active alignment, to distinguish it from active vs. inactive alignment proper.

The semantic basis of active alignment explains why there are manifestations of split intransitivity which do not represent active alignment proper, but are captured by comparable semantic principles. The selection of the perfective operator in French and attributive (descriptive) as well as resultative constructions in Italian are relevant cases. These phenomena are subject to semantic (Aktionsart) restrictions which are stricter than those
which define active alignment proper. Accordingly, they select a smaller portion of the intransitivity domain than active alignment does.

In addition to the tension between two types of alignment, the diagnostics of split intransitivity reveal the pressure of discourse constraints. This pressure is far greater in the case of some diagnostics than in others. In the present work, the morphosyntactic phenomena which are hardly affected by discourse are considered first (Chapters 2, 3 and 4). I then move on to diagnostics which, in my view, cannot be properly understood without consideration of discourse structure (Chapters 5, 6 and 7). Finally, I examine a set of morphosyntactic phenomena which are constrained by well-formedness conditions on the encoding of discourse structure, and not by the semantic parameters of split intransitivity. I claim that these are not diagnostics of split intransitivity, despite some evidence to the contrary (Chapter 8).

1.3 The diagnostics

I consider first the selection of the perfective operator (Chapter 2). Building upon Centineo (1986), I claim that, in Italian, the choice of the perfective operator indicates the markedness of the subject (the Privileged Syntactic Argument) from the point of view of accusative alignment. The notion of markedness is defined with respect to Van Valin and LaPolla’s (1997: 282) claim that, in accusative alignment, the default Privileged Syntactic Argument is the highest-ranking macrorole argument in the semantic representation of the predicate, typically an actor. Constructions which are marked in terms of their Privileged Syntactic Argument are non-active constructions, in the sense specified above. However, the selection of the perfective operator cannot be said to represent active vs. non-active alignment proper. In fact, it is only concerned with a subclass of undergoers and marked actors, i.e., those which have the syntactic role of Privileged Syntactic Argument. The chapter includes comparative synchronic and diachronic evidence, and a discussion of the selection of the perfective operator in a variety of complex predicates.

Chapter 3 deals with experiencer predicates (psych verbs). In my account, the defining trait of these predicates is that they have an experiencer argument. In addition, three types can be distinguished depending on the semantic role of the argument which has the syntactic function of Privileged Syntactic Argument: this is the experiencer in clauses with a type-(i)
experiencer predicate, a causer in clauses with a type-(ii) predicate, and a theme in clauses with a type-(iii) predicate. Type (i) and type (ii) are transitive predicates which – by and large – can be reflexivized, yielding different types of reflexives. Type (iii), on the other hand, requires inversion (Bossong 1998; Harris 1984a, b; Perlmutter 1984; Van Valin 1990) and displays an interesting behaviour vis-à-vis various diagnostics of split intransitivity. Psych verbs have been extensively discussed in the literature since they appear to challenge the hypothesis that thematic (semantic) roles and syntactic relations or configurations are related in systematic ways (Belletti and Rizzi 1988; Pesetsky 1987, 1988; Saltarelli 1992). In accordance with the classification introduced above, however, experiencer predicates do not pose any problem to the assumptions on semantic-syntax mapping which are independently made in Role and Reference Grammar.

Chapter 4 offers an analysis of *si*-constructions. These are considered to be a subclass of constructions with an unexpressed argument. Following Van Valin (1990), I assume that *si* marks the suppression of the highest-ranking argument in the semantic representation of the predicate. On the basis of this assumption, *si*-constructions are marked from the point of view of the grammatical relation Privileged Syntactic Argument, which explains why they invariably require the perfective operator *essere* ‘be’ in Italian. The chapter includes a detailed treatment of clitic reflexives, which are classified into four principal types, based on the intersection of two properties: whether they include a semantic position for a causer, and whether their specified argument is co-referent with the suppressed argument. As part of the analysis of unexpressed arguments, I further consider *si*-impersonals, *si*-passives and middles, as well as constructions in which an unexpressed argument is not indicated by *si*, but can have other morphosyntactic manifestations. I conclude that perfective *essere* ‘be’ signals the markedness of the pivot (i.e., the missing argument in the highest macrorole position of infinitival clauses), as well as the markedness of any other type of Privileged Syntactic Argument.

Chapter 5 deals with agreement. The discussion focuses primarily on the agreement by number and gender on the past participle of the perfect. I argue that, abstracting away from stylistic and sociolinguistic variation, this type of agreement resembles active vs. inactive alignment much more closely than the selection of the perfective operator. If, however, Modern Standard Italian is examined separately from other stylistically- or sociolinguistically-marked varieties, the agreement on the past participle of the perfect shows clear signs of a shift towards accusative (syntactic) align-
ment, in that it differentiates between privileged syntactic arguments and objects. This result is corroborated by the findings of the analysis of a corpus of ten literary texts in Modern Italian. These indicate clearly that a domain of past-participle agreement which used to be trigger happy (Comrie 2003), in that it included two possible triggers, has now yielded to pressure from the syntactic principle which privileges the subject. It is my contention that the intricacies of the shift from active to accusative alignment cannot be properly understood unless the role of discourse is taken into account. In particular, I claim that agreement with the object has retrenched in the domains where it is grammatical, but not where it is anaphoric (Bresnan and Mchombo 1987; Bresnan and Kanerva 1989). The role of discourse is also evident in the marking of person and number agreement on the finite form of the verb in a number of (Ital-o-)Romance languages, as well as in non-standard varieties of Italian. Person and number agreement on the finite form of the verb does not target the undergoer in Italian: in fact, it is a reliable criterion for the identification of the subject, whether actor or undergoer. As is the case with the agreement on the past participle of the perfect, however, it is primarily the undergoer that is affected by discourse factors in its role as controller.

Chapter 6 is concerned with ne, a pro-form which stands for the head (or core, in the Role and Reference Grammar sense) of a quantified noun phrase. The distribution of ne-cliticization poses a serious challenge to the theories of split intransitivity, since it involves a number of interesting mismatches, which might seem to suggest that it is not a clear-cut diagnostic or it is not a diagnostic at all. To mention just one problem, whereas some classes of adjectival predicates are not entirely incompatible with ne-cliticization, others are (Cinque 1990). I claim that ne-cliticization is a true diagnostic of split intransitivity. In fact, its distribution resembles very closely active vs. inactive alignment. In my analysis, the syntactic role of the ne-cliticized argument is irrelevant. What counts is the position of the argument in the semantic representation of a state predicate (which in turn can be part of an achievement or an accomplishment) as well as focus structure. The focus-structure constraints on ne-cliticization are crucial to the understanding of the apparent inconsistencies, since, in some discourse contexts, constructions with activity and adjectival predicates can receive an existential interpretation and thus satisfy the semantic condition on ne-cliticization. The chapter includes a treatment of ne-cliticization in complex predicates, and in reflexive constructions, as well as a brief discussion of other types of ne.
Finally, Chapters 7 and 8 are concerned with other possible diagnostics of split intransitivity which are found in constructions with attributive and predicative (passive, resultative and absolute) past participles and in word order. The study of past participles (Chapter 7) brings to light a number of interesting mismatches which have hardly received any attention so far. I capture these facts with a fine-grained analysis of semantics-syntax mapping which differentiates between two types of attributive structure and a number of predicative constructions. In accordance with Levin and Rappaport Hovav's (1995) observation that some unaccusativity mismatches are simply determined by the fact that given constructions select for specific classes of verbs, I conclude that the behaviour of past participles provides significant evidence for split intransitivity, even though the semantic restrictions on individual constructions are stricter than those which define active alignment.

In the analysis of word order (Chapter 8), I investigate the interaction of a syntactic principle and a pragmatic one. The former principle establishes that the position which precedes the predicate immediately is the default position of the Privileged Syntactic Argument (the subject) of the clause. The pragmatic principle is concerned with the position which follows the predicate immediately and establishes that this is the default focal position. The examination of word order in declarative main clauses leads me to conclude that this is not a diagnostic of split intransitivity in Italian, since it cannot be characterized in terms of active alignment, or in related Aktionssart terms. I explore the comparability of VS order (the placement of the subject in immediately post-predicate position) with the diagnostics of split intransitivity in the light of authentic findings from corpus analysis.

1.4 Role and Reference Grammar

Role and Reference Grammar (henceforth RRG) provides an ideal theoretical framework to develop the central idea of this work, i.e., the view that the manifestations of split intransitivity which are found in Italian are determined by the tension between syntactic and semantic alignment, and are variously constrained by information structure. In fact, both the descriptive tools and the theoretical constructs of RRG have been developed in order to study the crosslinguistic variation in the encoding of the interaction of discourse-pragmatics with the linking between syntax and semantics.
RRG posits three independent levels of representation: a representation of syntactic structure, a semantic representation, and a representation of the information structure of utterances. The interaction between these three types of representation is not derivational. The way that each level is conceived of reflects a unified aim, which is to satisfy the principle of typological adequacy.

Syntactic structure is concerned with, on the one hand, the relations between a predicate and its arguments, and, on the other hand, the building of phrasal, clausal and sentential units. I deal with the latter aspect of syntactic representation first. Clause structure is based on the semantically-motivated contrast between predicating and non-predicating units, and, among non-predicating units, between arguments and non-arguments. Only the nominal and adpositional phrases which are part of the semantic representation of the predicate are arguments. In RRG, they are called core arguments, and are classified into direct (nominative, accusative, and dative) and oblique arguments (for instance, locational arguments).

The locus of the predicate in syntax is called the nucleus. The nucleus and its arguments form the core of the clause, whereas non-arguments can occur in the clause-internal periphery. Accordingly, in the clause \[ \text{CLAUSE} \begin{array}{c} \text{CORE} \\ Mary \ [\text{NUCLEUS} \text{reads} \ \text{the paper}] \ [\text{PERIPHERY} \text{at breakfast}] \end{array} \], the arguments Mary and the paper and the nucleus reads form the core, whereas the adjunct at breakfast occurs in the periphery. The fact that the notions of core and periphery are defined semantically has the important consequence that these units can in principle occur in any order, depending on language-specific constraints on word order (Van Valin 2005: 5).

There is ample crosslinguistic evidence for the core vs. periphery opposition in clause structure, and this is claimed to be universal. By contrast, other positions outside the core and its periphery are not universal, and the consideration of language-specific questions of linear order is necessary to determine them. Italian provides evidence for all the positions assumed by RRG: the Pre-Core Slot and the Post-Core Slot, which usually host focal or contrastive elements of information, and immediately precede and follow the core, respectively, and the Left- and Right-Detached Positions, which precede and follow the clause within the sentence. The detached positions do not host focal elements of information, can be recursive, and are separated from each other or from the clause by a pause. Observe the examples below:
In (10a), the object *il giornale* ‘the paper’ is in the Left-Detached Position, and is referred to anaphorically by a resumptive object clitic within the core. The core (*Maria lo legge* ‘Mary reads it’) is followed by the peripheral adjunct *a colazione* ‘at breakfast’. In (10b), the object *il giornale* ‘the paper’ is also in the Left-Detached Position, but this is followed by a focal element in the Pre-Core Slot, *chi* ‘who’. This is the default position of wh-elements in languages which do not leave wh-elements in situ. The core only contains the nucleus and the resumptive object clitic, and is followed by the peripheral adjunct. Finally, (10c) differs from the previous examples, insofar as its subject, *Maria*, is contrastive, and occurs in the Post-Core Slot.

Syntactic representations are not specified by rules, but rather stored as a set of syntactic templates, which represent the syntactic inventory that is part of the speaker’s competence. The degree to which word order is rigid, in a given language, is indicated by the degree to which the templates are rigid or flexible. For instance, Italian has flexible word order, and thus the position of the predicate is specified, but that of the arguments is, to a large extent, variable (see Chapter 8). The syntactic inventory also indicates whether a language has the optional extra-core and extra-clausal positions.

The syntactic units nucleus, core, clause, and sentence join together in predicate, clause, and sentence linkage. The RRG theory of predicate and clause linkage will turn out to be very significant in the analysis of the selection of the perfective operator (Chapter 2), experiencer verbs (Chapter 3), agreement (Chapter 5), and *ne*-cliticization (Chapter 6). I postpone the treatment of linkage to the relevant chapters. In this context, I should note that predicate linkage can exhibit operators, as well as fully fledged predications.

Operators are best defined by contrast with auxiliaries and predications. Auxiliaries (Van Valin 2005: 13, note 3) are necessary for the formation of
the nucleus. This is best seen in non-finite clauses, where auxiliaries occur obligatorily, even though they do not modify the predicate for tense. Passive *essere* ‘be’ and the copulas *essere* ‘be’ and *stare* ‘stay’ of constructions with non-verbal predicates are auxiliaries (see Figure 1):

(11) a. *Questo giornale, essendo letto da tutti...*  
    This paper.MSG be.GER read.PP.MSG by everyone  
    ‘This paper, being read by everyone...’

b. *Il giornale, stando sul tavolo...*  
    The paper stay.GER on.the table  
    ‘The paper, being on the table...’

\[
\text{NUC} \quad \text{AUX} \quad \text{PRED} \\
\quad \quad \quad | \quad \quad \quad | \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{PP} \\
\text{Stando sul tavolo}
\]

*Figure 1*. The copula *stare*: an auxiliary in the nucleus.

Operators are not necessary for the formation of the nucleus. Rather, they are modifiers of the predicate, the core, or the clause, which encode aspect, modality, negation, tense, evidentiality, or illocutionary force (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997, henceforth VVLP: 40–52). Italian offers evidence for a bipartite classification of operators: (i) morphological operators, which cannot be predicative, and thus cannot form a semantically-defined syntactic unit, such as nucleus or core (cf. (12a)); (ii) syntactic operators, which form a syntactic nucleus or core, in that they can be both predicators and modifiers of the following predicate (cf. (12b)), or, alternatively, pure modifiers (see Chapter 2 for a treatment of the behaviour of *continuare* ‘continue’ as a pure modifier or a modifier and a predicator):

(12) a. *Il postino non è arrivato.*  
    The postman.MSG NEG be.3SG arrive.PP.MSG
‘The postman has not arrived.’

b. Ha continuato a salire.

Have.3SG continue.PP to go.up

‘S/he has continued to go up.’

In accordance with the semantically-principled theory of clause structure, operators which can predicate, as well as modify another predicator, contribute syntactic nuclei or cores of their own to the clause. Morphological operators do not provide a syntactic unit of their own. This is the case with the morphological operators è ‘is’ of (12a) and ha ‘has’ of (12b), which modify the nuclei of arrivare ‘arrive’ and continuare ‘continue’, respectively (see Figures 2 and 3), and link to a separate operator projection. Contrastingly, the predicative operator continuare ‘continue’ of (12b) contributes a nucleus and a core to the syntactic representation and also links to the operator projection (see Figure 3).

Figure 2. Perfective essere ‘be’: a morphological operator.

Observe that auxiliaries and operators alike can link to the Agreement Index node (AGX), a dependent of the nucleus, which is concerned with the agreement specifications of all the core-argument positions present in the semantic representation (Belloro 2004). I discuss the AGX node in Chapters 4 and 5.
It has long been known that noun phrases exhibit remarkable similarities to clauses; for instance, some of them can take arguments, as in *la scoperta del nucleo atomico* ‘the discovery of the atomic nucleus’ (see *Lord Rutherford ha scoperto il nucleo atomico* ‘Lord Rutherford discovered the atomic nucleus’). In addition, noun phrases can contain clauses, as in *il fatto che Lord Rutherford abbia scoperto…* ‘the fact that Lord Rutherford discovered…’. In the light of these similarities, the semantically-based model of the structure of the clause is carried over to the structure of noun phrases, with one significant difference: in the structure of noun phrases, there is no distinction comparable to that between clause and sentence. The nucleus of *la scoperta del nucleo atomico* is its head *scoperta*, which joins with the argument *del nucleo atomico* to form the core. Each level of the noun phrase has a periphery, and can be modified by operators. In *la scoperta del nucleo atomico*, there is a noun-phrase operator: the definiteness marker *la* ‘the’. Quantifiers modify the core of noun phrases, and there are aspectual modifiers of the nucleus (Van Valin 2005: 24–27; VVLP: 52–67).
In order to appreciate the RRG theory of grammatical relations in full, it is necessary to deal with semantic relations first. As was briefly mentioned above, semantic relations or roles are defined in terms of the position of arguments in the semantic representation of the predicate (Jackendoff 1976; VVLP: 82–138). The semantics of predicates depends on their Aktionsart. RRG draws upon Vendler (1967) in distinguishing between the four Aktionsart types state, activity, achievement, and accomplishment. To these, Van Valin (2005: 32) adds the non-Vendlerian class of semelfactives (C. S. Smith 1991: 55–58). State and activity are the basic types, which the other kinds of Aktionsart derive from. Both states and activities are [-telic] and [-punctual]. However, states describe static situations, whilst activities describe dynamic ones. As a result, the latter type is by definition compatible with manner adverbs (energicamente ‘energetically’, attivamente ‘actively’, violentemente ‘violently’, etc.), whereas the former is not:

(13)  a. love, see, know, be sick, be tall (*energetically) [states]
     b. march, walk, sing, eat (energetically) [activities]

Achievements and accomplishments denote the attainment of a resultant state. They thus include a state, introduced by the operator INGR, in the case of achievements, and BECOME, in the case of accomplishments. Both operators denote telicity. However, they differ insofar as the former indicates punctuality, whilst the latter marks the predicate as non-punctual. The compatibility of a predicate with a temporal phrase with in is a good indication of non-punctual telicity; unlike states, activities and achievements, accomplishments are compatible with in-phrases:

(14)  a. love, see, know, be sick, be tall (*in an hour) [states]
     b. march, walk, sing, eat (*in an hour) [activities]
     c. appear, disappear, shatter, explode (*in an hour) [achievements]
     d. melt, freeze, dry, burn (in an hour) [accomplishments]

Semelfactives depict repeatable punctual events with no resultant state, and are based on states or activities. Whether they are based on a state or an activity is ascertained on the basis of their compatibility with manner adverbs, whereas the fact that they can be followed by once indicates that they involve punctual events:

(15)  flash, cough, tap, glimpse (once) [semelfactives]
The tests to assess the Aktionsart of predicates which have been mentioned so far are representative of a set of standard experiments which were first designed by Dowty (1979), and have proved to be invaluable in the study of the Aktionsart of predicates. There are, of course, language-specific limitations to the adoption of these tests. In addition, in applying the tests it is necessary to bear in mind that idiosyncratic aspects of the meaning of specific verbs may affect the validity of the tests. For instance, *she rushed across the room slowly is odd, even though the predicate is an accomplishment, and accomplishments are usually compatible with pace adverbs (Van Valin 2005: 40). This odd result is due to an idiosyncratic aspect of the semantics of rush, and not to its Aktionsart. Such cases of incompatibility are called local co-occurrence effects.

Activities can combine with resultant states to yield active accomplishments. In the semantic representation, the activity is followed by a state embedded under a telic operator. Active accomplishments usually denote motion, with the attainment of a goal, or otherwise creation or consumption. The resultant state is a location, in the case of active accomplishments of motion, whereas it is the state of a created or consumed entity, in the case of active accomplishments of creation and consumption:

(16) a. run [activity] ~ run home [active accomplishment]
    b. draw [activity] ~ draw a picture [active accomplishment]
    c. drink [activity] ~ drink a beer [active accomplishment]

Finally, all the Aktionsart types have causative correlates, in which they are introduced by a causal predicate, followed by the operator CAUSE:

(17) a. be short [state] ~ shorten [causative state]
    b. march [activity] ~ march (tr.) [causative activity]
    c. shatter [achievement] ~ shatter (tr.) [causative achievement]
    d. melt [accomplishment] ~ melt (tr.) [causative accomplishment]

In the semantic representation, the argument positions are variables which can be replaced by arguments specified in the language under scrutiny. The other parts of the representation (the constant, or idiosyncratic part, and the operators) are in English. Below are examples of each of the Aktionsart types mentioned above:
(18) States
   a. be´ (x, [intelligent´])
   b. feel´ (x, [afraid´])
   c. dead´ (x)
   d. see´ (x, y)

(19) Activities
   a. do´ (x, [march´ (x)])
   b. do´ (x, [draw´ (x, y)])

(20) Achievements
    INGR explode´ (x)

(21) Semelfactives
    a. SEML see´ (x, y) (glimpse)
    b. SEML do´ (x, [cough´ (x)])

(22) Accomplishments
    a. BECOME frozen´ (x)
    b. BECOME known´ (x, y) (learn)

(23) Active accomplishments
    a. do´ (x, [run´ (x)]) & BECOME be-LOC´ (y, x)
    b. do´ (x, [draw´ (x, y)]) & BECOME created´ (y)

(24) Causatives
    a. [[do´ (x, Ø)] CAUSE [feel´ (y, [afraid´])]] (scare)
    b. [[do´ (x, Ø)] CAUSE [do´ (y, [march´ (y)])]] (march (tr.) )
    c. [[do´ (x, Ø)] CAUSE [INGR explode´ (x)]] (explode (tr.) )
    d. [[do´ (x, Ø)] CAUSE [SEML do´ (y, [flash´ (y)])]] (flash (tr.) )
    e. [[do´ (x, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME frozen´ (y)]] (freeze (tr.) )
    f. [[do´ (x, Ø)] CAUSE [do´ (y, [eat´ (y, z)])]
       & BECOME consumed´ (z)]] (feed (tr.) )

In this context, I shall not dwell on the differences between the states represented in (18). Relevant information will be provided in due course. Some clarification is in order with respect to causatives. The symbol Ø stands for an unspecified activity, and it is of course possible that the activ-
ity is spelled out instead. In addition, the causal predicate need not be an activity, but rather it can be of any Aktionsart type.

To return to the semantic role of arguments, it depends on the position they occupy in the semantic representation of the predicate. The five positions which are crucial to the linking of semantics with syntax are those which figure in the actor-undergoer hierarchy (cf. (8)), and are repeated here for convenience:

(25) Semantic positions which are relevant to the linking

The semantic relations of the arguments of a predicate of cognition are, in some sense, different from those of the arguments of a predicate which expresses feelings. The first predicate takes a ‘cognizer’ and a ‘content’, whereas the other takes an ‘emoter’ and a ‘target’ (VVLP: 115). These labels, however, are irrelevant to the linking with syntax. What counts is that both pairs of arguments classify as the first argument of \( \text{pred}^\prime \) and the second argument of \( \text{pred}^\prime \).

On the basis of their position on the actor-undergoer hierarchy, arguments are assigned a macrorole. This aspect of the linking was briefly considered above, and will be discussed further in section 2.2. In this context, it is worth stressing that bivalent predicates are not necessarily assigned two macroroles. In RRG, transitivity is defined in terms of the number of macroroles that a predicate takes: zero, one, or two. Bivalent predicates can take one macrorole, and be intransitive. This point is exemplified by the contrast between (19b) and (23b): (19b) is an intransitive activity, which can be monovalent or bivalent (cf. (26a)), whilst (23b) is a transitive active accomplishment (cf. (26b)):

(26) a. Disegno (fiori).
Draw.1SG flowers
‘I draw (flowers).’
b. Disegno due fiori.
Draw.1SG two flowers
‘I draw two flowers.’
The second argument of the activity in (26a) simply contributes to the characterization of the predicate. Accordingly, it is not assigned a macrorole. By contrast, the second argument of the active accomplishment in (26b) is referential and it is assigned a macrorole. Whether a bivalent predicate is intransitive is either determined by its semantic representation (for instance, predicates like (19b) are intransitive by definition) or otherwise must be marked overtly in the semantic representation. Relevant examples will be given in Chapter 2.

The only argument of an intransitive state, achievement, or accomplishment is assigned the macrorole undergoer. As for the only macrorole argument of an intransitive active accomplishment, whilst being an actor (the first argument of \( \text{do} \)), it also figures as the second argument of a state in the semantic representation (see \( \text{be-LOC} (y, x) \) in (23a)). It is thus an affected actor. The only argument of an intransitive activity (whether or not semelfactive) is an actor, and is not affected, since it is simply the first argument of \( \text{do} \). The assumption that the actor vs. undergoer contrast has its roots in the Aktionsart split between intransitives which include a state and intransitives which do not explains the semantic basis of split intransitivity in Italian (Van Valin 1990). In addition, it indicates how the diagnostics which manifest active alignment are related to constructions of Italian and Romance that are constrained by more restrictive semantic principles; for instance, resultative constructions in Italian (see Chapter 6).

Having introduced semantic roles and macroroles, I now move on to grammatical relations. The first thing to note is that some languages do not offer any evidence for the postulation of grammatical relations. This is the case with Acehnese, which marks arguments according to whether they are actors or undergoers, in accordance with the semantically-principled active vs. inactive alignment (Durie 1987; VVLP: 242–316). RRG does not postulate any grammatical relations for this language.

Most languages, however, do exhibit evidence for the postulation of grammatical relations. This evidence is offered by constructions in which a restricted set of semantic relations is eligible for a syntactic function. In Italian, for instance, only macrorole arguments can control person and number agreement on the finite form of the verb. Dative and oblique arguments cannot be macroroles and do not control finite agreement. Grammatical relations are, thus, restricted neutralizations of semantic relations for syntactic purposes. These generalizations are construction-specific, rather than language specific. This is the principal reason why RRG rejects the traditional notion of subject, and replaces it with the construction-
specific notion of Privileged Syntactic Argument (henceforth PSA). To be sure, well-studied languages like English and Italian do not provide much evidence for the assumption that grammatical relations should be defined on a construction-specific basis, but there is clear supporting evidence from lesser known languages (see Van Valin’s 1981 study of Jakaltek).

There are two principal types of PSA choice, which underlie accusative and ergative alignment. In accusative alignment, the PSA can be the actor or undergoer of an intransitive structure (S), the actor of a transitive structure (A<sub>T</sub>), or the undergoer in the passive voice (d(erived)-S). In ergative alignment, the PSA can be the actor or undergoer of an intransitive structure (S), the undergoer of a transitive structure (U<sub>T</sub>), or the actor in the antipassive voice (d-S). The accusative and ergative systems represent different defaults in the choice of the PSA in semantics-syntax mapping: the default PSA is the highest-ranking direct core argument, in the accusative system, and the lowest-ranking direct core argument, in the ergative system. This is clearly indicated by transitive constructions, where the PSA is the actor (A<sub>T</sub>), according to accusative alignment, and the undergoer (U<sub>T</sub>), according to ergative alignment. The passive and antipassive constructions, which ensure the selection of the marked PSA, can be chosen for pragmatic reasons, for instance, in order to maintain topic continuity in topic chains. In this case, the principle which underlies the choice of the PSA in the syntactic systems of alignment is overruled by a pragmatic principle.

The notion of PSA default is crucial to the understanding of a well-known diagnostic of split intransitivity in Italian, namely the selection of the perfective operator (see Chapter 2). The conflict between information structure and the default principle of PSA choice is relevant to the analysis of word order (see Chapter 8). I leave the treatment of other types of PSAs (for instance, the missing arguments of some infinitival constructions) to the relevant contexts.

The grammatical relation direct object does not have any theoretical status in RRG. Consider the passive. To account for it, it is sufficient to rely on the semantic functions actor and undergoer, and the notion of PSA default: the passive is a construction which requires the marked choice of PSA, i.e., undergoer. In this work, I nonetheless refer to the direct object, contrasting it with the PSA, and with dative objects. The contrast between PSAs and objects is discussed in the study of aspects of the morphosyntax of Italo-Romance which are yielding or have yielded to pressure towards accusative alignment. In early Romance, as well as in some contemporary
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Italo-Romance dialects, these morphosyntactic phenomena strive to contrast actors with undergoers. The pressure from accusative alignment has resulted in the abandonment of the semantic principle, and the establishment of a system of marking which targets the PSA. In such cases, I shall assume that the new system contrasts PSAs with objects (see Chapter 5).

Both macrorole assignment and the choice of the PSA are stages in the linking of the semantic and the syntactic levels of representation. Macrorole assignment is labeled as universal, in the RRG representation of the linking (VVLP: 177), since it belongs to the aspects of the linking which are characterized by a great deal of crosslinguistic regularity. The few aspects of macrorole assignment which are not universal are not central to this work, and will be left out of this discussion. By contrast with macrorole assignment, the choice of the PSA varies typologically, as was pointed out above, and in fact it is labeled as language-specific in the representation of the linking. In general, the grammatical phenomena which are motivated semantically are less likely to show typological or language-specific variation than those which are driven by syntax or discourse (VVLP; Van Valin 2005: 128). The findings of the present work suggest that the crosslinguistic regularity which is observed in the manifestations of split intransitivity is largely determined by the semantic basis of the phenomenon, whilst the variation, whether crossdialectal or crosslinguistic, tends to be driven by syntax and discourse.

The linking between semantics and syntax will not be discussed in much detail here (see VVLP and Van Valin 2005 for detailed treatment). The reader should bear in mind that RRG assumes that syntax and semantics are not derived from each other and the mapping between them is bidirectional. The mapping from semantics to syntax is part of the process of language production, whilst the mapping from syntax to semantics is part of the process of language interpretation. The most fundamental principle in the linking is the Completeness Constraint, which ensures that all the specified arguments in the semantic representation are realized syntactically in the sentence, and all the referring expressions in syntax are linked to an argument position in the semantic representation. Semantic argument positions can, of course, be left unspecified, in which case they do not correspond to referring expressions in syntax. A discussion of unexpressed arguments in Italian is provided in Chapter 4.

The mismatches between semantics and syntax are determined primarily by the failure of expression in syntax of a semantic predicate. Some
such mismatches are crucial to the analysis of puzzling aspects of split intransitivity in (Italo-)Romance (see Chapters 5 and 6).

The theory of information structure which is adopted in RRG draws closely upon the work of Lambrecht (1986, 1994, and 2000). Lambrecht (1994: 49) claims that there is a distinction between, on the one hand, (i) the pragmatic status of the denotata of sentence constituents in the minds of the discourse participants, and, on the other hand, (ii) the pragmatic relations between such denotata and the propositions in which they play the roles of arguments and predicates. Lambrecht’s differentiation is significant in the analysis of some aspects of split intransitivity in Italo-Romance. In this work, the two types of information are referred to as (i) identifiability (Chafe 1976; Du Bois 1980) and (ii) focus structure, respectively. An identifiable referent is one for which a representation can be assumed to exist in the addressee’s mind, whereas an unidentifiable referent is one for which no such representation can be assumed. In the course of the analysis, I shall point out that there exist various kinds of identifiability.

Focus structure is principally concerned with the relation between presupposition and assertion, and how these are encoded in sentence forms of natural languages (VVLP: 206–210). The relation between a presupposed topic and an asserted (focal) predicate is encoded in a construction called predicate focus. The reply to the question in (27) encodes this type of pragmatic relation:

(27) ‘Che fa Teresa?’ ‘SCRIVE UNA LETTERA.’
‘What is Teresa doing?’ ‘She is writing a letter’

Observe that the discourse predicate, i.e., what is being asserted about something or somebody, does not necessarily correspond to the predicate in semantics-syntax mapping, even though this is generally the case. An example of this mismatch will be relevant to my analysis (see section 6.4.1).

The structures whereby an open variable is filled by a single constituent are called narrow-focus constructions in RRG. Any constituent can be the focused element of information; in the reply in (28), this is the postnuclear argument:
In my analysis (see Chapter 8), I shall differentiate between *contrastive* narrow focus, which contrasts an argument with the members of a set to which it belongs, and *non-contrastive* narrow focus, which simply introduces a new element of information into discourse.

Finally, the expression *sentence focus* is used to refer to a presentational construction which lacks a presupposition, as illustrated by the reply to the question in (29):

(28) ‘*Chi ci va?*’ ‘*Vado io*.’
Who LCL go.3SG Go.1SG I
‘Who is going (there)?’ ‘I’ll go.’

In Chapter 6 I examine evidence which suggests strongly that although sentence focus lacks a presupposition, it can introduce topic vs. focus contrasts as part of the new information provided.

The notes on the theoretical constructs of RRG which I have provided in this section are brief and focus on the issues which are relevant to this work. For extensive treatment of the principles of RRG, I refer to Foley and Van Valin (1984), Van Valin (1993, 2005), and VVLP. My principal reference in this work is VVLP.12
Chapter 2
Perfective operators

2.1 The problem

In Italian, the perfect is formed with either of the two allomorphs of the perfective operator, essere ‘be’ (henceforth E) and avere ‘have’ (henceforth A), plus a past participle. Constructions with reflexive or impersonal si require E (cf. (1)). Elsewhere A is selected with synthetic transitive predicates (cf. (2)) and a subclass of intransitives (cf. (3a)), whereas E is selected with another subclass of intransitives (cf. (3b)).

(1) a. Paolo si è comprato due libri.
   Paul RFL be.3SG buy.PP.MSG two book.MPL
   ‘Paul has bought two books for himself.’

   b. Si è ballato.
   IMP be.3SG dance.PP
   ‘One has danced.’

(2) Paolo ha comprato due libri.
Paul have.3SG buy.PP two books
‘Paul has bought two books.’

(3) a. Lucia ha cantato / parlato / ballato.
   Lucy have.3SG sing.PP talk.PP dance.PP
   ‘Lucy has sung / talked / danced.’

   b. Maria è morta / caduta.
   Mary be.3SG die.PP.FSG fall.PP.FSG
   ‘Mary has died / fallen.’

The evidence provided in (3) suggests that the perfective operators differentiate between Perlmutter’s (1978) unergative and unaccusative classes (cf. (3a) and (3b), respectively). Thus, the distribution of the perfective operators in Italian is a diagnostic of split intransitivity. The data in (1) to
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(3) indicate that the intransitive constructions in which E is selected (cf. (3b)) must be in some sense comparable to *si*-constructions (cf. (1)), whereas the intransitive constructions in which A is selected must share some property with the transitive ones in (2). At the same time as it identifies the rationale for the split exemplified in (3), a satisfactory account of the selection of the perfective operator must also capture these correspondences.

Existing analyses of the selection of the perfective operator can be classified into two principal types: decompositional and rule-based accounts. The decompositional approach has been extremely influential since Kayne (1993) (see, among others, Belvin and Den Dikken 1997; Cocchi 1994, 1995; Ledgeway 1998; Longa, Lorenzo, and Rigau 1998; Mahajan 1997; Roberts 1997, 1998). Drawing upon Benveniste (1960, 1966), Szabolcsi (1981, 1983) and Freeze (1992), Kayne (1993) essentially proposes that there is no rule for the selection of the perfective operator, and that A and E are different spell-outs of a single underlying universal auxiliary BE (see also Kayne 1994: 102–105, 2000). The surface form of the perfective operator depends on the structure of its participial complement. The participle can be either a determiner phrase with clause-like properties, i.e., containing an abstract complementizer, or a smaller structure, without a complementizer. Perfective A results from incorporation of the abstract complementizer into BE.

To capture the distribution of the perfective operators in languages or dialects other than Italian, Kayne (1993) claims that the incorporation of the abstract complementizer into BE is sensitive to a number of factors, such as the grammatical person of the subject and the reflexive clitic. In the decompositional account, therefore, the correspondence between the structures illustrated in (2) and (3a) depends on incorporation, whilst that between the structures illustrated in (1) and (3b) is due to the absence of incorporation. However, there is no unifying principle for the presence or absence of incorporation: this can be triggered by the syntactic structure in which the participle is embedded, or by a number of additional factors.

The rule-based approaches ascribe the choice of E or A to a rule, which can be syntactic, semantic, or syntactico-semantic. The semantic and syntactico-semantic approaches (Bentley and Eythórsson 2003; Cennamo 2001a; Cennamo and Sorace 2005; Sorace 2000, 2004, and, with reference to language families other than Italo-Romance, Castillo-Herrero 2002, and Lieber and Baayen 1997) explain the correspondences exemplified above in terms of the semantics of verbs, or of the predicate of the clause. A po-
The problem for these approaches is that, although a significant proportion of clitic reflexives are telic, and telicity is a factor in the selection of E, other sí-constructions, including some reflexives, are not comparable to E-selecting intransitives in semantic terms (see Chapter 4). Accordingly, the selection of E in sí-constructions must be assumed to be triggered by the morpheme sí, while the semantic rule of perfective-operator selection reduces to an elsewhere condition which only holds in contexts other than sí-constructions.

A rule-based approach that does provide a unified account of the selection of E and A has been formulated within Relational Grammar and its later developments (La Fauci 1989, 2000, 2003; Loporcaro 2004; Perlmutter 1989). According to this approach, the Italian operator E indicates that the controller of finite agreement bears the grammatical relation 2 (object) at some stage in the syntactic derivation of the clause. If this is not the case, A is selected. Whilst capturing the relatedness of structures such as those in (1) and (3b), this approach encounters another kind of problem. Since Relational Grammar assumes that grammatical relations are primitives of linguistic analysis, and rejects any semantic or cognitive explanation (Rosen 1984), it denies the role of lexical semantics, thus failing to discriminate between classes of verbs which can take A or E and classes of verbs which are not subject to this alternation. As a result, the relational approach does not capture the crosslinguistic correspondences between the verb classes which are subject to variation and change in the selection of the perfective operator, and those which are reluctant to change (Bentley and Eythórsson 2003; Cennamo 2001a; Sorace 2000, 2004).

My account of the selection of the perfective operator stems from Centineo’s (1986) rule-based syntactico-semantic account, which is couched in the theoretical framework of RRG (see section 1.4). Following Centineo (1986), I propose that the selection of E indicates the markedness of the Privileged Syntactic Argument (PSA), i.e., in finite clauses, the controller of finite verb agreement. In accordance with accusative alignment, the assignment of the role of PSA neutralizes the semantic function of arguments, in particular the opposition between actor and undergoer. This is exemplified in (3): in (3a) the PSA is an actor, whereas in (3b) it is an undergoer. Crosslinguistically, accusative alignment requires, as the unmarked PSA, the highest-ranking macrorole argument in the semantic representation of the predicate (VVLP: 282). By default, the highest-ranking macrorole argument is the actor. This is indicated by transitive constructions like (2), where the highest argument is assigned the macrorole actor
and is chosen as the PSA, whereas the lower argument is assigned the macrorole undergoer and is realized syntactically as the other direct argument of the predicate. Given that, in Italian, the PSA is selected in accordance with accusative alignment, the default PSA is the highest macrorole, typically an actor. In my treatment of the selection of the perfective operator, I define PSA markedness with respect to this notion of default PSA (see section 2 of this chapter).

This approach allows me to test La Fauci’s (1984, 1988) claim that I adopt as my working hypothesis in this study; specifically, the idea that the development of Romance morphosyntax from Latin involves a partial departure from the predominant accusative alignment, and that this departure is manifested by some aspects of the morphosyntax of Modern Romance which are diagnostics of split intransitivity. My principal claim in this chapter is that the selection of the perfective operator in Italian manifests a departure from accusative alignment which is ultimately to be understood on the basis of the semantic representation of the predicate of the clause, but does not constitute active alignment, i.e., a type of alignment which contrasts actors with undergoers (see section 1.2 and VVLP: 255–257).

The analysis of the selection of the perfective operator which I will propose provides a unified account of the selection of A and E, thus explaining the correspondences mentioned at the beginning of this discussion, whilst also offering the theoretical tools for a descriptively adequate analysis of variation and change. In the sections to follow, I build upon Centineo’s (1986) analysis of the selection of the perfective operator in Italian, investigating a few issues which are not within the scope of Centineo’s analysis: (i) A vs. E alternation, i.e., the possibility of choice of either operator with the same lexical classes of verbs (§2.3); (ii) crossdialectal and crosslinguistic variation in perfective-operator selection (see §2.4), in particular, two patterns which I call ESSE-based distribution (see §§2.4.1, 2.4.1.1, 2.4.1.2) and HABERE-based distribution (§§2.4.2, 2.4.2.1, 2.4.2.2), and, finally, (iii) perfective-operator selection in complex predicates (see §2.5).

2.2 The markedness of the Privileged Syntactic Argument

The essence of Centineo’s (1986) theory of the selection of the perfective operator in Italian is the idea that E figures in clauses with a marked PSA, whilst A figures in clauses with an unmarked one. The default PSA is an
actor in Italian, as is the case with accusative alignment (VVLP: 282). Actor-vs.-undergoer assignment is captured by the actor-undergoer hierarchy: (4) The Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy (VVLP: 146)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\text{ACTOR} & \text{UNDERGOER} \\
\hline
\text{arg of 1st arg. of 1st arg. of 2nd arg. of arg of state} \\
\hline
\text{DO} & \text{do}´ (x, …) & \text{pred}´ (x,y) & \text{pred}´ (x,y) & \text{pred}´ (x) \\
\end{array}
\]

[‘→’ increasing markedness of realisation of argument as macrorole]

Given the semantic representation of a transitive predicate, the leftmost direct core argument is assigned the macrorole actor, whilst the rightmost one will be the undergoer. Consider the example in (5) and its semantic representation (cf. (5¹)): (5) *Pietro ha mangiato due panini.*

Peter have.3SG eat.PP two bread.rolls

‘Peter has eaten two bread rolls.’

\[(5¹) \quad \text{do}´ (\text{Pietro}, \text{[eat}´ (\text{Pietro, panini})]) \& \text{BECOME consumed}´ (\text{panini})\]

*Pietro* is the leftmost argument, and is assigned the macrorole actor, whilst *panini* ‘bread rolls’ is the rightmost argument, and is assigned the macrorole undergoer. Since the PSA is an actor (see the third person singular inflection on the operator *ha* ‘has’ as evidence that the actor is the PSA of the clause), A is selected.

The predicate of (5) is an active accomplishment, and its highest argument occupies the position ‘first argument of do´ (x, …)’ on the hierarchy in (4). Transitive predicates with different Aktionssort behave like (5) in terms of macrorole and PSA assignment.” Thus, the transitive state in (6) also requires A:

(6) *Luca ha visto Giulia.*

Luke have.3SG see.PP Julia

‘Luke has seen Julia.’
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The highest argument of (6) figures in the third position of the hierarchy, since the semantic representation of (6) is see’ (Luca, Giulia). This argument is assigned the macrorole actor because it is the leftmost macrorole argument in a transitive structure.

Bivalent predicates are not necessarily transitive, as it is not always the case that both arguments are assigned a macrorole, and this has consequences for the selection of the perfective operator. Whether a bivalent predicate is intransitive is either determined by its semantic representation (cf. (7), (8a) and (8b) below) or, otherwise, must be marked overtly with the notation [MR1] (i.e., one macrorole) in the semantic representation (cf. (9a) and (9b) below).

To begin with, there are constructions in which an argument is the predicator in the clause, rather than a referential unit, and thus it is not assigned a macrorole. This is the case with identificational constructions:

(7) Fabio è il mio medico.

Fabio be.3SG the POSS medical.doctor
‘Fabio is my doctor.’

Only one argument is assigned a macrorole in (7), Fabio, whilst the other, il mio medico ‘my medical doctor’, serves as the predicate of the clause (see **pred**’ in the representation be’ (x, [**pred**’])). The third person of ‘be’ (è ‘is’) is not a predicate, but simply a copula which identifies the PSA while also serving as a tense carrier. On the basis of the hierarchy shown in (4), the macrorole argument of (7) is an undergoer. In fact, it figures in the position ‘first argument of **pred**’ (x, y)’, and it is the only macrorole in the clause. Since the PSA of the clause is an undergoer, E is selected in the perfect (Fabio è stato il mio medico ‘Fabio has (lit. is) been my doctor’).

In other constructions, an argument serves to characterize the state of affairs denoted by the predicate. This type of argument is called an inherent argument, and is not assigned a macrorole (VvLP: 147–150):

(8) a. Carlo non beve vino.

Charles NEG drink.3SG wine
‘Charles does not drink wine.’

b. Questo libro costa cinquanta euro.

This book cost.3SG fifty euros
‘This book costs fifty euros.’
Vino ‘wine’ in (8a) and cinquanta euro ‘fifty euros’ in (8b) are inherent arguments, as suggested by the ungrammaticality of passivization: *vino non è bevuto da Carlo ‘wine is not drunk by Charles’; *cinquanta euro sono costati da questo libro ‘fifty euros are cost by this book’. Accordingly, neither is assigned a macrorole. In terms of the hierarchy in (4), the only macrorole of (8a) (Carlo) is an actor, since it figures in the second leftmost position (see the representation do’ (Carlo, [drink’ (Carlo, vino)])). Contrastingly, the macrorole argument of (8b) (libro) is an undergoer, similarly to the macrorole of (7), since it is the only macrorole of a state predicate (see the representation cost’ (libro, [fifty euros’])). It follows that the PSA of (8a) is unmarked, and A is selected in the perfect (Carlo non ha mai bevuto vino ‘Charles has never drunk wine’). The PSA of (8b), instead, is marked, and E is selected (Questo libro è costato cinquanta euro ‘This book has (lit. is) cost fifty euros’).

Other bivalent predicates are not transitive because one of the arguments is a dative argument. This is indicated with [MR1] in the semantic representation:

(9) a. Ci è capitato un fatto strano.
   DCL.1PL be.3SG happen.PP.MSG a fact.MSG strange
   ‘Something strange happened to us.’

b. Il film non ci è piaciuto.
   The film.MSG NEG DCL.1PL be.3SG appeal.PP.MSG
   ‘The film did not appeal to us.’

Dative arguments cannot be macroroles in Italian, as is suggested by the lack of choice for undergoer assignment in ditransitive constructions (*Hanno dato la ragazza un libro ‘they gave the girl a book’ or *la ragazza è stata data un libro ‘the girl was given a book’). Accordingly, the first person plural argument of (9a) and (9b) is not a macrorole and cannot serve as the PSA of the clause. The other argument is assigned the macrorole undergoer, given that it is the second argument of a state (see the second rightmost position on the hierarchy), and serves as the marked PSA. The perfective operator is therefore E.

I have discussed constructions with actor and undergoer PSAs, and I have suggested that actor PSAs are unmarked, whereas undergoer PSAs are marked from the point of view of accusative alignment. This is reflected in the selection of the perfective operator. In terms of the actor-undergoer
hierarchy, the cut-off point between actor and undergoer assignment is represented by the third position on the hierarchy: when the first argument of a state is the only macrorole in the clause, it will be an undergoer (cf. (7) and (8b)), when it is not, it will be an actor (cf. (6)). The distribution of the perfective operators, however, is not entirely captured by the opposition between actor and undergoer PSAs. In fact, there are constructions with an actor PSA which require E. It is to these constructions that I now turn.

Italian *andare* ‘go’ is an intransitive active accomplishment, and is thus represented as in (10):

\[(10) \text{do}' (x, [\text{move.away.from.reference.point'} (x)]) \& [\text{BECOME be-Loc'} (y, x)]\]

The only direct argument of (10) figures in the semantic representation both as the only argument of an activity (*do*’ (x, [...])) and as the lowest argument of a resultant state (*be-Loc*’ (y, x)). Since it is the argument of an activity, it is assigned the macrorole actor. However, given that it is also the lowest argument of a resultant state, it is an affected actor, and E is selected:

\[(11) \text{Dov' è Flavia? È già andata.}^{20}\]

Where be.3SG Flavia be.3SG already go.PP.FSG

‘Where is Flavia? She has already gone.’

Affected actors are a subclass of marked actors. Further exemplification of the selection of E with affected-actor PSAs will be provided in section 2.3, where I discuss the verb classes which are subject to the alternation of A and E in Italian.

Another subclass of marked actors is found in *si*-constructions. These constructions will be subject to in-depth scrutiny in Chapter 4. In this chapter, I simply follow Van Valin (1990: 257) in assuming that the clitic *si* marks the suppression of the highest-ranking argument in the semantic representation of the clause. In accordance with this analysis, the semantic representation of the *si*-constructions in (12a) and (12b) (cf. in (1a) and (1b)), is as in (12a\(^1\)) and (12b\(^1\)), respectively:

\[(12) a. \text{Paolo si è comprato due libri.}\]

Paul RFL be.3SG buy.PP.MSG two book.MPL

‘Paul has bought two books for himself.’
b. Si è ballato.
IMP be.3SG dance.PP
‘One has danced.’

(12) a¹. [[do´ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME have´ (Ø, libri)]]
   PURP [have´ (Paolo, libri)]
   b¹. do´ (Ø, [dance´])

One point that has not been developed in previous RRG accounts is whether the suppressed argument of *si*-impersonals is assigned a macrorole. In Chapter 4, I provide evidence which indicates that this is indeed the case with *si*-impersonals. By contrast, the suppressed argument of *si*-reflexives is not itself assigned a macrorole, but can be co-referent with a macrorole argument. Crucially, in neither case is the highest-ranking macrorole position a PSA.

Given that the highest-ranking macrorole position is suppressed in *si*-constructions, these are by definition marked from the point of view of PSA assignment. The highest expressed argument of (12a) and (12a¹) is the highest macrorole of a transitive state: have´ (Paolo, libri). Accordingly, it is an actor, on a par with the highest argument of (6) (*Luca ha visto Giulia* ‘Luke has seen Julia’). Although it is co-indexed with the highest position in the semantic representation, this argument does not itself figure in the highest position, which is filled by a suppressed argument. Since the actor is not in the highest macrorole position of the semantic representation, it is a marked actor, and, as a result, a marked PSA. The selection of E is predicted.

Similar considerations hold for the impersonal construction in (12b) and (12b¹). Given that the suppressed argument of this construction is the first argument of do´, it receives the macrorole actor. However, since it is suppressed, it is a marked actor which cannot serve as the PSA of the clause. Accordingly, this construction requires E.

I have considered two types of *si*-construction, a reflexive one and an impersonal one. These are representative of all kinds of *si*-construction, insofar as the selection of E is concerned. Recall that, in accusative alignment, the default PSA is the highest macrorole argument in the semantic representation of the predicate. In *si*-constructions, the highest macrorole position in the semantic representation is suppressed and cannot serve as the PSA; argument suppression results in PSA markedness.
Argument suppression is to be distinguished from argument modulation. The latter does not concern the semantic representation \textit{per se}, but rather the mapping of semantics with syntax. In Italian, argument modulation allows the non-canonical realization of an actor as an adjunct in the periphery of the core. This realization of the actor obtains optionally in the passive voice (see Figures 4 and 5):

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{active_voice_template.png}
\caption{Syntactic template for active voice}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{argument_modulation_template.png}
\caption{Syntactic template for argument modulation.}
\end{figure}

The passive voice is also characterized by PSA modulation, that is, the choice of the undergoer as the PSA of the clause. In (13), the undergoer (\textit{la notizia} ‘the news’) serves as the PSA, whilst the actor (\textit{la stampa} ‘the press’) is modulated:

(13) \textit{La notizia è stata divulgata dalla stampa.}
\begin{align*}
\text{The news.FSG be.3SG be.PP.FSG spread.PP.FSG by.the press.}
\end{align*}

\textit{‘The news has been spread by the press.’}
The PSA of (13) is clearly marked, given that it is an undergoer, and this explains the selection of the perfective operator E (see ‘è ‘is’).

The passive in (13) is formed with the voice auxiliary essere ‘be’ and a past participle. In the following chapters, other passive constructions will be considered; for instance, those formed with andare, lit. go, and venire, lit. come, plus a past participle, and si-passives. It is not necessary to analyse these structures in detail in this context, since they are comparable with the passive with essere ‘be’, insofar as PSA markedness is concerned. As regards the passives with andare and venire, I should note in passing that they rule out the perfect (see section 7.4), and thus the issue of the selection of the perfective operator is immaterial.

A passive construction which must instead be mentioned here is the passive formed with avere ‘have’ plus a past participle. This passive interests us in this context, in that, unlike that with essere ‘be’, it selects the perfective operator A. Observe the example in (14):

(14) Questo libro, l’ ho avuto regalato (da mia madre).

‘This book, I have had it given as a present (by my mother).’

Like the passive with the voice auxiliary essere ‘be’ (cf. (13)), that with avere ‘have’ is characterized by optional argument modulation. Indeed, the actor of transitive regalare ‘give as a present’ figures as a da-adjunct (da mia madre ‘by my mother’) in (14). In the passive with avere ‘have’, however, there is no PSA modulation. In fact, the PSA of the clause is not the undergoer of regalare ‘give as a present’, but rather the actor of another predicate, possessive avere ‘have’. The two predicates share a macrorole, the undergoer (questo libro ‘this book’), which figures as a topic in the Left-Detached Position.

In (14), therefore, possessive avere ‘have’ joins with another predicate to form a complex predicate. Evidence that (14) does not simply involve one predicate is provided by the perfective form of avere ‘have’ (ho avuto ‘have had’). In fact, Italian does not allow the double-composed perfect with perfective ‘have’ which is attested in popular French (J’ai eu fait ‘I have done’, lit. I have had done) and in dialects spoken in Northern Italy (for some Friulian examples, see Vanelli 1997: 283). Accordingly, facts such as those in (14) are better explained assuming that the construction in
question involves the juncture of two predicates. In particular, there is reason to think that this is a nuclear co-subordination, i.e., a construction with two nuclei joining under one nuclear node (see Figure 6):

![Diagram of nuclear co-subordination]

Crosslinguistically, nuclear junctures are characterized by the grouping together of the arguments into one set of core arguments. In Italian, such sharing is signaled by the grammaticality of the placement of any clitic arguments before the complex predicate (see Rizzi’s 1982 notion of restructuring, which will be discussed at more length in section 2.5). Thus, the position of the object clitic in (14) indicates that this is a nuclear juncture. That the nexus formed by the two nodes is a co-subordination is suggested by operator dependence at the level of the linkage (VVLP: 455), which, in this case, is the nucleus; in particular, the sharing of the perfective operator between ‘have’ and ‘give as a present’.

The PSA of the construction in (14) is the possessor. This is the first of the two macrorole arguments of a state, i.e., an actor, and thus A is selected. Observe in passing that there exists a correlated structure with PSA modulation, in which E is selected: questo libro mi è stato regalato da mia madre ‘this book was given to me as a present by my mother’. In this structure, there is only one predicate, regalare ‘give as a present’, and the undergoer of this predicate contributes a marked PSA to the clause.

I have claimed that, in Italian, the selection of the perfective operator indicates PSA markedness (Centineo 1986). Given that the PSA is chosen in accordance with accusative alignment, insofar as it neutralizes the opposition between actors and undergoers, PSA markedness is defined in terms of the default notion of PSA in accusative alignment. This is the highest-ranking macrorole argument in the semantic representation of the predi-
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cate, typically an actor (VVLP: 282). In Italian, E is selected when the PSA is marked, whilst A is selected when the PSA is unmarked. The A vs. E divide, however, does not correspond to the actor-vs.-undergoer divide. In fact, marked actors (i.e., affected and suppressed actors) classify as marked PSAs and require E. Accordingly, the A vs. E opposition does not constitute the type of alignment that is based on a semantic principle (active). I should further stress that, since the selection of the perfective operator relates to PSA assignment, it is only concerned with a subclass of undergoers, i.e., those which have the privileged syntactic function of controller of finite verb agreement. This further indicates that the selection of the perfective operator does not constitute active alignment. In the following chapters, I shall point out that there are other diagnostics of split intransitivity which target the undergoer regardless of its syntactic function. Unlike these diagnostics, the selection of the perfective operator is a diagnostic that is concerned with an aspect of the mapping of semantics with syntax (PSA assignment) and not with semantic representation alone.

In section 2.1, I pointed out that other approaches to the selection of the perfective operator do not identify a unifying principle for the selection of E. I hope to have shown that the notion of PSA markedness provides such a principle. In the next section, I shall investigate another thorny issue in the study of the selection of the perfective operator, namely the alternation of A and E with some classes of verbs. This issue is problematic for the theories which deny the role of lexical semantics in the selection of the perfective operator, but can be captured by the account proposed in this work, which bases macrorole assignment on the actor-undergoer hierarchy (cf. (4)).

2.3 Avere or essere?

This section is concerned with the alternation of A and E with some lexical classes of verbs. I consider four classes which exhibit this type of alternation. They encode: (i) controlled motional processes (e.g., correre ‘run’); (ii) change of state (e.g., seccare ‘dry’); (iii) punctual events with no resultant state (e.g., squillare ‘ring’), and, finally, (iv) states which can also be construed as activities or (active) accomplishments (e.g., vivere ‘live’ and convenire ‘be convenient, meet, agree’). Whereas the kinds of alternation which affect classes (i) and (ii) can be accounted for in terms of lexical
decomposition (Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998; VVLP: 109–110), those which concern the other classes will not yield to this approach.

The conditions on the selection of A or E are well-known and fairly well understood in the case of verbs which denote controlled motional processes (class (i)). Put simply, these verbs encode activities (cf. (15a) and (16a)) or active accomplishments (cf. (15b) and (16b)). The markedness of the PSA varies accordingly, and so does the perfective operator:

(15) a. Silvia ha corso alle Olimpiadi.
Sylvia have.3SG run.PP at.the Olympics
‘Sylvia has run at the Olympics.’
b. Silvia è corsa a casa.
Sylvia be.3SG run.PP.FSG to home
‘Sylvia has run home.’

(16) a. Il bimbo ha saltato sul letto.
The child have.3SG jump.PP on.the bed
‘The child has jumped on the bed.’
b. Il bimbo è saltato sul letto.
The child.MSG be.3SG jump.PP.MSG on.the bed
‘The child has jumped onto the bed.’

Both the (a) and the (b) sentences in (15) and (16) exhibit a prepositional phrase. The prepositional phrases which occur in the (a) sentences can be omitted with no consequences for the interpretation of the predicate or the grammaticality of the example (cf. (17a)). By contrast, the omission of the prepositional phrases which occur in the (b) sentences results in ungrammaticality (cf. (17b)):

(17) a. Che ha fatto Silvia? Ha corso (alle O.).
What have.3SG do.PP Sylvia have.3SG run.PP at.the O.
‘What has Sylvia done? She has run (at the Olympics).’
b. Che ha fatto Silvia? È corsa *(a casa).
What have.3SG do.PP Sylvia be.3SG run.PP.FSG to home
‘What has Sylvia done? She has run (home).’

The facts in (17) suggest that the preposition in (17a) is an adjunct preposition, whereas that in (17b) is an argument-adjunct preposition (VVLP: 159–162). Adjunct prepositions contribute an argument of their own to the
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semantic representation and occur in the periphery of the core in syntax. Contrastingly, argument-adjuncts share an argument with the predicate of the clause and figure within the syntactic core. Thus, the prepositional phrase in (17b) shares its argument with the predicate of the clause, and it has an impact on Aktionsart. The examples in (18) corroborate this point, since the predicate can be separated from an adjunct (cf. (18a)), whilst it is less easily separated from an argument-adjunct, since it shares an argument with it (cf. (18b)):

(18) a. *Silvia ha corso per ore sino a casa.*
   Sylvia have.3SG run.PP for hours up to home
   ‘Sylvia ran for hours as far as home.’

   b. *Silvia è corsa (??in dieci minuti) a casa.*
   Sylvia be.3SG run.PP.FSG in ten minutes to home
   ‘Sylvia ran home in ten minutes.’

Observe that the relative incompatibility of (18b) with the phrase ‘in ten minutes’ is not indicative of the Aktionsart of the predicate. Evidence that *correre* ‘run’ is an active accomplishment, when followed by an argument adjunct which indicates the reaching of an endpoint, is provided below:

(19) *Silvia è corsa a casa in dieci minuti.*
   Sylvia be.3SG run.PP.FSG to home in ten minutes
   ‘Sylvia ran home in ten minutes.’

*Correre* ‘run’ also tests out as an active accomplishment when followed by adverbs which indicate the attainment of a spatial endpoint, such as via ‘away’, su ‘upstairs’, giù ‘downstairs’:

(20) *Silvia è corsa su in un minuto.*
   Sylvia be.3SG run.PP.FSG upstairs in one minute
   ‘Sylvia ran upstairs in one minute.’

It is worth mentioning that the crucial factor in the alternations under consideration here is not animacy or agentivity. This is shown in (21). The PSA is inanimate in both (21a) and (21b), and in both cases a non-agentive activity is denoted. However, *volare* ‘fly’ is an active accomplishment in (21a), since it combines with the adverb via ‘away’, which indicates a spa-
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tial endpoint, and an activity in (21b). This explains the contrast in the selection of the perfective operator:

\[
(21) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Il fucile era volato via in un angolo.} \\
& \text{The rifle had flown into a corner.} \\
& \text{('The rifle had flown into a corner.' (Baricco, Senza sangue, p. 36))}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Quest’aereo ha volato per ore.} \\
& \text{This plane has flown for hours.}
\end{align*}
\]

The inherent meaning of the argument can, of course, convey a particular reading of the predicate. For instance, *saltare* is telic in both (22a) and (22b), and it is translated in English as ‘come off’, and ‘blow’, respectively:

\[
(22) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{È saltato un bottone.} \\
& \text{A button has come off.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{È saltata una valvola.} \\
& \text{A fuse has blown.}
\end{align*}
\]

The evidence in (22) is explained by the concept of coercion: the formal and telic qualia roles (Pustejovsky 1995) of the noun which provides the argument in the clause force a telic reading of the predicate. As a result the PSA is marked.

In the light of the evidence, it appears that class-(i) verbs select E when the context requires a telic reading. Otherwise they select A. In terms of the analysis of the selection of the perfective operator developed in section 2.2, E is selected when the PSA is an affected actor: the only argument of an activity (do’ (x, [...])) as well as the lowest argument of a resultant state (be-Loc’ (y, x)). Being an affected actor, it is a marked PSA. Instead, A is selected when the PSA is purely the argument of an activity (do’ (x, [...])), and thus an unmarked actor and an unmarked PSA.

Class-(i) verbs, therefore, display activity vs. active-accomplishment alternations. These alternations are captured in terms of lexical decomposition (Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998; VVLP: 102–113), in that the ac-
tive-accomplishment realizations (cf. (15b) and (16b)) exhibit an activity (cf. (15a) and (16a)) combined with a resultant state:

(15) a. do’ (Silvia, [run´ (Silvia)]) 
   b. do’ (Silvia, [run´ (Silvia)]) & BECOME be-Loc’ (casa, Silvia)

(16) a. do’ (bimbo, [jump´ (bimbo)]) 
   b. do’ (bimbo, [jump´ (bimbo)]) & BECOME be-Loc’ (letto, bimbo)

Whether the verbs of class (i) encode activities or active accomplishments depends on the particular construction in which they occur. Constructional approaches (see, among others, Borer 1994, 2004; van Hout 1996), however, have trouble dealing satisfactorily with the alternations under scrutiny without attributing any role to the lexicon.7 The principal difficulty of the constructional approaches (Borer 1994; Folli and Harley 2005; Sorace 2000) is that not all verbs exhibit comparable alternation patterns. Thus, it is not the case that all intransitive activities alternate with intransitive active accomplishments. Ballare ‘dance’, camminare ‘walk’, marciare ‘march’, nuotare ‘swim’ and other verbs which denote controlled motional processes are not members of class (i) in Italian, in that they are not subject to the alternation under discussion. An issue which deserves attention is whether the absence of active-accomplishment realizations for these verbs can be put down to their insensitivity to the context. With respect to this issue, it is significant that nuotare ‘swim’ can combine with a prepositional phrase formed with a ‘to’ (cf. (23a)), but other verbs which do not allow the activity vs. active-accomplishment alternation cannot (cf. (23b)):

(23) a. Lisa ha nuotato a riva.
   Lisa have.3SG swim.PP to shore
   ‘Lisa has swum to the shore.’
   b. Lisa ha camminato *(sino) alla torre.
   Lisa have.3SG walk.PP as.far.as to.the tower
   ‘Lisa has walked as far as the tower.’

The data in (23b) suggest that camminare ‘walk’ cannot combine with an argument-adjunct denoting the reaching of an endpoint, but rather solely with an adjunct (sino alla torre ‘as far as the tower’). Locational adjuncts do not share an argument with the predicate of the clause or affect its Ak-
Perfective operators (VVLP: 159). This explains the lack of A vs. E alternation. The same holds for other verbs which denote controlled motion, such as ballare ‘dance’ and marciare ‘march’.

As for nuotare ‘swim’, in the light of (23a) one might think that nuotare ‘swim’ can join with an argument-adjunct which indicates the reaching of an endpoint. If this were indeed the case, nuotare ‘swim’ would simply be insensitive to the context, with implications not only for the constructional approaches, but also for the theory of lexical decomposition. However, nuotare ‘swim’ does not join with any prepositional phrase with a ‘to’, thus contrasting with correre ‘run’:

(24) a. Lisa ha nuotato *(sino) a Dover.
   Lisa have.3SG swim.PP as.far.as to Dover
   ‘Lisa has swum as far as Dover.’
   b. Lisa ha nuotato ??(sino) alla riva del fiume.
   Lisa have.3SG swim.PP as.far.as to.the bank of.the river
   ‘Lisa has swum as far as the bank of the river.’

(25) a. Lisa è corsa a Dover.
   Lisa be.3SG run.PP.FSG to Dover
   ‘Lisa has run to Dover.’
   b. Lisa è corsa alla riva del fiume.
   Lisa be.3SG run.PP.FSG to.the bank of.the river
   ‘Lisa has run to the bank of the river.’

All things considered, it would seem that the activity verbs which do not exhibit alternation are not insensitive to the context, but rather cannot figure in the context which requires the active-accomplishment reading.

Evidence that can be problematic for the purely constructional approaches, i.e., the constructional approaches that do not rely at all on the lexicon, derives from crosslinguistic comparison (Talmy 1991). German tanzen ‘dance’ patterns with Italian correre ‘run’ in exhibiting the ‘be’-vs.-‘have’ alternation (cf. (26a) and (26b)), and so does German schwimmen ‘swim’, in spite of a tendency towards the selection of ‘be’ in all domains, which is illustrated in (27a):

(26) a. Sie haben im Schlafzimmer getanzt. (German)
    They have.3PL in.the bedroom dance_PP
    ‘They danced in the bedroom.’


b. Sie sind zum Schlafzimmer getanzt. (German)
They be.3PL to.the bedroom dance.PP
‘They danced into the bedroom.’

(27) a. Er ist / hat stundenlang geschwommen. (German)
He be.3SG have.3SG for.hours swim.PP
‘He has been swimming for hours.’

b. Er ist zum Leuchtturm geschwommen. (German)
He be.3SG to.the lighthouse swim.PP
‘He has swum to the lighthouse.’

French danser ‘dance’ and nager ‘swim’ pattern with their Italian counterparts, whereas monter ‘go up’ is subject to ‘have’ vs. ‘be’ alternation, as illustrated in (28). Observe that Italian salire ‘go up’ only requires A if followed by a second argument which is assigned the macrorole undergoer (e.g., hanno salito le scale ‘they went up the stairs’):

(28) a. Ils ont monté (les escaliers). (French)
They have.3PL go.up.PP the stairs
‘They have gone up (the stairs).’

b. Ils sont montés jusqu’au 10ème étage. (Fr.)
They.MPL be.3PL go.up.PP.MPL up.to the tenth floor
‘They have gone up to the tenth floor.’

In the light of the lexical idiosyncrasies and the crosslinguistic mismatches discussed, I assume that the membership of class (i), i.e., the class of verbs of controlled motional process which can combine with an argument-adjunct, and thus display activity vs. active-accomplishment alternations, is defined in the lexicon. The theory of lexical decomposition is a powerful tool which allows us to capture such alternations without resorting to multiple lexical entries for these verbs. I return to the issue of the lexical and constructional perspectives below.

Class (ii) consists of change of state verbs, which, according to the findings of a study reported in Sorace (2000), display variability in speaker judgement insofar as the selection of the perfective operator is concerned. Grammars and dictionaries of Italian make no mention of this variability.

For instance, Sabatini and Coletti (2003) recommend E for all of the verbs in question. In the examples, I use the symbol # to indicate that, with class (ii), it is the judgement of some native informants that provides evidence
for the alternation of the perfective operator. The standard variants with E are compatible with phrases which indicate completion. The acceptability of A, on the other hand, is favoured by or dependent upon the presence of temporal phrases of duration:

(29) a. I fichi sono seccati (*in un giorno*).
   ‘The figs dried (in one day).’
   b. #I fichi hanno seccato *(per una settimana).*
   ‘The figs have been drying for a week.’

(30) a. La legna (si) è bruciata (*in un’ora*).
   ‘The wood burned (in an hour).’
   b. #La legna ha bruciato *(?per un’ ora).*
   ‘The wood has been burning for an hour.’

(31) a. Le mele sono marcite (*in un giorno*).
   ‘The apples have become rotten (in one day).’
   b. #Le mele hanno marcito *(?per mesi).*
   ‘The apples have been rotting away for months.’

(32) a. Le piante sono fiorite (*in una notte*).
   ‘The plants blossomed (in one night).’
   b. #Le piante hanno fiorito *(?per mesi).*
   ‘The plants have been in bloom for months.’

Sorace (2000: 873) has noted that the preference for E is weakened by the presence of an external instigator in the lexical representation of the verb (externally-caused events are distinguished by Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995 from events which arise from inherent characteristics of the participant; see section 4.2.2). This is indeed the case with bruciare ‘burn’ and seccare ‘dry’. However, only some change of state verbs which are
subject to A vs. E alternation are causative. For instance, fiorire ‘blossom’ and marcire ‘rot’ are not (see the ungrammaticality of *il sole ha fiorito le rose ‘the sun has made the roses blossom’ and *l’umidità ha marcito la frutta ‘the dampness has made the fruit become rotten’). Moreover, there are verbs of change of state, which can denote causation by an external instigator (cf. (33a)), but categorically rule out A according to native speakers (cf. (33b)):

(33) a. Le sofferenze lo hanno invecchiato.
   The hardships OCL.MSG have.3SG cause.to.age.PP.MSG
   ‘The hardships caused him to age.’

   b. Fulvio *ha / è invecchiato.
      Fulvio have.3SG be.3SG age.PP.MSG
      ‘Fulvio has aged.’

The bulk of the verbs in question are deadjectival (dimagrire ‘thin’, ingrassare ‘fatten’, invecchiare ‘age’, ringiovanire ‘become younger-looking’, imbruttire ‘become uglier’, rimpicciolire ‘shrink’, lit. become small), and denote the gradual approach to a goal. In the perfect, they can denote the attainment of a final goal or, alternatively, the reaching of a further stage in the approximation to the goal. Bertinetto and Squartini (1995: 23), who refer to this class as gradual-completion verbs, have devised a series of tests to determine the membership to the class. Among such tests is the compatibility with the phrase di parecchio ‘by a lot’ and with sensibilmente ‘appreciably’. It is significant that the verbs which test out as gradual-completion verbs according to Bertinetto and Squartini’s (1995) diagnostics are positively associated with E (dimagrire / ingrassare / invecchiare / ringiovanire / imbruttire / rimpicciolire di parecchio / sensibilmente ‘thin / fatten / age / become younger-looking, become uglier, shrink by a lot / appreciably’), whereas those which exhibit variability in speaker judgement do not test out as gradual-completion verbs (*seccare / *bruciare / *marcire / *fiorire di parecchio / sensibilmente ‘dry / burn / rot / blossom by a lot / appreciably’). It must be concluded that gradual completion is not a relevant factor in the alternation.

Gradual-completion verbs constitute a separate class of verbs of change of state both in Italian and in other languages. In Italian, the majority of these verbs are formed with an adjective and a prefix which, in combination with the adjective, has inchoative meaning. In Venetan and Friulian, there are no lexical counterparts of the Italian verbs in question (Benincà
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1994: 73, note 4). Rather, the intransitive-accomplishment version is lexicalized by the sequence ‘become + adjective’, and the causative version by ‘make + become + adjective’. Comparable evidence is offered by Huallaga Quechua, where the telic and causative versions are obtained by inchoativization and causativization rules in the lexicon (hatun- ‘big’, hatun-ya:- ‘become big’, hatun-ya:-chi- ‘cause become big’, see Van Valin 2005: 46).

Deadjectival change of state verbs are formed with adjectives which denote stage-level states (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 95–96). The distinction between stage- and individual-level states was first proposed by Carlson (1977) and is essential to the analysis of split intransitivity. In fact, it will be mentioned again in this work, in connection with other manifestations of the split. Individual-level predicates denote properties of individuals, whilst stage-level ones denote contingent or resultant states, and are related to events. There are diagnostics of split intransitivity which are compatible with stage-level predicates, but not with individual-level ones. The behaviour of deadjectival verbs with respect to the selection of the perfective operator (cf. (33b)) is suggestive of the association of stage-level predicates with the unaccusative side of the intransitivity split. Before I explain this behaviour, however, I should return to the evidence illustrated in (29) to (32).

I suggest that the A vs. E alternations which can affect class-(ii) verbs, according to the judgement of some speakers, depend on the possibility of accomplishment vs. process construal. Van Valin (2005: 43–44) has proposed that the marker of non-punctual telicity BECOME should be decomposed into PROC & INGR to capture evidence which indicates that, in some languages (e.g., Mparntwe Arrernte), the process that is part of an accomplishment can be encoded separately from the resultant state. The telic correlate of the processes in question is encoded by adding a resultative suffix to the forms which denote process. Class-(ii) verbs are clearly not subject to such lexical rules. However, the data in (29) to (32) suggest that, in given contexts, some speakers construe them as processes, rather than processes plus resultant states. This reading is accounted for by Van Valin’s (2005) proposed semantic representation of accomplishments. If bruciare ‘burn’ is represented as in (34a), the reading which suppresses the resultant state corresponds to (34b):

(34)  a. PROC burn´(x) & INGR burned´(x)  
     b. PROC burn´(x)
Avere or essere?

From the point of view of lexical decomposition, A vs. E alternation with class-(ii) verbs is therefore not problematic. Contrastingly, it would seem that this type of alternation calls into question the account of the selection of the perfective operator which was proposed in section 2.2, if we tentatively assume that the argument of PROC burn’(x) (cf. (34b)) figures in the domain of the undergoer in the actor-undergoer hierarchy. One could go as far as to claim that these challenging data indicate an incipient spread of A in Italian. The spread of perfective ‘have’ has characterized the history of other Romance languages, and indeed has resulted in the retrenchment or even the disappearance of perfective ‘be’ in some such languages (see section 2.4.2). In the light of the current state of affairs, however, this hypothesis really seems to be too far-fetched, since the alternation of process and accomplishment construals only manifests itself in controlled speaker judgements. The choice of A might instead depend on the classification of the process construals on the actor-undergoer hierarchy, with some speakers conceiving of the processes as some kind of non-agentive activities.

To return to the deadjectival class of verbs of change of state (cf. (33)), the fact that, according to native-speaker judgements, the selection of E is unquestionable with this class is interesting in that it suggests that stage-level predicates are at the core of one side of the intransitivity split. As I mentioned in passing, this result is corroborated by evidence which will be examined in the following chapters. Phrased in terms of lexical decomposition, the findings indicate that the stage-level states which are encoded by the gradual-completion verbs cannot be obliterated in the semantics of the correlated deadjectival verbs. This is not surprising, since a great number of these verbs consist of an adjectival predicate plus a mere inchoative prefix. Thus, the deadjectival class only licenses the reading BECOME pred’(x).

The contrast in speaker judgements between gradual-completion verbs and class (ii) corroborates the point made above with respect to the purely constructional analyses of perfective operators, i.e., the analyses which do not assign any role to the lexicon. The variability in speaker judgements is susceptible to the context (see the phrases of duration in (29)-(32)). However, it is not clear how these approaches would predict that different classes of change of state verbs are not equally sensitive to context.

‘ring’, *suonare* ‘emit a sound, toll’, *tentennare* ‘totter’, *trillare* ‘ring’, etc. Evidence that they involve punctual events is provided by their compatibility with *una volta* ‘once’: *il faro ha lampeggiato una volta* ‘the headlight flashed once’. The absence of a resultant state is suggested by the possibility of an iterative reading in constructions with a singular PSA and a temporal phrase of duration: *il faro ha lampeggiato per dieci minuti* ‘the headlight flashed for ten minutes’.

Crosslinguistically, semelfactives pattern either with activities (SEML *do*’(*x*, [predicate’(*x*)])) or with states (SEML *predicate*’(*x*) or (*x*, *y*)). There is some evidence that the realization based on an activity is the norm in Italian. In particular, even though the compatibility of semelfactives with manner adverbs can be affected by local co-occurrence effects (see section 1.4), as in *tentennare violentemente* ‘totter violently’, or by the restriction of some semelfactives to inanimate arguments, as in *trillare energicamente* ‘ring energetically’, in general Italian semelfactives are fairly compatible with manner adverbs: *oscillare / tossire violentemente* ‘swing / cough violently’, *brillare intensamente* ‘glitter intensely’, etc. It is thus not surprising that the perfective operator recommended by Sabatini and Coletti (2003) is A, with the exception of *squillare* ‘ring’ and *suonare* ‘emit a sound, toll’, which are said to take either A or E.

The alternation in the selection of the perfective operator must be due to the possibility of a construal based on a state (SEML *predicate*’(*x*)) which is open to some such verbs. The behaviour of *tossire* ‘cough’, which is a semelfactive verb, but is not a member of class (iii), since it is not subject to A vs. E alternation, is significant in this respect. Suffice it to mention that *tossire* ‘cough’ can denote an agentive activity, unlike the other semelfactives mentioned, as is indicated by its compatibility with *di proposito* ‘on purpose’ (*Ha tossito di proposito* ‘s/he coughed on purpose’). Whilst it can be agentive, *tossire* ‘cough’ cannot receive a state-based interpretation.

Interestingly, the A vs. E alternations are affected by focus structure. In fact, E is required in sentence-focus constructions (see section 1.4) with the two verbs considered to be exceptional by Sabatini and Coletti (2003):

\[
\begin{align*}
(35) \quad & \text{a. } \text{Il telefono ha / è } \text{squillato alle otto.} \\
& \text{The phone.MSG have.3SG be.3SG ring.PP.MSG at.the eight} \\
& \text{‘The phone rang at eight.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{b. } \text{Che è } \text{successo?} \\
& \text{What be.3SG happen.PP}
\end{align*}
\]
È squillato / *Ha squillato il telefono.
Be.3SG ring.PP.MSG have.3SG ring.PP the phone.MSG
‘What happened? The phone rang.’

(36) a. Le campane sono suonate / hanno suonato alle sei.
The bell.FPL be.3PL toll.PP.FPL have.3PL toll.PP at.the six
‘The bells tolled at six.’

b. Che è successo?
What be.3SG happen.PP
Sono suonate / *Hanno suonato le campane.
Be.3PL toll.PP.FPL have.3PL toll.PP the bell.FPL
‘What happened? The bells tolled.’

The evidence provided in (35) and (36) is in accordance with the findings of corpus-based analysis of word order in presentational constructions (see Chapter 8). Although activities are not ruled out from presentational focus, the Aktionsart types which include a state (states, achievements and accomplishments) occur far more frequently than activities in this kind of focus structure. It would appear, therefore, that squillare ‘ring’ and suonare ‘emit a sound, toll’ are standardly realized as state-based semelfactives in sentence focus.

In sum, the A vs. E alternation with class (iii) is explained by the double possibility of activity- or state-based construals of some semelfactives. According to the norm, semelfactives are construed as activities in Italian, and thus provide an unmarked PSA to the clause. However, state-based construals are also possible, or required, in specific contexts, in which case the PSA will be marked. The possibility of activity-based or state-based construals is not captured by lexical decomposition, insofar as state-based semelfactives cannot be derived from activity-based ones, but it is nonetheless envisaged in the light of the semantics of the lexical class in question. The lexical analysis of this class, however, is not sufficient to capture the domains of the alternation. Rather, it must be combined with a theory of focus structure, to capture the realization of some members of the class as state-based semelfactives in presentational constructions.

The alternation of A and E with the remaining group of verbs (class (iv)) is traditionally analysed in terms of polysemy (see, by way of example, Lepschy and Lepschy 1988: 146). Some of the lexical pairs of class (iv) lend themselves to an account in terms of coercion (Pustejovsky 1995). Thus, abortire ‘miscarry or terminate a pregnancy’ behaves as a transitive active accomplishment or as an activity, if the second argument is not ex-
pressed. However, an inanimate PSA coerces the accomplishment reading ‘fail at an early stage’ (*Il progetto è abortito ‘the project failed at an early stage’). With other verbs, however, coercion does not suggest itself as an explanation. A case in point is *vivere ‘live’; which can be construed as ‘be alive’, a state (cf. (37)), or as ‘have experience’ or ‘act’, an activity (cf. (38)), but the contextual conditions for each construal are not clear:

(37) a. *I miei zii sono vissuti cent’anni.
   The POSS uncle/MPL be.3PL live.PP/MPL hundred years.
   ‘My uncles (and aunts) lived a hundred years.’
   b. (?)*I miei zii hanno vissuto cent’anni.
   The POSS uncle/MPL have.3PL live.PP hundred years.
   ‘My uncles (and aunts) lived a hundred years.’

(38) a. *I miei zii hanno vissuto qui tre anni.
   The POSS uncle/MPL have.3PL live.PP here three years
   ‘My uncles (and aunts) lived here three years.’
   b. (?)*I miei zii sono vissuti qui tre anni.
   The POSS uncle/MPL be.3PL live.PP/MPL here three years
   ‘My uncles (and aunts) lived here three years.’

Assuming that the example in (37) provides a more appropriate context for the selection of E, and that in (38) a better context for the selection of A, the use of the other operator is, however, grammatical in both contexts.

A comparable case is that of *convenire, which can mean ‘be convenient’ (a state), ‘meet up’ (an accomplishment), or ‘agree that…’ (a transitive active accomplishment). In accordance with the polysemous analysis, the alternation of E and A depends on the existence of multiple lexical entries for each verb, with semantic representations which differ both in terms of Aktionsart and in terms of their constant (i.e., the idiosyncratic part).

In this context, I shall not engage in an in-depth discussion of whether the polysemic perspective should be entirely replaced by a monosemic analysis. A promising monosemic approach is Cruse’s (2004) dynamic-construal approach, which is constructional (see also Croft and Cruse 2004: 109–140).” The approach which I have offered in this work is primarily, though not exclusively, based on a theory of lexical semantics. The crucial point that my analysis has evidenced is that the A vs. E alternations can only be captured by a theory that is ultimately based on Vendler (1967)
and Dowty (1979), with the important addition of the non-Vendlerian class of semelfactives (C. S. Smith 1991). In fact, regardless of the differences between the four verb classes analysed, the A vs. E alternation depends on Aktionsart. With respect to at least three classes, the alternation is clearly explained by PSA markedness. Significantly, these are the three types of alternation for which there is evidence other than controlled speaker judgements.

At the same time, the evidence clearly indicates that a theory of focus structure is needed, since the Aktionsart of the predicate, which depends on the morphosyntactic context in some cases (see class (i) and, based on the judgement of some speakers, class (ii)), is instead determined by discourse in others (see class (iii)).

To conclude this section, I should mention meteorological verbs. In Italian, A and E can both occur with these verbs in virtually free variation. Maiden and Robustelli (2000: 267) have suggested that A focuses on the activity expressed by the verb (Ha piovuto tutta la notte ‘it rained all night’), whilst E focuses on the state which results from an atmospheric event (Oggi è piovuto ‘it has rained today’). This account, however, is based on a tendency, rather than a rule. For instance, è piovuto tutta la notte ‘it has (lit. is) rained all night’ is grammatical. Given that impersonal met-eorological expressions admit the progressive, even in languages which rule it out with stative predicates, the semantic representation proposed in RRG is that of an activity (Van Valin 2005: 63). Thus, the representation of piovere ‘rain’ is do’ ([rain’]). In the light of this representation, meteorological verbs do not have either a macrorole argument or a PSA (see section 4.4 for a discussion of this point). The result is A vs. E alternation, which indicates the impossibility of classification of these structures in the terms of PSA markedness. Note, incidentally, that meteorological verbs provide evidence against a purely semantic analysis of the distribution of the perfective operator, i.e., an analysis that is based on Aktionsart but does not take into account the mapping of semantics with syntax. In fact, this type of analysis would predict that A is the only operator selected with these activities.

### 2.4 Crossdialectal and crosslinguistic variation

The issue of crossdialectal and crosslinguistic variation in the selection of the perfective operator has captivated a great number of linguists (see,
among many others, Aranovich 2005; Benincà 1994; Benincà and Vanelli 1984; Bentley and Eythórsson 2003; Cennamo 1999, 2001a; Cennamo and Sorace 2005; Cocchi 1994, 1995; Kayne 1993; La Fauci 1988; La Fauci and Loporcaro 1989, 1997; Ledgeway 1998, 2000; Loporcaro 1998, 2004; Sorace 1993a, 1993b, 2000, 2004). Broadly speaking, there are two kinds of distribution of perfective ‘have’ and ‘be’ in Romance. I regard them as the synchronic manifestations of two conflicting processes of spread of ‘be’ and spread of ‘have’ which have characterized the history of the perfective operators in the Romance languages (for the comparable advancement of ‘have’ in Germanic, see Rydén and Broström 1987). Accordingly, I refer to them as ESSE-based distribution and HABERE-based distribution. A debated issue in the study of the two types of perfective-operator selection is whether, in synchrony, they can be reduced to one single principle. In the following sections, I shall be concerned, first, with the ESSE-based distribution (section 2.4.1) and then with the HABERE-based distribution (section 2.4.2), and I shall claim that the two kinds of alternation should not be attributed to the same synchronic principle.

2.4.1 The ESSE-based distribution

In a number of Italo-Romance dialects (spoken in Abruzzo, Piedmont, Veneto, Tuscany, Lazio, Campania and Puglia; see Bentley & Eythórsson 2001; Giammarco 1970, 1973; Hastings 1996; Loporcaro 2004; Lorenzetti 1995; Rohlfs 1969: 123–124; Tufi 2000, 2004; Tuttle 1986), ‘have’ and ‘be’ are selected according to the grammatical person of the PSA. A comparable type of distribution of the perfective operator is found in some Catalan dialects spoken in the North of Spanish Catalonia and in French Catalonia (Languedoc and Roussillon) (Arqués i Arrufat 1910; Krüger 1911–1913; Verdaguer 1974). Various kinds of distribution according to grammatical person are attested: according to (i) person only, (ii) person and Aktionsart, and (iii) person, Aktionsart and tense. In some dialects, the grammatical number of the PSA also plays a role, with the selection of the perfective operator only affecting the singular persons or, alternatively, with one operator in the singular persons and the other one in the plural persons.

Selection according to person only is found in the dialect of L’Aquila (Abruzzo), with ‘be’ in the first and second persons, and ‘have’ in the third
person, of both the singular and the plural paradigms. Observe the present perfect paradigm of ‘write’:

\[(39)\] Sò  šcrittu, sci šcrittu, a šcrittu, (L’Aquila)
  Be.1SG write.PP be.2SG write.PP have.3SG write.PP
  sémo šcrittu, séte šcrittu, au šcrittu.
  be.1PL write.PP be.2PL write.PP have.3PL write.PP
  ‘I have written, you have written, s/he has written, etc.’
  (Hastings 1996)

In another dialect of Abruzzo, the dialect of Intro dacqua (Intr.), there is alternation according to person and number, with ‘be’ only in the second person singular:

\[(40)\] Èjj scrétt, sci scrétt, a scrétt, (Intr.)
  Have.1SG write.PP be.2SG write.PP have.3SG write.PP
  èmm scrétt, èit scrétt, óv scrétt.
  have.1PL write.PP have.2PL write.PP have.3PL write.PP
  ‘I have written, you have written, s/he has written, etc.’
  (Giammarco 1973: 71–72)

Numerous patterns of distribution according to person and semantic class of verb or Aktionsart are attested. In some varieties of Sorrentino (spoken in Campania), ‘be’ figures in the third person singular of accomplishments which denote change of state, whilst ‘have’ figures elsewhere (Cennamo 2001a). In Puglia, Altamurano exhibits free variation in most persons, and selection according to verb class in the third person only (Loporcaro 1988: 279–280); in contrast, in a variety of Salentino, ‘be’ occurs in the third person singular of all classes of verbs and in the third person plural of all classes except activities (unergatives, according to La Fauci and Loporcaro 1989: 167).

Selection according to person, Aktionsart and tense is found in the dialects of the Castelli Romani (Lazio). The most widespread pattern involves selection according to person in the present perfect of transitives and of intransitive activities (cf. (41a)), and generalized ‘be’ elsewhere (cf. (41b)) (Lorenzetti 1995: 246–248; Tufi 2000). The following data are from the dialect of Albano:
Perfective operators

(41) a. So mappnato, si mappnato, a mappnato,
Be.1SG eat.PP be.2SG eat.PP have.3SG eat.PP
sémo mappnato, séte mappnato, òf/anno mappnato.
be.1PL eat.PP be.2PL eat.PP have.3PL eat.PP
‘I have eaten, you have eaten, s/he has eaten, etc.’
(Lorenzetti 1995: 248)

b. ëro mappnato, ëri mappnato, ëra mappnato,
Be.1SG.PST eat.PP be.2SG.PST eat.PP be.3SG.PST eat.PP
ërimo mappnato, ërivo mappnato, ërino mappnato.
be.1PL.PST eat.PP be.2PL.PST eat.PP be.3PL.PST eat.PP
‘I had eaten, you had eaten, s/he had eaten, etc.’
(Lorenzetti 1995: 248)

With the class of verbs of controlled motional process (see class (i) analysed in section 2.3), Tufi (2004) has found generalized ‘be’ when the predicate of the clause combines with an argument-adjunct prepositional phrase which denotes the reaching of an endpoint (see the selection of ‘be’ in (42), where the predicative prepositional phrase sopre ‘u tettu ‘onto the roof’ combines with ‘climb’ to form an active accomplishment), and selection according to person in the presence of temporal adverbials of duration like tuttu ‘u giornu ‘all day’ (cf. (43a) and (43b)):

(42) Quillu gattu è sallitu sopre ‘u tettu. (Marinese)
That cat.MSG be.3SG climb.PP.MSG on the roof
‘That cat has climbed on to the roof.’
(Tufi 2004: 134)

(43) a. Oggi so cursu tuttu ‘u giornu. (Marinese)
Today be.1SG run.PP all the day
‘I have been running all day today.’

b. Oggi Pina ha cursu tuttu ‘u giornu. (Marinese)
Today Pina have.3SG run.PP all the day
‘Pina has been running all day today.’
(Tufi 2004: 135)

Thus, the domains of generalized ‘be’ are those which exhibit E in Italian (cf. (42)), whereas the domains of selection by person are those which exhibit A in Italian (cf. (43a) and (43b)).
‘Be’ is the only perfective operator attested in Modern Terracinese (Lazio). However, the emergence of ‘have’ in the third person of a variety of this dialect spoken by elderly people suggests that the present-day situation is the result of a process of generalization of ‘be’, with selection according to person at an earlier diachronic stage (Tuttle 1986: 267–269).

Finally, to my knowledge, in the aforementioned dialects of Catalan, there is selection according to person only, with a tendency for the domain of ‘be’ to be limited to the first person singular:

(44)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sun} & \quad \text{sapiūt} \\
\text{Be.1SG} & \quad \text{know.PP} \\
\text{‘I have known.’} \\
\text{(Krüger 1913: 54)}
\end{align*}
\]

2.4.1.1 The diachronic development of the ESSE-based distribution

Even though the focus of this work is on synchrony, it is worth discussing the diachronic development of the ESSE-based distribution, since it can shed some light on the status of this pattern of distribution vis-à-vis split intransitivity. Since Tuttle (1986), there is widespread consensus among researchers that alternation by person is part of a diachronic process of spread of ‘be’. However, linguists do not agree on the factors which have triggered this process or its chronology. Various hypotheses have been put forward. Giammarco (1973) has proposed that person alternation derived from the use of perfective ESSE with Latin deponents (Proficiscor ‘I set out’ / profectus sum ‘I have set out’, hortor ‘I incite’ / hortatus sum ‘I have incited’), and from the Latin resultative periphrasis with ESSE and a past participle (Cenatus sum ‘I am full as a result of eating’; potus sum ‘I am drunk as a result of drinking’, see English I am drunk). In support of this hypothesis, Giammarco mentions the agreement of the past participle with the PSA, which is found with Latin deponents and in the perfect of some dialects with the ESSE-based distribution. Whilst Giammarco’s hypothesis accounts for the spread of perfective ‘be’, it does not explain why ‘be’ and ‘have’ alternate according to person. This hypothesis also clashes with the view that perfective ESSE spread from Latin monovalent deponents with a theme/patient argument to intransitive predicates with comparable thematic structure (states, achievements, accomplishments), after the loss of transitive deponents (Vincent 1982; Vincent and Bentley 2001). Finally, there is
reason to believe that the ESSE-based distribution in Italo-Romance does not derive directly from Latin, but rather from the HABERE-based distribution. In particular, in a number of dialects (for example, those spoken in the Castelli Romani), alternation according to person only affects intransitive activities and transitive predicates. If alternation according to person had derived directly from the Latin deponents and resultative periphrases, one would not expect it to be constrained to these domains, since these were not the domains of perfective and copula ESSE ‘be’ in Latin. Secondly, the dialect of Terracinese, where ‘have’ surfaces in the third person in the variety spoken by the old generations, and ‘be’ is the only perfective operator in the variety spoken by the young generations, suggest that alternation according to person is the result of the spread of ‘be’ into the domains of ‘have’. Given that ‘be’ was a perfective operator at an earlier diachronic stage than ‘have’ (see Latin ESSE), the process of spread of ‘be’ in Terracinese is conceivable as a late process of replacement of the HABERE-based distribution by the ESSE-based distribution.

A different hypothesis has been put forward by Tuttle (1986). Tuttle has noted that, in a number of dialects with the ESSE-based distribution, the agreement of the past participle with the PSA is found in the same domains as in Italian. This, in his view, is evidence that the ESSE-based distribution derives from a system of selection of the perfective operator which is comparable to the Italian one, rather than from the Latin deponents. In particular, Tuttle proposes that the ESSE-based distribution originated from the dative of interest (benefactive clitic reflexives like *mi sono comprato due libri* ‘I bought two books for myself’), which expresses empathy, and thus, in Tuttle’s view, is principally used in the first and second persons. The correspondent transitive structure (*Ha comprato due libri* ‘s/he has bought two books’) is preferred in the third person, hence the appearance of ‘have’ in the third person of a great deal of dialects with the ESSE-based distribution.

Bentley and Eythórsson (2001) have argued against Tuttle’s (1986) hypothesis, pointing out that the dative of interest is widely used in the third person (*Si è comprato due libri* ‘He bought two books for himself’), and that there is no evidence that it is more closely associated with the first two persons. In addition, Bentley and Eythórsson have pointed out that the agreement of the past participle may well be independent of perfective-operator selection (see also Lorenzetti 1995; Loporcaro 1998). In Bentley and Eythórsson’s view, the rise of the ESSE-based distribution is due ultimately to the homonymous clash between the atonic forms of the
second and third persons of present-tense ‘have’ (a(i), a’ (2SG) ~ a (3SG), see Rohlfs 1968: 272–276). Perfective ‘be’ normally enters the paradigm in the second person, but can also enter the third person first, thus eliminating the clash. This gives rise to the selection according to person. The subsequent process of generalization of ‘be’ can lead to ‘be’ in the first and second persons, and ‘have’ in the third, or to the variety of patterns which were mentioned above. Similarly, the spread of ‘be’ can, but need not, result in the complete loss of the HABERE-based distribution. The situation found in present-day Terracinese represents the endpoint of this process of spread of ‘be’. Supporting evidence for Bentley and Eythórsson’s (2001) hypothesis is provided by the distribution, in a number of the dialects in question, of da (from Latin DE plus AB) and a (from Latin AD) in the future paradigms formed with ‘have’ plus da/a and infinitive. Crucially, da and a differentiate between the second and third persons of the singular. Accordingly, Bentley and Eythórsson claim that both the alternation of da and a in the periphrastic future and the alternation according to person in the perfect are grammatical person marking devices of the dialects in question.

2.4.1.2 The ESSE-based distribution vis-à-vis split intransitvity

I now return to synchrony and try to ascertain whether the ESSE-based distribution can be considered to be a manifestation of split intransitvity, on a par with the selection of the perfective operator in Italian, and also whether both types of selection can be captured by a single rule. By far the most influential unified account of the two kinds of distribution is Kayne’s (1993) decompositional analysis. Kayne proposes that, in Italian, the past participes of A-selecting predicates and E-selecting predicates are embedded in different underlying syntactic structures (see section 2.1). The realization of the operator as A results from a syntactic operation of incorporaion of an abstract complementizer into an underlying auxiliary BE. In order to capture person alternation, Kayne argues that this is the result of the language-specific sensitivity to a feature person of the subject noun phrase. In languages with this sensitivity, structures with third-person subjects undergo the syntactic process of incorporation, and this leads to the surface realization of the perfective operator as ‘have’. It follows that alternation according to person must presuppose a participial structure of the kind that is postulated for transitives and intransitive activities in Italian,
which are also supposedly subject to the incorporation of an abstract complementizer into BE.

As was pointed out in Bentley and Eythórsson (2001: 70–71), Kayne’s (1993) account is problematic in view of the great variety of patterns of ESSE-based distribution which are attested in Italo-Romance. It was mentioned above that, in some dialects, ‘be’ figures in the third person, rather than in the first and second persons. Kayne’s proposal, however, assumes a strict association of the third person with ‘have’, and of the first and second persons with ‘be’. Alternation according to tense is also hard to reconcile with Kayne’s analysis. Consider the dialects spoken in the Castelli Romani (Lazio). Since, in these dialects, alternation according to person only affects the present perfect, whilst elsewhere there is generalized ‘be’, in order for Kayne’s account to be valid, one should assume that the participles of the same types of predicates are embedded in different underlying structures in the present and in the other tenses. This assumption goes against the very essence of Kayne’s account, which is a lexical principle: participial constructions of different verb classes are embedded in different syntactic structures.

The evidence provided by the dialects of the Castelli Romani is particularly significant vis-à-vis the idea that perfective ‘be’ and ‘have’ deterministically correlate with different syntactic structures, whether à la Kayne or of any other kind. Observe the data in (45):

(45) N’ hanno sbocciati tante (rose). (Genzano)
QCL have.3PL blossom.PP.FPL many.FPL rose.FPL
‘Many ne (roses) have blossomed.’
(Tufi 2004: 218)

In (45) the past participle of sbocciare ‘blossom’ agrees with the undergoer, which is subject to ne-cliticization. In Italian, both the agreement of the past participle with the undergoer and ne-cliticization are diagnostics of split intransitivity which will be subject to in-depth scrutiny in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6, respectively. Assuming with Tufi (2000, 2004) that these are also diagnostics of split intransitivity in the dialects of the Castelli Romani, the mismatch between, on the one hand, the agreement of the past participle and ne-cliticization, and, on the other hand, the selection of ‘have’ suggests that ‘have’ does not correlate deterministically with the type of structure which is normally referred to as unergative (Perlmutter 1978, 1989), since this structure does not license the agreement of the past
participle with the PSA or ne-cliticization. Note, incidentally, that, in Italian, sbocciare ‘blossom’ licenses ne-cliticization and requires both the agreement of the past participle with the undergoer and the selection of E (Ne sono sbocciate tante (rose) ‘many ne (roses.FPL) have (lit. be) blossomed.FPL’).

Whereas the distribution of the perfective operators in the Castelli Romani differs from the distribution of their cognates in Italian, both in Italian and in the dialects in question the perfective operators distinguish clauses with a predicate that is transitive, or an intransitive activity, from clauses with a predicate that is an intransitive state, achievement or accomplishment (for the sake of argument, I abstract away from si-constructions and from the fact that, in the dialects of the Castelli Romani, this split only obtains in the present perfect). Significantly, even though the cut-off point between the two classes of predicates corresponds, the distribution of ‘be’ and ‘have’ differs. In the dialects of the Castelli Romani, ‘have’ only figures in the third person of present-tense transitives and intransitive activities, as a result of a diachronic process of spread of ‘be’ into the domains of ‘have’. The synchronic contrast between the dialects of the Castelli Romani and Italian is illustrated in Table 1:

Table 1. The distribution of the perfective operators in Italian and in the dialects of the Castelli Romani (partial overview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transitives and intransitive activities</th>
<th>Intransitive states, achievements, and accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castelli Romani</td>
<td>‘be’ ~ ‘have’</td>
<td>‘be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(present perfect only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>‘have’</td>
<td>‘be’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The co-occurrence of ‘be’ and ‘have’ in the middle column of Table 1 suggests that ‘be’ and ‘have’ are not split intransitivity diagnostics per se, and thus cannot be regarded as mere spell-outs of different syntactic structures. This criticism holds not only for the decompositional analysis, but also for any account which deterministically associates ‘be’ and ‘have’ with different patterns of syntax-semantics mapping (see section 4.2.1).

I shall return in sections 2.4.2.2 and 2.4.2.3 to the theoretical significance of the crosslinguistic discrepancies between the domains of ‘be’ and ‘have’. By way of conclusion of this discussion, I should add that the above findings suggest that the ESSE-based distribution and the distribu-
tion according to PSA markedness are unlikely to be captured successfully by a single rule (Bentley 2002; Bentley and Eythórsson 2001; Loporcaro 2004). Person alternation is a grammatical person marking device. In some dialects, this device distributes according to tense and Aktionsart. The distribution of person alternation according to Aktionsart overlaps defectively with the distribution of A in Italian (see Table 1). This partial correspondence is explained by diachrony: the spread of ‘be’ into the domain of ‘have’ (the ESSE-based distribution) follows historically the establishment of a pattern of perfective-operator selection which is comparable to the one that is found in Modern Italian.

2.4.2 The HABERE-based distribution

I now turn to the HABERE-based distribution and try to ascertain whether the selection of the perfective operators in Italian can be subsumed under this type of distribution, and how it compares to other HABERE-based patterns. I start with a historical overview.

2.4.2.1 The spread and generalization of HABERE

A number of Romance languages do not exhibit two perfective operators, but rather only one: ‘have’.” This situation is the result of a diachronic process of spread of ‘have’ into the domains of ‘be’. Classical Latin only had one perfective operator, ESSE ‘be’, which figured in the compound tenses of the passive voice and of deponent verbs. HABERE ‘have’ occurred in possessive structures where the nominal possessee could be modified by a resultative past participle:

(46) In ea provincia pecunias... collocatas habent.
In that province capital.ACC.FPL invested.ACC.FPL have.3PL
‘They have ... capital invested in that province.’
(Cicero, cited in Vincent 1982: 82)

In a seminal paper on the rise of perfective ‘have’ and ‘be’ in Romance, Vincent (1982) claimed that, while perfective ESSE ‘be’ was being generalized from passives and intransitive deponents to predicates with analogous thematic structure (i.e., intransitive predicates with a neuter – theme,
patient or locational – argument), possessive constructions like (46) were reanalysed as monoclausal perfective constructions with perfective HABERE ‘have’ and a transitive predicate: ‘they have invested … capital in that province’. Having been grammaticalized into a form of the perfective operator, perfective HABERE subsequently spread from transitive to intransitive constructions with an agent or effector argument.

Vincent’s (1982) account of the rise of perfective ‘have’ and ‘be’ has since been challenged on both empirical and theoretical grounds. In particular, Cennamo (1998, 2001c) has discovered late attestations of perfective ESSE in active transitive structures and has claimed that these outnumber the contemporary attestations of perfective HABERE. La Fauci (1997, 2005) has rejected the grammaticalization hypothesis. According to La Fauci, Latin HABERE ‘have’ was an auxiliary, on a par with ESSE ‘be’. ESSE occurred in middle constructions with nominal, adjectival and verbal predicates, whilst HABERE occurred in non-middle constructions with nominal predicates only. I shall not dwell on the details of La Fauci’s (1997, 2005) analysis. It is sufficient to recall that, in La Fauci’s terms, a middle construction exhibits a subject which does not hold this grammatical relation throughout the syntactic derivation of the clause (see section 1.2). Middle constructions with adjectival, nominal and verbal predicates are exemplified by the Italian structures Fi fi è un cane ‘Fifi is a dog’ (nominal predicate), Fi fi è fedele ‘Fifi is faithful’ (adjectival predicate), and Fi fi è scomparso ‘Fifi has (lit. is) disappeared’ (verbal predicate). Non-middle constructions with nominal predicates are exemplified by ho un cane ‘I have a dog’. According to La Fauci, in these constructions, ‘be’ and ‘have’ purely act as verifiers of the subject of the clause by means of agreement. The spread of HABERE to non-middle verbal structures (ho comprato / comprer-ò un cane ‘I have bought / I will buy a dog’) redressed the imbalance between the domains of ‘be’ and ‘have’, and yielded a more comprehensive system of middle vs. non-middle oppositions.

In Vincent’s (1982) analysis, the transition from Latin to Romance involves, as well as change, some degree of continuity. On the one hand, structures like (46) are reanalysed into single clauses, as HABERE is grammaticalized into an operator. On the other hand, the development of ESSE and HABERE as perfective operators is principled in terms of thematic structure. It is not by coincidence that ESSE comes to be used with predicates with a neuter subject and HABERE with predicates with an agent or effector subject. Rather, this distribution ensues from the distribution of ESSE and HABERE in Latin. According to La Fauci’s (1997, 2005)
proposal, there is no structural change in the transition from Latin to Romance. The spread of HABERE from structures with a nominal predicate (possessives) to structures with a verbal predicate (perfective and future) is part of an overall increase of the marking of middle vs. non-middle oppositions by active alignment.

Turning now to the changes which have subsequently taken place in the Romance languages, the distribution of the perfective operators in Italian is a subtype of the HABERE-based distribution because it derives directly from the historical development of HABERE discussed by Vincent (1982) and La Fauvi (1997, 2005). Active vs. non-active marking has extended in the history of Italian, as is witnessed by the generalization of E to all clitic reflexives (some classes of reflexives select A in thirteenth-century Italian, see Chapter 4). Accusative alignment has been preserved, however, in the choice of the PSA as well as, to some extent, in pronominal case and word order (see Chapter 8).

In other Romance languages, active vs. non-active marking has been neutralized to various extents. For simplicity, I constrain the present discussion to perfective operators. An analogical process of leveling has reduced the scope of ‘be’ or even eliminated it. Leveling does not involve structural change, but rather the reduction of the allomorphs of a form, in this case the aspectual operator. Thus, the domains of ‘be’ have been reduced in the history of French, but the two perfective operators still alternate in this language (for a synchronic proposal on their distribution, see section 2.4.2.2). The findings of an investigation conducted on a corpus of data from the twentieth century (Esch 2002) indicate that the retention of the selection of the perfective operator in Modern French is principally due to the French educational policies, and that perfective ‘be’ is slowly but inexorably dying out in the variety called français populaire ‘popular French’, which, for convenience, can be regarded as a low sociolinguistic variety of Modern French.

As a result of leveling, the domains of ‘be’ are narrower in French than in Italian. However, since the selection of the perfective operator in both languages is motivated ultimately by the original spread of active marking, the domain of perfective être ‘be’ in French is consistent with that of E in Italian; specifically, the former is a subset of the latter.

As for the correspondences between the scope of the selection according to grammatical person in the dialects of the Castelli Romani and that of A in Italian (see Table 1), they are explained by the assumption that the selection according to grammatical person (ESSE-based distribution) re-
sults from the spread of ‘be’ into the territory of ‘have’, after the establishment of a system of ‘be’ vs. ‘have’ selection comparable to the Italian one. Put simply, the distribution of ‘have’ and ‘be’ in the dialects of the Castelli Romani displays the encroachment of the ESSE-based distribution on the output of pressure towards active marking.

In Romanian, Sicilian, Standard Catalan, Spanish and Portuguese, perfective E has been ousted from the system. This situation results from the gradual retrenchment and total disappearance of one of the two markers of a functional opposition, i.e., the opposition between marked and unmarked PSAs, not from the suppression of the opposition per se. The modalities of the retrenchment of ‘be’ and advancement of ‘have’ are varied. La Fauci (1992) attributes a crucial role to reflexive constructions in the expansion of the domains of ‘have’ (see Chapter 4). Formentin’s (2001) and Ledgeway’s (2003) studies of Old Neapolitan identify a correlation between the occurrence of ‘have’ and irrealis modality (or mood) in early Neapolitan literature. Ledgeway (2003) points out that this correlation is reminiscent of morphosyntactic phenomena which occur in other languages, grammaticalizing active marking in accordance with modal distinctions.

The fact that historical leveling neutralizes the surface manifestation of a functional opposition, but does not result in any modification to structure itself, is extremely important vis-à-vis the popular view, mentioned in section 2.4.1.2 with respect to the ESSE-based distribution, that ‘be’ and ‘have’ are mere spell-outs of different kinds of syntax. This view is not only widespread among followers of the decompositional approach (Kayne 1993), but also embraced by theories of the semantics-syntax interface which assume that the crosslinguistic mismatches in the selection of the perfective operator indicate that the same semantic classes of verbs map on to different syntactic structures crosslinguistically (Randall et al. 2004; Sorace 2000, 2004). Although the approach taken in this work rests on the analysis of the semantics-syntax interface, my proposal crucially differs from others in that it does not deterministically associate ‘have’ and ‘be’ with different kinds of mapping. In section 2.4.1.2, I provided evidence against this assumption from the dialects of the Castelli Romani. Here I offer comparable evidence from Modern Sicilian. In this dialect, the clitic nni (‘ne’) originates from the quantified argument of those intransitives that require E in Italian (cf. (47) and (48)). Thus, I assume that Modern Sicilian nni is a diagnostic of split intransitivity. The perfective operator is not such a diagnostic, instead, for the reasons expounded above:
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\[(47)\] a. \(Nn’\ annu\ murutu\ assai.\) (Sicilian)
   QCL have.3PL die.PP many
   ‘Many ne have died.’

b. \(*Nn’\ annu\ ballatu\ assai.\) (Sicilian)
   QCL have.3PL dance.PP many
   ‘Many ne have danced.’

\[(48)\] a. \(Molti\ sono\ morti.\)
   Many.MPL be.3PL die.PP.MPL
   ‘Many have died.’

b. \(Molti\ hanno\ ballato.\)
   Many have.3PL dance.PP
   ‘Many have danced.’

The examples in (47) show that, in Modern Sicilian, intransitive structures exhibit two kinds of behaviour as far as \(nni\)-cliticization is concerned, but are homogeneous in terms of the selection of the perfective operator. If we consider both the selection of ‘be’ and ‘\(ne\)’-cliticization to be mere spell-outs of the syntactic structure associated with unaccusativity, data such as the Sicilian ones in (47a) and (47b) appear to be contradictory. The same line of reasoning holds for comparable mismatches found in other Romance languages which have lost perfective ‘be’ but display other manifestations of split intransitivity (see, for instance, the evidence from mainland Catalan cited in Bentley and Eythórsson 2003).

These mismatches call for a modular approach to split intransitivity such as the one adopted in this work. Although split intransitivity is ultimately determined by the semantic divide between classes of intransitive predications (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Perlmutter 1978; Sorace 2000; Van Valin 1990), its various manifestations in individual languages are subject to specific semantic, syntactic and information-structure constraints. Furthermore, diachronic processes can alter or obliterate one or more manifestations of split intransitivity in one language, but not its sisters, yielding dissimilarities between genetically-related languages. In the history of Sicilian, the selection of the perfective operator has been neutralized, as a result of the retrenchment and disappearance of one of its allomorphs. This superficial change has not affected syntax or semantics-syntax mapping, as is suggested by the persistence of \(nni\)-cliticization (for some historical notes on \(nni\)-cliticization see Bentley 2004c).” Insofar as
the perfective operator is concerned, the difference between Italian and Sicilian is thus summarized by the rules in (49a) and (49b):

(49)  
  a. Italian  
      Select A if the clause has a PSA that is unmarked.  
      Otherwise select E.  
  b. Sicilian  
      Select avirì ‘have’.  

2.4.2.2 The systematic nature of variation  

The discussion of the HABERE-based distribution has so far provided an account of the selection of the perfective operator in Sicilian and the other languages which have lost one of the allomorphs of the operator (cf. (49b)). No synchronic analysis has been offered, however, of the selection of the perfective operator in languages which have lost ‘be’ in some of its original domains, but not others. Sorace (1993a, 1993b, 2000, 2004) provides a useful starting point for this analysis. On the basis of the findings of comparative research, Sorace has claimed that crossdialectal and crosslinguistic variation in the selection of the perfective operator is systematic, and can be captured by an implicational hierarchy, which Sorace (2000, 2004) calls the Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy. The Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy is defined primarily by the degree of telicity of the predicate in the clause and of control/affectedness of the argument, and it ranges from verbs which encode telic change to verbs which encode atelic non-motional activity. In all the languages in which the selection of the perfective operator is a diagnostic of split intransitivity, the verbs which denote telic change categorically require ‘be’, whilst the verbs of atelic non-motional activity categorically require ‘have’. The semantic classes on the Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy are organized as follows:

(50)  
      change of location > change of state > continuation of a pre-existing state > existence of state > uncontrolled process > controlled motional process > controlled non-motional process (Sorace 2004: 256).  

The behaviour of these classes of verbs varies across languages. However, if, in a given language, ‘be’ is required by the verbs of a class x, the verbs
which belong to the classes to its left also require ‘be’. In this sense the hierarchy is implicational.

The Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy is illustrated by the comparison of the selection of the perfective operator in Italian and French (Bentley and Eyðhórsson 2003). In Italian and in European French, if the predicate of the clause encodes change of location, it requires ‘be’ (e.g., ‘go’, ‘come’, ‘return’, ‘fall’). Verbs of change of state fall into two subclasses. One subclass requires ‘be’ both in Italian and in French (e.g., ‘be born’ and ‘die’). The other subclass requires ‘be’ in Italian but, in French, is subject to alternation (e.g., ‘change’, ‘(dis)appear’, ‘escape’) or takes ‘have’ (e.g., the non-reflexive realizations of ‘break’, ‘melt’, ‘blacken’, ‘blush’). The following two classes on the hierarchy, denoting continuation of a state and existence of a state pattern with change of state in Italian, but not in French, in that, in this language, they require ‘have’. The last two classes of the hierarchy are associated with ‘have’ in both Italian and French, abstracting away from the alternation of A and E with verbs of motional process (see section 2.3) and the constructions with the suppression of the highest-ranking argument, to which I return below. In Canadian French, the domains of perfective ‘have’ are much wider than in European French (Canale, Mougeon, and Bélanger 1978; Vincent 1982). Significantly, the few remaining verbs which require ‘be’ all belong to the classes which denote change of location and change of state.

Comparable patterns of variation are found in Germanic, where the domain of ‘be’ is smaller in Danish than in German and Dutch, and the variation is faithful to the Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy (Bentley & Eyðhórsson 2003). English used to have two allomorphs of the perfective operator (Rydén & Brorström 1987), and this fact is traceable in nineteenth-century prose. The last attestations of perfective be figure with come and other verbs which belong to the extreme of the Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy that is associated with ‘be’. By way of example, see the following nineteenth-century excerpt drawn from a text outside my primary corpus: “I’m come for the doctor – I want the doctor, Silas had said” (George Eliot, Silas Marner, p. 112). Of course, a purely resultative, adjectival, reading of come cannot be ruled out in this case, as well as, presumably, in many of the examples which are adduced as evidence of the resistance of perfective ‘be’ in telic contexts. In fact, the double possibility of perfective or purely resultative construals could well be a factor in the success of ‘be’ with telic verbs. In the purely resultative construal, ‘be’ is a copula rather than a perfective operator (for resultative past participles see section 7.3).
Diachronic evidence in support of the Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy has been brought to light by Cennamo (2001a), with respect to some southern Italo-Romance dialects, and Castillo Herrero (2002), for Castilian Spanish (see also Benzing 1931 for considerations on the history of the perfective operators in Castilian Spanish which are in agreement with Sorace's hierarchy). In the languages which have undergone the process of leveling discussed in section 2.4.2.1, the selection of 'have' appears to have been conventionalized first with states, and only at a very late stage with the classes that denote telic change of state or location. Perfective 'be' is associated in particular with frequently used verbs such as 'come' and 'go'. Canadian French is a contemporary testimony of the resistance of 'be' with such verbs.

As regards the A vs. E alternations found in synchrony, we would expect them to affect the verb classes which are intermediate on the Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy. This prediction is borne out by the semelfactives which can be construed as states or activities, and by some of the verbs of class (iv) (see section 2.3), for instance vivere 'live', which can be construed as a state or an activity, similarly to some semelfactives. Other data indicate that the alternation can affect verbs which should in theory correlate strongly with either perfective operator. It is sufficient to mention the change of state vs. process alternations (e.g., marcire 'rot'). Sorace (2000) and Cennamo and Sorace (2005) propose that a fine-grained classification of verbs is necessary to account for these facts (see, for instance, the semantic analyses proposed in Bentley and Eythórsson 2003 and Jezek 2003). Indeed, only some change of location or change of state verbs allow A vs. E alternation, that is, verbs of indefinite change, which "express a change in a particular direction without specifying a telic endpoint" (Sorace 2000: 864), for instance 'rise', 'descend', 'wilt', and 'decay'. In the light of the evidence introduced in 2.3, the verbs that Sorace (2000) and Cennamo and Sorace (2005) refer to cannot be gradual-completion verbs, in the sense of Bertinetto and Squartini (1995), since these verbs are telic, whether they denote the attainment of a final goal or, alternatively, the reaching of a further stage in the approximation to the goal. Indeed, I pointed out in section 2.3 that Italian gradual-completion verbs do not exhibit A vs. E alternation.

To return to the issue of the loss of 'be' in some of its original domains, but not others, this historical process yields a synchronic stage in which the selection of 'be' and 'have' is not captured in terms of PSA markedness (cf. (49a)), in that not all marked PSAs are signalled by 'be'. In French,
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structures with a suppressed argument in the highest position of the semantic representation are marked by se and perfective ‘be’, as is the case with Italian, but the markedness of the PSA of most states and some change of state predicates is not indicated by the choice of the operator of the perfect. It would seem, therefore, that diachronic change has neutralized the pattern of distribution which is based on semantics-syntax mapping, viz. on the choice of a marked PSA, and has yielded a more complex rule. This rule contains two different sub-rules, one which is morphological, and the other semantic. The two sub-rules are related in terms of a disjunction, and thus cannot be said to constitute a proper generalization:

(51) Perfective operator selection in French
    Select avoir ‘have’ unless
    a. The construction is marked by se or
    b. The predicate is a telic intransitive.

The rule in (51) is in accordance with the essence of Sorace’s hierarchy, insofar as it indicates that the intransitive predicates which are most closely associated with the unaccusative side of the intransitivity split, and most reluctant to change, are telic. It also indicates that, due allowance being made for se-constructions, Aktionsart is the only factor that is relevant to the selection of the perfective operator in Modern French. Of course, the formulation in (51) does not capture the selection of the perfective operator in all its nuances. In particular, it does not account for the different behaviour of change of location and change of state verbs. Whether this different behaviour is to be indicated explicitly as part of the rule of the selection of the perfective operator is a moot point, though, since some verbs of change of state do not display alternation, whilst others do. Idiosyncratic variation is also attested. To give just one example, French rester ‘stay’, a verb that denotes continuation of state (i.e., lack of change) in Sorace’s hierarchy, selects être ‘be’.

Free and idiosyncratic variation is to be expected in a language which has been subject to substantial leveling. Whereas systems like the Italian one hardly allow any variation, since they are governed by a principle that establishes a clear-cut boundary between the domains of ‘be’ and ‘have’, the systems which result from extensive leveling are characterized by a vast amount of irregularity. This irregularity is particularly conspicuous in sociolinguistic and idiolectal varieties, whilst the educational policies hold on to the prescriptive norm (Esch 2002). In acquisitional terms, one must
envisage a great deal of memorization, as Pinker (1999) claims with respect to the acquisition of irregular forms, such as the irregular past tenses in English. In situations like the one of Canadian French, memorization is presumably the only mechanism at work in the acquisition of perfective ‘be’.

2.4.2.3 Crossdialectal and crosslinguistic variation: Conclusion

I have considered two types of distribution of the perfective operators, the ESSE-based distribution and the HABERE-based distribution. I have claimed that they should not be reduced to a single synchronic principle, despite the fact that, in individual dialect groups, one type of distribution impinges on the other. I have provided both synchronic and diachronic arguments against the view that, across languages, perfective ‘be’ and ‘have’ correlate deterministically with two different types of underlying structure. The actor-undergoer hierarchy is valid across languages, and so are the principles which govern macrorole and PSA assignment. However, only in the case of some languages (e.g., Italian and Sardinian, which will be discussed below) can the selection of the perfective operator be captured in terms of PSA markedness. In other languages, the situation is more complex. In French, Aktionsart still plays a role in perfective-operator choice. However, other factors come into play, including a morphological rule with regards to constructions marked by se. Finally, there are languages in which the perfective operator has lost its diagnostic power with respect to split intransitivity. The crossdialectal and crosslinguistic discrepancies must be captured by the (different) instructions which are included in the language-specific rules for the perfect.

2.5 Complex predicates

I now consider the selection of the perfective operator in complex predicates, i.e., structures in which two predicators or, alternatively, an operator and a predicator join together to form the predicate of the clause. The complex predicates in the examples in (52) exhibit a modal unit:

(52) a. Ha / *È dovuto farlo.
    have.3SG be.3SG must.PP do.it
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‘He had to do it.’

b. Perché ci è andato? Ha / *È dovuto.
   Why LCL be.3SG go.PP have.3SG be.3SG must.PP
   ‘Why did he go there? He had to.’

c. Ha / è dovuto andarci.
   Have.3SG be.3SG must.PP go.LCL
   ‘He had to go there.’

d. Ci *ha / è dovuto andare.
   LCL have.3SG be.3SG must.PP.MSG go
   ‘He had to go there.’

The evidence in (52) shows that dovere ‘must’ does not alter the conditions for the selection of A (cf. (52a)), and requires A when it stands alone (cf. (52b)). Dovere can instead alter the conditions for the selection of E, as is shown in (52c), since andare ‘go’ alone would not allow the free alternation of A and E. Finally, the presence of dovere makes no difference to the selection of the operator, if the modal periphrasis is preceded by a clitic argument of the predicate (cf. (52d)). This is the phenomenon which, since Rizzi (1976, 1982), has been known as restructuring.

With evidence from data such as those in (52c) and (52d), Rizzi (1976, 1982) argued that there exists a rule in Italian syntax which optionally reanalyses an underlying biclausal structure into a simple clause. If there is clitic climbing, that is, a clitic argument of the infinitival predicate precedes the operator, this reanalysis occurs obligatorily. The selection of the perfective operator is evidence that a single predicate has been formed, since the selected operator is the one that is required by the infinitival predicate.

Since Rizzi’s original formulation of the issue, much work on restructuring has been carried out from a variety of theoretical perspectives (see, among others, Aissen and Perlmutter 1983; Butt 1995; Davies and Rosen 1988; Monachesi 1999; Skytte and Salvi 1991). My account of the selection of the perfective operator of complex predicates is based on the RRG theory of predicate and clause linkage which was introduced in section 2.2 (VVLP: 441–492). This approach differentiates between the syntactic units which combine into a complex predicate or clause (juncture) and the type of syntactic link established between these units (nexus). In my analysis, the possibility of placement of a clitic argument of an infinitival predicate before a modal or aspectual unit is primarily a diagnostic of juncture, but it can also reflect the type of nexus established between two units, whereas
the selection of the perfective operator is simply explained in terms of nexus. In fact, the nexus between two syntactic units is sensitive to their respective contribution to the semantic representation.

As well as modal units, I consider two types of aspectual units, which I refer to as class (i) (cominciare ‘begin’, continuare ‘continue’, finire ‘finish’) and class (ii) (andare ‘go’, venire ‘come’, tornare ‘return’, and stare ‘stay’). Class-(ii) units can denote motion or location (Skytte and Salvi 1991: 514), as well as aspect. The selection of the perfective operator, and indeed the morphosyntax of the complex predicates formed with andare, venire, tornare, stare is not sensitive, however, to whether motion / location or mere aspect are encoded, and thus the purely aspectual type and the type that denotes motion or location can be subsumed under one single class, which I refer to as class-(ii) aspectuals. I begin my treatment with this class, which differs from modals and class-(i) aspectuals in terms which are relevant to the selection of the perfective operator.

2.5.1 Class-(ii) aspectuals

Italian andare ‘go’, venire ‘come’, tornare ‘return’, and stare ‘stay’ can join with an infinitive to denote motion or location (cf. (53a) and (53b)) or to modify it simply in aspectual terms (cf. (53b), (54a) and (54b)):

(53) a. Giorgio è andato a prenderlo.
   George be.3SG go.PP.MSG to get.OCL
   ‘George has gone to get it.’

   b. Giorgio è tornato a prenderlo.
   George be.3SG return.PP.MSG to get.OCL
   ‘George has returned to get it.’ ‘George has taken it again.’

(54) a. Giorgio è andato a saperlo.
   George be.3SG go.PP.MSG to know.OCL
   ‘George has come to know about it.’

   b. Giorgio è stato a farlo.
   George be.3SG stay.PP.MSG to do.OCL
   ‘George has been doing it.’

Unlike the other aspectual or modal units, class-(ii) aspectuals have a bearing on the selection of the perfective operator regardless of whether
they are preceded by a clitic argument of the infinitive. This is shown by
the following correlates of (53) and (54), where the clitic argument pre-
cedes the complex predicate:

(55) a. Giorgio lo è andato a prendere.
George OCL be.3SG go.PP.MSG to get
‘George has gone to get it.’

b. Giorgio lo è tornato a prendere.
George OCL be.3SG return.PP.MSG to get
‘George has returned to get it.’ ‘George has taken it again.’

(56) a. Giorgio lo è andato a sapere.
George OCL be.3SG go.PP.MSG to know
‘George has come to know about it.’

b. Giorgio lo è stato a fare.
George OCL be.3SG stay.PP.MSG to do
‘George has been doing it.’

Even though the complex predicates in (55) and (56) are transitive,
since they exhibit two macroroles, the perfective operator is E. This sug-
gests that the PSA is marked, and that macrorole assignment is determined
by the motion / location or aspectual unit alone and not by the other unit or
the whole complex predicate.

Comparative evidence indicates that there is no a priori reason why
class-(ii) aspectxuals should behave as they do in Italian. In a variety of
Ladin, transitive complex predicates with aspectual ‘return’ require perfec-
tive ‘have’, as is shown by the first complex predicate in (57) (ai torna’ a
bètelo in pè, lit. I have returned to put it in feet), which contrasts with the
second one (l’è torna’ a toma’ ‘he has (lit. is) fell down again’) in terms
of transitivity and perfective-operator selection:

(57) Ai torna’ a bètelo in pè, (Ladin)
Have.1SG return.PP to put.OCL in feet
ma ‘l è torna’ a toma’.
but SCL be.3SG return.PP to fall
‘I set him back on his feet again, but he fell down again.’
(Parry 2001)
In Nuorese Sardinian, the selection of the perfective operator is not affected by aspectual *torrare* ‘return’ (cf. (58a)). Contrastingly, complex predicates with motion *torrare* ‘return’ require E (cf. (58b)):

(58) a. *Appo torratu a léghere cussu libru.* (Nuorese)
    Have.1SG return.PP to read that book
    ‘I have read that book again.’

b. *So torratu a léghere cussu libru.* (Nuorese)
    Be.1SG return.PP.MSG to read that book
    ‘I went back to read that book.’

(Jones 1993: 152)

The semantic contrast between (58a) and (58b) suggests that aspectual *torrare* ‘return’ does not predicate or contribute any arguments to the semantic representation of (58a), but rather simply modifies the matrix predicate in aspectual terms. If this assumption is correct, the selection of ‘have’ in (58a) is predicted, since the PSA is an actor, i.e., the first macrorole of transitive *léghere* ‘read’. In (58b), motion *torrare* ‘return’ contributes a predicate and an argument to the semantic representation. The selection of ‘be’ follows from the markedness of the PSA, which, according to the proposed analysis, is the affected actor of an intransitive active accomplishment.

The comparative evidence illustrated above suggests that, to capture the behaviour of the Italian complex predicates formed with class-(ii) aspectuals, it is essential to verify whether the class-(ii) unit is a predicator or an operator that does not contribute to the semantic representation.

To begin with, complex predicates with class-(ii) aspectuals test out as nuclear junctures, in the light of the ungrammaticality of independent negation and modalization of the infinitive (cf. (59a) and (59b), respectively), the position of clitics (cf. (59c)), and, lastly, the control of agreement in *si*-constructions (cf. (59d)):

(59) a. *Carlo è andato a (*non) sciare.*
    Charles be.3SG go.PP.MSG to  NEG ski
    ‘Charles has gone to (not) ski.’

b. *Carlo è andato a (*voler) sciare.*
    Charles be.3SG go.PP.MSG to want ski
    ‘Charles has gone to (want to) ski.’
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c. Carlo lo è andato a vedere.
   Charles OCL be.3SG go.PP.MSG to see
   ‘Charles has gone to see it.’

d. Si sono andati a prendere i libri.
   IMP be.3PL go.PP.MPL to get the books.MPL
   ‘One has gone to get the books.’

As I pointed out in section 2.2, in nuclear junctures, the arguments are grouped together, and thus they occur outside the nucleus within the core (unless they are focused or dislocated, which cannot be the case with clitic arguments). Thus, if a clitic argument of the infinitive is hosted by the aspectual unit (cf. (59c)), the linking must occur at the level of the nucleus, and not of the core or of the clause (Paris 1999; VVLP: 444–445). Internal negation and deontic modals are core operators (VVLP: 40–52). It follows that the ungrammaticality of independent negation and modalization of the infinitive (cf. (59a) and (59b)) further indicates that the two parts of the complex predicate do not constitute independent cores. Lastly, si-constructions are characterized by the suppression of the highest-ranking argument in the semantic representation (see section 2.2). If the two predicates were part of different cores, the suppression of the argument of ‘come’ or ‘go’ would not result in the control of agreement by the second argument of ‘get’. However, if the two predicates are joined at the nuclear level, they can share all their arguments, and the control by the undergoer of ‘get’ is grammatical (cf. (59d)). By way of contrast, observe the behaviour of conative sperare ‘hope’. This verb patterns differently from andare ‘go’ and the other class-(ii) aspectuals in all the relevant respects, and this fact is reflected in the selection of the perfective operator (cf. (60d)):

(60) a. Carlo ha sperato di non dover lavorare.
   Charles have.3SG hope.PP of NEG must work
   ‘Charles has hoped not to have to work.’

b. *Carlo lo ha sperato di fare.
   Charles OCL have.3SG hope.PP of do
   ‘Charles has hoped to do it.’

d. *Si sono sperati di prendere i libri.
   IMP be.3PL hope.PP.MPL of get the books.MPL
   ‘One has hoped to get the books.’

d. Carlo ha / *è sperato di partire.
   Charles have.3SG be.3SG hope.PP of leave
‘Charles has hoped to leave.’

Unlike class-(ii) aspectuals, sperare ‘hope’ forms a core juncture with the following infinitive.

The evidence provided so far indicates that class-(ii) aspectuals link to an infinitive to form a nuclear juncture. Since andare ‘go’, venire ‘come’, tornare ‘return’, and stare ‘stay’ can denote movement or location in space, they can be assumed to contribute a predicate and arguments of their own to the semantic representation of the clause (like motion tornare ‘return’ in (58b) and unlike aspectual tornare in (58a)). Accordingly, the complex predicates under scrutiny can be analysed as structures in which two predicative nuclei combine to form one complex nucleus, i.e., nuclear co-subordinations (see Figure 7). The selection of E in these structures is predicted because the PSA is the affected actor of andare ‘go’, venire ‘come’, tornare ‘return’, or the undergoer of stare ‘stay’, i.e., a marked PSA. Observe that transitivity is irrelevant to the selection of the perfective operator, in that the PSA is marked, and E is selected.

![Figure 7. Nuclear co-subordination: class-(ii) aspectuals](image)

The proposed analysis is somewhat problematic with respect to the complex predicates in which andare, venire, tornare, and stare do not denote motion or location. It could be argued, in fact, that these units do not contribute to the semantics of the clause, allowance being made for their aspectual meaning, and thus that they cannot be predicators. My analysis has suggested, however, that these units contribute at least an argument, and thus they are predicators.

In support of my proposal, I should mention that distributional evidence indicates that andare and venire contrast semantically, even when they do not denote motion, with venire stressing affectedness of the speaker and andare suggesting distance from the speaker (or the argument which con-
tributes the PSA): *lo sono andato / venuto a sapere per caso ‘I came to know about it by chance’, *non so proprio dove sia *venuto / andato a finire ‘I really do not know where it may have ended up’. This contrast corroborates the hypothesis that class-(ii) aspectuals are predicates rather than mere operators. In addition, the Aktionsart tests indicate clearly that the Aktionsart of the complex predicate is determined by the class-(ii) aspectual. In other words the whole complex predicate is telic regardless of the Aktionsart of the second predicate:

(61) Mario lo è venuto a sapere in due minuti.

Mario OCL be.3SG come.PP.MSG to know in two minutes
‘Mario came to know about it in two minutes.’

Sapere ‘know’ is a state and does not alone combine with in-adverbials. The result in (61) thus endorses my analysis of the selection of E, since it must be determined by the aspectual unit, which turns out to be a predicator.

2.5.2 Class-(i) aspectuals and modals

Class-(i) aspectuals and modals exhibit two clusters of properties which co-distribute systematically. This suggests that they can be part of two types of syntactic structure.” To investigate these types of syntactic structure, it is essential to bear in mind that A is the perfective operator which is selected with modals, when they stand alone (cf. (52b)). When a modal unit is followed by an infinitive, but there is no clitic argument of the infinitive preceding the modal, either A or E is selected, the latter operator only if the infinitive is a predicate that requires E. As for class-(i) aspectuals, the selection of the perfective operator is sensitive to the animacy value of the PSA:

(62) a. Lisa ha continuato / *è continuata.

Lisa have.3SG continue.PP be.3SG continue.PP.FSG
‘Lisa has continued.’

b. Il rumore *ha / è continuato.

The noise.MSG have.3SG be.3SG continue.PP.MSG
‘The noise has continued.’
c. *Il suolo ha / è continuato a sprofondare.*
   The ground have.3SG be.3SG continue.PP to sink
   ‘The ground has continued to sink.’

d. *Pietro ha / ?è continuato a star male.*
   Peter have.3SG be.3SG continue.PP to be unwell
   ‘Peter has continued to be unwell.’

The existing treatments of complex predicates do not normally mention
the contrasts exemplified in (62a) to (62d), possibly because of the exten-
sive variation in speaker judgements about complex predicates (Rizzi
1982), but also because the above contrast is virtually neutralized in con-
texts which are marked as irrealis: *Pietro sarebbe continuato a star male se
non si fosse curato* ‘Peter would have (lit. be) continued to be unwell, if he
had not undergone treatment’. This fact suggests that the selection of the
perfective operator is sensitive to epistemic modality in Italian, in accord-
ance with Ledgeway’s (2003) claim about Old Neapolitan, even though
PSA markedness clearly outranks epistemic modality in the determination
of the choice of the perfective operator (see the ungrammaticality of
*Pietro sarebbe continuato a ballare* ‘Peter would have (lit. be) continued
to dance’).

Turning now to the split behaviour of class-(i) aspectuals and modals,
when the choice of A suggests that the PSA is not an argument of the in-
finival predicate, but rather only of the aspectual or modal unit, the
placement of clitic arguments before the aspectual or modal unit is un-
grammatical, whereas independent negation of the infinitive is acceptable:

   Peter LCL have.3SG continue.PP to come
   ‘Peter has continued to come (to it).’

   b. *Pietro ha continuato a venir(ci).*
   Peter have.3SG continue.PP to come.LCL
   ‘Peter has continued to come (to it).’

   c. *Pietro ha continuato a non venire con noi.*
   Peter have.3SG continue.PP to NEG come with us
   ‘Peter has continued not to come with us.’

(64) a. *Pietro (*ci) ha voluto venire.*
   Peter LCL have.3SG want.PP come
   ‘Peter wished to come (to it).’
b. Pietro ha voluto venir(ci).
   Peter have.3SG want.PP come.LCL
   ‘Peter wished to come (to it).’

c. Pietro ha voluto non venire con noi.
   Peter have.3SG want.PP NEG come with us
   ‘Peter wished not to come with us.’

On the other hand, when the selection of the operator suggests that the PSA is the highest argument of the infinitive, clitics can precede the aspectual or modal unit, and the infinitive cannot be negated independently:

(65)  
   a. Paola ci sarebbe continuata a venire.
       Paula LCL be.3SG.COND continue.PP.FSG to come
       ‘Paola would have continued to come to it.’

   b. Paola sarebbe continuata a (*non) partire.
       Paola be.3SG.COND continue.PP.FSG to NEG leave
       ‘Paola would have continued not to leave’

(66)  
   a. Paola ci è voluta venire.
       Paula LCL be.3SG want.PP.FSG come
       ‘Paola has wished to come to it.’

   b. Paola è voluta (*non) partire.
       Paola be.3SG want.PP.FSG NEG leave
       ‘Paola wished not to leave’

The possibility of independent negation of the infinitive in (63c) and (64c) suggests that the two predicates constitute separate cores. However, in these complex predicates, any core operators which modify the first unit also modify the second unit. This fact is illustrated by negation. In Paola non ha continuato a / voluto venire con noi ‘Paola has not continued / wished to come with us’, the infinitive is within the scope of negation. The sharing of operators at the level of juncture indicates that the two cores are not merely co-ordinated, but must be co-subordinated (VVLP: 448–454). This means that the two cores are joined together under a single core (see Figure 8). The selection of the perfective operator in (63) and (64) supports this analysis, since it indicates that the PSA is not provided by the second predicate, but rather by the modal or aspectual unit, which must then be a predicador.
I pointed out above that independent negation of the infinitive is ungrammatical in (65b) and (66b). This fact, together with clitic placement in (65a) and (66a), would seem to indicate that we are faced with nuclear junctures.

\[\text{Figure 8. Core co-subordination: class-} (i) \text{ aspectuals and modals}\]

Only aspect, however, is a nuclear operator, whereas deontic and volitional modality are core operators (VVLP: 40–52). Accordingly, only the complex predicate in (65) should constitute a nuclear juncture. This apparent puzzle is solved as follows. The selection of the perfective operator suggests that the PSA is the argument of the second predicate of both (65) and (66), and thus it can be assumed that the aspectual and modal units do not predicate or contribute arguments of their own to the semantic representation of (65) and (66). A syntactic operator which does not contribute to the semantic representation of the clause is a subordinated operator (VVLP: 457–459). Since aspect is a nuclear operator, the structure illustrated in (65) must be a nuclear subordination. Contrastingly, the structure illustrated in (66) must be a core subordination, given that modality is a core operator. The subordinated operators are not predicates, but pure modifiers of a nucleus (see Figure 9) and of a core (see Figure 10), respectively. I assume that the placement of clitics before the whole complex predicate is allowed independently of whether it is the core or the nucleus that is modified since the operators are subordinated in this case, i.e., they are not predicators:
The systematic co-distribution of the two clusters of properties shown in (63) to (66) is thus the manifestation of the twofold nature of class-(i) aspectuals and modals as predicators or operators. Unlike class-(ii) aspectuals, which invariably contribute to the semantic representation of the clause, class-(i) aspectuals and modals can also be mere modifiers of the predicate, in which case they have no bearing on the selection of the perfective operator.

In section 2.5.1, I pointed out that even though the evidence suggests that class-(ii) aspectuals are predicators, their role in the semantic representation is not always clear, apart from the contribution of an argument. A similar problem arises with the modals dovere ‘must’ and potere ‘can’. Whilst dovere ‘must’, potere ‘can’, and volere ‘want’ pattern alike in constructions with an infinitival predicate, volere ‘want’ figures in a much wider range of constructions than the other two modals. It can license two nominal arguments (Paolo vuole una caramella ‘Paul wants a sweet’). In addition, it joins with a clause, when there is no co-reference between its PSA and the PSA of the following predication: Maria vuole che loro se ne
vadano, lit. Mary wants that they go away. Neither of these constructions is available with dovere ‘must’ and potere ‘can’: *Paolo può / deve una caramella ‘Paul may / must a sweet’, *Maria può / deve che loro se ne vadano, lit. Mary may / must that they go away.

Crosslinguistically, volitional modals behave differently from deontic modals. It is sufficient to think of a number of Italo-Romance dialects which are spoken in Salento and Calabria, where an infinitive can figure after ‘can’ but not after ‘want’ (Rohlfs 1972: 318–332).

These facts might be thought to undermine the unified analysis proposed above for complex predicates with modal units. Indeed, others have claimed that dovere ‘must’ and potere ‘can’ are raising predicates, i.e., operators which do not license arguments of their own (see, for instance, Ledgeway 2000). However, the hypothesis that, unlike volere ‘want’, dovere ‘must’ and potere ‘can’ cannot contribute to the semantic representation or to the valence of the complex predicate does not capture the codistributing properties of these modals. In addition, this analysis does not do justice to the fact that potere ‘can’ and dovere ‘must’ can stand alone (cf. (52b)). Finally, it does not explain why a clitic argument can but need not be hosted by modals and class-(i) aspectuals, whereas it obligatorily forms a cluster with the perfective operator. Contrast *ha visto lo and l’ha visto ‘s/he has seen it’ with può vederlo and lo può vedere ‘s/he may see it’.

Crossdialectal research has demonstrated that Italian dovere ‘must’ and potere ‘can’ behave differently from their cognates in other Romance languages. In Nuorese Sardinian, such modals play no role in the selection of the perfective operator:

(67) a. Appo / *so pòttitu ballare. (Nuorese)
   Be.1SG can.PP be.1SG can.PP dance
   ‘I have been able to dance.’
   b. So / *appo pòttitu andare. (Nuorese)
   Have.1SG be.1SG can.PP MSG go
   Be.1SG have.1SG can.PP.MSG go
   ‘I have been able to go.’
   (Jones 1993: 143)

Interestingly, the Nuorese modals which fail to contribute to the selection of the perfective operator host any clitic arguments of the predicate (for comparable evidence from Neapolitan and Calabrian, see Ledgeway 2000: 156 and Lombardi 1997: 159–160):
Perfective operators

(68)  
\[ \text{Juanne lu devet / potet fakere.} \]  
John OCL must.3SG can.3SG do
\[ \text{‘John must / can do it.’} \]  
(Nuorese)

b. \[ \text{*Juanne devet / potet lu fakere.} \]  
John must.3SG can.3SG OCL do
\[ \text{‘John must / can do it.’} \]  
(Jones 1993: 143)

The clear-cut contrast between Italian and the other languages should not be overlooked. The evidence suggests that Italian \textit{dovere} ‘must’ and \textit{potere} ‘can’ differ from their cognates in other Romance languages. Whilst, in these languages, ‘must’ and ‘can’ do not contribute an argument or the PSA to the clause, Italian ‘must’ and ‘can’ are syntactically more independent than their cognates, and can contribute to the selection of the PSA and the perfective operator. The problem of the exact contribution of ‘must’ and ‘can’ to the semantics of the clause remains unresolved. However, it seems appropriate to assume that these modals can join with an infinitival predicate to form either core subordinations or core co-subordinations, in which case they provide at least an argument to the semantics of the clause.

To conclude, it is worth noting that the proposed analysis of class-(i) aspectuals and modals is supported by evidence from passivization. Whereas class-(i) aspectuals allow passivization (cf. (69a)), modals do not (cf. (69b)) (Aissen and Perlmutter 1983; Cinque 2003; Rizzi 1976):

(69)  
\[ \text{Le case furono cominciate a costruire.} \]  
The house.FPL be.3PL.PST begin.PP.FPL to build
\[ \text{‘One started to build the houses.’} \]

b. \[ \text{*Le case furono potute costruire.} \]  
The house.FPL be.3PL.PST can.PP.FPL build
\[ \text{‘One was able to build the houses.’} \]

Recall that passivization consists of PSA modulation, as well as optional argument modulation. PSA modulation cannot occur across cores, since arguments are bound to their core, at least insofar as the marking of relations is concerned. The contrast between (69a) and (69b) is explained by the assumption that the complex predicate in (69a) is a nuclear juncture, whilst that in (69b) is a core juncture. One point that is often neglected in
accounts of passivization with complex predicates is that this is problematic with class-(i) aspectuals, if the PSA is animate: *?Le persone furono cominciate a disturbare ‘one started to annoy people’. This fact is in accordance with an independent assumption which follows from my analysis: core co-subordination is the preferred option with class-(i) aspectuals when the PSA is animate (see the selection of A in (62d)).

2.5.3 Series of modals and aspectuals

In complex predicates with series of modal and aspectual units, deontic and volitional modals precede aspectual units, in accordance with the hierarchical scope of operators (deontic and volitional modals are core operators, aspectuals are nuclear operators). In addition, class-(i) aspectuals normally only combine with class-(ii) units if these denote motion or location (see section 2.5.1). Otherwise the aspectual contribution of the first aspectual unit may clash with that of the second one (*Dove ha cominciato ad andare a finire? ‘where did it start to end up?’). Regardless of the number of modal and aspectual modifiers which occur in a sequence, the options which are available to these units in terms of nexus and juncture are the same as in complex predicates with two units (see sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.2). Whereas class-(i) aspectuals and modals need not predicate, class-(ii) aspectuals always predicate. Thus, they contribute the PSA of the clause, unless this is provided by a preceding predicator.

In sequences of deontic or volitional modals and aspectuals, the modals can join with the following units to form a core co-subordination (cf. (70a)) or a core subordination (cf. (70b)):

(70) a. Carla ha dovuto cominciare ad andarci.
   Carla have.3SG must.PP begin to go.LCL
   ‘Carla had to begin to go there.’

b. Carla ci è dovuta cominciare ad andare.
   Carla LCL be.3SG must.PP.FSG begin to go
   ‘Carla had to begin to go there.’

In (70a), two cores join under one core node (see Figure 8), and the second core contains an aspectually-modified nucleus. In (70b), there is only one predicate andare ‘go’, and its nucleus and core are independently modified by subordinated aspectual and modal units (see Figures 9 and 10).
If a modal or a class-(i) aspectual is a predicator, it provides the PSA of the clause, regardless of the units that follow:

(71) a. Carla ha dovuto andare a prenderlo.
Carla have.3SG must.PP go to get.OCL
‘Carla had to go to get it.’

b. Carla ha cominciato ad andare a prenderlo.
Carla have.3SG begin.PP to go to get.OCL
‘Carla began to go to get it.’

However, if the modal is not a predicator, and a class-(ii) unit follows, this provides the PSA of the clause obligatorily, with the result of the selection of E (cf. (72a), (73)). The same kind of structure is grammatical with non-predicating class-(i) aspectuals, subject to the animacy constraint discussed in section 2.5.2. If the perfective operator is marked as irrealis, the constraint does not hold (cf. (72b)):

(72) a. Carla è dovuta andare a prenderlo.
Carla be.3SG must.PP.FSG go to get.OCL
‘Carla had to go to get it.’

b. Carla sarebbe cominciata ad andare a prenderlo.
Carla be.3SG.COND begin.PP.FSG to go to get.OCL
‘Carla would have started to go to get it.’

(73) Carla lo è dovuta / *ha dovuto
Carla OCL be.3SG must.PP.FSG have.3SG must.PP
andare a prendere.
go to get
‘Carla had to go and get it.’

Epistemic modals cannot be perfective or contribute to the semantic representation of the clause. The presence of an epistemic modal is thus entirely irrelevant to the selection of the perfective operator:

(74) a. Carla deve avere cominciato ad andarci.
Carla must.3SG have begin.PP to go.LCL
‘Carla must have started to go there.’

b. Carla ci deve essere cominciata ad andare.
Carla LCL must.3SG be begin.PP.FSG to go
‘Carla must have started to go there.’

Example (74a) is a core co-subordination, in which *cominciare* ‘begin’ contributes the PSA of the clause, and thus A is selected. Contrastingly, E is required in (74b), since this is a nuclear subordination, and thus the PSA is the highest argument of *andare* ‘go’, a marked actor.

As is to be expected, class-(ii) aspectuals invariably determine the selection of the perfective operator, when they are modified by it, since they are predicators by definition:

\[(75)\]
\[
a. \quad Carla \text{ deve essere andata a prendere.} \\
\quad Carla \text{ must.3SG be go.PP.FSG to get.OCL} \\
\quad ‘Carla must have gone to get them.’ \\
b. *Carla \text{ deve aver andato a prendere.} \\
\quad Carla \text{ must.3SG have go.PP to get.OCL} \\
\quad ‘Carla must have gone to get them.’ \\
c. Carla li \text{ deve essere andata a prendere.} \\
\quad Carla \text{ OCL must.3SG be go.PP.FSG to get} \\
\quad ‘Carla must have gone to get them.’
\]

To sum up, the complex predicates formed with series of modal and aspectual units corroborate the claim that modals and class-(i) aspectuals can but need not predicate, and that class-(ii) aspectuals are predicators by definition. The PSA of the clause is obligatorily provided by class-(ii) aspectuals, when they are not preceded by another predicative.

2.5.4 *Si*-constructions with complex predicates

The role of reflexive *si* in the selection of the perfective operator of complex predicates differs from that of object clitics (Lepsch and Lepsch 1988: 144). Observe the example in (76a), and its correlate in (76b):

\[(76)\]
\[
a. \quad Avevano dovuto buttarglisi addosso. \\
\quad Have.3PL.PST must.PP throw.DCL.RFL on \\
\quad ‘They had to throw themselves on him.’ \\
\quad (Masina, *Il volo del passero*, p. 15) \\
b. Gli si erano dovuti buttare addosso. \\
\quad DCL RFL be.3PL.PST must.PP.MPL throw on
\]
They had to throw themselves on him.’

As is expected in the light of the findings illustrated in the previous sections, (76b) does not license the selection of A (*Gli si avevano dovuto buttare addosso ‘they had to throw themselves on him’). Interestingly, however, the selection of A in (76a) is not optional, but rather a requirement of this structure (*Erano dovuti buttarglisi addosso ‘they had to throw themselves on him.’). The ungrammaticality of the selection of E in (76a) is not expected in the light of the analysis developed above, since we have seen that there need not be a clitic hosted by the modal in order for this unit to behave as a pure modifier of the following predicate.

With reference to the analysis developed in this chapter, the evidence on reflexives indicates that class-(i) aspectuals and modals cannot behave as pure modifiers of the predicate when this hosts si. The rationale of this requirement becomes clear in the light of the independent assumption that si marks the suppression of the highest-ranking argument in the semantic representation of the clause (see section 2.2 above and Chapter 4). Recall that this suppression results in PSA markedness, i.e., markedness vis-à-vis the default choice of PSA in accusative alignment. The obligatory realization of the class-(i) aspectual or the modal as a predicator results in the availability of an unmarked PSA for the clause, and thus the avoidance of the marked choice. Of course, the unmarked choice is not available when si marks the whole complex predicate (cf. (76b)), indicating that the highest argument of the complex predicate is suppressed. Similarly, the alternation shown in (76) is not available with class-(ii) aspectuals, which obligatorily provide a marked PSA to the clause (Si è andata / *ha andato a lamentare, È andata / * ha andato a lamentarsi ‘she went to complain’), or for si-impersonals, where the suppressed argument is the highest one by definition (Si è cominciato / *ha cominciato a mangiare ‘one has started to eat’).

2.5.5 Complex predicates: Conclusion

As is the case with synthetic predicates, the selection of the perfective operator in complex predicates depends on PSA markedness. Class-(ii) aspectual units (andare ‘go’, venire ‘come’, stare ‘stay’, etc.) are predicators. Unless they are preceded by another predicator, they provide a marked PSA to the clause, which results in the selection of E. Class-(i) aspectuals (cominciare ‘begin’, continuare ‘continue’, finire ‘finish’, etc.) and modals
(other than epistemic) can but need not predicate. When they behave as predicators, they provide an unmarked PSA to the clause, unless the highest argument is suppressed (si-constructions).

2.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have considered the selection of the perfective operator, and I have claimed that, in Italian, this is captured in terms of PSA markedness. The latter is defined with respect to the default choice of PSA in constructions with accusative alignment. This is the highest-ranking macrorole argument in the semantic representation of the predicate, normally an actor. The proposed analysis accounts for the selection of the perfective operator in transitive and intransitive constructions with synthetic and complex predicates, whether or not marked by si, and for the A vs. E alternation with at least three classes of verbs. I have further examined two types of selection of the perfective operator, which are attested crossdialectally and crosslinguistically, the ESSE-based distribution and the HABERE-based distribution. I have claimed that the ESSE-based pattern encroaches on the HABERE-based one in some languages, but the two types are not determined by the same synchronic principle. The HABERE-based distribution is diachronically related to the selection of the operator according to PSA markedness. However, in a number of languages (e.g., French), it can no longer be captured synchronically in terms of PSA markedness, as a result of a historical process of leveling.
Chapter 3
Experiencer predicates

3.1 Introduction

In a typological survey of the marking of the experiencer in European languages, Bossong (1998) has shown that these languages vary considerably in the extent to which they mark overtly the peculiar semantics of experiencer verbs. The participant encoded by the highest argument is subject to experience which originates from the participant encoded by the second argument. In addition, the experiencer is by definition animate, since there cannot be emotions or feelings without an animate perceiver, whereas the provider of the experience need not be animate. These aspects of the semantics of experiencer verbs differentiate them from other bivalent predicates, in particular, prototypical transitives. These are characterized by an action or an event which ensues from an animate participant and affects a participant that is both lower on the semantic-relations hierarchy and unmarked in terms of animacy.

The two strategies which are adopted by European languages to encode the semantic relationship between an experiencer and a theme are called by Bossong generalization and inversion. The former treats the experiencer like the agent of transitive constructions, whilst the latter marks morphosyntactically the semantic difference between experiencers and agents, as well as the peculiar semantic relation between the theme and the experiencer. The strategy which Bossong refers to as generalization fully represents accusative marking, in that it neutralizes the contrast between semantic relations (agent and experiencer) for syntactic purposes (PSAhood) and assigns the role of default PSA to the highest argument. By contrast, inversion runs counter to the default of PSA assignment in accusative alignment, insofar as it realizes experiencer verbs as intransitive predications with an undergoer (theme) PSA. Bossong’s (1998) findings indicate that Italian adopts the accusative strategy approximately twice as much as inversion, and, in this respect, it does not differ substantially from Latin. Accordingly, it would appear that, with respect to the encoding of emo-
tional, intellectual or physical experience, active alignment has not pro-
gressed in the transition from Latin to Italian."

This chapter provides a brief overview of experiencer predicates in Ital-
ian, introducing issues which will prove to be relevant to the analysis of
morphosyntactic phenomena dealt with in following chapters. Building
upon an influential paper by Belletti and Rizzi (1988), I focus on the three
types of experiencer predicate which are illustrated below:

(1)

a. *Ada teme la guerra.*
   Ada fear.3SG the war
   ‘Ada fears the war.’

b. *La guerra spaventa Ada.*
   The war scare.3SG Ada
   ‘The war scares Ada.’

c. *Ad Ada non piace la guerra.*
   To Ada NEG appeal.3SG the war
   ‘War does not appeal to Ada.’

Due allowance being made for the reflexive counterparts of such predic-
cates, which will be discussed in section 4.2.5, the types illustrated in (1b)
and (1c) represent accusative marking and inversion, respectively, whereas
the type exemplified in (1a) can display both generalization, in Bossong’s
(1998) sense, and a kind of marking that runs counter to the default of PSA
assignment in accusative alignment.

3.1.1 Three types of experiencer predicate

An issue which arises in the analysis of the classes illustrated in (1), and to
which great importance has been attached in the literature (see, among
others, Belletti and Rizzi 1988; Pesetsky 1987, 1988; Saltarelli 1992) is the
challenge which they appear to pose to the view that thematic roles and
syntactic relations or configurations are related in systematic ways. This
idea is well-established in modern linguistics. It is sufficient to mention
Perlmutter and Postal’s (1984: 97–100) Universal Alignment Hypothesis,
which states that the initial grammatical relation of each nominal in a given
clause can be predicted from the meaning of the clause, and Baker’s (1988)
Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis, which establishes that theta-
roles are consistently assigned to particular syntactic positions. It has been
claimed that experiencer verbs are problematic vis-à-vis these hypotheses, since the same thematic roles (experiencer and theme) are assigned to different syntactic positions (or relations) in the three structures illustrated in (1). For instance, it is thought that the object of the structure illustrated in (1a) and the subject of the structure in (1b) are both themes. If this analysis were correct, it would support Rosen’s (1984) independent critique of the view that initial grammatical relations of arguments can be derived from their semantic roles or from the semantics of the clause.

I argue that, once the semantics of experiencer verbs is properly understood, they do not challenge the theoretical assumptions on semantics-syntax mapping which are independently made in RRG. Nor do these verbs constitute a problem vis-à-vis the hypotheses put forward by Perlmutter and Postal (1984) and Baker (1988). In my account, the defining property of experiencer predicates is that they have an experiencer argument. However, the three classes differ from each other in that type (i) has an experiencer PSA (cf. (1a)), type (ii) a causer PSA (cf. (1b)), and type (iii) a theme PSA (cf. (1c)). The tripartite classification adopted in my analysis is sketched in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i): experiencer PSA</th>
<th>(ii): causer PSA</th>
<th>(iii): theme PSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amare ‘love’</td>
<td>annoiare ‘bore’</td>
<td>bastare ‘be sufficient’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ammirare ‘admire’</td>
<td>attrarre ‘attract’</td>
<td>capitare ‘happen’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avere fiducia in ‘trust’</td>
<td>colpire ‘impress’</td>
<td>dispiacere ‘regret’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avere paura di ‘fear’</td>
<td>confondere ‘confuse’</td>
<td>interessare ‘interest’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desiderare ‘desire’</td>
<td>disgustare ‘disgust’</td>
<td>mancare ‘be missing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detestare ‘detest’</td>
<td>divertire ‘amuse’</td>
<td>piacere ‘like’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disprezzare ‘scorn’</td>
<td>interessare ‘interest’</td>
<td>rincrescere ‘regret’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invidiare ‘envy’</td>
<td>irritare ‘irritate’</td>
<td>riuscire ‘succeed’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odiare ‘hate’</td>
<td>nauseare ‘nauseate’</td>
<td>seccare ‘bother’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ricordare ‘remember’</td>
<td>preoccupare ‘worry’</td>
<td>toccare ‘befall’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sedegnare ‘scorn’</td>
<td>scandalizzare ‘scandalize’</td>
<td>venir fatto di ‘happen’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| sentire + noun ‘feel...’ | spaventare ‘frighten’ | ...
| sentirsi + adj., noun, adv. ‘feel...’ | sorprendere ‘surprise’ | ...
| temere ‘fear’        | stupire ‘amaze’ | ...
Experiencer predicates

The lists in Table 2 are not exhaustive. Type (i), for instance, also includes a number of verbs which denote cognition, like *conoscere ‘know’* (Bos-song 1998: 260–265), as well as reflexive experiencer verbs which have no non-reflexive counterpart, like *arrabbiarsi ‘get angry’* (see section 4.2.3). What is of interest in this context, however, is that the above groupings represent the three patterns of PSA assignment which I claim to be possible with non-reflexive experiencer predicates: (i) experiencer PSA, (ii) causer PSA, and, lastly, (iii) theme PSA. In the following sections, I justify this claim with further analysis, and I discuss both the accusative strategy and the strategies which run counter to this type of alignment.

3.2 Type-(i) experiencer predicates

Type-(i) experiencer verbs test out as bivalent states which take an experiencer and a theme argument:

(2)  *Paola detesta gli arroganti.*
Paula detest.3SG the arrogant.MPL
‘Paola detests arrogant people.’
*detest* (Paola, arrogant)

The example in (2) does not admit in-adverbials (*Paola detesta gli ignoranti in un’ora ‘Paula detests arrogant people in an hour’) and is fairly incompatible with the progressive aspect (*?Paola sta detestando gli ignoranti, lit. Paula is detesting arrogant people’), thus testing out as a state. The experiencer is the highest-ranking argument in the semantic representation, according to the semantic relations hierarchy based on argument positions (see section 1.4, e.g., (25)). Given that both arguments are available for macrorole assignment, the actor-undergoer hierarchy (see section 1.4, e.g. (8)) establishes that the experiencer *Paola* will be an actor and the theme *gli ignoranti* an undergoer. The resultant construction is transitive. Finite verb agreement indicates that the experiencer is the PSA of the clause. The structure in (2) is clearly unmarked in terms of PSA assignment, and, in fact, the operator that is selected in its perfective correlate is *A (Paola ha detestato tutti quegli arroganti ‘Paola has detested all those arrogant people’)*.

Type (i) also includes a number of complex predicates, for instance a class which is formed with *avere ‘have’* plus a noun:
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(3) Avere caldo ‘feel hot’ (lit. have heat); avere freddo ‘feel cold’ (lit. have cold); avere fame ‘be hungry’ (lit. have hunger); avere paura ‘be afraid’ (lit. have fear); avere ribrezzo ‘be disgusted’ (lit. have disgust); avere sete ‘be thirsty’ (lit. have thirst); avere sonno ‘be sleepy’ (lit. have sleepiness); avere stima (di) ‘admire’ (lit. have esteem of); avere fiducia (in) ‘trust’ (lit. have trust in); avere sdegno (di) ‘disdain’ (lit. have disdain of), etc.

Avere ‘have’ is a predicator in these complex predicates, as it contributes an experiencer to the semantic representation (recall that the analysis of complex predicates in Chapter 2 suggested that predicators may simply provide an argument to the semantics of the clause).

Evidence that it is avere ‘have’ that provides the experiencer comes from the contrast between the complex predicates with avere illustrated in (3) and correlated periphrases with fare ‘make’: fare paura ‘scare’, fare ribrezzo ‘disgust’, fare schifo ‘disgust’, etc. In the counterparts formed with fare, which are only available for some of the complex predicates with avere ‘have’, the highest semantic argument is not an experiencer, but rather a causer. The experiencer, on the other hand, is expressed as a non-macrorole dative argument (Quel rumore ha fatto paura al bambino ‘that noise scared the child – lit. to the child’).

The argument which is realized by the postverbal noun in the predicates listed in (3) serves to characterize the state of affairs denoted by the predicate. Usually, this role is played by inherent arguments, which are not assigned a macrorole (VVLP: 147–150, see section 2.2). In fact, like canonical inherent arguments, the second argument of the predicates in question is not affected in semantic terms. In addition, it rejects passivization (cf. (4a)) and clefting (cf. (4b)). However, this argument does not behave consistently as an inherent argument, in that it can be quantified and it allows ne-cliticization (cf. (4c)):

(4) a. *Paura è stata avuta...
   Fear.FSG be.3SG be.PP.FSG have.PP.FSG
   ‘Fear was felt…’
   b. *?È paura che ho.
   Be.3SG fear that have.1SG
   ‘It is fear that I have.’
Finally, the complex predicates in (3) require A in the perfect, and this would seem to indicate that they are transitive, i.e., they have both an actor and an undergoer:

(5)  *Paola ha avuto paura del cane.*

Paula have.3SG have.PP fear of.the dog

‘Paula (has) felt scared by the dog.’

We are thus faced with conflicting evidence. A clue to the solution of this problem is offered by the comparison of the predicates in (3) with quasi-synonymous predicates which are formed with the auxiliary *essere* ‘be’ and an adjective:

(6)  *Avere caldo* ‘be hot’ vs. *essere accaldati* ‘feel hot (as a result of…);
    avere freddo ‘feel cold’ vs. *essere infreddoliti* ‘feel chilled (as a result of…);
    avere fame ‘be hungry’ vs. *essere affamati* ‘be starving’;
    avere paura ‘be afraid’ vs. *essere impauriti* ‘be frightened’;
    avere sete ‘be thirsty’ vs. *essere assetati* ‘be parched’;
    avere sonno ‘be sleepy’ vs. *essere assonnati* ‘be sleepy’;
    avere fiducia (in) ‘trust’ vs. *essere fiduciosi (in)* ‘be trustful (in a particular situation)’, etc.

The periphrases with ‘be’ which are listed in (6) denote resultant or contingent states, i.e., stage-level states (Carlson 1977, see section 2.3). In RRG, such states are represented as monovalent predicates with a patient argument which is assigned the macrorole undergoer and serves as the marked PSA of the clause (Schwartz 1993; VVLP: 103):

(7)  *Paola è stata fiduciosa.*

Paula be.3SG be.PP.FSG trustful.FSG

‘Paola is / has been trustful.’

**trustful’ (Paola)**

The phrases with *essere* ‘be’ are of interest to us since they constitute quasi-synonymous counterparts of the complex predicates listed in (3), but they contrast with them in terms of semantics-syntax mapping: unlike the
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phrases with ‘have’, those with ‘be’ have a marked PSA. It appears, therefore, that type-(i) experiencer predicates display two options for the encoding of physical feelings and emotional or intellectual experience: one that is faithful to the predominant accusative alignment of Italian, exemplified by the complex predicates formed by ‘have’ plus a noun, and another one which is not faithful to accusative alignment, exemplified by the periphrases formed with ‘be’ plus an adjective. It is interesting that the periphrases which require a marked PSA denote stage-level states, in accordance with the tendency for such states to be encoded as unaccusative (see section 2.3).

The selection of the perfective operator suggests that the ‘have’-plus-noun phrases have an actor and an undergoer. At the same time as it constitutes an argument, the undergoer serves to characterize the state of affairs denoted by the predicate. The conflict between the argumental and predicative functions of this component of the semantics of the predicates in question results in the split morphosyntactic behaviour seen above: although the argument can be ne-cliticized, it cannot be clefted or serve as the PSA of the clause. A semantic representation which indicates that the lowest argument is a predicator is the following: have´ (x, [pred´]). This is based on Schwartz’s (1993) analysis of predicative arguments in nominal and adjectival constructions with a copula (see section 5.6). Unlike the predicative argument of other predicates (see for instance the predicative argument of costare ‘cost’ discussed in section 2.2, e.g. (8b)), in this case, pred´ serves both as a predicator and as the undergoer in semantics-syntax mapping. The highest argument is an actor, whilst any further arguments of pred´ will not be macroroles. See the semantics of avere paura dei cani ‘have fear of dogs’: have´ (x, [fear.of´ (cani)]), where x and fear.of´ are macroroles, but cani ‘dogs’ is not.

Type-(i) experiencer predicates include other complex predicates formed with a verbal and a nominal predicator: sentire plus noun (sentire caldo ‘feel hot’, lit. feel heat, sentire freddo ‘feel cold’, lit. feel cold, etc.), as well as a number of comparable periphrases (provare ribrezzo ‘be disgusted’, lit. feel disgust, provare rabbia ‘be angry’, lit. feel anger, nutrire rancore ‘hold a grudge’, etc.). Observe the examples below:

(8) a. Sento molto freddo.
    Feel.1SG much cold
    ‘I am very cold.’
b. Provo ribrezzo per lui.
   Feel.1SG disgust for him
   ‘I am disgusted with him.’

These predicates require the same analysis as those formed with avere ‘have’ plus a noun. In fact, whilst they allow the quantification and ne-cliticization of the argument provided by the noun, they ban its passivization. In the perfect, they require A: ho sentito molto freddo ‘I (have) felt very cold’. The semantic representation of these predicates is thus as follows: feel’ (x, [cold’]) (VVLP: 103, 156). The argument x is the actor and the unmarked PSA of the clause, whilst the predicative theme is the undergoer.

Whereas the phrases mentioned so far provide evidence that the theme has both argumental and predicative function, there is a further subclass of type-(i) experiencer predicates which does not provide any such evidence. These are predicates formed with reflexive sentirsi plus a non-verbal component: sentirsi bene / male / triste / (uno) stupido ‘feel well, unwell, sad, (a) stupid (one)’:

(9) Dario si sente uno stupido.
   Dario RFL feel.3SG a stupid
   ‘Dario feels stupid.’

Not only does the theme of (9) disallow passivization, but it also bans ne-cliticization. The sentence below is acceptable on the reading ‘of stupid people, one has heard one’, since sentire can also mean ‘hear’, but not on the intended reading:

(10) *Stupido, se ne è sentito uno.
    Stupid.MSG RFL.QCL be.3PL feel.PP.MSG one
    ‘Stupid one, he felt (i.e., thought he was) one’ (intended reading)

In the light of the analysis of ‘feel’ introduced above, the semantic representation of these reflexive verbs must be as follows: feel’ (x, [pred’]) [Ø] (the symbol [Ø], which marks a particular class of reflexives, can be disregarded for the moment). In this case, however, the theme pred’ only has a predicative function, and thus the higher argument is assigned the macrorole undergoer. Predictably, the perfective operator required by this construction is E (Dario si è sentito uno stupido ‘Dario has felt stupid’).
Any further argument will be an argument of the embedded predicate and will not be a macrorole:

(11) Dario si sente arrabbiato con Daniela.
    Dario RFL feel.3SG angry with Daniela
    ‘Dario feels angry with Daniela.’
    feel´(Dario, [angry.at´(Daniela)] [Ø]

Unlike the complex predicates formed with avere ‘have’ and sentire ‘feel’ plus a noun, those formed with reflexive sentirsi plus a non-verbal component constitute a marked strategy vis-à-vis accusative alignment.

The analysis proposed above is problematic insofar as the nominals which follow avere ‘have’ and sentire ‘feel’ with both predicative and argumental function are not represented differently from the non-verbal component of the predicates formed with sentirsi ‘feel (refl.)’, which only has a predicative function. I leave this technical aspect of the analysis aside. An interesting result which will emerge from the analysis conducted in following chapters is that only nominal predicates which join with another predicator can receive a macrorole and exhibit some of the behaviour which is typical of arguments. Contrastingly, nouns which contribute the only predicator in the clause do not behave as arguments. Thus, ne-cliticization is not admitted with the second argument of copular constructions with ‘be’ and a nominal predicate (*Ne sono studenti due ‘two ne are students’).

3.3 Type-(ii) experiencer predicates

Unlike type-(i) experiencer verbs, which are stative, type-(ii) experiencer verbs admit an inchoative or telic reading (cf. (12a)), as well as a stative one (cf. (12b)):

(12) a. Quando lo vedo mi spavento.
    When OCL see.1SG RFL frighten.1SG
    ‘I get frightened when I see him.’
    b. Si spaventa dei gatti.
    RFL fear.3SG of.the cats
    ‘S/he is afraid of cats.’
Type-(ii) verbs also differ from type (i) in that they admit causative paraphrases, and thus they require a causative component in their semantics (Everaert 1986: 113; Grimshaw 1990: 22–30; Kenny 1963; Pesetsky 1987: 134, 1988; Ruwet 1972; Saltarelli 1992). By way of example, see the pair of sentences below, where (13b) is a paraphrase of (13a):

(13) a. La TV irrita Luca.
    The TV irritate.3SG Luke
    ‘TV irritates Luke.’

    b. La TV fa sì che Luca si irriti.
    The TV make.3SG so that Luke RFL irritate.3SG.SUBJ
    ‘TV causes Luke to feel irritated.’

Since Postal (1970: 41–44), it has been known that, in English, the verbs which I refer to as type-(ii) experiencer verbs have an adjectival counterpart in –ing, which takes a prepositional phrase with to, and another counterpart in –ed, which takes a prepositional phrase with at, of, by, about, or with:

(14) a. TV is irritating to Luke / Luke is irritated at TV.

    b. TV is boring to Luke / Luke is bored with TV.

    c. TV is amusing to Luke / Luke is amused with / at / by TV.

The correspondence between type-(ii) experiencer verbs and Postal’s pairs of predicates further supports the view that type-(ii) experiencer verbs are causative; the first argument of clauses with an adjectival predicate in –ing plays the semantic role of a causer, whereas the second argument of such clauses, and the first argument of clauses with a predicate in –ed, is a causee.

In accordance with the causative analysis, it must be assumed that the arguments of type-(ii) verbs do not appear in the same semantic positions as the arguments of type (i). Rather, the highest argument is a causer. As for the other argument, the English paraphrases in (15) suggest that this is either the only argument of a resultant state or the first argument of feel:


The semantics of type-(ii) experiencer verbs can thus be represented as follows:

\[(16) \quad [[do´(x, Ø)] \text{CAUSE} [\text{BECOME pred´}(y)]] \]
\[(16) \quad [[do´(x, Ø)] \text{CAUSE} [\text{feel´}(y, [\text{pred´}])]] \]

Any further argument must be realized as a non-macrorole argument of the second predicate:

\[(17) \quad I \text{ giornali aizzavano } i \text{ cittadini contro il governo.}
The papers enrage.3PL.PST the citizens against the government
\quad ['The newspapers enraged the citizens against the government.']
\quad [[do´(giornali, Ø)] \text{CAUSE} [\text{feel´}(cittadini, [\text{angry.at}´(governo)])]] \]

In the light of the semantic difference between type (i) and type (ii), it is predicted that the argument which has been claimed to play the same semantic role in pairs like Ada teme la guerra ‘Ada fears war’ and la guerra spaventa Ada ‘war frightens Ada’ should be treated differently in the syntax of the two structures. The experiencer is the highest argument in the semantics of type (i) (Ada teme la guerra ‘Ada fears war’), and thus it serves as the default PSA of the clause. Contrastingly, the experiencer of type (ii) (La guerra spaventa Ada ‘war frightens Ada’) is the second argument in the semantic representation. It is assigned the macrorole undergoer, and, in active non-reflexive predications, it is realized syntactically as the direct object. The default PSA of this structure is a causer.

In addition to PSA assignment, the proposed analysis captures other syntactic contrasts between the two classes under examination. First, the different behaviour of type (i) and type (ii) vis-à-vis syntactic causativization (Belletti and Rizzi 1988: 303) depends on the absence or presence of a causer in their respective representations:

\[(18) \quad \text{a. } \text{Questo lo ha fatto temere (a / da Mario).}
This OCL have.3SG make.PP.MSG fear to / by Mario
\quad ['This made Mario fear him.]
\quad \text{b. } \text{Questo lo ha fatto preoccupare (*a / *da Mario).}
This OCL have.3SG make.PP.MSG worry (*to / *by Mario)
\quad ['This made him feel worried (about Mario).']\]
There is no causer in the semantics of type-(i) verbs, and thus they can be embedded in a fare-causative independently of the realization of their highest argument. Observe the semantic representation of (18a), where the fare-causer (questo ‘this’) and the experiencer of temere ‘fear’ (Mario) are specified in different positions:

(18) a. [[do’ (questo, Ø)] CAUSE [fear’ (Mario, 3SG)]]

In syntax, the fare-causer is the PSA, whereas the highest-ranking argument of the embedded predicate (Mario), is realized as a dative argument or the extra-core actor of a passive, in accordance with a causative pattern which is widespread crosslinguistically (Comrie 1981a; 1985: 338–342).

Type-(ii) experiencer verbs can also be embedded in fare-causatives. However, their causer must coincide with that of fare, otherwise two causers compete for the same semantic position. Accordingly, the options in (19a) and (19b) are both grammatical, but the corresponding construction with two causers is not (cf. (18b)):

(19) a. Questo lo ha fatto preoccupare.
   This OCL have.3SG make.PP.MSG worry
   ‘This made him worry.’
   [[do’ (questo, Ø)] CAUSE [feel’ (3SG, [worried’])]]

   b. Mario lo ha fatto preoccupare.
   Mario OCL have.3SG make.PP.MSG worry
   ‘Mario made him worry.’
   [[do’ (Mario, Ø)] CAUSE [feel’ (3SG, [worried’])]]

The parallel behaviour of causative predicates other than experiencer verbs supports the suggested analysis (*Questo lo ha fatto uccidere / bruciare da Mario, lit. this made him / it being killed / burned by Mario).

Secondly, passivization is problematic with type-(ii) verbs (Belletti and Rizzi 1988: 303), in particular with preoccupare ‘worry’, but this is not the case with type (i) (cf. (20c)):

(20) a. *Livia è (stata) preoccupata dai compagni.
   Livia be.3SG be.PP.FSG worry.PP.FSG by.the classmates
   ‘Livia is / has been worried about her classmates.’
b. ?Livia è (stata) spaventata dai compagni.
   Livia be.3SG be.PP.FSG scare.PP.FSG by.the classmates
   ‘Livia is / has been scared by her classmates.’

c. Livia è (stata) amata dai compagni.
   Livia be.3SG be.PP.FSG worry.PP.FSG by.the classmates
   ‘Livia is / has been loved by her classmates.’

Recall that passivization consists of PSA modulation and, optionally, argument modulation. The principal reason why it is problematic with type-(ii) experiencer verbs is that, in the stative reading, the lowest argument also serves as a predicate, in accordance with the RRG assumption, based on Schwartz (1993), that \( \text{pred} \) is an argument with predicative function in the representation \( \text{feel}^{x}[, \text{pred}] \). As a result of its predicative function, this argument is not available for passivization (see the behaviour of type-(i) experiencer predicates formed with \( \text{avere} \) ‘have’ or \( \text{sentire} \) ‘feel plus a noun’).

Type (ii) also admits a telic reading, however, and this should allow passivization, since, in this reading, the lowest argument is available for modulation (see \( y \) in …CAUSE \[ \text{BECOME pred}^{y} \]). In fact, only a subset of type-(ii) experiencer verbs bans passivization altogether, \( \text{preoccupare} \) ‘worry’ being a case in point (cf. (20a)).

Not only does \( \text{preoccupare} \) ‘worry’ stand out vis-à-vis passivization, but it also behaves differently from other type-(ii) verbs with respect to the possibility of an arbitrary reading of its highest argument. This reading is said to arise in constructions where an unspecified third-person plural PSA can be identified with a PSA that is specified in the neighbouring, usually immediately following, context. The arbitrary reading is banned from the perfect with \( \text{preoccupare} \) ‘worry’ (cf. (21)) and may not arise in other contexts (cf. (22)):

(21) \( \text{Hanno spaventato / *preoccupato i vicini.} \)
   Have.3PL scare.PP worry.PP the neighbours
   \( \text{Dev’ essere stato un ladro.} \)
   Must.3SG be be.PP.MSG a thief.MSG
   ‘Somebody scared / worried our neighbours. It must have been a thief.’
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(22) Qui preoccupano / spaventano / offendono gli americani.
Here worry.3PL scare.3PL offend.3PL the Americans
‘Here people worry / scare / offend the Americans.’

In rejecting the arbitrary reading of its PSA, preoccupare ‘worry’ behaves like a great deal of unaccusatives, which ban the arbitrary reading of their direct argument, particularly in contexts which favour a stage-level interpretation, for instance the perfect (Cinque 1988):

(23) Sono arrivati a casa mia. *Dev’ essere Leo.
Be.3PL arrive.PP.MPL to home POSS must.3SG be Leo
‘Somebody arrived at my place. It must be Leo.’

Perfective aspect contributes to the stage-level construal of predicates. In fact, in section 6.4.1, I shall provide evidence that it is a factor in the stage-level interpretation of non-causative states. By way of example, note that the stative predicate buono means ‘good-natured’ in the present and ‘well-behaved’ in the perfect. Accordingly, in the present, buono denotes an individual-level property, whilst in the perfect it denotes a stage-level state.

The resistance of the highest argument of preoccupare ‘worry’ to an arbitrary interpretation in the perfect is likely to depend on a property which makes it similar to the group of unaccusatives mentioned above, including non-causative states (e.g., buono ‘good-natured’ or ‘well-behaved’). I argue that this property regards the causer of preoccupare ‘worry’, which is an effector, whilst the causer of other type-(ii) verbs, for instance offendere ‘offend’, can be an effector or an agentive instigator. On the semantic-relations hierarchy, effectors are closer to locations, themes or patients (the semantic relations that non-causative states can take) than agents are.

Supporting evidence for the different nature of the causer of preoccupare ‘worry’ and that of other type-(ii) verbs, for instance offendere ‘offend’, is provided by the incompatibility of preoccupare, and the compatibility of offendere, with expressions of intentionality:

(24) Ti ho *?preoccupato / offeso apposta.
OCL have.1SG worry.PP offend.PP deliberately
‘I made you worry / I offended you deliberately.’
Preoccupare ‘worry’ must be embedded in a fare-causative, in order to combine with expressions of intentionality:

(25) Ti ho fatto preoccupare apposta.
OCL have.1SG make.PP worry deliberately
‘I made you worry deliberately.’

Observe further the contrast illustrated in (26), which indicates that effectors resist an arbitrary interpretation, at least in stage-level contexts, whilst agentive instigators do not:

(26) Hanno offeso Giuseppe.
Have.3SG offend.PP Joseph
*Devono essere state le immagini in TV. /
Must.3PL be been.PP.FPL the image.FPL in TV
Dev’ essere stata la sua fidanzata.
Must.3SG be been.PP.FSG the POSS fiancé.FSG
‘Somebody offended Joseph. It must have been the images on TV. /
It must have been his fiancé.’

In sum, it would seem that preoccupare ‘worry’ rejects an arbitrary interpretation of its highest argument because this is by default an effector. The behaviour of preoccupare ‘worry’ with respect to passivization must also be related to the semantics of the highest argument. Being an effector, this argument tends to be encoded as the non-macrorole adjunct of a resultative construction, rather than as the canonical da-actor of a passive:

(27) Livia è preoccupata *da / per gli esami.
Livia be.3SG worry.PP.FSG by for the exams
‘Livia is worried about the exams.’

A similar analysis would seem to hold for the English counterparts of type-(ii) predicates, in the light of the behaviour of the adjectival forms in –ed discussed by Postal (1970) (cf. (14)). In the last analysis, type-(ii) verbs are relatively incompatible with passivization because they can receive a stative reading which disallows PSA modulation. In addition, some of them, for instance preoccupare ‘worry’, tend to reject an agentive causer, which results in further incompatibility with the canonical passive with a da-actor.
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(Livia è (stata) *preoccupata / offesa dai compagni ‘Livia is / has been worried about / offended by her classmates’).

The experiencer predicates with fare ‘make’ which were introduced in section 3.2 are worthy of mention in this context:

(28) Quel rumore ha fatto paura al bambino.

That noise have.3SG make.PP fear to.the child
‘That noise scared the child.’

The highest argument of these predicates (rumore ‘noise’ in (28)) is a causer. This argument serves as the PSA, and thus these are type-(ii) experiencer predicates. In these structures, the experiencer is realized as a non-macrorole argument (see al bambino ‘to the child’ in (28)), and there is a further argument, the theme, (see paura ‘fear’) which would seem to be an inherent argument, but tests out as a macrorole argument. In particular, it can be ne-cliticized:

(29) Paura, me ne ha fatta molta.

Fear.FSG DCL QCL have.3SG make.PP.FSG much.FSG
‘It scared me a lot.’

The theme is thus a predicate-argument, in the sense discussed above with reference to the type-(i) predicates formed with avere ‘have’ and sentire ‘feel’ plus a noun. Incidentally, Alba-Salas (2004: 300) has brought to light evidence which suggests that, in the predicates in question, the experiencer is licensed by fare, on a par with the causer. In fact, it cannot be cleft together with the theme-predicate as one constituent. This fact indicates that fare ‘make’ is a predicator in these structures:

(30) *È paura a Ali che Mark fa.

Be.3SG fear to Ali that Mark make.3SG
‘What Mark does is to frighten Ali.’

(Alba-Salas 2004: 300)

To conclude this treatment of type-(ii) experiencer verbs, it is necessary to mention the members of this class which denote events with either psychological or physical consequences: attrarre ‘attract’ and colpire ‘impress or strike’ are prime examples of this subclass. These events are not necessarily encoded causatively across languages. For instance, close equiva-

In Italian, the verbs with both psychological and physical readings constitute a special subclass of type (ii). They are obligatorily telic and punctual: le tue parole lo hanno colpito / un sasso lo ha colpito (*in / *per dieci minuti ‘your words impressed him / a stone hit him (in / for ten minutes)’.

Accordingly, they do not disallow passivization:

(31) Leo è stato colpito da un sasso.
Leo be.3SG be.PP.MSG hit.PP.MSG by a stone
‘Leo was hit by a stone.’

Note, however, that, in the passive with essere ‘be’, the physical reading of the predicate is the norm (cf. (32a)), whereas a comparable, resultative, structure with rimanere ‘remain’ lends itself to the psychological reading (cf. (32b)):

(32) a. Leo è stato colpito da Marco.
Leo be.3SG be.PP.MSG hit.PP.MSG by Mark
‘Leo was hit by Mark.’

b. Leo è rimasto colpito da Marco.
Leo be.3SG remain.PP.MSG hit.PP.MSG by Mark
‘Leo was impressed by Mark.’

The default interpretation of (32a) depends on the fact that the causer of psychological colpire ‘strike’ is an effector, on a par with the causer of preoccupare ‘worry’.

The verbs under discussion can be embedded under causative fare. The resultant structure, however, requires the physical reading:

(33) Mario lo ha fatto colpire (da / a Luca).
Mario OCL have.3SG make.PP.MSG hit by / to Luke
‘Mario made someone / Luca hit him.’

Since fare-causatives like (33) are compatible with a da-actor, we are faced with a puzzling contrast between this subclass and the rest of type-(ii) experiencer verbs, which do not admit a modulated causer in a da-phrase. Clearly, the da/a adjunct of (33) cannot be a causer, since, if this were the
case, this causer would compete with the fare-causer for the same semantic position. It follows that the physical reading of the verbs in question is not causative, but rather a non-causative active accomplishment:

\[(34)\] Luca colpisce Giorgio.
Luke hit.3SG Giorgio

‘Luke hits George.’
\[d\]’ (Luca, [hit’ (Luca, Giorgio)]) & INGR hit’ (Giorgio)

The psychological readings, instead, are causative, as is suggested by the fact that they are not found in the structure in (33) and they admit causative paraphrases:

\[(35)\] Questo fa sì che lui rimanga colpito.
This make.3SG so that he remain.3SG.SUBJ impress.MSG

‘This causes him to be(come) impressed.’
(not ‘This causes him to be hit’).
\[d\]’ (questo, Ø) CAUSE [INGR impressed’ (lui)]

We have thus seen that Italian colpire and attrarre are causative achievements in the psychological reading (‘impress’ and ‘attract’, respectively), and non-causative active accomplishments in the non-psychological reading (‘hit’ and attract’, respectively). The contrast between the two readings explains their behaviour under causative fare.

Whilst in Italian only the physical reading of these predicates is not causative, in other languages they are not causative altogether. To return to Dutch opvallen ‘impress, strike’, Hoekstra (1984: 185) has proposed that it requires inversion (Harris 1984a, b; Perlmutter 1979, 1984). Similarly, Zaenen (1993: 143) lists opvallen ‘impress’ among the Dutch experiencer verbs whose subject is neither an experiencer (see type (i) in Italian) nor a causer (see type (ii)). Following Van Valin’s (1990) account of inversion, I propose that the theme is the only macrorole in the clause, an undergoer, whereas the other argument is an experiencer which is not assigned a macrorole. The same analysis holds for German auffallen ‘impress, strike’:

\[(36)\] a. Die fout is mij opgevallen. (Dutch)
That mistake be.3SG me strike.MSG

‘That mistake struck me.’
(Hoekstra 1984:185)
b. *Der Fehler ist mir aufgefallen.* (German)
   That mistake be.3SG me strike.PP
   ‘That mistake struck me.’

This analysis, which has the advantage of capturing the selection of ‘be’ (see *is* ‘is’ in (36a) and *ist* ‘is’ in (36b)), since the verbs in question turn out to be telic and intransitive, will be applied to Italian type-(iii) experiencer verbs in the next section.

3.4 Type-(iii) experiencer predicates

Type-(iii) experiencer verbs require inversion (Bossong 1998; Harris 1984a, b; Perlmutter 1979, 1984; Van Valin 1990). As is suggested by the name of this construction, the highest argument is not coded morphosyntactically as such, at least in some respects, whereas a lower argument may exhibit some of the coding or behaviour that is typical of the highest argument in accusative alignment. Crosslinguistically, verbs which require inversion tend to denote emotions, physical feelings and needs, as well as cognition, and the inverted coding of the arguments can be said to depend on the lack of agentivity of the higher argument, which is an experiencer.

Quirky case in Icelandic constitutes a classic example of inversion, where the highest argument is not marked by nominative case, by far the most common case for Icelandic PSAs, but the lower argument does not serve as the PSA in its stead:

(37) *Þeim líkar matur-in-n og borðu mikið.* (Icelandic)
   3PL.DAT like.3SG food.DEF.SG and eat.3PL much
   ‘They like food and eat much.’
   (Rögnvaldsson 1982, cited in VVLP: 358)

As well as dative marking on the third person plural pronoun *Þeim*, the lack of verb agreement on *líkar* ‘likes’ in (37) indicates that the third person plural argument is not the PSA of the clause. However, in other respects, the highest semantic argument of (37) behaves as a PSA. In particular, it occurs in core-initial position, the canonical position of the PSA in Icelandic, and it controls the missing argument of the second clause, as witnessed by the agreement on *borðu* ‘eat’ (for comparable evidence, see Thráinsson 1994: 176). I shall point out below that analogous conflicting
evidence is offered by the morphosyntax of Italian constructions with type-
(iii) experiencer verbs. Icelandic likar ‘likes’ is of course also comparable
to Old English me lyketh, lit. to me likes, which displays inversion,
whereas Modern English I like testifies a shift towards accusative align-
ment, since it assigns the role of PSA to the experiencer.

The results of a diachronic study of subject case marking in Icelandic
(Eythórsson 2002) have revealed that, unlike the historical spread of nomin-
ative case (or nominative sickness), the generalization of dative case (or
dative sickness) follows a semantic principle, in that it targets experiencer
arguments. Statistical evidence indicates that dative marking of the highest
argument of experiencer predicates vastly outranks any other kind of case
marking of such arguments in Modern Icelandic. From my perspective,
these findings are interesting, in that they reveal a conflict between a type
of marking which is faithful to accusative alignment, and neutralizes se-
matic relations (nominative), and one that is motivated by semantic rela-
tions (dative). I have suggested that the manifestations of split intransitivity
in Italian represent various kinds of deviation from accusative alignment,
and type-(iii) experiencer verbs constitute one such deviation, on a par with
the subclass of type (i) which was examined in section 3.2 (esserese ‘be’ or
sentirsi plus a non-verbal predicate).

Like type-(i) experiencer verbs, the bulk of type-(iii) ones are non-
causative bivalent states. In fact, they reject any suitable causative para-
phrases. For instance, (38b) is not a paraphrase of (38a):

(38) a. A loro piace questo quadro.
   To.them appeal.3SG this picture
   ‘This picture appeals to them.’

b. Questo quadro fa sì che loro (si) piacciano.
   This picture make.3SG so that they RFL appeal.3PL.SUBJ
   ‘This picture causes them to appeal (to themselves).’

Some type-(iii) verbs have causative correlates, which belong to type
(ii). Thus, interessarsi ‘interest’ ‘be interested’, dispiacere ‘(cause)
regret’, and seccarsi ‘annoy, bother’ or ‘be annoyed or bothered’ allow
both causative and non-causative realizations. In the causative reading, the
experiencer is a macrorole argument, specifically the undergoer (see the
accusative clitic lo ‘him’ in (39a)). By contrast, in the non-causative read-
ing, the experiencer is a dative argument (see the dative clitic gli ‘to him’
in (39b)):
(39) a. *Queste vicende lo seccano.*
   These events OCL bother.3PL
   ‘These events bother him.’

b. *Queste vicende gli seccano.*
   These events DCL bother.3PL
   ‘These events bother him.’

The possibility of causative and non-causative encoding of some physical, intellectual or emotional experiences is observed in crosslinguistic analysis. Thus, in section 3.3, I noted the morphosyntactic difference between, on the one hand, Italian *colpire* ‘impress’, and, on the other, Dutch *opvallen* ‘impress’ and German *auffallen* ‘impress’. I claimed that this difference depends on the lack of a causative component in the semantics of the last two verbs. Similarly, states of affairs such as appealing and pleasing can be encoded causatively or non-causatively crosslinguistically. Pesetsky (1988: 59–60) claims that Italian *piacere* corresponds to English *appeal to*, whilst *please* is causative. There are other languages in which pleasing is encoded causatively. For instance, VVLP (99) list ‘please’ among the predicates which take causative morphology in Barai, a language of Papua New Guinea.

Given that type-(iii) experiencer verbs do not test out as causative, they are comparable to type (i) in terms of the thematic relations of their arguments, which are an experiencer and a theme. By contrast with the experiencer of type (i), however, that of type (iii) is a dative argument, and thus it is not a macrorole. The predication is thus intransitive, and the theme is assigned the macrorole undergoer by virtue of its position in the semantic representation. The undergoer serves as the PSA of the clause, insofar as it controls finite verb agreement. Thus, the PSA is marked and E is selected:

(40) a. *A loro è piaciuto questo quadro.*
   To them be.3SG appeal.PP.MSG this picture.MSG
   ‘They liked this picture.’

c. *Mi è rincresciuto il mio errore.*
   DCL be.3SG regret.PP.MSG the POSS mistake.MSG
   ‘I regretted my mistake.’

Whilst the above analysis captures the selection of the perfective operator, there are other aspects of the morphosyntax of type-(iii) predicates.
which might, at first, seem to be puzzling. To begin with, the occurrence of the theme or the experiencer in immediately prenuclear position does not affect grammaticality (Vanelli 1986: 271, note 10). In this respect, type-(iii) experiencer predicates contrast with type (i):

(41) a. A Chiara piace la musica classica.
   ‘Classical music appeals to Chiara.’
   b. La musica classica piace a Chiara.
   ‘Classical music appeals to Chiara.’

(42) a. Chiara ama la musica classica.
   ‘Chiara loves classical music.’
   b. *La musica classica ama Chiara.
   ‘Chiara loves classical music.’ (intended reading).

Both (41a) and (41b) are grammatical. They contrast in terms of information structure, but this point is not relevant to my present purposes (see Chapter 8 for a pragmatic principle which is at work in the determination of word order). In contrast, there is a clear-cut grammaticality difference between (42a) and (42b): only (42a) is grammatical. The word order in (42b) is ruled out, unless the theme is contrastive (LA MUSICA CLASSICA ama Chiara ‘It is classical music that Chiara loves’). In this case, the theme is not in the immediate prenuclear position, but rather in the Pre-Core Slot (see section 1.4).

The above data suggest that the core-internal linearization rules can rank first the argument which is semantically the highest (the experiencer, cf. (41a)) or the one which is syntactically more prominent (the PSA, cf. (41b)), depending on information structure. The same does not hold for clauses with type-(i) experiencer predicates or, indeed, any other transitives (see *il gelato mangia Paolino ‘ice-cream is eating little Paolo’). These facts are significant in that they indicate that the grammar of Italian recognizes that the experiencer of type-(iii) verbs is the highest-ranking semantic argument, although it does not treat it as the controller of finite agreement.
Comparable evidence has been provided by Perlmutter (1979, 1984), who has pointed out that the experiencer of Italian inversion constructions can control the pivot, i.e., the missing argument, of some infinitival clauses:

(43) A Renato sono talmente piaciuti i tuoi figli
to Renato be.3PL so.much appeal.PP.MPL the POSS child.MPL
da invitarli a Natale.
to invite.OCL at Christmas
‘Renato liked your children so much that he invited them at Christmas.’

A dative argument cannot normally control the pivot of an infinitival structure equivalent to (43):

(44) Hanno comprato talmente tanti regali a Renato
Have.3PL buy.PP so many presents to Renato
da viziario / *da essere viziato.
to spoil.OCL to be spoil.PP.MSG
‘They bought so many presents to Renato that they spoiled him.’

This is further evidence that the experiencer of type-(iii) predicates behaves as a privileged syntactic argument in some respects, even though it does not control finite agreement. Further similar evidence is obtained by looking at the control of possessive proprio ‘own’ within the clause (Beltletti and Rizzi 1988: 321–324; Cresti 1990: 65–71; Giorgi 1984).

Assuming, as I do, that the control of finite verb agreement is the primary diagnostic for PSAhood in Italian, structures with type-(iii) experiencer predicates are marked from the perspective of accusative alignment. However, the experiencer behaves as the highest-ranking argument, in some respects, yielding the apparently contradictory results shown above. These findings are easily captured by an analysis that allows for the possibility of mismatch between the syntactic control of finite verb agreement, which neutralizes the semantic hierarchy between the experiencer and the theme, and the control of the pivot of infinitival constructions, which is sensitive to this hierarchy. Word order is also sensitive to the semantics of inversion.

Whereas type-(i) experiencer verbs have quasi-synonymous counterparts with a marked PSA (see the pairs in (6), e.g., avere caldo ‘be hot’ vs.
_esse essere accaldati_ ‘feel hot’), type-(iii) verbs can have quasi-synonyms with an unmarked PSA. In these synonyms, it is the experiencer that is a macro-role and serves as the PSA of the clause. In this sense, these predicates pattern with type (i):

(45) a. *Mi manca tutto / manco di tutto.*

DCL lack.3SG nothing lack.1SG of everything

‘I lack everything.’

b. *Mi bisognano molte cose / Ho bisogno di molte cose.*

DCL need.3PL many things have.1SG need of many things

‘I need many things.’

Type-(iii) experiencer verbs can also be part of impersonal constructions, i.e., constructions which lack a PSA altogether. In some Indo-European languages, the structures in which neither the experiencer nor the theme plays the role of PSA are marked by the reflexive morpheme (see Geniušienė 1987: 271 for some Lithuanian evidence). In Italian, this is not the case:

(46) a. *(Mi) bastare vederti un attimino.*

DCL suffice.3SG see.OCL a moment.DIM

‘It is sufficient (to me) to see you for a moment.’

b. *Basta che ti veda un attimino.*

Suffice.3SG that OCL see.1SG.SUBJ a moment

‘It is sufficient that I see you for a moment.’

c. *Bisogna andar via.*

Need.3SG go away

‘One needs / we need to / must go away.’

d. *Bisogna che tu vada via.*

Need.3SG that you go.2SG.SUBJ away

‘You must go away.’

In (46), *bastare* ‘be sufficient’ and *bisognare* ‘need’ take a clausal complement which does not, however, behave syntactically as an argument, or as the PSA of the clause. In fact, it cannot occur in core-initial position (*Vederti un attimino bastare* ‘to see you for an instant is sufficient’), and it does not allow wh-extraction (*È vederti un attimino che bastare* ‘it is to see you for an instant that is sufficient’).
Whereas the experiencer of \textit{bastare} ‘need’ can be overt, in which case it is a dative argument (cf. (46a)), the expression of the experiencer of \textit{bisognare} ‘need’ is subject to regional variation. The discrepancy between regional varieties of Italian displays in synchrony different stages of a diachronic development studied by Benincà and Poletto (1997). In Old Italian, \textit{bisognare} ‘need’ exhibits the canonical behaviour of a type-(iii) experiencer verb. Observe the following example from fourteenth-century Italian, where the experiencer is realized as a dative argument (\textit{ci} ‘to us’):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(47)] \textit{Per ciò che egli ci bisogna} \hspace{1cm} \textit{(Old Italian)}
\begin{enumerate}
\item For it that he DCL need.3SG
\item ‘Since we need him’
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

\textit{(Decameron, III, 1, 16, cited in Benincà and Poletto 1997: 108)}

In Modern Italian, \textit{bisognare} ‘need, must’ is restricted to impersonal constructions with no experiencer, in some varieties, but not in others (cf. (45b)). The diachronic change undergone by \textit{bisogna} ‘need’ involves the loss of the experiencer, which, in the construction of type (iii), is not assigned the syntactic role of PSA, as well as the restriction of the second semantic position to a clausal complement which is not a syntactic argument.

A different development which can affect type-(iii) experiencer verbs is their reanalysis as passives. Modern Italian exhibits a construction in which \textit{venire} ‘come’ is followed by the past participle of \textit{fare} ‘do’. This complex predicate is a synonym of \textit{capitare} ‘happen’, an experiencer verb of type (iii), but is typical of high registers:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(48)] \textit{Cercavo quel libro nello studio e mi è venuto fatto di trovarlo in cucina...} \hspace{1cm} \textit{(Ambrosini 2000: 560)}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Look.1SG.PST that book in.the study and DCL be.3SG venuto fatto di trovarlo in cucina...
\item come.PP do.PP of find.OCL in kitchen
\item ‘I was looking for that book in the study and I happened to find it in the kitchen’
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Whilst the structure under scrutiny is lexically constrained in Modern Italian, it is productive in Old Italian, where it can exhibit past participles other than \textit{fatto} ‘done’ (Ambrosini 2000; Giacalone Ramat 2000; Salvi 2005). Observe the following example from Boccaccio’s \textit{Decameron},
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where *venire* combines with the past participles of *alzare* ‘lift’ and *vedere* ‘see’:

(49) *Venne alla giovane alzato il viso*

Come.3SG.PST to.the young lift.PP.MSG the face.MSG

*e veduto ciò che...* (Old Italian)

and see.MSG that REL

‘The young woman happened to lift her face and see what...’

(*Decameron*, IX, 2, 14, cited in Ambrosini 2000: 560)

In Ambrosini’s (2000) view, the restriction of this complex predicate to the phrase with *fare* is due to the reanalysis of the dative experiencer as an agent, and the subsequent reanalysis of the whole construction as a passive structure with the voice operator *venire* (for the passive with *venire* see section 7.4). In fairness, the passive with *venire* is attested in Late Latin, and, more conspicuously, in early Italo-Romance literature (Cennamo 2003, 2005b). Accordingly, the facts considered by Ambrosini manifest the diachronic decline of one of two structural alternatives, inversion and the passive. The demise of the former is favoured by the existence of the latter. The point which is worth stressing here is that the synchronic variability between inversion and passive is favoured by the fact that, in both constructions, the PSA is the lowest core argument.

In the informal registers of Modern Italian, *venire* ‘come’, as well as *scappare* ‘escape’, figure in the following inversion constructions:

(50) a. *Mi viene fame* ‘I become hungry’; *mi viene sete* ‘I become thirsty’; *mi viene voglia di...* ‘I start to feel like...’; *mi viene sonno* ‘I become sleepy’, etc.

b. *Mi viene (fatto) bene* ‘I do it well’ (lit. it comes done well to me).

c. *Mi viene in mente* ‘it occurs to me.’

d. *Mi scappa la pipì* ‘I need a wee’, *mi è scappato uno starnuto* ‘I couldn’t help sneezing’, *mi è scappato un urlo* ‘I couldn’t help screaming’, etc.

(51) *Gli era venuto l’ impulso di farlo.*

DCL be.3SG.PST come.MSG the impulse.MSG of do.OCL

‘He had felt an impulse to do it.’

(*De Carlo, Due di due*, p. 203)
By contrast with the other type-(iii) verbs, these predicates can be telic. In fact, the telic interpretation is the only option in the perfect, since *venire* 'come' entails a resultant state in the perfect (Squartini 1999). Finally, *venire* 'come' and *scappare* 'escape' can also take an infinitival complement which does not behave as a syntactic argument, similarly to the clausal complement of *bisognare* 'need' and the like:32

\[(52) \quad \text{Mi viene / scappa da ridere.} \]
\[
\text{DCL come.3SG escape.3SG to laugh }
\]
\[
\text{‘I feel like / can’t help laughing.’} 
\]

3.5 Conclusion

I have discussed experiencer predicates (usually called psych verbs), adopting a tripartite classification. I have claimed that the shared property of these predicates is that they have an experiencer argument. The other argument is a theme, in the case of the classes which were named type (i) (e.g., *amare* 'love', *temere* 'fear', etc.) and type (iii) (e.g., *piacere* 'appeal to', *bastare* 'suffice', etc.), whereas it is a causer in the case of type (ii) (e.g., *preoccupare* 'worry', *spaventare* 'frighten', etc.). Abstracting away from the reflexive counterparts of experiencer predicates, which will be discussed in Chapter 4, the morphosyntax of type (ii) is faithful to accusative marking, whilst the morphosyntax of type (iii) is characterized by inversion, which involves a marked (undergoer) PSA. Finally, type (i) can display both accusative marking and a type of marking that runs counter to the default of PSA assignment in accusative alignment.

The proposed analysis is not problematic vis-à-vis the RRG theory of semantics-syntax mapping, or Perlmutter and Postal’s (1984) and Baker’s (1988) hypotheses on the relation between grammatical and semantic relations. In fact, the alleged problem of psych verbs, i.e., the association of the same thematic roles with different syntactic relations or positions, is only a by-product of an incorrect semantic analysis of the predicates in question. The proposed account also captures the selection of the perfective operator and word order, as well as a number of puzzling facts which concern the behaviour of the theme (types (i) and (ii)), the causer (type (ii)) and the experiencer (type (iii)).

To return to the findings of Bossong’s (1998) typological survey mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, whereas Italian adopts the accusa-
tive strategy approximately twice as much as the inversion strategy, French has made considerable headway towards the adoption of the accusative strategy across the board. Finally, Romanian has changed dramatically in the opposite direction, with inversion being twice as frequent as generalization. The significance of these findings can only be appreciated in full in relation to the other manifestations of split intransitivity which are found in the languages in question. Italian provides robust evidence of the flagging of PSAs which are not canonical from the perspective of accusative alignment. Suffice it to mention the selection of the perfective operator (Chapter 2) and the marking with *sì*, to be treated in Chapter 4. It also exhibits evidence of active alignment, as will be shown in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6, which deal with the agreement of the past participle and *ne*-cliticization. However, in the morphosyntax of experiencer predicates, Italian does not exhibit a preference for inversion, which is principled semantically, over the accusative strategy, which is principled syntactically. Contrastingly, Romanian, which does not indicate PSA markedness with the perfective operator, exhibits an unmistakable tendency towards the use of inversion. As pointed out by Bossong (1998: 268), this tendency is not inherited from Latin. Rather, inversion is an innovative strategy which is motivated by the semantics of the predicates in question. Clearly, languages are subject to conflicting diachronic pressures which yield apparently contradictory synchronic results.
Chapter 4
Si-constructions and unexpressed arguments

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an account of si-constructions and unexpressed arguments. The essence of the analysis of si-constructions is the idea that such structures are characterized by the suppression of the highest-ranking argument in the semantic representation of the clause (Van Valin 1990: 257). Si is not an argument, but rather a morphosyntactic marker of argument suppression. Due to the suppression of the highest argument, si-constructions cannot have a PSA that is unmarked from the point of view of accusative alignment. Accordingly, they are of interest in the treatment of split intransitivity. In section 2.2, I illustrated this point with reference to one type of reflexive structure (e.g., Paolo si è comprato due libri ‘Paul has bought two books for himself’), and one type of si impersonal (e.g., Si è ballato ‘one has danced’). In this chapter, I provide a detailed typology of si-constructions. All kinds of si-construction are marked from the point of view of PSA choice, and select perfective essere ‘be’ (E). Contrastingly, the behaviour of si-constructions varies vis-à-vis other diagnostics of split intransitivity, viz. the agreement of the past participle and ne-cliticization. This variation can be captured on the basis of the classification of si-constructions which is proposed in this chapter. The suggested typology also accounts for patterns of dialect variation in the selection of the perfective operator and past-participle agreement.

The chapter is organized as follows. I consider reflexives in section 4.2. After discussing the number and type of arguments which can figure in the semantic representation of reflexives (§ 4.2.1), I introduce a typology which differentiates between four principal classes. These are obtained from the intersection of the values relative to two properties, causativity and the co-reference of the suppressed argument with another argument (§§ 4.2.2 and 4.2.3). Section 4.2.4 deals with the relation of reflexivization with analytic passivization and fare-causativization. Section 4.2.5 discusses the reflexive correlates of experiencer predicates (see Chapter 3).
Finally, I deal with semantics-syntax mapping, and I discuss the importance of the proposed classification of reflexives with respect to the selection of the perfective operator (§ 4.2.6). Section 4.3 is concerned with *si*-impersonal constructions (§ 4.3.1), *si*-passives (§ 4.3.2), and middles (§ 4.3.3), as well as reflexive *si*-impersonals and *si*-passives (§ 4.3.4). In section 4.4, I differentiate between three kinds of unexpressed argument, arguing that suppressed arguments are a subset of this class of argument, and I advance a proposal on the semantic representation of unexpressed arguments and their relation to syntax. The conclusions are offered in 4.5.

### 4.2 Reflexives

Italian has both clitic and full reflexives. Clitic reflexives exhibit an atonic reflexive pronoun (see *si* in (1a)), whilst full ones exhibit a tonic reflexive pronoun (see *sé* in (1b)) which is often combined with the emphatic adjective *stesso* 'self' (see *se stessa* (1b)):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(1) a. } & \text{ Maria } \text{* si } \text{ vede.} \\
& \quad \text{Mary RFL see.3SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘Mary sees herself.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{ Maria } \text{ vede } \text{* sé / se stessa.} \\
& \quad \text{Mary see.3SG RFL self} \\
& \quad \text{‘Mary sees herself.’}
\end{align*}\]

The antecedent and the tonic reflexive pronoun of full reflexives are independent, albeit co-referent, arguments to which two macroroles are assigned. Thus, the structure in (1b) is represented semantically as *see’* (Maria, se stessa), and it is transitive, witness the selection of A:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(2) } & \text{ Maria } \text{ ha } \text{ visto } \text{ se stessa.} \\
& \quad \text{Mary have.3SG see_PP RFL self.FSG} \\
& \quad \text{‘Mary has seen herself.’}
\end{align*}\]

Since it is a transitive structure, the type of construction illustrated in (1b) and (2) will not be the focus of my discussion. Rather, I concentrate on clitic reflexives. According to a well-established view (see among others, Comrie 1985; Geniušiené 1987; Grimshaw 1982, 1990), the reflexive morpheme alters the valence of a predicate. Following Van Valin (1990:
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257), I take the clitic *si* to mark the suppression of the highest-ranking argument in the semantic representation of the clause (for comparable analyses from different theoretical perspectives, see Embick 2004; Grimshaw 1990; Haider and Rindler-Schjerve 1987; Marantz 1984). Evidence that the suppressed argument of reflexives is the highest one in semantics is provided by crosslinguistic comparison. In particular, unlike its Russian cognate –*sja* (cf. (3a) and (3b)), Italian *si* does not mark the omission of the undergoer (cf. (3c) and (3d)):

(3)  a. *Kury nesut jajca.*
    Hens lay.3PL eggs
    ‘Hens lay eggs.’

    b. *Kury nesut -sja.*
    Hens lay.3PL RFL
    ‘Hens lay (eggs).’
    (Comrie 1985: 319–322)

c. *Le galline depongono le uova.*
    The hens lay.3PL the eggs
    ‘Hens lay eggs.’

d. *Le galline si depongono.*
    The hens RFL lay.3PL
    ‘Hens lay (eggs).’ (intended reading)

To be sure, Italian *si* occurs in constructions where the second argument is not realized as a direct argument (see *ricordare qualcosa* ‘remember something’ and *ricordarsi di qualcosa*, lit. remember oneself of something). However, I shall provide evidence which suggests that the occurrence of *si* is independent of the realization of the second argument of these constructions (see section 4.2.5).

Further evidence that the suppressed argument of reflexives is the highest one in the semantic representation comes from anticausative and causative reflexives. Anticipating somewhat the contents of the analysis which will be developed in section 4.2.2, I should note that anticausative reflexives like *offendersi* ‘get offended’ are structures with a suppressed causer (see the causative counterpart *offendere* ‘offend’, ‘cause to get offended’). By definition, the causer is the highest direct core argument in the semantics of the causative predicate. Accordingly, the suppressed argument of anticausative reflexives must be the highest direct core argument in their semantic representation.
Due to argument suppression, the construction in (1a), *Maria si vede* ‘Mary sees herself’, can be represented semantically as \( \text{see}^* (\emptyset, \text{Maria}) \), whereby co-indexation indicates that the suppressed argument is co-referent with the co-indexed argument. Since the PSA *Maria* is not in the highest macrorole position in the semantic representation, this structure is marked from the point of view of accusative alignment. This explains why E is selected in Italian (see section 4.2.2):

(4) *Maria si è vista.*

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Mary} & \text{RFL} \; \text{be.3SG} \; \text{see.PP.FSG} \\
\text{‘Mary has seen herself.’}
\end{array}
\]

I shall now broaden the analysis of reflexives. First, I examine the number and type of arguments which appear in the semantic representation of reflexives (see section 4.2.1). I then classify these structures in terms of two properties: (i) whether the unexpressed argument qualifies as a causer and (ii) whether the suppressed argument is co-referent with a specified argument (see sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3).

4.2.1 Italian clitic reflexives: Preliminary classification

I distinguish between monadic and non-monadic reflexives. Monadic reflexives only have one specified variable in the semantic representation (see *l’albero* ‘the tree’ in (5a)), whilst, in Italian, non-monadic reflexives have a maximum of two specified variables in their semantics (see Pietro ‘Peter’ and *capelli* ‘hair’ in (5b)):

(5)  

a. *L’albero si è abbattuto.*

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{The tree.MSG} & \text{RFL} \; \text{be.3SG} \; \text{fall.PP.MSG} \\
\text{‘The tree has fallen down.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. *Pietro si è tagliato i capelli.*

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Peter} & \text{RFL} \; \text{be.3SG} \; \text{cut.PP.MSG} \; \text{the hair} \\
\text{‘Pietro has had his hair cut.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

Monadic reflexives can be further subdivided into intransitive direct (cf. (6a)), inherent (cf. (6b)), intransitive dative (cf. (6c)), and reciprocal (direct (6d) or oblique (6e)), whilst non-monadic ones can be benefactive (cf. (7a)) or possessive (direct (7b) or oblique (7c)):
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(6)  
a. *Flavia si lava.*  
Flavia RFL wash.3SG  
‘Flavia washes herself.’  
b. *Flavia si imbroncia.*  
Flavia RFL become.grumpy.3SG  
‘Flavia becomes grumpy.’  
c. *Flavia si risponde.*  
Flavia RFL answer.3SG  
‘Flavia answers her own question.’  
d. *Flavia e Clelia si abbracciano.*  
Flavia and Clelia RFL hug.3PL  
‘Flavia and Clelia hug each other.’  
e. *Flavia e Clelia si litigano.*  
Flavia and Clelia RFL argue  
‘Flavia and Clelia argue with each other.’

(7)  
a. *Lucio si compra un libro.*  
Lucio RFL buy.3SG a book  
‘Lucio buys a book for himself.’  
b. *Lucio si tocca la testa.*  
Lucio RFL touch.3SG the head  
‘Lucio touches his head.’  
c. *Lucio si dà un colpo in testa.*  
Lucio RFL give.3SG a blow in head  
‘Lucio hits himself on the head.’

The typology illustrated in (6) and (7) is based on the arguments which figure in the semantic representation of reflexives. Since intransitive-direct reflexives correlate with transitive structures (*Flavia lava la macchina* ‘Flavia washes the car’), they have two argument positions in their semantics. Similarly, intransitive-dative reflexives have bivalent counterparts (*Flavia risponde a Lilli* ‘Flavia replies to Lilli’), and thus they must be assumed to have two argument positions. One of these positions is a non-macrorole position which is realized as a dative argument in the non-reflexive counterpart. Reciprocals, whether direct or oblique, also have bivalent counterparts (*Flavia abbraccia Clelia* ‘Flavia hugs Clelia’ and *Flavia litiga con Clelia* ‘Flavia argues with Clelia’). Inherent reflexives, instead, only have one argument position in the semantic representation, as is indicated by the absence of non-reflexive correlates (*Sara imbroncia*...
Flavia ‘Sarah makes Flavia become grumpy’). The non-reflexive counterpart of benefactive reflexives includes a purposive component (Lucio compra un libro per se stesso ‘Lucio buys a book for himself’). Finally, possessive reflexives correspond to bivalent structures in which the second argument is provided by a possessive noun phrase (Lucio tocca la sua testa ‘Lucio touches his head’). On a par with their correlates with a dative external possessor (Lucio gli tocca la testa ‘Lucio touches his head’, see König and Haspelmath 1998), they can be considered to be constructions with possessor ascension. The semantic representations of the types of reflexives illustrated in (6) and (7) include the same components as the representations of their non-reflexive correlates, with the peculiarity, however, that the highest argument is suppressed. Inherent reflexives are the only class which does not have a non-reflexive counterpart and does not involve argument suppression proper, but is marked as if it did. In section 4.2.3, I advance a hypothesis about this apparent inconsistency of the grammar of Italian.

The proposed typology of reflexives will turn out to be relevant to the selection of the perfective operator, if not in Modern Italian, in previous diachronic stages of this language, and in other Romance languages. In addition, this classification of reflexives will prove relevant to a number of crossdialectal and crosslinguistic differences in past-participle agreement (see Chapter 5). Finally, ne-cliticization is sensitive to the above typology of reflexives (see Chapter 6). Before a detailed account can be given of semantics-syntax mapping in the structures under investigation, however, it is necessary to analyse further their semantics. In particular, it is essential to differentiate between reflexives which require a causative or anticausative analysis, and reflexives which will not yield to this analysis. This will be the topic of the next two sections.

4.2.2 Causative and anticausative reflexives

The valence alternations of transitive vs. reflexive pairs can affect a causer argument (see, among others, Cennamo 1993; Comrie 1985: 319–342; Geniušienė 1987: 257–261; Haspelmath 1993; Labelle 1992; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 79–133; Marantz 1984: 179–102). Thus, Romance reflexives like Italian aprirsi (intr.) ‘open’ (cf. (8a)) are anticausative counterparts of causative structures (see aprire (tr.) ‘open’ in (8b)): 
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(8)  

a. *La porta si apre.
   The door RFL open.3SG
   ‘The door opens.’

b. *Il vento apre la porta.
   The wind open.3SG the door
   ‘The wind opens the door.’

Drawing upon Chierchia’s (1989) observation that unaccusatives have unstable valence, that is, they oscillate between transitive and intransitive realizations, both diachronically and crossdialectally, Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 79–133) have suggested that alternating unaccusatives like ‘open’ are derived from causative transitives (cf. (8b)) by the prevention of the realization of the causer. The relationship between unaccusatives and correlated causatives can be represented semantically as follows:

(9)  

a. Y opens.
   [[Ø DO-SOMETHING] CAUSE [Y BECOME OPEN]]

b. X opens y.
   [[X DO-SOMETHING] CAUSE [Y BECOME OPEN]]

In contrast with Chierchia (1989), Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 119–133) deny that all unaccusatives derive from causatives. For instance, in their view, verbs which denote existence and appearance are not related to causatives in the way that alternating unaccusatives are. Evidence for this is provided by the lack of lexical causatives which correlate with these verbs, not to mention the paucity of Romance reflexives which encode the notions of existence and appearance, and, lastly, the incompatibility of such verbs with the modifier ‘by itself’ in the sense of ‘without outside help’ (e.g., *trovarsi (*da sé) ‘find oneself (without outside help’).

I concur with Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) that the verbs which test out as unaccusative cannot all be said to correlate with causative structures, and I further propose that, in Italian, the anticausative analysis should be restricted to the reflexive members of reflexive vs. transitive alternations. My analysis draws upon the findings of Haspelmath’s (1993) typological survey of inchoative vs. causative pairs, as well as upon Levin and Rappaport Hovav’s (1995: 89–98) differentiation between external and internal causation. My results indicate that, in Italian, there is a clear tendency to encode reflexively events which are likely to be caused by an external instigator, and which are treated as (anti-)causatives across lan-
guages. Contrastingly, events which are less likely to involve causation by an external instigator tend not to be encoded as reflexives in Italian.

Events which are likely to be caused by an external instigator, and are frequently encoded as causatives or anticausatives crosslinguistically, are events of splitting, breaking, closing, opening, gathering, and connecting (Croft 1990; Haspelmath 1993: 103). In Italian, such events are normally encoded by transitive vs. reflexive pairs. By way of example, consider the list in (10):

(10) *Allargare* (tr.) / *allargarsi* (intr.) ‘widen’; *annerire* (tr.) / *annerirsi* (intr.) ‘blacken’; *aprire* (tr.) / *aprirsi* (intr.) ‘open’; *chiudere* (tr.) / *chiudersi* (intr.) ‘close’; *collegare* (tr.) / *collegarsi* (intr.) ‘connect’; *cuocere* (tr.) / *cuocersi* (intr.) ‘cook’; *diluire* (tr.) / *diluirsi* (intr.) ‘dilute’; *disgelare* (tr.) / *disgelarsi* (intr.) ‘thaw’; *frantumare* (tr.) / *frantumarsi* (intr.) ‘shatter’; *ispessire* (tr.) / *ispessirsi* (intr.) ‘thicken’; *imbiancare* (tr.), *imbiancarsi* (intr.) ‘whiten’; *muovere* (tr.) / *muoversi* (intr.) ‘move’; *raccogliere* (tr.) / *raccogliersi* (intr.) ‘gather’; *raffreddare* (tr.) / *raffreddarsi* (intr.) ‘cool’; *rompere* (tr.) / *rompersi* (intr.) ‘break’; *sciogliere* (tr.) / *sciogliersi* (intr.) ‘thaw’, ‘melt’; *spostare* (tr.) / *spostarsi* (intr.) ‘move’; *stemperare* (tr.) / *stemperarsi* (intr.) ‘dilate’, etc.

Events of drying, freezing, going out, and sinking are not necessarily caused by an instigator and are less likely to have a causative realization across languages (Haspelmath 1993: 103). Some of these events are not encoded reflexively in Italian: *affondare* (intrans., trans.) ‘sink’ and *uscire* (intrans.) ‘go out’ are such cases. Others are encoded by transitive vs. reflexive pairs. However, non-reflexive intransitive realizations are also allowed: *asciugare* (trans., intrans.) ‘dry’; *bruciare* (trans., intrans.) ‘burn’; *congelare* (trans., intrans.) ‘freeze’, etc. Observe an authentic example with non-reflexive *bruciare* ‘burn’:

(11) *Ha raccolto spazzatura,… guidato un camioncino*  
Have.3SG collect.PP rubbish drive.PP a van.MSG  
*di hot dog e hamburger finché è bruciato*...  
of hot dog and hamburger until be.3SG burn.PP.MSG...  
‘He collected rubbish … drove a hot-dog van, until it burned...’  
(De Carlo, *Due di due*, p. 219)
Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 90–91) have pointed out that verbs which denote emission of sound, light, smell, and substance do not tend to be part of causative alternations. They relate this fact to the tendency for causative alternations to exclude verbs which denote internally-caused eventualities, i.e., events which arise from inherent properties of the participants. Interestingly, verbs which denote emission tend not to be reflexive in Italian:


The Italian evidence supports the findings of the studies mentioned above, in particular Levin and Rappaport Hovav’s (1995) distinction between external and internal causation. In addition, this evidence lends itself to an analysis which differentiates semantically between reflexives and corresponding intransitives (e.g., *bruciarsi* vs. *bruciare* ‘burn (intr.)’). I propose that the reflexive realizations encode events with a defocused or unknown causer, and are thus anticausative, whilst the corresponding intransitives are not.

It is worth pointing out that a similar relation holds between mediopassives and corresponding intransitives in Latin. Specifically, Hatcher (1942: 27–37, 52–57) noted that Late Latin mediopassives denote events with an external cause (e.g., *incendor* (mediopassive) ‘be on fire, burn’, which is related to *incendo* (tr.) ‘set on fire’), whereas corresponding intransitives denote events which are physiological or not caused (e.g., *ardeo* (intr.) ‘be incandescent, shine, burn’) (see also Brambilla Ageno 1964: 200). Significantly, some such alternations are maintained in Romance, where a number of mediopassives have been replaced by reflexives (see Italian *incendiarsi* ‘be on fire, burn’ and *incendiare* (tr.) ‘set on fire’ vs. *ardere* (intr. only) ‘be incandescent, burn’).

My claim that the anticausative analysis should be restricted to reflexives in Italian is also corroborated by comparative evidence from French. Labelle (1992: 391) has pointed out that a number of French clitic reflexives have non-reflexive intransitive counterparts (e.g. *(se) noircir*
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‘blacken’). The clitic reflexives denote caused processes (13a), whilst their non-reflexive intransitive counterparts denote processes which occur as part of the natural course of events (13b):

(13) a. *Les murs près de la cheminée se noircissent.* (French)
    ‘The walls near the chimney are becoming black.’
    b. *Après l’ extraction du nerf, les dents noircissent.* (French)
    ‘After the extraction of the nerve, the teeth blacken.’
    (Labelle 1992: 391)

Levin and Rappaport Hovav’s (1995) proposal is based on the decompositional account of causation (Dowty 1979), which is also adhered to in RRG. In the existing RRG analyses, transitive vs. reflexive pairs are represented semantically as in (14a) and (14b), respectively (see Centineo 1995; VVLP: 411):

(14) a. $\text{[[dó'}(x, \emptyset)] \text{CAUSE [BECOME pred́'}(y)]]}$
    b. $\text{[[dó'}(\emptyset, \emptyset)] \text{CAUSE [BECOME pred́'}(x)]]}$

The semantic representation in (14b) represents a causative structure in which the causer is suppressed. This is the representation which I henceforth adopt for the reflexive members of reflexive vs. causative pairs. The caused event can be stative rather than telic, and I shall return to this point in due course.

My analysis does not detract from Chierchia’s observation that unaccusatives can correlate with causatives. *Morire* ‘die’ (BECOME dead́’(x)) is indeed related semantically to causative *uccidere* ‘kill’ ([$\text{[[dó'}(x, \emptyset)] \text{CAUSE [BECOME dead́'}(y)]]}$), and the respective representations illustrate their relatedness. However, *morire* ‘die’ is not causative and has no anticausative reflexive counterpart in Modern Italian. Causative *morire* ‘kill’ is attested in early Romance, as is shown in this example, which is drawn from an early Neapolitan text:

(15) *Palamides no era stato muorto in le bactalle ma segretamente era stato muorto.*
    Palamides NEG be.3SG.PST be.PP.MSG kill.PP.MSG in the battle but secretly be.3SG.PST be.PP.MSG kill.PP.MSG
per Ulique e Dyomede. (Old Neapolitan)
by Ulysses and Diomedes
‘Palamides had not been killed in the battle, but secretly by Ulysses and Diomedes.’

(Libru de la Destructione de Troya, Ital. 617, p. 270: 4–5).

The existence of causative morir(e) ‘cause to die’ in early Romance provides a clue for the analysis of Modern Italo-Romance (e.g., Abruzzese) and Spanish morirs(e) ‘die’. Despite the absence, in synchrony, of a homonymous causative counterpart, morirs(e) can be analyzed as anticausative (but it is more likely to be an inherent reflexive, see section 4.2.3).

By differentiating between the semantics of non-reflexive intransitives (e.g., morire ‘die’) and anticausative reflexives (e.g., aprirsi ‘open’) in the way proposed above, it becomes possible to capture the existence of transitive, reflexive and non-reflexive intransitive sets. The non-reflexive intransitive members of these sets are simply not anticausative. Observe the three realizations of ‘freeze’ illustrated below:

(16) a. Il freddo congela l’ acqua.
   The cold freeze.3SG the water
   ‘The cold (temperature) freezes the water.’
   [[do´ (freddo, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME frozen´ (acqua)]]
b. L’ acqua si congela.
   The water RFL freeze.3SG
   ‘The water freezes.’
   [[do´ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME frozen´ (acqua)]]
c. L’ acqua congela.
   The water freeze.3SG
   ‘The water freezes.’
   BECOME frozen´ (acqua)

Admittedly, the semantic representations proposed in (16) do not illustrate some Aktionsart contrasts which are said to characterize the reflexive vs. non-reflexive intransitive pairs. Specifically, the reflexive members of these pairs are said to denote events which lead to an endpoint, whereas the non-reflexive intransitive realizations are said to encode change which does not necessarily lead to an endpoint (see, among others, Labelle 1992; Zrbi-Hertz 1987). In addition, the reflexive realizations can contrast with the non-reflexive ones in terms of inchoativity (Grimshaw 1982: 100).
With respect to telicity, it should be noted that the non-reflexive realizations can nonetheless denote the attainment of an endpoint, witness the occurrence of "è bruciato" ‘has burned’ in the authentic example cited in (11). The possibility of non-telic readings of some non-reflexive intransitives can be captured in terms of the process vs. accomplishment alternations, which were discussed in section 2.3 (Van Valin 2005: 43–44). As for inchoativity, this is standardly encoded by BECOME in RRG. Thus, the proposed representations do capture the essential aspects of the semantics of the verbs in question.

Crucially, there exist reflexives which are neither telic nor inchoative; for instance Italian "sentirsi bene, male", etc. ‘feel well, unwell, etc.’, "ricordarsi ‘remember’, dedicarsi ‘dedicate oneself’, and French "se promener ‘(take a) walk’. Thus, the appearance of the morpheme "si is not to be associated deterministically with telicity or inchoativity. Rather, the trait shared by reflexive constructions is the suppression of the highest argument, as is assumed in the unified account of si-constructions offered in this chapter.

Apparent counterevidence to my proposal on the reflexive vs. non-reflexive pairs is the fact that non-reflexive intransitives are not entirely incompatible with a number of causativity tests. Such tests do not work well with [+ human] PSAs, but they yield acceptable results with other PSAs. This contrast is illustrated in (17) and (18):

   Lisa go.out.3SG by RFL
   ‘Lisa goes out without outside help.’

   Lisa sink.3SG by RFL
   ‘Lisa sinks without outside help.’

(18) a. Il gatto esce da sé.
   The cat go.out.3SG by RFL
   ‘The cat goes out by itself.’

   b. L’ acqua esce da sé.
   The water come.out.3SG by RFL
   ‘Water will come out by itself.’

The verbs under investigation also give puzzling results in terms of their compatibility with manner adverbs (e.g., "violentemente ‘violently’, facilmente ‘easily’, etc.). As I pointed out in section 1.4, this class of adverbs
Reflexives modifies activities. Thus, causatives which include a causal activity are predicted to be compatible with manner adverbs, whereas non-causative intransitives are expected in principle to rule them out. Surprisingly, uscire 'go out' and affondare 'sink' do not ban the adverb facilmente 'easily':

(19) a. ?L’ acqua è uscita facilmente,
    The water.FSG be.3SG come.out.PP.FSG easily
    non ho dovuto usare una pompa.
    NEG have.1SG must.PP use a pump
    ‘Water came out easily. I did not need to use a pump.’

b. ?La nave è affondata facilmente.
    The ship.FSG be.3SG sink.PP.FSG easily
    ‘The boat sank easily.’

Similarly, expressions like una morte violenta ‘a violent death’ might seem to suggest that the semantics of morire ‘die’ does include an activity.

I argue that the facts illustrated in (17) to (19) do not constitute sufficient evidence in favour of an anticausative analysis of non-reflexive intransitives. The partial compatibility of non-reflexive intransitives with some causativity tests and with manner adverbs does mean that they are semantically related to causatives. Suffice it to mention the causative reading of the transitive counterpart of affondare ‘sink’, the existence of different lexically-causative counterparts for other such verbs (see uccidere (tr.) ‘kill’, which correlates with morire (intr.) ‘die’), and, finally, the possibility of occurrence in causative periphrases such as the fare-causative construction (see fare uscire ‘to let out / make someone go out’). This relatedness, however, does not entail that the intransitive verbs in question are anticausative. Significantly, reflexives combine more easily with the causativity tests than non-reflexive intransitives. In particular, the results of the tests are hardly affected by the [+ human] value of the PSA (Giovanni si muove da sé / facilmente / con una spinta ‘John moves by himself / easily / with a push’).

Some intransitives which have no causative counterpart in standard Italian are used causatively in Italo-Romance or in regional varieties of Italian. Thus, uscire ‘go out’, entrare ‘come in’, salire ‘go up’, and scendere ‘go down’ are used transitively in a number of regional varieties of the South due to the pressure of Italo-Romance dialects in which the lexemes for ‘go out’, ‘come in’, ‘go up’, and ‘go down’ can be causative, meaning ‘take out’, ‘take in’, ‘take up’ and ‘take down’. In the regional Italian of Sicily,
for instance, one can say *esci l’acqua dal frigo!* ‘take the water out of the fridge!’, which literally translates as ‘go the water out of the fridge’. Even though *uscire* ‘go out’ and the like can be used causatively in such regional varieties, I argue that they are not anticausative when used intransitively, because, in such varieties, as is the case with Italian, anticausatives are marked morphologically by reflexivization. Evidence in support of my claim is provided by the causativity tests, which produce results comparable with (17)-(19) both in regional Italian and in the relevant dialects (Sicilian *?Pina / L’acqua nesci sula sula* ‘Pina / the water comes / goes out without outside help’).

So far I have argued that, normally, in Italian, the events which arise from inherent properties of the participants, as well as those which can involve causation, but are not necessarily caused, are encoded as non-causative. In contrast, the events which are typically caused by an external instigator are normally encoded as anticausative vs. causative pairs. I have also claimed that the reflexive morpheme is the overt marker of the suppression of the causer. I will now distinguish further between causative and anticausative reflexivization. This distinction can be characterized as follows. Whilst the causer of anticausative reflexives is both suppressed and unrecoverable in semantics, the causer of causative reflexives is co-referent with an argument which is expressed in the semantic representation, and hence recoverable, albeit suppressed. Observe the following data:

(20)  
\[ \text{a. Gli anni hanno invecchiato Luisa.} \]  
\[ \text{The years have age.PP Louise} \]  
\[ \text{‘The years have made Louise age.’} \]

\[ \text{b. Luisa è invecchiata in pochi anni.} \]  
\[ \text{Louise be.3SG age.PP.FSG in few years} \]  
\[ \text{‘Louise has aged in very few years.’} \]

\[ \text{c. Luisa si è invecchiata di proposito.} \]  
\[ \text{Louise RFL be.3SG age.PP.FSG on purpose} \]  
\[ \text{‘Louise has made herself (look) older on purpose.’} \]

The predicate of (20a) is a causative transitive accomplishment, where the causer is not suppressed. The predicate of (20b) is an intransitive accomplishment, which, in accordance with the proposal put forward above, involves no causer. Finally, the predicate of (20c), is a causative reflexive. Whilst being suppressed, the causer of this structure is co-referent with the lower expressed argument. To account for the contrast between the con-
structions in which the suppressed causer is not only suppressed, but also unrecoverable semantically, and those in which the causer corresponds to the causee, I propose that the position of the suppressed causer should be co-indexed with the causee in the representation of causative reflexives. The semantic representation of the examples in (20) is thus as follows:

(20)  a. \([\text{do}´(anni, \emptyset)] \text{CAUSE} \[\text{BECOME old}´(Luisa)]\]
    b. \(\text{BECOME old}´(Luisa)\)
    c. \([\text{do}´(\emptyset, \emptyset)] \text{CAUSE} \[\text{BECOME old}´(Luisa)]\]

The reflexive correlates of a good deal of gradual-completion verbs (see section 2.3) are causative, in the sense explained above:

(21) \(\text{Dimagrire (tr., intr.) ‘(make someone) thin’ / dimagrirsì ‘make oneself thin’;}\)
    \(\text{imbruttire (tr., intr.) ‘(make someone) become ugly’ / imbruttirsi ‘make oneself look ugly’;}\)
    \(\text{ingrassare (tr., intr.) ‘fatten’ / ingrassarsi ‘fatten oneself’; invecchiare (tr., intr.) ‘(make someone) age’ / invecchiarsi ‘age oneself’}, \text{etc.}\)

According to some informants, the reflexive version of some of the Italian verbs listed in (21) need not involve an overt causer (e.g., \(\text{ingrassarsi ‘fatten (intr.)’}\)). These speaker judgements, which manifest the tendency towards the generalization of the reflexive morpheme in regional Italian (Telmon 1993: 121), do not invalidate the theoretical distinction between anticausative and causative reflexives. The question which should be addressed at this point is exactly how we differentiate between causative and anticausative reflexives. I propose that whilst both types of reflexives admit causative paraphrases, causative reflexives also have full-reflexive counterparts, unlike anticausative ones. Since reflexives with a specified argument that is inanimate do not have full-reflexive correlates, it turns out that the PSA of causative reflexives must be [+animate]:

(22)  a. \(\text{Ciro si è tagliato / ha tagliato se stesso.}\)
    \(\text{Ciro RFL be.3SG cut.PP.MSG have.3SG cut.PP RFL self ‘Ciro has cut himself.’}\)
    b. \(\text{La porta si è aperta /}\)
    \(\text{The door RFL be.3SG open.PP.FSG}\)
The difference between these two types is marked by co-indexation in the semantic representation:

(22) a. [[do′ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME cut′ (Ciro)]]
    b. [[do′ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME open′ (porta)]]

To be sure, there can be ambiguity between causative and anticausative constructions with animate PSAs. This type of ambiguity can only be resolved in context:

(23) Con quella cura Fiorella si è guarita.
    With that treatment Fiorella RFL be.3SG heal.PP.FS G
    ‘With that treatment Fiorella healed (herself).’

Note that causative reflexives do not correspond to Castelfranchi and Parisi’s (1976: 94–98) agentive reflexives, since these are allegedly characterized by intentionality, rather than animacy. Castelfranchi and Parisi do cite the paraphrase with a full reflexive as a test to identify agentive reflexives. However, this test alone does not identify causative (or agentive) reflexives, but rather the reflexive classes which involve co-indexation in the semantic representation. I shall discuss below a class of non-causative (and non-agentive) reflexives whereby the overt argument is co-referent with the suppressed one (A Maria capitò di vedersi / vedere se stessa allo specchio ‘Mary happened to see herself in the mirror’). Two types of tests are necessary to identify causative reflexives: the causativity tests and the paraphrase with a full reflexive.

The proposed opposition between causative and anticausative reflexives holds both on theoretical grounds and in the light of empirical evidence which will be introduced in due course. In theoretical terms, causative reflexives are comparable to a subclass of non-causative ones in terms of co-reference, and thus co-indexation, in the semantic representation. This relatedness explains the similar behaviour of these two subclasses of reflexives vis-à-vis ne-cliticization (see section 6.5).
4.2.3 Non-causative reflexives

In section 4.2.2, I considered reflexive structures which allow a causative paraphrase, and I distinguished between anticausative and causative ones. I argued that both types have a suppressed causer in the semantic representation. However, in causative reflexives (Maria si imbruttisce ‘Mary makes herself look ugly’), this argument is recoverable due to its co-reference with a specified semantic position, whereas the suppressed causer is not recoverable in anticausative reflexives (La casa si è allagata ‘the house flooded’). It is now time to move on to those reflexives which rule out a causative or anticausative analysis, in that they do not provide any evidence that the suppressed argument is a causer. Consider radersi ‘shave’ and arrabbiarsi ‘get angry’. In order for rader(si) ‘shave’ and arrabbiar(si) ‘get angry’ to be used causatively they have to be embedded in a syntactic causative structure, for instance the fare-causative. In fact, arrabbiarsi ‘get angry’ does not have a transitive counterpart:

(24) La televisione mi *arrabbia / fa arrabbiare.

The television OCL get.angry.3SG make.3SG get.angry
‘Television makes me angry.’

As for radersi ‘shave’, the fact that (25b) is not a paraphrase of (25a) suggests that this verb is not causative:


The barber shave.3SG Peter
‘The barber shaves Peter.’

b. Il barbiere fa sì che Pietro si rada.

The barber make.3SG so that Peter RFL shave.3SG.SUBJ
‘The barber makes Peter shave (himself).’

In the light of the evidence provided in (24) and (25), it must be assumed that there exist non-causative reflexives, which have no causal component in their semantics.

The absence of a causal component is not only the defining property of the reflexives under scrutiny, but also the only defining property that is shared by the two types represented in (24) and (25). There is, in fact, a significant divide in the class of non-causative reflexives between inherent reflexives, which exhibit no co-reference and no co-indexation in the se-
mantic representation, and the other non-causative reflexives, which do. Observe the data in (26a) and (26b), which indicate that only non-causative reflexives that are not inherent allow a paraphrase with a full reflexive. As was pointed out in the previous section, causative reflexives also allow such a paraphrase (cf. (26c)), whilst anticausative ones do not; ‘gets offended’, the anticausative reading of *si offende, is not a paraphrase of ‘offends himself’ (cf. (26d)):

(26) a. Si rade / rade se stesso.  
   RFL shave.3SG shave.3SG RFL self  
   ‘He shaves himself.’

b. Si arrabbia / *arrabbia se stesso.  
   RFL get.angry.3SG get.angry.3SG RFL self  
   ‘He gets angry (not ‘he angers himself’).’

c. Si imbruttisce / imbruttisce se stesso.  
   RFL make.look.ugly.3SG make.look.ugly.3SG RFL self  
   ‘He makes himself look ugly.’

d. Si offende / offende se stesso.  
   RFL offend.3SG offend.3SG RFL self  
   ‘He gets offended / He offends himself.’

In accordance with the suggested representation of causative reflexives (cf. (22a) and (22a’)), co-reference is to be indicated by the co-indexation of the suppressed argument with the specified one in the semantics of non-causative non-inherent reflexives. Thus, *si rade is represented as follows:

(26) a’. do’ (Ø, Ø) & BECOME shaven’ (3SG_i)

Inherent reflexives constitute a potential problem for any analysis of reflexives, since reflexivization cannot be captured in terms of a change of valence (with reference to French, see Grimshaw 1982; Gross 1968; Ruwet 1972) or of Aktionsart. In the theoretical terms adopted in this work, since inherent reflexives have no transitive counterpart, and do not allow a causative paraphrase, it must be assumed that they only have one argument position in the semantic representation. This position is clearly filled by the argument that is specified. As a result, there is no higher position to allow for argument suppression. As for Aktionsart, the reflexive morpheme cannot be defined as a marker of inchoativity or telicity, since there are a num-
ber of [-telic] and [-inchoative] inherent reflexives (e.g., *arrabattarsi* ‘muddle through’, *ostinarsi* ‘be obstinate’, *trastullarsi* ‘dawdle’, etc.).

Diachronic evidence can be of help in the analysis of inherent reflexives. Some of the verbs which are inherent reflexives in Italian are part of causative vs. reflexive pairs in Latin (e.g., *abstineo* ‘keep somebody or something away from something’ / *me abstineo* ‘keep away from money, food, crime, etc.’). Others are deponents or mediopassives (e.g., *irascor* ‘get angry’), or otherwise reflexives whereby, in Hatcher’s (1942: 49) view, the reflexivization encodes the subject’s *animum* ‘mental faculties or senses’ (*me relaxo* ‘relax’, ‘set oneself free of’). Lastly, some require the accusative of the higher argument and the genitive of the lower one (*me erroris paenitet* ‘I repent of the mistake’). The last kind of encoding is likely to be related to the fact that these are bivalent predications which do not have the properties of prototypical transitives. In fact, the highest-ranking argument is not an agent, but an experiencer. Indeed, these constructions are comparable to type-(iii) experiencer predicates in Modern Italian (see section 3.4).

To be sure, the diachronic evidence does not account for reflexivization in synchrony, but it can help us to understand why some of these verbs take the reflexive morpheme in Modern Italian. The latter can be the left-over of earlier causative alternations. In this case, reflexivization may simply be acquired by memorization (see the selection of perfective ‘be’ in languages like Canadian French, which was discussed in section 2.4.2.2). Otherwise, reflexivization may mark arguments which are in the first position in the semantic representation, but are nonetheless low on the thematic hierarchy (see, for instance, the experiencer of *arrabbiarsi* ‘get angry’). Finally, in some cases, there are imperfect semantic correlations between putatively inherent reflexives and causative transitives. A relevant example is *alzarsi* ‘get up’ which correlates defectively with *alzare* ‘lift’.

In the last analysis, it appears that inherent reflexives are the only type of *si-*construction which does not involve the suppression of a semantic argument, but is marked as if it did. This peculiarity must be marked overtly in the semantic representation, and I tentatively propose that it should be indicated with the symbol [Ø]:

(27)  

\[ Ci \quad arrabbiamo. \]

RFL  get.angry.1PL

‘We get angry.’

BECOME angry’ (1PL) [Ø]
Si-constructions and unexpressed arguments

The symbol \( \text{Ø} \) in (27) indicates that the only argument is marked as if it were suppressed, even though it is actually expressed (1PL).

Pseudo-reflexive motion verbs are to be regarded as inherent reflexives and to be analysed as proposed in (27). Examples are andarsene ‘go away’ (see andare), and partirsì or partirsene ‘leave’ (see partire). Such pseudo-reflexives are very widespread in Italo-Romance (for some dialect evidence see, among others, Avolio 2003: 315). The same analysis holds for pensarsi ‘think’ and credersi ‘believe’ which are attested in Old Italian:

(28) a. Lo re si pensò di non essere legittimo.
   The king RFL think.3SG.PST of NEG be legitimate
   ‘The king thought that he was not legitimate.’
   (Novellino, III, 16)
   b. Io mi credo che noi n’ avremmo... servigio.
   I RFL believe.1SG that we GCL have.3PL.COND service
   ‘I believe we would gain from his help.’
   (Decameron, III, 1, 16)

The claim that the highest argument of inherent reflexives is marked as if it were suppressed is not a mere technicality of the proposed analysis. Rather, it proves to be of significance vis-à-vis the acceptability of ne-cliticization. This point will be dealt with at length in Chapter 6. What should be noted here is that, according to the judgement of a sample of native speakers, ne can realize the argument of anticausative reflexives. Contrastingly, ne-cliticization is problematic with inherent reflexives. In section 6.5, I shall relate this contrast to the difference between the ne-cliticized argument of anticausative reflexives, which is independent from the suppressed argument (cf. (29a)), and the argument of inherent reflexives, which is instead marked as suppressed (cf. (29b)):

(29) a. Se ne aprono / spezzano / bruciano molti.
   RFL QCL open.3PL break.3PL burn.3PL many
   ‘Many ne open / break / burn.’
   [[do’(Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME pred’ (molti ne)]]
   b. *?Se ne arrabbiano molti.
   RFL QCL get.angry.3PL many
   ‘Many ne get angry.’
   BECOME angry’ (molti ne) [Ø]
4.2.4 Analytic passivization and causativization

A well-known fact about clitic reflexives is that they rule out analytic passivization, i.e., passivization with an auxiliary of voice (e.g., essere ‘be’) plus a past participle:

\[(30)\]
\[
a. \text{*Eva si è stata vista.}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Eve RFL be.3SG be.FP.FSG see.FP.FSG}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\text{‘Eve has been seen by herself.’}
\]
\[
a. \text{*Eva si è stata uccisa.}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Eve RFL be.3SG be.FP.FSG kill.FP.FSG}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\text{‘Eve has been killed by herself.’}
\]

The data in (30a) and (30b) illustrate the ungrammaticality of the analytic passivization of non-causative (cf. (30a)) and causative (cf. (30b)) clitic reflexives. As a matter of fact, all kinds of clitic reflexives pattern alike vis-à-vis analytic passivization.

Analytic passivization consists of PSA modulation (the lowest direct core argument plays the role of the PSA of the clause) and, optionally, argument modulation (the actor can figure as a peripheral adjunct). The reason why clitic reflexives cannot passivize analytically is straightforward. Consider the semantic representations of (30a) and (30b):

\[(30)\]
\[
a^1. \text{see}^\prime (\emptyset, \text{Eva})
\]
\[
b^1. [[\text{do}^\prime (\emptyset., \emptyset)] \text{CAUSE} [\text{BECOME dead}^\prime (\text{Eva})]]
\]

Since the highest argument is suppressed, it is the second argument that serves as the PSA of the clause (Eva in both cases). Thus, some kind of PSA modulation characterizes reflexives by definition, as it does passives. Reflexive PSA modulation, which is triggered by argument suppression, is marked by the reflexive morpheme. Passive PSA modulation, which is not triggered by argument suppression, is marked by the passive morposyntax (an auxiliary, such as ‘be’ or ‘come’, plus a past participle). In sum, reflexivization and analytic passivization are kinds of PSA modulation which are motivated, and overtly marked, in different ways. Thus, reflexives cannot passivize analytically because, by definition, they require a PSA other than the highest argument.

The proposed account does not hold for inherent reflexives, since the PSA of these structures is the highest argument in the semantic representa-
tion (cf. (27)). In this case, however, PSA modulation is ruled out because inherent reflexives only have one argument position, and are thus comparable to intransitives. The suppression of the only argument of inherent reflexives is, of course, grammatical. However, once this argument is suppressed, there is no other argument that can serve as a PSA. The result is a reflexive impersonal construction (C’i si arrabbia ‘one gets angry’, see section 4.3.4).

An interesting question to be addressed at this point is whether clitic reflexives allow argument modulation. If the suppressed argument is co-indexed with the lower argument, it can figure in syntax as a da-actor that is co-referent with the PSA and is expressed by a reflexive pronoun:

\[(31)\quad \text{Eva si è uccisa da sé.}\]
\[\text{Eve RFL be.3SG kill.PP.FSG by RFL}\]
\[\text{‘Eve has killed herself by herself’}\]

This option is not open to anticausative reflexives, however, since the suppressed argument is not semantically recoverable, and thus it cannot show up in syntax: Eva si è offesa da sé ‘Eva offended herself’ is a causative reflexive and not a paraphrase of anticausative Eva si è offesa ‘Eva got offended’. The same restriction holds for inherent reflexives (*Eva si è arrabbiata / arrabattata / ostinata / trastullata da sé ‘Eva has got angry / muddled through / been obstinate / dawdled by herself’).

Whereas reflexives cannot passivize in synchrony, they can develop into passives in diachrony (Bertuccelli Papi 1980; Cennamo 1993, 2001b, with respect to Romance, and, for a typological approach, Siewierska 1984; Geniušienė 1987: 266–271). For instance, the Latin reflexive marker se has developed into a passive marker. The reanalysis of Latin reflexive se as a passive marker is claimed to have first occurred in anticausative reflexives (Cennamo 1993). A parallel process of development of anticausative reflexives into passives appears to have occurred in Scandinavian (Geniušienė 1987: 269; Enger and Nesset 1999). This reanalysis can be explained as follows: anticausative reflexives are constructions in which the highest argument is not only suppressed but also unrecoverable semantically, and a lower argument is pressed into service as the PSA of the clause. Accordingly, they can be reanalysed as other constructions with PSA modulation whereby the highest argument is suppressed and different from the modulated PSA, i.e., SE-passives (see section 4.3.2). Observe that the semantic representation of anticausative reflexives is identical to
that of corresponding si-passives and si-impersonals (see sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2). Thus, \([\text{do}^\text{\textsuperscript{}} (\varnothing, \varnothing)] \text{CAUSE} [\text{BECOME open'} (\text{porta})]\) is the representation of \(\text{la porta si apre} \) ‘the door opens’, ‘the door is opened’, and of \(\text{si apre la porta} \) ‘one opens the door’, ‘the door is opened’. The formal differences between these constructions (concerning word order, finite and non-finite agreement, etc.) are established in semantic-syntax mapping. As for the interpretation of the suppressed argument, which can be a referential first person singular in si-passives and si-impersonals, but not in anti-causative reflexives, this is determined in discourse.

The diachronic step which follows the reanalysis of SE as a marker of SE-passives is the reanalysis of SE as the only marker of the passive voice. This change has actually taken place in Romanian, where the construction with SE has almost entirely replaced the ‘be’-passive, in accordance with the early loss of ‘be’ as a perfective operator (Vincent 1982: 87).

The analysis of clitic reflexives developed above also explains why, in Modern Italian, clitic reflexives cannot be embedded under causative \(\text{fare} \):

(32) a. \(\text{Luca ha fatto veder(*si) / uccider(*si) Eva.} \) Luke have.3SG made.PP see.RFL kill.RFL Eve ‘Luke has made Eve see / kill her.

b. \(\text{Luca ha fatto offender(*si) / arrabbiar(*si) Eva.} \) Luke have.3SG made.PP offend.RFL get.angry.RFL Eve ‘Luke has made Eve get offended / angry’.

Modern Italian \(\text{fare-} \)causatives are nuclear co-subordinations, i.e., constructions in which two predicative nuclei join together under a single nucleus (see section 2.5.1, Figure 7). Evidence that co-subordination is the relevant type of nexus is provided by the selection of the perfective operator, which indicates that \(\text{fare} \) ‘make’ is a predicator (\(\text{Luca l’ha / *è fatta cadere} \) ‘Luke made her fall’). As for the level of juncture, the position of the clitic argument of \(\text{cadere} \) ‘fall’ in \(\text{Luca l’ha fatta cadere} \) ‘Luke made her fall’ suggests that this is the nucleus. The results of the remaining diagnostics which I mentioned in my analysis of complex predicates developed in Chapter 2 corroborate this finding.

Since \(\text{fare-} \)causatives are nuclear co-subordinations, the highest argument, i.e., the \(\text{fare-} \)causer, is shared by the two predicates. If the \(\text{fare-} \)causer is overt, as is the case with \(\text{Luca} \) in (32a) and (32b), a si-reflexive cannot be embedded in the \(\text{fare-} \)causative (*\(\text{Luca ha fatto vedersi} \) ‘Luke has made somebody see him’). This ban follows from the assumption that
si marks the suppression of the highest argument in the semantic representation. Of course, there is no such ban on the suppression of the fare-causer itself:

(33) a. Luca si è fatto vedere / uccidere.
    Luke RFL be.3SG made.PP.MSG see kill
    ‘Luke has made somebody see / kill him.’

b. Luca si è fatto offendere.
    Luke RFL be.3SG made.PP.MSG offend
    ‘Luke has made somebody offend him.’

The only exception is provided by inherent reflexives: *Luca si è fatto arrabbiare ‘Luke made somebody make him angry’. Inherent reflexives cannot figure in the structure exemplified in (33a) and (33b), since they only have one argument position (cf. (27)), whilst the structure in question requires two separate arguments in the semantic representation. Thus, in (33a') and (33b'), the suppressed causer is co-referent with the causee Luca, and there is another unspecified argument (x), i.e., the highest argument of ‘see’, ‘kill’ and ‘offend’. In the case of ‘kill’ and ‘offend’, this unspecified argument is itself a causer. Finally, the second Ø in [do’ (Ø₁, Ø)] is an unspecified causal activity:

(34) a. Luca si è fatto vedere dal medico.
    Luke RFL be.3SG make.PP.MSG see by.the doctor
    ‘Luke has had the doctor see him.’

b. Luca si è fatto uccidere dai ricattatori.
    Luke RFL be.3SG make.PP.MSG kill by.the blackmailers
    ‘Luke has let the blackmailers kill him.’
Note, incidentally, that the construction illustrated in (34b) differs from the ungrammatical construction discussed in section 3.3 (*Questo lo ha fatto uccidere / preoccupare / bruciare da Mario, lit. this made him / it being killed / worried / burned by Mario), insofar as the highest causer is suppressed and is clearly separate from the da-causer. Incidentally, some type-(ii) experiencer predicates are not admitted in the structure in (34b), and I return to this point in section 4.2.5 of this chapter (Luca si è fatto *preoccupare / *?spaventare / offendere da Mario ‘Luke has let Mario worry / frighten / offend him.’).

To conclude, the assumption that si marks the suppression of the highest argument in the semantic representation explains why clitic reflexives reject analytic passivization and cannot be embedded in fare-causatives. The classification of reflexives provided in sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 explains the peculiar behaviour of inherent reflexives with respect to the suppression of the fare-causer.

### 4.2.5 Reflexive experiencer verbs

Experiencer verbs were introduced in Chapter 3, where it was claimed that three patterns of PSA assignment are found with these verbs: experiencer PSA (type (i)), causer PSA (type (ii)) and theme PSA (type (iii)). Type-(i) experiencer predicates are transitive structures with no causer in their semantics (Paola fa sì che gli arroganti si detestino ‘Paola makes arrogant people detest themselves’ is not a paraphrase of Paola detesta gli arroganti ‘Paola detests arrogant people’). Accordingly, reflexivization of these verbs yields non-causative non-inherent reflexives, specifically, intransitive-direct ones. As was proposed in previous sections, the co-reference of the suppressed argument with the specified lower argument is indicated by co-indexation in the semantic representation:

\begin{equation}
\text{(35)} \quad \text{Paola si detesta.}
\end{equation}

> Paula RFL detest.3SG
> ‘Paula detests herself.’

\textit{detest}’ (Ø, Paola)

Three subclasses of type (i) are worth mentioning in this context. First, the complex predicates formed with avere ‘have’ (e.g., avere paura ‘fear’) and sentire (e.g., sentire freddo ‘feel cold’). These predicates do not allow re-
flexivization. This fact is expected in the light of the predicative function of the second argument of the complex predicates in question which stops it from being modulated. Since reflexivization is a kind of PSA modulation, it is ruled out, on a par with analytic passivization (*Paura è stata avuta... ‘fear was had...’).

Secondly, the complex predicates formed with reflexive sentirsi (e.g., sentirsi bene ‘feel well’) are inherent reflexives with only one argument, which is marked as suppressed (cf. (27)):

(36) Paola si sente bene.
    Paula RFL feel.3SG well
    ‘Paula feels well.’

Finally, type (i) includes reflexives which, at a first glance, would seem to result from the suppression of the second semantic argument, contrary to the assumption that si marks the suppression of the highest argument (confidarsi con ‘confide in’, ricordarsi (di) ‘remember’, dimenticarsi (di) ‘forget’). Such reflexives are found in other Indo-European languages and are treated in the literature as deaccusative reflexives, i.e., reflexives with a demoted object (Geniušiené 1987: 256):

(37) a. Non ricordo tuo fratello.
    NEG remember.1SG your brother
    ‘I do not remember your brother.’

b. Non mi ricordo di tuo fratello.
    NEG RFL remember of your brother
    ‘I do not remember your brother.’

The second argument is a macrorole in (37a), whilst it is not a macrorole, in (37b). However, there is evidence that the reflexive marking is independent of the treatment of the lower argument. Observe the alternatives of (37b) provided in (38a) and (38b), and the authentic example in (39), which exhibits the relative pronoun che that realizes the undergoer:

(38) a. Non ricordo di tuo fratello.
    NEG remember.1SG of your brother
    ‘I do not remember your brother.’
b. Non mi ricordo tuo fratello.
   NEG RFL remember.1SG your brother
   ‘I do not remember your brother.’

(39) Con l’ indignazione e la sorpresa e l’ ironia
   With the indignation and the surprise and the irony
   che mi ricordavo nella sua voce.
   that RFL remember.1SG.PST in.the POSS voice
   ‘With the indignation, surprise and irony that I remembered
   in his voice.’ (De Carlo, *Due di due*, p. 249)

The data in (38) and (39) indicate clearly that the appearance of the reflexive morpheme does not depend on the treatment of the lower argument. Therefore, it can be concluded that reflexive *ricordarsi* ‘remember’ does not differ from other reflexives in the respect that is relevant to the treatment of split intransitivity, i.e., the suppression of the highest-ranking argument. The same holds for the other reflexives of this group.

Turning now to the reflexive counterparts of type-(ii) experiencer verbs, a few scholars have argued that these are antipassive structures (see, among others, Cresti 1990; Masullo 1992). This account arises from the view that the two arguments of type-(ii) experiencer predicates are a theme and an experiencer. If this view were correct, reflexivization would involve the demotion of a theme. In Chapter 3, however, I provided evidence that the two macrorole arguments of type-(ii) experiencer verbs are a causee and an experiencer. As a result, their reflexive counterparts must exhibit a suppressed causer, and be anticausative. The antipassive account is unjustified.

The suppressed causer of reflexive type-(ii) experiencer verbs can show up as a non-macrorole argument of the embedded predicate:

(40) a. Elio si spaventa dei gatti.
   Elio RFL scare.3SG of.the cats
   ‘Elio is afraid of cats.’
   [[do´(Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [feel´(Elio, [afraid.of´(gatti)])]]

b. Elio si interessa di cucina.
   Elio RFL interest.3SG of cooking
   ‘Elio is interested in cooking.’
   [[do´(Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [feel´(Elio, [interested.in´(cooking)])]]
Interestingly, the reflexive counterparts of type-(ii) experiencer verbs do not admit a causative reading. Thus, *Luca si è preoccupato / spaventato / irritato* cannot be read as ‘Luke worried / scared / irritated himself’. This fact is in part explained by the relative incompatibility of type-(ii) verbs with agentive causers. As was pointed out in section 3.3, however, it is not the case that all type-(ii) verbs categorically reject agentive causers. In accordance with the lack of a causative reading, type-(ii) experiencer verbs are not allowed in the reflexive structure illustrated above in (34b). In fact, this structure is characterized by the co-reference of the highest causer and the causee. One exception is *offendere* ‘offend’, which admits an agentive causer (see also causative *Luca si è offeso da sé* ‘Luca offended himself’):

(41)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Luca} & \quad \text{si} \quad \text{è} \quad \text{fatto} \quad *\text{spaventare} / \text{offendere} \\
& \quad \text{Luke} \quad \text{RFL} \quad \text{be.3SG} \quad \text{make.PP.MSG} \quad \text{scare} \quad \text{offend} \\
& \quad \text{dal suo migliore amico.} \quad \text{by.the POSS best friend} \\
& \quad \text{‘Luke has let his best friend scare / offend him.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Some type-(ii) causative vs. anticausative pairs originate from dialect pressure, but have now become part of informal, and sociolinguistically low, pan-Italian variation. Observe the reflexive form of *imparare* ‘learn’ in the following authentic example:

(42)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ma prima di impararmi ce n’era voluto.} \\
& \quad \text{But before of learn.RFL CL QCL be.3SG.PST want.PP} \\
& \quad \text{‘But I had taken a long time to learn.’} \\
& \quad \text{\textbf{(Maraini, Memorie di una ladra, p. 105)}}
\end{align*}
\]

In standard Italian, *imparare* ‘learn’ is an intransitive accomplishment, and does not have a causative or anticausative variant. Contrastingly, in a number of dialects, as well as in low varieties of Italian, *imparare* can be causative, meaning ‘teach’ (‘Glielo imparo ‘I teach it to him / her’). In agreement with this possibility, *imparare* can also be realized as an anticausative reflexive, as in (42).

With respect to the type-(ii) experiencer verbs which admit both psychological and physical readings, it should be noted that the reflexive realizations of the physical readings are non-causative non-inherent reflexives (cf. (43b)), given that these readings are not causative (see section 3.3):
Reflexives

(43) a. *Luca colpisce Giorgio.*
   Luke hit.3SG Giorgio
   ‘Luke hits George.’
   **do´** (Luca, [hit´ (Luca, Giorgio)]) & INGR hit´ (Giorgio)

b. *Luca si colpisce.*
   Luke RFL hit.3SG
   ‘Luke hits himself.’
   **do´** (Ø, [hit´ (Ø, Luca)]) & INGR hit´ (Luca)

The psychological predicates, on the other hand, should in theory admit anticausative counterparts. Such realizations, however, are not grammatical (*Luca si colpisce ‘Luke is / gets impressed’, *Luca si attrae ‘Luke is / gets attracted’). A resultative periphrasis with rimanere, lit. remain, is used instead of these structures, which do not have a grammatical realization in Italian:

(44) a. *Luca colpisce Giorgio.*
   Luke impress.3SG Giorgio
   ‘Luke impresses George.’
   [[**do´** (Luca, Ø)] CAUSE [INGR impressed´ (Giorgio)]]

b. Giorgio rimane colpito (da Luca).
   George remain.3SG impress.PP.MSG by Luke
   ‘George is impressed by Luke.’
   [[**do´** (Luca, Ø)] CAUSE [INGR impressed´ (Giorgio)]]

Finally, the reflexive realizations of type-(iii) verbs are non-causative and non-inherent (piacersi ‘like oneself’ and bastarsi ‘be self-sufficient’). Some type-(iii) verbs, however, cannot be reflexivized, since their semantics requires that the second argument be inanimate, and an inanimate PSA is not licensed with non-causative non-inherent reflexives (see, *capitarsi ‘happen to oneself’, *riuscirsi ‘succeed to oneself’).

4.2.6 Semantics-syntax mapping in reflexive predications

The assumption that reflexive structures have a marked PSA captures the selection of the perfective operator in Italian, but not in other Italo-Romance or Romance languages. In order to explain the crosslinguistic discrepancies in the selection of the perfective operator in reflexive con-
strications, it is necessary to consider the mapping of semantics with syntax in the various classes of reflexives which have been identified. The analysis of semantics-syntax mapping will also provide the basis of a treatment of past-participle agreement in reflexive constructions (see Chapter 5).

In previous sections, I proposed a twofold classification. On the one hand, reflexives can be divided into monadic and non-monadic, and further subclasses identified on the basis of the number and type of arguments which figure in the semantic representation. The example in (45a) illustrates a monadic reflexive, whereas the one in (45b) illustrates a non-monadic reflexive:

\[(45) \quad \text{a. } \text{Si è visto.} \quad \text{RFL be.3SG see.PP.MSG} \quad \text{‘He has seen himself.’} \quad \text{see’ (Ø, 3SG)}
\]

\[\text{b. } \text{Si è comprato una macchina.} \quad \text{RFL be.3SG buy.PP.MSG a car} \quad \text{‘He has bought a car for himself.’} \]

\[\text{[[do’ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME have’ (Ø, car)]]} \]

\[\text{PURP [have’ (3SG, car)]} \]

On the other hand, four classes of reflexives are distinguished on the basis of the intersection of two properties: whether there is a causer in the semantic representation, and whether the suppressed argument is co-referent with a specified argument. Both anticausative and causative reflexives have a suppressed causer. However, only the suppressed causer of causative reflexives is co-referent with a lower argument. The example in (46a) displays causative *uccidersi* ‘kill oneself’, whilst that in (46b) exhibits anticausative *annoiarsi* ‘feel bored’. Non-causative reflexives have no causer in their semantics. They divide into two subclasses, that is, those with argument suppression proper (cf. (46c)), and those which are marked as if the highest argument were suppressed even though it is not (cf. (46d)). Only the former type is characterized by the semantic co-reference of the suppressed argument with a lower argument:

\[(46) \quad \text{a. } \text{Si è uccisa.} \quad \text{RFL be.3SG kill.PP.FSG} \quad \text{‘She has killed herself.’} \quad \text{[[do’ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME dead’ (3SG)]]} \]
b. *Si è annoiata.*  
   RFL be.3SG bore.PP.FSG  
   ‘She has got bored.’  
   
   \[
   ([\text{do}^{\prime}(\emptyset, \emptyset) \ \text{CAUSE} \ \text{feel}^{\prime}(3SG, [\text{bored}^{\prime}])])
   \]

c. *Si è vista.*  
   RFL be.3SG see.PP.FSG  
   ‘She has seen herself.’  
   see^{\prime}(\emptyset, 3SG)  

d. *Si è pentita.*  
   RFL be.3SG repent.PP.FSG  
   ‘She has repented.’  
   \text{BECOME repentant}^{\prime}(3SG) [\emptyset]

Both types of classification are relevant to the analysis of the morphosyntax of reflexives. In monadic reflexives, the suppression of the highest-ranking argument leaves only one argument available for macrorole and PSA assignment. This will always be an undergoer, since it is not the highest direct core argument in the semantic representation (cf. (46a), (46b) and (46c)). Inherent reflexives differ from other monadic reflexives, in that they only have one argument position. Their argument is also a marked PSA, however, because of the position it occupies in the semantic representation (cf. (46d)). Figure 11 illustrates semantics-syntax mapping with a non-causative monadic reflexive structure (cf. (46c)). The reflexive morpheme figures under the Agreement Index node (AGX) in syntax. This node is a dependent of the nucleus, which receives the agreement specifications of all the core argument positions present in the semantic representation (Belloro 2004)."  

In section 4.2.1, I differentiated between intransitive-direct and intransitive-dative reflexives. By contrast with the specified argument of intransitive-direct reflexives, the argument that is not suppressed in intransitive-dative reflexives occurs in a semantic position which is by default a non-macrorole position, the first position of a two-place state embedded under BECOME (VVLP: 376–377):  

(47) a. *Chiara si è risposta.*  
   Chiara RFL be.3SG reply.PP.FSG  
   ‘Chiara has replied to herself.’  
   
   \[
   ([\text{do}^{\prime}(\emptyset, [\text{express}^{\prime}(\alpha).to.(\beta).in.language.(\gamma)^{\prime}(\emptyset, \text{Chiara}))]) 
   \]
   CAUSE [BECOME aware of^{\prime}(\text{Chiara}, z)] (\text{Chiara} = \beta, z = \alpha).
Intransitive-dative reflexives are thus marked in terms of PSAhood, not only because the highest argument is suppressed, but also because the argument which serves as the PSA of the clause is not a macrorole. This marked pattern of semantics-syntax mapping is motivated as follows: since the highest-ranking argument is suppressed, the only available argument is pressed into service as the undergoer PSA. The same analysis holds for dative reciprocals (*Maria e Paola si scrivono* ‘Mary and Paula write to each other’). The non-macrorole status of the PSA has no morphosyntactic reflex in Italian, but it does surface in French, where these reflexives do not exhibit the agreement of the past participle with the PSA (*Marie et Paule se sont écrites* ‘Mary and Paula have written to each other’).

In non-monadic reflexives, the suppression of the highest-ranking argument leaves two arguments available for macrorole assignment. These are the two arguments of a possessive noun phrase, in the case of possessive reflexives (cf. (48a)), and the two arguments of a benefactive predi-
cate, in benefactive ones (cf. (48b)). The highest-ranking argument is assigned the macrorole actor, whilst the lowest one will be the undergoer:

(48) a. Anna si è lavata la faccia.
    Hannah RFL be.3SG wash.PP.FSG the face
    ‘Hannah has washed her face.’
    do´ (Ø, [wash´ (Ø, faccia)]) & BECOME washed´
    (have.as.part´ (Anna, faccia))

b. Anna si è comprata una borsa.
    Hannah RFL be.3SG buy PP.FSG a handbag
    ‘Hannah has bought a handbag for herself.’
    [[do´ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME have´ (Ø, borsa)]]
    PURP [have´ (Anna, borsa)]

In Italian, the suppression of the highest argument is a sufficient condition for the selection of E. Contrastingly, in Logudorese Sardinian, perfective ‘be’ is required in monadic reflexives (cf. (49a) and (49b)), and ‘have’ in non-monadic ones (cf. (49c)):

(49) a. Mangedda s’est samunada. (Logudorese)
    Mangedda RFL be.3SG wash.PP.FSG
    ‘Mangedda has washed herself.’

b. Sas fozzas si sun siccadas. (Logudorese)
    The leaf.FPL RFL be.3PL dry.PP.FPL
    ‘The leaves have dried.’

c. Mangedda s’at comperadu duos liberos. (Log.)
    Mangedda RFL have.3SG buy PP two books
    ‘Mangedda has bought two books for herself.’

The contrast illustrated in (49) can be explained as follows. The general principle of perfective-operator selection which is at work in Italian is also at work in Logudorese Sardinian. Thus, ‘be’ is selected if the PSA is an undergoer or an affected actor, i.e., a marked PSA (see Mangedda est an-nada ‘Mangedda has (lit. is) gone’). However, Logudorese distinguishes between undergoers and affected actors, which are treated as marked PSAs, and the marked actors of non-monadic reflexives, which are treated as unmarked PSAs. As a result, ‘have’ is selected in non-monadic reflexives, which have a marked, but not affected, actor PSA (see Figure 12).
The contrast between Logudorese Sardinian and Italian reveals that the selection of perfective ‘be’ is subject to a more restrictive criterion in Logudorese than it is in Italian. In section 5.7.1, I shall point out that, in Logudorese, information structure also plays a role in the selection of the perfective operator, blocking the selection of ‘be’ in some domains.

Interesting patterns of distribution of the perfective operators are attested in early Italo-Romance reflexives. Abstracting away from modal factors (Formentin 2001; Ledgeway 2003), a split has been noted between inherent reflexives, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, reflexives which include at least two semantic positions. Observe the following examples from early Sicilian:

---

**Figure 12. Semantics-syntax mapping: Non-monadic reflexives**
In my analysis, the structure exemplified in (50a) only has one argument position in the semantic representation, whereas (50b) and (50c) have two or more positions. In addition, in the second type of structure, the suppressed argument is co-referent with a specified one, as is always the case with causative and non-causative non-inherent reflexives. In other words, these structures are to some extent comparable to transitive constructions, even though only the non-monadic one (cf. (50c)) has two macroroles. In the light of the findings illustrated in (50), it is not clear whether the factor that is crucial to the selection of the perfective operator is the number of argument positions in the semantic representation or the co-reference of the suppressed argument with a specified argument. Below I introduce evidence which suggests that the second hypothesis is more plausible.

In diachronic terms, it has been claimed that data such as those in (50) attest the beginning of a process. La Fauci (1992) has shown that all kinds of reflexives can select ‘have’ in early Sicilian. However, the types illustrated in (50b) and (50c) do so to a greater extent than inherent ones. In the light of this evidence, La Fauci (1992) suggests that reflexives such as (50b) and (50c) play an important role in the process of restoration of an accusative system in Sicilian, at least insofar as the selection of the perfective operator is concerned. In particular, due to their comparability with transitives, these reflexive structures constitute a bridge between a system with two allomorphs of the perfective operator and one with no such allomorphy.

In Old Italian, there is a tendency for the types of reflexives exemplified in (50b) and (50c) to select avere ‘have’. This indicates that, in the transi-
tion to Romance, A establishes itself in these structures, which are comparable to transitives. At a later stage, however, E replaces A in all reflexive constructions. In other words, the types of reflexives exemplified in (50b) and (50c) represent the last stronghold of A in the development of the Modern Italian system of perfective-operator selection (Vincent 1982).

As for inherent reflexives, not only do they stand out in early Italo-Romance, in that they are more strongly associated with perfective ‘be’ than the other classes of reflexives, but they are also characterized by the frequent lack of the reflexive morpheme in the perfect (Brambilla Ageno 1964: 201; La Fauci 1992: 190; Ledgeway 2003):

\[(51)\]

\[a. \text{Illo se partio } da \text{ chella isula. (Old Neapolitan)}\]
\[
\text{He RFL leave.3SG.PST from that island}
\]
\`
He left that island.'
\[
\text{(Libru de la Destructione de Troya, p. 53: 32, cited in Ledgeway 2003: 33)}
\]

\[b. \text{Erano partuti } \text{ de Troya. (Old Neapolitan)}\]
\[
\text{Be.3PL.PST leave.PP.MPL from Troya}
\]
\`
They had left Troya.'
\[
\text{(Libru de la Destructione de Troya, p. 266: 22, cited in Ledgeway 2003: 33)}
\]

Furthermore, Formentin’s (2004: 192–193) study of an early Venetan text records instances of the double-composed perfect with the operator ‘be’ (lit. I am been plus past participle) both with unaccusatives and in predications with inherent reflexives. These reflexives only exhibit the reflexive morpheme in the present. These facts indicate that inherent reflexives are not comparable to transitives, but rather to unaccusatives.

Significantly, among the reflexive structures which may lack the reflexive pronoun and select E in the perfective tenses, Brambilla Ageno (1964: 200) lists some anticausative reflexives which derive from Late Latin mediopassives (\textit{sanari} / \textit{se sanare} ‘heal (intr.)’, \textit{dissolvi} / \textit{se dissolvere} ‘dissolve (intr.)’, etc.). Accordingly, the theoretical distinction between reflexive structures which involve the co-reference of a suppressed argument with one that is specified (causative and non-causative non-inherent reflexives), and reflexive structures which do not involve such co-reference (inherent and anticausative reflexives) finds some support in the study of early Italo-Romance. Combined with the findings exemplified in (50) and (51), Brambilla Ageno’s (1964) data lead one to think that the co-reference
in the semantic representation might be the crucial factor in the selection of the perfective operator, as well as in the marking with the reflexive morpheme or the lack thereof.

A final pattern of distribution of the perfective operators which is worthy of mention in this context occurs in Modern Venetan. This variety exhibits evidence of free alternation of the allomorphs of the perfective operator in reflexive structures:

(52) a. Se sëmò màlà(i) / se gëhëmò màlà. (Venetan)
   IMP be.1PL get.ill.PP.MPL RFL have.3PL get.ill.PP
   ‘We have got ill.’

b. Ve sì peticà(i) / ve gàvì peticà. (Venetan)
   RFL be.2PL comb.PP.MPL RFL have.2PL comb.PP
   ‘You have combed yourselves.’

   (Benincà and Vanelli 1984: 183)

By contrast with clitic reflexives, Venetan se-impersonals are sensitive to Aktionsart insofar as the selection of the perfective operator is concerned (Benincà 1994; Benincà and Vanelli 1984; Lepschy 1984: 71–74):

(53) a. Se gà / *zë capio tuto ormai. (Venetan)
   IMP have.3SG be.3SG understand.PP all by.now
   ‘One has understood everything by now.’

b. Se gerà riva(i) màsa tardi. (Venetan)
   IMP be.3SG.PST arrive.PP.MPL too late
   ‘One had arrived too late.’

   (Benincà and Vanelli 1984: 184)

Clearly, PSA markedness or Aktionsart are not sufficient criteria to account for the selection of perfective ‘be’ in Venetan. In addition, the contrast between the selection of the perfective operator in reflexives and se-impersonals further suggests that Venetan differentiates between two kinds of argument suppression. I shall return to this point in my treatment of unexpressed arguments (see section 4.3.1).

To sum up, I have mentioned four patterns of distribution of the perfective operators which are attested in Italo-Romance reflexives: (i) the system represented by Modern Italian, which marks all reflexive structures with E; (ii) the system represented by Old Italian and Old Sicilian, which differentiates between inherent (and, in all probability, anticausative) re-
flexives and other reflexives; (iii) the system represented by Logudorese Sardinian, which differentiates between monadic and non-monadic reflexives; and, finally, (iv) the Venetan system, which does not obligatorily indicate Aktionsart (or PSA markedness) in reflexives. Both the Modern Italian and the Venetan systems neutralize the differences between the various classes of reflexives. However, Italian marks argument suppression by the selection of E, whereas, in Venetan, reflexive argument suppression is a sufficient but not a necessary condition for ‘be’ to be selected.

The difference between classes of reflexives, which is neutralized in Modern Italian and Modern Venetan, surfaces in the Old Sicilian and the Old Italian systems, which treat reflexives with co-reference in the semantic representation differently from other reflexives. This different treatment is in accordance with the comparability of the first kind of reflexives with transitives. Finally, like Italian, Logudorese Sardinian indicates PSA markedness in reflexives. However, the cut-off point between marked and un-marked PSAs differs in Logudorese and Italian, with all non-affected actors being treated as unmarked PSAs in Logudorese.

4.3 Impersonal si-constructions

When impersonal si-constructions were first introduced in the context of the treatment of perfective operators, it was argued that the generalized selection of E in such structures is due to the suppression of the highest semantic argument, as is the case with the generalized selection of E in clitic reflexives. It is now time to substantiate this claim with more in-depth treatment of si-impersonals. I consider first si-impersonals proper, i.e., structures which have no PSA, as a result of the suppression of the highest argument (see section 4.3.1). Then, I discuss si-passives, that is, si-constructions in which the second direct core argument serves as the PSA of the clause (see section 4.3.2), and a related type of structure, often referred to as the middle construction (see section 4.3.3). Finally, section 4.3.4 is concerned with reflexive si-impersonals and si-passives.

4.3.1 Si-impersonals

Proper si-impersonals are structures without a PSA. Two subclasses should be distinguished: first, structures in which argument suppression leaves no
potential PSA, and secondly, structures in which there is an available argument, but this does not trigger finite agreement on the verb. These two subclasses are illustrated in (54a) and (54b), respectively:

(54) a. Si canta.
IMP sing.3SG
‘One sings.’

b. Si compra due penne.
IMP buy.3SG two pens
‘One buys two pens.’
(Lepschy 1978: 34)

The predicate of (54a) is monovalent. Accordingly, argument suppression leaves no potential PSA in the clause. The third-person singular ending of the finite form of the verb does not agree anaphorically with an established topic, in the way that the inflection does in pro-drop constructions like canta ‘s/he sings’ (for anaphoric agreement see section 5.2). In addition, it does not receive the arbitrary interpretation that, in Italian, can be associated with the third person plural (see section 3.3):

Have.3PL knock.PP must.3SG be Leo
‘Somebody knocked. It must be Leo.’

IMP be.3SG knock.PP must.3SG be Leo
‘One has knocked. It must be Leo.’

Thus, the third-person singular ending of si canta ‘one sings’ in (54a) must be considered to be a default inflection, and, by contrast with the inflection of pro-drop constructions, cannot be thought to play the role of an argument in the semantics or the syntax of the structure under scrutiny. The clause in (54b) differs from the one in (54a) in that it has a potential controller, the undergoer (due penne ‘two pens’), which, however, fails to serve as the PSA of the clause. Si-constructions like (54b) are said by Lepschy and Lepschy (1988: 225) to be “admittedly far less common” than their correlates with control of agreement, and are excluded from grammars.

The suppressed argument of si-impersonals is obligatorily [+human], as is suggested by the unacceptability of examples such as *si abbaia ‘one
barks’ and *si tramonta ‘one sets’ (see il sole tramonta ‘the sun sets’). In fact, Wehr (1995) proposes that the most salient feature of si-impersonals is a participant that is, at the same time, human and unspecified. The [+human] value of the unspecified participant is a frequent crosslinguistic constraint on impersonal constructions (Blevins 2003), and, in section 4.4, I shall point out that, in Italian, there are other structures with an unexpressed argument which share this trait. RRG assumes that grammatical structures are stored as fully-fledged constructional templates, which are constellations of morphosyntactic, semantic and pragmatic instructions which the grammar combines into particular forms within the production and interpretation processes (VVLP: 430–436). This mentioned restriction on si-im impersonals can be thought of as a constructional feature specified in the fully-fledged constructional template of si-im impersonals.

There is, in fairness, a small number of set phrases which would seem to constitute exceptions to the requirement that the suppressed argument of si-im impersonals be [+human]; first, the phrases si fa buio ‘it gets dark’, si fa sera ‘it becomes evening’, and si fa tardi ‘it gets late’. Cennamo (1995: 98) has argued that, in such cases, the morpheme si plays an aspectual role, that is, the marking of the encoded events as telic. Only in si fa tardi ‘it gets late’, however, does the morpheme si occur obligatorily. In the other cases, it is optional, and its absence does not affect telicity (see fa buio ‘it gets dark’ and fa sera ‘it becomes evening’). The phrases in question illustrate the extension of the morpheme si to impersonal domains which do not have a suppressed argument. The fact that these structures are marked as if they involved the suppression of the highest argument must be made explicit in the semantic representation, as is the case with inherent reflexives. A further example is trattarsi ‘be about’, which can be found in a proper si-impersonal construction, with a suppressed [+human] argument (cf. (56a)), or in an identificational construction, where the unexpressed argument is not [+human] (cf. (56b)):

(56) a. Sinora si è trattato di questioni secondarie.
   So.far IMP be.3SG deal.PP of matters secondary
   ‘So far one has dealt with secondary matters.’

   b. Si tratta di una questione delicata.
   IMP deal.3SG of a matter sensitive
   ‘It is a sensitive matter.’
Despite the lack of the highest argument, and of finite verb agreement, si-impersonals provide clear evidence that the highest argument is in some sense visible in the semantic representation. First, the marking with si indicates that this argument is comparable to the highest argument of reflexives, i.e., it is a suppressed argument. Secondly, the highest argument of si-impersonals can be interpreted as a first person plural, as well as, marginally, a second person plural (Wehr 1995: 56). The possibility of a first person plural construal is another characteristic of si-impersonals which is commonly found in impersonal constructions (see, by way of example, French on, used instead of nous, and Portuguese a gente, used for nos). In some regional varieties of Italian (specifically, Tuscan Italian), the first person plural is standardly replaced by the si-impersonal construction, although the first person plural subject pronoun can co-occur with impersonal si: (noi) si canta ‘we sing’. This clearly indicates that the highest position in the semantics of si-constructions has some content. Thirdly, si-impersonals exhibit the alternation of singular and plural morphology on the past participle:

\[(57) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ Si è } \text{ andati } \text{ via } \text{ tardi.} \\
& \text{IMP be.3SG go.PP.MPL away late} \\
& \text{‘One (we) went away late.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{ Si è } \text{ letto } \text{ molto.} \\
& \text{IMP be.3SG read.PP much} \\
& \text{‘One read a lot.’}
\end{align*}\]

The plural marking is also found on adjectival and nominal predicates:

\[(58) \text{Ogni tanto si è troppo stanchi per pensare.}
\text{Every much IMP be.3SG too tired.MPL for think}
\text{‘Sometimes one is too tired to think.’}
\text{(Baricco, Senza sangue, p. 41)}\]

When the si-construction has the value of a first person plural, the plural inflection exhibits masculine or feminine agreement, depending on the discourse participants realized by the suppressed argument (Si è andate via tardi ‘we (F) have gone.FPL away late’).

Anticipating somewhat the contents of Chapter 5, I should note that past-participle agreement in si-impersonals does not differ from past-
participle agreement in personal constructions. Thus, the following counterparts of (57a) and (57b), which do not exhibit argument suppression:

(59) a. *Siamo andati via tardi.*
   Be.1PL go.PP.MPL away late
   ‘We went away late.’
   b. *Abbiamo letto molto.*
   Have.1PL read.PP much
   ‘We have read a lot.’

Whereas finite agreement is missing in (57) and present in (59), past-participle agreement displays the same distribution in both sets of sentences. Unlike finite verb agreement, which neutralizes semantic functions (actor and undergoer) for syntactic purposes (PSAhood), past-participle agreement targets a cluster of semantic functions (undergoers and marked actors), in Italian, abstracting away from a number of stylistic and sociolinguistic factors which will be dealt with in Chapter 5. Accordingly, past-participle agreement would appear to recognize the macrorole of the suppressed argument of *si*-impersonals.

The split marking illustrated in (57a) and (57b) is not the only type of split behaviour observed in *si*-impersonals. Cinque (1988) has noted that unaccusative, adjectival, nominal, passive, and type-(ii) experiencer predicates rule out a non-referential reading in *si*-constructions with specific time reference. Thus, (60a) contrasts with (60b) and (60c), in that only the first one of these examples allows a non-referential reading:

(60) a. *Oggi, a Beirut, si è sparato tutta la mattina.*
   Today at Beirut IMP be.3SG shoot.PP all the morning
   ‘Today, in Beirut, one shot all morning.’
   b. *Oggi, a Beirut, si è nati senza assistenza medica.*
   Today at Beirut IMP be.3SG be.born.PP.MPL without assistance medical
   ‘Today, in Beirut, we were born with no medical assistance.’
   c. *Oggi, a Beirut, si è stati uccisi....*
   ‘Today, in Beirut, we have been killed....’

(Cinque 1988: 542)
Cinque suggests that this split depends on the tendency for unaccusatives to receive a stage-level reading in structures with specific time reference. As was pointed out in section 2.3, stage-level predicates denote contingent or resultant eventualities rather than properties of classes of individuals, and thus the argument of stage-level predicates is more likely to be referential than that of individual-level ones. The facts brought to light by Cinque are interesting in the context of the present discussion, insofar as they constitute further evidence that the suppressed argument of *si*-impersonals is visible in the semantic representation.

In the light of the above evidence, I propose that the suppressed argument of *si*-impersonals is represented semantically as the suppressed argument of clitic reflexives (Ø):

(61)  
\[
\text{Si è studenti.} \\
\text{IMP be.3SG student.MPL} \\
\text{‘One is a student.’} \\
\text{be’ (Ø, \{student\})}
\]

Unlike the suppressed argument of reflexives, however, that of *si*-impersonals is assigned a macrorole. Depending on the discourse context, as well as on the linguistic co-text, this argument is either interpreted generically or as a first person plural. The referent of the first-person plural reading is not accessed on the basis of the semantic information, but rather recovered in discourse. The exact workings of this process could be investigated with the aid of Discourse Representation Theory (Kamp and Reyle 1993; Van Valin 2005: 170–174). However, this technical aspect of the analysis will not be developed here.

I am now able to return to the Venetan data mentioned at the end of section 4.2.6. The contrast in the selection of the perfective operator with reflexives and *se*-impersonals suggests that, in Venetan, the perfective operator is not sensitive to PSA markedness, but rather to macrorole assignment, which is of course ultimately determined by Aktionsart: free ‘have’ vs. ‘be’ alternation is not found in *se*-impersonals, since the suppressed argument of *se*-impersonals is an actor or an undergoer (/ marked actor).

My claim that the suppressed argument of *si*-impersonals is assigned a macrorole is corroborated by the behaviour of type-(iii) experiencer verbs. The sentences in (62) clearly indicate that the second argument of type-(iii) experiencer verbs, i.e., the theme, can be suppressed in *si*-impersonal con-
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structures (cf. (62a)), whereas the highest argument of these verbs, i.e., the experiencer, cannot (cf. (62b) and (62c)):

(62) a. Quando si è giovani si piace (agli altri).
    When IMP be.3SG young.MPL IMP appeal.3SG to.the others
    ‘When one is young, one appeals (to the others).’

b. *Si piace i giovani.
    IMP appeal.3SG the young.MPL
    ‘One likes the young.’

c. (*Si) capita di essere in ritardo.
    IMP happen.3SG of be in lateness
    ‘One / It happens to be late.’

Recall from section 3.4 that only the second argument of type-(iii) experiencer predicates is assigned a macrorole, whilst the experiencer is realized as a non-macrorole dative argument. If the suppressed argument of si-impersonals requires a macrorole, the ungrammaticality of the si-constructions in (62b) and (62c) is explained by the assumption that the experiencer of type-(iii) experiencer verbs cannot be a macrorole. Note, incidentally, that the fact that (62b) is not acceptable is independent of the absence of agreement, as is indicated by the corresponding structure *si piacciono i giovani ‘one likes (lit. like.3PL) the young’, which is equally ungrammatical.

In my treatment of reflexive si-impersonals (see section 4.3.4), I argue, for independent reasons, that the reflexive suppressed argument precedes the impersonal one in the semantic representation (inherent reflexives constitute an exception with which we need not concern ourselves here). This means that if both arguments of type-(iii) experiencer verbs are suppressed, the lowest argument, i.e., the theme, is the one which is subject to si-impersonal suppression. Since the theme is a macrorole, such structures are expected to be grammatical. This prediction is borne out by the data (e.g., ci si piace ‘one likes oneself’).

4.3.2 Si-passives

Si-passives are comparable to analytic passives insofar as they display PSA modulation: the PSA is not the highest-ranking direct core argument in the
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semantic representation, but rather a lower argument, as is indicated by finite agreement in (63a) and (63b):

(63)  a. Le stelle si vedono.
    The stars IMP see.3PL
    ‘The stars can be (lit. are) seen.’
  b. Si affittano biciclette.
    IMP hire.3PL bicycles
    ‘We hire bicycles.’

That the PSA of (63a) is le stelle ‘the stars’ is also suggested by word order (Lepschy and Lepschy 1988: 225), even though a prenuclear PSA is not a requirement of si-passives (see (63b)).

As for the first argument, the marking with si indicates that it is suppressed. The semantic representation of (63a) and (63b) is, therefore, as in (63a\(^1\)) and (63b\(^1\)):

$$
(63a^1) \text{ see}^\prime (\emptyset, \text{stelle}) \\
(63b^1) \text{ do}^\prime (\emptyset, [\text{hire}^\prime (\emptyset, \text{biciclette})])
$$

The suppressed argument can be referential (cf. (63b)), and thus I suggest that it is assigned a macrorole in semantics-syntax mapping, on a par with the highest argument of si-impersonals. The suppressed argument of (63a) and (63b) is an actor.

Given that they have a PSA, si-passives are not, strictly speaking, impersonal constructions, and should not be referred to as impersonal passives. Observe, however, that si-passives are not equivalent to analytic passives. When passives were discussed in section 2.2, it was pointed out that, insofar as semantic representation and macrorole assignment are concerned, analytic passives do not differ from corresponding active constructions. If the actor of an analytic passive is specified in the semantics, it appears in a peripheral da- ‘by’-phrase in syntax. This is called argument modulation. The same considerations do not hold for si-passives. In these structures, the actor is suppressed, i.e., it is realized as \(\emptyset\), in its semantic position. This explains why, according to native speakers, as well as grammars of Italian, as a rule, the actor remains unexpressed in this structure (Maiden and Robustelli 2000: 285; Salvi 2005). In this sense, si-passives behave like the two classes of reflexives whereby the suppressed argument is not co-referent with a specified argument, and thus must not
figure overtly as an extra-core actor in the clause (see section 4.2.4). This restriction is frequently found across languages in structures comparable to *si*-passives (Comrie 1977; Siewierska 1984).

In relatively formal registers, the first argument of the predicate can appear in a peripheral phrase with *da parte (di)*, lit. by part (of):

(64) a. *Da parte degli adulti non si dovrebbero mai usare espressioni volgari davanti ai bambini.*  
   ‘Coarse language should never be used by adults in front of children.’

   b. *Da parte panamense si afferma che niente cambierà la gestione del canale dopo lo smantellamento delle basi USA.*  
   ‘It is stated by the Panamanians that nothing will change the management of the canal after the dismantling of the US bases.’

   (Maiden and Robustelli 2000: 285)

In addition, according to Lepschy and Lepschy (1988: 224–225), argument modulation with a *da*-phrase is also possible in *si*-passives, although very rare:

(65) *Quest’ opera si accoglie con entusiasmo da tutti.*  
   ‘This work is enthusiastically acclaimed by all.’

   (Lepschy & Lepschy 1988: 224–225)

Observe, however, that the *da*-phrase of (65) has universal value. In fact, any modulated actor that corresponds to an argument specified in the semantic representation is entirely ruled out (*Quest’ opera si accoglie con entusiasmo da Giorgio* ‘This work is enthusiastically acclaimed by Giorgio’). As for the data in (64a) and (64b), in neither case should it be assumed that they illustrate argument modulation. Rather, the phrases with *da parte (di)* are peripheral adjuncts which contribute an argument but not a macrorole to the clause.
In thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Italian, *si*-constructions allow the expression of the actor in a phrase with *da*, *per*, or *da parte di* (Salvi 2005; Serianni 1988: 362). The expression of the suppressed argument is also licensed by monovalent predicates:

(66)  
*Non vuol che ’n sua città per me si vegna.*

NEG want.3SG that in POSS city by me IMP come.3SG.SUBJ

Lit. He does not want that it is come to his city by me.

( *Divina Commedia*, 1,1,126, cited in Salvi 2005)

In the light of data like (66), it appears that early Italian *si*-constructions can involve argument modulation in semantics-syntax mapping rather than argument suppression in the semantic representation. Salvi (2005) goes as far as to claim that *si*-impersonals have not yet appeared at that stage. This hypothesis is hard to reconcile with the findings of the studies mentioned in section 4.2.4 (Cennamo 1993; Geniušienė 1987) which suggest that, diachronically, *si*-constructions with the modulation of the highest argument develop from *si*-constructions with the suppression of the highest argument. Clearly, the diachronic analyses of *si*-constructions come up against problematic evidence which indicates synchronic oscillations between argument suppression and argument modulation at various stages of the language. A modern correlate of the Old Italian structure shown in (66) is the Germanic intransitive passive illustrated by German *von der Jugend wurde getanzt*, lit. it was danced by the young (Wehr 1995: 23–25), which is characterized by argument modulation rather than argument suppression.

The realization of the highest argument of a transitive predicate as Ø normally yields a *si*-passive rather than a *si*-impersonal structure, if the second argument is a nominal, as witness the rarity of the *si*-impersonals illustrated above in (54b) (*Si compra due penne* ‘one buys two pens’). By contrast, PSA modulation does not normally obtain when the second argument is a clitic pronoun (cf. (67a)). Agreement, however, figures on the past participle of the perfect (cf. (67b)):

(67)  
a.  
*Le si compra.*

OCL IMP buy.3SG

‘One buys them.’

b.  
*Le si è comprate.*

OCL.FPL IMP be.3SG buy.PP.FPL

‘One has bought them.’
The contrast between *si*-constructions in which the second argument is a nominal and *si*-constructions in which the second argument is a clitic is explained by the fact that, in the second type of structure, there is an accusative form of the clitic: accusative forms cannot serve as the PSA of the clause in Italian (non-finite verb agreement, instead, is not dependent on PSAhood; see Chapter 5).14

As for tonic pronouns, whilst third-person nominative pronouns can serve as the controllers of finite agreement in *si*-passives, first- and second-person ones cannot (Burzio 1986: 49; D’Alessandro 2004: 117–157; Cinque 1988):

(68) a. *Essi si vedono.
   They IMP see.3PL
   ‘They are seen.’

b. *Noi si vediamo.
   We IMP see.1PL
   ‘We are seen.’

c. *Voi si vedete.
   You IMP see.2PL
   ‘You (pl.) are seen.’

The contrast between, on the one hand, (68a), and, on the other hand, (68b) and (68c) further illustrates the difference between the *si*-passive and the analytic passive. Whereas argument suppression in the *si*-passive is only compatible with third-person modulated PSAs, argument modulation in the analytic passive does not result in any restriction on the modulated PSA. The constraint which is at work in *si*-passives depends on the requirement that the suppressed argument of *si*-constructions be an unspecified human argument, which can optionally be recovered in discourse. The third person, being the non-person from the point of view of discourse (Benveniste 194675), can provide a modulated PSA which is not at the same time interpreted as the suppressed argument. The first and second persons, on the other hand, refer to the speaker and the interlocutor, respectively, and hinder the unspecified or discourse-based interpretation of the suppressed argument. This constraint on the grammatical person of the overt argument of *si*-constructions does not hold for *si*-impersonals. This is shown by examples like (69), where the lowest direct core argument is a tonic pronoun which bears non-nominative case and does not control finite agreement:
In the absence of PSA modulation, the referent of the pronoun te ‘you’ is not taken to be co-referent with the suppressed argument.

4.3.3 Middles

Another construction which is characterized by both the suppression of the highest argument and PSA modulation is the si-middle construction, which is illustrated below:

(70) a. *Questi libri si vendono bene.*
    These books IMP sell.3PL well
    ‘These books sell well.’

b. *Questo vetro si rompe facilmente.*
    This glass IMP break.3SG easily
    ‘This glass breaks easily.’

c. *Questi vini si bevono caldi.*
    These wines IMP drink.3PL hot
    ‘These wines should be drunk hot.’

d. *Questo metallo si piega facilmente.*
    This metal IMP bend.3SG easily
    ‘This metal bends easily.’

Unlike si-passives, si-middles do not denote states of affairs, but rather the potentiality of states of affairs, which is determined by properties of individuals. Thus, a suitable paraphrase of (70a) is *questi libri hanno la caratteristica di vendersi bene* ‘these books have the characteristic that they sell well’, whilst a paraphrase of (70b) is *questo vetro ha lo svantaggio di rompersi facilmente* ‘this glass has the disadvantage that it breaks easily’, and so on.

Another property which contrasts si-middles with si-passives is that the suppressed argument of si-middles can neither be referential (the first-person plural reading is ruled out) nor appear as a non-macrorole argument in a peripheral adjunct:
Si-constructions and unexpressed arguments

(71) a. *Questi vini si bevono caldi (*da parte nostra).*
   These wines IMP drink.3PL hot by part POSS
   ‘These wines should be drunk hot (by us).’

b. *Questo metallo si piega facilmente (*da tutti).*
   This metal IMP bend.3SG easily by everybody
   ‘This metal bends (can be bent) easily (by everybody).’

In the light of these facts, it is clear that *si*-middle constructions are individual-level predicates. Unsurprisingly, they rule out the perfective aspect, which favours a stage-level reading of predicates. The perfective counterparts of the sentences in (70) are grammatical (see, by way of example, *questi libri si sono venduti facilmente* ‘it has been easy to sell these books’). However, they do not classify as *si*-middles, in that they denote events rather than properties. Furthermore, *si*-middles rule out those predicates which are likely to receive a stage-level interpretation regardless of the aspectual features of the clause. Thus, the examples below are not *si*-middles, but rather *si*-passives, as is suggested by the ungrammaticality of their translation into English middle constructions:

(72) a. *Queste cose si vedono facilmente.*
   These things IMP see.3PL easily
   ‘These things are seen easily.’ (not ‘These things see easily’)

b. *Questo metallo si trova facilmente.*
   This metal IMP find.3SG easily
   ‘This metal is found easily.’ (not ‘This metal finds easily’)

*Vedere* ‘see’ is a state, and there is generally a problem with the occurrence of stative predicates in *si*-middle constructions. Observe the following list of verbs, which is based on Geniušienė’s (1987: 266) typological survey, and displays verbs which occur frequently in the middle construction:

(73) *Affilare* ‘sharpen’; *aprire* ‘open’; *bere* ‘drink’; *chiudere* ‘close’; *comprare* ‘buy’; *consumare* ‘wear out’; *fondere* ‘melt’; *guidare* ‘drive’; *leggere* ‘read’; *mangiare* ‘eat’; *mantenere* ‘keep’; *piegare* ‘bend’; *pronunciare* ‘pronounce’; *rompere* ‘break’; *scrivere* ‘write’; *vendere* ‘sell’.
Some of the items which appear in (73) are members of transitive vs. anticausative reflexive pairs (e.g., aprire ‘open (tr.)’ / aprirsi ‘open (intr.)’). Others are verbs of consumption and creation (e.g., bere ‘drink’ and scrivere ‘write’). Crucially, the semantics of all these verbs includes an activity. That the predicates of si-middles include an activity is also indicated by their compatibility with manner adverbs, notably facilmente ‘easily’.

Assuming that the semantic representation of si-middles includes an activity, the suppressed argument is an agent or an effector. This argument, which can not be a causer, is suppressed in its position and does not appear in any other semantic or syntactic position, whilst the second argument serves as the PSA of the clause. Middles also require a manner adverb (bene ‘well’ in (70a) and facilmente ‘easily’ in (70b) and (70d)) or an adjectival modifier (see caldi ‘hot’ in (70c)), and this means that they cannot be considered to be identical with anticausative reflexives. VVLP (417) have suggested that the obligatory modifier of si-middles can be regarded as the predicate of a stative predication into which the activity is embedded as an argument. In accordance with this analysis, the representation of (70d) is equivalent to that of è facile piegare questo metallo ‘it is easy to bend this metal’:

(70)  d’: be’([[do’(Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME bent’ (metallo)]], [easy’])

I adhere to VVLP’s suggestion for si-middles with an adverbial modifier. With respect to si-middles with adjectival modifiers, I propose a different representation, in view of the fact that the adjectival modifier agrees with the PSA in gender and number (see caldi ‘hot.MPL’, in (70c), which agrees with vini ‘wine.MPL’). Specifically, I suggest that only the argument which serves as the PSA is embedded in the stative predicate encoded by the adjective, whilst the rest of the activity is not:

(70)  c’: do’(Ø, [drink’(Ø, [be’(vini’[hot’])])])

This representation indicates that the predicate ‘hot’ solely modifies the second argument. The underlining indicates that this is the main argument of the predication. Since the suppressed argument of si-middles cannot be referential or recoverable with the phrase da (parte di), and si-middles do not provide any other evidence of macrorole assignment, I suggest that the suppressed argument is not a macrorole in these structures.
In sum, *si*-middles share with *si*-passives both the suppression of the highest argument, which is marked by *si*, and PSA modulation. By contrast with *si*-passives, however, they are subject to further constructional constraints. First, they require a manner adverb or an adjectival modifier of the second argument. In semantic terms, they are constrained to predicates which include an activity. Furthermore, they rule out perfective aspect and any explicit reference to time or space. Finally, there is a pragmatic constraint on *si*-middles, which states that the referent of the PSA should be a topic. As a result, the PSA cannot figure in the immediate postnuclear position, which is the default position of focal elements of information, or in the pre- and post-core slots, which are positions available for contrastive units of information (see section 8.4.1): *‘Si piega QUESTO METALLO facilmente ‘this metal bends easily’, ‘it is this metal that bends easily’, ‘*QUESTO METALLO si piega facilmente ‘it is this metal that bends easily’*. In the last analysis, *si*-middles predicate a property of a topic.

I should finally mention middle constructions without *si*, which I henceforth refer to as x-middles:

(74) a. *Questi libri vendono bene.*
   These books sell.3PL well
   ‘These books sell well.’

   b. *Questa marca di jeans veste grande.*
   This brand of jeans dress.3SG big.
   ‘This brand of jeans has large sizes.’

   c. *Questa scarpa calza piccolo.*
   This shoe wear small
   ‘This model of shoe has small sizes.’

The structure illustrated in (74) is not productive in Italian. In particular, it is not interchangeable with *si*-middles, with the exception of *vendere ‘sell’* (cf. (70a) and (74a)), and it is constrained stylistically, since it figures in particular varieties, for instance the language of adverts. The absence of *si* would lead one to think that x-middles do not involve the suppression of the highest argument. In fact, slogans like *veste giovane ‘dresses in a young fashion’* give reason to believe that this hypothesis is correct. In these slogans, the overt or understood PSA is the name of the brand which is being advertised, whereas the unexpressed argument is the second argument. Thus, a brand of clothes can dress people in a young fashion, i.e., make them look young. The assumption that x-middles do not
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involve the suppression of the highest argument explains why they are not exchangeable with si-middles. The structure illustrated in (70a) and (74a) is an exception. In this case it is the highest argument that is suppressed, and this suppression is only optionally marked. Another important difference between x- and si-middles concerns the adjectival modifier, which, in x-middles, does not agree with the PSA. Contrast masculine piccolo ‘small’, in (74c), which does not agree with the feminine PSA scarpa ‘shoe’, with masculine plural caldi ‘hot’, in (70c), which agrees with vini ‘wines’. This detail suggests that the adjective of x-middles is used as an adverb. In the light of the evidence, a possible semantic representation for x-middles is the following:

(75) Questa marca veste giovane.

This brand dress.3SG young ‘This brand dresses in a young fashion.’

be’ ([[do’ (questa marca, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME dressed’ (x)]],

[young'])

In (75) the highest argument is specified (Ø is an unspecified activity), whilst x is the unexpressed lower argument. Incidentally, this analysis of Italian x-middles does not hold for English middles, where it is the highest argument that is unexpressed (This glass breaks easily).

4.3.4 Reflexive si-impersonal and si-passive constructions

So far I have considered separately si-impersonals and si-passives, on the one hand, and clitic reflexives, on the other. I have claimed that, whilst both types of construction are characterized by the suppression of the highest argument, only the suppressed argument of si-impersonals and si-passives is assigned a macrorole. It is now time to discuss the constructions which combine both kinds of argument suppression, i.e., reflexive si-impersonal and si-passive structures. Examples are given below:

(76) a. Ci si preoccupa.

RFL IMP worry.3SG ‘One worries.’

b. Ci si vede.

RFL IMP see.3SG
Si-constructions and unexpressed arguments

‘One sees oneself.’

c. Ci si lava i capelli.
RFL IMP wash.3SG the hair.MPL
‘One washes one’s hair.’
d. Ci si lavano i capelli.
RFL IMP wash.3PL the hair.MPL
‘One washes one’s hair.’

Whereas the examples listed in (76a), (76b), and (76c) are si-impersonals, due to the lack of a PSA, that in (76d) is a si-passive, as suggested by the agreement of the finite form of the verb with the second argument. Only non-monadic reflexives can be passivized with si, since, in these constructions, reflexive argument suppression leaves an argument available for PSA modulation (see sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.6).

The structures illustrated in (76) are characterized by the marking of double argument suppression (ci si), and this fact deserves some comment, since it might seem to run counter to the claim that Italian si only marks the suppression of the highest-ranking argument. Furthermore, it is necessary to ascertain the order of occurrence of reflexive si with respect to impersonal and passive si.

The double marking with ci si is not problematic vis-à-vis the proposed analysis of Italian si. In fact, if the highest argument is suppressed, the PSA of the clause is sought in a lower position (see Maria si vede ‘Mary sees herself’, where the highest position is suppressed, as indicated by si, and the lower position provides the PSA Mary). The suppression of the argument in this lower position must be indicated overtly precisely because this is a potential PSA. The first marker of argument suppression is realized by ci, an allomorph of si, by virtue of a Tuscan rule which bans the sequence of the two identical morphemes (Rohlfs 1968: 234).

Interestingly, double argument suppression is not marked consistently across Italo-Romance. Rather, some dialects simply mark with one SE both reflexivization and the lack of a PSA. Rohlfs (1968: 234) mentions the Lombard structure se lava ‘one washes oneself’, with only one se, which corresponds to Italian ci si lava ‘one washes oneself’, even though the double marking of argument suppression is actually attested with a plural interpretation: se se pentiss ‘we repent’ (Nicoli 1983: 329).

The question of the linear order of reflexive si and impersonal or passive si is to be addressed in the light of further evidence on the linear order of clitics in Italian si-constructions. Observe the examples below:
Impersonal si-constructions

(77) a. Se lo compra.
RFL OCL buy.3SG
‘S/he buys it for himself / herself.’
b. Lo si compra.
OCL IMP buy.3SG
‘One buys it.’

The sentences in (77a) and (77b) show that, whilst reflexive si precedes direct-object clitics, impersonal si follows such clitics. Since, unlike impersonal si, reflexive si displays person and number agreement with the PSA (see me lo compre ‘I buy it for myself’, te lo compri ‘you buy it for yourself’, etc.), the ordering of clitics in (77) seems to indicate that, in Italian si-constructions, the clitics which exhibit agreement precede those that do not. This hypothesis agrees with Manzini and Savoia’s (2001) claim that clitic sequences exhibit inflectional positions followed by aspectual positions.

There is, however, an invariant locative clitic, ci or vi ‘there’, which obligatorily precedes the reflexive clitic, and thus also the impersonal one:

(78) Ci se ne compra.
LCL RFL QCL buy.3SG
LCL IMP QCL buy.3SG
‘S/he buys some for herself/himself there.’
‘One buys some there.’

The ordering of locative ci/vi ‘there’ with respect to the reflexive morpheme indicates that there is more to the linear order of clitics in si-constructions than is captured by the above hypothesis.

Interesting clues to the rationale of the linear order of clitics in Italian si-constructions are provided by the following facts. First, locative ci / vi ‘there’ and dative clitics (e.g., gli ‘to him’) are mutually incompatible in these structures (cf. (79a) and (79b)). Secondly, ci/vi ‘there’ can be replaced by gli, lit. to him, in informal varieties of Italian (79c):

LCL DCL.OCL DCL LCL.OCL IMP buy.3SG
‘One buys it there for him/her.’
b. *Ci tela /*?Ti cela si compra.
   LCL DCL.OCL DCL LCL.OCL IMP buy.3SG
   ‘One buys it there for you.’

c. Cela / gliela si mette.
   LCL.OCL DCL.OCL IMP put.3SG
   ‘One puts it there.’

Finally, in a few Italo-Romance dialects, the locative and third-person dative clitic forms coincide (e.g., Northern ghe, ga, and Southern ci; see Rohlfs: 1968: 156–157, 1969: 252–254). The mutual incompatibility of locative and dative clitics in si-constructions, as well as the tendencies towards syncretism, could be explained by the status of locative and dative arguments as non-macrorole arguments. It is not implausible, in fact, that arguments which do not play the role of macroroles in semantics-syntax mapping come to be expressed by the same clitics. In other Italian constructions, dative and locative clitics are adjacent and precede accusative clitics (e.g., *mi (DCL) ce (LCL) lo (OCL) porta ‘s/he takes it there to me’; see Nocentini 2003).

I can thus reformulate my preliminary hypothesis. Clitics in Modern Italian si-constructions are ordered as follows: the clitics which realize non-macrorole arguments (LCL, DCL, RFL) precede the clitics which realize macrorole ones (OCL, IMP, QCL). Thus, the latter type occurs closer to the nucleus than the former. The reflexive clitic (RFL) occurs in-between the locative and the second series of clitics, in that, whilst it is not assigned a macrorole, it marks the suppression of a macrorole argument, and it can be co-referent with a macrorole argument (see Figures 11 and 12).

Lepschy (1978: 39) has noted that the structure in (80) can receive a referential first-person plural reading, comparable to the referential reading of impersonal si, as well as a third-person singular one. Native-speaker judgements indicate that speakers do not agree on whether the first-person plural reading of (80) includes a locative component (see the second gloss), whereas they agree that it is benefactive:

(80) Ci se la è comprata.
   LCL RFL OCL.FSG be.3SG buy.PP.FSG
   LCL RFL/IMP OCL.FSG be.3SG buy.PP.FSG
   ‘S/he has bought it there for herself/himself.’
   ‘We have bought it (there?) for ourselves.’
Lepschy’s (1978) observation is interesting in the present context, in that, whereas neither of the possible readings of the structure in (80) runs counter to the idea that, in *si*-constructions, clitics are ordered according to whether they realize macroroles, in the locative and benefactive reading (see the second gloss), benefactive first-person plural *si* figures in the position of reflexive *si*, thus supporting the analysis proposed above of the position of reflexive *si*. Observe that, in the non-referential impersonal structure, *si* occurs in its canonical position: *Ce la *si* è comprata ‘one has bought it there.’ Finally, it should be noted that the locative and benefactive reading of (80) reveals the neutralization of two kinds of *si*, in accordance with the neutralization which is attested elsewhere in Italo-Romance (see the Lombard data cited above).

The hypothesis that clitics in Modern Italian *si*-constructions are ordered according to whether they realize macrorole arguments is challenged by evidence on the clitic *ne*, which immediately precedes the verb whether it is a macrorole (*Se ne compra ‘s/he buys some for herself / himself’*) or not (*Se ne spaventa ‘she is afraid of it’*). The position of non-macrorole *ne*, however, simply reveals a tendency for the same clitic forms to occupy the same positions in Modern Italian (Nocentini 2003), not to mention that another type of non-macrorole *ne* is inherent when it co-occurs with inherent-reflexive verbs of motion: *se ne esce* simply means ‘s/he leaves’.

In the last analysis, the general principle that governs the linear order of clitics in Italian *si*-constructions is that non-macrorole positions precede macrorole ones.” Thus, reflexive *si* precedes impersonal *si* in the sequence *ci *si*. However, there are conflicting pressures which affect the order of clitics, and thus non-macrorole *ne* follows reflexive *si* in the immediate prenuclear position.

The important question which should be addressed now is whether the above findings identify independent syntactic positions defined under the AGX node in syntax, in which case one could distinguish maximally eight positions, and minimally five, as is shown in Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGX&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>AGX&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>AGX&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>AGX&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>AGX&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>RFL</td>
<td>OCL</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>QCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCL</td>
<td>RFL/IMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(LCL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternatively, Table 3 merely represents the linear order of clitics in Modern Italian *si*-constructions. Whilst this order is mirrored under the AGX node in the syntax of Italian *si*-constructions, the branches of the AGX node have no independent status. I support the latter hypothesis, in the spirit of the RRG theory of agreement (the AGX node simply spells out any bundles of agreement features of the core arguments in the clause), and in the light of the conflicting pressures which affect different constructions or different varieties of Italian to various extents.

Turning now to the semantics of reflexive *si*-impersonals and *si*-passives, I propose that reflexive argument suppression precedes impersonal or passive argument suppression in the semantic representation. This assumption, which is independent of the linear order of reflexive and impersonal *si*, and is assumed to hold crossdialectally, follows from the semantics of anticausative and causative reflexives (see section 4.2.2). By definition, anticausative and causative reflexives are reflexives with a suppressed a-causer. Thus, (81a) has the counterpart in (81b), which is identical to (81a) but for the suppression of the causer. If the highest specified argument of (81b) is suppressed, the result is an anticausative *si*-impersonal (cf. (81c)):

(81) a. *La fidanzata offese* Filippo.
The fiancé offend.3SG.PST Philip
‘Philip got offended by his fiancé.’ (lit. The fiancé offended Ph.)
[[do´ (fidanzata, Ø)] CAUSE [INGR offended’ (Filippo)]]

b. *Filippo si offese.*
Philip RFL offend.3SG.PST
‘Philip got offended.’
[[do´ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [INGR offended’ (Filippo)]]

c. *Ci si offese.*
RFL IMP offend.3SG.PST
‘One got offended.’
[[do´ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [INGR offended’ (Ø)]]

If the causer is absent in the semantic representation, as must be the case with *si*-impersonals or passives (cf. (82a)), it cannot be further suppressed. This is shown in (82b), which does not have a grammatical realization in Italian:
Impersonal si-constructions

(82) a. Si offese Filippo.
   IMP offend.3SG.PST Philip
   ‘One offended Philip.’
   [\[do` (Ø, Ø)\] CAUSE [INGR offended` (Filippo)]]

   b. ?? offese Filippo.
   ?? offend.3SG.PST Philip
   ‘??.’
   [\[do` (??, Ø)\] CAUSE [INGR offended` (Filippo)]]

I assume that the marker of reflexive argument suppression precedes the marker of impersonal argument suppression in the other kinds of reflexives identified in this study, as well, with the exception of inherent reflexives. These are marked as if they involved argument suppression, even though the highest argument is in fact specified in the semantic representation. As a result, reflexive and impersonal marking are not in competition in this structure: impersonal argument suppression yields the structure in (83):

(83) Ci si arrabbia.
   RFL IMP get.angry.3SG
   ‘One gets angry.’
   BECOME angry` (Ø) [Ø]

The data on si-impersonals with type-(iii) experiencer verbs which were introduced in section 4.3.1 (cf. (62)) indicate that my proposal on the semantics of constructions which are both impersonal and reflexive must have some psychological reality. In fact, if the respective order of impersonal and reflexive argument suppression did not matter, the native speaker would not be able to differentiate between grammatical structures like ci si piace ‘one likes oneself’ and ungrammatical ones like *si piace la musica ‘one likes music’. Assuming that the impersonal argument suppression follows the reflexive one in the semantic representation, a macrorole is assigned to the second suppressed argument in the semantics of ci si piace ‘one likes oneself’. This is the theme, and independent evidence indicates that the theme of type-(iii) experiencer predicates requires a macrorole (see 3.4). Contrastingly, the experiencer of type-(iii) predicates does not receive a macrorole; thus, *si piace la musica ‘one likes music’ is ungrammatical.

Figures 13 and 14 illustrate the mapping of semantics with syntax in anticausative si-impersonals and inherent-reflexive si-impersonals, respectively. In both cases, a macrorole is assigned to the argument that is sup-
pressed by impersonal suppression, but in neither case does this argument map on to syntax. Both reflexive *si* (*ci*) and impersonal *si* are linked to the

AGX node, since they realize features of an argument (suppression, as well as, in the case of reflexive *si*, person and number agreement). By contrast, the dummy third-person singular inflection does not link to the AGX node, since it does not represent agreement.

*Figure 13*. Semantics-syntactic mapping: anticausative *si*-impersonals
To conclude, I have argued that, in the semantics of reflexive *si*-impersonals, the marker of reflexive suppression precedes the marker of impersonal suppression (with the exception of inherent reflexives). This aspect of the semantic representation of reflexive *si*-impersonals is independent of the linear order of the reflexive and impersonal morphemes. Unlike this linear order, the semantic facts are expected to hold crossdialectally.

4.4 Unexpressed arguments

The analysis of *si*-constructions raises some interesting questions on the role of unexpressed arguments in semantics and syntax. Some of these questions have already been addressed in the discussion of *si*-constructions. I have argued that, whilst the unexpressed argument of all *si*-constructions is suppressed, only that of *si*-impersonals and *si*-passives is assigned a macrorole. In neither case does this unexpressed argument link to syntax.

It is now time to consider unexpressed arguments in general, focusing on issues which are relevant to split intransitivity. Observe the following data:

(84)    *Si è nuotato e ci si è stancati.*
        IMP be.3SG swim.PP and RFL IMP be.3SG become.tired.PP.MPL
        ‘We have swum and we have become tired.’

(85)    *Aver nuotato ci ha stancato.*
        Have swim.PP OCL have.3SG make.tired.PP
        ‘Swimming has made us tired.’

Both the structure in (84) and the one in (85) receive a referential [+human] interpretation. Accordingly, we must assume that these structures involve an unexpressed argument, in particular, the argument of *nuotare* ‘swim’ in both cases. The unexpressed argument of *nuotare* in (85) is also analogous to the one in (84), insofar as it rejects the arbitrary interpretation (*Aver nuotato è stato stupido.* *Dev’essere stato Leo* ‘Swimming was a stupid thing to do. It must have been Leo’).
As far as morphosyntax is concerned, the structures in (84) and (85) are comparable in terms of past-participle agreement. The singular inflection on the past participle of *nuotare* ‘swim’ in (84) and (85) contrasts with the plural inflection on the past participle of *andare* ‘go’ in (86a) and (86b), respectively:

(86) a. *Si è andati a nuotare e...*  
   *IMP be.3SG go.PP.MPL to swim and*  
   ‘We have been swimming and...’

b. *Essere andati a nuotare...*  
   *Be go.PP.MPL to swim*  
   ‘Having been swimming...’

In accordance with the proposal advanced in section 4.3.1, these data suggest that the unexpressed arguments of (85) and (86b) are assigned a macrorole, like the suppressed arguments of (84) and (86a).10

Other morphosyntactic evidence, however, indicates that the unexpressed arguments of the two types of structure are not identical. To begin with, the infinitival structures in (85) and (86b) are not marked by *si*. Secondly, these structures do not exhibit a dummy personal inflection, but rather a missing argument, or pivot, which is either controlled by an argument in the wider clause (see the first person plural clitic *ci* in (85)) or recoverable in discourse.

The type of matrix coding which is known as *control* provides evidence of infinitival clauses with a pivot, i.e., an unexpressed argument which is matrix-coded (or controlled) by an argument in the higher clause:

(87) a. *Paola dubitava di aver mai sognato.*  
   *Paula doubt.3SG.PST of have ever dream.PP*  
   ‘Paula doubted that she had ever dreamt.’

b. *Paola dubitava di esserci mai andata.*  
   *Paula doubt.3SG.PST of be.LCL ever go.PP.FSG*  
   ‘Paula doubted that she had ever gone there.’

By contrast with the controlled pivots of (87a) and (87b), the unexpressed pivot of an infinitival clause classifies as a suppressed argument marked by *si* when it lacks a controller:
Unexpressed arguments

(88) Sembra / ritengo non essersi fatto il possibile.  
Seem.3SG believe.1SG NEG be.IMP make.PP the possible
‘It seems / I believe that one has not done one’s best.’

The construction in (88) lacks a controller for its pivot, which is the highest macrorole argument in the semantic representation of its infinitival predicate. The correlate of (88) in which the pivot is controlled exhibits the perfective operator A and is not marked by si (Ritengo di aver fatto il possibile ‘I believe that I have done my best’). The comparison between the two correlated constructions suggests that uncontrolled syntactic pivots are marked by both si and E. On the basis of the independent assumption that pivots are a type of PSA (Van Valin 2005: 101–107; VVLP: 274–285), the rule of perfective-operator selection which was formulated in section 2.4.2.1 (cf. (49)) captures the selection of the perfective operator in infinitival clauses. According to this rule, A is selected when the clause has a PSA that is unmarked. The pivot (PSA) of (88) is uncontrolled, i.e., missing. Thus, E is selected.

Unexpressed arguments which are not suppressed can be indicated with x in the semantic representation. Accordingly, the semantics of (85) (Aver nuotato ci ha stancato ‘Swimming has made us tired’) is as in (85'). Co-indexation simply indicates that the unexpressed argument is understood to be co-referent with another argument:

(85') [[do' (x, [swim' (x)])] CAUSE [BECOME tired' (1PL)]]

On a par with unexpressed highest arguments, unexpressed second arguments (Rizzi 1986) can be indicated as x in the semantic representation. Observe that they can be controllers of pivots (the unexpressed second argument of incoraggiare ‘encourage’ is the controller of the pivot of andar via ‘go away’ in (89a)), and that their adjectival modifiers require a plural inflection (cf. (89b)):

(89) a. L’ atmosfera incoraggia ad andar via.  
The atmosphere encourage.3SG to go away
‘The atmosphere encourages one to go away.’

b. Un dottore serio visita nudi.  
A doctor serious visit.3SG nude.MPL
‘A serious doctor visits (people) nude.’
(Rizzi 1986: 505)
As is the case with the constructions discussed above, agreement provides evidence that the unexpressed second argument of these structures is a macrorole. These unexpressed arguments are not marked by *si if they are not controlled, however, since they do not figure in the highest macrorole position of their predicate (see the absence of *si to mark the second argument of *incoraggiare ‘encourage’).

I pointed out above that the highest argument of type-(iii) experiencer predicates cannot be subject to impersonal argument suppression, since it rejects a macrorole. Predictably, this argument cannot be a pivot either, since this kind of unexpressed argument is assigned a macrorole like the suppressed argument of *si-impersonals (*Mi ha insegnato a / *dubita di / *ritiene di piacere la musica ‘S/he has taught me to like music’ ‘S/he doubts / believes that s/he likes music’).

So far I have distinguished between two kinds of unexpressed argument in the highest macrorole position of a predicate: those which are suppressed, and marked by *si, and those which are not. There is a third kind of structure which must be mentioned in the present context. This structure exhibits an avalent predicate, for instance impersonal meteorological expressions: *piove ‘it rains’. Impersonal meteorological expressions do not provide any evidence of an unexpressed argument. They cannot be semantically controlled or referential, and, in morphosyntactic terms, they do not exhibit *si or trigger agreement on the past participle. The fact that some languages, for instance English, require that an expletive be given to these predicates in syntax does not entail that this expletive links to a position in the semantic representation. Nor is there a requirement, from the theoretical perspective taken in this work, that a silent expletive be postulated in those languages which, like Italian, do not require an overt one in syntax. Recall from section 2.3 that the semantic representation proposed for these predicates is do’ ([pred’]) (Van Valin 2005: 63). This semantic representation does not have a position for the expletive to link to.

To sum up, I have proposed a tripartite classification based on the role of the unexpressed argument in semantics-syntax mapping (see Table 4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Si-constructions Infinitival constructions not marked by *si</th>
<th>Avalent predicates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantics: Ø</td>
<td>Semantics: x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unexpressed arguments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No MR to reflexive Ø</th>
<th>MR to x position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR to impersonal Ø</td>
<td>Realization: controlled No MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization: suppressed pivot</td>
<td>No PSA or pivot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA / pivot</td>
<td>Realization: none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suppressed arguments are indicated with Ø in the semantic representation. They are of two types: those that are assigned a macrorole, found both in si-impersonals and in si-passives, and those which are not, found in clitic-reflexive and si-middle constructions. In neither case is there any evidence that the suppressed argument is a PSA or maps on to syntax. The highest macrorole argument of infinitival constructions which are not marked by si is a controlled pivot, it is indicated as x in the semantic representation, and assigned a macrorole. Finally, avalent predicates do not exhibit any evidence of an argument position available for PSAhood. In Italian, this is marked by the free alternation of the allomorphs of the perfective operator.

This brief treatment of unexpressed arguments has brought to light a significant fact: both the selection of the perfective operator and the marking with si indicate PSA (/ pivot) markedness and are not concerned with arguments other than the highest macrorole argument of the predicate, in accordance with the notion of default PSA (/ pivot) in accusative alignment. The free alternation of A and E which is found in impersonal meteorological constructions is explained by the lack of an argument position in the semantic representation; the selection of A or E may be guided by the grammatical tradition, but it does not have any psychological significance.

4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have analysed si-constructions and other structures with an unexpressed argument. Following Van Valin (1990), I have argued that si marks the suppression of the highest-ranking macrorole argument in the semantic representation of the clause. In accordance with this assumption, si-constructions are marked in terms of PSA assignment and are of interest in the treatment of split intransitivity. I have contrasted suppressed arguments which are assigned a macrorole, and occur in si-impersonals and si-passives, with suppressed arguments which are not assigned a macrorole, and figure in clitic reflexives and si-middles. This contrast accounts for the relative linear order of reflexive and impersonal si and for the be-
haviour of type-(iii) experiencer verbs (the *piacere*-type of psych verbs) in 
si-constructions. My analysis of clitic reflexives captures the selection of 
the perfective operator in (Italo)-Romance languages and in Old and Mod-
erm Italian. It also provides the foundation of an analysis of past participle 
agreement and *ne*-cliticization in reflexive constructions of Modern Italian 
(see Chapters 5 and 6). In a brief treatment of unexpressed arguments, I 
have proposed a tripartite classification of unexpressed arguments in the 
highest macrorole position of the predicate: suppressed PSAs or pivots 
(marked by *si*), controlled pivots, and the absent argument of a valent pred-
icates.
Chapter 5
Agreement

5.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with agreement. The discussion focuses primarily on non-finite agreement, specifically, the control of number and gender agreement on the past participle of perfective, absolutive and passive constructions and on the non-verbal predicate of copular constructions. Finite agreement is also subject to scrutiny, however, with particular reference to presentational constructions.

In Italian, constructions with perfective 'be' also exhibit gender and number agreement of the past participle with the PSA (the subject of the clause), whereas there is no past-participle agreement with the PSA in constructions with perfective 'have'. In another well-known Romance language, French, there appears to be a strong correlation between the selection of perfective 'be' and past-participle agreement with the PSA, allowance being made for exceptional constructions like intransitive-dative reflexives. Thus, the selection of perfective 'be' and past-participle agreement with the PSA could be considered to be two sides of the same coin. However, extensive crossdialectal research has shown that, albeit related, these two types of marking do not always co-occur (Cennamo 2001a; Loporcaro 1998). Accordingly, any satisfactory theory of split intransitivity must capture both the domains of overlap and those of discrepancy between these two kinds of morphosyntactic marking. In the discussion that follows, I consider some mismatches between the selection of 'be' and past-participle agreement with the PSA, and I argue against any approach which deterministically relates the presence or lack of past-participle agreement with the PSA to the unaccusative vs. unergative split.

The reader will recall that my working hypothesis is La Fauci’s (1984, 1988) idea that the development of a system of split intransitivity in Romance is due to the advancement of active alignment, to the detriment of accusative alignment, in the transition from Latin to Romance. This incomplete typological shift yields a type of alignment which I refer to as
active vs. non-active, in that it does not entirely coincide with active vs. inactive alignment. From the theoretical perspective taken in this work, active vs. inactive alignment is principled in semantic terms, since it contrasts actors with undergoers (VLP: 255–257). The manifestations of split intransitivity in Romance diverge from semantic alignment to various extents. Thus, the analysis conducted in Chapter 2 has shown that the selection of the perfective operator is captured by the notion of PSA markedness. Although PSA markedness is ultimately explained by the semantic representation of the clause, it does not contrast actors with undergoers, since it is only concerned with PSAhood, which is a syntactic notion: the presence of an undergoer in the clause only triggers the selection of perfective *essere* ‘be’, if the undergoer is the PSA. In addition, marked actors test out as marked PSAs in Italian, and are flagged with perfective *essere* ‘be’. As a result, the ‘have’ (A) vs. ‘be’ (E) split does not constitute a system of semantic alignment which differentiates between actors and undergoers.

Past-participle agreement with the undergoer is already found in Latin. In a number of Romance languages, it has retrenched to various degrees, as part of a process of restoration of accusative alignment. In Italian, past-participle agreement with the undergoer has been maintained. In my analysis, I argue that, if one abstracts away from stylistic, sociolinguistic and geolinguistic variation, the distribution of past-participle agreement in Modern Italian is principled in semantic terms, and resembles closely the semantic notion of active vs. inactive alignment, even though it does not completely coincide with it. If, however, one constrains the analysis to the standard variety of Modern Italian, the picture becomes more complex, in that syntax and information structure turn out to play a role vis-à-vis agreement.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section 5.2 introduces my account of the agreement of perfective and passive past participles. Section 5.3 deals with variation in Italian, and offers an account of *trigger-happy agreement* (Comrie 2003) in non-monadic reflexives which is based on the results of corpus analysis. Section 5.4 deals with complex predicates. Sections 5.5 and 5.6 focus on absolute participles, and copular constructions, respectively. Finite agreement in presentational constructions is considered in 5.7. In section 5.8, agreement is reconsidered in the crossdialectal perspective. Finally, some conclusions are drawn together in section 5.9.
5.2 The agreement of perfective and passive past participles

In this section I claim that, in Italian, past-participle agreement constitutes a semantically-principled system of active vs. non-active alignment. In putting forward this proposal, I disregard the contrast between optional and obligatory agreement, a matter to which I return in section 5.3, where I consider stylistic, sociolinguistic, and geolinguistic variation.

In Italian, the control of agreement on the past participle of perfective constructions is restricted to macrorole arguments. In particular, the agreement of the perfective past participle can be controlled by an under-goer (cf. (1b)), or a marked actor (cf. (2b) and (3)), but not by an unmarked actor (cf. (1a) and (2a)):

(1) a. Lisa ha lavorato / -*a.
   Lisa have.3SG work.PP FSG
   ‘Lisa has worked.’

   b. Lisa è caduta / -*o.
   Lisa be.3SG fall.PP.FSG MSG
   ‘Lisa has fallen.’

(2) a. Lisa ha corso / -*a tutto il giorno.
   Lisa have.3SG run.PP FSG all the day
   ‘Lisa has been running all day.’

   b. Lisa è corsa / -*o in ospedale.
   Lisa be.3SG run.PP.FSG MSG in hospital
   ‘Lisa ran to the hospital.’

(3) Lisa si è comprata due orologi.
   Lisa RFL be.3SG buy.PP.FSG two watch.MPL
   ‘Lisa has bought two watches for herself.’

At first sight, these data would seem to suggest that the distribution of past-participle agreement corresponds to that of E. This hypothesis is corroborated by evidence from ‘be’-passives, where the controller of the agreement on both the perfective and the passive past participles is the under-goer:
(4) *I ladri sono stati acciuffati.*  
The thief.MPL be.3PL be.PP.MPL catch.PP.MPL  
‘The thieves have been caught.’

Broadening the empirical basis of the analysis to constructions with two macroroles, the hypothesis that the agreement of the past participle is not controlled by an unmarked actor is borne out, but the idea that the distribution of past-participle agreement corresponds to the distribution of E is not:

(5) a. *Questi fiori, li ho avuti regalati da mia sorella.*  
These flower.MPL OCL.MPL have.1SG have.PP.MPL give.PP.MPL by POSS sister  
‘These flowers, I have had them given by my sister.’

b. *I libri, te li ho restituiti.*  
The book.MPL DCL OCL.MPL have.1SG return.PP.MPL  
‘The books, I have returned them to you.’

c. *Non ne hai basta d’aver rubata quella...?*  
NEG PCL have.2SG enough of have steal.PP.FSG that.FSG  
‘Is it not bad enough that you stole the one…’

(5a) displays a passive which is formed with possessive *avere* ‘have’ and a past participle. In section 2.2 (see Figure 6), I proposed that this structure consists of the nuclear co-subordination of possessive ‘have’ with another predicator. The argument shared by the two predicates (*fiori* ‘flowers’) is an undergoer, since it is the lowest argument in the semantic representation of both predicates. This argument controls past-participle agreement on both predicates. Non-finite agreement is also controlled by the undergoer in (5b) and (5c), which are active transitive clauses.

Since the perfective operator selected in (5) is A, these data indicate clearly that the domains of past-participle agreement do not correspond to those of the selection of E. Crucially, the sets of data in (1) to (4) and (5) differ insofar as, where applicable, the controller of past-participle agreement is a PSA, in the first set, and an object, in the second. This shows that the agreement of the past participle is not sensitive to the syntactic role of the controller: undergoers are triggers of agreement regardless of whether they are PSAs.
Recall now that the selection of the perfective operator does not correspond to the semantic definition of active alignment that is adopted in this work, since it is only concerned with PSAs, and PSAhood is a syntactic notion. In the light of the findings illustrated in this section, it appears that the agreement of the perfective past participle contrasts with the diagnostic analysed in Chapter 2, and that it resembles much more closely the semantic notion of active marking. Of course, data such as those in (2b) and (3), showing that the agreement of the perfective past participle can be triggered by marked actors, suggest that there is no perfect match between the diagnostic under scrutiny here and active alignment. In this respect, past-participle agreement deviates from active alignment in the same way as the selection of the perfective operator does.

The evidence provided so far also suggests that the conditions on the control of the agreement features which appear on the perfective past participle also hold for the passive past participle; the agreement specifications on the perfective participle of the passive auxiliary (stati ‘be.PP.MPL’) and on the passive participle (acciuffati ‘catch.PP.MPL’) in (4) are both provided by the undergoer.

To return to the data in (5), there is a significant difference between (5a) and (5b), on the one hand, and (5c), on the other. In (5a) and (5b), the undergoer is an extra-core argument, which is co-referent with a clitic pronoun inside the core, i.e., the resumptive clitic li ‘them’. Contrastingly, the nominal undergoer of (5c) is inside the core, and it is not referred to anaphorically by a resumptive clitic. The control of past-participle agreement by the core-internal nominal undergoer of a transitive clause only occurs in the literary registers of Modern Italian, and in a number of socially- or regionally-marked varieties. In fact, the counterpart of (5c) with no past-participle agreement is grammatical, and indeed preferable, in most varieties of Modern Italian (cf. (6a)), whilst agreement is not optional in (5b) (cf. (6b)):

(6)  
   a. Non ne hai basta d’aver rubato quella...?  
      NEG PCL have.2SG enough of have steal.PP that.FSG  
      ‘Is it not bad enough that you stole the one...’
   b. *I libri, te li ho restituito.  
      The book.MPL DCL OCL MPL have.1SG return.PP  
      ‘The books, I have returned them to you.’
In section 5.3, I shall explore further the contrast in past-participle agreement between clauses with a core-internal nominal undergoer and clauses with a core-internal clitic which is co-referent with a core-external nominal undergoer. For the moment, I should point out that I regard as transitive both the structures with a core-internal nominal undergoer and those with a core-internal clitic. My analysis is based on work on agreement conducted by Bresnan and Mchombo (1987) and Bresnan and Kanerva (1989). Working on Chichewa, a head-marking Bantu language spoken in East Central Africa, Bresnan and Mchombo (1987) and Bresnan and Kanerva (1989) have developed Givón's (1976) idea that the agreement between a verb and its arguments is comparable to the agreement between a discourse topic and a bound pronoun. They have distinguished between grammatical and anaphoric agreement. For instance, in Chichewa, subject agreement is obligatory, and it can be either grammatical, if there is a subject argument in the clause, or anaphoric, if there is none, and the agreement marker refers to the subject as an established topic. Object agreement, on the other hand, is optional and exclusively anaphoric. When the object agreement marker co-occurs with its co-referent nominal, the nominal encodes a discourse topic which binds the agreement marker on the verb.

I propose that transitive clauses with a core-internal nominal undergoer and with a core-internal clitic differ insofar as, in the first type, past-participle agreement, if present, is grammatical (cf. (5c)). Contrastingly, in the second type, past-participle agreement is anaphoric, in that it denotes a relationship with a topic (cf. (5a) and (5b)). Following Belloro (2004), I take both the core-internal clitic and the inflectional ending on the past participle to be realizations of bundles of agreement features. These features appear in place of the argument in the semantic representation, if the argument is understood, whereas, if the argument is specified, these features co-occur with it in its semantic position. The argument and/or the bundle of agreement features are assigned the macro role undergoer, and thus the structures in question are transitive.

As for the syntactic realization of the agreement features, I assume with Belloro (2004) that, regardless of whether the realizations of the bundles of agreement features co-occur with the argument or replace it, they figure in the Agreement Index node (AGX) in syntax. In Chapter 4, I pointed out that this node is a dependent of the nucleus which receives the agreement specifications of all the core argument positions present in the semantic representation. By assuming that the bundles of agreement features figure
in the argument positions in the semantic representation, and link to the AGX node in syntax, one captures both the properties that Italian shares with head-marking languages and its dependent-marking nature. I illustrate the proposal based on Belloro (2004) in Figure 15:

![Figure 15](image-url)

*Figure 15. Agreement in transitive clauses with a core-external undergoer*
Non-monadic reflexives are also structures with two macroroles. In (3) I provided evidence that the past participle agrees with the marked actor in such structures. However, the undergoer can also be a trigger of past-participle agreement (Lepschy and Lepschy 1988: 210–211; Maiden and Robustelli 2000: 270, 272):

(7) a. Lucilla si è letta/ -i quei libri.
   Lucilla.FSG RFL be.3SG read.PP.FSG MPL those book.MPL
   ‘Lucilla has read those books for her own benefit.’

   b. Paolo si è graffiato /-e le manine.
   Paul RFL be.3SG scratch.PP.MSG FPL the hands.DIM.FPL
   ‘Paul has scratched his little hands.’

The sentences in (7a) and (7b) show that past-participle agreement is controlled either by the marked actor (Lucilla in (7a) and Paolo in (7b)) or by the undergoer (libri in (7a) and manine in (7b)) in non-monadic reflexives. When the past participle agrees with the undergoer, there is a mismatch between the selection of E and past-participle agreement, which is not controlled by the PSA. This mismatch is evidence that the selection of E and past-participle agreement with the PSA do not necessarily go together, since the selection of the perfective operator is only concerned with the PSA, whereas past-participle agreement does not appear to be constrained by this syntactic notion.

Non-monadic reflexives can be considered to be constructions with trigger-happy agreement, in the sense of Comrie (2003), i.e., structures in which different arguments compete for control. In section 5.3.1, I shall argue that, much in the same way as the cases of trigger-happy agreement discussed in Comrie (2003), there are information-structure factors which govern past-participle agreement in non-monadic reflexives.

### 5.3 Variability and change in perfective past-participle agreement

The above discussion has brought to light a contrast between two kinds of transitive construction where the nominal undergoer is inside and outside the core, respectively (cf. (5c) and (5a)-(5b)). Further examples are provided below:
Variability and change

(8)  
a. *La cantina, l’ ho pulita / *-o.*  
   The cellar.FSG OCL.FSG have.1SG clean.PP.FSG MSG  
   ‘The cellar, I have cleaned it’

b. *Ho pulito / (?)-a la cantina.*  
   Have.1SG clean.PP FSG the cellar.FSG  
   ‘I have cleaned the cellar.’

In the structure exemplified in (8a), the undergoer is cross-referenced obligatorily by a core-internal resumptive clitic and by the gender and number inflection on the past participle. By contrast, in the type of structure shown in (8b), the past participle can agree with the core-internal undergoer, but does not normally do so in Modern Standard Italian. Past-participle agreement with a core-internal nominal is a feature of the literary registers, as well as of some central and southern varieties of Italian, which are subject to the influence of the dialects spoken in these areas (for some of these dialects, see Rohlfis 1969: 116; Loporcaro 1998: 64–76; Tufi 2005). Finally, Loporcaro (1998: 224–227) has observed that past-participle agreement with a core-internal nominal undergoer is recorded in data from language acquisition.

In my analysis of a corpus of ten literary texts in Modern Italian (see the references for the details of the primary literature), I have hardly found any instances of past-participle agreement with the core-internal nominal undergoer of transitive structures ((5c) is one such example). Maraini’s *Memorie di una ladra* constitutes an interesting exception, since there are four instances of this pattern of agreement. This is a very small number, but a higher one than is recorded in the other texts:

(9)  
a. *Dopo che avevo lavati i panni.*  
   After that have.1SG.PST wash.PP.MPL the cloth.MPL  
   ‘After I had cleaned the clothes.’  
   (Maraini, *Memorie di una ladra*, p. 78)

b. *Quelle che hanno ammazzati i bambini.*  
   Those REL have.3PL kill.PP.MPL the child.MPL  
   ‘Those who have killed the children.’  
   (Maraini, *Memorie di una ladra*, p. 225)

Since, in this novel, the narrating voice represents an uneducated speaker, this finding would seem to indicate that past-participle agreement with a core-internal nominal undergoer in transitive clauses crops up in the low
sociolinguistic varieties due to dialect pressure (note that the story is based in central Italy). This is often the case with structures which were once part of the standard, and have subsequently been ousted, but are still present in some dialects.

In order to understand why past-participle agreement with the core-internal nominal undergoer of transitive constructions is hardly found in Modern Italian, it is helpful to take a brief look at diachrony. The Romance perfect with ‘have’ derives from a Latin construction with *habere*, a past participle and a noun phrase (*In ea provincia pecunias magnas collocatas habent* (Cicero) ‘they have great capital invested in that province’). The past participle behaves like an adjectival modifier in these structures (for a critical discussion of this point, see Salvi 1982). Accordingly, it agrees with the nominal that it modifies. In Chapter 2, I discussed the two principal hypotheses on the development of this structure. On the one hand, it has been argued that this development involves a process by which (i) *habere* loses its status as a fully-fledged predicate thus grammaticalizing into an operator and (ii) the clause with two predicates is reanalysed as a clause where the participle is the only predicate and the PSA is its argument (Vincent 1982). On the other hand, La Fauci (1997, 2005) has claimed that *habere* is an auxiliary in Latin, and the development of a perfect with ‘have’ in Romance is the result of the extension of this auxiliary from non-middle structures with a nominal predicate (possessive constructions) to non-middle structures with a verbal predicate (perfective constructions) (see section 2.4.2.1).

In Old Italian, past-participle agreement with the core-internal nominal undergoer of constructions with two macroroles is still the norm:

(10) a. *Che non presa aggiane un'altra.*
    That NEG take.PP.FSG have.3SG.SUBJ.PCL a other.FSG
    ‘That he has not taken another one of them’

b. *S' avea messa la più ricca roba.*
    RFL have.3SG.PST put.PP.FSG the most rich cloth.FSG
    ‘He had put on the richest clothes.’
    (Novellino, XCVI, 6, cited in Lucchesi 1962–1963: 223)

It follows that, in Old Italian, past-participle agreement in perfective constructions truly is a semantically-principled system of active vs. inactive alignment, which opposes undergoers with actors. The regularity of past-
Variability and change

participle agreement with the undergoer of non-monadic reflexives (cf. (10b)) is very significant, since it indicates that the marked actors which figure in non-monadic reflexives rank with actors, rather than with undergoers, insofar as past-participle agreement is concerned. Only affected actors rank with undergoers in Old Italian. However, as I explained in section 2.2, affected actors figure both in the highest semantic position and in a lower semantic position, as the affected argument of a state predicate. Accordingly, they are comparable to undergoers, in that they figure in a semantic position which pertains to undergoers.

Rare examples of absence of past-participle agreement are attested in Latin (Ramat 1983). However, in Italian, the process of loss of perfective past-participle agreement in constructions with two macroroles can only be said to begin in the thirteenth century. At this stage, it is recorded in transitive clauses, but not in non-monadic reflexives. In addition, it would seem to be subject to lexical diffusion, or – better – retraction, in that the omission of past-participle agreement only tends to affect a small class of verbs (Lucchesi 1962–1963: 218–219).

The situation is radically different in Modern Italian, as we have seen. As is usually the case with linguistic change, the literary registers are the most conservative ones, and can still show past-participle agreement with the core-internal nominal undergoer of transitive perfective structures (cf. (5c)). In addition, this type of agreement is determined by dialect pressure and sociolinguistic factors. In most varieties of Modern Standard Italian, however, past-participle agreement with a core-internal nominal undergoer is very rare in transitives clauses.

The questions which should be asked at this point are the following: why past-participle agreement with the undergoer has retrenched in transitive clauses, but not in intransitive ones (contrast (6a) with (1b)), and why, in transitive clauses, past-participle agreement with a core-internal nominal undergoer has lost ground, whilst past-participle agreement with a core-external one has not (contrast (6a) with (5b) and (6b)). Ideally, the answers to these questions will also capture the change which has occurred in non-monadic reflexives. As was mentioned above, in Modern Italian, past-participle agreement can in theory be controlled either by the undergoer or by the actor of these structures (cf. (7a) and (7b)). However, Hall (1958) has noted that native-speaker judgements suggest that past-participle agreement with the actor is preferable in this domain.

Following La Fauci (1984, 1989), it can be said that the resilience of past-participle agreement in intransitive domains, and the possibility for
the marked actor of non-monadic reflexives to control past-participle agreement denote a drift towards accusative marking which runs counter to the drift towards active alignment that characterizes the origin of Romance morphosyntax. In fact, the control of past-participle agreement by the only macrorole argument of intransitives and by the marked actor of non-monadic reflexives marks the syntactic contrast between PSAs and objects. In this respect, the transition from Old to Modern Italian involves a change from a system which opposes undergoers with actors to one which opposes PSAs with objects. Significantly, this transition is not complete, witness the obligatoriness of past-participle agreement with the undergoer in transitive structures like (8a): ‘La cantina, l’ho pulita ‘The cellar, I have cleaned it’. In order to explain past-participle agreement in transitive clauses, it is necessary to return to the hypothesis advanced in section 5.2 that past-participle agreement is grammatical in transitive clauses with a core-internal nominal undergoer, whereas it is anaphoric in clauses with a core-internal clitic. In the light of this proposal, the changes which have occurred in transitive perfective structures have almost entirely obliterated grammatical past-participle agreement, whilst they have preserved anaphoric past-participle agreement. Given that anaphoric agreement is realized by pronominal and inflectional elements which are co-referent with an established topic, it appears that the tendency towards the restoration of accusative alignment has been constrained by information-structure factors in Italian. In particular, in transitive clauses, past-participle agreement has only retrenched in the domain where it denotes the syntagmatic relation between the predicate and the nominal undergoer. Contrastingly, past-participle agreement has been maintained where the pronominal and inflectional elements stand in for a presupposed or detached topic. Table 5 sketches the contrast between Old and Modern Italian with respect to the agreement of the perfective past-participle. This outline is provisional and will be modified slightly on the basis of the results of corpus analysis.

Table 5. Past-participle agreement in perfective constructions: Old vs. Modern Italian (provisional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Italian</th>
<th>Modern Italian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active vs. inactive</td>
<td>active vs. non-active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(actor vs. undergoer/affected actor)</td>
<td>(actor vs. undergoer/marked actor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA or object</td>
<td>PSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligatory: grammatical or anaphoric</td>
<td>obligatory: grammatical or anaphoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obligatory iff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligatory iff</td>
<td>anaphoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given that past-participle agreement in perfective constructions is not restricted to PSAs, its underlying principle must be assumed to be semantic both in Old and Modern Italian. However, Modern Italian shows clear signs of a shift towards a syntactically and pragmatically determined system of past-participle agreement. The relevance of syntax (PSAhood) is indicated by the inclusion of the marked actor of non-monadic reflexives among the possible controllers, as well as by the contrast between past-participle agreement with undergoer and marked-actor PSAs, which is obligatory regardless of its pragmatic function, and past-participle agreement with the object, which is only obligatory if it is anaphoric. The agreement of the past participle with the PSA and with the object of non-monadic reflexives are mutually exclusive. Table 5 does not indicate, however, how the syntactic principle (agreement with the PSA) and the pragmatic one (anaphoric agreement with the object) are ranked in Modern Italian. This issue will be addressed in the next section with the help of the findings of corpus analysis.

Even though, in Modern Italian, the information-structure constraints only apply to past-participle agreement with the object, in principle, these constraints could also hold for past-participle agreement with the PSA, if the pragmatic factors outranked the syntactic ones. This theoretical possibility is exemplified by Italo-Romance dialects where past-participle agreement with the PSA is banned or optional in the absence of an established topic. Below are examples from Florentine (Flor.):

(11) a. Gli è vvenuho la tu mamma.
   (Florentine)
   SCL.MSG be.3SG come.PP the POSS mother.FSG
   ‘YOUR MUM HAS COME.’

b. L’è vvenuha la tu mamma. (Flor.)
   SCL.FSG be.3SG come.PP.FSG the POSS mother.FSG
   ‘Your Mum HAS COME.’
   (Stefanini 1969: 19, 23)

The example in (11a) is a presentational structure where the past participle and the subject clitic do not agree with the focal PSA. Contrastingly, (11b) is a structure with predicate focus (see section 1.4), where the subject clitic spells out the gender and number features of a topical PSA, and there is past-participle agreement. Clearly, in Florentine, the information structure conditions on past-participle agreement are not constrained by syntactic
factors, i.e., by the opposition between PSAs and objects. The pattern of agreement illustrated in (11) is very widespread in Northern Italo-Romance (Loporcaro 1998: 85, note 47). I shall return to it in sections 5.7 and 5.8, where I deal with finite agreement in a crossdialectal perspective.

5.3.1 How happy is trigger-happy agreement in non-monadic reflexives?

Non-monadic reflexives are constructions with two macroroles whereby the actor is co-referent with the suppressed highest argument (see Figure 12, section 4.2.6). On the one hand, they are transitive, in that they have two macroroles. On the other hand, they are comparable to a class of intransitives, specifically active accomplishments (e.g., *andare* ‘go’), in that neither the actor of non-monadic reflexives nor the actor of intransitive active accomplishments can simply be defined as the highest argument in the semantic representation. The history of Italian reflects these conflicting properties of non-monadic reflexives, since, in Old Italian, they are marked as transitive structures (with A and past-participle agreement controlled by the undergoer, see Lucchesi 1962–1963: 223), whereas in Modern Italian they require E, on a par with other constructions with a marked PSA. With respect to past-participle agreement in Modern Italian, I argued earlier that non-monadic reflexives constitute a domain of trigger-happy agreement (Comrie 2003). This claim was based on the grammatical rule which states that there are two competing triggers in non-monadic reflexives, the actor PSA and the undergoer (Lepschy and Lepschy 1988: 210–211; Maiden and Robustelli 2000: 270, 272):

(12) a. *Mia sorella si è comprata due orologi.*  
POSS sister.FSG RFL be.3SG buy.PP.FSG two watch.MPL  
‘My sister has bought two watches for herself.’

b. *Mia sorella si è comprati due orologi.*  
POSS sister.FSG RFL be.3SG buy.PP.MPL two watch.MPL  
‘My sister has bought two watches for herself.’

As I mentioned above, it has been claimed that the competition for agreement in non-monadic reflexives is a manifestation of the partial restoration of accusative alignment in Modern Italian (La Faucci 1989: 227–230), in accordance with the general retrenchment of grammatical past-participle agreement in transitive structures (cf. (5c) vs. (6a)). After all, the
spreading of a system of active marking in the transition from Latin to Romance never ousted accusative alignment, witness finite agreement in Italian, which does not distinguish between actor PSAs and undergoer PSAs.

Quantitative analysis conducted on ten literary texts in Modern Italian has revealed that the overwhelming majority of non-monadic reflexives with a core-internal nominal undergoer exhibit past-participle agreement with the PSA. In my analysis, I excluded four types of construction with non-monadic reflexives; in particular, those in which one of the potential controllers was (i) a core-internal clitic co-referent with an extra-core nominal (cf. (13a)), (ii) a clause-external nominal referred to by a wh-element within the clause (cf. (13b)), and (iii) a ne-cliticized noun phrase (cf. (13c)), plus those in which the two candidates for control agreed in gender and number (cf. (13d)):

(13) a. Sisto se l’ è sposata.
    Sisto.MSG RFL OCL.FSG be.3PL marry.PP.FSG
    ‘Sisto married her.’
    (Maraini, Memorie di una ladra, p. 31)

b. Uno dei dieci che il farmacista si era portati.
    One of.the.MPL ten REL the chemist.MSG RFL be.3SG take.PP.MPL
    ‘One of ten which the chemist had taken with him.’
    (Sciascia, A ciascuno il suo, p. 19)

c. Me ne sono fatte tre con la Lea.
    RFL QCL be.1SG make.PP.FPL three with the Lea
    ‘I did it three times with Lea.’
    (Lucarelli, L’estate torbida, p. 76)

d. Carnera si è tirato un colpo.
    Carnera RFL be.3SG pull.PP.MSG a shot.MSG
    ‘Carnera (a man) has shot himself.’
    (Lucarelli, L’estate torbida, p. 119)

It is impossible to determine which of the two candidates is the controller in cases like (13d). As for the other structures shown above, they were excluded from the quantitative analysis in order to factor out the pressure from discourse (anaphoric agreement, cf. (13a)) and any construction-specific constraints (cf. (13b) and (13c)). I shall return below to past-participle agreement in these domains.
In the remaining contexts with non-monadic reflexives, I found that past-participle agreement was controlled by the PSA in 77 out of 84 occurrences, i.e., in 91.7% of cases. Examples are provided below:

(14) a. Marta… sì sia tagliata i capelli.
   Martha RFL be.3SG.SUBJ cut.PP.FSG the hair.MPL
   ‘Martha… has had her hair cut.’
   (Tabucchi, Sostiene Pereira, p. 137)

b. Guido… sì è aggiustato la giacca.
   Guido RFL be.3SG rearrange.PP.MSG the coat.FSG
   ‘Guido… rearranged his coat.’
   (De Carlo, Due di due, p. 115)

This result suggests that the change which was mentioned above has almost driven out past-participle agreement by a core-internal nominal undergoer in non-monadic reflexives, and that there is virtually no free variation in past-participle agreement in this domain.

Interestingly, agreement with the core-internal nominal undergoer of non-monadic reflexives has only been found in three of the ten texts examined, and, within all of these, in a lower percentage than the agreement with the marked actor PSA. One of the three texts in question is Maraini’s Memorie di una ladra:

(15) Questo Libero… s’era tolta la vita.
   This Libero.MSG RFL be.3SG.PST take.PP.FSG the life.FSG
   ‘This Libero had taken his life’
   (Maraini, Memorie di una ladra, p. 121)

Maraini’s Memorie di una ladra also provides some instances of past-participle agreement with the undergoer of transitive structures (cf. (9a) and (9b)), and the possible reasons for this result have already been discussed. It is also worthy of mention that one of the relevant examples exhibits an undergoer which is syntactically heavy (cf. (16a)). In addition, in two cases (cf. (16a) and (16b)), the reflexive form is a first person plural pronoun, and past-participle agreement with first- and second-person clitic forms is subject to variability (see section 5.3.2):
The fact that the few exceptions to the general trend are only provided by three texts suggests that agreement with the marked-actor PSA really is the norm in Modern Standard Italian, in the structure under scrutiny, even though there is still the possibility of stylistically, sociolinguistically or geolinguistically constrained variation. Thus, whereas, in Old Italian, non-monadic reflexives pattern with transitives in the selection of the perfective operator and past-participle agreement, in Modern Standard Italian, they pattern with intransitives with a marked PSA (unaccusatives).

On the basis of the results considered so far, it seems that trigger-happy agreement is being replaced by agreement with the PSA. Non-monadic reflexives, however, do exhibit an important property of trigger-happy agreement: they are sensitive to information structure. Thus, the undergoer regularly triggers past-participle agreement, if it is a core-internal clitic which is co-referent with a topic:

(17) *Quella spilla [...], qualcuno se l’è messa in tasca.*

‘That broach, somebody put it into his/her pocket.’

(Lucarelli, *L’estate torbida*, p. 52)

It follows that the spread of past-participle agreement with the marked-actor PSA of non-monadic reflexives has almost ousted grammatical but not anaphoric past-participle agreement with the undergoer. From this point of view, the changes which have occurred in non-monadic reflexives parallel those which have affected transitive constructions, thus indicating that the mentioned discourse factors outrank the syntactic principle. The
mismatch discussed at the end of section 5.2 (selection of E but failure of past-participle agreement with the PSA) has only been overcome in Modern Standard Italian in the case of grammatical agreement.

5.3.2 Morphological harmony

To capture past-participle agreement in constructions with two macroroles, I have claimed that only anaphoric past-participle agreement is obligatory in transitive clauses. With specific reference to non-monadic reflexives, I have proposed that anaphoric past-participle agreement outranks grammatical past-participle agreement. These claims would seem to be challenged by the evidence provided by constructions with first- and second-person clitics and with ne-cliticization.

Anaphoric past-participle agreement is optional with a first- or second-person clitic undergoer. An authentic example is shown in (18). However the correlate of this structure without past-participle agreement is also grammatical (Il tecnico ci ha aiutato...):

(18) Il tecnico ci ha aiutati a trascinarlo...
    The technician OCL.1PL have.3SG help.PP.MPL to drag.OCL
    ‘The technician helped us to drag it...’
    (De Carlo, Due di due, p. 289)

The contrast between obligatory past-participle agreement with a third-person clitic undergoer and optional past-participle agreement with a first and second person clitic undergoer already surfaces in thirteenth-century Italian (Lucchesi 1962–1963: 220–223). A similar pattern of agreement is found in Logudorese Sardinian, where past-participle agreement is ruled out with first- and second-person clitics, whilst it is obligatory with third-person ones.

(19) a. Non m’ as bidu. (Logudorese)
    NEG OCL.1SG have.2SG see.PP
    ‘You have not seen me (M/F).’

b. Los as bidos. (Logudorese)
    OCL.3MPL have.2SG see.PP.MPL
    ‘You have seen them.’
The optionality of past-participle agreement with first- and second-person clitics has been explained in terms of the lack of morphological harmony between the inflection on the past participle and the clitic controller (La Fauci 1989: 225, note 13, Loporcaro 1998: 42–43). First- and second-person clitics do not vary according to gender, but according to person and number, whilst past-participle agreement spells out number and gender features. It follows that the anaphoric realization of first- and second-person undergoers by the inflection on the past participle is not entirely congruous with their realization by a core-internal clitic. Thus, even though the discourse conditions for perfective past-participle agreement are realized in structures like those in (18) and (19), in that agreement is anaphoric, agreement is not required, in Italian, and banned, in Logudorese.

Further problematic evidence would seem to be provided by transitive structures with the quantified clitic ne (the ne which originates from a quantified noun phrase, see Chapter 6), where the past participle agrees with a core-internal quantifier:

(20) Ne ha raccontate tante (balle).
    QCL have.3SG tell.PP.FPL many.FPL lie.FPL
    ‘(Lies), s/he has told many ne.’

The clitic ne occurs obligatorily in Italian when a topical undergoer (/affected actor) is co-referent with a focal quantifier. For instance, in (20), the topical undergoer balle ‘lies’ is co-referent with the separate focal quantifier tante ‘many’. In theory, past-participle agreement is optional in structures with ne-cliticization, and its optionality has been explained in terms of morphological harmony (La Fauci 1989, Loporcaro 1998: 43). However, my findings from corpus analysis show systematic past-participle agreement in such structures.

From the perspective taken in this work, the conditions for past-participle agreement with the undergoer are fulfilled in (20), since there is a core-external topical undergoer (balle ‘lies’) which is co-referent with the core-internal clitic ne. What is unclear is why agreement should be obligatory, since there is a core-internal focal quantifier. This apparent puzzle is solved by the independent assumption, which will be discussed in Chapter 6, that quantified ne is the head of the phrase which triggers agreement, tante ne in (20). Pressure towards morphological harmony yields morphological features which are harmonic with those spelled out on the quantifier. However, the past participle does not agree solely with the focal ele-
ment of information, but rather with an undergoer which is split across focus (the quantifier within the core of the clause) and topic (the co-referent extra-core nominal argument which is referred to by ne inside the core).

Supporting evidence for this account comes from constructions with genitive ne. In such constructions, I have not found past-participle agreement:

(21) a. *Il dolore e la rabbia avevano confuso il cervello di doña María Estella, ne avevano scardinato le membrane.*

‘Pain and anger had confused doña María Estella’s mind and unhinged her memories.’
(Masina, *Il volo del passero*, p. 91)

b. *Quel tipo di fanatismo... Ne ha avuto raggelanti conferme.*

‘That type of fanaticism... she has had scaring confirmation of it.’
(Fallaci, *La rabbia e l’orgoglio*, p. 91)

Neither in (21a) nor in (21b) is the clitic ne the head of the potential controller of past-participle agreement (see section 6.6). Rather, ne refers anaphorically to a topical complement of the focal heads *memorie* ‘memories’ and *fanatismo* ‘fanaticism’. Compare the counterparts of (21a) and (21b) in which this complement is specified: *avevano scardinato le memorie di doña María Estella* ‘they had unhinged doña María Estella’s memories’, and *ha avuto raggelanti conferme di quel tipo di fanatismo* ‘she has had scaring confirmation of that type of fanaticism’. In (21a) and (21b), the potential controller is thus a focal unit inside the core. As is predicted by my analysis of transitive clauses with a core-internal nominal undergoer, past-participle agreement with this argument need not be realized.
5.3.3 Wh-arguments

A further challenge is posed by transitive structures with wh-arguments. I illustrate this point below with reference to restrictive relative clauses (cf. (22a)), as well as interrogative (cf. (22b)) and exclamative clauses (cf. (22c)):

(22) a. Le lettere che ho spedito /-e oggi.
   The letter.FPL REL have.1SG send.PP FPL today
   ‘The letters which I have sent today.’

b. Quante lettere ho spedito /-e oggi?
   How.many.FPL letter.FPL have.1SG send.PP FPL today
   ‘How many letters have I sent today?’

c. Quante lettere ho spedito /-e oggi!
   How.many.FSG letter.FPL have.1SG send.PP FPL today
   ‘What a lot of letters I have sent today!’

In RRG, wh-arguments are assumed to occur in a position which precedes the core and is called Pre-Core Slot. In restrictive relative clauses, which are subordinated to the head of a noun phrase, it is the wh-pronoun (che ‘which’ in (22a)) that figures in the Pre-Core Slot, whereas its coreferent argument occurs outside the clause (VVLP: 497–503; Van Valin 2005: 220–222).

Past-participle agreement with the head of a transitive relative clause was the norm in Old Italian (Lucchesi 1962–1963: 216–217), whilst this type of agreement is said to have almost disappeared in Modern Italian (Hall 1958: 99; Loporcaro 1998: 12–13). I have found a few instances of it in my corpus:

(23) Racconta anche cose… che ha sepolte...
   Tell.3SG even thing.FPL REL have.3SG bury.PP.FPL
   ‘He even tells things that he has buried…’

(Masina, Il volo del passero, p. 111)

On the whole, the evidence suggests that perfective past-participle agreement with the head of a transitive relative clause is optional, although not as rare as agreement with the core-internal nominal undergoer of other transitive clauses. The same holds for clauses where the wh-argument is the undergoer of a non-monadic reflexive (cf. (13b)). In fact, these struc-
tures have been left out from the quantitative analysis discussed in section 5.3.1:

(24) a. *L’ idea che i più si sono fatta…*  
   The idea.FSG.REL the.MPL most RFL be.3PL make.PP.FSG  
   ‘The idea that the majority of people have acquired…’  
   (Sciascia, *A ciascuno il suo*, p. 138)  

   b. *Questa moglie che si è presa.*  
   This wife.RFL REL RFL be.3SG take.PP.FSG  
   ‘This wife he took.’  
   (Maraini, *Memorie di una ladra*, p. 290)  

The structures in (22) to (24) are puzzling for the following reasons. First, they are constructions with two macroroles whereby an extra-core undergoer, which is not realized core-internally by a clitic, can be cross-referenced by the inflection on the past participle. Furthermore, whereas the referent of the extra-core undergoer of (22a) and (24) could be considered to be an established topic, since these are restrictive relative clauses with a definite nominal head, that of (22b), (22c) and (23) is not topical (observe that, by contrast with the wh-argument of relative clauses, that of interrogative and exclamative clauses is by definition not topical). Significantly, the extra-core undergoer of (22a) and (24) is not topical, i.e., presupposed, in the same way as that of structures with a core-internal clitic. In fact, in the case of restrictive relative clauses with a definite nominal head, it is the existence of the referent of the nominal that is presupposed (Lombardi Vallauri 1994, 2002: 22–26), regardless of whether this has already been mentioned or can be taken for granted in discourse. In the light of this difference, and of the absence of a core-internal clitic, I assume that relative clauses do not exhibit anaphoric agreement in the sense explained above.

The lack of contrast, insofar as past-participle agreement is concerned, between the wh-arguments of all types of relative clauses, and interrogative or exclamative clauses, suggests that the informational weight of the wh-argument is not relevant to past-participle agreement in this domain. This intuition is corroborated by comparative evidence from French. Like Italian, this language shows a contrast between anaphoric and grammatical agreement with the undergoer of transitive constructions (even though, in French, past participle agreement is merely orthographic in most cases, and
thus it must be assumed that it is primarily determined by the prescriptive norm rather than by natural speaker competence):

(25) a. *J’ai envoyé / *-es les lettres. (French)
   I have.1SG send.PP FPL the letter.FPL
   ‘I have sent the letters.’

   b. Les lettres, je les ai envoyées. (French)
      The letter.FPL I OCL.PL have.1SG send.PP.FPL
      ‘The letters, I have sent them.’

However, all wh-arguments are treated alike vis-à-vis past-participle agreement. By contrast with what happens in Italian, this is required:

(26) a. Voilà la maison que j’ ai achetée. (French)
    Here the house.FSG REL I have.1SG buy.PP.FSG
    ‘There’s the house which I have bought.’

   b. Quelle maison a -t-il achetée? (French)
      What house.FSG have.3SG the buy.PP.FSG
      ‘Which house has he bought?’

   c. Que de problèmes il a rencontrés! (French)
      What of problem.MPL he have.3SG encounter.PP.MPL
      ‘What a lot of problems he has encountered!’

      (Byrne and Churchill 1993: 351)

I conclude that, both in French and Italian, past-participle agreement with wh-arguments is not subject to information-structure restrictions. In Modern Italian, past-participle agreement with the wh-undergoer of transitive clauses is optional, as a result of the historical drift towards accusative alignment.

5.3.4 Conclusion

The development of past-participle agreement in Italian perfective constructions is characterized by changes which affect clauses with two macroroles: (i) the retrenchment of past-participle agreement with a core-internal nominal undergoer, and (ii) the inclusion of the marked-actor PSA of non-monadic reflexives among the possible controllers. I have brought to light first-hand evidence that past-participle agreement with a core-
internal undergoer has almost been ousted by past-participle agreement
with the PSA of non-monadic reflexives. Following La Fauci (1989), I
consider the retrenchment of past-participle agreement in constructions
with two macroroles to be related to the conflict between accusative and
active alignment, with the former type being predominant in Modern Ital-
ian. However, in my analysis, the conflict between accusative and active
alignment does not explain the contrast between two-macrorole structures
with a core-external and a core-internal undergoer. To capture this contrast
I have argued that, in structures with two macroroles, past-participle
agreement is only obligatory if it is anaphoric (Bresnan and Mchombo
1987; Bresnan and Kanerva 1989). As well as anaphoric, past-participle
agreement must be harmonic, i.e., congruous with any other co-referent
agreement specifications, in order to be obligatory.

In the light of the findings of my corpus analysis, Table 5 must be
amended as shown in Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past-participle agreement in perfective constructions: Old vs. Modern Italian (revised)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Italian</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active vs. inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(actor vs. undergoer/affected actor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA or object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligatory: grammatical or anaphoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outranked by:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Non-finite agreement in complex predicates

This section is concerned with past-participle agreement in complex predic-
cates. I start with the complex predicates which were subject to scrutiny in
Chapter 2. I then move on to past-participle agreement in complex predic-
cates with causative and perception verbs. Finally, I discuss predicates with
an inherent argument. The principles which explain past-participle agree-
ment in simple predicates also hold for complex predicates. However, a
further, syntactic, condition holds for complex predicates, which can in-
validate the requirements of information structure. This condition ulti-
Non-finite agreement in complex predicates

mately contributes to the split between PSAs and objects, and thus to accusative alignment, in past-participle agreement.

5.4.1 Past-participle agreement in complex predicates with aspectual and modal units

In section 2.5, it was argued that a group of aspectual predicates which were referred to as class-(ii) aspectuals, and the homonymous motion/state predicators, join with another predicator to form nuclear co-subordinations (see Figure 7), whereas the aspectual operators which were called class-(i) aspectuals and the modals volere ‘want’, potere ‘can’ and dovere ‘must’ can license two types of nexus with a following infinitive, subordination or co-subordination (see Figures 8, 9, and 10). Class-(i) aspectuals are subordinated at the nuclear level, and modals at the core level. It was further claimed that the selection of the perfective operator in aspectual and modal complex predicates depends on the nexus formed by the two units. Only if the nexus is a co-subordination does the aspectual or modal operator contribute an argument which serves as the PSA. As is the norm, the perfective operator of the clause is selected in terms of PSA markedness.

Past-participle agreement in complex predicates is sensitive both to the nexus and to the level of juncture at which this nexus takes place (nucleus or core). To start with, past-participle agreement is not found in core co-subordinations with modals and class-(i) aspectuals:

(27)  a. Marta ha continuato a non venire con noi.
     Martha have.3SG continue.PP to NEG come with us
     ‘Martha has continued not to come with us.’
     b. Marta avrebbe voluto non venire.
     Martha have.3SG.COND want.PP NEG come
     ‘Martha would have liked not to come.’

(28)  a. Marta ha continuato a non vederla.
     Martha have.3SG continue.PP to NEG see.OCL.FSG
     ‘Martha has continued not to see her.’
     b. Marta avrebbe voluto non vederla.
     Martha have.3SG.COND want.PP NEG see.OCL.FSG
     ‘Martha would have liked not to see her.’
As was explained in Chapter 2, the negation of the sole infinitive is evidence that the modal/aspectual operator and the infinitive are predications which belong to separate cores in syntax. This explains the absence of past-participle agreement in (27a) and (27b), since the macrorole assigned to the only argument of the modal/aspectual predicator depends solely on the semantic properties of this unit: this argument is thus an unmarked actor and an unmarked PSA, and it cannot trigger past-participle agreement. In (28a) and (28b), there is an undergoer, which is realized by the object clitic la. However, since the undergoer is not in the core of the past participle, i.e., it is not an argument of the predicate in the participial form, it cannot control past-participle agreement.

Class-(i) aspectuals and modals can also join with an infinitive to form nuclear and core subordinations, respectively. In this case, past-participle agreement is licensed in the relevant contexts:

(29) a. Marta ci è continuata ad andare.
    Martha LCL be.3SG continue.PP.FSG to go
    ‘Martha has continued to go there.’

b. Marta ci è voluta andare.
    Martha LCL be.3SG want.PP.FSG go
    ‘Martha wished to go there.’

(30) a. Marta li ha continuati a vedere.
    Martha OCL.MPL have.3SG continue.PP.MPL to see.
    ‘Martha has continued to see them.’

c. Marta li ha voluti vedere.
    Martha OCL.MPL have.3SG want.PP.MPL see.
    ‘Martha wished to see them.’

Class-(i) aspectuals and modals do not contribute a predicate or any argument of their own to the structures illustrated in (29) and (30). Rather, they are pure modifiers of the following predicate. Accordingly, in (29a) and (29b), the PSA is the macrorole argument of andare ‘go’, i.e., an affected actor, and, as predicted by my account, it triggers past-participle agreement. In (30a) and (30b), past-participle agreement is controlled by the second argument of vedere ‘see’. This is a topical extra-core undergoer, which is realized core-externally by a clitic hosted by the AGX node of the aspectual or modal unit.
The cases discussed so far indicate that past-participle agreement constitutes a system of active vs. non-active marking in complex predicates, as it does in simple predicates. The information-structure restrictions which are at work in simple predicates also hold for past-participle agreement in complex predicates. In particular, the undergoer of transitive constructions only triggers past-participle agreement obligatorily if it is a core-external topic which is realized anaphorically inside the core. Note in passing that it is difficult to test grammatical past-participle agreement in the correlates of (30a) and (30b), since such correlates can be analysed as core-co-subordinations, and this explains the absence of agreement:

(31) a. *Marta ha continuato / (*?-i) a vedere i bimbi.
    Martha have.3SG continue.PP MPL to see the kid.MPL
    ‘Martha has continued to see the kids.’

    b. Marta ha voluto / (*?-i) vedere i bimbi.
    Martha have.3SG want.PP MPL see the kid.MPL
    ‘Martha wished to see the kids.’

Further evidence that the usual constraints hold for past-participle agreement in complex predicates is offered by constructions with class-(ii) aspecualts and their motion/state correlates. Recall that these are predicators which join with an infinitive to form nuclear co-subordinations. The past participle agrees either with the affected actor PSA (cf. (32a) and (32b)) or with a core-external topical undergoer (cf. (33a) and (33b)):

(32) a. Elda è andata / -*i a prendere.
    Elda be.3SG go.PP.FSG MPL to get.OCL.MPL
    ‘Elda has gone to get them.’

    b. Claudio è venuto / -*i a vederli.
    Claudio be.3SG come.PP.MSG MPL to see.OCL.MPL
    ‘Claudio has come to see them.’

(33) a. Elda li è andati / ?-a a prendere.
    Elda OCL.MPL be.3SG go.PP.MPL FSG to get
    ‘Elda has gone to get them.’

    b. Claudio li è venuti / ?-o a vedere.
    Claudio OCL.MPL be.3SG go.PP.MPL MSG to see
    ‘Claudio has come to see them.’
The data in (32a) and (32b) indicate that the control of agreement by an argument of the infinitive is ruled out if this argument is hosted by the infinitive itself. Recall that nuclear co-subordinations are formed by individual predicative nuclei which join together into a complex nucleus (see Figure 7). The ban on past-participle agreement with the clitic in (32) indicates that a syntactic condition is at work: anaphoric agreement on the past participle is not licensed unless the past participle and the clitic attach to the same nucleus. This condition is satisfied in (33). The contrast between the two structures is illustrated in Figures 16 and 17. In my corpus, I have not found a representative sample of examples comparable to (32) and (33). Accordingly, the discussion is based on the acceptability judgements provided by native speakers, and it should be noted that the preference for agreement with the topical undergoer of (33) has not been expressed unanimously:

Figure 16. The position of clitics and past-participle agreement (cf. (33a))
The licensing of past-participle agreement by the affected actor of *andare* ‘go’ in (33a) (*Elda li è andata a prendere…* ‘Elda has gone.FSG to get them’) can be explained in terms of the syntactic condition stated above. In particular, I assume that this pattern of agreement is licensed when the core-external topical undergoer is realized as an argument of the complex nucleus (see Figure 18).

I should also mention that speakers seem to avoid anaphoric past-participle agreement with the object in structures which favour the purely aspectual reading of *andare a*, *venire a*… and the like:

(34) *Elda lo è andata/ ?-o a scoprire.*

I presume that the preference illustrated in (34) is related to the fact that class-(ii) aspectuals can have a sentential complement (cf. *Elda è andata a scoprire il fatto che*… ‘Elda came to know about the fact that…’). In the preferred structure, the anaphor referring to a sentential complement attaches to the complex nucleus and not to the nucleus of the class-(ii) aspectual operator (see Figure 18):
Comparable conflicts are found in constructions with series of modal and aspectual predicates:

\[(35)\]  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Elda } & \quad \text{li } \quad \text{è dovuta } / \ -i \ \text{andare a prendere.} \\
\text{Elda} & \quad \text{OCL.MPL be.3SG must.PP.FSG MPL go to get} \\
\text{‘Elda had to go and get them.’}
\end{align*}
\]

In terms of the analysis developed in Chapter 2, the modal in (35) constitutes a core which does not project a predicate, and this explains the position of the clitic. The variable pattern of past-participle agreement exemplified in (35) indicates that the agreement specification features of the undergoer can either be part of the subordinated core or of the predicative core.

To conclude this section, a word on reflexives is in order. Past-participle agreement is obligatory in monadic reflexives with modal and aspectual operators:

\[(36)\]  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Lea } & \quad \text{si } \quad \text{è voluta } / \ *-o \ \text{fotografare} \\
\text{Lea.FSG RFL be.3SG want.PP.FSG MSG photograph} \\
\text{‘Lea wished to photograph herself.’}
\end{align*}
\]
b. Lea si è andata / *-o a fotografare
   Lea.FSG RFL be.3SG go.PP.FSG MSG to photograph
   ‘Lea has gone to photograph herself’

In these cases, past-participle agreement is required, since these are intransitive structures with an undergoer available for control (see Figure 11). Predictably, past-participle agreement is trigger happy in non-monadic reflexives, but there is a preference for control by the affected actor (see section 5.3.1):

(37) a. Lea si è voluta / (-o) mettere il cappotto.
    Lea.FSG RFL be.3SG want.PP.FSG MSG put.on the coat
    ‘Lea wished to put her coat on.’
   b. Lea si è andata / (-o) a mettere il cappotto.
    Lea.FSG RFL be.3SG go.PP.FSG MSG to put.on the coat
    ‘Lea has gone to put her coat on.’

Interestingly, if the undergoer is realised anaphorically inside the core, the same tensions are observed as were described above. Such tensions are explained by the syntactic constraint on past-participle agreement in complex predicates and the optional attachment of the clitic to the minimal syntactic unit of the past participle (see Figures 16 and 18):

(38) a. Lea se lo è voluta / -o mettere.
    Lea.FSG RFL OCL.MSG be.3SG want.PP.FSG MSG put
    ‘Lea wished to put it on.’
   b. Lea se lo è andata / -o a mettere.
    Lea.FSG RFL OCL.MSG be.3SG go.PP.FSG MSG to put
    ‘Lea has gone to put it on.’

To recapitulate, I have provided evidence that past-participle agreement in complex predicates with aspectual and modal operators is subject to the constraints which are at work in simple predicates. However, a further, syntactic, condition holds for these predicates: anaphoric agreement is only allowed if the topical object is realized as an argument of the nucleus of the past participle. This condition outranks the information-structure restrictions on past-participle agreement in transitives, and ultimately strengthens the divide between PSAs and objects in the control of past-participle agreement (see Figure 18).
5.4.2 Past-participle agreement in complex predicates with causative and perception verbs

In Chapter 2 I did not discuss the selection of the perfective operator in fare-causatives, or in complex predicates with perception verbs, since these are transitive constructions which select A obligatorily (due allowance being made for those which are marked with si). In section 4.2.4, I pointed out that fare-causatives are nuclear co-subordinations. Complex predicates with perception verbs can also constitute nuclear co-subordinations. Thus, fare-causatives and complex predicates of perception behave alike with respect to perfective past-participle agreement:

(39) a. *Ha visto / fatto cadere Eva.
   Have.3SG see.PP make.PP fall Eve.FSG
   ‘S/he has seen / made Eve fall.’

   b. L’ ha vista / fatta / *-o cadere.
   OCL.FSG have.3SG see.PP make.FSG MSG fall
   ‘S/he has seen/made her fall.’

As is normally the case with transitives, past-participle agreement with the undergoer is only obligatory if this is a core-external topic which is realized core-internally by a clitic hosted by the nucleus of fare or of the perception verb.

In (39a) and (39b), there are only two core arguments in the semantic representation. As for constructions with three arguments, the highest-ranking argument of the embedded predicate cannot be realized as an actor, since there is a higher argument in the semantic representation which is assigned the macrorole actor and serves as the PSA (the fare-causer or the perceiver). Thus, the highest-ranking argument of the embedded predicate is realized in Italian as a dative argument or the modulated actor of a passive, in accordance with a wide-spread crosslinguistic pattern (Comrie 1981a, 1985: 338–342):

(40) Mario ha fatto lavare la macchina da/a Leo.
    Mario have.3SG make.PP wash thecar.FSG by/to Leo
    ‘Mario has made Leo wash the car.’
Non-finite agreement in complex predicates

(41) Mario ha visto lavare la macchina da/a Leo.
Mario have.3SG see.PP wash the car.FSG by/to Leo
‘Mario has seen Leo wash the car.’

If, on the other hand, the highest-ranking argument of the second predicate is a topic, it is realized by a dative clitic pronoun:

(42) Mario gli ha fatto lavare la macchina.
Mario DCL have.3SG make.PP wash the car.FSG
‘Mario has made him wash the car.’

(43) Mario gli ha visto lavare la macchina.
Mario DCL have.3SG see.PP wash the car.FSG
‘Mario has seen him wash the car.’

Since dative arguments are not assigned a macrorole in Italian, this argument is not a potential controller. Past-participle agreement is triggered by the undergoer under the usual conditions:

(44) Gliel’ ha fatta / vista *-o lavare.
DCL.OCL.FSG have.3SG make.PP.MSG wash
‘S/he has made /seen him wash it.’

Complex predicates with perception verbs also allow a different type of nexus and juncture. This is a core co-ordination, where the second argument in the semantic representation is the lowest argument of the perception verb, and this argument controls the highest argument of the embedded predicate:

(45) Mario ha visto Leo lavare la macchina.
Mario have.3SG see.PP Leo wash the car
‘Mario saw Leo wash the car’

Evidence that (45) is a core juncture comes from clitic placement. Whereas in the nuclear co-subordination the lowest argument of the embedded predicate can be expressed by a clitic which precedes the complex predicate (cf. (44)), this is not possible in the core co-ordination (*L’ha vista Leo lavare ‘he saw it being washed by Leo’). Evidence that the two predicates are co-ordinated is provided by the fact that temporal operators are
shared across the two predicates, but modal ones are not. Thus, in *ieri vide Leo lavare la macchina* ‘yesterday he saw Leo wash the car’, both predicates are in the scope of the temporal adverb *ieri* ‘yesterday’ and the past-tense operator. Contrastingly, in *vuole vedere Leo lavare la macchina* ‘he wants to see Leo wash the car’, only ‘see’ is in the scope of the modal operator ‘want’. Temporal operators modify the clause, whilst modal ones modify the core. Accordingly, the two predicates of the structure exemplified in (45) are linked at the level of the clause and are part of different cores (see Figure 19).

*Figure 19. Core co-ordination.*

In the core co-ordination, past-participle agreement is controlled by the second argument of the perception verb, optionally, if this is a core-internal nominal (cf. (46a)), and obligatorily, if this is core-external and there is a co-referential clitic inside the first core (cf. (46b)):

\[(46)\]
\[\text{a. } \text{Mario ha visto /?(-a) Lia lavare il motorino.}\]
\[\text{Mario have.3SG see.PP FSG Lia.FSG wash the motorbike}\]
\[\text{‘Mario saw Lia wash the motorbike.’}\]
\[\text{b. } \text{Mario l’ ha vista / *-o lavare il m.}\]
\[\text{Mario OCL.FSG have.3SG see.PP MSG wash the m.}\]
\[\text{‘Mario has seen her wash the motorbike.’}\]

The second argument of the embedded predicate cannot trigger agreement on the past participle of the perception verb because it is not the undergoer of the predicate of perception (*Mario ha visto / *i Lia lavare i motorini* ‘Mario has see.PP (*MPL) Lia wash the motorbikes.MPL’).
Turning now to reflexives, as is to be expected, past-participle agreement with the undergoer PSA is obligatory in the case of monadic reflexives:

(47) a. L’ attrice si è fatta / *-o fotografare.  
The actress.FSG RFL be.3SG make.PP.FSG MSG photograph  
‘The actress has let herself be photographed.’

b. L’ attrice si è vista / *-o fotografare.  
The actress.FSG RFL be.3SG see.PP.FSG MSG photograph  
‘The actress has seen herself be photographed.’

In the case of non-monadic reflexives, there is a preference for control by the affected actor (see section 5.3.1):

(48) a. Si è fatta / (?-e) comprare le scarpe.  
RFL be.3SG make.PP.FSG FPL buy the shoes.FPL  
‘She has made somebody buy shoes for her.’

b. Si è vista / (?-i) rubare i soldi.  
RFL be.3SG make.PP.FSG MPL steal the money.MPL  
‘She has seen somebody steal her money.’

5.4.3 Activity vs. active-accomplishment alternations

A number of constructions previously referred to as idiomatic (J. C. Smith 1991) or semi-idiomatic (Belletti and Rizzi 1996) show puzzling patterns of past-participle agreement. The structures in question are exemplified below:

(49) a. Hanno messo fine al conflitto.  
Have.3PL put.PP end.FSG to the conflict  
‘They have put an end to the conflict.’

b. Ho fatto astrazione di alcuni problemi.  
Have.1SG make.PP abstraction.FSG of some problems  
‘I have abstracted away from some problems.’

c. Non ho preso parte a quell’ evento.  
NEG have.1SG take.PP part.FSG to that event  
‘I have not taken part in that event.’
Agreement

d. Non mi ha dato retta.
   NEG DCL have.3SG give.PP attention.FSG
   ‘S/he has not listened to me.’

e. Ho fatto finta di niente.
   Have.1SG do.PP pretence.FSG of nothing
   ‘I pretended I did not notice anything.’

On a par with the experiencer predicates formed with avere ‘have’ and a noun (see Chapter 3), these complex predicates face us with conflicting evidence, insofar as they normally ban passivization (cf. (50)), but they require perfective A (cf. (49)), which might suggest that they have two macroroles:

(50) a. *Astrazione è stata fatta di...
   Abstraction be.3SG be.PP.FSG make.PP.FSG of
   ‘Abstraction was made from...’
   b. *Parte è stata presa a...
      Part.FSG be.3SG be.PP.FSG take.PP.FSG to
      ‘Part was taken in...’

Belletti and Rizzi (1996) have noted that some of the constructions in question marginally allow passivization. In these cases, the past participle regularly agrees with the lower argument, which must be assumed to be an undergoer:

(51) a. Esigo che sia messa fine
    Demand.1SG that be.3SG.SUBJ put.PP.FSG end.FSG
    al conflitto.
    to.the conflict
    ‘I demand that one puts an end to the conflict.’
    b. Va fatta astrazione di questi problemi.
       Go.3SG make.PP.FSG abstraction.FSG of these problems
       ‘One ought to abstract away from these problems.’
       (Belletti and Rizzi 1996: 17)

Furthermore, in an analysis of nineteenth-century Italian texts, J. C. Smith (1991) records instances of past-participle agreement with the lower argument of these constructions in transitive clauses:
Recall now that, in the analysis of type-(i) experiencer predicates (see section 3.2), I argued that the second argument of the phrases with avere ‘have’ (e.g., avere paura ‘be afraid’) has both argumental and predicative function: it is assigned a macrorole (undergoer), but it is also part of the predicate, and thus it cannot serve as the PSA. At first, the phrases considered here might seem to require the same analysis. However, these phrases differ from the type-(i) experiencer predicates with avere ‘have’ in that they marginally allow passivization. Stylistic matters play a role in the exceptional licensing of undergoer behaviour (PSA modulation and control of participial agreement). The phrases cited by Belletti and Rizzi (1996) (mettere fine ‘to put an end to’ and fare astrazione ‘to abstract away from’) are in fact used in formal registers of Modern Italian. Suffice it to mention Beccaria’s (2002: 184–185) somewhat polemical notes on the proliferation of these periphrases in the bureaucratic style. I suggest, therefore, that the complex predicates under investigation are activity predicates with an inherent argument. The selection of A in (49) is simply due to the presence of an unmarked PSA. In the formal registers, these phrases admit active-accomplishment realizations whereby the second argument can serve as PSA (cf. (51)) and trigger past-participle agreement (cf. (51) and (52)).

5.4.4 Conclusion

In this section, I have ascertained that the conditions which are at work in the determination of past-participle agreement in simple predicates are also responsible for this type of agreement in complex predicates. However, a syntactic constraint has emerged from the analysis of complex predicates. This constraint outranks the information-structure constraints on past-participle agreement in transitive constructions.
Non-finite agreement in absolute participles

Absolute participial constructions provide evidence of an active vs. non-active split, in that the controller of agreement on the participle can be an undergoer or a marked actor, but not an unmarked actor (see La Fauci 1984, 1989 and Perlmutter 1989: 67–68 for the claim that this argument is an object). This is shown in (53), where past-participle agreement is controlled by an undergoer (cf. (53a) and (53c)), an affected actor (cf. (53b)), or a marked actor (cf. (53c)), but not an unmarked actor (cf. (53d)):

(53) a. Preparata la cena, cominciarono a mangiare.
    Prepare.PP.FSG the dinner.FSG begin.3PL.PST to eat
    ‘Once they had made dinner, they started to eat.’

    b. Rientrata Emma, cominciò la festa.
    Return.PP.FSG Emma begin.3SG.PST the party
    ‘Once Emma had returned, the party started.’

    c. Lavata / (?)i -si i capelli, Emma uscì.
    Wash.PP.FSG MPL RFL the hair.MPL Emma go.out.3SG.PST
    ‘Once she had washed her hair, Emma went out.’

    d. *Telefonata a Emma, si misero a tavola.
    Phone.PP.FSG FSG Emma RFL put.3PL.PST at table
    ‘Once Emma had phoned, they sat down at the table.’

An analysis of absolute participles will be provided in section 7.5. This construction only interests us in the present context insofar as the past participle exhibits grammatical agreement with its undergoer or marked actor, and the obligatoriness of agreement with the undergoer in structures like (53a) is unexpected in the light of the optionality (and rarity) of grammatical past-participle agreement in transitive perfective constructions. Observe the contrast between the perfective participle in (54a) and its absolute counterpart in (54b):

(54) a. Avendo Gigi spento / (?-a) la luce...
    Have.GER Louis switch.off.PP FSG the light.FSG
    ‘Having Louis switched off the light....’
The obligatoriness of agreement on absolute participles would seem to indicate that these are adjectival or passive participles. The adjectival analysis of absolute participles, however, is challenged by morphosyntactic evidence. Specifically, absolute participles do not bear adjectival modification (cf. (55a)) or substitute for adjectives. Some Italian verbs have adjectival and verbal past participles, and it is the latter type that figures in absolute structures (cf. (55b)):

(55)  a. *Preparatissima la cena...
Prepare.PP.SUPERL.FSG the dinner.FSG
Lit. Very prepared the dinner,...
 b. *Asciutti / Asciugati i panni,...
Dry.MPL dry.PP.MPL the cloth.MPL
‘Having dried the clothes,...’

As for the passive analysis, Loporcaro (2003) has claimed that this analysis only holds for a subclass of the participial structures illustrated in (53), that is, those whose controller does not exhibit co-reference linkages with the matrix clause. The possibility of argument modulation supports the passive analysis of these absolute participles:

(56)  Arrestati dalla polizia tutti i manifestanti,
Arrest.PP.MPL by.the police all the protesters
i tumulti cessarono.
the riots cease.3PL.PST
‘The protesters having been arrested by the police, the riots ceased.’
(Loporcaro 2003: 224)

The participial clauses which do display a co-reference linkage with the matrix clause (cf. (57)) are claimed by Loporcaro (2003) to be active constructions, since the second argument can be encoded by accusative clitics. Contrast the grammatical construction in (57b) with the ungrammatical one in (57c), which indicates that the second argument of the participle cannot be realized by an accusative clitic if there is no co-reference linkage between the subordinate and the matrix clause:
(57) a. Arrestati i manifestanti, la polizia...
   ‘Having arrested the protesters, the police…’

   b. Arrestatili, la polizia...
   ‘Having arrested them, the police…’

   c. *Arrestatili, cessarono i tumulti.
   ‘Having arrested them, the riots ceased.’

Loporcaro’s (2003) proposal that the participial structures exemplified in (56) are passive does not entirely solve the puzzle of the obligatoriness of grammatical agreement, since the passive analysis does not extend to (53a) or (57a). The obligatoriness of agreement with the undergoer of these structures, however, is not as surprising as one might think at first blush. In fact, the contrast between grammatical and anaphoric agreement concerns perfective constructions with two macroroles. The actor of participial absolutes is ousted from the participial structure, unless it is modulated. Compare the grammatical structure in (56) with its ungrammatical counterparts in which the actor is not modulated: *arrestati la polizia tutti i manifestanti,…; *arrestati tutti i manifestanti la polizia,… Grammatical past-participle agreement with the undergoer of absolute participles is thus comparable to grammatical agreement in intransitive perfective constructions (Emma è caduta ‘Emma has fallen (lit. is fallen.FSG’) ). Past-participle agreement with the undergoer is, of course, expected if the actor is modulated (cf. (56)).

To conclude this section, it should be pointed out that absolute participles are comparable with adjectives and analytic passives, insofar as the participle contributes a predicate and its argument, but it is not involved in the morphosyntactic workings of the clause. In particular, PSAhood cannot be marked on it, and neither can the temporal specifications which in Italian are marked on the finite form of the verb or on an operator. In section 5.8, I shall point out that the constructions in which finiteness cannot be marked on the predicate itself are the only ones that have maintained non-finite agreement in the Romance languages which have lost perfective past-participle agreement (for instance Sicilian and Spanish).
5.6 Non-finite agreement in constructions with adjectival and nominal predicates

This section is concerned with constructions in which there is only one predicator, which is provided by an adjective or a noun, and is accompanied by a copula (‘be’). In Italian, these constructions would appear to pattern with one side of the intransitivity split, in some respects, and with the other side, in others. For instance, their copula selects perfective E (cf. (58a)). However, it has been claimed that they reject ne-cliticization (cf. (58b)), allowance being made for an exceptional class of adjectives (Cinque 1990). Finally, adjectival and nominal predicates do not figure in absolute constructions of the kind discussed in section 5.5, whether or not in conjunction with the past-participle of the copula (cf. (58c)):

(58) a. Linda è stata ammalata.
   Linda be.3SG be.PP.FSG sick.FSG
   ‘Linda has been sick.’

    b. *Ne sono bianchi molti.
       QCL be.3PL white.MPL many.MPL
       ‘Many ne are white.’

    c. *(Stata) ammalata Linda,…
       Be.PP.FSG sick.FSG Linda
       ‘Linda having been sick,…’

The puzzling behaviour of adjectival and nominal predicates has led to controversy, with some accounts claiming that the constructions in question are unergative (Burzio 1986: 74, note 13) and other accounts analysing them as unaccusative (La Fauci 2000: 75–90). In accordance with the former approach, adjectival passives have also been ranked with unergatives (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1986). By contrast with the mentioned approaches, Cinque (1990) has argued that, on a par with verbal predicates, adjectival ones can be divided into an unergative class and an unaccusative one. Cinque’s proposal was later adopted and elaborated in other syntactic studies of adjectives (Baker 2003: 62–70; Bennis 2004). In this section, I focus on non-finite agreement. I postpone to Chapters 6 and 7 the treatment of adjectival passives, which I call resultative state predicates, ne-cliticization, and absolute constructions with adjectival predicates.
Following Jackendoff’s (1983: 188–207) suggestion that constructions with adjectival and nominal predicates encode properties which are located in individuals, Schwartz (1993) has proposed that these constructions are bivalent structures with a theme, which serves as their predicate, and a locational argument:

(59) a. *Linda è irascibile / una cantante.*
    Linda be.3SG quick-tempered a singer
    ‘Linda is quick-tempered / a singer’
    a¹. be’ (Linda, *[quick-tempered]*)
    a². be’ (Linda, *[singer]*)

According to Schwartz’s (1993) proposal, since the theme has the role of predicate, it is not available for macrorole assignment. As a result, it is also unavailable for a number of morphosyntactic operations which only concern macrorole arguments. The locational argument is the only one that is available for macrorole assignment in the constructions under scrutiny. Given that the predicate is stative, the locational argument will be an undergoer.

Turning now to non-finite agreement, both the adjective and the past participle of the copula agree with the undergoer (cf. (60a)). If the predicate is a nominal, the presence of number and, in some cases, gender agreement depends on whether the construction is identificational (cf. (60b) and (60c)) or equational (cf. (60d)). Whereas the lack of gender agreement on the nominal predicate of (60b) depends on the absence of a feminine form of this noun, the lack of both number and gender agreement on the nominal predicate of (60d) is a constructional feature. The past participle of the copula is subject to obligatory agreement with the undergoer:

(60) a. *Linda è stata disonesta.*
    Linda be.3SG be.PP.FSG dishonest.FSG
    ‘Linda has been dishonest’

b. *Linda è stata il mio medico.*
    Linda be.3SG be.PP.FSG the POSS medical.doctor.MSG.
    ‘Linda has been my doctor.’

c. *Linda è stata la mia miglior amica.*
    Linda be.3SG be.PP.FSG the POSS best friend.FSG.
    ‘Linda has been my best friend.’
d. I bambini di Linda sono stati
   The kid.MPL of Linda be.3PL be.PP.MPL
   l’ argomento della discussione.
   the topic.MSG of the conversation
   ‘Linda’s kids were the topic of the conversation.’

The structure illustrated in (60d) has a counterpart which might seem to suggest that past-participle agreement with the theme predicate is also an option:

(61) La argomento della discussione sono stati /
   The topic.MSG of the conversation be.3PL be.PP.MPL
   *è stato i bambini di Linda.
   be.3SG be.PP.MSG the kid.MPL of Linda
   ‘Linda’s kids were the topic of the conversation.’

However, there is evidence to the contrary. To begin with, finite agreement shows that i bambini ‘the kids’ is the PSA in both (60d) and (61), regardless of word order. Secondly, Moro (1997: 23–30) has pointed out that the two nominal constituents which are found in copular constructions with a nominal predicate behave differently with respect to a number of morpho-syntactic tests, including cliticization with the pro-predicate clitic lo. Being the predicate of the clause, l’argomento della discussione ‘the topic of the discussion’ can be realized by the pro-predicate lo (I bambini di Linda lo sono stati ‘Linda’s kids were such’). The same does not hold true for i bambini di Linda ‘Linda’s kids’ (*l’argomento della discussione lo è stato / sono stati ‘the topic of the conversation was such’). The asymmetry between the two nominals supports the idea that the one which does not trigger agreement on the copula is the predicate. Accordingly, (61) is simply a counterpart of (60d) with inverted linear order of the constituents. Therefore, non-finite agreement is controlled by the undergoer in structures with a nominal predicate, not by the theme predicate. I return to these facts in section 6.4.1, where I consider the notion of predicate in semantics-syntax mapping vis-à-vis the notion of discourse predicate (the domain of the assertion).
5.7 Finite agreement: Crossdialectal evidence

So far I have been concerned with non-finite agreement. My analysis has suggested that, whilst non-finite agreement marks active vs. non-active alignment, which is ultimately based on a semantic principle, it is constrained by information-structure factors which differentiate between syntactic PSAs and objects. In particular, the grammatical vs. anaphoric split in non-finite agreement only affects two-macrorole constructions where the controller is not a PSA, but rather an object. In this section, I move on to finite agreement. I propose that, whilst finite agreement marks accusative (syntactic) alignment, it can be constrained by information-structure factors which differentiate between the semantic functions undergoer / affected actor and actor.

In previous work on split intransitivity (see, for instance, Burzio 1986: 121–122; Belletti 1988; Jones 1993: 100), finite agreement has received a syntactic treatment. Abstracting away from a number of theory-internal technicalities, it has been proposed that the postverbal argument which fails to license finite agreement on an intransitive predicate, for instance in French, is an object which fails to be realized as the subject of the clause. This analysis is supported by the crosslinguistic tendency for finite agreement to be missing in unaccusative structures:

(62) *Il est arrivé des étudiants.* (French)

EXPL be.3SG arrive.PP some students.MPL

‘There arrived some students.’

It has also been claimed that the tendency for postverbal arguments of unaccusative predicates to fail to trigger finite agreement is constrained by their definiteness value, with indefinite nominals like *des étudiants* ‘some students’ in (62) being the only type of argument that occurs in such impersonal constructions. Belletti (1988), for instance, has proposed that unaccusative verbs assign partitive case, as evidenced by the indefiniteness of their postverbal argument. In Belletti’s view, if the postverbal argument of an unaccusative verb is definite, it is not internal to the verb phrase, i.e., it is not an object, but rather it is adjoined to the right of the verb phrase. Arguments adjoin freely to the right of the verb phrase in null-subject languages, as is suggested by the Italian example *arrivano gli studenti* ‘the
students are arriving’. Contra Belletti (1988: 8), La Fauci and Loporcaro (1997) have pointed out that the argument cannot be right-adjoined to the verb phrase in the sentence *arrivano gli studenti a lezione* ‘the students arrive to the class’, since it is followed by a prepositional phrase which is internal to the verb phrase.

Contrary to what happens in French, postverbal arguments of unaccusatives do not fail to trigger finite agreement in Standard Italian (but see section 5.7.2 for some non-standard varieties). Observe that this is not only true of structures with definite arguments, but also of structures with indefinite ones:

\[(63) \text{*Arrivano molti studenti a lezione.} \]

Arrive.3PL many student.MPL to class

‘There arrive many students to class.’

In La Fauci and Loporcaro’s (1997) syntactic analysis, indefinite postverbal arguments are objects of impersonal constructions (in the sense of Perlmutter 1983), regardless of whether they trigger finite agreement. The difference between Italian and French is ultimately determined by the fact that French requires an expletive subject (*il*, cf. (62)), which controls agreement.

I put forward a radically different proposal on finite agreement, based on evidence from Logudorese and Nuorese Sardinian. In my account, the lack of agreement in constructions like (62) does not depend on syntax, but rather on the interaction of information structure with alignment. We have seen that this interaction is responsible for the lack of past-participle agreement with the undergoer in constructions with two core-internal macroroles. I shall now introduce evidence which suggests that the said interaction can be responsible for the lack of finite agreement with the undergoer in constructions with one macrorole.

### 5.7.1 Evidence from Logudorese and Nuorese Sardinian

Logudorese and Nuorese Sardinian present us with evidence which challenges the syntactic analyses of finite agreement with postnuclear arguments. To begin with, the absence of agreement with a postnuclear argument does not only concern unaccusative structures (64a), but also unergative ones (64b):
Secondly, the correlation of finite agreement with the definiteness value of the postverbal argument is asymmetric, insofar as indefinite arguments trigger agreement if they bear contrastive stress (cf. (65a)), but otherwise fail to do so (cf. (65b)), whereas definite arguments never fail to trigger agreement (cf. (66a) and (66b)):

(65) a. Bi sun medas fiores in sa tanca, CL be.3PL many.PL flower.MPL in the meadow others in su orto. (Logudorese) ‘There are many flowers in the meadow, others in the orchard.’

b. B’ at medas fiores in sa tanca. (Log.) ‘There are many flowers in the meadow.’

(66) a. Bi sun sos piattos in sa mesa. (Logudorese) CL be.3PL the plate.MPL in the table Lit. There are the plates on the table.

b. *B’ at sos piattos in sa mesa. (Logudorese) CL have.3SG the plate.MPL in the table Lit. There has the plates on the table.

Observe that the absence of agreement co-distributes with the selection of invariant ‘have’, both in structures which would normally require this operator, because the PSA is unmarked (cf. (64b)), and in structures which normally require ‘be’ (contrast (64a) with sas piseddas sun bennidas a domo, ‘The girls have (lit. are) come home’). Note further that bi is not an expletive subject, since it is missing in the domains where expletive subjects are required by non null-subject languages (cf. (67a)). In addition, it
can co-occur with overt referential subjects in prenuclear position (cf. (67b)):

\[(67) \quad \text{a. At } \text{pioppidu. (Logudorese)}
\]

\[
\text{Have.3SG rain.PP}
\]

\[
\text{‘It has rained.’}
\]

\[
\text{b. Juanne non } \text{b’ est } \text{arrabadu. (Logudorese)}
\]

\[
\text{John NEG CL be.3SG arrive.PP.MSG}
\]

\[
\text{‘John has not arrived.’}
\]

Clearly, the Sardinian data are hard to reconcile with the purely syntactic accounts which deterministically associate the failure of agreement with a postverbal argument and / or the indefinite value of the postverbal argument with unaccusative syntax.

With evidence from a wide variety of languages, Lazard (1998: 67–73) has pointed out that the verbal form which figures in presentational structures often lacks agreement with the nominal which introduces a new referent, whether this nominal can co-occur with an object in the clause or has itself the properties of an object. In the light of the difficulty of identification of the role of this argument in the clause, Lazard (1998) introduces the term \textit{actant H}, which is meant to distinguish it from prototypical subjects and objects. It would seem that the argument which figures in the Sardinian structures introduced above well exemplifies the notion of \textit{actant H}. Lazard (1998) claims that \textit{actant H} typically figures in existentials. In Bentley (2004a), I independently argued that the Sardinian structures under discussion are existential constructions. In my analysis, the postverbal argument is the argument of an existential predicate which is part of the semantic representation of the sentence, but does not figure in syntax. This argument is modified by a predicate which takes the position of the main predicate in syntax. Observe the semantic representation of (64b):

\[(64) \quad b^1. \text{exist}’([\text{be’} (\text{piseddas, [do’ (piseddas, [dance’ (piseddas)]})])])
\]

The underlining in (64b\textsuperscript{1}) indicates that \textit{piseddas} ‘girls’ is the argument of \textit{exist’}. This argument is embedded in another predication, which, for convenience, I represent semantically as a relative clause \textit{(be’ (piseddas, [do’ (…)])}. The predicate \textit{dance’} is the only predicate that figures in syntax. In the light of this analysis, (64b) would be appropriately translated as ‘there are many girls who (/and they) have danced’, and (64a) as ‘there are many girls who (/and they) have come home’.
The parallel patterns of agreement and choice of copula which characterize, on the one hand, the constructions in question (cf. (64a) and (64b)) and, on the other hand, existentials (cf. (65) and (66a)) constitute evidence in support of my existential analysis. Further evidence is provided by n(d)e-cliticization. The Sardinian quantified or partitive clitic n(d)e can be considered to be a diagnostic of split intransitivity, on a par with its Italian cognate ne (see Chapter 6). In fact, it can only originate from the lowest argument of any predicate which includes a state. Jones (1993: 209–201) has pointed out that, in Nuorese, instead of n(d)e-cliticization of the argument of intransitive activities, which is ungrammatical, one usually finds n(d)e-cliticization of an impersonal existential structure:

(68) a. Metas (*nde) an cantatu.  (Nuorese)  
Many QCL have.3PL sing.PP  
‘Many (ne) have sung.’

b. Bind’ at metas ki an cantatu. (Nuorese)  
CL.QCL have.3SG many that have.3PL sing.PP  
‘There are many ne who have sung.’

(Jones 1993: 210).

To return to the structures under investigation, one would expect n(d)e to be compatible with (64a), but not with (64b), which has an activity predicate. Contrary to this expectation, however, both structures allow n(d)e-cliticization:

(69) a. Binn’ at bennidu medas.  (Logudorese)  
CL.QCL have.3SG come.PP many.PL  
‘There are many ne who have come.’

b. Binn’ at balladu medas.  (Logudorese)  
CL.QCL have.3SG dance.PP many.PL  
‘There are many ne who have danced.’

The compatibility of (69b) with n(d)e clearly suggests that the n(d)e-cliticized argument must be the argument of a state, in my analysis the existential predicate (see section 6.3.1 for in-depth treatment of a similar case of syntax-semantics mismatch in Italian). The above prediction is, however, borne out by a correlate of (69b) which exhibits agreement, in that this structure rules out n(d)e-cliticization: *bin(d)’ana balladu medas
‘many *ne* have danced’. My existential analysis does not extend to this presentational construction.

Drawing on Lambrecht’s (1994: 49) distinction between two types of information structure, focus structure and identifiability (see section 1.4), in Bentley (2004a) I proposed that, in Logudorese and Nuorese Sardinian, the particle *bi* combines with word order to mark focus structure. In particular, *bi* plus a postnuclear argument mark sentence focus or narrow focus on the argument. Contrastingly, agreement and the selection of ‘have’ mark identifiability (see also Chafe 1976, Du Bois 1980). An identifiable referent is one for which a representation can be assumed to exist in the addressee’s mind, whereas an unidentifiable referent is one for which no such representation can be assumed. In addition, an anchored discourse referent is one that is explicitly related to another referent. My claim is that, in Sardinian presentational, invariant ‘have’ marks unidentifiable and unanchored discourse referents (see Prince’s 1981’s notion of brand-new referents). Typically, unidentifiable referents are realized linguistically by indefinite nominals. Both the referent of (65a) (*Bi sun medas fiores in sa tanca, ateros in su orto* ‘there are many flowers in the meadow, others in the orchard’) and the one of (65b) (*B’at medas fiores in sa tanca* ‘there are many flowers in the meadow’) are encoded as unidentifiable. However, in (65a), the unidentifiable referent (*‘many flowers in the meadow’*) is anchored, that is explicitly related, to another referent (*‘others in the orchard’*). Observe that the quantifier is not cardinal but rather proportional (Milsark 1979) in this example. In particular, instead of denoting the cardinality of the flowers which are in the meadow, the quantifier denotes the proportion of flowers which are in the meadow, which is contrasted with the proportion of those that are in the orchard. It is this contrast that constitutes a kind of anchoring. Since it refers to an anchored referent, the indefinite argument triggers agreement in (65a). The example (65b) contrasts with the one in (65a), in that the indefinite argument of (65b) refers to an unidentifiable unanchored referent, which results in the selection of invariant ‘have’.

The lack of one-to-one correspondence between the indefiniteness of the nominal and the lack of agreement in Sardinian (cf. (65a) and (65b)) strongly supports an analysis which considers agreement to be sensitive to factors that are not binary (for instance, the subject vs. object divide). I have argued that the principal factor at work is information structure, and, in particular, identifiability.'
Standard Italian exhibits a contrast between past-participle agreement with the PSA (subject past-participle agreement) and past agreement with the undergoer of transitive constructions (object past-participle agreement). The latter is constrained by information structure, in that it is only obligatory if it is anaphoric, whilst the former is not. The same holds for Sardinian, if, for the sake of argument, one temporarily abstracts away from the presentational constructions discussed in this section, as well as the contrast between grammatical persons which was mentioned above. Thus, undergoer/affected actor PSAs trigger past-participle agreement (cf. (70a)), whilst other actor PSAs do not (cf. (70b)). Observe that, unlike Italian, Logudorese Sardinian exhibits no past-participle agreement in non-monadic reflexives (cf. (71)):

(70) a. (Sas piseddas) sun bennidas a domo. (Log.)
    The girl.FPL be.3PL come.PP.FPL to home
    ‘The girls have come home.’
  b. (Sas piseddas) an balladu. (Log.)
    The girl.FPL have.3PL dance.PP
    ‘The girls have danced.’

(71) Mangedda s’ at comperadu duos liberos. (Log.)
    Mangedda.FSG RFL have.3SG buy.PP two book.MPL
    ‘Mangedda has bought two books for herself.’

The absence of past-participle agreement with the marked actor in (71) reflects the relative insensitivity of Sardinian to argument suppression, which I have already discussed in relation to the selection of the perfective operator. Since the PSA of (71) does not classify as a marked PSA, in Logudorese (see section 4.2.6), it is not a candidate for control of non-finite agreement. The absence of past-participle agreement with the undergoer in the same structure is in accordance with what happens in other constructions with two macroroles. The undergoer of these constructions only triggers agreement if it is a third-person core-external topic, realized core-externally by a clitic:

(72) a. Mangedda at bidu / *-os sos liberos. (Log.)
    Mangedda have.3SG see.PP MPL the book.MPL
    ‘Mangedda has seen the books.’
Finite agreement marks accusative alignment in Sardinian, as is the case with Italian. However, in Sardinian, there are well-formedness conditions on the encoding of information structure which hold for constructions with one macrorole. Adopting my existential analysis of the Sardinian presentationals illustrated in (64a) and (64b), these conditions turn out only to affect intransitive constructions with an undergoer. They can be formulated as follows: when the undergoer encodes an unidentifiable unanchored referent, grammatical agreement is banned and, if applicable, the operator ‘have’ is required.

To conclude, both in standard Italian and Logudorese and Nuorese Sardinian, non-finite agreement is based on a semantic principle, active alignment, but it is constrained by information structure factors which differentiate between PSAs and objects. In Logudorese and Nuorese Sardinian, there are further constraints on non-finite agreement, which only hold for intransitive constructions (cf. (64a) and (64b)). These constraints extend to finite agreement, which is otherwise principled syntactically, in terms of accusative alignment. They ban agreement with an undergoer that realizes an unidentifiable and unanchored discourse referent.

5.7.2 Finite agreement in Italian

In Old Italian, finite agreement with a third-person immediately postverbal PSA is sometimes missing (Brambilla Ageno 1964; Salvi 1991; Vanelli 1986):

(73) *Ci sarebbe degli impacci.
    CL be.3SG_COND some trouble.MPL
    ‘There would be some trouble.’

According to Vanelli (1986: 257–258), since Old Italian is subject to a syntactic constraint on word order which requires that the verb should take the second position in the clause, the subject can occur in postnuclear posi-
tion regardless of its role in focus structure. The absence of agreement in structures like (73) can thus be considered to be a device which marks this role. The evidence cited in the literature suggests that the lack of agreement characterizes clauses with an undergoer / affected-actor PSA (cf. (73) and the data reported in Wandruszka 1982: 16 and Salvi 1991: 231).

The marking of information structure by finite agreement is continued in Modern non-Standard Italian. Nocentini (1999) goes as far as to claim that, in the spoken Italian of Tuscany, finite agreement is only controlled by a prenuclear topical argument. The following list of authentic examples is drawn from Alisova (1972: 145–146):

(74) a. *L’ Italia verrebbe distrutta,*
   The Italy come.3SG.COND destroy,PP.FSG
   se non ci fosse i soldati.
   if NEG CL be.3SG.SUBJ the soldier.MPL
   ‘Italy would be destroyed, if there were no soldiers.’

b. *Quando viene i miei fratelli dagli...*
   When come.3SG the POSS brother.MPL give.3SG.DCL
   ‘When my brothers arrive, give them...’

c. *Da questo osservatorio partiva gli ordini.*
   From this observatory leave.3SG.PST the order.MPL
   ‘It’s from this observatory that the orders were sent out.’

d. *Mi piace i balocchi che vendono.*
   DCL appeal.3SG the toy.MPL REL sell.3PL
   ‘I like the toys that they sell.’

e. *Poi nacque gli incidenti...*
   Then be.born.3SG PST the incident.MPL
   ‘Then the trouble started...’

Two properties of these authentic examples from non-Standard Italian appear to me to be particularly relevant to the present discussion. First, the lack of finite agreement co-distributes with the appearance of the argument in immediately postnuclear position. Secondly, there is no definiteness restriction on the postnuclear argument: the postnuclear nominals of (74) are, in fact, definite. This fact suggests that an analysis in terms of identifiability, along the lines of my account of Sardinian presentationals (see section 5.7.1), would not be appropriate.
The structures in (74) are sentence-focus constructions which introduce a new element of information in discourse. They reveal two conditions on the morphosyntactic encoding of focal elements of information: the undergoer (/affected actor) of intransitive sentence-focus constructions (i) occurs in postnuclear position and (ii) fails to trigger agreement. Condition (i) also holds true for Standard Italian, and will be discussed in Chapter 8. Contrastingly, condition (ii) does not hold true for Standard Italian, with rare exceptions in *si*-constructions (Lepschy 1976: 159, 1978: 35–38; Lepschy and Lepschy 1988: 224–225). I include here an example from Lepschy (1978: 35):

(75) *Si è comprato due penne.*  
IMP be.3SG buy.PP two pens  
“We have bought two pens.”

5.7.3 Finite vs. non-finite agreement: Conclusion

I have discussed agreement in Old and Modern Italian. My findings have brought to light an apparent contradiction: finite agreement is affected by information-structure factors in Old Italian, but not in Modern Standard Italian. Contrastingly, non-finite agreement is constrained by information structure in Modern Italian but not in Old Italian.

The apparent contradiction in the role of information structure in the development of agreement is explained within the context of the advancement of accusative alignment. The information-structure constraints on finite agreement which are at work in Old Italian differentiate between actors and undergoers / affected actors, only affecting the marking of undergoers / affected actors. Since these constraints are no longer valid, finite agreement is entirely governed by a syntactic principle in Modern Standard Italian: it marks accusative alignment, and it obliterates the semantic contrast between actors and undergoers.

The retrenchment of non-finite agreement also constitutes a step towards the neutralization of the opposition between actors and undergoers, given that non-finite agreement in Old Italian singles out undergoers and affected actors, but this is not the case in Modern Italian. I have claimed that this step in the establishment of accusative alignment cannot be properly understood unless one recognizes that it is constrained by information structure: grammatical non-finite agreement with the object is virtually
lost, whilst anaphoric non-finite agreement with the object is retained. As is the case with finite agreement in Old Italian, the information structure factors affect the marking of undergoers.

In the spoken Italian of Tuscany, and in Logudorese and Nuorese Sardinian, finite agreement is subject to constraints which are comparable to those that hold for Old Italian, in that they are principled by information structure. In the next section, I consider agreement in broader crossdialectal perspective. My aim is twofold. I intend to discuss further the process of advancement of accusative alignment and, secondly, to examine the theoretical implications of some discrepancies between past-participle agreement with the PSA and the selection of E.

5.8 Agreement in crossdialectal perspective

In the discussion that follows, I do not aim to provide an exhaustive picture of agreement in Romance (for extensive crossdialectal investigation of past-participle agreement in this language family see Loporcaro 1998). My aim is, instead, to focus on a limited number of Romance languages which provide significant evidence regarding the factors which are at work in the conflict of accusative and active alignment. I start with finite agreement.

Finite agreement tends to be determined syntactically in Romance, in accordance with accusative alignment. The most significant exceptions are found in presentational constructions of the type discussed in sections 5.7.1 and 5.7.2. Comparable presentational structures are found throughout Northern Italo-Romance (see, for instance, Burzio 1986: 122–126 and Parry 1997: 243, 2000, for Piedmontese; Forner 1997: 251 for Ligurian, and Hajek 1997: 277 for Emilian-Romagnol). These presentational constructions normally exhibit intransitive states, achievements, and accomplishments, that is, unaccusative predicates, even though intransitive activities, or unergative predicates, also emerge in the presentational structures of some dialects (see Brandi and Cordin 1989 for Trentino and Florentine; Parry 2000 for Piedmontese, and Saccon 1992 for Venetan). My proposal about Sardinian presentational might also be valid for some of these presentational constructions, as is suggested by Piedmontese and Venetan evidence. Both Parry (2000), with respect to the Piedmontese dialect of Oglianico (Ogl.), and Saccon (1992), in her discussion of the Venetan dialect of Conegliano, note that ‘ne’-cliticization correlates with lack of finite agreement in presentational with unergative predicates:
Agreement in crossdialectal perspective

(76) a. ‘Nte sta fabbrica a -i na travajava tante. (Ogl.)
   Lit. There worked many ne in this firm.
   (Parry 2000: 397)

   In this firm SCL CL QCL work.3SG.PST many.FPL

   b. Ghen a telefonà tanti. (Conegliano)
   Lit. There has phoned many ne.
   (Saccon 1992: 391)

   CL.QCL have.3SG phone.PP many.MPL

‘Ne’ does not normally co-distribute with unergatives in the dialects of Oglianico and Conegliano. However, ‘ne’ cliticization of the argument of an unergative predicate is permitted in presentationals where there is no finite agreement. These facts clearly parallel the Logudorese and Nuorese data discussed in section 5.7.1.

A different case is reported by Forner (1997: 251). In Ligurian, the absence of finite agreement with a postnuclear argument is not constrained to intransitive constructions. Rather the actor of transitive structures fails to trigger agreement, if it is focused and it occurs in the immediately postnuclear position. In this case, the undergoer is topicalized:

(77) I libri u i cata l’ Ana. (Ligurian)
   ‘The books, Hannah will buy them.’
   (Forner 1997: 251)

   The books SCL OCL buy.3SG the Hannah

The absence of finite agreement in (77) is indicated by the subject clitic u, which is a dummy subject clitic also figuring with avalent predicates (e.g., ‘rain’). Forner’s Ligurian data are significant, in that they challenge the purely syntactic analyses of the absence of agreement with postnuclear arguments. Suffice it to note that, in (77), it is the PSA of a transitive construction that occurs immediately after the verb and fails to behave as the PSA of the clause. These facts are hard to reconcile with the mentioned syntactic accounts. The Ligurian evidence is also crucial for a correct interpretation of the role of information structure in finite agreement, insofar as it indicates that, in principle, such factors can affect the behaviour of
any focused macrorole, not simply the behaviour of focused undergoers / affected actors.

Since, in the majority of cases, it is a focal undergoer / affected actor that fails to trigger finite agreement, the result which is observed across a wide number of Romance languages, including Old Italian and Modern non-Standard Italian, is some irregularity in accusative alignment. It is thus significant that this irregularity has disappeared in the modern standard, since this fact represents a step forward in the advancement of accusative alignment.

As regards non-finite agreement, Modern Italian constitutes an intermediate synchronic stage between two stages represented by other Romance languages. On the one hand, there are dialects which have preserved past-participle agreement in transitive constructions, regardless of the grammatical vs. anaphoric split. The following example is from a Central Italo-Romance dialect spoken in Lazio:

(78) Kì t’ à data la bòtta. (Roiate)
Who DCL have.3SG give.PP.FSG the blow.FSG
‘Who has hit you.’

On the other hand, there are languages which have virtually lost past-participle agreement with the undergoer in both intransitive and transitive clauses (Sicilian, Southern Calabrian, Spanish, Portuguese and Romanian). This loss has obliterated a type of argument marking which is principled semantically, i.e., active alignment. Observe the following Sicilian data:

(79) a. Dici ca ‘unn’ a murutu. (Sicilian)
Say.3SG that NEG have.3SG die.PP
‘They say that s/he has not died.’
    b. I babbaluci ‘un tì l’ a’ manciatu. (Sic.)
The snail.MPL NEG RFL OCL.MPL have.2SG eat.PP
‘The snails, you have not eaten them.’

The only argument of the intransitive clause ‘unn’a murutu ‘s/he has not died’ in (79a) is an undergoer. Since there is no past-participle agreement (the masculine inflection is the neutral one in Sicilian as is the case with Italian), there is no indication of the gender of the PSA. Example (79b) is a transitive clause with a core-external topical undergoer which is
realized core-internally by a clitic. Anaphoric agreement with this undergoer is not marked on the past participle, by contrast with what we find in the corresponding Italian construction (*Le lumache non te le sei mangiate* ‘the snails.FPL, you have not eat.PP.FPL them.’).

Central Italo-Romance can be taken to represent, in synchrony, the starting point of the diachronic process which has yielded the retrenchment of past-participle agreement in constructions with two macroroles. Insofar as transitive structures are concerned, Central Italo-Romance illustrates the situation which is attested in Old Italian, and, to a much lesser extent, in some registers of Modern Italian (contrast (5c) with (6a)). Interestingly, the majority of the Central Italo-Romance dialects also exhibit obligatory agreement with the undergoer of non-monadic reflexives (Loporcaro 1998: 67–76), similarly to Old Italian.

Sicilian, Spanish, Portuguese and Romanian represent a very advanced stage of the process of retrenchment of past-participle agreement. In these languages, past-participle agreement has been preserved on passive and resultative past participles but not on perfective participles, as is shown by the following examples drawn from authentic conversation:

(80) a. *Io sugnu pagata *pi viriri travagghiari a vuautri. (Sic.)
    I be.1SG pay.PP.FSG for see work to you.PL
    ‘I (a woman) get paid to watch you guys work.’

b. *Pina a statu partuta.* (Sicilian)
    Jo.FSG have.3SG be.PP leave.PP.FSG
    ‘Josephine has been away.’

Whereas the passive participle *pagata* ‘paid.FSG’ and the resultative one *partuta* ‘left.FSG’ of (80a) and (80b) display agreement, the perfective participle of the copula *essiri* ‘be’ (*statu* ‘be.PP’), in (80b), does not.

Example (80b) is a copular structure formed with the auxiliary *essiri* ‘be’ and a past participle. Predictably, copular structures in which the auxiliary *essiri* ‘be’ is followed by a non-verbal predicate also display non-finite agreement in Sicilian (cf. (81)). Agreement does not extend, however, to the perfective past participle of the auxiliary (cf. (81b)):

(81) a. *‘Sta picciridda è veru aurusa.* (Sicilian)
    This little.girl.FSG be.3SG really gracious.FSG
    ‘This little girl is really gracious.’
b. *Sta picciridda a statu veru aurusa.* (Sic.)
   This.little.girl.FSG have.3SG be.PP really gracious.FSG
   ‘This little girl has been really nice.’

In the light of the evidence in (79), (80), and (81), it appears that non-finite agreement has been preserved in Sicilian constructions whereby PSA-ness (finite agreement) and tense cannot be marked on the predicate: the analytic passive, which, unlike the Latin passive in *-r*, is formed with the passive auxiliary *essiri* ‘be’, regardless of tense, and the constructions with resultative past participles and non-verbal predicates, which also require the auxiliary *essiri* ‘be’ for the formation of the nucleus. The remaining construction with a predicate which cannot show finite agreement is the absolute participial construction. Absolute participles are not found in present-day Sicilian. It is notable, however, that they require past-participle agreement in Spanish (Sp.), i.e., another language which has lost non-finite agreement on the perfective past participle:

(82) *Terminada la guerra, las tropas volvieron a casa.* (Sp.)
   End.PP.FSG the war.FSG the troops return.3PL.PST to home
   ‘Once the war was over, the troops went back home.’

The last stronghold of non-finite agreement in Romance is, therefore, a set of constructions in which the predicate cannot be finite, i.e., carry the agreement specifications which identify the PSA, as well as the tense, of the clause. It is this predicate alone that preserves agreement in these constructions. Interestingly, the factors regarding information structure which have been discussed in this chapter, in particular the contrast between grammatical and anaphoric agreement, prove to be absent before the process of retrenchment begins (see Central Italo-Romance), and, on the other hand, in the terminal stage of the same process (see Sicilian).

5.8.1 The agreement of the perfective past participle with the PSA and split intransitivity.

The purpose of this section is to pursue an argument which was introduced in the discussion of the selection of the perfective operator (see sections 2.4.1.2 and 2.4.2.1). With the support of dialect evidence, I claim that, although the selection of perfective ‘be’ and past-participle agreement with
the PSA are both manifestations of split intransitivity, and require a unified account, in Italian, it should not be taken for granted that their appearance, in a given language or a given construction, necessarily results from the type of semantics-syntax mapping which is identified with unaccusativity. Conversely, the failure of either or both of these diagnostics to be manifested does not necessarily rule out this type of mapping.

5.8.1.1 Abruzzese, Sicilian and Marchigiano

I start with an Abruzzese (Abr.) dialect where ‘have’ is the only perfective operator attested nowadays, the dialect of San Tommaso (province of Pescara). In this dialect, the ending of both singular and plural past participles is /is/. However, number agreement is marked by the metapisonic raising of the stressed vowel of plural participles in –AT(U), indicating an original ending –i. Number agreement with the PSA is observed on the perfective participle of constructions which require the same type of agreement in Italian. The examples in (83) and (84) illustrate this parallelism:

(83) T’i arruàtɔ / v’ auàtɔ erruàtɔ. (Abr.)
RFL have.2SG wash.PP  RFL have.2PL wash.PP.PL
‘You have washed yourself / you have washed yourselves.’
(Giammarco 1973: 73–74)

(84) Ti sei  lavato / vi siete lavati.
RFL be.2SG wash.PP.MSG RFL be.2PL wash.PP.MPL
‘You have washed yourself / you have washed yourselves.’

Metaphonic past-participle agreement with the PSA in (83) correlates with the Italian type of past-participle agreement, indicating that the PSA is an undergoer. Unlike past-participle agreement, the selection of the perfective operator does not correspond in the two languages, as a result of a diachronic process of leveling which has ousted perfective ‘be’ from many Romance languages, including the dialect of San Tommaso (see section 2.4.2.1). In synchronic terms, Italian contrasts unmarked actors with undergoers and marked actors with past-participle agreement, and marked and unmarked PSAs with the selection of the perfective operator. The dialect of San Tommaso, instead, only has the first type of marking. Clearly,
the PSA of the examples in (83) is marked from the point of view of accusative alignment, like the one in the examples in (84). However, this is not indicated in (83) by the selection of the perfective operator.

Moving on to Sicilian, in section 2.4.2.1 I pointed out that, whilst the perfective operator neutralizes the intransitivity split, the distribution of Sicilian *nni* compares with the distribution of its Italian cognate *ne*. Thus, Modern Sicilian *nni* can cliticize the only argument of intransitive states, achievements and accomplishments, but not the only argument of activities (for the exact formulation of the conditions on *ne*-cliticization in Italian see Chapter 6):

(85) a. *Nn’ annu murutu assai*. (Sicilian)
    QCL have.3PL die.PP many
    ‘Many *ne* have died.’

b. *Nn’ annu ballatu assai.* (Sicilian)
    QCL have.3PL dance.PP many
    ‘Many *ne* have danced.’

The absence of agreement of the perfective participle with the PSA also neutralizes the unaccusative-vs.-unergative opposition, as is illustrated by the contrast between (85a) and its Italian translation in (86):

(86) Ne sono morti / -e molti / -e.
    QCL be.3PL die.PP.MPL FPL many.MPL FPL
    ‘Many *ne* have died.’

It follows that, in Sicilian, *nni* cliticization is a split intransitivity diagnostics, but other diagnostics, namely the selection of perfective operator and the agreement of the perfective participle with the PSA, are missing.

So far I have looked at languages in which the agreement of the perfective participle with the PSA singles out undergoer and affected- (or marked-) actor PSAs (Italian and the Abruzzese dialect of San Tommaso) or fails to do so (Sicilian). To conclude this discussion, it is necessary to mention some dialects of Abruzzo and Marche, where the agreement of the perfective participle with the PSA extends to domains in which the PSA is not an undergoer or a marked actor. The example below is from the dialect of Introdacqua (Abruzzo):
(87) **Essə á maštə**

He have.3SG eat.PP.MSG
‘He has eaten.’
(Giammarco 1970: 183)

The form of the past participle which appears in (87) contrasts with the plural form **meΠətə** ‘eat.PP.MPL’ of **ëssə əvə meΠətə** ‘they have eaten’. Since the controller is an actor, this pattern of participial agreement does not have a correlate in Italian:

(88) **Ha / hanno mangiato.**

Have.3SG have.3PL eat.PP
‘He / they have eaten.’

A similar pattern of agreement of the past participle is observed in the dialect of Ripatransone (Marche) (**stuΠətə** ‘study.PP.FSG’ / **stuΠətə** ‘study.PP.FPL’, see Loporcaro 1998: 181). In these dialects of Abruzzo and Marche, therefore, past-participle agreement with the PSA is not a diagnostic of split intransitivity, as a result of a diachronic process of generalization which has overridden active marking.

In the light of the variation exemplified in this section, it must be concluded that the theoretical significance of individual morphosyntactic phenomena (for instance, past-participle agreement) in a given language can only be properly appreciated in the light of independent criteria like the Aktionsart tests. Crossdialectal and diachronic evidence indicates that specific phenomena may lose their diagnostic power in a given language, but not in other languages, whilst other phenomena may still be diagnostics of split intransitivity in the same language.

### 5.8.2 Adverbial agreement

A linguistic feature which characterizes the Italo-Romance dialects spoken to the South of the Gaeta-Rieti-Teramo isogloss is the lack of a distinct morphological class for adverbs; these are simply homonymous with adjectives. In general, adverbs do not exhibit agreement in these dialects, as is usually the case crosslinguistically. However, Ledgeway (2002: 116–119) has brought to light some interesting cases of adverbial agreement in Cosentino (Calabrian):
The above facts are of interest in the present context, since they appear to indicate that, in Cosentino, the adverb agrees with the undergoer (contrast (89a) with (89b), (89c) and (89d)). Thus, adverbia l agreement in this dialect constitutes a system of active alignment, which Italian does not have.

5.9 Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed agreement in Italian. Building upon La Fauci (1984, 1989), I have argued that non-finite agreement marks active vs. inactive alignment in Old Italian, in that it is only controlled by undergoers and affected actors. In some registers of Modern Italian, non-finite agreement differs minimally from its correlate in Old Italian, contrasting undergoers and marked actors with unmarked actors. In Modern Standard Italian, intransitive constructions contrast with constructions with two macroroles. In the structures with two macroroles, non-finite agreement is subject to a condition on the encoding of information structure. This constraint is comparable to the conditions which govern agreement in Chichewa, a Bantu language studied by Bresnan and Mchombo (1987) and Bresnan and Kanerva (1989). I have argued that, in structures with two macroroles, past-participle agreement with the undergoer is only obligatory if it is anaphoric, as well as consistent with any other core-internal agreement specifications of the controller.
Finite agreement marks accusative alignment in Modern Standard Italian. Thus, the selection of the PSA consistently neutralizes the semantic opposition of actors and undergoers. This opposition is not entirely obliterated in Old Italian, as well as in non-standard registers of Modern Italian, where the focal undergoer (/affected actor) of presentational constructions may not trigger finite agreement.

The contrast between Old and Modern Italian witnesses the historical advancement of accusative alignment, with the consequent retreatment of active alignment. The findings discussed in this chapter clearly suggest that this diachronic process is constrained by conditions on the encoding of information structure. Both the discourse constraints on finite agreement and those on non-finite agreement typically target the undergoer (/affected actor), that is the macrorole which is marked in languages or constructions with accusative alignment. A number of (Italo)-Romance languages provide further evidence in favour of my claim that agreement is subject to well-formedness constraints on the encoding of information structure.

The crossdialectal analysis of agreement phenomena shows that the diachronic process of drift towards accusative alignment has made much more headway in some (Italo)-Romance languages (for instance, Sicilian) than in others (for instance, Modern Standard Italian). Predictably, information-structure factors are maximally relevant in the languages which represent intermediate stages between the two diachronic poles of active and accusative alignment.

The analysis has also brought to light a number of mismatches between past-participle agreement with the PSA, the selection of the perfective operator, and other diagnostics of split intransitivity. These mismatches challenge the deterministic correlation of each of these types of morphosyntactic marking with unaccusative syntax.
Chapter 6

Ne-cliticization

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter I consider ne-cliticization, focusing on constructions where ne originates from a quantified noun phrase. When the Unaccusative Hypothesis was first formulated (Perlmutter 1978), it was noted that ne realizes the direct object of transitive structures (Ne ho letti molti ‘I have read many ne’), as well as the only direct core argument of intransitive structures which require E (Ne sono arrivati molti ‘many ne have (lit. are) arrived’). Accordingly, ne-cliticization was claimed to be exclusively compatible with underlying objects, and to be a diagnostic of unaccusativity (Belletti and Rizzi 1981; Burzio 1986; Perlmutter 1983, 1989). Subsequent research, however, brought to light facts which would seem to undermine the above view. First, Lonzi (1986) pointed out that ne can also figure in constructions with A-selecting intransitives (Ne telefonano, tifosi, la domenica! ‘supporters, many ne phone on Sundays!’), and others drew attention to comparable dialect data (see, for instance, Parry 2000). Secondly, Cinque (1990), claimed that adjectival predicates are split into two classes, with only one class allowing ne-cliticization (Ne sono noti solo pochi ‘only few ne are well-known’ vs. *ne sono bianchi solo tre ‘only three ne are white’). There is no agreement as to whether adjectival predicates should be analysed as structures with an external argument (see, among others, Burzio 1986) or as unaccusative structures (see, among others, La Fauci 2000). Neither hypothesis, however, would appear to be in accordance with the split evidenced by ne-cliticization. Finally, ne-cliticization of the argument of reflexive predicates is problematic (see Reinhart and Siloni 2004), in that, whilst some reflexive predicates allow it (Se ne bruciano molte (case) ‘(houses), many ne burn down’), others rule it out (*Se ne accidono molti ‘many ne kill themselves’ (intended reading)).

The said conflicting facts have led to the hypothesis that ne-cliticization is not strictly speaking a diagnostic of unaccusativity, but rather a case of surface unaccusativity (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 277), i.e., a
Ne-cliticization phenomenon which receives its explanation from discourse considerations alone. Therefore, it is not surprising that the literature on ne-cliticization is not nearly as copious as that on the selection of the perfective operator, si-constructions, and past-participle agreement, even though researchers have kept citing ne-cliticization as a diagnostic of unaccusativity.

I aim to demonstrate that ne-cliticization is only problematic for the approaches which strive to ascribe split-intransitivity phenomena to a single principle, whether syntactic, semantic or pragmatic. According to my account, split intransitivity in Italian, whilst being primarily determined by the tension between syntactic (accusative) alignment and semantic (active) alignment, is constrained by well-formedness conditions on the encoding of information structure. In the previous chapters, these conditions have been shown to affect agreement to a greater extent than the selection of the perfective operator and si-constructions. In the discussion which follows, I point out that the workings of ne-cliticization remain a mystery unless information structure is taken into account. At the same time, I argue against any analysis of this phenomenon that reduces it to discourse considerations alone. I claim that ne-cliticization targets the lowest-ranking argument of any stative predicate, and that it only occurs in constructions which introduce a new element of information into discourse. The putatively problematic cases of ne-cliticization do not run counter to these assumptions. My account indicates that ne-cliticization constitutes a type of alignment that is principled in semantic terms, and that, unlike past-participle agreement, it shows no signs of a shift towards accusative alignment. In fact, in constructions where there is more than one potential trigger of ne-cliticization, only the one that is the lowest in the semantic representation licenses ne-cliticization, regardless of the respective syntactic functions of the potential triggers.

The chapter is organized as follows. I consider first the domains of ne-cliticization which are in agreement with Perlmutter’s Unaccusative Hypothesis (§ 6.2). Secondly, I move on to the analysis of evidence which would appear to be problematic for this hypothesis, namely ne-cliticization in structures with A-selecting predicates (§ 6.3). Section 6.4 is concerned with constructions with non-verbal predicates (adjectival, nominal, and locative). Ne-cliticization in si-constructions is dealt with in section 6.5. In section 6.6, I contrast the structures in which ne originates from a quantified noun phrase with those where ne realizes the di- or da-complement of a noun, a verb or an adjective. Finally, I draw some conclusions in section 6.7.
6.2 Canonical ne-cliticization

According to the Unaccusative Hypothesis, intransitive structures do not form a homogeneous class, but rather are split into two subclasses with distinct morphosyntax: unaccusative and unergative. Unlike the argument of the latter type of structure, the argument of the former type patterns with the direct object of transitives in a number of ways. Ne-cliticization would seem to be a case in point. Clauses with ne-cliticization typically exhibit a quantifier, which modifies the direct object of a transitive predicate (cf. (1a) and (1b)) or the only argument of an intransitive predicate (cf. (2a) and (2b)). In the syntactic core of the clause, the quantified noun phrase is realized by ne and the quantifier. If the quantified noun is overt, it occurs in a detached position outside the clause, as is the case with the (b) sentences below:

(1)  a. Ne ho letti molti.
    QCL have.1SG read.PP.MPL many.MPL
    ‘I have read many ne.’

    b. (Libri), ne ho letti molti.
    Books QCL have.1SG read.PP.MPL many.MPL
    ‘(Books), I have read many ne.’

(2)  a. Ne sono arrivati due.
    QCL be.3PL arrive.PP.MPL two
    ‘Two ne have arrived.’

    b. (Studenti), ne sono arrivati due.
    Students QCL be.3PL arrive.PP.MPL two
    ‘(Students), two ne have arrived.’

Ne-cliticization is obligatory both in the (a) and in the (b) examples above. The sentences in (2a) and (2b) illustrate ne-cliticization of the argument of an intransitive predicate which selects E. Ne-cliticization is also required in comparable passive structures:

(3)  a. Ne sono stati promossi due.
    QCL be.3PL be.PP.MPL pass.PP.MPL two
    ‘Two ne have been passed.’
Contrastingly, *ne*-cliticization of the argument of A-selecting intransitives is problematic:

(4)  a. *Ne hanno mangiato molti.
    QCL have.3PL eat.PP many.MPL
    ‘Many ne have eaten.’ (intended reading)

b. *(Affamati), ne hanno mangiato molti.
    Starve.PP.MPL QCL have.3PL eat.PP many.MPL
    ‘(Starving people), many ne have eaten.’ (intended reading)

The difference between the behaviour of E-selecting intransitive structures such as (2) and (3), and, on the other hand, A-selecting ones, is crucial to the view that *ne*-cliticization is a diagnostic of split intransitivity. In fact, within a syntactic approach to the unaccusative vs. unergative divide, the data in (1) to (4) have been said to indicate that the argument realized by *ne* is an underlying object. The tendency for the quantifier to appear in the immediate postnuclear position has also been cited as supporting evidence for this analysis (Burzio 1986). In the discussion that follows, I first develop an account of *ne*-cliticization which draws upon Van Valin (1993) (see sections 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.2.3), and secondly, consider a number of problematic facts (see sections 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5). According to Van Valin’s (1993: 92–97) analysis, there are two conditions on *ne*-cliticization. The first condition regards focus structure: *ne* realizes a topical noun with a focal quantifier. The second condition is concerned with the semantic representation: *ne*-cliticization is only available for the lowest argument of any stative predicate. I shall thus examine these two aspects of structures with *ne*.

6.2.1 Focus structure

Observe the data in (5a) and (5b). In (5a) the quantified noun phrase *molti studenti* ‘many students’ refers to a focal element of information; *ne*-cliticization is not licensed in this sentence. Contrastingly, in (5b) the extra-core noun (*studenti* ‘students’) refers to a topical element of informa-
tion and is separated from its co-referent focal quantifier (\textit{molti} ‘many’) in immediately postnuclear position; here \textit{ne}-cliticization is obligatory:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(5)] a. (*\textit{Ne}) \textit{sono arrivati} MOLTI STUDENTI.
\end{enumerate}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{verbatim}
QCL be.3PL arrive.PP.MPL many.MPL student.MPL
\end{verbatim}
\end{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘Many students have arrived.’
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(5)] b. *(\textit{Ne}) \textit{sono arrivati} MOLTI, studenti.
\end{enumerate}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{verbatim}
QCL be.3PL arrive.PP.MPL many.MPL student.MPL
\end{verbatim}
\end{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘(Students), many \textit{ne} have arrived.’
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}

The contrast between the examples in (5a) and (5b) is explained by the first condition on \textit{ne}-cliticization: \textit{ne} realizes a topical noun with a focal quantifier. This condition also captures the tendency for the quantifier to occur in the immediately postnuclear position (Burzio 1986), since this is the default position of arguments which refer to focal elements of information (see Chapter 8). To be sure, the quantifier can also precede the nucleus, as has been pointed out by Lepschy (1989):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(6)] \textit{Mah, io penso che questi libri che spedisci}
\end{enumerate}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{verbatim}
But I think.1SG that these book.MPL that send.2SG
quasi tutti andranno persi. Ma no, vedrai che nearly all go.3PL.FUT lose.PP.MPL But no see.2SG.FUT that
MOLTI ne arriveranno.
\end{verbatim}
\end{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘Well, I think that, of these books which you are sending, nearly all will be lost.’ \textemdash ‘No no, you will see that many \textit{ne} will arrive.’
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{verbatim}
(Lepschy 1989: 430)
\end{verbatim}
\end{footnotesize}

However, in the structure exemplified in (6), the quantifier bears contrastive focus, and occurs in the Pre-Core Slot, rather than in the prenuclear position inside the syntactic core. Furthermore, structures with partitive \textit{ne} can exhibit focal information other than the quantifier (Cardinaletti and Giusti 1992: 132):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(7)] \textit{Ne ho letti MOLTI di QUESTI}
\end{enumerate}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{verbatim}
QCL have.1SG read.PP.MPL many.MPL of these.MPL
\end{verbatim}
\end{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item and \textit{NEG of those.MPL}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item ‘I have read many \textit{ne} of these and not of those.’
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
A double contrast is illustrated in (7). On the one hand, the quantifier *molti* ‘many’ is contrasted with its co-referent topical head (e.g., *libri* ‘books’). On the other hand, the two partitive complements (*di questi* ‘of these’ and *di quelli* ‘of those’) are contrasted with each other. For our current purposes, it is essential to note that, if the quantifier and the head did not contrast in terms of their informational weight, there would be no *ne*-cliticization: *Ho letto molti libri di QUESTI e non di QUELLI* ‘I have read many books among these and not among those’.

If the standard tests for the determination of focus structure are applied to clauses with *ne*, these turn out to represent either sentence focus or narrow focus on the argument, whilst *ne* is banned from predicate focus:

(8) a. *CHE FANNO molti studenti?* *NE arrivano MOLTI.*
   What do.3PL many student.MPL QCL arrive.3PL many.MPL
   ‘What do many students do? Many *ne* arrive.’

b. *QUANTI ne arrivano? NE arrivano MOLTI.*
   How.many.MPL QCL arrive.3PL QCL arrive.3PL many.MPL
   ‘How many *ne* arrive? Many *ne* arrive.’

c. *NE ARRIVANO MOLTI, STUDENTI, IN QUEST’AULA!*
   QCL arrive.3PL many.MPL student.MPL in this classroom
   ‘(Students), many *ne* arrive in this classroom.’

*Ne*-cliticization contrasts a topical head with a co-referent focal quantifier. This is not what we find in predicate focus, which is characterized by the contrast between a topical argument and a focal predicate. Since the element of information elicited in the question in (8a) is a predicate, a felicitous reply to this question should provide a focal predicate. Accordingly, *ne*-cliticization is infelicitous in the reply to this question. Contrastingly, the quantifier is focal both in (8b) and (8c). In the former case, the quantifier fills the variable which is left open in the question (narrow focus). In the latter case, the nominal head and its quantifier are contrasted in terms of their informational weight, even though all the information provided is new (sentence focus). In other words, a topic vs. focus contrast is introduced as part of the new information provided.

So far we have seen that *ne*-cliticization occurs in narrow or sentence focus, and that it involves a contrast between a focal quantifier and a co-refering topical head. A possible problem for this view is represented by structures with *ne*-cliticization which lack an overt quantifier:
(9) a. *Il prof. ne ha bocciati, studenti!*
   The teacher QCL have.3SG fail.PP.MPL student.MPL
   ‘(Students), the teacher has failed many ne!’
   
b. *Libri, Lucia ne legge.*
   Books Lucy QCL read.3SG
   ‘(Books), Lucy reads some ne.’

Structures such as (9a) and (9b) involve an understood quantifier. The rising intonation on the core of (9a), which is typical of exclamations, suggests that the understood quantifier is ‘a lot’. As for (9b), the absence of rising intonation indicates that the understood quantifier is ‘some’. Evidence from passivization supports this analysis:

(10) a. *Studenti, ne sono stati bocciati!*
   Student.MPL QCL be.3PL be.PP.MPL fail.PP.MPL
   ‘(Students), many ne have been failed!’
   
b. *Libri, ne vengono letti da Lucia.*
   Book.MPL QCL come.3PL read.PP.MPL by Lucy
   ‘(Books), some ne are read by Lucy.’

The inherent argument of activity predicates (e.g., *leggere libri* ‘read books’) cannot be passivized in Italian (*Libri vengono letti da Lucia* ‘books are read by Lucy’). By contrast, quantified undergoers, which are not inherent arguments, can be passivized (*Alcuni libri vengono letti da Lucia* ‘some books are read by Lucy’). The grammaticality of passivization in (10a) and (10b) indicates that the semantic representation of these structures includes a quantifier. Significantly, this quantifier is not part of the presupposition, but rather is asserted by *ne*-cliticization itself (as well as the rising intonation in (9a) and (10a)). Accordingly, it can be assumed to constitute a new element of information, and thus to contrast with the topical head.

Finally, Cinque (1991) and Cardinaletti and Giusti (1992) have pointed out that *ne*-cliticization can affect a noun or a noun phrase. In the light of data like (11), where *uno ne* ‘one ne’ stands for the noun and its arguments (*un libro sulla storia di Sicilia di Mack Smith* ‘a book by Mack Smith on the history of Sicily’), I assume that the topic can be the head or the core of the noun phrase:
Quantifiers modify the core of noun phrases, that is, the nominal head and its arguments. This explains the reading of *ne* in (11) above. Note, however, that *uno one* can also informally be read as ‘book’, in which case *ne* solely stands for the head of the noun phrase.

In the light of the above analysis, I conclude, in agreement with Van Valin (1993), that *ne* realizes a topical nominal head or core which contrasts with a focal quantifier.

### 6.2.2 Semantic representation

The second condition on *ne*-cliticization is concerned with the semantic representation: *ne*-cliticization is only available for an argument of a state predicate. More precisely, the argument realized by *ne* is the lowest-ranking one (in terms of the actor-undergoer hierarchy) of the state predicate in the semantic representation. This formulation of the semantic condition rules out *ne*-cliticization of the argument of activity predicates:

(12) *(Attori, ne cantano molti.)*

Actor.MPL QCL sing.3PL many.MPL

‘(Actors), many ne sing.’

The ungrammaticality of (12) depends on the absence of a state predicate in the semantic representation of *cantare* ‘sing’, which is an activity.

I exemplify here *ne*-cliticization in structures with state (cf. (13a) and (13b)), achievement (cf. (13c) and (13d)), and (active) accomplishment predicates (cf. (13e), (13f) and (13g)). Other theoretical approaches would classify these predicates as unaccusative ((13a), (13c), (13e), and (13f)) and transitive ((13b), (13d), and (13g)): 
The state in (13a) is intransitive (exist` (x)), and ne realizes its only argument, whilst the state in (13b) is transitive (see` (x, y)), and ne realizes its second argument. The pair in (13c) and (13d) shows ne-cliticization of the only argument of an intransitive achievement (INGR appeared` (x)) (cf. (13c)), and of the lowest argument of a transitive causative achievement ([[do` (x, Ø)] CAUSE [INGR shattered` (y)]])) (cf. (13d)). Finally, the predicates of (13e), (13f) and (13g) are accomplishments. In (13e), the ne-cliticized argument is the only one available (BECOME dead` (x)). Contrastingly, the predicates of (13f) and (13g) are bivalent active accomplishments. The ne-cliticized argument is the lowest argument of a state in both cases: the lowest argument of BECOME be-LOC` (y, x) in the semantics of andare `go` (do` (x, [move.away.from.ref.point` (x)])) & BECOME be-LOC` (y, x)), and the only argument of the resultant state written` (y) in the semantics of transitive scrivere `write` (do` (x, [write` (x, y)])) & BECOME written` (y)).

The list in (13) could of course be longer. However, the examples provided are sufficient to indicate that, whether transitive or intransitive, the
predications which allow ne-cliticization include a state. Given that, in the approach taken in this work, the unaccusative vs. unergative divide corresponds to the split between intransitive predicates which include a state (states, achievements and accomplishments), and intransitive predicates which do not (activities), the second condition is in agreement with the canonical view of ne-cliticization which associates this kind of morphosyntactic marking with the unaccusative side of the split.

Recall now that, according to my working hypothesis, the manifestations of split intransitivity in Italian result from a conflict between a type of alignment which is principled in syntactic terms (accusative) and another type of alignment, which is principled in semantic terms (active). The restriction of ne-cliticization to the lowest argument in the semantic representation of states clearly indicates that ne-cliticization manifests the type of alignment that is explained on semantic grounds. In fact, among the diagnostics examined so far, ne-cliticization would seem to be the one which is maximally sensitive to the semantics of the clause. Both the selection of the perfective operator and the marking with si signal an anomaly, in terms of accusative alignment, which concerns the Privileged Syntactic Argument (PSA) of the clause. Since this anomaly is explained by the semantic status of a syntactic function, these diagnostics manifest the tension between syntactic and semantic alignment. As for agreement, in Chapter 5 I pointed out that non-finite agreement targets the undergoer (abstracting away from discourse factors), regardless of whether this is a PSA or an object. However, I also brought to light data which provide evidence for a shift towards syntactic alignment. In particular, in structures with two candidates for past-participle agreement (non-monadic reflexives), it is the PSA that is chosen as the controller of past-participle agreement in Modern Standard Italian. Ne-cliticization is not concerned with the syntactic function of the ne-cliticized argument, witness its occurrence in both transitive clauses, where it realizes the object, and intransitive clauses, where it realizes the PSA. In addition, the assignment of the macrorole undergoer to an argument is not a sufficient condition for ne-cliticization to be licensed. In fact, the ne-cliticized argument must be the lowest-ranking argument in the semantic representation. If the undergoer is not the lowest-ranking argument, ne-cliticization does not occur. In section 6.4, I claim that this contrast between past-participle agreement and ne-cliticization explains why, in constructions with nominal predicates, the past participle of the copula agrees with the undergoer PSA (Carla è stata una studentessa ‘Carla has be.PP.FSG a student’), but this argument cannot be ne-cliticized (*Ne è
stata studentessa una ‘one ne has been a student’). In section 6.5, I show that ne-cliticization in si-constructions is captured by the assumption that ne targets the lowest-ranking argument in the semantic representation. First, however, it is necessary to consider ne-cliticization in complex predicates.

6.2.3 A note on ne-cliticization in complex predicates

Complex predicates are of interest in this context for two reasons. First, they provide further evidence that ne-cliticization is motivated in terms of active alignment, and, unlike past-participle agreement, does not yield to pressure towards accusative alignment. Secondly, they reveal the precise syntactic domain of ne-cliticization; in particular, this turns out to be banned across syntactic cores. I start with complex predicates formed with a motion or aspectual unit and an infinitive.

In section 2.5.1 (see Figure 7), I argued that these are nuclear co-subordinations which select E because the motion or aspectual unit contributes a state predicate to the semantic representation and the PSA of the clause is the lowest argument of this predicate. Thus, even though the complex nucleus of (14) is transitive, E is required due to PSA markedness, since the PSA is the affected actor of andare ‘go’:

(14) Li sono andati a vedere.

‘They went to see them.’

If the semantic constraint on ne-cliticization purely required that the ne-cliticized argument should be the argument of a state predicate, the kind of complex predicate illustrated in (14) would provide two candidates for ne-cliticization: the argument of andare ‘go’ which figures as the second argument of the resultant state BECOME be-LOC’ (y, x), and the second argument of the transitive state vere ‘see’ (see’ (x, y)). Interestingly, the lowest argument of BECOME be-LOC’ cannot be ne-cliticized in this structure (cf. (15a)), whereas the second argument of see’ can (cf. (15b)):

(15) a. *Ne sono andati a vederli due.

‘Two ne went to see them.’
b. *Ne sono andati a vedere due.*
   QCL be.3PL go.PP.MPL to see two
   ‘They went to see two ne.’

The second argument of *see* is clearly the lowest argument in the kind of complex predicate under scrutiny, in that it only figures in the second position of *see* (x, y). Contrastingly, the direct core argument of the active accomplishment *andare* ‘go’ figures both in the activity and in the state of the predicate, as is shown by the variable x in the following semantic representation: *do* (x, [move.away.from.ref.point(x)]) & BECOME be-LOC(y, x). These facts support the idea that *ne*-cliticization targets the lowest argument of a state. They further indicate that, unlike past-participle agreement, *ne*-cliticization is not sensitive to PSAhood: the *ne*-cliticized argument is not the PSA of the clause, even though this is a potential candidate for *ne*-cliticization, because there is a lower argument in the semantic representation of a state.

The non-locational argument of the motion or aspectual predicate can be *ne*-cliticized if there is no lower argument of a state. Observe (16), where the infinitival predicate *protestare* ‘protest’ is an intransitive activity:

(16) *Ne sono venuti a protestare due.*
   QCL be.3PL come.PP.MPL to protest two
   ‘Two ne came to protest.’

Interestingly, the direct core argument of the motion predicate can also be *ne*-cliticized in the structure illustrated in (17), regardless of the presence of a lower argument of the infinitival predicate:

(17) *Ne sono venuti due a prenderlo.*
   QCL be.3PL come.PP.MPL two to get.OCL.MSG
   ‘Two ne came to get it.’

The position of the quantifier *due* ‘two’ in (17) suggests that this construction combines two cores, unlike the structures in (14), (15), and (16). This hypothesis is corroborated by the fact that any clitic object of *prendere* cannot precede the first predicate (*Lo sono venuti due a prendere ‘two ne came to get it’*). In the light of the contrast between (15a) and (17), it ap-
pears that, whilst targeting the lowest-ranking argument, ne-cliticization is only licensed core-internally.

We should thus ascertain if ne-cliticization is licensed across cores within core co-subordinations, since co-subordinated cores are joined under a core node. In section 2.5.2 (see Figure 8), I argued that class-(i) aspectuals and modals can link to other predicates to form core co-subordinations. When they do, they determine the selection of the perfective operator, since they contribute the PSA of the clause. The examples in (18a) and (18b) clearly represent core co-subordinations, since the choice of the perfective operator indicates that the PSA is not contributed by venire ‘come’, but rather by the aspectual or modal unit. Ne-cliticization is not licensed:

(18) a. *Ne hanno continuato a venire molti.
   QCL have.3PL continue.PP to come many.MPL
   ‘Many ne have continued to come.’
   b. *Ne hanno voluto venire molti.
   QCL have.3PL want.PP come many.MPL
   ‘Many ne have wanted to come.’

The ungrammaticality of ne-cliticization in (18a) and (18b) indicates that this is not licensed across the cores of a core co-subordination. Thus, ne-cliticization targets the lowest-ranking argument of a state, and, in syntax, it only operates within minimal cores.

Complex predicates with causative or perception units face us with potential exceptions both to the semantic condition on ne-cliticization and to the claim that ne-cliticization only occurs core-internally. Examples of ne-cliticization in fare-causative constructions are given below:

(19) a. Ne faccio scrivere due a Luca.
   QCL make.1SG write two to Luke
   ‘I make Luke write two ne.’
   ‘I make two ne write to Luke.’
   b. Ne faccio scrivere molte (*le lettere).
   QCL make.1SG write many.FPL the letter.FPL
   ‘I make many ne (F) write (the letters).’
   ‘I make (someone) write many ne (F).’
As was pointed out in sections 4.2.4 and 5.4.2, fare-causatives are nuclear co-subordinations. The first argument of transitive predicates embedded under fare is realized as a non-macrorole dative argument (see a Luca ‘to Luke’ in (19a)) or the extra-core actor of a passive (da Luca ‘by Luke’ is also a possibility in (19a)). The second argument is the undergoer direct object of the complex predicate fare-plus-infinitive (see due ‘two’ in (19a)). If the predicate embedded under fare is not transitive, its only argument is assigned the macrorole undergoer and behaves as the direct object of the complex predicate (see molte ‘many’ in the reading ‘I make many people write’ of (19b)). If no dative argument or agent is expressed, as is the case with (19b), the ne-cliticized argument can represent either the second argument of ‘write’ (‘I make (someone) write many ne’) or the only argument of ‘write’ (‘I make many ne (people) write’). In both cases, the ne-cliticized argument is the lowest argument in the semantic representation of the transitive complex predicate, as is indicated by the incompatibility of (19b) with a further direct object (le lettere ‘the letters’).

In the semantic representation, the ne-cliticized argument is strictly speaking an argument of a state only if it is the second argument of write’ (see many in (19b)). Contrastingly, it figures in the position of an effector, if it is the only argument of write’ (see many in (19b)): 

(19) b¹. I make many write.
   [[do´(1SG, Ø)] CAUSE [do´(many, [write´(many)])]]

b². I make someone write many.
   [[do´(1SG, Ø)] CAUSE [do´(someone,
   [write´(someone, many)]) & BECOME written´(many)]]

It would appear, however, that the semantic representation of constructions like (19b) needs some refinement, to indicate that the second argument of the transitive fare-causative construction is an affected argument, i.e., the argument of a state, whether it originates from the highest argument of write´, and it is the causee, or from the lowest one. I shall leave this technicality of the analysis aside. What I should stress for the purposes of the current analysis is that ne-cliticization consistently selects the lowest-ranking argument (see the incompatibility of (19b) with the object le lettere ‘the letters’, in both readings of this structure). This argument is the affected argument of a transitive predication.
The ambiguity of causatives like (19) arises with complex predicates which exhibit a verb of perception, as well, since these too can be nuclear co-subordinations:

(20) \( Ne \) ho viste scrivere due (da / a Luca).
    QCL have.1SG see.PP.FPL write two by to Luke
    ‘I have seen two write / being written (by Luke).’

However, as the reader will recall from section 5.4.2, complex predicates formed with verbs of perception also allow a different syntactic realization. Specifically, a core co-ordination, where the highest argument of the second predicate is matrix-coded by the second argument in the first core. This is illustrated in (21):

(21) Ho visto Maria scrivere due lettere.
    Have.1SG see.PP Mary write two letters
    ‘I have seen Maria write two letters.’

If the structures under discussion involved raising (matrix coding as non-PSA, see section 6.4.3), it could be argued that they do not abide by the semantic condition on \( ne \)-cliticization, since this would be triggered by the highest argument of the second predicate. It could also be claimed that \( ne \)-cliticization does not occur core-internally, assuming that the highest argument of the second predicate occurred in the second core. However, there is evidence that these are control constructions where the highest argument of ‘write’ is controlled by the second argument of ‘see’ (see Figure 20). In particular, the second argument of ‘see’ triggers past-participle agreement on ‘see’ and precedes the first core, if it is a clitic, \((L’ho vista scrivere due lettere ‘I have seen.FSG her write two letters’\)). This indicates that this argument is in the first core, and that it is its status with respect to see’ that matters for processes related to the matrix-core verb.

Since the argument shared by the two predicates is the lowest argument of the stative perception predicate, this is shown in the semantics, where the underlining indicates that the second argument of see’ is \( Maria \) rather than the whole semantic representation of write’:

(21) \( ^{1} \) see’ (1SG, [do’ (\( Maria, \) [write’ (\( Maria, \) due lettere)])])
    & BECOME written’ (due lettere)
The second argument of the perception predicate can be *ne*-cliticized within its core (cf. (22a)). Independent *ne*-cliticization of the lowest arguments of the two cores is also possible, as is shown in (22b):

(22) a. *Ne ho viste due scrivere le lettere.*
   QCL have.1SG see.PP.FPL two write the letters
   ‘I have seen two *ne* write the letters.’

   b. *Ne ho viste due scriverne tre.*
   QCL have.1SG see.PP.FPL two write.QCL three
   ‘I have seen two *ne* write three *ne*.’

To conclude, the analysis of a number of complex predicates provides evidence that *ne*-cliticization targets the lowest-ranking argument of a state, regardless of its syntactic function, and that it is licensed within a minimal core. Further treatment of *ne*-cliticization in complex predicates will be given in section 6.4.3.

---

*Figure 20. Core co-ordination with complex predicates of perception.*
6.3 Some putative exceptions

So far I have considered constructions with *ne*-cliticization which support Perlmutter’s (1978) Unaccusative Hypothesis, in that *ne* originates from the lowest argument of a state predicate. I now move on to the analysis of data which were first brought to light by Lonzi (1986), and which challenge the assumption that *ne*-cliticization occurs in accordance with the Unaccusative Hypothesis. I list the relevant examples below:

(23) a. *Ne attecchirono pochi (bulbi)*.
   QCL take.root.3PL.PST few.MPL bulb.MPL
   ‘(Bulbs), few ne took root.’

b. *Ne funzionano solo due (orologi)*.
   QCL function.3PL only two watch.MPL
   ‘(Watches), only two ne are functioning.’

c. *Ne oscillano regolarmente solo tre (metronomi)*.
   QCL swing.3PL regularly only three metronome.MPL
   ‘(Metronomes), only three ne swing regularly.’

d. *Non ne trilla forte nessuna (sveglia)*.
   NEG QCL ring.3SG loud none.FSG alarm-clock.FSG
   ‘(Alarm-clocks), none ne ring loud.’

e. *Ne telefonano, tifosi, la domenica!*.
   QCL phone.3PL supporter.MPL the Sunday
   ‘Supporters, many ne phone on Sundays!’

f. *Ne corsero tanti, giovani*.
   QCL run.3PL.PST many.MPL young.MPL
   ‘Young people, many ne ran.’

g. *Ne starnutiscono tanti, bambini, qui*.
   QCL sneeze.3PL many.MPL child.MPL here
   ‘Children, many ne sneeze, here.’

h. *Ne cammina tanta, gente, su quei marciapiedi*.
   QCL walk.3SG much.FSG people.FSG on those pavements
   ‘People, a lot ne walk on those pavements.’

The uses of *ne* illustrated in (23) are unexpected under the traditional view of *ne*-cliticization, in that the verbs which figure in these examples normally constitute A-selecting predicates. Interestingly, some such verbs
belong to the classes which exhibit variability in the selection of the perfective operator (see section 2.3): *attecchire* ‘take root’, *funzionare* ‘function’, *trillare* ‘ring’, and *oscillare* ‘swing’ are such cases. The correspondence between the variability in the selection of the perfective operator and the possibility of *ne*-cliticization is an interesting fact to which I return below. Other predicates which figure in (23), however, do not show the alternation of A and E (*telefonare* ‘phone’, *starnutire* ‘sneeze’, and *caminare* ‘walk’), whereas *correre* ‘run’ only selects E when a spatial endpoint is encoded, which is not the case with the structure in (23f).

In the light of the data in (23), Lonzi (1986) has proposed that *ne*-cliticization is associated with an eventive information structure, which rules out the agentive reading of the predicate, and has the informative value of change and novelty. The subject of the sentences in (23) is considered by Lonzi (1986: 106) to be the object of a material movement, which is realized syntactically as an internal argument to which nominative case is assigned. Lonzi further points out that the *ne*-cliticization of the argument of A-selecting verbs is favoured by typical associations between events and participants, as exemplified by *trillare* ‘ring’ and *sveglie* ‘alarm clocks’, or *oscillare* ‘swing’ and *metronomi* ‘metronomes’, since in these cases the emphasis is not on the participant or doer, but rather on the event itself. This links with another characteristic of the structures in (23). In particular, the tendency for the nominal element realized by *ne* to be overt, albeit outside the syntactic core. For the sake of grammaticality, it is more important that this nominal should be expressed in the structures with verbs which do not exhibit variability in the selection of the perfective operator (cf. (23e), (23g), and (23h)) than in the structures with verbs that do (cf. (23a), (23b), (23c), (23d), and (23f)).

The facts brought to light by Lonzi (1986) would seem to bear a remarkable resemblance to English locative inversion (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 215–277). In the light of Lonzi’s data, the set of intransitive verbs which allow *ne*-cliticization of their argument would appear to be too large for *ne*-cliticization to be regarded as a diagnostic of unaccusativity. In addition, the tendency for the *ne*-cliticization of the argument of A-selecting verbs to be favoured by the emphasis on the event as a whole, rather than on the doer, indicates that *ne*-cliticization is licensed by a particular type of information structure, and thus it might be a manifestation of surface unaccusativity, in the sense of Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995). If this were the case, the traditional association of *ne*-cliticization with one side of the intransitivity split would simply result from the ten-
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dency for unaccusative predicates to figure in presentational structures, even though unergative predicates would also allow ne-cliticization of their argument in the appropriate discourse contexts. In essence, Lonzi’s (1986) proposal, i.e., the idea that ne-cliticization is licensed by an eventive information structure, is analogous to Levin and Rappaport Hovav’s (1995) proposal on locative inversion. Lonzi, however, suggests that the eventive information structure requires that the argument should be an internal argument in underlying syntax.

Whilst drawing closely upon Lonzi’s (1986) intuitions, in my treatment of the facts illustrated in (23), I argue against any analysis that reduces ne-cliticization to a phenomenon which is purely explained by discourse factors. I claim, in accordance with a proposal which I put forward in Bentley (2001, 2004b), that, in the constructions in (23), as is the case elsewhere, ne realizes the lowest argument of a state.

6.3.1 A red herring

Lonzi (1986) claims that the puzzling structures with ne have the value of change and novelty. In the terms adopted in this work, they should, thus, represent sentence focus (Lambrecht 1994, 2000). This assumption is borne out by distributional evidence which suggests that the non-canonical uses of ne are problematic not only in predicate focus, as is predictable, but also if there is narrow focus on the postnuclear quantifier. I illustrate this point in (24) and (25), confining the analysis to examples (23e) and (23h):

(24) a. **CHE fanno tanti tifosi?**
   What do.3PL many.MPL supporter.MPL
   ‘What do many supporters do?’
   *Ne telefonano, tifosi, la domenica!*
   QCL phone.3PL supporter.MPL the Sunday
   ‘Supporters, many ne phone on Sundays!’
   b. **CHE fa tanta gente?**
   What do.3SG much.FSG people.FSG
   ‘What do many people do?’
   *Ne cammina tanta, gente, su quei marciapiedi.*
   QCL walk.3SG much.FSG people.FSG on those pavements
   ‘People, a lot ne walk on those pavements.’
The data in (24a) and (24b) indicate that the ne-cliticization of the argument of activity predicates is incompatible with the contrast between a presupposed argument and a focal predicate, which is the essence of predicate focus. In the interrogative structures in (25a) and (25b), as well as the respective replies, there is narrow focus on the quantifier. Accordingly, these data show that the ne-cliticization of the argument of A-selecting predicates is infelicitous in narrow focus. It is facts like those illustrated in (25a) and (25b) that generated the idea that ne-cliticization is a diagnostic of unaccusativity. The tendency for the nominal head to be overt in (23) is also an indication that these examples represent sentence focus: the new information that these structures contribute to discourse includes the contrast between a topical nominal and its focal quantifier.

According to Lonzi’s account, ne-cliticization is restricted to eventive discourse contexts regardless of the Aktionsart of the predicate. This assumption is not borne out by the data, however, as indicated by the contrast between the examples in (25a) and (25b) and those in (26):

(25) a. _QUANTI_ di loro / (*ne) telefonano?
   How.many.MPL of them QCL phone.3PL
   ‘How many of them phone?’
   *Ne telefonano_ TANTI.
   QCL phone.3PL many.MPL
   ‘Many ne phone.’

   b. _QUANTI_ di loro / (*ne) camminano?
   How.many.MPL of them QCL walk.3PL
   ‘How many of them walk?’
   *Ne camminano_ TANTI.
   QCL walk.3PL many.MPL
   ‘Many ne walk.’

Whilst ne is ruled out in (25a) and (25b), it is required in (26), which exhibits narrow-focus constructions with an intransitive achievement, an
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intransitive accomplishment, and an intransitive state. It is interesting that
the grammaticality of (26) is not affected by the fact that the topical nomi-
nal is simply understood. These facts indicate that ne-cliticization of the
argument of E-selecting verbs occurs both in sentence focus and if there is
narrow focus on the argument, whereas ne-cliticization of the argument of
A-selecting verbs is problematic in narrow focus.

Having established that the non-canonical data are constrained to sen-
tence focus, unlike the canonical cases of ne-cliticization, I now move on
to the analysis of the semantics of the problematic structures. For reasons
which will become clear in due course, I start the discussion with reference
to the data in (23a) and (23e) to (23h). The standard tests for the determi-
nation of the Aktionsart of predicates yield puzzling results, when applied
to these data. In particular, these structures are relatively incompatible with
phrases such as ‘for an hour’ and ‘spend an hour Xing’, whilst they are
compatible with ‘in an hour’:

(27) a. *Ne passa un’ora tanta, gente, a camminare su...
QCL spend.3SG an hour m.FSG p.FSG to walk on
‘People, many ne spend an hour walking on those pavements.’
b. ?Ne cammina tanta, gente, per un’ora su....
QCL walk.3SG much.FSG people.FSG for an hour on
‘People, many ne walk for an hour on those pavements.’

(28) Ne cammina tanta, gente, in un’ora su...
QCL walk.3SG much.FSG people.FSG in an hour on
Lit. People, many ne walk in an hour on those pavements.

The findings in (27) and (28) are unexpected, in that camminare ‘walk’
normally tests out as an activity, i.e., it combines with ‘for an hour’ and
‘spend an hour Xing’, but not with ‘in an hour’:

(29) a. Tanta gente passa un’ora a camminare su...
Much.FSG p.FSG spend.3SG an hour to walk on
‘Many people spend an hour walking on those pavements.’
b. Tanta gente cammina per un’ora su...
Much.FSG people.FSG walk.3SG for an hour on
‘Many people walk for an hour on those pavements.’
c. *Tanta gente cammina in un’ora su...
   Much.FSG people.FSG walk.3SG in an hour on
   ‘Many people walk in an hour on those pavements.’

An interesting fact about the structures in (23g) and (23h) is that the locational phrase is not optional (*Ne cammina tanta, gente, ‘people, many ne walk’). Similarly, the sentence in (23e) would normally be construed with an implicit deictic element (‘many customers phone here on Sundays’), in accordance with a property of some Italian structures with a postnuclear PSA (Benincà 1988: 124–125) which will be subject to scrutiny in Chapter 8.

In the light of the obligatoriness of the locational phrase in constructions such as (23g) and (23h), Saccon (1992) has proposed that ne-cliticization requires a locational element in syntax, which need not be overt. Other researchers have subscribed to the locative analysis of ne-cliticization (see, among others, Cresti 2003, and Penello 2004). Evidence cited in support of this analysis comes from Northern Italo-Romance dialects where the partitive (or quantified) clitic co-occurs obligatorily with a locational clitic:

(30) Dei libri che te ghé ordinà
    Of.the books REL SCL have.2SG order.PP
    ghin rivarà solo che tre. (Carmignano (Padua))
    (L)CL.PCL arrive.3.FUT only that three
    ‘Of the books which you ordered, only three ne will come.’
    (Penello 2004: 49)

Penello (2004) points out that, in some Venetan dialects, not only does the etymologically locational clitic co-occur obligatorily with the partitive clitic in the expression of partitivity (cf. (31a)), but also in existential constructions (cf. (31b)). However, in other dialects, the locational clitic occurs on its own in existentials (cf. (31c)) and in locative constructions (cf. (31d)):

(31) a. Dei libri che te avea ordinà
    Of.the books REL SCL have.2SG.PST order.PP
    ghe ne rivàr sol tre. (Crocetta (Treviso))
    (L)CL PCL arrive.3.FUT only three
    ‘Of the books which you had ordered, only three ne will come.’
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b. Ghe né un ceeo. (Crocetta (Treviso))
   (L)CL PCL be.3SG a child
   ‘There is a child.’

c. Ghe zé un puteo. (Carmignano (Padua))
   (L)CL be.3SG a child
   ‘There is a child.’

d. Ghe portetu ti el ceeo, (a) scuola?
   LCL take.2SG.SCL you the child to school
   ‘Are you taking the child to school?’ (Crocetta (Treviso))
   (Penello 2004: 14, 51)

I shall comment below (see section 6.3.1.1) on the importance of the evidence brought to light by Penello (2004). In this context, it should be noted that the locative analysis is problematic from the point of view of semantics-syntax mapping. In the following discussion I explain why.

To begin with, the locative hypothesis is challenged by Italian data such as (23g) and (23h): if ne-cliticization provides a locational argument to the semantic representation, why is it that ne-cliticization is ungrammatical when the locational argument is omitted from these examples? In other words, the locative analysis does not capture the contrast between (i) structures such as (23g) and (23h), which require an overt locational phrase, (ii) constructions like (23e), which imply a deictic element (‘here’) that need not be overt, and, lastly, (iii) constructions which do not imply or require any deictic element.

The default covert locational argument in Italian is ‘here’. This is suggested by the behaviour of telefonare ‘phone’, which was mentioned above, and of other intransitives which allow a non-contrastive postnuclear PSA (see arriva Maria, which means ‘Here comes Mary’). Building upon Benincà (1988), Tortora (1997, 2001) has claimed that these are goal-entailing verbs of inherently-directed motion (terminology from Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995). Crucially, there is no evidence that verbs other than these involve a covert locational argument in constructions with ne-cliticization. Thus, *ne partono molti*, lit. many *ne* leave, does not necessarily mean ‘many leave from here’, just like *ne muoiono molti*, lit. many *ne* die, does not necessarily mean ‘many die here’, etc.

Observe further that the locational argument of locative constructions is part of the assertion, and occurs after the theme, in Italian and in other languages with SVO order (see Babby’s 1980: 99–101 discussion of the contrast between locatives and existentials in Russian). Thus, the locative
construction il libro è sullo scaffale ‘the book is on the shelf’ occurs in utterances where ‘the book’ is part of the presupposition, whereas what is being asserted is that the book is on the shelf. The locational phrase is a focal element of information, and locative constructions represent predicate focus. However, ne-cliticization is not compatible with predicate focus. The etymologically locational clitic which is found in constructions with ne-cliticization of Northern Italo-Romance dialects, and other Romance languages to which I return below (see section 6.3.1.1), occurs in core-initial position. This is the position of the Italian existential marker ci, which is only etymologically locative (Bentley 2006; La Fauci and Loporcaro 1993, 1997; Moro 1993, 1997), and not the position of the locational argument of locative constructions.

Finally, if the predicate of constructions with ne-cliticization were locative, this would explain why the data in (23e) to (23h) are relatively incompatible with ‘for an hour’, but it would not capture the compatibility of these sentences with ‘in an hour’, since locatives are states, and states do not normally combine with in-phrases.

My alternative proposal is as follows. The constructions exemplified in (23) are sentence-focus structures. Sentence focus has presentational function, and thus tends to exhibit predicates which introduce a new referent into discourse, for instance existential predicates. Existentials are states and do not combine with the phrase ‘in an hour’ (Ce ne sono tanti (*in un’ora), ‘there are many ne (*in an hour)’). However, if the quantified argument of an existential predicate is modified by an activity, the predication can be construed as a finite series of events, and can be modified by ‘in an hour’:

\[
(32) \quad \text{Ce ne sono tanti, che cantano, in un’ora.} \\
\text{There QCL be.3PL many that sing.3PL in an hour} \\
\text{‘There are many who sing in an hour.’}
\]

The example in (32) denotes many singing events which take place in an hour (for instance, in a show); its predicate tests out as an accomplishment.

In the light of this, it is clear that if the quantified argument of the sentences in (23) were the argument of an existential predicate, and were further modified by an activity, both ne-cliticization and the compatibility with ‘in an hour’ would be expected. This is, in my view, the correct analysis of the structures under scrutiny. The theoretical basis of this analysis is Carlson’s (1977) distinction between stage-level and individual-level
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individual-level predicates denote properties of individuals, whilst stage-
level ones denote stages, and are related to events. Accordingly, 'dogs are
running' (stage level) denotes a spatially- and temporally-bounded event
in which a particular set of individuals is involved. Contrastingly, 'dogs run'
(individual level) denotes a property of a kind, and is not bounded in the
sense mentioned above. Stage-level predicates can receive existential in-
terpretation (Carlson 1977: 446; Pustejovsky 1995: 226). The existential
reading can be conveyed by markers of sentence focus, locational or tem-
poral adjuncts, and, finally, tense or aspect (Carlson 1977: 444; Kratzer

The structures in (23) are presentational constructions which introduce
quantified sets of entities into discourse, predicking something on their
behaviour. Some of the events in question are bounded in a spatial sense
(cf. (23e), where the deictic element is implicit, as well as (23g) and (23h),
where it is overt) or in a temporal sense (cf. (23a), (23e) and (23f)). Others
are not bounded in these ways (cf. (23b) to (23d)). However, on a par with
the other structures under scrutiny, they do not denote inherent properties
of individuals, but rather the behaviour of a particular set of entities
(watches, metronomes, and alarm clocks).

In accordance with the above facts, I suggest that the predicate of the
structures in (23) is a stage-level existential predicate which introduces a
quantified argument into discourse. More precisely, it introduces a topic-
vs.-focus contrast between an argument and its quantifier. The activity is a
mere modifier of the quantified argument, similarly to a restrictive relative
clause. Appropriate English translations of these sentences are as follows:

(33)  a. (Bulbs), there are only few that (/and they) took root.
b. (Watches), there are only two that (/and they) function.
c. (Metronomes), there are only three that (/…they) swing regularly.
d. (Alarm clocks), there are none that (/and they) ring loud.
e. Supporters, there are many who (/and they) phone on Sunday!
f. Young people, there are many who (/and they) ran.
g. Children, there are many who (/and they) sneeze here.
h. People, there are many who (/and they) walk on those pavements.

The semantic representations of the structures in (23) comprise the ar-
gument of an existential predicate which is modified by an activity predi-
cate (see the analysis of the Sardinian presentationals with bi proposed in section 5.7.1). In addition, in (23e), (23g), and (23h), the semantic representation of the activity predicate is modified by a locational adjunct. I exemplify the two kinds of semantic representations with reference to (23f) and (23h):

(23) f. \textbf{exist}´(\textit{be}´(\textit{tanti ne}, [\textit{do}´(giovani, [\textit{run}´(giovani,)])]))

(23) h. \textbf{exist}´(\textit{be}´(\textit{tanta ne}, [\textit{be-on}´(marciapiedi, [\textit{do}´(gente, [\textit{walk}´(gente,)])]))])

Ne stands for the topical head or core, and the quantifier is its operator. Accordingly, \textit{tanti} and \textit{tanta} share the same argument position, and constitute the only argument of the existential predicate (\textit{exist}´(x)), as is indicated by the underlining in the semantic representation. This argument is embedded in an attributive semantic representation (\textit{be}´(x, [\textit{pred}])) that is the semantic representation of the activity predicate. The noun which is co-referent with \textit{tanti} figures in a peripheral position in semantic representation, i.e., as the argument of \textit{run}´ and \textit{walk}´. The locational phrase is treated as the first argument of a locative predicate (\textit{be-on}´(y, x)), in accordance with the standard RRG treatment of adjunct prepositional phrases (VVLP: 159–163). The mapping of these structures to syntax is discussed in section 6.3.1.2.

The predicate of the constructions which are spatially or temporally bounded (cf. (23a) and (23e) to (23h)) is construed as a finite series of events. It tests out as an accomplishment, since it is non-punctual and telic. This is why these structures are compatible with the phrase ‘in an hour’. Some activities are more easily construed in this way than others. This is the case with ‘phone’, which can be interpreted as an accomplishment, ‘make a phone call’, and can have an intrinsic deictic value ‘phone here’.

By contrast, ‘sneeze’ and ‘walk’ do not license ne-cliticization, unless the stage-level interpretation is conveyed by an overt locational phrase. Finally, in (23a) and (23f), the stage-level existential reading is conveyed by the past tense (*?Ne corrono molti, giovani ‘young people, many run’).

The predicate of the structures in (23b) to (23d) is not construed as a bounded series of events, in accordance with the lack of temporal or spatial binding. In fact, these examples do not admit the phrase ‘in an hour’. Interestingly, solo ‘only’ improves considerably the acceptability of (23b) and (23c), whilst it would obviously be ungrammatical in (23d), where the
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quantifier is ‘none’. *Solo* ‘only’ is a focusing element, i.e., an adverbial that draws attention to an element in a sentence and normally selects the new information provided by the utterance (Quirk et al. 1985: 604; Wasow 2002: 65). In the constructions under investigation, *solo* ‘only’ selects the quantified entity or set of entities which is being introduced into discourse.

The putatively deviant constructions turn out to be comparable with the Russian genitive of negation, as analysed by Babby (1980). There are, in fact, remarkable correspondences in terms of word order, the typical associations of events and arguments, the role of focusing elements such as *solo* ‘only’ (see *ni odin* ‘not even one’ in the Russian constructions considered in Babby 1980: 21–22), and the presentational function of the constructions under scrutiny. Others have pointed out that the two phenomena are comparable (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Cresti 2003). One contrast that my analysis brings to light is that, with respect to the Italian constructions, it would not be accurate to claim that the activity predicates which figure with *ne*-cliticization are desemanticized, as is instead claimed with reference to the predicates which figure with the Russian genitive of negation (Babby 1980: 17). In fact, the activity predicates cannot be omitted from the Italian constructions. I have suggested that the activity predicates are modifiers, as opposed to main predicates, in the semantic representation.

The role of the activity predicates as modifiers explains the strict information-structure constraints which operate on the putatively deviant cases of *ne*-cliticization. Given that the activity predicates are not desemanticized, but rather contribute to the semantic representation, the allegedly deviant constructions cannot simply introduce a new unit of information – i.e., a missing variable – into discourse. Thus, they do not exhibit narrow focus on the argument. In order for activity predicates to allow *ne*-cliticization, the existential reading has to arise. This happens in sentence focus, where the activity predicates play the role of modifiers.

On the whole, the verbs in (23a) to (23d) are more easily combined with *ne* than those in (23e) to (23h): they do not require temporal or spatial binders and they are marginally acceptable even if the topical head does not figure in the sentence. This fact is undoubtedly related to the alternation in the selection of the perfective operator exhibited by these verbs (see section 2.3). Both *attecchire* ‘take root’ and *funzionare* ‘function’ denote events which can be encoded as processes or full accomplishments (Van Valin 2005: 43–44). *Oscillare* ‘swing’ and *trillare* ‘ring’, on the other hand, are semelfactives, which can be activity-based or state-based. The
reason why *ne-*cliticization is licensed more easily with these predicates than with those which solely denote activities must be related to the possibility of construals that are compatible with *ne-*cliticization in both narrow- and sentence-focus constructions.

Clearly, any analysis of *ne-*cliticization which purely relies on information structure is unlikely to capture the contrast between verbs which license *ne-*cliticization both in narrow focus and in sentence focus (canonical *ne-*cliticization), and verbs which license it, more or less freely, in sentence focus, but not in narrow focus. In order to account for this contrast, one has to consider the Aktionsart of predicates, i.e., the semantic basis of split intransitivity.

Evidence in favour of the proposed existential analysis is provided by the fact that *ne-*cliticization is subject to a number of constraints which are at work in existentials cross-linguistically. Observe the following example:

(34) Tifoni, se ne scatenano in questa parte del Pacifico.
Typhoons RFLQCLbreak.out.3PLin this part of.the Pacific
‘Typhoons, there arise some in this part of the Pacific.’

The example in (34) can only mean that it is typical of this part of the Pacific that typhoons arise in it, and not that it is a property of typhoons that they arise in this part of the Pacific (Casadio 1992). This means that the universal reading of the nominal which is *ne-*cliticized is ruled out. *Ne-*cliticization is, in fact, ruled out with strong quantification (Milsark 1974, 1979), as is shown by its incompatibility with *tutto* ‘all’, *entrambi* ‘both’, and *ogni* ‘each’:

(35) *Ne arriva(no) tutti / entrambi / ogni.
QCL arrive.3SG/PL all both each
‘Everybody / both / each *ne* is / are arriving.’

Finally, Cresti (2003) has argued that *ne* can work as a scope blocker, i.e., it can constrain the scope of the quantifier. Thus, in *nessuno ne ha risolto molti*, the quantifier cannot have scope over the negation. This example can only mean ‘there is nobody who solved many (e.g., problems)’, and not ‘there are many that nobody solved’. This fact is in accordance with a property of *there*-existentials, where the *pivot*, i.e. the direct-core argument of the existential predicate, takes the narrowest scope (Heim 1987).
One could wonder whether the analysis which has been proposed for the non-canonical structures with ne-cliticization should be extended to all cases of ne-cliticization. I do not wish to postulate an existential predicate for all structures with ne-cliticization. This would certainly seem inappropriate in the case of transitive constructions. Observe that according to some native speakers (Cresti 2003), though not others, the quantifier can have scope over negation in such constructions: Gianni non ne ha risolti molti can mean both ‘it is not the case that John solved many ne’ and ‘there are many ne that John did not solve’. I simply propose that constructions with ne-cliticization can receive an existential reading. Interestingly, the evidence suggests that intransitive achievements and accomplishments lend themselves more easily to an existential reading than activity predicates do. Thus, achievements are compatible with ‘in’-phrases in both narrow- and sentence-focus constructions with ne-cliticization (Quante ne esplosero in un’ora? ‘how many ne exploded in an hour’? ne esplosero tante, bombe, in un’ora ‘bombs, many ne exploded in an hour’). Achievements are of course incompatible with ‘in’-phrases elsewhere, since they are punctual.

6.3.1.1 Comparative evidence

The Logudorese and Nuorese Sardinian constructions which were introduced in section 5.7.1 support my analysis of the data in (23), since they share a number of properties with existentials, and license n(d)e-cliticization regardless of the Aktionsart of the overt predicate:

(36) a. Binn’ at bennidu medas. (Logudorese)
CL.QCL have.3SG come.PPl many.PL
‘There are many who (/and they) have come.’

b. Binn’ at cantadu medas. (Logudorese)
CL.QCL have.3SG sing.PP many.PL
‘There are many who (/and they) have sung.’

N(d)e-cliticization is unexpected with activity predicates like cantare ‘sing’. In fact, the only possible reading of Logudorese n(d)’at cantadu medas is ‘(songs), s/he has sung many ne’. However, n(d)e-cliticization is licensed in (36b) because the quantified argument is the only argument of an existential predicate.
The Sardinian marker of sentence focus (bi) occurs in the same position as the clitic ghe in the Northern Italo-Romance structures cited in (30) and (31) (Penello 2004). The occurrence of this clitic in purely existential structures, whether in conjunction with the partitive clitic (dialect of Crocetta: Ghe né un ceo ‘there is a child’) or alone (dialect of Carmignano: Ghe zé un puteo ‘there is a child’) suggests that ghe does not necessarily signal a locational argument, in conjunction with ‘ne’-cliticization, but is an existential marker comparable with Logudorese bi. In semantic terms, ghe, like Logudorese bi and Italian ci, need not be locational, but may simply indicate that there is an existential predicate in the semantic representation (see the analyses of existential ci proposed, contra Freeze 1992, in Bentley 2006; La Fauci and Loporcaro 1993, 1997; Moro 1993, 1997).

Similar considerations hold for ‘ne’-cliticization in some Piedmontese dialects which were briefly considered in section 5.8. The fact that the cliticization with the cognate of ne correlates systematically with the lack of verbal agreement (Parry 2000) suggests that ‘ne’ realizes the argument of an existential predicate. The etymologically locational clitic which co-occurs with ‘ne’ is a marker of sentence focus. I illustrate this point here with Piedmontese data from Parry (2000). Contrast the example with ‘ne’-cliticization, which exhibits the clitic j but no agreement (cf. (37a)), with the example without ‘ne’-cliticization, which displays agreement (cf. (37b)):

(37) a. A l’è rivajne tante. (Piedmontese)
SCL be.3SG arrive.PP.CL.QCL many.FPL
‘There arrived many.’

b. A son rivà tante. (Piedmontese)
SCL be.3PL arrive.PP many.FPL
‘Many have arrived.’
(Parry 2000: 396)

On the basis of the position of the quantifier and, where applicable, the lack of agreement, it could of course be argued that constructions with ‘ne’-cliticization are merely impersonal, rather than existential. This hypothesis, however, would not explain the contrast between unaccusatives and unergatives vis-à-vis ‘ne’-cliticization. Thus, the stricter information-structure conditions on non-canonical ne-cliticization in Italian and the ban on agreement with non-canonical ‘ne’-cliticization in Sardinian and other Romance varieties would remain unexplained. Finally, the results of the
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Aktionsart tests illustrated in (27) to (29) would also be unaccounted for. Needless to say, this hypothesis also disregards Perlmutter’s (1983: 178) classic analysis of impersonal constructions which distinguishes them from ne-cliticization.

Other supporting evidence for the idea that structures with ‘ne’-cliticization can be existential is offered by French. It has long been known that, although French il-impersonal constructions are more naturally formed with ‘be’-selecting intransitives (cf. (38a)), they also admit some ‘have’-selecting intransitives (cf. (38b) and (38c)).” Recall from section 2.4.2.2 that there is a wider range of A-selecting intransitives in French than in Italian; thus, the state exister ‘exist’ (cf. (38b)) selects avoir ‘have’ on a par with the activity manger ‘eat’ (cf. (38c)):

(38) a. Il est arrivé quelqu’un. (French)
EXPL be.3SG arrive.PP somebody
‘There has (lit. is) arrived somebody.’

b. Il existe beaucoup de problèmes. (French)
EXPL exist.3SG many of problems
‘There exists many problems.’

c. Il mange beaucoup de journalistes
EXPL eat.3SG many of journalists
da los ce restaurant. (French)
in this restaurant
Lit. There eats many journalists in this restaurant.
(Jones 1996: 125)

The examples in (38b) and (38c) are drawn from Jones (1996: 124–127), who points out that, whilst exister ‘exist’ is a state, and this may explain why it is used in impersonal constructions, manger ‘eat’ is an activity, and thus is not expected in impersonals. Jones spells out a number of constraints on the occurrence of activity predicates in French il-impersonals. A locational adjunct is often needed (note that, without the location, il mange beaucoup de journalistes would be read as ‘he eats many journalists’). This adjunct must denote a place that is conventional for the activity encoded by the predicate. Thus, ??il mangeait deux mille ouvriers dans cette usine, lit. there ate two thousand workers in this factory, is odd because the activity ‘eat’ is not normally associated with the location ‘factory’. Finally, structures like (38c) can hardly be modified by manner adverbs (*?Il
nageait très bien beaucoup de gens dans la piscine, lit. there swam very well many people in the swimming pool).

The obligatoriness of the locational binder in impersonal structures with activity predicates, the typical association of activities and locations, and, finally, the ban on adverbs which typically modify activities are clearly reminiscent of the well-formedness constraints on the non-canonical uses of ne. In agreement with my analysis of the presentational constructions with ne-cliticization, it could be proposed that, in the semantic representation, the main predicate of the non-canonical French il-impersonals is existential. The argument of this predicate is modified by the overt predicate.

The reason why impersonals with il are of interest in this context is that, insofar as intransitive constructions are concerned, French ‘ne’-cliticization (en-cliticization) is limited to impersonal structures with il. Thus, (39a) is not grammatical, whereas (39b) is:

\[(39)\]  
\[\text{a. } \text{Beaucoup en arrivent. (French)} \]
\[\text{Many QCL arrive.3PL} \]
\[\text{‘Many en arrive.’} \]
\[\text{b. } \text{Il en arrive beaucoup. (French)} \]
\[\text{It QCL arrive.3SG many} \]
\[\text{‘There arrive many.’} \]

Constructions like (38c) license en-cliticization, subject to the well-formedness conditions which were mentioned above. This fact is predicted by the existential analysis:

\[(40)\]  
\[\text{a. } \text{Il en mange beaucoup dans ce restaurant. (French)} \]
\[\text{It QCL eat.3SG many in this restaurant} \]
\[\text{‘There are many who eat in this restaurant.’} \]
\[\text{b. } \text{Il en nage beaucoup dans le petit bain. (French)} \]
\[\text{It QCL swim.3SG many in the small pool} \]
\[\text{‘There are many who swim in the small pool.’} \]

The French data support the proposed analysis of Italian ne-cliticization as a morphosyntactic operation which can only affect clauses with activity predicates if the principal predicate of these structures is existential.
6.3.1.2 Semantics-syntax mapping

I have proposed that the constructions with ne-cliticization which are apparently problematic vis-à-vis the view that ne-cliticization is a diagnostic of split intransitivity are, in fact, a red herring, in that the argument that is ne-cliticized is the only argument of a state predicate. The reason why these constructions appear to be problematic is that the state predicate is not spelled out in syntax. This analysis amounts to the claim that the semantic representation and the syntax of these structures are not homogeneous. In this section, I explain how the proposed semantic representation of the examples in (23) maps on to syntax. The syntax-semantics mismatch provides an explanation of the selection of the perfective operator in these structures.

I illustrate the semantics-syntax mapping of the putatively deviant constructions with reference to (23f) (Ne corsero tanti, giovani 'young people, there were many who ran'). Since the main predicate is monovalent (exist'), the syntactic template selection principle selects a core template with one argument slot in it (see Figure 21). This slot is filled by tanti ne, the argument of exist'. The existential predicate does not map on to syntax, which leaves run' to figure as the matrix predicate in the syntactic nucleus. To satisfy the Completeness Constraint, giovani 'young people' must be realized in the syntax, and it can be assumed to figure in the Right-Detached Position (RDP). This is the position of afterthoughts, which are separated from the most salient information by a pause (Antinucci and Cinque 1977; Benincà 1988: 146; Salvi and Vanelli 2004: 307; Vanelli 1986: 271, note 12). The mapping is analogous in the constructions which include a locational or temporal adjunct (cf. (23g) and (23h)), with the exception that the said adjunct fills the syntactic periphery of the core.

According to some informants, the perfective counterparts of the sentences in (23) are ungrammatical. Other informants accept the perfect, on condition that A is selected (cf. (41a) and (41b)). There is general agreement that the selection of E is ruled out (cf. (42a) and (42b)):

(41) a. ?Ne hanno corso molti, giovani.
QCL.3PL have run.many M.PL.3PL young M.PL.3PL
‘Young people, there are many who have run.’
b. ?Ne hanno telefonato, tifosi, la domenica.
   "Supporters, there are many who have phoned on Sunday."

Figure 21. Syntax-semantics mismatch in presentational constructions with ne-cliticization.

(42) a. *Ne sono corso /-i molti, giovani.
   "Young people, there are many who have run.'
b. *Ne sono telefonato / -i, tifosi, la domenica.

‘Supporters, there are many who have phoned on Sunday.’

The ungrammaticality of the perfective structures with E, and of past-participle agreement, in (42a) and (42b), is clear evidence against any analysis which states that the argument of activity predicates is realized as an internal argument (in syntactic terms) or a theme (in semantic terms) in presentational focus. On the other hand, the hypothesis that ne-cliticization might simply be a manifestation of surface unaccusativity, i.e., a by-product of the tendency, which can be overridden, for state, achievement and accomplishment predicates to occur in presentational constructions, does not explain why, once activity predicates are accepted in such constructions, their canonical perfective forms are rejected by some speakers (cf. (41a) and (41b)).

The analysis of the selection of the perfective operator developed in this work predicts that, as a result of the syntax-semantics mismatch discussed above, the selection of the perfective operator should be problematic, since the argument of the existential predicate is a marked PSA, but it is the activity predicate that is in the scope of the perfective operator. If the semantic structure were spelled out in full in syntax, the perfective operator of the existential predicate would be E, and the perfective operator of the activity predicate would be A (Ce ne sono stati tanti che hanno corso ‘There have (lit. are) been many who have run’). Since the existential predicate is not spelled out, some speakers accept the selection of A because it is the activity predicate that is in the scope of the perfective operator. Note that the marked PSA also figures in the semantic representation as the argument of the activity predicate. However, other speakers do not accept either operator, as a result of the mismatch between semantics and syntax.

6.3.2 Ne-cliticization in constructions with activity predicates:

Conclusion

The analysis of ne-cliticization in constructions with activity predicates has indicated that these constructions introduce a new element of information into the universe of discourse. The main predicate is existential, and ne-cliticization originates from the only argument of this predicate. The activ-
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Ity predicate plays the role of a modifier of the said argument in the semantic representation, but it behaves as the sole predicate in syntax. This analysis captures the strict information-structure constraints which hold for ne-cliticization with activity predicates, and has predictive power with respect to the selection of the perfective operator.

### 6.4 Constructions with non-verbal predicates

Constructions with non-verbal predicates have not received the due attention in previous work on ne-cliticization, with the exception of Cinque (1990) and Bentley (2004b). Cinque (1990) brought to light data which would seem to suggest that adjectival predicates are split into two classes, on a par with verbal ones:

1. **(43)** a. *Ne sono note solo alcune (...poesie).*
   - QCL be.3PL well-known.FPL only some.FPL poem.FPL
   - ‘Poems, only some *ne* are well-known.’

   b. *Ne sono buoni pochi (...articoli).*
   - QCL be.3PL good.MPL few.MPL article.MPL
   - ‘Articles, only few *ne* are good.’

   (Cinque 1990: 7)

   In the light of facts such as those in (43), *noto* ‘well-known’ was claimed by Cinque to represent an unaccusative class of adjectives, whereas *buono* ‘good’ was said to represent an unergative class. Observe, however, that there is no contrast between (43a) and (43b) in terms of agreement (recall from Chapter 5 that adjectival predicates agree with their PSA, since this is an undergoer), and this fact would seem to point to the conclusion that adjectival predicates constitute a homogeneous class in terms of split intransitivity.

   Cinque (1990) further claimed that resultative state predicates related to passives do not test out as unaccusative:

2. **(44)** *Ne sono spezzati due (rami), purtroppo.*
   - QCL be.3PL break.PP.MPL two branch.MPL unfortunately
   - ‘(Branches), two *ne* are broken, unfortunately.’
In Cinque’s view, the predicate of (44) is an adjectival passive (for my account of resultative state predicates, see section 7.3). The discrepancy between adjectival and verbal passives is unexpected under the assumption that related verbs, nouns, and adjectives have unique theta-marking and selectional properties (see Chomsky’s 1970 Lexicalist Hypothesis). Cinque proposes that the incompatibility of ne-cliticization with adjectival passives is due to facets of the derivational process of the adjectival forms from morphologically derived verbal forms, i.e., past participles.

The split noted by Cinque (1990) poses a potential problem vis-à-vis the theories which claim that adjectival predicates require unergative syntax (see, among others, Burzio 1986), as well as those which claim that they require unaccusative syntax (see, among others, La Fauci 2000). Baker (2003) attempts to deal with the problem brought to light by Cinque, but his attempt would seem to fail vis-à-vis further data on ne-cliticization with adjectival predicates uncovered in Bentley (2004b). These data essentially indicate that the grammaticality of ne-cliticization of the argument of adjectival predicates is affected by tense and aspect, as well as by the presence of focusing elements in the clause. Observe the examples below:

(45) a. Ne sono stati spezzati due (rami).
   QCL be.3PL be.PP.MPL break.PP.MPL two branch.MPL
   ‘(Branches), two ne have been broken.’

b. Ne furono spezzati due (rami).
   QCL be.3PL.PST break.PP.MPL two branch.MPL
   ‘(Branches), two ne were broken.’

The perfective and punctual past tense correlates of the ungrammatical sentence in (44) are grammatical constructions. To be sure, the sentences in (45a) and (45b) receive passive interpretation, in that they do not simply denote resultant states, but also the processes which lead to these states. Accordingly, it could be said that ne-cliticization in (45a) and (45b) is irrelevant to ne-cliticization in adjectival constructions. Observe now the data in (46):

(46) a. Ne sono spezzati solo due (rami).
   QCL be.3PL break.PP.MPL only two branch.MPL
   ‘(Branches), there are only two (which are) broken.’
b. Non ne è spezzato nemmeno uno.
   NEG QCL be.3PL break.PP.MSG not.even one.MSG
   ‘There is not even one (which is) broken.’

Whether the predicate of structures such as (44), (46a) and (46b) should be considered to be adjectival or verbal is a matter of debate (see Chapter 7 for a discussion of this issue). The point which interests us in this context is that, similarly to (44), the constructions in (46a) and (46b) simply denote resultant states, and they license ne-cliticization. Significantly, it is the presence of solo ‘only’ in (46a) and nemmeno uno ‘not even one’ in (46b) that makes all the difference with respect to ne-cliticization.

Ne-cliticization of the argument of adjectives which are not related to passive structures is also sensitive to tense and aspect:

(47) a. *Ne sono buoni molti.
   QCL be.3PL good.MPL many.MPL
   ‘Many ne are good.’
b. *?Ne stanno buoni molti.
   QCL stay.3PL good.MPL many.MPL
   ‘Many ne behave.’
c. ?Ne sono stati buoni molti.
   QCL be.3PL be.PP.MPL good.MPL many.MPL
   ‘There are many who have been good / have behaved.’

Data like (47a) led Cinque to claim that a subclass of adjectives is unergative (cf. (43b)). However, the facts in (47b) and (47c) challenge this view, since in these cases ne-cliticization is acceptable, albeit to various degrees. In the next section, I provide evidence which indicates that ne-cliticization of the argument of buono ‘good’ is entirely acceptable in other contexts.

It would seem, therefore, that ne-cliticization cannot be captured by an analysis which is purely based on grammatical categories and their subcategorization and theta-marking properties, whatever we assume these properties to be, even though the problematic facts noted by Cinque (1990) clearly suggest that grammatical categories play a role in the phenomenon under investigation.

In my treatment of non-verbal predicates, I first consider ne-cliticization in constructions with adjectival predicates (see section 6.4.1), and then move on to nominal and locative predicates (see section 6.4.2). Finally, I discuss ne-cliticization in constructions with matrix coding as PSA or non-
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PSA (raising), since these constructions can exhibit non-verbal predicates (see section 6.4.3).

6.4.1 Constructions with adjectival predicates

This section is concerned with the puzzling behavior of adjectives vis-à-vis *ne*-cliticization. Adhering to Schwartz’s (1993) and VVLP’s (103–105) analysis of copular constructions (see sections 3.2 and 5.6), I propose that the split which was noted by Cinque (1990) is ultimately due to the sensitivity of *ne*-cliticization to the relative prominence of arguments in the semantic representation. *Ne*-cliticization selects the lowest argument in the semantic representation of a state. Only some adjectival predicates have their lowest argument available for morphosyntactic purposes, and this explains the mentioned split. On the whole, *ne*-cliticization is problematic with all adjectival predicates, and I argue that this is due to the focus-structure constraint on *ne*.

I first consider the contrast between related adjectival and verbal predicates:

(48) a. *Ne biancheggiano molti.*
   QCL be.white.3PL many.MPL
   ‘Many *ne* appear white at the present moment.’

   b. *Ne sono bianchi molti.*
   QCL be.3PL white.MPL many.MPL
   ‘Many *ne* are white.’

(49) a. Se *ne ammalano molti.*
   RFL QCL get.ill.3PL many.MPL
   ‘Many *ne* get ill.’ ‘Many get ill (with it).’

   b. *Ne sono malati molti.*
   QCL be.3PL ill.MPL many.MPL
   ‘Many *ne* are ill.’

The predicates which license *ne*-cliticization in (48a) and (49a) are an intransitive state and an intransitive accomplishment, respectively; in both cases, the only argument of the state is available for morphosyntactic purposes:
290 Ne-cliticization

(48) a\(^1\). \textbf{white}' (x)

(49) a\(^1\). BECOME \textbf{ill}' (x) [Ø]

In Schwartz’s (1993) and VVLP’s (103–105) account of copular constructions, the sentences in (48b) and (49b) do not have their lowest argument available in morphosyntax, since this is an argument with predicative function. In fact, it is the only predicator in the clause and cannot receive a macrorole:

(48) b\(^1\). \textbf{be}' (x, \textbf{white}')

(49) b\(^1\). \textbf{be}' (x, \textbf{ill}')

Whilst the argument represented by \textbf{pred}' cannot be \textit{ne}-cliticized because it is unavailable, the first argument (x in (48b\(^1\)) and (49b\(^1\))) cannot be \textit{ne}-cliticized, since it is not the lowest one in the state predicate.

Evidence in favour of this account of the ungrammaticality of \textit{ne}-cliticization in copular constructions is provided by the Italian possessive dative. Consider the following data:

(50) a. \textit{Il meccanico mi } ha \textit{riparato la macchina.}
    The mechanic DCL.1SG have.3SG repair.PP the car
    ‘The mechanic repaired my car.’

b. \textit{Il bambino } mi \textit{si è } \textit{ammalato.}
    The baby.MSG DCL.1SG RFL be.3SG get.ill.PP.MSG
    ‘My baby has got ill.’

c. \textit{Il bambino (*mi) è malato.}
    The baby.MSG DCL.1SG be.3SG ill.MSG
    ‘My baby is ill.’

d. \textit{Il bambino non } mi \textit{mangia da tre giorni.}
    The baby NEG DCL.1SG eat.3SG from three days
    ‘My baby has not eaten for three days.’

The possessive dative targets the lowest argument in the semantic representation. Thus, the sentence in (50a) can be paraphrased as ‘the mechanic repaired my car’ but not as ‘my mechanic repaired the car’, since the possessive dative can only realize the second argument of transitive predications. This is also the only argument which can be \textit{ne}-cliticized in these
structures (*Macchine, il meccanico ne ripara molte* ‘(cars), the mechanic repairs many *ne*’ vs. *ne riparano le macchine molti* ‘many *ne* repair cars’).

The contrast between (50b) and (50c) shows that the possessive dative is compatible with reflexive *ammalarsi* ‘get ill’ but not with its adjectival counterpart *essere malato* ‘be ill’, in agreement with *ne*-cliticization (cf. (49a) and (49b)). If we now consider (50d), we note that this structure allows the possessive dative, whereas it rejects *ne*-cliticization (*Ne mangiano molti* ‘many *ne* eat’ (intended reading)). This contrast is explained as follows. Unlike *ne*-cliticization, the possessive dative is not restricted to stative predicates. Accordingly, it can target the argument of an activity, as is the case with (50d), as long as there are no lower arguments in the semantic representation. Other languages may restrict the domain of the possessive dative to stative predicates (see the evidence offered by Baker 2003: 70–72), but this is the not the case with Italian, which explains the discrepancy highlighted above.

The contrast between the possessive dative and *ne*-cliticization depends on a restriction which holds for *ne*-cliticization, but not for the possessive dative: *ne*-cliticization is confined to arguments of states. This well-formedness constraint is crucial in terms of split intransitivity, insofar as it prevents the *ne*-cliticization of the only argument of activities. Both the possessive dative and *ne*-cliticization yield problematic results with adjectival predicates. Since the possessive dative is not affected by the intransitivity split, it is implausible that these problematic results are due to the status of adjectives vis-à-vis the said split. The parallelism between the possessive dative and *ne*-cliticization depends, instead, on the sensitivity of both morphosyntactic phenomena to the respective ranking of the arguments in the semantic representation.

Turning now to Cinque’s (1990) data, among the adjectives which Cinque considers to be unaccusative there are those in (51):

(51) a. ??Fatto, *ne* è *noto* *uno*.
   Fact.MSG QCL be.3SG well-known.MSG one.MSG
   ‘Fact, one *ne* is well-known.’

   b. ??Risultati, *ne* sono *prevedibili* *due*.
   Result.MPL QCL be.3PL foreseeable.MPL two
   ‘Results, two *ne* are foreseeable.’

   c. ??Beningo, *ne* è *bene* *uno*.
   Character.MSG QCL be.3SG well.MSG one.MSG
   ‘Character, one *ne* is well.’
The adjective *noto* ‘well-known’ belongs to a class of epistemic adjectives, which can take an overt experiencer: *i fatti sono noti / ovvi a tutti* ‘the facts are well-known / obvious to everyone’. Following Perlmutter’s (1984) inversion analysis of epistemic adjectives, it can be argued that adjectival predicates like *noto* ‘well-known’, *chiaro* ‘clear’ (not ‘pale’ or ‘bright’), *sicuro* ‘certain’, *evidente* ‘evident’ and *certo* ‘certain’ are type-(iii) experiencer predicates (see section 3.4). These predicates are states whose lowest-ranking argument, i.e., the theme, is assigned a macrorole, whilst the highest argument is realized as a non-macrorole argument. This is what we find in the adjectival structures under discussion. In fact, the experiencer cannot serve as the PSA of the clause, in spite of the fact that, in semantic terms, it is the highest argument: *tutti sono noti di questi fatti*, lit. everybody is well-known of these facts. *Ne*-cliticization is licensed, albeit marginally, because the lowest-ranking argument, i.e., the theme, is available in these constructions. The semantic representation of copular constructions with this type of adjective is, in fact, $\text{be}^{'}(x, [\text{pred}^{'}(y)])$, where $y$ is the theme. I return below to the low degree of acceptability of (51a).

The adjectival predicate of (51b), *prevedibile* ‘foreseeable’, is a member of a class of adjectives in -bile or -vole which Ambrosini (1982: 75–79) claimed to be passive in the light of the following facts: (i) their meaning (they express a potential passive), (ii) the fact that they are deverbal formations (see transitive *prevedere* ‘foresee’), and, finally, (iii) the possible co-occurrence with an adjunct with da ‘by’, a ‘to’, or per ‘for’, that is, the prepositions used with the actor of passives in Romance: *questi fatti sono prevedibili da tutti* ‘these facts are foreseeable to everyone’. The adjunct encodes the highest argument of the adjectives in question, which cannot serve as the PSA (*Tutti sono prevedibili di questi fatti*, lit. everyone is foreseeable of these facts), on a par with the highest argument of type-(iii) experiencer predicates. In fact, this argument is itself an experiencer, i.e., the locus of intellectual or emotional experience (see *comprensibile* ‘comprehensible’, *gradevole* ‘pleasant’ and *piacevole* ‘pleasant’). Accordingly, these adjectives can be considered to be lexically-modalized type-(iii) experiencer predicates. *Ne*-cliticization of the lowest argument of these predicates is marginally allowed, in that this argument is available for morphosyntactic purposes: the semantics of these adjectives can be represented as that of the class of *noto* ‘well-known’: $\text{be}^{'}(x, [\text{pred}^{'}(y)])^{118}$.

A third class which seems to me to pattern with the two adjectival classes exemplified in (51a) and (51b), but is said to behave differently by
Cinque (cf. (44)), is constituted by the past participle of passives in present-tense constructions:

(52) a. ??Insegnante, ne è apprezzato uno.
   Teacher.MSG QCL be.3SG appreciate.PP.MSG one.MSG
   ‘Teacher, one ne is appreciated.’

       b. ??Porte, ne sono aperte due.
       Door.FPL QCL be.3PL open.PP.FPL two
       ‘Doors, two ne are open.’

Speakers do not agree on the acceptability of (52a) and (52b), as they do not agree on the acceptability of (51a) and (51b), and I shall return to this point below. It is interesting to note, however, that the predicates in question are resultant states which are related to passives. In the spirit of RRG (VVLP: 103–105, Van Valin 2005: 46), and of other theories of the lexicon-syntax interface, I assume that the semantic representation of such states is essentially a portion of the semantic representation of the related verbal passives, where only a resultant state and its argument are represented, whilst there is no slot for the highest argument. Compare the semantic representation of the passive in (53a) with the stative predicate in (53b), which does not include a slot for the causative activity or the causer:

(53) a. La porta è stata aperta.
       The door.FSG be.3SG be.PP.FSG open.PP.FSG
       ‘The door has been opened.’

       [[doo’(Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME open’(porta)]]

       b. La porta è aperta.
       The door.FSG be.3SG open.PP.FSG
       ‘The door is open.’

       open’(porta)

The only argument of the state in (53b) is available in morphosyntax, and thus it should license ne-cliticization.

I have identified three classes of adjectival predicates which satisfy Van Valin’s (1993) second condition on ne-cliticization, and indeed test out better vis-à-vis ne-cliticization than other adjectival predicates. Two of these classes correspond to the adjectives that Cinque (1990) regards as unaccusative, whilst the third one is related to passives. What should be
explained now is why *ne*-cliticization is only marginally acceptable with these classes of adjectives.

A clue to the solution of this problem comes from facts which I introduced in (46) and I repeat here for convenience:

(54) *Ne sono spezzati / prevedibili solo due.*
    QCL be.3PL break.PP.MPL foreseeable.MPL only two
    ‘There are only two (which are) broken / foreseeable.’

The presence of *solo* ‘only’ in (54) is sufficient to ensure the grammaticality of *ne*-cliticization. In the discussion of *ne*-cliticization of the argument of activity predicates, I argued that the presence of focusing elements like *solo* ‘only’ (cf. (23b) and (23c)) can convey a presentational reading. In this reading, the main predicate in the semantic representation is an existential one, which explains the grammaticality of *ne*-cliticization. I further pointed out that there is a remarkable parallelism between these data and the genitive of negation in Russian (Babby 1980), which is also sensitive to the presence of focusing elements in the clause. Similarly to (23b) and (23c), the structures in (54) should be analysed as presentational constructions, where the *ne*-cliticized argument is the only argument of an existential predicate. The adjectival predicates *broken* and *foreseeable* are modifiers of the argument of the existential predicate (*due ne*). These constructions can be represented as follows:

(54) a. exist (be (due *ne*, [broken (due *ne*)])).
    b. exist (be (due *ne*, [foreseeable (due *ne*)])).

I suggest that the contrast between the presentational constructions, where *ne*-cliticization is undoubtedly grammatical, and the constructions where *ne*-cliticization is only marginally acceptable (cf. (51) and (52)) depends on the focus structure of copular constructions, which is not presentational. Copular constructions with adjectival and nominal predicates are cited in the literature on the thetic-vs.-categorical distinction as prime examples of categorical judgements (Sasse 1987: 512). Thus, they are constituted by two parts, one which denotes an entity and the other which predicates a property of the entity. The correlate in discourse of this bipartite semantic structure is predicate focus, i.e., an assertion which concerns the relation between a topical argument and a focal predicate. Observe the data below:
Constructions with non-verbal predicates

(55) a. *COME sono* i rami?
   ‘How are the branches?’

\[ (I \text{ rami}) \text{ SONO SPEZZATI.} \]
   The branches are broken.’

b. *Sono spezzati* i RAMI (non LE RADICI).
   ‘It is the branches that are broken, not the roots.’

The word order illustrated in (55a) is unmarked: the argument is introduced as part of the presupposition, whilst the assertion concerns the relation between the argument and the focal predicate. The word order in (55b) is only allowed if the argument bears contrastive narrow focus.

The marginality of the data in (51) and (52) is explained by the fact that copular constructions normally predicate the relation between a topical argument and a focal predicate, given that ne-cliticization does not occur in predicate focus.

A brief digression is in order. In section 5.6, I discussed copular constructions with nominal predicates, and I supported Moro’s (1997) view that the argument which triggers agreement is the PSA of these constructions, regardless of word order. Thus, both in *i bambini di Linda sono stati l’argomento della discussione* ‘Linda’s kids were the topic of the discussion’ and in *l’argomento della discussione sono stati i bambini di Linda*, lit. the topic of the discussion were Linda’s kids, the undergoer PSA is *i bambini di Linda* ‘Linda’s kids’. The word order difference between the two structures indicates a difference in focus, since the referent of the postcopular nominal introduces focal information in both cases. The assumption that the postcopular nominal is the argument PSA in *l’argomento della discussione sono stati i bambini di Linda* might seem to run counter to my claim that ne-cliticization is problematic in copular constructions because these structures involve predicate focus. This potential problem is related to the difficult definition of the notion of predicate. In particular, the discourse predicate may differ from the predicate in semantics-syntax mapping. Thus, *i bambini di Linda* ‘Linda’s kids’ is a predicate in discourse (what is being asserted about something or somebody), in *l’argomento della discussione sono stati i bambini di Linda*, but an argument, the PSA, in semantics-syntax mapping. The treatment of this issue goes beyond the scope of the present discussion and will not be pursued here. It is sufficient
to note that the ungrammatical copular structures with *ne-cliticization are predicate-focus constructions in the sense that the postcopular adjective (or nominal, see section 6.4.2) is part of what is being asserted. Put simply, there is too much in the domain of the assertion of these structures. For instance, in *ne sono PREVEDIBILI MOLTI, ‘many ne are foreseeable’, it is asserted that the third-person plural topical argument has the properties denoted by the postcopular adjective and that it is ‘many’.

As was pointed out by Cinque (1990), adjectival predicates other than those belonging to the classes exemplified in (51) and (52) are even more resistant to the *ne-cliticization of their argument. Thus, *ne sono buoni solo due ‘only two ne are good’ would not normally be regarded as acceptable, despite the presence of a focusing element. However, a presentational reading can be conveyed by perfective aspect. Thus, the acceptability contrasts introduced in (47), and repeated below in (56), are captured by the idea that the perfect contributes an existential stage-level reading to copular constructions with adjectival predicates. Predictably, focusing elements like solo ‘only’ further improve the acceptability of these structures (cf. (56d)):

(56)  a. *Ne sono buoni molti.
    QCL be.3PL good.MPL many.MPL
    ‘Many ne are good.’
 b. *?Ne stanno buoni molti.
    QCL stay.3PL good.MPL many.MPL
    ‘Many ne behave.’
 c. ?Ne sono stati buoni molti.
    QCL be.3PL be.PP.MPL good.MPL many.MPL
    ‘There are many who have been good / have behaved.’
 d. Ne sono stati buoni solo due.
    QCL be.3PL be.PP.MPL good.MPL only two
    ‘There are only two who have been good / have behaved.’

Copular constructions with the adjective buono ‘good’ can be construed in two ways, depending on the copula (this is a well-known phenomenon in Romance, see the Spanish and Portuguese alternation of ser and estar). When used with essere ‘be’, buono denotes a property of an individual or a class. When used with stare ‘stay’, buono is a stage-level predicate indicating the behaviour of an individual or a set of individuals on a particular occasion. Unsurprisingly, the second structure with buono marginally lends
itself to ne-cliticization (cf. (56b)). However, the predicate is focal, and ne-cliticization is problematic. Adjectival predicates which allow alternative stage- and individual-level construals are onesto ‘honest’, calmo ‘calm’, tranquillo ‘tranquil’, attento ‘careful’, affettuoso ‘caring’, etc.

Other adjectives are relatively incompatible with the perfect, and rule out the copula stare ‘stay’ altogether, since they denote individual-level properties. Colour adjectives are one such class (cf. (57a)), and in general adjectives which denote physical appearance behave alike (cf. (57b) and (57c)):

(57) a. Due sono (*?stato) / *stanno verdi.
   Two be.3PL be.PP.MPL stay.3PL green.MPL
   ‘Two are / have been green.’

   b. Due sono (*?stato) / *stanno alti.
   Two be.3PL be.PP.MPL stay.3PL tall.MPL
   ‘Two are / have been tall.’

   c. Due sono (*?stato) / *stanno biondi.
   Two be.3PL be.PP.MPL stay.3PL blond.MPL
   ‘Two are / have been blond.’

   Interestingly, the existential predicate must be marked overtly by ci ‘there’ in order for these predicates to license ne-cliticization of their available argument, and the quantifier must figure in the immediately postcopular position, that is the default position of the argument of existential constructions. This is illustrated by the contrast between (58a) and (58b):

(58) a. Ce ne sono due verdi / alti / biondi.
   CL QCL be.3PL two green.MPL tall.MPL blond.MPL
   ‘There are two (which are) green / tall / blond.’

   b. *Ne sono verdi / biondi / alti solo due.
   QCL be.3PL green.MPL blond.MPL tall.MPL only two
   ‘Only two ne are green / tall / blond.’

   The semantic representation of constructions like (58a) is comparable with the one illustrated above in (54a1) and (54b1), except that the lowest argument is the predicate in this case: exist’ ([be’ (due ne, [yellow’)])]. The quantifier is focal, and ne-cliticization is licensed.

   In conclusion, even though copular constructions with adjectival predicates are stative, and thus pattern with the unaccusative side of the intransi-
tivity split, they are relatively incompatible with *ne*-cliticization. I have argued that this is due to the fact that copular constructions normally involve predicate focus in discourse. I have further pointed out that the adjectival predicates which are regarded by Cinque (1990) as unaccusative are type-(iii) experiencer predicates, whether lexically modalized (e.g., *prevedibile* ‘foreseeable’) or not (e.g., *noto* ‘well-known’). *Ne*-cliticization is not as problematic with these classes of adjectives as with other classes, in that they satisfy Van Valin’s (1993) second condition on *ne*-cliticization: the lowest argument in the semantic representation is available for morphosyntactic purposes. However, since the constraint on focus structure is not satisfied, *ne*-cliticization only yields marginally acceptable results, unless an existential construal is possible. Resultant state predicates related to passives (e.g., *spezzato* ‘broken’) are considered by Cinque (1990) to be unergative. However, there is evidence which suggests that they behave similarly to type-(iii) experiencer adjectives, and should be classified accordingly. A second class, which was regarded as unergative by Cinque, concerns adjectives which allow either an individual-level or a stage-level reading (e.g., *buono* ‘good’ or ‘well-behaved’). Such adjectives only allow *ne*-cliticization of their argument if an existential stage-level reading arises, depending on the choice of the copula, the presence of focusing elements in the clause, and aspect. Finally, constructions with a third class of adjectives are considerably more resilient to the existential reading, in that this class is associated with individual-level properties (e.g., *alto* ‘tall’). With such predicates, *ne*-cliticization is only allowed if an existential predicate is overtly marked by *ci* ‘there’.

### 6.4.2 Constructions with locative and nominal predicates

On a par with adjectival predicates, locative and nominal predicates require a copula in Italian (see section 5.6). This copula is normally *essere* ‘be’, although *stare* ‘stay’ can occur in locative structures:

\[(59) \quad \text{a.} \quad \text{Due sono / stanno sul tavolo.} \quad \text{Two be.3PL stay.3PL on.the table} \quad \text{‘Two are on the table.’} \]

\[(59) \quad \text{b.} \quad \text{Due sono / *stanno insegnanti.} \quad \text{Two be.3PL stay.3PL teacher.MPL} \quad \text{‘Two are teachers.’} \]
Ne-cliticization is banned from the copular structures exemplified in (59a) and (59b), as is shown below:

(60)  a. *Ne sono / stanno sul tavolo due.
    QCL be.3PL stay.3PL on.the table two
    ‘Two ne are on the table.’
    b. *Ne sono insegnanti due.
    QCL be.3PL teacher.MPL two
    ‘Two ne are teachers.’

From the perspective adopted in this work, the findings in (60b) are to be expected, in view of the sensitivity of ne-cliticization to the prominence of the arguments in the semantic representation. In fact, the lowest argument is the only predicator in the clause, and is thus unavailable for ne-cliticization.

The same argument does not hold for (60a), however, since locative predicates are bivalent states whose second argument is available in morphosyntax (be-LOC’ (x, y)). The ungrammaticality of structures like (60a), therefore, must depend on the first constraint on ne-cliticization, viz. the restriction on focus structure. Indeed, copular constructions with both nominal and locative predicates pattern with other copular structures, in that they normally assert the relation between a presupposed argument and a focal predicate. Suffice it to mention that the occurrence of a focal argument in postnuclear position is hardly acceptable and obligatorily marks contrastive focus (??Sono sul tavolo QUESTI, non QUELLI ‘it is these, not those, that are on the table’, ??Sono insegnanti QUESTI, non QUELLI ‘it is these, not those, who are teachers’).

As is the case with the classes of adjectives which are resistant to a stage-level reading (cf. (58)), the existential reading is only really triggered by the clitic ci ‘there’, in constructions with nominal and locative predicates. Predictably, it is only in structures with ci that ne-cliticization is licensed. Compare (60a) and (60b) with the following related examples, where the linear order indicates that the quantifier is focal:

(61)  a. Ce ne sono / stanno due sul tavolo.
    CL QCL be.3PL stay.3PL two on.the table
    ‘There are two (which are) on the table.’
b. *Ci ci vanno a casa.*
1. exist′ ([be-on′ (tavolo, due ne)])
2. exist′ ([be′ (due ne, [teachers ′])])

The obligatoriness of the clitic *ci* ‘there’ in locative constructions further challenges the locative analysis of *ne*-cliticization. If *ci* marked a locational argument in constructions with *ne*-cliticization, it would be expected to figure in all constructions with *ne*-cliticization with the exception of locative ones. Not only would it be redundant, in this domain, but it would violate a constraint on the syntax of resumptive clitics. These are required when a co-referent argument is absent or syntactically detached, and ruled out, when the co-referent argument occurs within the same clause (*Ci vanno a casa* ‘they go home’ vs. *(ci) vanno, a casa ′home, they go there’). However, locative structures are among a very small number of stative constructions which require *ci* in conjunction with *ne*-cliticization in Italian. This is evidence that *ci* marks something else in conjunction with *ne*-cliticization, namely an existential predicate.

6.4.3 *Ne*-cliticization in matrix coding as PSA or non-PSA

In this section I return to complex predicates, and I pay particular attention to constructions which comprise non-verbal units: matrix coding as PSA or non-PSA (Frajzynger 1995; VVLP: 561–575). These structures are normally referred to with the term raising, since, in English, they exhibit two syntactic cores, and the PSA or the object of the highest core is provided by the second predicate in the semantic representation (see *I believe them to be dead*, where the object in the syntactic core of *believe*′ is provided by the predicate *dead*). In Italian, only matrix coding as PSA can occur across cores, as we shall see below, and the defining property of these constructions is that the PSA or the object of the clause is provided by the
second predicate in the semantic representation. Thus, the third-person plural argument of the second predicate, *lavorare* ‘work’, serves as the PSA of (62a), as is shown by the inflection on *sembrare* ‘seem’. By contrast, the highest argument of *sembrare* ‘seem’ is not assigned a macrorole, and is realized in syntax as a dative argument, as is the case with the highest argument of experiencer predicates of type (iii) (see section 3.4). The PSA of the clause in (62b) is the first-person singular highest argument of *credere* ‘believe’, whilst the third-person plural argument of the adjectival predicate *morti* ‘dead’ serves as the direct object of the clause (see the direct-object clitic *li* ‘them’):

(62) a. *Mi* sembrano aver lavorato già abbastanza.

   DCL.1SG seem.3PL have work.PP already enough

   ‘They seem to me to have worked enough already.’

b. *Li* credo morti.

   OCL.MPL believe.1SG dead.MPL

   ‘I believe them to be dead.’

Note in passing that the construction exemplified in (62b) differs from the complex predicates of perception illustrated above in (21) and (22) (see Figure 20), insofar as, in (62b), the object of the clause is not the second argument of the first predicate. Rather, the second argument of *credere* ‘believe’ is the whole semantic representation of *morti* ‘dead’: *believe*(1SG, [dead(3PL)]). Evidence of this difference is the fact that, in the core co-ordination with a verb of perception, the second predicate can be omitted. The same does not hold true of the matrix-coding construction:

(63) a. *La* vedo (lavare la macchina).

   OCL see.1SG wash the car

   ‘I see her (wash the car).’

b. *Li* credo *(morti)*.

   OCL.MPL believe.1SG dead.MPL

   ‘I believe them *(to be dead).*’

The semantic difference between the structure with matrix coding (cf. (62b)) and complex predicates of perception (cf. (21) and (22)) is indicated by the absence of underlining in the semantic representation of matrix coding.
Matrix coding as non-PSA allows *ne*-cliticization in Italian, as is shown by the data in (64):

(64) Ne reputano / considerano / credono valido uno.
QCL believe.3PL consider.3PL believe.3PL valid.MSG one
‘They believe one *ne* to be valid.’

The facts illustrated in (64) are not problematic, since the two predicates are joined at the level of the nucleus, as is suggested by the position of the clitics in (62b) and (64). In addition, both conditions on *ne*-cliticization are satisfied, in that the complex predicate in question is stative, the *ne*-cliticized argument is the lowest argument, and the topical head or core of the *ne*-cliticized nominal contrasts with a focal quantifier.

Turning now to *ne*-cliticization in matrix coding as PSA, I should note first that *sembra* ‘seem’ can link to bare nuclei or to more complex syntactic structures:

(65) a. Me ne sembra valido uno.
DCL QCL seem.3SG valid.MSG one
‘One *ne* seems to me to be valid.’

b. Sembra esserne valido uno.
Seem.3SG be.QCL valid.MSG one
‘One *ne* seems to be valid.’

c. *Ne sembra essere valido uno.
QCL seem.3SG be valid.MSG one
‘One *ne* seems to be valid.’

The position of the clitic *ne* in (65a) indicates that *sembra* ‘seem’ joins with the bare adjective at the level of the nucleus. This hypothesis is corroborated by the fact that the sole adjectival predicate cannot be negated by core negation (*Me ne sembra non valido uno ‘one seems to me not to be valid’). Since *sembra* is a type-(iii) experiencer predicate, the semantic representation of (65a) must be comparable to the one proposed above with respect to type-(iii) experiencer adjectives, except that *sembra* ‘seem’ figures in place of the operator be* in this case: seem* (x, [pred* (y)]). Since the lowest argument is available, *ne*-cliticization is licensed.121

As for the contrast in (65b) vs. (65c), which was first brought to light by Perlmutter (1983: 164–170), it appears to be determined by the level of juncture of the complex predicate in question. Observe the scope of modal-
ity in (66a) and negation in (66b), as well as the position of clitics in (66c) and (66d):

(66)  
       Seem.3PL can be valid.MPL
       ‘It seems that they can be valid.’
   b. *Sembrano non esser validi.
       Seem.3PL NEG be valid.MPL
       ‘They do not seem to be valid.’
   c. *Li sembrano aver comprati.
       OCL.MPL seem.3PL have buy.PP.MPL
       ‘They seem to have bought them.’
   d. *Sembrano averli comprati.
       Seem.3PL have.OCL.MPL buy.PP.MPL
       ‘They seem to have bought them.’

Since the modal operator *potere* ‘can’ only has scope over the second predicate in (66a), the two predicates cannot be joined at the nuclear level, but rather must be joined at the core level. The same conclusion is reached on the basis of the scope of core negation in (66b). Clitic placement in (66c) and (66d) further supports the same point. It follows that (65c) is ungrammatical because the clitic figures outside its core.

I conclude that *ne*-cliticization is grammatical in matrix-coding as non-PSA, since this involves a nuclear juncture in Italian, and both conditions on *ne*-cliticization can be met. Matrix-coding as PSA can only license *ne*-cliticization if it involves a nuclear juncture, as is the case with the complex predicates formed with *sembrare* and a bare adjectival nucleus.

6.4.4 Non-verbal predicates: Conclusion

I have considered *ne*-cliticization in copular constructions with adjectival, nominal and locative predicates, and I have accounted for the puzzling behaviour of these structures vis-à-vis *ne*-cliticization. The first condition on *ne*-cliticization is not satisfied in these constructions because they assert the relation between a presupposed argument and a focal predicate. Contrastive narrow focus on the argument is also a possibility, but a very marginal one indeed. Even though the structures under scrutiny are stative, the second condition on *ne*-cliticization is not normally met, since the lowest-
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ranking argument is unavailable for morphosyntactic purposes. There are some exceptions, i.e., some copular constructions with adjectival predicates which have their lowest argument available for ne-cliticization. These include the adjectives which Cinque (1990) claimed to be unaccusative. I have classified these exceptional structures into two kinds: type-(iii) experiencer predicates, whether lexically modalized (e.g., prevedibile ‘foreseeable’) or not (e.g., noto ‘well-known’), and resultative state predicates related to passives (e.g., spezzato ‘broken’).

Interestingly, the lowest argument of any non-verbal predicate can be ne-cliticized if an existential reading arises. There are non-verbal predicates which are particularly resistant to such a reading, and I have claimed, with evidence from the choice of copula and the relative incompatibility with the perfect, that this is normally due to their being associated with individual-level properties.

I have further examined a number of complex predicates with matrix coding as PSA or non-PSA which exhibit non-verbal predicates. When the semantic and pragmatic conditions on ne-cliticization are met, whether or not this is licensed depends on the level of juncture of the complex predicate: ne-cliticization does not occur across cores.

The vexed question of whether adjectives are unaccusative or unergative predicates can only be solved by recognizing that, whilst split intransitivity in Italian manifests the tension between accusative and active alignment, some diagnostics are sensitive to the role of arguments in semantics-syntax mappings, and others are not. In addition, the diagnostics of split intransitivity are affected to various extents by information-structure constraints. Thus, the selection of the perfective operator and the marking with si are only concerned with the PSA (or pivot) of the clause. The import of information-structure constraints on these diagnostics is minimal. Past-participle agreement would seem to constitute semantically-driven active alignment, in that it targets the undergoer, whether or not this serves as a PSA. I have nonetheless shown that, if a marked actor and an undergoer compete as triggers of past-participle agreement, the former prevails in Modern Standard Italian, and this is likely to be a sign that past-participle agreement is yielding to pressure from the predominant accusative alignment. In addition, the topical or focal value of the trigger in discourse plays an important role in past-participle agreement.

Ne-cliticization originates from the lowest-ranking argument of a state, regardless of whether this is a PSA or an object. Ne-cliticization of the undergoer of adjectival and nominal predicates is problematic because this
is not the lowest-ranking argument of the constructions in question (with some exceptions, which I have discussed above). Other diagnostics (perfective-operator selection and past-participle agreement, etc.) mark adjectival predicates as unaccusative because they are not exclusively concerned with the lowest argument in the semantic representation. *Ne*-cliticization is further affected by information structure constraints, since it marks a discontinuous constituent with a topical head or core and a focal quantifier. In particular, *ne*-cliticization occurs in narrow focus and sentence focus, but not in predicate focus. Given that copular constructions assert the relation between a topical argument and a focal predicate, *ne*-cliticization is problematic in these constructions.

Unless the interaction of information-structure conditions and semantic constraints on *ne*-cliticization is taken into account, the complex set of data which copular constructions present us with remains a mystery, and so does the mismatch between *ne*-cliticization and the other diagnostics of split intransitivity.

As a last argument in favour of the view that *ne*-cliticization is problematic in copular constructions because of its sensitivity to the semantic prominence of the cliticized argument and to focus structure, consider what follows. If, in a language, *ne*-cliticization simply indicated the active vs. inactive split, with no regard to semantic prominence or focus structure, the domain of *ne*-cliticization would be comparable to that of past-participle agreement in Old Italian. Data from Old Sicilian lead one to think that such a language might have existed at a previous stage of the history of Romance. I have examined these data in depth in Bentley (2004c). In this context, I simply wish to offer some relevant evidence, as an illustration of the said theoretical possibility:

\[(67)\] \textit{Ndi foru vaki figlati lxxvij.} (Old Sic.)
\text{QCL be.3PL.PST cow.PL give.birth.PP.PL eighty-seven}
\text{Eighty-seven *ne* were cows which had just given birth.}'
\textit{(Il «Caternu» dell’Abate Senisio, p. 227, 73v.: 23)}

Although the text from which I drew the data in (67) is reliable in philological terms, the fact that data like those in (67) have only been found in this text casts a shadow on the validity of this evidence as representative of Old Sicilian. It might simply be representative of the idiolect of the author, or of any of the copiers. It might be typical of the style represented by the text in question. However, this is unimportant for the purposes of the pre-
sent discussion. What these data illustrate is a language where ndi ‘ne’ realizes the undergoer, regardless of semantic prominence or focus. Observe that the non-verbal predicate exhibited by (67) is amongst the most resistant to the existential reading in Modern Italian (a nominal predicate, vaki figlati ‘cows which have just given birth’). The cited micro-variation supports the answer that my analysis has provided to the question of the nature of copular constructions in terms of split intransitivity: these align with unaccusatives in terms of Aktionsart, but fail to license ne-cliticization due to the constraints on semantic prominence and focus structure which are specific to this morphosyntactic phenomenon.

6.5 Ne-cliticization in si-constructions

The various kinds of si-construction analysed in Chapter 4 pattern differently with respect to ne-cliticization, in Italian as in other languages, and this fact has been regarded by others as evidence that reflexives are not unaccusative structures (see Reinhart and Siloni’s 2004 proposal, which contrasts with Grimshaw 1990; Labelle 1992; Marantz 1984). The question of whether reflexives, and si-constructions in general, are unaccusative does not arise as such from the theoretical perspective taken in this work. Si-constructions have, by definition, a marked PSA, and thus select E in Italian. Their behaviour vis-à-vis other diagnostics of split intransitivity depends on the unique combination of semantic, pragmatic and syntactic constraints which are relevant to each diagnostic. In this section, I explain the behaviour of Italian si-constructions vis-à-vis ne-cliticization in terms of the two well-formedness conditions introduced in section 6.2.

Si-impersonals do not exhibit ne-cliticization if there is only one argument position in the semantic representation (Si arriva ‘one arrives’, si muore ‘one dies’, etc.). This fact is to be expected, since, as a result of the suppression of the highest-ranking argument, there is no argument left available for quantification and ne-cliticization. Si-impersonals which exhibit a second argument, as is the case with (68a), can license ne-cliticization of the lower argument, as is shown in (68b):

(68) a. Si compra due penne.
    IMP buy.3SG two pens
    ‘One buys two pens.’
    (Lepschy 1978: 34)
b. Se ne compra due.
   IMP QCL buy.3SG two
   ‘One buys two ne.’

The most straightforward interpretation of the structure in (68b) treats this structure as a non-monadic reflexive (‘S/he buys two ne for herself/himself’), and I return to non-monadic reflexives below. Empirically, construals like (68b) are infrequent, just like their correlate in (68a) (see section 4.3.1). However, the structure in question is grammatical, since both conditions on ne-cliticization are satisfied.

The si-passive counterpart of (68b) is also grammatical, and it would be preferred to (68b) according to most speakers (see section 4.3.2):

(69) Se ne comprano due.
   IMP QCL buy.3PL two
   ‘Two ne are bought.’

In the structure represented in (69), ne realizes a topical nominal head or core with a focal quantifier, and the quantified argument is the lowest-ranking argument of a state embedded under BECOME. Incidentally, the grammaticality of ne-cliticization in such structures supports the hypothesis that si marks the suppression of the highest argument in the semantic representation, assuming that ne-cliticization targets the lowest-ranking argument.

As for reflexives, the ne-cliticization of the lowest argument of non-monadic reflexives is not problematic:

(70) a. Clelia si compra una macchina.
   Clelia RFL buy.3SG a car
   ‘Clelia buys a car for herself.’

   b. Clelia se ne compra una.
   Clelia RFL QCL buy.3SG one
   ‘Clelia buys one ne for herself.’

In section 4.2.6, I pointed out that the suppression of the highest-ranking argument in non-monadic reflexives leaves two arguments available for macrorole assignment. Ne-cliticization affects the lowest one, as is shown in (70b):
(70) b1. [[do´ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME have´ (Ø, una ne)]]
    PURP [have´ (Clelia, una ne)]

It is worth pointing out that the marked actor of non-monadic reflexives is not a trigger of ne-cliticization (*Se ne comprano una macchina molti / molti una macchina ‘many ne buy themselves a car’), whereas this argument is the controller of past-participle agreement in Modern Standard Italian (see section 5.3.1). This fact further supports the view put forward in this chapter that ne-cliticization manifests a semantically-principled type of alignment, in that it only targets the lowest-ranking argument of a state, and, unlike past-participle agreement, it does not yield to pressure from accusative alignment.

The facts are less clear in the case of monadic reflexives, and this might explain why there is hitherto no exhaustive treatment of ne-cliticization with reflexives. The results of a survey which I conducted with native-speaker informants have nonetheless brought to light the following patterns of distribution: (i) constructions with ne-cliticization of the lowest argument of causative and non-causative non-inherent reflexives receive a passive interpretation (cf. (71)); (ii) anticausative reflexives license ne-cliticization of their lowest argument, provided that this is available for morphosyntactic purposes (cf. (72)); (iii) ne-cliticization of the lowest argument of inherent reflexives is only acceptable if this can be interpreted as a di- or da-complement, or with the aid of factors which I illustrate below (cf. (73)). I start with non-causative (non-inherent) and causative reflexives:

(71) a. Se ne vedono / radono / lavano molti.
    RFL QCL see.3PL shave.3PL wash.3PL many.MPL
    ‘Many ne are / get seen / shaved / washed.’
    (Not ‘many ne see / shave / wash themselves.’)

b. Se ne uccidono / tagliano molti, apposta.
    RFL QCL kill.3PL cut.3PL many.MPL on.purpose
    ‘Many ne get killed / cut on purpose.’
    (Not ‘many ne kill / cut themselves on purpose.’)

The translations of the examples in (71a) indicate that two kinds of interpretation should in theory be licensed by the structures in question: a passive one and a reflexive one (see sections 4.3.2 and 4.2.3). However, the reflexive reading is disallowed, according to most native speakers. The
same holds for the set of examples in (71b), except that these structures are causative (see section 4.2.2).

In my analysis of reflexives, I claimed that, in the semantic representation of non-causative (non-inherent) and causative reflexives, the suppressed argument is co-referent with a lower argument. This co-reference is marked by co-indexation, as is shown below in the semantic representations of *vedersi* ‘see oneself’ (cf. (71a’)), and *tagliarsi* ‘cut oneself’ (cf. (71b’)):

(71)  a’.* see˚ (Ø, x_i) (reflexive)
     b’.[[do˚ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME cut˚ (x_i)]] (reflexive)

The lowest argument of these states should in principle lend itself to *ne*-cliticization, since it is available for morphosyntactic purposes, and it can be focal in discourse. The incompatibility of these reflexives with *ne*-cliticization must thus depend on the co-indexation of the *ne*-cliticized argument with the suppressed one, as is suggested by the contrast of the semantic representations in (71a”) and (71b”) with their *si*-passive correlates:

(71)  a”. * see˚ (Ø, x) (*si*-passive)
     b”.[[do˚ (Ø, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME cut˚ (x)]] (*si*-passive)

The semantic representations in (71a”) and (71b”) differ from those in (71a”) and (71b”) purely insofar as co-indexation is concerned: the lowest argument is not co-referent with the suppressed one in the *si*-passive structures. Given that *ne*-cliticization targets the lowest argument in the semantic representation, if the lowest argument is co-referent with a higher argument, it is not as good a candidate for *ne*-cliticization as the lowest-ranking argument of the corresponding structure without co-indexation. Observe that co-indexation in the semantic representation is not problematic as such, but only if it affects the *ne*-cliticized argument, as is indicated by the grammaticality of (70b) (cf. (70b”).

Anticausative reflexives face us with sets of apparently conflicting data:

(72)  a. * Se ne aprono / rompono / bruciano due.  
     RFL QCL open.3PL break.3PL burn.3PL two 
     ‘Two *ne* open / break / burned.’
     ‘Two *ne* are / get opened / broken / burned.’
b. Se ne spaventano / preoccupano / irritano due.
   RFL QCL scare.3PL worry.3PL irritate.3PL two
   ‘One scares / *worries / irritates two ne.’ (passive)
   ‘??Two ne are /get scared / worried / irritated’ (reflexive)
   ‘Two are scared of / worry about / are irritated at x.’ (reflexive)

The facts in (72a) are fairly uncontroversial, both on an anticausative and on a passive (causative) reading. The acceptability of the passive reading is expected, given that it involves no co-indexation in the semantic representation, and so is the acceptability of the anticausative interpretation, assuming as I do that anticausatives do not involve co-indexation either (see section 4.2.2). I illustrate this point with respect to the semantic representation of the anticausative aprirsi ‘open’:

\[(72)\]  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a}^1. \left[ \text{do} \ (Ø, Ø) \right] \text{CAUSE} \left[ \text{BECOME open} \ (due \ ne) \right] \\
\text{(anticausative reflexive)}
\end{array}
\]

The facts in (72b) might appear to be contradictory, in that the passive reading – which is translated with impersonal one – is generally recognized to be acceptable, with the exception of ‘worry’:

\[(72)\]  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{b}^1. \left[ \text{do} \ (Ø, Ø) \right] \text{CAUSE} \left[ \text{BECOME scared} \ (due \ ne) \right] \\
\text{(si-passive)}
\end{array}
\]

The contrast between preoccupare ‘worry’ and other type-(ii) experiencer verbs was dealt with in section 3.3, where it was pointed out that the causer of preoccupare ‘worry’ resists an arbitrary interpretation to a greater extent than the highest argument of other type-(ii) experiencer verbs (e.g., offendere ‘offend’) because it is usually an effector rather than an agentive instigator. In addition, whilst other type-(ii) experiencer verbs are relatively incompatible with the analytic passive, preoccupare ‘worry’ rules it out. The data discussed in section 3.3 are supported by the results of my survey on ne-cliticization with reflexives; the passive (causative) reading of ‘worry’ does not arise in (72b), given that si indicates a human argument, and human causers are more easily associated with agents than with effectors. A fare-causative would be used instead of the structure in (72b): se ne fanno preoccupare due ‘one causes two ne to worry’.

The reflexive reading of (72b) is problematic, in that the lowest-ranking argument is only available on the inchoative reading of these structures
‘two get scared, get worried, get irritated’, cf. (72b^2)), and not on the static one (‘two are scared / worry / are irritated’, cf. (72b^3)):

(72)  \[ \begin{align*}
&b^2: \left[ \text{do}^\prime \left( \emptyset, \emptyset \right) \right. \text{CAUSE} \left[ \text{INGR afraid}' \ (\text{due ne}) \right] \right) \text{CAUSE} \left[ \text{feel}' \ (\text{due ne, [afraid']}) \right] \] \text{(stative)}
&b^3: \left[ \text{do}^\prime \left( \emptyset, \emptyset \right) \right. \text{CAUSE} \left[ \text{feel}' \ (\text{due, [afraid.of']}) \right] \] \text{(stative)}
\end{align*} \]

As is the case with copular constructions (see sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.2), the argument that is available for ne-cliticization is not the lowest one in the structure illustrated in (72b^3), since the lowest semantic argument serves as a predicate (afraid'). Finally, many speakers have pointed out that the reflexives in (72b) are entirely acceptable if ne replaces a di-complement of the predicate (Due si spaventano / preoccupano / irritano di ciò ‘two are scared of / worry about / are irritated at x’). This is predicted, on the basis of my analysis of type-(ii) experiencer predicates, in that the lowest argument is available in this case. Ne realizes the lowest argument in the semantic representation below:

(72)  \[ \begin{align*}
&b^3: \left[ \text{do}^\prime \left( \emptyset, \emptyset \right) \right. \text{CAUSE} \left[ \text{feel}' \ (\text{due, [afraid.of'] (ne)}) \right] \] \text{(stative)}
\end{align*} \]

The lowest argument of (72b^3) is not a macrorole (see section 3.3), and this indicates that the semantic condition on ne-cliticization is concerned with the lowest ranking argument, rather than with the undergoer as such. In addition, the lowest argument of (72b^4) is an indirect argument of the predicate. Ne does not realize the head or core of a quantified noun phrase, in these structures, but rather a separate, indirect argument. I return to this type of ne in section 6.6.

Turning finally to inherent reflexives, many native speakers, although by no means all, deem ne-cliticization of the argument of these predicates to be odd (cf. (73a)^123 unless ne realizes a di- or da-complement of the predicate (cf. (73b)). Interestingly, the inherent reflexives which can take a di- or da-complement also appear to lend themselves more easily to ne-cliticization of their direct argument, if the di- or da complement is absent (cf. (73b)). Finally, if an existential interpretation is conveyed by the context, ne-cliticization is acceptable with any inherent reflexive (cf. (73c)):

(73)  \[ \begin{align*}
&a. \ *?Se \ ne \ arrabbiano \ / \ trastullano \ / \ ostinano \ due. \\
&RFL \ QCL \ get.angry.3PL \ dawdle.3PL \ be.obstinate.3PL \ due \ ‘Two \ ne \ get \ angry / \ dawdle / \ are \ obstinate.’
\end{align*} \]
b. Se ne pentono / ammalano / astengono due.
   RFL QCL repent.3PL get.ill.3PL abstain.3PL two
   ‘Two ne repent of / get ill with / abstain from it.’
   ‘Two ne repent / get ill / abstain.’

c. Se ne trastullano molti, *?(studenti, a marzo).
   RFL QCL dawdle.3PL many.MPL student.MPL at March
   ‘Students, there are many ne who dawdle in March.’

The realization with ne of the di- or da-complement of (73b) is predicted, since, in this case, ne stands for the lowest argument of a state. Needless to say, in this case, as in (72b), we are not dealing with the ne which originates from a quantified noun phrase. The facts in (73c) are also straightforward, since the ne-cliticized argument is the only argument of an existential predicate. The speaker judgements on (73a) pose a bigger challenge, since the available argument is the only argument of a state (cf. (73a\textsuperscript{1})), and is thus predicted to allow ne-cliticization:

(73) \textsuperscript{a\textsuperscript{1}}. BECOME angry\textsuperscript{‘} (x) [Ø]

The relative ungrammaticality of forms such as those in (73a) must depend on the marking of the argument as a suppressed one. Observe that, in the reflexive structures which have been found to license ne-cliticization (non-monadic, anticausative, reflexives with a di- or da-complement, and reflexives embedded in an existential predication), the ne-cliticized argument is independent of the suppressed one. Contrastingly, ne-cliticization is not allowed if the ne-cliticized argument is co-indexed with a higher, suppressed, one (see causative and non-causative non-inherent reflexives, which obligatorily yield a passive reading if subject to ne-cliticization). In (73a\textsuperscript{1}), the potential trigger of ne-cliticization is the argument that is marked as suppressed. The evidence suggests that many speakers consider this marking to hinder ne-cliticization, similarly to a violation of the requirement that the ne-cliticized argument must be the lowest-ranking one.

As for the possibility of interpretation of (73b) as ‘two ne repent / get ill / abstain’, it does not represent conflicting evidence with respect to (73a). In fact, unlike the reflexives in (73b), those in (73a) do not take a di- or da-complement. Accordingly, a lexical factor must be at work here: the verbs which admit one kind of ne are also more likely to admit the other.

The distribution of ne-cliticization in si-constructions supports the classification of such structures which was proposed in Chapter 4: ne-
cliticization is not problematic if the *ne*-cliticized argument is the lowest-ranking one in the semantic representation, it is available in morphosyntax, and it is not co-indexed with the suppressed highest argument (or – according to many speakers – is not itself marked as suppressed).

6.6 Other functions of *ne*

In this final section I discuss other functions of *ne*, which I refer to as pro-*di* and pro-*da*. I distinguish two kinds of pro-*di ne*: type (a), which originates from the complement of a nominal argument or a quantifier (in RRG terms, an indirect core argument of a nominal or quantifier head), and type (b), which stands for the complement of a verbal, nominal, or adjectival predicate. Pro-*da ne* can be thought of as a locational argument. In what follows, I examine the distribution of the various types of *ne*, and I propose a unified account which captures the constraints that hold for each type. I illustrate below the functions of *ne*:

(74) a. *Pacchi, *ne arrivano pochi.* (head of quantified NP)
   Parcel.MPL QCL arrive.3PL few.MPL
   ‘Parcels, only few *ne* arrive.’

   b. *Di quei pacchi, *ne arriva una parte.* (type-(a) pro-*di*)
   Of those parcels PCL arrive.3PL a part
   ‘Of those parcels, only a part *ne* arrives.’

   c. *Di Giulia, *ne conosco la sorella.* (type-(a) pro-*di*)
   Of Julia GCL know.1SG the sister.FSG
   ‘Of Julia, I know the sister *ne,*.’

   d. *Del progetto, *ne discutono.* (type-(b) pro-*di*)
   Of.the project GCL discuss.3PL
   ‘About the project, they discuss *ne.*’

   e. *Dall’ ufficio, *ne esce adesso.* (pro-*da*)
   From.the office LCL come.out.3SG now
   ‘From the office, s/he is coming out *ne* just now.’

Both the *ne* which is the head or core of a quantified noun phrase (cf. (74a)) and type-(a) pro-*di ne* (cf. (74b) and (74c)) originate from a direct argument of the predicate. Type-(a) pro-*di ne* realizes the topical di-complement of this direct argument (see *di quei pacchi* ‘of those parcels’ in (74b) and *di Giulia* ‘of Julia’ in (74c)), which is split from its focal head
(see *una parte* ‘a part’ in (74b) and *la sorella* ‘the sister’ in (74c)). Observe that, apart from a partitive and a possessor complement, type-(a) pro-*di ne* can stand for an agent or an effector (cf. (75)), a theme (cf. (76)), or a patient (cf. (77)). For convenience, I use the gloss GCL for all kinds of type-(a) pro-*di ne* with the exception of the partitive one, which I gloss as PCL (cf. (74b)):

(75) a. *Temono l’attacco delle sinistre.*
   Fear.3PL the attack of.the lefts
   ‘They fear the attack of the left-wing parties.’

     b. *Ne temono l’attacco.*
     GCL fear.3PL the attack
     ‘They fear the attack *ne* (of them).’

(76) a. *Gradiscono il regalo di una nuova bicicletta.*
   Appreciate.3PL the present of a new bike
   ‘They appreciate the present of a new bike.’

     b. *Ne gradiscono il regalo.*
     GCL appreciate.3PL the present
     ‘They appreciate the present *ne* (of it).’

(77) a. *Condannano la distruzione di quell’edificio.*
   Condemn.3PL the destruction of that building
   ‘They condemn the destruction of that building.’

     b. *Ne condannano la distruzione.*
     GCL condemn.3PL the destruction
     ‘They condemn the destruction *ne* (of it).’

Type-(b) pro-*di ne* and pro-*da ne* contrast with quantified *ne* and type-(a) pro-*di ne* in that they realize an indirect complement of the predicate of the clause. Thus, in (74d), *ne* realizes the indirect complement of *discutere* ‘discuss’ (*del progetto* ‘about the project’), whilst, in (74e), *ne* realizes the indirect complement of *uscire* ‘go out’ (*dall’ufficio* ‘from the office’).

Let us now investigate further the distribution of type-(a) pro-*di ne*, with a view to comparing it with that of quantified *ne*. In (78), I illustrate partitive *ne* and, in (79), genitive *ne*:
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(78) a. Di quei candidati, ne scelgono tre.
   Of those candidates PCL choose.3PL three
   ‘Of those candidates, they choose three ne.’

b. Di quei documenti, ne scompaiono due.
   Of those documents PCL disappear.3PL two
   ‘Of those documents, two ne disappear.’

c. Di quei fatti, ne è nota la metà.
   Of those facts PCL be.3PL w.-known.FSG the half.FSG
   ‘Of those facts, only half ne are well-known.’

d. *Di quei soldati, ne marcia una dozzina
   Of those soldiers PCL march.3SG a dozen
   ‘Of those soldiers, a dozen ne march.’

e. *Di quei compiti, ne è buona una parte.
   Of those assignments PCL be.3SG good.FSG a part.FSG
   ‘Of those assignments, a part ne is well done.’

(79) a. Del tuo amico, ne conosco la famiglia.
   Of.the your friend GCL know.1SG the family
   ‘Of your friend, I know the family ne.’

b. Di quei soldi, ne basta la metà.
   Of those money.PL GCL suffice.3SG the half
   ‘Of that money, half ne is sufficient.’

c. Di quei problemi, ne è certa la causa.
   Of those problems GCL be.3SG certain.FSG the cause.FSG
   ‘Of those problems, the cause ne is certain.’

d. *Dell’ alunno, ne ha telefonato il padre.
   ‘Of the pupil, GCL have.3SG phone.PP the father
   ‘Of that pupil, the father ne has phoned.’

e. *Di quei bambini, ne è buona la tata.
   ‘Of those kids GCL be.3SG good.FSG the nanny.FSG
   ‘Of those kids, the nanny ne is good.’

The data in (78) and (79) indicate that type-(a) pro-di ne originates from the lowest argument of transitive constructions (cf. (78a) and (79a)) or of E-selecting intransitives (cf. (78b) and (79b)) and of type-(iii) experiencer adjectives (cf. (78c) and (79c)). Contrastingly, it does not originate from the PSA of A-selecting intransitives and of adjectives which do not have their lowest argument available for morphosyntactic purposes (cf. (78d), (78e), (79d), and (79e)). The above distribution is comparable with the
distribution of the *ne* which realizes the head or core of a quantified noun phrase.

The comparability of type-(a) *pro-di ne* and the *ne* which is the focus of studies on split intransitivity has been noted by others (Cinque 1990; Cresti 2003). From the perspective adopted in this work, the correspondences illustrated above suggest that the semantic well-formedness condition on *ne*-cliticization which was introduced in section 6.2 also holds for type-(a) *pro-di ne*: both kinds of *ne* originate from the lowest-ranking argument of a state.

As for focus structure, both kinds of *ne* mark a topic vs. focus split. However, whereas quantified *ne* realizes the topical head or core of a discontinuous nominal constituent, type-(a) *pro-di ne* realizes the topical complement of such a constituent. This contrast explains a minor but significant morphosyntactic difference, which, to my knowledge, has not been accounted for by others. On the basis of the results of corpus analysis, in section 5.3.2, I pointed out that past-participle agreement with the focal quantifier of quantified *ne* occurs regularly in Modern Italian. The same cannot be said of past-participle agreement with the focal head of type-(a) *pro-di ne*. According to Lepschy and Lepschy (1988: 211), in this case agreement is optional (cf. (80a)). Indeed, I have not found agreement in my corpus (cf. (80b)):

(80) a. *Ne hanno mangiato/-a la metà.*
   GCL have.3PL eat.PP. FSG the half.FSG
   ‘They have eaten half *ne* (of it).’
   (Lepschy and Lepschy 1988: 211)

b. *Ne avevano scardinato le memorie.*
   GCL have.3PL.PST unhinge.PP the memory.FPL
   ‘They had unhinged the memories *ne* (of her).’
   (Masina, *Il volo del passero*, p. 91)

As I pointed out in Chapter 5, the agreement contrast between the two kinds of *ne* is explained by the fact that, in structures such as (80a) and (80b), the focal head of the undergoer argument is internal to the core of the clause. Core-internal focal undergoers are only optional triggers of agreement in Modern Standard Italian. In sum, although the two kinds of *ne* are comparable in that they originate from the lowest-ranking argument of a state, they do not pattern alike vis-à-vis a diagnostic of split intransitiv-
Other functions of *ne*, namely past-participle agreement, for reasons which are related to the discourse constraints on past-participle agreement.

Another fact which does not normally receive enough attention is that not every *di*-complement of a nominal head can be cliticized by *ne*. Observe the structures in (81a) and (81b), which exemplify type-(b) pro-*di ne*, since *ne* realizes the indirect complement of a nominal predicate:

\[(81) \quad \text{a. } \text{È l'insegnante di Carla} / \text{Ne è l'insegnante.} \]

\[\quad \text{Be.3SG the teacher of Carla GCL be.3SG the teacher} \]

\[\quad '\text{S/he is Carla's teacher} / '\text{S/he is the teacher } \text{ne (of her).}' \]

\[\quad \text{b. } \text{È l'insegnante di fisica} / *\text{Ne è l'insegnante.} \]

\[\quad \text{Be.3SG the teacher of physics GCL be.3SG the teacher} \]

\[\quad '\text{S/he is the teacher of physics} / '\text{S/he is the teacher } \text{ne (of it).}' \]

Both *l'insegnante di Carla* ‘the teacher of Carla’ (cf. (81a)) and *l'insegnante di fisica* ‘the teacher of physics’ (cf. (81b)) are predicative arguments, i.e., non-verbal predicates of copular constructions. However, only the indirect complement of the possessive argument in (81a) can be cliticized by *ne*. There is no reason to believe that the contrast between the two structures depends on the syntax of the two noun phrases. In fact, in both cases, the *di*-complement is an indirect core argument of the nominal head. The difference between the two structures must then depend on the semantic representation of the two non-verbal predicates. In particular, the predicate of (81b) is represented semantically as a whole, whilst the predicate of (81a) is not:

\[(81) \quad \text{a'. be'}(3SG, \text{[have'}(\text{Carla, insegnante})]) \]

\[\quad \text{b'. be'}(3SG, \text{[teacher.of.physics']}) \]

The lower argument of the possessive predicate in (81a') is the head of the nominal phrase in syntax, whilst the higher argument, i.e., the possessor, is its complement. Since the head and the complement are separate arguments in the semantic representation of the possessive noun phrase, they can constitute different information units in discourse. In particular, the possessor can be topical, in constrast with the possessee. Accordingly, the possessor can be realized by *ne*. The semantic representation of *l'insegnante di fisica* ‘teacher of physics’ treats the nominal phrase as a whole (cf. (81b')), even though in syntax, *l'insegnante* ‘the teacher’ is the head of the noun phrase and *di fisica* ‘of physics’ is its complement. In
accordance with this semantic representation, teacher.of.physics’ is treated as a unit in focus structure, and thus it cannot license the realization of the *di*-phrase with *ne*. In sum, *ne* does not originate from any *di*-complement of a nominal head; the *di*-complement must constitute a separate unit in semantic representation and focus structure, in order to be replaced by *ne*.

Type-(b) pro *di ne* can also realize the topical complement of a focal adjectival or verbal predicate:

(82)  
\[
\text{Sono contenti di ciò.} / \text{Ne sono contenti.} \\
\text{Be.3PL happy.MPL of this GCL be.3PL happy.MPL} \\
\text{‘They are happy about this.’ / ‘They are happy *ne* (about this).’}
\]

(83)  
\[
\text{Parlano di ciò} / \text{Ne parlano.} \\
\text{Talk.3PL of this GCL talk.3PL} \\
\text{‘They talk about this.’ / ‘They talk *ne* (about this).’}
\]

The data in (82) and (83) suggest that type-(b) pro-*di ne* targets the lowest argument in the semantic representation, as is the case with type-(a) pro-*di ne*:

(82)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{be} & \, (x, \, \text{[happy.about} \, y])
\end{align*}
\]

(83)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{do} & \, (x, \, \text{[express.(a).to.(β).in.language.(γ)} \, (x, \, y)]) \text{ CAUSE [BE-COME aware of} \, (y, \, z)] \, (y = β, \, z = α).
\end{align*}
\]

In the semantic representations above, type-(b) pro-*di ne* realizes the lowest argument. Crucially, the lowest argument of (83) is the non-macrorole argument of an activity (*parlare* ‘talk’). Thus, unlike type-(a) pro-*di ne*, type (b) is not restricted to states. Furthermore, type-(b) pro-*di ne* need not originate from a split argument (as is the case with (81a)), but rather normally replaces a topical indirect argument altogether. Accordingly, it figures in constructions where topical *ne* contrasts with a focal predicate. Evidence that type-(b) pro-*di ne* occurs in constructions with focus on the predicate is provided by structures with non-verbal predicates (cf. (82)), which constrain with ungrammatical constructions like (56a) (*Ne sono BUONI MOLTI ‘many *ne* are good’). The grammaticality of quantified *ne* in copular constructions is affected by the fact that both the predicate and the
quantifier are part of the assertion in these structures. In constructions with type-(b) pro-di ne, the same problem does not arise, since the predicate is the only information unit in the assertion.

A unified analysis of ne must therefore recognize that type-(b) pro-di ne realizes a topical argument, like the other kinds of ne, and this argument is the lowest one in the semantic representation. At the same time, however, type-(b) pro-di ne must be distinguished from the quantified ne that is normally considered in the literature on split intransitivity, and from type (a). In fact, type-(b) pro-di ne is not confined to states and it occurs in constructions with focus on the predicate.

Let us finally turn to pro-da ne and consider the examples below:

(84)  a. La morte di Roscio lo aveva profondamente
colpito. Ne aveva sentito vuoto e pena.
‘Roscio’s death had deeply affected him. He had drawn ne (from it) a sense of emptiness and pain.’
(Sciascia, A ciascuno il suo, p. 48)

b. Da quella fonte sgorga un’acqua purissima.
Ne sgorga un’acqua purissima.
‘Out of that spring gushes very pure water.’

(c. Sono disgustato dal tuo comportamento.
Ne sono disgustato.
‘I am disgusted with your behaviour.’

The argument realized by pro-da ne is not necessarily the lowest-one in the semantic representation. For instance, in (84a), ne realizes a location, whereas the arguments vuoto e pena ‘emptiness and pain’ are themes. In (84c), pro-da ne realizes a causer (see section 3.3). Pro-da ne can also originate from the topical actor of a passive:
Example (85) further indicates that pro-da ne need not realize the lowest argument in the semantic representation. In sum, it appears that neither type-(b) pro-di ne nor pro-da ne abide by the well-formedness constraints which hold both for quantified ne and for type-(a) pro-di ne. Type-(b) pro-di ne realizes the lowest argument of any kind of predicate, whilst pro-da ne does not target the lowest argument in the semantic representation. In neither case does ne mark a split constituent. The one trait that is shared by all kinds of ne is that this clitic indicates a topic vs. focus constrast, referring anaphorically to the topic.

Only quantified ne and type-(a) pro-di ne turn out to be relevant to the treatment of split intransitivity, in that they originate from the lowest argument of a state predicate, realizing the core (or head) and the complement of this argument, respectively.

6.7 Conclusion

Despite some apparent counterevidence, quantified ne (i.e., the ne which originates from a quantified noun phrase) is a diagnostic of split intransitivity. In fact, it targets the lowest-ranking argument of any state predicate, and it contrasts with morphosyntactic phenomena which are sensitive to the semantic prominence of the arguments, but are not restricted to states (the possessive dative). The stage-level existential reading which arises in sentence focus explains some apparently problematic uses of ne with A-selecting verbal predicates and with non-verbal predicates. Abstracting away from the effects of the well-formedness conditions on information structure, ne-cliticization is the manifestation of split intransitivity which, better than any other diagnostic considered so far, constitutes a type of alignment that is principled in semantic terms (active). The analysis conducted in this chapter indicates that, unlike past-participle agreement, ne-cliticization does not display any signs of pressure from the predominant syntactic alignment.

I have provided an analysis of ne-cliticization in si-constructions, explaining the apparently contradictory behaviour of reflexives on the basis of the theory of such structures developed in Chapter 4. Lastly, I have ex-
amined the uses of *ne* which do not originate from a quantified noun phrase. A unified account of *ne* is possible, and indeed desirable, as long as it captures the contrast between four types (quantified, type (a) pro-*di*, type (b) pro-*di*, and pro-*da*), and it explains why only quantified *ne* and type-(a) pro-*di* *ne* are diagnostics of split intransitivity.
Chapter 7
Past participles

7.1 Introduction

A much cited diagnostic of split intransitivity is the adjectival behaviour of past participles (see, among others, Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 2004: 5–6; Hoekstra 1984: 178–179; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 11; Perlmutter 1989: 69–71; Pesetsky 1988: 113–119). In particular, it has long been known that the past participle of verbs which test out as unaccusative in perfective constructions can have attributive function, similarly to an adjectival modifier (cf. (1)), whilst the past participle of verbs which test out as unergative in perfective constructions cannot have this function (cf. (2)). In this respect, the past participle of unaccusative structures patterns with the past participle of transitive structures, which can modify its lowest argument (cf. (3)):

(1)  
La ragazza è cresciuta / La ragazza cresciuta.
The girl.FSG be.3SG grow.PP.FSG The girl.FSG grow.PP.FSG
‘The girl has grown’ / Lit. The girl grown.

(2)  
La ragazza ha ballato / *La ragazza ballato / -a.
The girl.FSG have.3SG dance.PP The girl.FSG dance.PP -FSG
‘The girl has danced’ / Lit. The girl danced.

(3)  
Hanno costruito una casa / La casa costruita.
Have.3PL build.PP a house.FSG The house.FSG build.PP.FSG
‘They have built a house’ / Lit. The house built.

In terms of Aktionsart, the well-known facts exemplified in (1) to (3) suggest that the past participles of predicates which include a state can modify their lowest argument, whilst other past participles cannot (recall that the lowest argument of all kinds of achievement and accomplishment is the argument of a state).
Another well-known diagnostic of split intransitivity concerns absolute participial constructions. Specifically, the direct argument which immediately follows the absolute participle inside its core can only be an undergoer or a marked actor (see Perlmutter 1989: 67–68 for the claim that this argument is an object), as is indicated by the grammaticality contrast between (4) and (5):

(4) Cresciuta la ragazza,
    Grow.PP.FSG the girl.FSG
    non c' era più motivo di preoccuparsi di lei.
    NEG CL be.3SG.PST more reason of worry.RFL of her 'Once the girl had grown, there was no longer reason to take care of her.'

(5) *Telefonato / a la ragazza,
    Phone.PP FSG the girl.FSG
    non c' era più motivo di preoccuparsi per lei.
    NEG CL be.3SG.PST more reason of worry.RFL for her 'Once the girl had phoned, there was no longer reason to worry about her.'

The past participle of crescere 'grow', an intransitive accomplishment, can figure alongside its only argument in the absolute construction (cf. (4)), whereas the past participle of telefonare 'phone', an intransitive activity, cannot (cf. (5)). Evidence like this would lead one to think that the state / achievement / accomplishment vs. activity split – or the unaccusative vs. unergative divide – holds for absolute participles, as well as for attributive ones. In-depth investigation of the behaviour of past participles, however, indicates that this hypothesis needs some refinement.

To mention but a few problematic issues, there is no one-to-one correspondence between attributive and absolute structures of the kind mentioned above in terms of the past participles which are licensed in each of these constructions:

(6) a. La ragazza stimata.
    The girl.FSG esteem.PP.FSG
    'The girl held in high esteem.'
b. *Stimata la ragazza, le affidano un incarico.
   Esteem.PP.FSG the girl.FSG DCL assign.3PL a task
   ‘Since the girl is held in high esteem, they assign her a task’.

The discrepancy brought to light in (6a) and (6b) suggests that stative past participles can modify a nominal head within a noun phrase. However, the same class of past participles yields problematic results when followed by its lowest direct core argument within the absolute participial construction.

Secondly, the state (/ achievement / accomplishment) vs. activity split does not explain the contrast between past participles which can occur in prenominal and postnominal position within the noun phrase (cf (7a)), and past participles which can only occur in postnominal position (cf. (7b)):

(7) a. Lo scrittore stimato /
   The writer.MSG esteem.PP.MSG
   lo stimato scrittore.
   the esteem.PP.MSG writer.MSG
   ‘The writer held in high esteem.’ / Lit. The esteemed writer.

b. Lo scrittore ucciso /
   The writer.MSG kill.PP.MSG
   *l’ ucciso scrittore.
   Lit. The writer killed.

Finally, the state (/ achievement / accomplishment) vs. activity split does not account for the relative incompatibility of the past participles of non-telic predicates with the resultative structure formed with the copula essere ‘be’:

(8) Dicono che Maria è morta / *guardata.
   Say.3PL that Mary be.3SG die.PP.FSG see.PP.FSG
   ‘They say that Mary is dead / watched.’

The resultative structure with the past participle of guardare ‘watch’ is not ungrammatical, but rather odd, whereas its correlate with the past participle of morire ‘die’ is both grammatical and perfectly natural. These facts are hard to reconcile with the view that the intransitivity split differentiates categorically between predicates with a state in the semantic representation and predicates without a state. All of the cited mismatches are also prob-
lematic for any syntactic analysis based on the contrast between two classes of intransitives which take an underlying subject and an underlying object, respectively. A comprehensive account of the behaviour of past participles must capture these discrepancies. In the discussion which follows, the mentioned mismatches are captured with an analysis of semantics-syntax mapping which differentiates between two types of attributive structure and a number of constructions where past participles have predicative function (passive, resultative and absolutive). Attributive past participles are considered in section 7.2, and predicative past participles in sections 7.3 to 7.5. In particular, sections 7.3 and 7.4 deal with passive and resultative participles, and section 7.5 is concerned with absolute participles. Adjectival and nominal compounds which include participles are briefly discussed in section 7.6, and some general conclusions are drawn together in section 7.7.

7.2 Attributive past participles: Restrictive and descriptive constructions

As I mentioned above, it has long been thought that, unlike the past participle of unergatives (cf. (9)), that of unaccusatives (cf. (10)) can have attributive function, similarly to an adjectival modifier. The past participle of unaccusatives thus patterns with that of transitives, which can modify its lowest argument (cf. (11)). This generalization is illustrated below:

(9)  **Il concorrente ha indovinato.**  
The contestant have.3SG guess.PP  
‘The contestant has guessed.’

*Il concorrente **indovinato.**  
The contestant.MSG guess.PP.MSG  
Lit. The contestant guessed.

(10)  **Con i figli già cresciuti**  
With the child.MPL already grow.PP.MPL  
e andati per il mondo.  
and go.PP.MPL around the world  
‘With their children already grown and gone around the world.’

(De Carlo, *Due di due*, p. 299)
I dimostranti hanno bloccato il traffico.

‘The demonstrators have blocked the traffic.’

Il traffico bloccato.

Lit. The traffic blocked.

In terms of Aktionsart, the past participle of states / achievements / accomplishments can be used attributively (cf. (10) and (11)). Contrastingly, the past participle of activities is banned from the attributive structure (cf. (9)).

Interesting evidence is provided by the behaviour of the past participle of verbs which are subject to A vs. E alternation in the selection of the perfective operator. Recall that this alternation can be determined by the possibility of activity vs. active-accomplishment construal (see class (i) discussed in 2.3), process vs. accomplishment construal (class (ii)), semelfactive state vs. semelfactive activity construal (class (iii)), and, finally, state, activity or (active-)accomplishment construal (class (iv)). In the light of the data in (9) to (11), which indicate a split between states / achievements / accomplishments and activities, one would expect the activity construals to be banned from the attributive construction. This expectation is borne out by the behaviour of verbs which, depending on the context, denote active accomplishments or activities:

(12) a. I genitori corsi *(a casa).
   The parent.MPL run.PP.MPL to home
   Lit. The parents run home.

   b. L’ uccello volato *(sul tetto).
   The bird.MSG fly.PP.MSG on.the roof
   Lit. The bird flown on to the roof.

   c. Il bambino saltato *(sul letto).
   The child.MSG jump.PP.MSG on.the bed
   Lit. The child jumped on to the bed.

The examples in (12) are ungrammatical unless an argument-adjunct indicates that they encode active accomplishments of movement towards an endpoint rather than mere activities. No argument-adjunct is needed if the formal and telic qualia roles (Pustejovsky 1995) of the head noun force an accomplishment reading of the modifier (see section 2.3):
The verbs which allow process vs. accomplishment construals are not incompatible with the attributive construction. However, in this construction, they do not combine with phrases which denote duration, which suggests that they are construed as accomplishments:

(14) a. * _La legna bruciata_ (*_per ore_).
    The wood.FSG burn.PP.FSG for hours
    Lit. The wood burned for hours.
    b. * _La pianta fiorita_ (*_per giorni_).
    The plant.FSG blossom.PP.FSG for days
    Lit. The plant blossomed for days.

The behaviour of the past participle of semelfactives is not sensitive to context. Semelfactives can be based on a state or an activity. In neither case do they behave as stative modifiers, however, because they do not include a simple state (pred’(x)) or a resultant state (BECOME pred’(x)). Rather, their semantic representation includes a semelfactive state or a semelfactive activity – SEML predicate’(x); SEML do’(x, [predicate’(x))):

(15) a. * _Il paziente tossito_.
    The patient.MSG cough.PP.MSG
    Lit. The patient coughed.
    b. * _Il telefono squillato_.
    The phone.MSG ring.PP.MSG
    Lit. The phone rung.
    c. * _Il metronomo oscillato_.
    The metronome.MSG swing.PP.MSG
    Lit. The metronome swung.

Verbs which can denote states, activities or (active) accomplishments are generally accepted in the attributive construction, even though it is not always clear that a state or accomplishment reading is favoured in the given context. Thus, whilst a state or accomplishment reading suggests itself for (16a) and (16b), as well as for (17a), the same does not hold true
for (17b), since manner adverbs such as violentemente ‘violently’ and intensamente ‘intensely’ typically modify activities:

\[(16)\]
\[
a. \text{Un imprenditore fallito.} \\
\text{A entrepreneur.MSG fail.PP.MSG} \\
\text{Lit. An entrepreneur failed.}
\]

\[
a. \text{Un imprenditore mancato.} \\
\text{A entrepreneur.MSG miss.PP.MSG} \\
\text{‘Somebody with the unexploited potential to be an entrepreneur.’}
\]

\[(17)\]
\[
a. \text{Le persone vissute durante la guerra.} \\
The people.FPL live.PP.FPL during the war \\
‘The people lived during the war.’
\]

\[
b. \text{Un uomo vissuto violentemente / intensamente.} \\
\text{A man.MSG live.PP.MSG violently / intensely} \\
\text{‘A man lived violently / intensely.’}
\]

By contrast with the evidence from class (i) (cf. (12)), the evidence from class (iv) (cf. (17b)) suggests that, in this case, the possibility of a stative construal can override the contextual information. This result is in accordance with the findings on the selection of the perfective operator in that, as was pointed out in section 2.3, the role of the context is not clear with this group of verbs.

In the light of the evidence, it can be concluded that the occurrence in the attributive construction is only ruled out for the past participle of semelfactives and for those verbs which solely encode activities. In neither case is there a simple or resultant state in the semantic representation.

As is clear from the behaviour of the participial correlates of transitives (cf. (11)), bivalent past participles modify their lowest argument. Accordingly, the past participle of type-(ii) experiencer verbs can be used attributively, as long as it modifies the causee:

\[(18)\]
\[
a. \text{La studentessa preoccupata.} \\
The student.FSG worry.PP.FSG \\
\text{Lit. The student worried.}
\]

\[
b. \text{La studentessa irritata.} \\
The student.FSG irritate.PP.FSG \\
\text{Lit. The student irritated.}
\]
In turn, the past participle of type-(i) and type-(iii) experiencer verbs can be an attribute of the theme but not of the experiencer (for comparable evidence from Dutch, see Bennis 2004: 110):

(19) a. L’esame temuto.  
    The exam.MSG fear.PP.MSG  
    Lit. The exam feared.

  b. Il bambino desiderato.  
    The child.MSG desire.PP.MSG  
    Lit. The child desired.

(20) a. Il fatto capitato.  
    The fact.MSG happen.PP.MSG  
    Lit. The fact happened.

  b. Il denaro bastato ?(a…).  
    The money.MSG suffice.PP.MSG to  
    Lit. The money sufficed to...

  c. La sorte toccata ?(a…)  
    The fate.FSG befall.PP.FSG to  
    Lit. The fate befallen to…

Examples (20b) and (20c) illustrate a recurrent pattern in the behaviour of type-(iii) experiencer predicates vis-à-vis the diagnostics which target the lowest-ranking argument: in order for the diagnostic to apply successfully to the lowest argument, the highest argument must also be overt (see ne-cliticization in constructions with matrix coding as PSA, discussed in 6.4.3). Below I offer an explanation of this point.

Since both the arguments of bivalent predicates can be expressed in the attributive construction under scrutiny, as witness type-(iii) experiencer predicates, the fully-fledged semantic representation of the past participle must be found in the semantics of this construction. Perlmutter (1989: 69–70) suggested that attributive past participles are comparable to reduced relative clauses. In accordance with this suggestion, I propose that the attributive construction which has been dealt with so far should be represented as a restrictive relative clause which includes the whole representation of the modifying past participle. I illustrate my proposal in (21):

(21) a. I genitori corsi a casa.  
    The parent.MPL run.PP.MPL to home
‘The parents (who have) run home.’

be’ (genitori, [do’ (genitori, [run’ (genitori)]) & BECOME be-at’ (casa, genitori)])

b. Il bambino desiderato.
   ‘The child (who is) desired.’
   be’ (bambino, [desire’ (x, bambino)])

c. Il fatto capitato.
   ‘The fact (which has) happened.’
   be’ (fatto, [happen’ (x, fatto)])

d. La sorte toccatami.
   ‘The fate (which has) befallen to me.’
   be’ (sorte, [befall’ (1SG, sorte)])

The reader will recall that restrictive relative clauses are represented with be’ (x, [pred’]), where the underlining marks the head noun in the semantic representation of the complex nominal (VVLP: 591). Assuming that attributive past participles are reduced relative clauses which modify the lowest argument of a state, the structures in (21a) to (21d) are all grammatical, since in all cases it is the lowest argument of a state that is modified: genitori from BECOME be-at’ (casa, genitori) in (21a), bambino from desire’ (X, bambino) in (21b), fatto from happen’ (X, fatto) in (21c), and, lastly, sorte from befall’ (1SG, sorte) in (21d).

Following Conte (1973), I assume that postnominal adjectives are also part of reduced restrictive relative clauses. Thus, the grammaticality of structures like i politici stupidi ‘the politicians (who are) stupid’ suggests that the postnominal modifier targets the lowest available argument of a state, rather than the lowest argument tout court, in other words the undergoer or affected actor of the clause. In fact, the argument politici ‘politicians’ is not the lowest one in the copular construction i politici (che sono) stupidi ‘the politicians (who are) stupid’, according to Schwartz’s (1993) proposal discussed in previous chapters:

(22) I politici stupidi.

The politician.MPL stupid.MPL
   ‘The politicians (who are) stupid.’
   be’ (politici, [be’ (politici, [stupid’])])
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The idea that the full semantic representation of the past participle is included in the attributive construction examined so far does not entail that all its arguments must be expressed. Rather, argument positions can remain unspecified, as is shown in (21b) and (21c). Interestingly, if the highest argument of a type-(iii) experiencer predicate is expressed, it is realized as a dative argument (cf. (21d)). Similarly, the highest argument of a transitive predicate can figure in the construction under scrutiny as a demoted actor:

(23) *Il bambino desiderato dalla coppia.

The child.MSG desire.PP.MSG by.the couple

‘The child (who is) desired by the couple.’

be' (bambino, [desire' (coppia, bambino)])

The proposed analysis, which equates attributive past participles with reduced restrictive relative clauses, satisfactorily accounts for the attributive construction which has been considered so far. The same analysis, however, does not capture another kind of attributive structure, where the past participle occurs in prenominal position. In particular, this analysis does not do justice to the contrast between the past participles which can occur prenominally and postnominally, and those which can only occur postnominally (cf. (7)):


The esteem.PP.MSG writer.MSG

‘The esteemed writer.’

b. *L’ucciso scrittore.

The kill.PP.MSG writer.MSG

‘The killed writer.’

Italian does not have the Germanic construction with a prenominal restrictive relative clause (e.g., German die ein Buch lesende Frau, Frisian de in boek lêzende frou ‘the woman who is / was reading a book’, see Rijkhoff 1998: 350). In fact, unlike the attributive construction with a postnominal modifier, that with a prenominal modifier does not license the expression of arguments other than the one which is modified by the past participle:
Similarly to the semantic representation of postnominal past participles, that of prenominal ones must be assumed to be attributive. In the light of the contrast shown in (25), however, one must assume that the semantic representation of prenominal past participles does not include all the argument positions of the participial predicate. Therefore, I tentatively adopt the representation illustrated below for prenominal past participles.

(26) a. *Lo stimato scrittore.
   The esteem.PP.MSG writer.MSG
   ‘The esteemed writer.’

   be’ (scrittore, [esteemed'])

b. L’amata compagna.
   The love.PP.FSG partner.FSG
   ‘The beloved partner.’

   be’ (compagna, [beloved'])

A modification of this tentative proposal will turn out to be necessary, in the light of further facts, which will be considered below. The proposed semantic representation explains why under no circumstances can the highest argument of prenominal past participles be overt (cf. (25b)): the modified noun figures as the highest argument, and there is no higher position in the semantic representation. Contrast esteem’ (x, scrittore) with be’ (scrittore, [esteemed']).

To return to the classes of past participles which can serve as prenominal modifiers, the state (/achievement / accomplishment) vs. activity split is relevant to the distribution of these participles. In fact, the data in (27) indicate that activities and semelfactives are banned from the prenominal position, as they are from the postnominal position:

(27) *La ballata ragazza lit. the danced girl, *la nuotata atleta lit. the swum athlete, *lo squillato telefono lit. the rung telephone, *il tos-sito paziente lit. the coughed patient, etc.
However, there must be more to the distribution of prenominal past participles than the state vs. activity split. In fact, both the set of past participles in (28) and the one in (29) can occur in postnominal position within the noun phrase, but only the set in (29) can also figure in prenominal position:

(28) *La cresciuta ragazza lit. the grown girl, *il marcito legno lit. the rotten wood, *l’esistito mostro lit. the existed monster, *lo scattato meccanismo lit. the gone-off mechanism, *il morto soldato lit. the died soldier, *il saltato bottone lit. the come-off button, *la bruciata legna lit. the burned wood, etc.

(29) Il preoccupato viaggiatore ‘the worried traveller’, il tuo apprezziatis- simo intervento ‘your very much appreciated intervention’, l’amato compagno ‘the beloved partner’, il compianto genitore ‘the lamented parent’, etc.

The exact principle which determines the possibility for a past participle to occur prenominally is hard to pin down. The structures in (29) could be said to be adjectival constructions derived from passives, since the past participles in question can also be transitive, and the modified argument is the undergoer of the transitive correlates. However, it is not the case that the past participle of any transitive structure can figure prenominally in an attributive construction:

(30) *La costruita casa lit. the built house, *il letto libro lit. the read book, *il mangiato panino lit. the eaten bread-roll, *il guardato film lit. the watched film, etc.

The data in (29) also indicate that the past participles of type-(i) and type-(ii) experiencer verbs figure prominently in the attributive construction under scrutiny. However, this is not the case with type (iii):"}

(31) *Il capitato fatto lit. the happened fact, *il bastato denaro lit. the sufficed money, *il piaciuto spettacolo lit. the liked performance, etc.
Sciarone’s (1970) study of adjectival attributive constructions includes the following authentic examples, which would seem to include adjectival correlates of the past participles of transitive predicates:

(32) *Un’aumentata proporzione di persone*... *‘a big proportion of people’, il deciso intervento dei vigili del fuoco* *‘the prompt intervention of the firemen’, un approfondito esame delle cose da farsi* *‘an accurate examination of the things to be done’, and una più diffusa dichiarazione* *‘a clearer declaration’. (Sciarone 1970: 60–94).

Interestingly, in all but one of the examples in (32), the postnominal position is occupied, and this must favour the prenominal placement of the past participle. In addition, it is debatable whether the adjectival modifiers in question are synonymous with their transitive correlates. In fact, *aumentare* would normally translate as ‘increase, augment’, *decidere* as ‘decide’, *approfondire* as ‘deepen, investigate more thoroughly’; finally, *diffondere* means ‘spread’. The translations given in (32) reflect Sciarone’s (1970) own suggestions.

So far it has been established that the past participles which figure in prenominal position are a subset of those which can occur postnominally within the noun phrase, and it has been noted that, even though these past participles can have transitive correlates, it is by no means the case that the past participles of all transitives can occur prenominally in an attributive construction. To understand exactly which past participles are allowed in prenominal position it is useful to consider attributive constructions with adjectives.

Prenominal adjectives are said to have subjective or affective meanings in Latin and in the Romance languages (Marouzeau 1922: 99–103; Bally 1909; Radatz 2001: 116). The fact that the past participle of type-(i) and type-(ii) experiencer verbs can occur prenominally is in agreement with the said characteristic of prenominal adjectives, in that experiencer verbs indicate feelings and intellectual states. The subjective quality of prenominal modifiers also provides a clue to understanding why prenominal past participles often bear adjectival modification. In fact, this kind of modification often improves the acceptability of the construction (see *il *?*(tanto) desiderato bambino* ‘the much desired child’). Thus, the prenominal past participle does not express an objective discrete quality, but rather a subjective quantifiable one. The ungrammaticality of examples such as those in (30)
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(see *la (tanto) costruita casa lit. the (much) built house, etc.) is thus likely to depend on the fact that the past participles in these examples express factual and discrete states.

The subjective and quantifiable quality of prenominal attributes also explains the contrast between (33) and (34), examples which display the correlates of intransitive predicates:

(33) a. *Il cresciutissimo Leo spiccava fra i compagni.

The very grown Leo stood out among his classmates.

b. Guardava tristemente il tanto invecchiato genitore.

‘S/he was looking sadly at his/ her much aged parent.’

(34) *Il mort(issimo) soldato giaceva fra i feriti.

The very dead soldier was lying among the wounded.

Unlike type-(i) and type-(ii) experiencer verbs, which are stative or admit stative readings, crescere ‘grow’ and invecchiare ‘age’ are telic. They are, however, gradual-completion verbs (Bertinetto and Squartini 1995). As I explained in previous chapters, whilst being telic, gradual completion verbs denote the gradual approach to a goal. The appearance of cresciutissimo ‘very grown’ and tanto invecchiato ‘much aged’ in prenominal position is obviously favoured by the fact that these denote states that are achieved in measurable steps. This reading is also favoured by the adjectival modification. The same is not true of morire ‘die’.

Interestingly, it is not the case that the past participles of gradual completion verbs are all equally compatible with the prenominal position. In general, those which can express the subjective judgement of an unexpressed evaluator, are more acceptable in this construction than others. This interpretation can be promoted by the context, as is the case with
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(33b), where the adverb tristemente ‘sadly’ suggests that the attribute of the theme of guardare ‘look’ expresses the evaluation of the cognizer.

Prenominal adjectives are also said to denote an inherent quality of the referent of the noun (see Sciarone 1970: 42). Drawing upon Siegel (1976, 1979) and Bolinger (1967), Vincent (1986) has proposed that the quality denoted by preverbal adjectives is inherent in the sense that it is to be interpreted in relation to the reference of the noun which it modifies. Thus, provetto ‘proficient’ in provetto ballerino means proficient as a dancer and not in general terms. Similarly, vecchio ‘old’ in vecchio amico ‘old friend’ means old as a friend and not according to date of birth. In Vincent’s (1986) account, the prenominal adjective forms a complex referential unit in conjunction with the reference of the noun, similarly to a nominal compound. Following Vincent (1986), Radatz (2001: 115–116) suggests that noun phrases with prenominal adjectives form a ‘construction’, in the sense of Construction Grammar (Goldberg 1995; Croft 2001). As a result, the meaning of the compound adjective-plus-noun is not completely predictable from the meaning of the component parts. An earlier study of the position of the adjective in French successfully argues that French prenominal adjectives require deixis of the lexical context (Waugh 1977: 95–98). Thus, in furieux menteur ‘a compulsive liar’, the adjective furieux is interpreted with respect to the semantic features which are the most salient to the meaning of the noun modified in the noun phrase (i.e., liar-like qualities). Accordingly, the meaning of the modifier in furieux menteur differs from the meaning of the same adjective in the phrase furieux mangeur ‘a compulsive eater’.

To return to past participles, the evidence considered in this section suggests that there exists a synchronic rule which allows past participles to be realized as adjectives (see the possibility of adjectival modification, for instance with the superlative morphology –issim–). Since prenominal past participles are adjectives, by virtue of the said rule, I assume that Vincent’s (1986) analysis of prenominal adjectives is also valid for prenominal past participles. This account enables me to explain why the past participle of type-(iii) experiencer verbs does not figure prenominally, thus contrasting with type (i) and type (ii): type-(iii) experiencer verbs do not denote inherent properties of a theme, but rather the effect that a theme has on an experiencer, as explained by Bossong (1998). Thus, *il piaciuto spettacolo, lit. the liked performance, is ungrammatical because the meaning of the attributive past participle is not to be interpreted in conjunction with the meaning of the theme, but rather in conjunction with the meaning of the
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experiencer. By contrast, *lo stimato scrittore* ‘the esteemed writer’, which exhibits the past participle of an experiencer verb of type (i), exemplifies the construction identified by Vincent (1986), since the meaning of the past participle is to be read in conjunction with the meaning of the theme (‘held in high esteem as a writer’). In addition to the morphosyntax of inversion, attributive constructions with prenominal past participles are, therefore, an ideal testbed to ascertain how the semantic relation between an experiencer and a theme is encoded: type-(i) predicates encode the emotion or intellectual experience that an experiencer has with respect to a theme, whilst type-(iii) ones encode the effect of a theme on an experiencer (see Chapter 3). This characteristic of type-(iii) experiencer predicates further explains why the diagnostics of split intransitivity which target the lowest-ranking argument are not satisfied by the lowest argument alone, when they apply to this type of predicate. Rather, the highest argument is also usually expressed (cf. (20b) and (20c) of this chapter and 6.4.3, e.g. (65a)). This is because the meaning of the predicate is only fully understood in relation to the experiencer.

I therefore propose that prenominal past participles denote non-discrete stative attributes which join with the reference of a nominal head to yield a complex referential unit. An argument which is not included in the semantic representation of the complex nominal may constitute the understood subjective experiencer of the denoted state. In fact, even the past participles of verbs whose semantic representation does not include a position for an experiencer seem to require or favour a reading with an understood evaluator in this construction (cf. (33b)).

The two types of attributive construction which I have been concerned with in this section correspond to the adjectival constructions which are referred to in the literature as restrictive and descriptive (Lepschy and Lepschy 1988: 190, see also Schwarze’s 1995: 683 differentiation between the identifying and the characterising functions of adjectives). In the restrictive construction, the participial or adjectival modifier is postnominal and focal. In syntax, it figures in the post-nuclear periphery of the noun phrase, similarly to a restrictive relative clause (Van Valin 2005: 220–222). In the descriptive construction, the participial or adjectival modifier is prenominal and is not focal. Its syntactic position is the pre-nuclear periphery of the noun phrase (Van Valin 2005: 25). As for the semantic representation, the analysis based on Vincent (1986) suggests that the representation proposed in (26) must be refined. As a tentative proposal, I suggest the one in (35):
Further refinement of the semantic representation of the descriptive construction is obviously needed. To mention but one point, prenominal modifiers of proper nouns (cf. (33a)) presumably require a slightly different representation. The representation in (35), however, does illustrate the essence of my proposal.

To recapitulate, two kinds of attributive construction should be distinguished, a restrictive one and a descriptive one. The class of past participles which can occur in the latter type is a subset of the class of past participles which can occur in the former one. Both constructions are semantically represented with \( \text{be}^\prime (x, [\text{pred}']) \). However, only the restrictive construction includes the full semantic representation of the participle, being analogous to a reduced restrictive relative clause. The semantic representation of the descriptive construction is comparable to that of a compound noun. Since the restrictive attributive construction solely modifies an undergoer or an affected actor, it constitutes a manifestation of active alignment. As for the descriptive construction, it modifies the lowest available argument of a state. The above discussion has shown, however, that the semantic constraints on the adjectival participles which are admitted in this construction are stricter than those which define the domain of active alignment.

### 7.3 Predicative past participles: Passive and resultative constructions

In previous work on resultatives, two kinds of definition have been adopted. On the one hand, resultatives have been said to be structures that express a state which implies a previous event (Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988: 6). On the other hand, a more restrictive definition requires that two eventualities are encoded in the resultative construction: “a hallmark of the
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English resultative construction is the presence of a result XP – an XP denoting a state or location that holds of the referent of an NP in the construction as a result of the action denoted by its verb.” (Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2001: 766). Whereas forms which fit the latter definition are well attested in English (I had my hair cut short, the river froze solid, etc.), they are not so common in Italian. In this language, the adjective which encodes the resultant state must be repeated (cf. (36a)) or, otherwise, modified, for instance with the superlative morphology (cf. (36b)). Alternatively, the resultant state can be encoded by a prepositional phrase (cf. (36c)):

(36) a. Ho dipinto il muro bianco bianco.
    ‘I painted the wall bright white.’ (intended reading)
    b. Si è tagliata i capelli cortissimi.
    ‘She had her hair cut very short.’
    c. L’ho rotto in pezzi.
    ‘I broke it into pieces.’

The first eventuality cannot be an intransitive state, achievement, or accomplishment, while reflexives are admitted only if they are non-monadic (cf. (36b)):

(37) *Il fiume (si) è ghiacciato solidissimo.
    ‘The river froze (very) solid.’

In general, the resultatives illustrated in (36) only exhibit predicates which allow causative readings outside this structure (note that (36a), where the first eventuality is not causative, is only marginally acceptable). However, it is not the case that all causatives are admitted in the construction (Il fatto ha rattristato il vicinato (*triste triste) ‘the fact has saddened the neighbourhood (very sad)’). For a detailed account of the constraints that apply to Italian, I refer to Napoli (1992). Given that the first eventuality cannot be an intransitive predicate in Italian, this type of resultative construction will not be discussed any further. In my treatment, I adhere to Nedjalkov and Jaxontov’s (1988) definition, which encompasses resulta-
tives where the eventuality leading to a resultant state is not expressed. I constrain the discussion to resultatives formed with essere ‘be’, venire ‘come’, and andare ‘go’ plus past participle, which I contrast with the quasi-homonymous passives.

When I dealt with the passive formed with ‘be’ plus a past participle, and the corresponding resultative construction (see 6.4.1, e.g. (53)), I proposed that, in the semantic representation, the resultative construction constitutes a portion of the passive structure, and that it contains the resultant predicate and its argument:

\[(38) \ a. \ \text{La porta è stata aperta (dal bidello).} \]
\[ \text{The door.FSG be.3SG be.PP.FSG open.PP.FSG by.the janitor} \]
\[ \text{‘The door has been opened (by the janitor).’} \]
\[ [\text{do’ (bidello/x, [open’ (bidello/x, porta)])}] \text{CAUSE} \]
\[ [\text{BECOME open’ (porta)}] \]
\[ b. \ \text{La porta è aperta.} \]
\[ \text{The door be.3SG open.PP.FSG} \]
\[ \text{‘The door is open.’} \]
\[ \text{open’ (porta)} \]

In Italian, it is not always easy to distinguish the passive with essere ‘be’ from the corresponding resultative construction, since the actor need not be expressed in the passive (cf. (38a)). Another factor which hinders the identification of Italian resultatives with ‘be’ is the indication of PSA markedness with the perfective operator E. In fact, perfective structures marked by E look identical to their resultative correlates, which are marked with the copula essere ‘be’:

\[(39) \ \text{È morta.} \]
\[ \text{Be.3SG die.PP.FSG} \]
\[ \text{‘She has died.’ / ‘She is dead.’} \]

Morphosyntactic evidence of the difference between passive, resultative and perfective structures is provided by Sicilian. To begin with, the Sicilian correlates of the Italian examples in (38a) and (38b) display different participial forms:

\[(40) \ a. \ \text{A puorta a statu graputa.} \ (\text{Sicilian}) \]
\[ \text{The door.FSG have.3SG be.PP open.PP.FSG} \]
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‘The door has been opened.’

b. A puorta è aperta. (Sicilian)
   The door.FSG be.3SG open.FSG
   ‘The door is open.’

The existence of double participial forms for the same verb is a widespread phenomenon in Romance to which I return below (see, among others, Ledgeway 2000: 228–233 for Southern Italo-Romance, and Loporcaro, Pescia, Ramos 2004 for Portuguese). Typically, the two participial forms of the same verb have specialized behaviour or functions (adjectival vs. verbal, resultative vs. perfective). For instance, the Sicilian form of ‘open’ which figures in (40b) is adjectival; whilst it occurs in the resultative construction, it cannot be passive (cf. (40a)) or perfective (unn’ aju *apertu / graputu a puorta ‘I have not opened the door’).

Secondly, Sicilian has lost the alternation of the perfective operator as a result of diachronic leveling (see 2.4.2.1). Interestingly, intransitive perfective structures like ha murutu ‘s/he has died’ have correlates in Sicilian which exhibit essiri ‘be’ and a past participle that agrees in gender and number with the undergoer or affected-actor PSA:

(41) a. È muorta ri vint’ anni. (Sicilian)
   Be.3SG die.PP.FSG from twenty years.
   ‘She has been dead for twenty years.’

   b. Nna ’stu minutu è partuta. (Sicilian)
      In this moment be.3SG leave.PP.FSG
      ‘She is away for the moment.’

   c. U piru è tuttu ciurutu. (Sicilian)
      The pear.tree.MSG be.3SG all.MSG blossom.PP.MSG
      ‘The pear tree is covered in blossoms.’

The examples in (40b) and (41) are resultative structures, comparable to the Italian one seen above in (38b). In fact, the perfective correlates of these structures do not combine with temporal adverbials like ‘for the moment’ or with adjectival modifiers like preposed tutto ‘all, completely’. Therefore, the proposed semantic representation for these structures consists of a resultant state plus its only argument, similarly to the representation of (38b):

(40) b¹. open’ (puorta) (a puorta è aperta ‘the door is open’)
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(41) a. dead' (3SG) (è muorta ‘she is dead’)
    b. left' (3SG) (è partuta ‘she is away’)
    c. blossomed’ (3SG) (è ciurutu ‘it is in blossoms’)

The resultative representations differ from those of their perfective correlates in that they lack a telic operator (see BECOME dead’ (3SG), etc.). Accordingly, the resultative construction under scrutiny is accounted for in terms of lexical decomposition (see section 2.3).

The proposed analysis of resultatives formed with ‘be’ and a past participle captures the relatedness of structures like (38b), which are correlates of telic transitive constructions, with structures like (41a), which are counterparts of telic intransitives. In both cases, the semantic representation of the resultative structure reduces the semantics of a telic predicate to the resultant state pred’ (x). This analysis also explains why the resultatives under scrutiny cannot exhibit semelfactives or activities, since there is no resultant state in the semantics of these Aktionsart types (see section 7.3.1 for some putative exceptions). Finally, it suggests that the structures formed with ‘be’ and the past participle of a transitive state should be construed as passives, regardless of whether the actor is expressed, since the semantic representation of transitive states is pred’ (x, y), where pred’ is not a state embedded under BECOME or INGR. This expectation is supported by examples like the following:

(42) *?È ormai visto.
      Be.3SG by.now see.PP.MSG
‘He / it is seen by now.’

The example in (42) is only acceptable on a passive reading (È ormai visto in cattiva luce (da tutti) ‘by now he is seen in a bad light (by everyone)’) since the past participle of stative vedere ‘see’ cannot encode a portion of a telic predicate.

In principle, the past participle of non-telic intransitive states should not have a resultative correlate either. Indeed, when such a participle follows a form of essere ‘be’, it is normally interpreted as a perfective participle (È vissuto ‘he has lived’, è esistito ‘it has existed’). In addition, Sicilian does not have resultative counterparts of these forms.

Whether resultative constructions formed with the copula essere ‘be’ (or with the operators venire ‘come’ and andare ‘go’, which I discuss in
7.4) rule out the past participles of non-telic verbs altogether is a moot point, though. This is due to the fact that adjectives can be resultative (VVLP: 103), and there are examples of resultative adjectives which are homonymous with the past participles of non-telic verbs. Thus, there exists an adjectival form *vissuto meaning ‘experienced’ (È *una donna molto vissuta ‘she is a very experienced woman’). The question arises how a stative past participle can enter the resultative construction, if this is formed by lexical decomposition in the way illustrated above.

In general, the problematic forms under investigation are not entirely synonymous with the non-telic verbs which they are homonymous with. In addition, they have limited distribution. *Vissuto ‘experienced’, for instance, is only used attributively (È *vissuto means ‘he has lived’ and not ‘he is experienced’), and yields odd results if embedded in a construction with matrix coding: ?mi sembra vissuto ‘he seems to me to be experienced’, *?lo credo vissuto ‘I believe him to be experienced’. The grammaticality of comparative or superlative forms like un uomo più vissuto di quanto non si direbbe ‘a more experienced man than one would think’, un uomo vissutissimo ‘a very experienced man’ strongly suggests that this is an adjective. Similar considerations hold for the past participle of some transitives. For instance, *amato, in the sense of ‘popular’, exhibits some adjectival behaviour (see è più amato di quanto non si direbbe ‘he is more popular than one would think’).

All things considered, it appears that the participial forms in question are not the mere outputs of the synchronic rule postulated with respect to the attributive construction. Rather, these are resultative adjectives that require separate lexical entries from their rough correlates (the stative participles). Crucially, this class of adjectival participles is lexically constrained. By contrast, the resultative construal of participles which are correlates of telic perfective participles is not lexically restricted, although it is constrained by the context (the requirements of the construction).

7.3.1 Apparently problematic data

The occurrence of the past participle of stative verbs in the resultative construction is only problematic insofar as it shows that this construction may not result from lexical decomposition. Other data pose a bigger challenge to the analysis of resultatives developed above. In particular, the past parti-
ciple of a limited number of activities can exhibit adjectival behaviour in the resultative construction with the copula ‘be’:

(43)  a. Ma sei proprio fumata?
But be.2SG really smoke.PP.FSG
‘Tell me, are you really stoned?’

b. Era completamente bevuta.
Be.3SG.PST completely drink.PP.FSG
‘She was completely drunk.’

In (43), *fumata* ‘stoned’ and *bevuta* ‘drunk’ would appear to be predicated of the only argument of an activity, contrary to what has been established so far with respect to resultative past participles. Should these forms be regarded as correlates of transitive structures (‘smoke something’, ‘drink something’), the results obtained would still be hard to explain, since *fumata* ‘stoned’ and *bevuta* ‘drunk’ appear to modify the highest argument of the transitive predicates in question, rather than the lowest one.

Facts such as those illustrated in (43) are in fact not unique in Romance. It is sufficient to think of the Latin type SUM CENATUM ‘I am full as a result of eating’, inherited by a number of Romance languages. For instance, in the regional Italian of Sicily, one can say *veniamo cenati?* ‘shall we make sure we dine before we come to yours?’ (lit. shall we come dined.MPL?). Such forms exist in Germanic, as well, as is the case with English *I am drunk*, which would seem to exhibit the past participle of *drink*.

I claim that the evidence in (43) does not challenge the above analysis of resultatives. Both *fumata* ‘stoned’ and *bevuta* ‘drunk’ exhibit semantic specialization, with *fumata* referring to a specific type of smoking, and *bevuta* to a specific kind of drinking. These forms thus differ semantically from *fumare* ‘smoke’ and *bere* ‘drink’. In addition, the same forms admit adjectival modification: *è più bevuto che mai* ‘he is drunker than ever’. Lastly, they occur in matrix coding constructions (*mi sembra bevuto* ‘he seems to me to be drunk’), as well as after imperatives, on a par with adjectives (*non venire bevuto / stanco!*, ‘do not come drunk / tired!’ as opposed to *non venire cantato / dormito!*, lit. do not come sung / slept!). In the light of these facts, I propose that these are adjectival lexical entries which are not the output of the synchronic rule introduced in section 7.2. The semantic representations of the constructions in (43) are resultative adjectival representations (drunk’ (x), stoned’ (x)) which do not constitute a
portion of the semantics of the predicates do’ (x, [smoke’ (x)]) and do’ (x, [drink’ (x)]) (or their transitive correlates). As was pointed out with reference to the adjectival participles of stative predicates, the class of resultative adjectives which are lexical correlates of activity participles, but can be found in the resultative construction, is lexically constrained: it is not the case that the past participle of any activity is a member of this class (*era tutto cantato, lit. he was all sung).

7.4 Passive and resultative venire ‘come’ and andare ‘go’

Above I discussed the relation between the passive and resultative structures formed with essere ‘be’ plus a past participle. I provided evidence that there is reason to differentiate between these two constructions, even though passive and resultative structures with essere ‘be’ may look identical, if the actor of the passive is not expressed. It is now time to point out that other passives cannot be resultative. Observe the following data:

(44) a. *Il pavimento viene lavato.
   The floor.MSG come.3SG wash.PP.MSG
   ‘The floor is washed.’

   b. Il pavimento va lavato.
   The floor.MSG go.3SG wash.PP.MSG
   ‘The floor must be washed.’

‘Come’ and ‘go’ serve as passive auxiliaries in some Romance languages (Green 1982; Haiman and Benincà 1992: 108; Rohlfs 1969: 128–129), and the examples in (44a) and (44b) indicate that this is the case with Italian. Unlike venire ‘come’, andare ‘go’ is lexically modalized: it denotes deontic or participant-external modality (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998). A much debated question is why passive venire and andare cannot be perfective in Italian, in contrast with passive essere ‘be’:

(45) a. Il pavimento è stato lavato.
   The floor.MSG be.3SG be.PP.MSG wash.PP.MSG
   ‘The floor has been washed.’

   b. *Il pavimento è venuto lavato.
   The floor.MSG be.3SG come.PP.MSG wash.PP.MSG
   ‘The floor has been washed.’
Squartini (1999) has ascribed the ungrammaticality of the structure illustrated in (45b) to the Aktionsart of *venire* ‘come’. Starting from the consideration that the perfect of *venire* ‘come’ includes a resultant state, Squartini (1999) has argued that the aspetual contribution of perfective *venire* would clash with the dynamic-eventive character of the passive with *venire*, and this explains the ungrammaticality of the perfective forms.

In the spirit of Squartini (1999), I assume that the passives with *venire* and *andare* cannot be perfective because of the passive auxiliaries that figure in them. In my view, however, it is *venire* and *andare* themselves that mark the passive as non-resultative or dynamic-eventive, to use Squartini’s terminology. By non-resultative I mean that these passives do not denote resultant states. By contrast, I do not subscribe to the widespread view that the passive with *venire* only suits activity predicates, since this view is invalidated by the grammaticality of examples like *il codice della strada viene rispettato da tutti* ‘the highway code is respected by everyone’, where the voice auxiliary joins with a state predicate.

Observe that passives need not be dynamic-eventive, as is clearly indicated by the Spanish passive with *estar* ‘stay’, which is marked as resultative (cf. (46a)), and by the Italian passive with *essere* ‘be’, which is not marked as non-resultative, and thus can be perfective (cf. (46b)):

(46) a. *España está representada por el vicepresidente*
   Spain.FSG stay.3SG represent.PP.FSG by the vice-president
   del Gobierno. 
   (Spanish)
   ‘Spain is represented by the Vice-president of the Government.’
   (Pountain 1993: 176)

b. *L’Italia è stata rappresentata da...*
   The Italy.FSG be.3SG be.PP.FSG represent.PP.FSG by
   ‘Italy has been represented by...’

The Spanish example in (46a) exhibits the copula *estar*, which marks stage-level predicates, including resultant states. It is thus a resultative passive. Italian does not have a correlate of the Spanish structure in (46a), since the stage-level copula *stare* ‘stay’ cannot figure in present tense of
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passives (*L’Italia sta rappresentata da… ‘Italy is, lit. stays, represented by…’

To return to the passives with andare and venire, it is significant that they can only be read as habitual, when combined with ormai ‘by now’ (cf. (47a) and (47b)), in contrast with their correlate with essere ‘be’ (cf. (47c)), which is a resultative construction:

(47)  a. Il pavimento viene ormai lavato ?(ogni giorno).
    The floor.MSG come.3SG by.now wash.PP.MSG every day
    ‘The floor is now washed every day.’

    b. Il pavimento va ormai lavato ?(con cautela).
    The floor.MSG go.3SG by.now wash.PP.MSG with caution
    ‘The floor must now be washed with caution.’

    c. Il pavimento è ormai lavato.
    The floor.MSG be.3SG by.now wash.PP.MSG
    ‘The floor is now washed (i.e., clean).’

The contrast of (47a) and (47b) with (47c) depends on the auxiliaries that figure in these structures: only the last one is a resultative construction.

The evidence suggests that, in their role as voice auxiliaries, venire and andare mark the passive as non-resultative. They thus contrast with resultative passive operators like Spanish estar (cf. (46a)), and with neutral ones like Italian essere ‘be’. The fact that venire and andare mark the passive as non-resultative does not mean that they are predicative operators, though. Owing to its modal contribution, andare ‘go’ might be thought to be a core operator which forms a core subordination in conjunction with the past participle, similarly to some of the core operators analysed in 2.5.2. This cannot be the case, however, since andare ‘go’ is needed as the auxiliary of the passive nucleus. I suggest that these auxiliaries of voice figure as part of the syntactic nucleus of the clause, on a par with passive essere ‘be’, and do not contribute a predicate or any arguments of their own (see Figure 22).
Figure 22. The syntactic status of passive venire, andare, and essere.

The above proposal on the semantic and syntactic status of venire and andare is supported by the contrastive analysis of these passive auxiliaries and homonymous resultative operators. In section 3.4, I considered a number of inversion constructions with venire ‘come’. These constructions are of interest here, in that they are resultative, and they allow the occurrence of venire in the perfective form. Andare ‘go’ plus past participle also has a resultative correlate, which is not modalized, and does not test out as a passive, in that it rejects an actor, whether expressed or implied (Salvi 1988: 92–93):

(48)  a. Il pavimento mi è venuto pulito.
    The floor.MSG DCL be.3SG come.PP.MSG clean.PP.MSG
    Lit. The floor has come clean to me.
    b. Il documento è andato distrutto.
    The document.MSG be.3SG go.PP.MSG destroy.PP.MSG
    ‘The document has got destroyed.’

The question which must be addressed in this context is how the structures in question relate to the non-resultative passives discussed above. I propose that, unlike the non-resultative passive auxiliaries of (44a) and (44b), venire and andare contribute the operators BECOME or INGR to the semantic representation of the resultative construction illustrated in (48a) and (48b). Evidence that venire and andare contribute to the semantic representation is the fact that the highest argument of (48a) is not simply an argument of the past participle, which does not alone license inversion. The dative argument could also be a possessive dative. Again, the possessive dative would only be compatible with the complex predicate (*il pavimento mi è pulito lit. the floor is clean to me). As for resultative andare, it imposes lexical restrictions on the following predicate. Specifically, it only admits participial (or prepositional) predicates with negative connotations, e.g., distrutto ‘destroyed’, bruciato ‘burned’, smarrito ‘mis-laid’, disperso ‘lost’, in pezzi ‘into pieces’, in rovina ‘ruined’, etc. Accordingly, venire and andare provide a telic operator to the semantic representation of the structures under scrutiny and modify its valence. One could go as far as to claim that these are resultative constructions whereby the first eventuality if provided by an intransitive predicate. However, venire and andare do not provide an eventuality, but rather modify the Aktionsart and
the valence of the second predicate. The resultant complex predicate implies a previous event.

I have thus proposed that the passives with *venire* and *andare* are marked as non-resultative by the respective passive auxiliaries. This explains their rejection of the perfective aspect. These structures contrast both with the passive with *essere*, which is not marked as non-resultative, and with the resultative complex predicates formed with *venire* and *andare* plus a predicate, which, due to the semantic contribution of *venire* and *andare*, express states that imply a previous event.

7.5 **Predicative past participles: Absolute constructions**

Absolute participles were introduced in 5.5, where it was noted that, on a par with predicative adjectives, the past participle of the absolute construction is a predicate which contributes its argument(s) to the semantic representation of the clause, but cannot participate in the morphosyntactic workings of the clause. In particular, it cannot carry the tense and person specifications which, in Italian, figure partly or wholly on the finite form of the verb. This kind of predicate exhibits number and gender agreement with an undergoer, or a marked actor, both in Italian and in the Romance languages which have lost agreement on the perfective past participle.

In section 5.5, however, I argued against any analysis that equates absolute participles to adjectives, since absolute participles do not bear adjetival modification or substitute for adjectives. I repeat the relevant evidence below:

(49) a. *Preparatissima* la cena...
    Prepare.PP.FSG.SUPERL the dinner.FSG
    Lit. Very prepared the dinner, ...

b. *Ascitti / Ascigati* i panni, ...
    Dry.MPL dry.PP.MPL the cloth.MPL
    Lit. Having dried the clothes, ...

The examples in (49) rule out the adjectival analysis of absolute participles, since they show that absolute participles reject the superlative morphology (cf. (49a)), and do not substitute for adjectives (cf. (49b)). The past participle *asciutto* ‘dry’ is an adjectival past participle, comparable to
Sicilian *aperto* ‘open’ (see 7.3). Like Sicilian, Italian exhibits a number of participial pairs: *accettato* vs. *accètto* ‘accepted / welcome’, *asciugato* vs. *asciutto* ‘dried / dry’, *guastato* vs. *guasto* ‘broken down / broken’, *seccato* vs. *secco* ‘dried / dry’. The members of these pairs contrast insofar as one is regular (stressed on the thematic vowel and formed with the participial ending –*to*), whilst the other is irregular (athematic). The irregular member exhibits adjectival behaviour, in that it takes adjectival modification and it is banned from the passive:

\[(50)\]
\[
a. \text{I panni sono asciuttissimi.} \\
\text{The cloth.MPL be.3PL dry. MPL.SUPERL} \\
\text{‘The clothes are very dry.’}
\]
\[
b. \text{I panni sono asciutti (*dal sole).} \\
\text{The cloth.MPL be.3PL dry.MPL by.the sun} \\
\text{‘The clothes are dry (by the sunshine).’}
\]

The adjectival member of the participial pairs does not figure in the absolute construction, unless it is modified by *una volta* ‘once’ or *(non) ap-pena* ‘as soon as’, a point to which I return below (*Una volta asciutti i panni... ‘Once the clothes are dry, ...’*). Given that verbal past participles do not need any such modification to serve as absolute participles, it can be concluded that absolute participles are not adjectival by definition.

The issue which must be addressed in this context is whether absolute participles offer evidence of an active vs. non-active split, that is, evidence of the intransitivity split which is the focus of this work. Scholars do not agree on this point. In fact, despite the seminal work of La Fauci (1984, 1989) and Perlmutter (1989: 67–68), among others, who consider absolute participles to be diagnostics of split intransitivity, it has been claimed that absolute participles do not necessarily abide by the principle(s) of the un-accusative vs. unergative split. Egerland (2000: 608) has pointed out that some unergatives (i.e., activities) are admitted in absolutive constructions:

\[(51)\]
\[
\text{Appena cenato, andremo al cinema.} \\
\text{As.soon.as dine.PP go.1PL.FUT to.the cinema} \\
\text{‘As soon as we have dined, we shall go to the cinema.’}
\]

In turn, Loporcaro (2003) has argued that a satisfactory account of participial absolutes can only be given if two types of reduced clause with the verb in the participial form are distinguished: participial absolutes proper
and participial dependent clauses. The final subject (i.e. the controller) of participial absolutes is free from co-reference linkages with the main clause (cf. (52a)), whereas this is not the case with the final subject of participial dependent clauses: see (52b), where the missing argument of the participial clause is controlled by the PSA of the matrix clause.

(52) a. *Rientrata Emma, cominciò la festa.*
   Return.PP.FSG Emma begin.3SG.PST the party
   ‘Once Emma had returned, the party started.’

b. *Preparata la cena, cominciarono a mangiare.*
   Prepare.PP.FSG the dinner.FSG begin.1PL.PST to eat
   ‘Once they had made dinner, they started to eat.’

Loporcaro (2003) claims that only the structure illustrated in (52a) is subject to the constraints which are relevant to split intransitivity. Participial dependent clauses, on the other hand, admit unergative participles:

(53) *Vendemmiato, i contadini lasciarono il paese.*
   Harvest.PP the workers leave.3PL.PST the town
   ‘Having harvested the grapes, the agricultural workers left the town.’
   (Loporcaro 2003: 215)

Whilst successfully capturing some aspects of the morphosyntax of participial constructions, as was pointed out in section 5.5, Loporcaro’s classification is orthogonal to the classification of absolute participial clauses which is relevant to the notion of split intransitivity adopted in this work. This classification is based on a constraint concerning the direct argument which immediately follows the participle within its core. This argument must be an undergoer or a marked actor, regardless of the issue of the co-reference linkages between the participial clause and the main clause:

(54) a. *Perduti i soldi, non c’è speranza.*
   Lose.PP.MPL the money.MPL NEG CL be.3SG hope
   ‘Since the money is lost, there is no hope.’

b. *Telefonato / -a Emma, non c’è più speranza.*
   Phone.PP FSG Emma NEG CL be.3SG more hope
   ‘Emma having phoned, there is no more hope.’
   Phone.PP  FSG Emma OCL have.1PL tell.off.PP.FSG
   ‘Once Emma phoned, we told her off.’

   Phone.PP  FSG Emma OCL have.1PL tell.off.PP.FSG
   ‘Once Emma phoned, we told her off.’

Unlike the examples in (54), those in (55) exhibit co-reference linkages with the main clause, and, in this sense, are comparable with (53). The point which is relevant to the Unaccusative Hypothesis, however, is valid in both cases: the direct argument which immediately follows the absolute participle within its core must be an undergoer or a marked actor. The same constraint holds true for the controller of agreement on the absolute participle, which, however, need not occur within the core (Pettinatasi i capelli, Emma uscì, lit. having combed.FSG to herself the hair.MPL, Emma.FSG went out). Again, this well-formedness condition is valid regardless of the issue of the co-reference linkages with the main clause (Pettinatasi Emma, uscirono, lit. Emma.FSG having combed.FSG herself, they went out). It appears, then, that absolute participles provide the following evidence of active marking: (i) past-participle agreement and (ii) the choice of the direct argument which can follow the participle within its core. Since I dealt with agreement in 5.5, in this context I focus on the absolute construction in which the participle is immediately followed by a core-internal direct argument.

The discrepancies between attributive and absolute constructions which were first introduced in (6) indicate that there are Aktionsart constraints on the structure under investigation:

a. Promossa la ragazza, le affidano un incarico.
   Promote.PP.FSG the girl.FSG DCL assign.3PL a task
   ‘Having promoted the girl, they assign her a task.’

b. *Stimata la ragazza, le affidano un incarico.
   Esteem.PP.FSG the girl.FSG DCL assign.3PL a task
   ‘Holding the girl in high esteem, they assign her a task.’

The contrast between (56a) and (56b) challenges any semantic analysis which is purely based on the state vs. activity split, given that both the absolute past participle in (56a) and the one in (56b) include a state. This evidence would also escape any syntactic proposal claiming that the core-
internal argument of absolute participles must simply be an underlying object. Clearly, a more fine-grained analysis is needed.

Absolute participles join with a clause to form clausal co-subordinations. The semantic relation between the two propositions is temporal: the completion of the state of affairs expressed in the participial clause is understood to precede or lead to the state of affairs denoted by the finite clause. As is often the case with temporal relationships of this kind, the preceding event can serve as the cause or the condition for the following event (*post hoc ergo propter hoc*).

Temporal relations between propositions tend to be expressed by clausal subordination crosslinguistically. Accordingly, absolute participles are somewhat marked in terms of the interclausal relations hierarchy (VVLP: 481), which is concerned with the way that semantic relations between propositions are encoded in clause linkage. On the other hand, temporal, causal and conditional clauses often constitute topics, insofar as they set the scene for the information provided by the main clause (Haiman 1978). This is the case with absolute participles: these participial clauses constitute the presupposition of the assertion provided by the finite clause. Unlike other temporal, causal and conditional clauses, however, the absolute participial construction which is of interest to us is constrained in terms of focus structure. In fact, it sets the scene for the asserted information by introducing a participant which is crucial to the appreciation of the assertion. Indeed, Salvi (1986: 39) has noted that a co-referent argument in the co-subordinated clause cannot be focal, since this argument has already been introduced (*Uscito Giovanni, telefonò Giovanni* ‘JOHN, having gone out, JOHN phoned’). Incidentally, this participant can be identifiable (Chafe 1976; Du Bois 1980), as is suggested by the definiteness of the nominal in the participial clause of (56a). What matters is that the argument in question is central in the presupposition which prepares the assertion.

As is the case with structures which introduce a participant into discourse, absolute participles require that the core-internal argument should figure in postnuclear position regardless of its grammatical function (see section 8.4.2). In addition, the Aktionsart of the predicate of absolute participles includes a state, and I shall point out in the analysis of word-order that this is a recurrent feature, though not a requirement, of constructions which introduce a new element of information into discourse. Recall now that it is the completion of the state of affairs expressed by the participial clause that is interpreted as prior or leading to the state of affairs expressed
by the finite clause. In accordance with this aspect of the semantic relation between the two propositions, simple states are avoided, whilst the stative predicates which figure in the structures under scrutiny are the resultant states of telic eventualities.

My proposal is, therefore, that the absolute construction in which a direct argument follows the participle within its core requires the semantic representation BECOME pred’(x) or INGR pred’(x). This analysis explains why the following examples are ungrammatical; they exhibit states that are not embedded in a telic semantic representation:

(57) a. *Amato / *stimato / *compianto il ragazzo,...
   Love.PP.MSG esteem.PP.MSG lament.PP.MSG the boy.MSG
   ‘The boy being loved / held in high esteem / lamented,...’
   b. *Vissuto / *esistito il ragazzo,...
   Live.PP.MSG exist.PP.MSG the boy.MSG
   ‘The boy having lived / existed,...’
   c. *Stata pronta la cena,...
   Be.PP.FSG ready.FSG the dinner.FSG
   ‘The dinner being ready,...’

Example (57a), which includes the past participles of type-(i) experiencer verbs, suggests that bivalent states are excluded from the construction under investigation. Type-(iii) experiencer predicates are also incompatible with the absolute structure (see *piaciuta la cena (ai commensali),... ‘since the table companions had liked the dinner,...’). The data in (57b) and (57c) suggest that monovalent states are also banned, in accordance with the proposal made above. In fairness, the ungrammaticality of (57c) is determined by a restriction which is independent from the Aktionsart of the predicate, namely the ban of non-predicative participles from the absolute construction (Rosen 1997). However, the adjectival predicate alone is also banned (see *pronta la cena,...).

By contrast with type-(i) experiencer predicates, which are stative, type-(ii) ones, which can be inchoative or telic (see 3.3), are admitted:

(58) a. Preoccupatosi il professore, ...
   Worry.PP.MSG.RFL the professor.MSG
   ‘The professor having got worried,...’
   b. Irritatosi il professore,...
   Irritate.PP.MSG.RFL the professor.MSG
Past participles

‘The professor having got irritated,…’

The findings illustrated in (58) are expected, on the basis of the assumption that the predicates in question receive a telic reading in context.

Semelfactives cannot figure alongside their argument in absolute participles, since by definition they do not include BECOME or INGR:

(59) a. *Lampeggiato il faro,...
   Flash.PP.MSG the headlight.MSG
   ‘The headlight having flashed,…’

b. *Oscillato il metronomo,...
   Swing.PP.MSG the metronome.MSG
   ‘The metronome having swung,…’

My hypothesis, which has so far been corroborated by the evidence, would appear to clash with the fact that a number of pure states figure in the structure under investigation, provided that this exhibits adverbials such as una volta ‘once’ or (non) appena ‘as soon as’:

(60) a. *(Una volta) asciutti i panni,...
   One time dry.MPL the cloth.MPL
   ‘Once the clothes are dry, ....’

b. *(Una volta) pronta la cena
   One time ready.FSG the dinner.FSG
   ‘Once the dinner is ready, ....’

c. ?*(Una volta) visto il video,
   One time see.PP.MSG the video.MSG
   ‘Having watched the video,...’

The predicate of (60a) is the adjectival past participle of asciugare ‘(become) dry’, and it denotes a resultant state. The fact that this adjectival predicate cannot figure alone in the absolute construction suggests that the semantic representation of this structure is not the same as that of resultatives with ‘be’ (see 7.3): pred’ (x). On the other hand, the fact that the same adjectival predicate can figure in the absolute construction if combined with una volta ‘once’ or (non) appena ‘as soon as’ suggests that these adverbials contribute to the semantics of the clause. The telic counterpart of asciutto ‘dry’ does occur alone in the same structure (see asciugatisi i panni,... ‘the clothes having become dry, ...’). The semantic
representation of this predicate is \textsc{become} dry `(x), and it is not unreasonable to assume that \textit{una volta asciutti} (cf. (60a)) is semantically equivalent to \textsc{become} dry `(x). How can the adverbials \textit{una volta} ‘once’ or (non) appena ‘as soon as’ contribute a telic component to the semantic representation of the predicate? They force a reading whereby it is not a pure state that is encoded, but an event leading to a state. In the theoretical terms adopted in this work, they contribute the operator \textsc{become} to the semantic representation. The same account holds for (60b) and (60c). Due to the contribution of the adverbial, the semantics of (60b) is \textsc{become} ready `(cena) and that of (60c) is \textsc{become} seen `(film).

There are stative predicates which do not behave like those in (60b) and (60c). In fact, some states are compatible with a stage-level reading, and a sense of completion, which is usually conveyed by the context, for instance, the qualia properties of the object. Others only allow an individual-level reading, and will not figure in the construction under scrutiny. This is the case with \textit{stimare} ‘esteem’, and with adjectives like \textit{intelligente} ‘intelligent’, which do not combine with \textit{una volta} ‘once’ or (non) appena ‘as soon as’. Finally, the adjective \textit{buono} ‘good’, alongside those which were said to acquire a stage-level reading in the perfect (see 6.4.1), do not figure in the construction illustrated in (60). In fact, they cannot combine with a copula (e.g., \textit{stato}, lit. stayed), for the reasons stated in Rosen (1997), and otherwise receive an individual-level reading (*una volta buono il ragazzo, lit. once the boy is good).

The absolute construction analysed in this section denotes an event which leads to a resultant state. Thus, it includes the operator \textsc{become} or INGR. In addition, this construction introduces a discourse participant, which is an undergoer or a marked actor. This analysis explains why the lowest but not the highest argument of transitive predication can follow the participle within its core. What figures in the construction is the telic portion of the transitive predicate, which includes the lowest argument:

\begin{verbatim}
(61) a. Mangiare un tramezzino.
   Eat a sandwich
   ‘Eat a sandwich.’
   \textsc{do}'(x, [\textsc{eat}'(x, y)]) & \textsc{become} eaten'(y)

b. Mangiato un tramezzino,…
   Eat.PP.MSG a sandwich.MSG
   ‘Having eaten a sandwich,…’
   \textsc{become} eaten'(x)
\end{verbatim}
7.6 Compounds with *ben(e)* or *mal(e)* plus a participle

An interesting difference is observed between two classes of adjectival or nominal compounds which consist of either of the adverbs *ben(e)* ‘well’ and *mal(e)* ‘badly’, followed by a present or past participle. The compounds formed with a past participle only represent Aktionsart types which include a state, and modify the lowest or only direct argument of the state. Contrastingly, the compounds formed with a present participle represent any Aktionsart type and modify the highest or only argument of the participle. Tables 7 and 8 provide lists of examples which illustrate the two types of compound.

The past participles which figure in the left-hand column of table 7 are correlates of states, achievements, or (active) accomplishments, i.e., Aktionsart types which include a state in their semantic representation. Significantly, these participles modify their lowest or only direct argument. These data are thus in agreement with the intransitivity split, as it is conceived of in this work. Semantically, the participles which figure in the compounds can differ somewhat from the related verbs, as is shown by the translations provided. This suggests that the compounds constitute separate lexical entries. The present participles in the left-hand column of table 8 belong to verbs which test out as states, activities, or (active) accomplishments. The compounds modify the highest or only direct argument of the predicates in question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Aktionsart / argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beneamato</td>
<td>amare</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘beloved’</td>
<td>‘love’</td>
<td>lowest direct argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benearrivato</td>
<td>arrivare</td>
<td>active accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘welcome’</td>
<td>‘arrive’</td>
<td>only direct argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bennato</td>
<td>nascere</td>
<td>achievement/ accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘well-born, well-bred’</td>
<td>‘be born’</td>
<td>only direct argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benvenuto</td>
<td>venire</td>
<td>active accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘welcome’</td>
<td>‘come’</td>
<td>only direct argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benvisto</td>
<td>vedere</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘well thought-of’</td>
<td>‘see’</td>
<td>lowest direct argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7. Adjectival and nominal compounds with past participles (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Aktionsart / argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>benvoluto ‘popular, loved’</td>
<td>volere bene ‘love’</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malaccètto ‘unwelcome’</td>
<td>accettare ‘accept’</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malaugurato ‘unlucky, inauspicious’</td>
<td>augurare ‘wish’</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malandato ‘run down, in bad shape’</td>
<td>andare ‘go’</td>
<td>active accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malcapitato ‘unfortunate, unlucky’</td>
<td>capitare</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malnato ‘ill-bred’</td>
<td>nascere ‘be born’</td>
<td>achievement/ accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malvissuto ‘somebody who has lived an evil life’</td>
<td>vivere ‘live’</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malvisto ‘disliked, unpopular’</td>
<td>vedere ‘see’</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8. Adjectival and nominal compounds with present participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Aktionsart / argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beneficiente ‘beneficient, beneficial’</td>
<td>fare ‘make’</td>
<td>activity or active accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benestante ‘well-off, well-to-do’</td>
<td>stare ‘be, stay’</td>
<td>highest direct argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benparlante ‘well-spoken’</td>
<td>parlare ‘speak’</td>
<td>activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benpensante ‘orthodox thinker’</td>
<td>pensare ‘think’</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benportante ‘healthy and vigourous in spite of age’</td>
<td>portare ‘carry’</td>
<td>activity or active accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malpensante ‘somebody who thinks wrong of others’</td>
<td>pensare ‘think’</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Adjectival and nominal compounds with present participles (continued)
Past participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>maldicente</th>
<th>dire ‘say’</th>
<th>activity or active accomplishment (highest direct argument)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘slanderer, slanderous’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>malvivente</th>
<th>vivere ‘live’</th>
<th>state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘criminal, delinquent’</td>
<td></td>
<td>only direct argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.7 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed attributive and predicative constructions with past participles, bringing to light a number of mismatches which challenge any binary syntactic or semantic analysis of these structures. Attributive past participles modify the lowest available argument of a state. However, it is necessary to distinguish between a restrictive and a descriptive attributive construction. The restrictive construction exhibits the past participle of states, achievements and accomplishments, and is comparable to a reduced restrictive relative clause. The past participle is focal in this construction, and occurs in the immediately postnuclear periphery inside the nominal core (Lo scrittore ucciso, lit. the writer killed). Crucially, the modified argument is an undergoer or an affected actor. Accordingly, the restrictive construction provides evidence of active alignment. The descriptive construction only licenses the past participle of states which denote quantifiable properties. In the light of semantic and distributional evidence, it has been argued that the past participle of this construction is systematically subject to a rule which turns it into an adjective. Following Vincent’s (1986) analysis of prenominal adjectives, I have suggested that the quantifiable stative attribute joins with the reference of the nominal head to yield a complex referential unit (Lo stimato scrittore ‘The esteemed writer’).

In the analysis of predicative participles, it has been claimed that passives can be marked as resultative or non-resultative (see the Italian passive formed with venire and andare plus past participle, which is not resultative), or, alternatively, be neutral (see the Italian passive formed with essere ‘be’ plus past participle). The resultative construction formed with essere ‘be’ and a past participle (È morto ‘he is dead’), which is known in the literature as adjectival passive, has been claimed to correspond to the semantic representation \textbf{pred} (x), a portion of the semantics of a telic predicate. The discussion has brought to light a number of puzzling facts concerning past participles which are not related to telic predicates (È proprio fumata ‘she is really stoned’). I have suggested that these are adjec-
tives which are not related to the corresponding participles by lexical decomposition. This class of adjectival past participles is lexically constrained.

Absolute participles join with a matrix clause to yield a clausal co-subordination. In discourse, absolute participles constitute topics, in that they provide the presupposition for the following assertion. The absolute construction is of interest in the study of split intransitivity for two reasons: (i) past-participle agreement is controlled by an undergoer or a marked actor; (ii) the direct argument which can follow the participle immediately within its core must also be an undergoer or a marked actor. In particular, this is the lowest argument of a stative predicate embedded under the telic operator BECOME or INGR.

Finally, it has been noted that adjectival and nominal compounds formed with either of the adverbs ben(e) ‘well’ and mal(e) ‘badly’ and an adjectival past participle only exhibit the participles of verbs which include a state in the semantic representation and modify the lowest or only direct argument of the state.

The mismatches between the various constructions with past participles do not invalidate the view that past-participle behaviour has diagnostic power vis-à-vis split intransitivity. Rather, they are explained by the hypothesis, put forward by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) with respect to English, that given constructions select for specific classes of verbs. The verb classes which are admitted by some participial constructions constitute a narrower semantic domain than the domain which is defined by active alignment.
Chapter 8
Word order

8.1 Introduction

Since Perlmutter (1983) and Burzio (1986), word order has figured in treatments of the Unaccusative Hypothesis. The aim of this chapter is to ascertain exactly what evidence word order provides, if any, for the intransitivity split in Italian. Particular emphasis is placed on the interplay between a syntactic principle, which is concerned with the immediately prenuclear position inside the core, and ensures that this is the default position of the PSA, and a pragmatic principle, which is concerned with the immediately postnuclear position, and ensures that this is the default position of focal direct arguments. The examination of word order in declarative main clauses indicates that this is not a diagnostic of split intransitivity in Italian. VS order (i.e., the placement of the PSA in the immediately postnuclear position inside the core) is licensed more freely with predicates which include a state in the semantic representation than with activity predicates. However, this is merely a by-product of the workings of the pragmatic principle mentioned above. The PSA of activity predicates can also occur in the immediately postnuclear position, if this principle is satisfied.

After considering the first treatments of word order in the context of split intransitivity (§ 8.2), I introduce the reader to the syntactic and pragmatic principles which interact in the determination of word order in Italian declarative main clauses (§ 8.3). The subsequent discussion focuses on intransitive constructions with a postnuclear PSA (§ 8.4). Contrastive focus (§ 8.4.1) is distinguished from non-contrastive focus (§ 8.4.2). In section 8.4.3, I illustrate the results of a corpus-based study of locative inversion, and in section 8.4.4, I analyse non-contrastive VS order vis-à-vis ne-cliticization, pointing out that ne-cliticization is a true manifestation of split intransitivity, unlike VS order. The conclusion follows in section 8.5.
8.2 Word order and split intransitivity

The relevance of word order to split intransitivity in Modern Italian was noted in the early work on the Unaccusative Hypothesis (Perlmutter 1983; Burzio 1986). Unlike Old Italian, which is claimed to be a V2 language, i.e., a language which requires that the verb should occur in second position in the clause, after another constituent which is not necessarily the subject, Modern Italian is generally thought to exhibit basic SV(O) order. In accordance with this kind of linear order, the immediately postnuclear position can be filled by a direct object (cf. (1)), whereas the PSA figures in the immediately prenuclear position inside the core:

(1) [CORE Leo [NUCLEUS ama] Eva].
   Leo love.3SG Eve
   ‘Leo loves Eve.’

Starting from the assumption that the basic word order of Modern Italian is SV(O), Perlmutter (1983) noted that the only argument of some intransitive constructions occurs by default after the verb, thus correlating with the direct object of transitive clauses. By way of example, consider the data in (2):

(2)  a. *Due soluzioni ci sono.
    Two solutions there be.3PL
    ‘There are two solutions.’
  b. Ci sono due soluzioni.
    There be.3PL two soluzioni
    ‘There are two solutions.’
  c. Ce ne sono due.
    There QCL be.3PL two
    ‘There are two ne.’
    (Perlmutter 1983: 168)

Perlmutter (1983: 168) argued that, unless the preverbal argument bears contrastive prominence, the linear order in (2a) is ungrammatical. Thus, the unmarked position of the argument of existential esserci ‘there + be’ is the immediately postverbal position (cf. (2b)). This is also the default posi-
tation of the quantifier of constructions with *ne*-cliticization (cf. (2c)), which is assumed to originate from an object.

To account for the facts illustrated in (2), Perlmutter (1983) suggested that existential *esserci* ‘there + be’ is an impersonal construction, that is, a construction where the argument is an object, comparable to the object of transitives and the only argument of unaccusatives with VS order (*Sono rimaste delle persone* ‘Some people have stayed’, lit. are remained some people).

The PSA of activity predicates (unergatives) can also follow the verb in Italian:

(3)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Mi sta telefonando il direttore.} \\
\text{DCL.1SG stay.3SG phone.GER the director} \\
\text{‘The director is on the line.’} \\
\text{(Tabucchi, Sostiene Pereira, p. 164)}
\end{array}
\]

However, in the light of the ungrammaticality of the *ne*-cliticization of the argument of unergatives, Perlmutter (1983) claimed that the argument of structures like (3) is not an object.

In Burzio’s (1986: 21) view, “virtually any type of sentence with pre-verbal subject has a counterpart in which ‘the subject’ appears to the right of the verb”. However, in clauses like (4), the argument figures in the position in which it is generated:

(4)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{È morto il cane.} \\
\text{Be.3SG die.PP.MSG the dog.MSG} \\
\text{‘The dog has died.’}
\end{array}
\]

By contrast, in *mi sta telefonando il direttore*, ‘the director is on the line’ (lit. to me is phoning the director), the argument follows the verb as a result of movement that adjoins it to the verb phrase.

Burzio’s idea that virtually any subject can follow its predicate in Italian has become known as the claim that Italian has free inversion. Note that, unlike the type of inversion which was considered in section 3.4, in this case the term inversion specifically refers to the linear order of the constituents rather than to the overall morphosyntactic encoding of the grammatical relations between the predicate and its arguments.

Burzio (1986: 85–177) relates the productivity of Italian inversion to the fact that Italian is a null-subject language. Following Rizzi (1982),
Burzio assumes that the rich inflection of Italian can behave as a pronoun associated with the preverbal position both in structures with a postverbal subject (cf. (5a)) and in structures which lack a subject altogether (cf. (5b)):

\[(5) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Ha telefonato Gianni.} \\
& \text{Have.3SG phone.PP John} \\
& \text{‘John phoned.’}
\end{align*} \]

\[(5) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Ha telefonato.} \\
& \text{Have.3SG phone.PP} \\
& \text{‘He phoned.’}
\end{align*} \]

Non-null-subject languages do not have free inversion (see the contrast between French *il a téléphoné Jean ‘John has phoned’ and *il arrive que… ‘it happens that…’), and require an expletive in preverbal position, when the potential PSA occurs in postverbal position (see French *il).

Perlmutter’s (1983) and Burzio’s (1986) observations are the starting point of my own treatment of Italian word order in the context of split intransitivity. I aim to capture the rationale of facts such as those noted by Perlmutter (cf. (2)), which indicate that, by default, some intransitives exhibit an immediately postnuclear argument, and to work out the constraints on the placement of the PSA of intransitive clauses in the immediately postnuclear position. Whilst drawing upon Burzio’s (1986) intuition that intransitive constructions with a postnuclear PSA are not necessarily unaccusative in Italian, I object to the idea of free inversion. Indeed, the theory of free inversion is at the same time too restrictive and too lax with respect to word order in constructions with activity predicates (unergatives). It does not admit the possibility for the postnuclear PSA of unergative structures to figure in the same position as the postnuclear PSA of unaccusative ones. I assume that this possibility exists, in the light of evidence from presentational constructions which has been brought to light by Benincà (1988) and will be discussed in due course. The postnuclear PSA of activity predicates thus occurs in one of three positions: (i) the immediately postnuclear one (cf. (6a)), (ii) the Post-Core Slot, where it is contrastive (cf. (6b)), and (iii) the Right-Detached Position, where it serves as a kind of afterthought in discourse (cf. (6c)):
In the last case, the PSA is separated from the core by a pause. Significantly, only the argument of some activity predicates can occur in the immediately postnuclear position. The theory of free inversion, however, does not do justice to the focus-structure constraints on the postnuclear placement of the PSA of activity predicates.

Burzio’s (1986) theory of free inversion is also assumed to hold for bivalent predications, thus failing to account for the greater flexibility of word order in constructions with type-(iii) experiencer predicates than in clauses with transitives. Unlike the PSA of type-(iii) experiencer predicates (cf. (8b)), the PSA of transitive clauses can only occur in the immediately postnuclear position if the undergoer is a topical clitic:

(7)  
Il premio, chi l’ ha vinto?

The prize.MSG who OCL have.3SG win_PP.MSG ‘The prize, who won it?’
L’ ha vinto quello studente.
OCL have.3SG win_PP.MSG that student ‘That student won it.’

The occurrence of a nominal object undergoer in the immediately prenuclear position is banned (*Il premio ha vinto quello studente, lit. the prize has won that student), unlike the occurrence of the undergoer of type-(iii) experiencer predicates in the same position (cf. (8a)):

(8)  
Quello studente è piaciuto alla giuria.

That student.MSG be.3SG appeal_PP.MSG to.the jury ‘That student impressed the jury.’
Word order

b. Alla giuria è piaciuto quello studente.
   To.the jury be.3SG appeal.PP.MSG that student
   ‘That student impressed the jury.’

I shall now provide an introduction to word order in Italian declarative main clauses (see section 8.3). This is not meant to be exhaustive, but rather to illustrate briefly the interplay of syntax with pragmatic factors in Italian word order. Secondly, I shall focus on intransitive main clauses and discuss matters which are strictly relevant to split intransitivity (see section 8.4). The treatment includes a study of locative inversion in Italian, which is based on the findings of corpus-based analysis (see section 8.4.3). The principal claim put forward is that the constraints on the appearance of the PSA of activities in the immediately postnuclear position are ultimately determined by the relative incompatibility of this type of Aktionsart with non-contrastive focus on the PSA.

8.3 The interaction of syntax with discourse

The results of typological research indicate that the patterns of linear order which are displayed by the majority of natural languages reflect the tension between the syntactically-motivated orders SOV, SVO, VSO, and, on the other hand, a pragmatic principle which strives to establish the respective order of thematic (topical) and rhematic (focal) units of information. Bos-song (1980) has claimed that, crosslinguistically, there is a clear tendency for the rheme to follow the theme, regardless of the basic syntactic order – and the basic alignment – of individual languages. Italian does not constitute an exception in this sense. Indeed, a useful starting point in the study of the linear order of the constituents in Italian is the assumption that the linear patterns which are available reflect the tension between, on the one hand, basic SV(O) order and, on the other, a pragmatic principle which requires that, in declarative main clauses, the constituents which introduce new information occur after the verb. SV(O) order places the PSA in the core-internal immediately prenuclear position. Contrastingly, the pragmatic principle establishes that the core-internal immediately postnuclear position is the default position of focal direct arguments (Van Valin 1993: 97).

As is pointed out in Sornicola (1986), based on Firbas (1964), the syntactic and pragmatic principles can be in agreement with each other. Consider utterances like Guido ha accarezzato il gatto ‘Guido has stroked
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The cat’. Abstracting away from the variants of this utterance which are obtained by placing contrastive prominence on the first constituent or the verb, the sequence *ha accarezzato il gatto* ‘has stroked the cat’ pushes the communication forward – to use Firbas’ (1964: 270) expression - more than does *Guido*. The constituent in the core-internal immediately postnuclear position (*il gatto* ‘the cat’) is focal. Evidence in support of this analysis is the fact that the utterance *Guido ha accarezzato il gatto* ‘Guido has stroked the cat’ would be a suitable reply to the question *che ha fatto Guido?* ‘what has Guido done?’, in which *Guido* is introduced as part of the presupposition. Contrastingly, the passive correlate of the above sentence (*Il gatto è stato accarezzato da Guido* ‘the cat has been stroked by Guido’) would not be a felicitous reply to the same question. This is because the passive introduces *il gatto* ‘the cat’ as part of the presupposition.

Crosslinguistically, the passive can be used to maintain continuity in topic chains (Foley and Van Valin 1984: 354–360). The passive can also, of course, introduce a participant as a topic, regardless of whether it has been mentioned previously. Thus, if the utterance *il bambino è stato punto da un’ape* ‘the baby has been stung by a bee’ is pronounced abruptly, or as a reply to the question *che è successo?* ‘what happened?’, which does not provide a presupposition, the choice of the passive is explained in view of the situational or co-textual salience of *il bambino* ‘the baby’. In other words, the passive can serve as a device that ensures SV order when the undergoer carries less communicative weight than the rest of the assertion.” As was briefly mentioned above there is a syntactic rule which bans the nominal undergoer of transitive clauses from the core-internal immediately prenuclear position. As a result of this rule, *il bambino ha punto un’ape* is not a grammatical option to encode the information ‘a bee has stung the baby’, even in contexts where *il bambino* ‘the baby’ does not carry as much communicative weight as the rest of the utterance.

The lack of free inversion of the PSA and the nominal undergoer in transitive clauses indicates that syntax can override discourse in the determination of Italian word order. Significant evidence that the syntactic principle at work in word order is the one which underlies accusative alignment, as claimed by La Fauci (1989: 228), is provided by the findings of Bernini’s (1995) and Sornicola’s (1995) corpus-based studies of VS order in Italian. In fact, although both studies reveal that VS order is far from infrequent, subject to stylistic variation, SV order turns out to be predominant in intransitive constructions, as well as in transitive ones. The predominance of SV order in intransitive constructions would seem to suggest
that, regardless of whether the PSA is marked, its default position is immediately prenuclear. This position neutralizes the semantic contrast between actors and undergoers. Thus, the fact that, the pragmatic conditions being equal, as is the case with predicate-focus constructions such as *Guido ha cantato* ‘Guido has sung’ and *Guido è morto* ‘Guido has died’, SV order is the chosen order indicates that the semantic (active) alignment is not directly involved in the determination of Italian word order.

The syntactic principle which governs word order is also illustrated by *si*-constructions. In fact, Lepschy and Lepschy (1988: 225) claim that the undergoer PSA of *si*-passives tends to precede the verb, thus contrasting with the undergoer of their impersonal correlates:

(9) a. *La verità non si può sempre dire.* (passive)  
   The truth NEG IMP can.3SG always tell  
   ‘The truth cannot always be told.’

b. *Non si può sempre dire la verità.* (impersonal)  
   NEG IMP can always tell the truth  
   ‘One cannot always tell the truth.’  
   (Lepschy and Lepschy 1988: 225)

Like the analytic passive discussed above, the *si*-passive with a prenuclear PSA introduces the participant as a topic whilst preserving SV order. The markedness of the PSA is not indicated by word order in either type of passive. As for reflexives, Cennamo’s (1995) analysis of a corpus of newspaper reports and stretches of conversation has revealed that clauses with reflexive *si* display the sequence N₁ *si* V as the default word order, regardless of classes of reflexives, with the *si* V N₁ sequence being triggered by the heaviness of N₁, or pragmatic factors, like the focal value of N₁.

To conclude, evidence from corpus analysis suggests that word order primarily encodes accusative alignment in Modern Italian. However, the syntactic principle which underlies accusative alignment interacts with a pragmatic principle. This establishes that the core-internal immediately postnuclear position is the default position of constituents which provide focal elements of information in discourse. It is to the workings of this principle that I now turn.
8.4 Intransitive constructions with a postnuclear PSA

Let us now focus on intransitive main clauses with VS order, and try to ascertain the well-formedness conditions which operate on these clauses. A great deal of research has already been carried out on this matter. In particular, researchers have investigated the semantics of the verb classes which figure in VS sequences. One need only think of Wandruszka’s (1982: 7–9) list of verb classes which allow VS order: existentials, verbs denoting intrinsic – for instance optical or acoustic – properties of the referent of the subject (e.g., splendere ‘shine’, predicated of the sun), verbs denoting typical properties of the subject (e.g., verdeggiare ‘be/appear green’, predicated of a garden), verbs denoting states of affairs attributed to the subject as one of its properties (e.g., dominare ‘dominate’, predicated of a character), etc. With evidence from journalistic prose and speech, Bernini (1995: 55) demonstrates that VS order is primarily found with predicates which denote existence (e.g., esserci ‘there + be’), appearance to the scene (e.g., arrivare ‘arrive’, iniziare / prendere il via ‘start’), continuation (e.g., continuare / proseguire ‘continue’), change (e.g., ridurre ‘reduce’, cambiare ‘change’), and exit from the scene (e.g., morire ‘die’, concludersi ‘finish’). Sornicola (1995: 77), whose corpus includes both journalistic prose and excerpts from unplanned conversation, points out that the majority of VS sequences include mono-argumental inchoative, telic and resultative predicates. Sornicola (1995) further notes that animacy plays a role, in that inanimate, and often abstract, postverbal subjects are more frequent than animate ones. In general terms, the cited results would appear to be in agreement with the findings of research on Old Romance, which highlight the predominance of VS order with verbs that denote existence and movement (de Dardel 1983).

The greater frequency of VS order in unaccusative structures than in unergative ones supports the first views on word order advanced in the context of the study of split intransitivity (Perlmutter 1983). From the theoretical standpoint adopted in this work, it would seem to suggest that VS order differentiates between undergoers or affected actors and other actors. At the same time, though, one should not overlook the possibility of VS order in unergative structures. This possibility was exemplified with reference to Burzio’s (1986) theory of free inversion (cf. (6a)) and is further
illustrated below with an authentic example drawn from a journalistic text outside my primary corpus:

(10) Tace il ministro degli Interni C... Clarke.
    Keep.silent.3SG the minister of.the internal.affairs C. Clarke
    ‘The Home Secretary C. Clarke will not comment on the matter.’
    (Luigi Offeddu, Corriere della Sera, 18 August 2005)

In (10), VS order introduces a new element of information into discourse. Tacere ‘keep silent’ behaves as an activity (or a transitive active accomplishment), in Italian, and is even compatible with the phrase di proposito ‘on purpose’, which indicates intentionality. It is thus an agentive activity.

Further counterevidence to the categorical association of VS order with unaccusativity is provided by Benincà (1988: 124–125). Benincà (1988) has noted that only some unaccusatives allow a pragmatically unmarked, i.e., non-contrastive, immediately postnuclear PSA. Thus, the PSA of arriva Maria, lit. arrives Mary, is not contrastive, whereas the PSA of parte Maria, lit. leaves Mary, is contrasted with the members of a set to which it belongs. Benincà has claimed that the same contrast holds for unergatives, insofar as a limited number of unergatives (e.g., telefonare ‘phone’, suonare ‘ring’, bussare ‘knock’) allow a pragmatically unmarked postnuclear PSA. The verbs which allow a pragmatically unmarked postnuclear PSA are claimed by Benincà to have an implicit locational argument, which serves as the topic of the utterance.

Benincà’s (1988) claim might seem to be invalidated by the results of corpus analysis, which suggest greater flexibility than would seem to be admitted by the scholar. Example (10) is a case in point, in that it displays a non-contrastive postnuclear PSA with an activity predicate which does not have a covert locational element. Observe, however, that whilst structures like (10) are standard in journalistic prose, they are virtually absent from other styles. Significantly, I have not found any comparable data in my corpus of ten literary texts in Modern Italian. The reason why the non-contrastive placement of the PSA in immediately postnuclear position is found in journalistic prose, and can occur in constructions with activity predicates which do not normally exhibit this word order in other styles, is that the bulk of journalistic prose introduces new events. Thus, activity predicates can be part of sentence-focus constructions by virtue of the conventions of this style, which are adhered to both by the writer and by the reader.
In the types of journalistic prose which do not make announcements, for instance the comment or cultural pages of newspapers, one expects to find more limited evidence of VS order than in the news sections. In fact, Soromicola (1995: 79) observes some variation in the prose of newspapers, with SV order characterizing descriptions and background information, and VS order prevailing in the narrative and in foreground parts of the text. These findings support my claim on VS order with activity predicates.

Activity predicates can of course introduce new events in other styles. However, failing the support of the stylistic conventions of journalistic prose, other clues may be necessary to indicate that a new event is being introduced into discourse. Tense and aspect contribute to the encoding of focal events, and thus of sentence focus, as was shown in 6.3.1. This explains a fact which has not yet received due attention. In particular, some of the predicates which admit a non-contrastive immediately postnuclear PSA only do so if they are temporally or aspectually marked:

    Phone.3SG Lisa
    ‘It is Mary who is phoning / will phone.’

    b. *Ha telefonato / sta telefonando / telefonò Lisa.*
    Have.3SG phone.PP stay.3SG phone.GER
    phone.3SG.PST Lisa
    ‘Lisa has phoned / is phoning / phoned!’

The focus on the PSA of (11a) is, in fact, contrastive, in that it contrasts this argument with a set to which it belongs. The PSA of (11b) can simply introduce a new event with a focal participant.

It should by now be clear that, in order to capture the stylistic contrasts mentioned above, as well as the intricacies of the immediately postnuclear behaviour in intransitive constructions, one needs to consider focus structure. This is what I shall do in the following sections. Following Benincà (1988), I distinguish between contrastive focus, discussed in section 8.4.1, and non-contrastive focus, considered in 8.4.2. Contrastive postnuclear PSAs figure in the Post-Core Slot, regardless of the Aktionsart of the predicate. Non-contrastive postnuclear PSAs figure in the immediately postnuclear position. The analysis of non-contrastive VS order will lead me to a discussion of locative inversion. In accordance with Levin and Rappaport Hovav’s (1995) study of locative inversion in English, I shall
propose that this is not a diagnostic of split intransitivity in Italian, in spite of the predominance, in this structure, of predicates which include a state.

8.4.1 Contrastive focus on the postnuclear PSA

Contrastive narrow focus on the postnuclear PSA is exemplified in (12):

(12) Le guardiane... dovevano fare quello che dicevano le suore perché comandavano loro.

The warders must.3PL.PST do that REL say.3PL.PST the nuns because rule.3PL.PST them ‘The warders had to do what the nuns said because they (the nuns) were the ones who ruled the place.’

(Maraini, Memorie di una ladra, p. 230)

The postnuclear PSA of comandavano ‘ruled’, loro ‘them’, is a tonic pronoun which refers anaphorically to a participant introduced previously in discourse (suore ‘nuns’). The placement of the pronoun in postnuclear position, as well as intonational prominence, would seem to indicate that this referent is focal. At the same time, the fact that this element is anaphoric suggests that, in this case, VS order does not signal a new unit of information. On the contrary, what is indicated by word order and intonational prominence is that the unit is contrasted with the members of a set to which it belongs.

Contrastive VS order is not subject to any of the conditions which were identified above with reference to non-contrastive VS order. In terms of Aktionsart, comandare ‘rule’ is an agentive activity, and this indicates that there are no Aktionsart constraints. In addition, the verb need not imply a locational argument: indeed, there is no entailed location with comandare ‘rule’. Finally, tense and aspect are irrelevant. In fact, contrastive VS order is not confined to or ruled out by the perfective aspect:

(13) a. Telefona LUISA.
    Phone.3SG Louise ‘It is Louise that is phoning.’

b. Ha telefonato LUISA, non Piera.
    have.3SG phone.PP Louise NEG Piera ‘It is Louise that phoned, not Piera.’
As is the case with other languages, in Italian, verbs of saying and thinking require that their PSA should occur in postnuclear position after citations:

(14) “Sposami” disse il PRINCIPE.
    Marry.IMPER.OCL say.3SG.PST the prince
    “Marry me” said the Prince

Bernini (1995: 46) has argued that VS order is grammaticalized after citations. Clearly, this grammaticalized pattern originates from a contrast in discourse, whereby the postnuclear PSA is a member of a set (for instance, the characters of a novel).

As far as the position of postnuclear contrastive PSAs is concerned, in the light of evidence from transitive clauses, I assume that these occur in the Post-Core Slot:

(15) Ha vinto il premio quello studente.
    Have.3SG win.PP the prize that student
    ‘It was that student that won the prize.’

Since the nominal undergoer of (15) figures in the immediately postnuclear position, and there is no pause between the undergoer and the PSA, the latter must occur in the Post-Core Slot.

Incidentally, contrastive units of information can also figure in the Pre-Core Slot (cf. (16a)), which is otherwise the position of wh-elements (cf. (16b)):

(16) a. LUISA ha telefonato, non Piera.
    Louise have.3SG phone.PP NEG Piera
    ‘It was Louise who phoned, not Piera.’

b. Chi ha telefonato?
    Who have.3SG phone.PP
    ‘Who has phoned?’

Accordingly, the positions of prenuclear and postnuclear contrastive arguments are symmetric: the Pre-Core Slot and the Post-Core Slot.

By way of conclusion of this short treatment, I should stress that, given that there are no Aktionsart constraints on contrastive VS order, this is strictly speaking irrelevant to the treatment of split intransitivity. Contras-
tive postnuclear PSAs will thus be factored out from the analysis of VS order.

8.4.2 Non-contrastive focus on the postnuclear PSA

Above it was mentioned that non-contrastive VS order is frequently found in journalistic prose, in particular in the news sections of newspapers. In fact there appear to be some discrepancies between journalistic prose and other styles, with journalistic prose allowing non-contrastive VS order more freely than other styles by virtue of its conventions, which are aimed at introducing new events.

Structures which introduce events into discourse are not a peculiarity of the journalistic style, of course. Consider the examples below:

\begin{align*}
\text{(17) a. } & \text{ C’ è UN PROBLEMA.} \\
& \text{There be.3SG a problem} \\
& \text{‘There is a problem.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{È successo IL FINIMONDO.} \\
& \text{Be.3SG happen.PP the bedlam} \\
& \text{‘There was bedlam.’} \\
& \text{(Maraini, Memorie di una ladra, p. 278)} \\
\text{c. } & \text{Manca IL SUO VISTO STAMPATO.} \\
& \text{Be.missing.3SG the POSS seal stamp.PP} \\
& \text{‘Your seal of approval is missing.’} \\
& \text{(Tabucchi, Sostiene Pereira, p. 206)} \\
\text{d. } & \text{Serve IL TUO AIUTO.} \\
& \text{Need.3SG the POSS help} \\
& \text{‘Your help is needed.’}
\end{align*}

These examples predicate the existence (cf. (17a)), coming into being (cf. (17b)), absence (cf. (17c)) and need (cf. (17d)) of a new discourse participant. The predicates of these structures do not contribute much information to the assertion. In fact, in terms of Sasse’s (1987) thetic vs. categorical distinction, these constructions constitute prime examples of thetic, i.e., non-predicative, statements. In the theory of focus structure adopted in this work, these examples involve narrow focus on the argument or sentence focus. In neither case is the argument contrastive." Incidentally, the fact that the PSA can be definite indicates that identifiability is irrelevant.
I mentioned Perlmutter’s (1983) view that existential *esserci* ‘there + be’ exhibits by default a postnuclear argument because it is an impersonal construction. In my analysis, the unmarked position of the argument of existential *esserci* ‘there + be’, as well as the other predicates listed in (17), is immediately postnuclear because this argument is by default focal. The correspondence between the unmarked position of the argument of existential *esserci* ‘there + be’ and of the quantifier of structures with *ne*-cliticization is explained by the fact that this quantifier is also focal (see 8.4.4 for a contrastive analysis of *ne*-cliticization and VS order). Significantly, the argument of existential *esserci* ‘there + be’ can be part of the presupposition, even though this is not usually the case. This is shown by the following authentic example, where SV order expresses the speaker’s failed expectation that she and her friend would have found work as artists:

(18) *E il lavoro d’artiste non c’è.*

And the work of artists NEG there be.3SG

‘And the work for artists simply does not exist.’

(Maraini, *Memorie di una ladra*, p. 95)

The pragmatic principle which targets focal direct arguments is irrelevant to (18), and the syntactic principle on the position of the PSA is satisfied.

Turning now to the constraints on non-contrastive VS order which were brought to light by Benincà (1988: 124–125), goal-entailing verbs of inherently directed motion (terminology from Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995 and Tortora 1997, 2001) do not require a contrastive reading of the postnuclear PSA (cf. (19)). Benincà claims that it is the topical location that licenses the non-contrastive reading of the PSA:

(19) a. *Arrivano  i nostri!*  

    Arrive.3PL the POSS  

    ‘Here come our allies!’

b. *Torna il freddo.*  

    Return.3SG the cold  

    ‘The cold is back.’

c. *Entra uno spiffero d’aria.*  

    Enter.3SG a draught of air  

    ‘There is a draught coming in.’
In fact, predicates such as ‘arrive’, ‘return’, and ‘come (in)’ are known to favour VS order in a wide variety of SV(O) languages, to the point that Bossong (1980) has argued that this phenomenon is a *pragmatic universal*. Observe the Chinese examples in (20):

(20) a.  *Kè-rén lái-le.*  
     (Chinese)  
     Guest.people come.PRF  
     ‘The guests have come.’

b.  *Lái-le kè-rén.*  
     (Chinese)  
     Come.PRF guest.people  
     ‘Some guests are coming.’  
     (Bossong 1980: 62)

The interesting fact which Benincà (1988) has pointed out with respect to Modern Italian is that, unlike the verbs shown in (19), source-entailing verbs do not involve an understood location and their postnuclear PSA is interpreted contrastively (observe that we are not dealing with locative inversion here, but rather with bare VS order):

(21) a.  *Parte Maria.*  
     Leave.3SG Mary  
     ‘It is Mary who is leaving’

b.  *Scappa il gatto.*  
     Escape.3SG the cat  
     ‘It is the cat that escapes.’

Whilst supporting Benincà’s (1988) hypothesis with dialect evidence, Tortora (1997, 2001: 314, note 3) mentions in passing a problem which, to my knowledge, has not yet received an exhaustive treatment: the contrast noted by Benincà between different classes of unaccusatives is neutralized in the perfect and other aspectually- or temporally-marked domains:

(22) a.  *Partì un filmato da qualche città in guerra.*  
     Leave.3SG.PST a newsreel from some city in war  
     ‘A newsreel started about a city during the war.’  
     (Baricco, *Senza sangue*, p. 50)

b.  *È scappato il gatto.*  
     Be.3SG escape.PP.MSG the cat  
     ‘The cat has escaped!’
The examples in (22) are sentence-focus constructions which introduce new events, including a focal participant, into discourse.

Adopting Benincà’s (1988) proposal for (19), the question which arises is why the topical location of (19) and the temporal or aspectual properties of (22) yield the same effect, i.e., non-contrastive focus on the postnuclear argument. Recall now that, in my analysis of some apparently problematic evidence on ne-cliticization (see 6.3.1 and 6.4.1), I pointed out that both locational and aspectual or temporal bounders can elicit a stage-level eventive reading of predicates. The same clearly holds for the constructions under investigation here: the examples in (22a) and (22b) introduce a new event into discourse.

Non-contrastive VS order with activity predicates is also subject to temporal or aspectual constraints. *Telefonare* ‘phone’ is a case in point. Not only does *telefonare* ‘phone’ entail a location (‘here’), when it is followed by the PSA, but it can also receive a telic interpretation (‘make a phone call’). This makes it an ideal candidate for the occurrence in the eventive sentence-focus constructions. In order to encode a new event, however, it must also be temporally or aspectually bounded. Thus, the PSA of *telefona Maria* ‘it is Mary who phones / will phone’ is contrastive, whilst the PSA of the authentic example shown in (3) (*Mi sta telefonando il direttore*, ‘the director is on the line’) is not. *Chiamare* ‘call’, which also entails a speaker-oriented goal, when followed by the PSA, behaves in the same way:

(23) *Ha chiamato la nonna!*  
*Have.3SG call.PP the Granma*  
‘Grandma has called!’

In general, unless they entail a location, activity predicates do not allow non-contrastive focus on the postnuclear PSA (with the exception of the journalistic prose, for the reasons explained above). Interestingly, the activity predicates which do occur in sentence focus can be agentive, as is suggested by their compatibility with the phrase *di proposito* ‘on purpose’. Contrastingly, there are non-agentive activities (e.g., *dormire* ‘sleep’) which are not found in the construction under scrutiny. This indicates that the licensing of a non-contrastive immediately postnuclear PSA is independent of criteria such as agentivity, volitionality and intentionality. The crucial factor would seem to be the possibility of expressing a new event, as opposed to an activity.
The predicates which are incompatible with sentence focus can of course occur in abruptive utterances. However, the relevant constructions will involve predicate focus, which requires SV order and treats the referent of the argument as part of the presupposition (cf. (24a)). Alternatively, the new participant is realized as the argument of an existential predicate, modified by an activity predicate (cf. (24b)) (for comparative evidence, see Lambrecht 1986, 2000: 653–655; Sasse 1987: 538–539):

(24) a. *Il bimbo STA DORMENDO.*
    The baby stay.3SG sleep.GER
    ‘The baby is asleep.’

b. *C’ è IL BIMBO CHE DORME.*
    CL be.3SG the baby that sleep.3SG
    ‘The baby is asleep.’

The same strategies are adopted with non-verbal predicates (cf. (25a) and (25b)). In fact, with these predicates, VS order elicits a contrastive reading of the argument (cf. (25c)):

(25) a. *Il bimbo È MALATO.*
    The baby be.3SG ill
    ‘The baby is ill.’

b. *C’ è IL BIMBO CHE È MALATO.*
    CL be.3SG the baby that be.3SG ill
    ‘The baby is ill.’

c. *È malato IL BIMBO.*
    Be.3SG ill the baby
    ‘It is the baby who is ill (not…).’

The results of corpus analysis (Sornicola 1995: 77), which point to the high frequency of inchoative, telic and resultative predicates in VS order, corroborate the point made above, since these predicate types encode new events or stage-level states. The same holds for continuare ‘continue’, which indicates contingency, and is often found in non-contrastive VS structures (Continua il freddo ‘it is still cold’).

Finally, a word on bivalent predications is in order. In section 3.4, I pointed out that, in constructions with a type-(iii) experiencer predicate, the occurrence of the experiencer or the theme in immediately prenuclear position does not affect grammaticality (La musica classica piace a Chiara...
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/a Chiara piace la musica classica (‘Chiara likes classical music’). Thus, the core-internal linearization rules can rank first either the argument which is semantically the highest (the experiencer) or the one which is syntactically more prominent (the theme PSA), depending on information structure. My findings indicate unequivocally that the experiencer occurs in prenuclear position in the vast majority of cases:

(26) a. A Savioli sfuggì un sorriso.
   To Savioli escape.3SG.PST a smile
   ‘Savioli could not help smiling.’
   (Lucarelli, L’estate torbida, p. 66).
   b. A ti basta il pensiero di Ercoletto.
   To you DCL.2SG suffice.3SG the thought of Ercoletto
   ‘What keeps you going is the thought of Ercoletto.’
   (Maraini, Memorie di una ladra, p. 78)

The same result emerges from Wandruszka’s (1982: 37–38) analysis. This further stresses the frequency of pronominal expression of the experiencer.

As was suggested by Bossong (1998), the essence of the semantics of type-(iii) experiencer verbs is that the highest argument is the recipient of the event or state of affairs expressed by the predicate. In terms of information structure, the highest argument clearly tends to be the participant that is the most salient in discourse, serving as background information of the assertion. This explains the predominance of VS order, since the highest argument is the topic and the theme PSA is focal. Interestingly, the bulk of type-(iii) experiencer predicates are stative, not telic. Contrast (26a), which is telic, with (26b), which is stative. What counts is that the structures in question are bounded by a topic, which is the participant concerned by the eventuality. A similar analysis holds for other constructions which, like (26), exhibit a prenuclear argument which serves as the topic in discourse:

(27) a. Gli girava la testa.
   DCL.3SG spin.3SG.PST the head
   ‘His head was spinning.’
   (Lucarelli, L’estate torbida, p. 61).
   b. Le si era serrata la gola.
   DCL.3SG RFL be.3SG.PST close.PP.FSG the throat
   ‘She had a lump in her throat.’
   (Masina, Il volo del passero, p. 78)
(28) *Di don Silverio non giunse più notizia alcuna.*

Of don Silverio NEG arrive.3SG.PST more news any

‘No more news of don Silverio was ever heard again.’

(Masina, *Il volo del passero*, p. 20)

Examples (27a) and (27b) exhibit possessor raising, whilst the prenuclear argument of (28) is an indirect core argument of the postnuclear nominal head. In both cases, the prenuclear argument is the discourse participant which is concerned by the eventuality expressed by the predicate, whilst the PSA is a direct argument which encodes the focal participant in discourse.

8.4.3 Locative inversion

So far I have considered constructions in which an eventive reading is elicited by Aktionsart, or by an understood locational topic plus, in some cases, the temporal or aspectual specifications of the predicate. I have further pointed out that, similarly to a location, other kinds of prenuclear argument can serve as the topic of the assertion, if they refer to the discourse participant which is concerned by the eventuality expressed by the predicate. This is the case with the experiencer of a number of stative experiencer predicates. Locational topics can of course be overt:

(29) a. *Dall’ oceano arrivò una spessa cortina di nebbia.*

From.the ocean arrive.3SG.PST a thick layer of fog

‘A thick layer of fog came in from the ocean.’

(Tabucchi, *Sostiene Pereira*, p. 13)

b. *Al semaforo scattò il verde.*

At.the lights go.off.3SG the green

‘The lights changed to green.’

(Baricco, *Senza sangue*, p. 49)

c. *Alla villa è rimasta solo una domestica.*

At.the villa be.3SG stay.PP.FSG only a maid

‘Only one maid has stayed at the villa.’

(Lucarelli, *L’estate torbida*, p. 36)

d. *Sul suo viso si dipinse.*

On.the POSS face RFL paint.3SG.PST
un’ espressione meravigliata.
an expression surprised
‘An expression of surprise appeared on his face.’
(Tabucchi, Sostiene Pereira, p. 62)

The examples in (29) illustrate the construction which is known as locative inversion (see, e.g., Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 215–277). This is characterized by a prenuclear locational or temporal topic and VS order. As I did with respect to free inversion in Italian (Burzio 1986), I use the term inversion to refer to the respective order of the constituents, rather than to the relations between the predicate and its arguments. In (29), the locational phrases provide background information, i.e., a topical location, for the new events which are being introduced into discourse. These structures are thus comparable to those with a covert locational topic which were considered in the previous section.

Instead of introducing a new event in a narration, locative inversion can also have a descriptive function, which would seem to be comparable to Atkinson’s (1973: 15) notion of staged activity (the reader has the impression of being part of the scene being described):

(30) a. Accanto alle piscine sorgevano due capanni di legno.
    Next to the pools rise.3PL.PST two huts of wood
    ‘Next to the pools, there stood two wooden huts.’
    (Tabucchi, Sostiene Pereira, p. 127)
b. Dall’ altro lato verdeggiava il Río Dorado.
    From the other side appear.green.3SG.PST the river golden
    ‘The green Río Dorado could be seen on the other side.’
    (Masina, Il volo del passero, p. 11)

In (30a) and (30b), the locational phrases set the scene for the introduction of a new element of information in a description. Thus, the participant which is referred to by the immediately postnuclear argument is not presupposed. Incidentally, identifiability is not a relevant factor in locative inversion, as is suggested by the fact that the postnuclear argument can be a definite nominal (cf. (30b)). This is another trait of locative inversion which is shared with the bare VS order.

In the literature on English locative inversion, there is no agreement as to whether this is a diagnostic of unaccusativity. Hoekstra and Mulder (1990) argue in favour of the unaccusative analysis, claiming that certain
verbs vary in their meaning, and as a result can license two kinds of syntax, unaccusative or unergative. In constructions with locative inversion, the predicate is assumed by Hoekstra and Mulder (1990) to require the reading which licenses unaccusative syntax.

Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) argue against the unaccusative analysis of English locative inversion, pointing out that the unergatives which occur in this construction (e.g., work and chatter) do not constitute a semantically-coherent class which maps on to a class of unaccusatives by virtue of decompositional semantics (as is the case with the activity vs. active accomplishment alternations of Italian, see 2.3). Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 217) further claim that there are no compelling syntactic reasons for the unaccusative analysis. The scholars account for the predominance of unaccusative predicates in terms of the discourse function of locative inversion. This function is presentational (see also Bresnan 1994), and thus requires a predicate that is informationally light, i.e., a predicate that does not contribute as much information as the postnuclear PSA. Verbs which encode existence and appearance are informationally light, and, indeed, they abound in locative inversion. There are classes of unaccusatives, however, which are argued by Levin and Rappaport Hovav not to be light. The verbs which encode externally-caused events of change of state are among such classes. Interestingly, in English, this verb class is virtually absent from locative inversion. Conversely, there are unergatives which are informationally light, and these are found in English locative inversion (for instance, verbs which encode the emission of sound, light, and smell).

I noted above that, in Italian, locative inversion can either introduce a new event into discourse or add a new element of information to a description. These functions would seem to indicate that Italian locative inversion also requires a predicate that is informationally light. Bearing in mind the debate on English locative inversion, it is thus appropriate to investigate further what Aktionsart classes are allowed by locative inversion in Italian, in order to ascertain whether this can be said to constitute a diagnostic of split intransitivity in this language. In addressing this question, I factor out contrastive VS order, as well as constructions with goal-entailing activities which are preceded by a temporal topic. These two types of construction cannot contribute evidence against the unaccusative analysis of locative inversion. In fact, contrastive VS order occurs with predicates of any Aktionsart type (see section 8.4.1). As for goal-entailing activities preceded
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by a temporal topic, VS order could be claimed to be licensed by the covert location (see section 8.4.2):

(31) a. Al primo piano lavorano i tipografi.
At the first floor work.3SG the printers
‘The first floor is where the printers work.’

b. Un attimo fa ha telefonato tua madre.
A instant ago have.3SG phone.PP POSS mother
‘Your mother has just phoned (here).’

In (31a), the PSA is postnuclear because it is contrasted with the members of a set to which it belongs. As for the example in (31b), it entails an understood topic ‘here’, and thus the presence of a prepositional phrase in prenuclear position might be immaterial with respect to VS order. I also leave out locative inversion with impersonal and passive si, because, in si-impersonals and passives, the respective order of the nucleus and the argument is claimed to depend primarily on whether the argument is encoded as the PSA (Lepschy and Lepschy 1988).

The verbs which are best represented in my collection of authentic data are existential esserci ‘there + be’ and a number of telic intransitives: apparire ‘appear’, arrivare ‘arrive’, cessare ‘end’, entrare ‘come in’, morire ‘die’, salire ‘go up, rise’, scattare ‘go off’, scomparire ‘die (lit. disappear)’, scoppiare ‘burst’, sorgere ‘rise’, tornare ‘return’, venire ‘come’, etc. Relevant examples of telic intransitives were given above in (29a) and (29b), and further illustration is provided below:

(32) a. Oggi da N.Y. è partito lo yacht....
Today from NY be.3SG leave. PP.MSG the yacht.MSG
‘Today the yacht... has left from New York.’

(Tabucchi, Sostiene Pereira, p. 14).

b. Ogni tanto tornava la nave del loro padre.
Every much return.3SG.PST the ship of.the POSS father
‘Every once in a while the ship of their father came back.’

(Calvino, Il sentiero dei nidi di ragno, p. 43)

Telic reflexives and analytic passives are also well represented (cf. (33)). Inchoatives are found, sometimes as part of a complex predicate (cf. (34)):

(33) a. Nelle abitazioni si accesero... lampade e lumini.
In the houses RFL light.3PL.PST lamps and oil.lamps
‘Then oil lamps lit up in the houses.’
(Masina, *Il volo del passero*, p. 34).

b. *Sul passo era stata eretta*  
On.the pass be.3SG.PST be.PP.FSG erect.PP.FSG  
una piccola fortezza.  
a little.FSG fortress.FSG  
‘A little fortress had been erected on the pass.’
(Masina, *Il volo del passero*, p. 11).

(34) *Lontano, nel torrente, cominciano a gracidare le rane.*  
Far.away in.the stream begin.3PL to croak the frogs  
‘Far away, in the stream, the frogs are starting to croak.’
(Calvino, *Il sentiero dei nidi di ragno*, p. 41)

The prominence of telic and inchoative predicates suggests that the principal function of locative inversion is that of introducing a new event into discourse. This is also the principal function of non-contrastive bare VS order. Interestingly, however, atelic predicates are also found in locative inversion, in connection with its descriptive function:

(35) a. *Davanti a ogni getto stavano sedute delle persone.*  
In.front to every jet stay.3PL.PST seated.PP some people  
‘There were people seated in front of every jet.’
(Tabucchi, *Sostiene Pereira*, p. 70).

b. *Sulle torrette stanno sentinelle armate.*  
On.the turrets stay.3PL sentries armed  
‘There were armed sentries on the turrets.’
(Calvino, *Il sentiero dei nidi di ragno*, p. 63)

c. *Sul pianerottolo continuava ad aleggiare un terribile puzzo di fritto.*  
On.the landing continue.3SG.PST to stir  
a terrible stench of fry.PP  
‘On the landing there was still a stench of fried food.’
(Tabucchi, *Sostiene Pereira*, p. 135).

d. *Nella scuola brilla soltanto una piccola lampada.*  
In.the school sparkle only a small lamp  
‘There is only a small lamp sparkling in the school.’
(Masina, *Il volo del passero*, p. 127)
The sentences in (35) exhibit stage-level predicates. Observe the occurrence of the copula *stare* ‘stay’, in (35a) and (35b), and the fact that the predicate of (35c) is formed with aspectual *continuare* ‘continue’, which marks a contingent state of affairs. Finally, in (35d), the argument is marked by the focusing adverb *soltanto* ‘only’, which promotes a stage-level existential reading of the predicate (see Chapter 6).

In general, it would seem that locative inversion allows more flexibility, insofar as the Aktionsart of the predicate is concerned, when it is part of a description than when it introduces an event. In fact, the use of the imperfect indicative, typical of past-tense descriptions, can improve the grammaticality of locative inversion or counterbalance the effect of an activity predicate, which would otherwise convey a contrastive reading of the post-nuclear PSA. Contrast the two examples below:

(36) a. *Sul letto in fondo dormono i bambini.*
   On.the bed in back sleep.3PL the children
   ‘The children sleep on the bed at the back.’

   b. *Sul letto in fondo dormivano i bambini.*
   On.the bed in back sleep.3PL.PST the children
   ‘The children were sleeping on the bed at the back.’

The present tense (cf. (36a)) promotes a contrastive reading of the post-nuclear PSA (the children as opposed to other members of the family). The PSA need not be contrastive, though, if the imperfect indicative is used (cf. (36b)).

Below are authentic examples of descriptive locative inversion with activity predicates:

(37) a. *Nel cielo ventoso volano le nuvole.*
   In.the sky windy fly.3PL the clouds
   ‘The clouds are flying in the windy sky.’

   b. *Vi regnava ancora l’antica oscurità.*
   There rule.3SG.PST still the old obscurity
   ‘There ruled still the old obscurity.’
   (Masina, *Il volo del passero*, p. 91)

Both *volare* ‘fly’ and *regnare* ‘rule’ are activities. *Volare* ‘fly’ can test out as an active accomplishment, if followed by an argument-adjunct which
expresses the attainment of a goal (see 2.3). However, the locational phrase *nel cielo ventoso* ‘in the windy sky’ does not encode a goal, and thus the predicate of (37a) is an activity. Observe that neither *volare* ‘fly’ nor *regnare* ‘rule’ are agentive in (37), since the PSA is inanimate. Rather, these predicates can be said to have a descriptive function, suggesting that, in the topical scene, the clouds are moving fast (cf. (37a)), and the obscurity is overwhelming (cf. (37b)). Further examples of locative inversion with activity predicates are found among the examples of VS order collected by Wandruszka (1982: 12): *due passi in là sorrideva... un vecchio gentiluomo* ‘an old gentleman was smiling a few steps away’.

Interestingly, I have not found any examples of locative inversion with activity predicates which require a volitional agent as their highest argument (e.g., *bere* ‘drink’, *camminare* ‘walk’, *leggere* ‘read’, *mangiare* ‘eat’, *marciare* ‘march’, *parlare* ‘speak’, *studiare* ‘study’, etc.)$^{145}$ These predicates are not sufficiently light, and thus cannot simply introduce a participant into discourse as part of a new event or a description.

On the whole, corpus analysis suggests that there is a great deal of overlap between locative inversion in Italian and English – as well as many more SVO languages, including French, Spanish, and Chinese (Bossong, p.c.). It is sufficient to think of the abundance of verbs which indicate existence or appearance on to the scene (*apparire* ‘appear’, *arrivare* ‘arrive’, *giungere* ‘arrive’, *tornare* ‘return’, *venire* ‘come’, etc.) or encode the emission of sound, smell or light (*brillare* ‘glitter, sparkle’). Some discrepancies are also to be noted, though. First, in Italian, locative inversion is licensed by predicates which encode externally caused events. An example was provided with anticausative *accendersi* ‘light up’ in (33a).

Secondly, it has been maintained that the predicates which figure in English locative inversion are predictable from the context (Birner 1992, 1994; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 230). This claim is reminiscent of hypotheses which have been advanced on presentational constructions of various languages, and which propose an existential analysis of such constructions: see Wandruszka (1982) on Italian and Jones (1996) on the French *il*-construction. There is no doubt that, in general, the predicate is to some extent predictable in Italian locative inversion. By way of example, consider the pairs *accendersi* ‘light up’ and *lampade* ‘lamps’ (cf. (33a)), *gracidare* ‘croak’ and *rane* ‘frogs’ (cf. (34)), *aleggiare* ‘stir’ and *puzzo* ‘stench’ (cf. (35c)), *brillare* ‘glitter, sparkle’ and *lampada* ‘lamp’ (cf. (35d)). However, the predicate does not appear to be completely predictable from the argument, or vice versa. In fact, in a number of cases, the
chosen verb is not the only option in the given context. Thus, *brillare* ‘glitter, sparkle’ contrasts with *luccicare* ‘twinkle’ in terms of the intensity of the light emanated, and with *splendere* ‘shine’, in that it tests out as a semelfactive, whilst *splendere* ‘shine’ does not. Since the predicate contributes to the encoding of the event or the description of the scene, it cannot be omitted. In other cases, the choice of the verb is hardly predictable from the argument. In (37a), *volavano* ‘were flying’ indicates that the clouds are moving fast, whereas in (37b) *regnava* ‘ruled’ indicates that the darkness is overpowering. Neither predicate is the default choice with the respective argument. Similar considerations are valid with respect to the example from Wandruszka (1982) which was cited above (*sorridere* ‘smile’ and *gentiluomo* ‘gentleman’, etc.). An existential analysis of Italian locative inversion which is based on the redundancy of the predicate would, to my mind, be descriptively inadequate.

An existential reading can of course be encoded differently, that is, by virtue of the stage-level character of the predicate (Carlson 1977: 446; Pustejovsky 1995: 226). Thus, both the telic predicates which indicate appearance on to the scene, and the predicates which encode stage-level states could be said to elicit an existential reading. Furthermore, existential *esserci* ‘there + be’ figures prominently in locative inversion. However, unlike non-canonical *ne*-cliticization, which exhibits a focal quantifier and other crucial evidence in favour of an existential analysis (see the results of the Aktionsart tests and the constraints on the reading of the quantifier which were discussed in 6.3.1), locative inversion does not necessarily provide such evidence. I conclude, therefore, that locative inversion is not existential by definition.

In the light of my findings, it can be argued that the verb which figures in Italian locative inversion contributes the main predicate of the clause (with individual exceptions, like (35d)). Given that locative inversion introduces a new event into discourse or a new piece of information in a description, the predicate has to be informationally light. In particular, it must not provide more information than the postnuclear argument. In general, this is the case with telic predicates which encode movement or internally-caused change of state. Atelic predicates are also found, however, and the majority of them are stage-level states or non-agentive activities.

A potential objection to the analysis of Italian locative inversion is that this language allows VS order regardless of the overt locational or temporal topic. Corpus analysis, however, has brought to light an interesting margin of discrepancy between non-contrastive bare VS order and locative
inversion. To begin with, in a number of cases, it is the locational or temporal topic that licenses VS order. This divergence between locative inversion and non-contrastive bare VS order is related to the descriptive function of locative inversion (see, for instance, (35a) and (35b)).

Secondly, the constraints on VS order with predicates that include a state (Benincà 1988) do not hold in the context of locative inversion. Thus, whereas the PSA of *parte Lucia ‘it is Lucy who is leaving’ receives a contrastive interpretation out of context, that of *il 20 maggio *parte Lucia ‘Lucia is leaving on 20 May’ is not necessarily contrastive, but rather can be presentational.

I argued that the principal factor in the licensing of non-contrastive VS order with bare activity predicates is whether they can encode new events. This type of encoding depends on the possibility of a telic reading, the entailment of a topic, and the temporal or aspectual specifications of the predicate. Bare VS order is allowed with *telefonare ‘phone’, *suonare ‘ring’, *bussare ‘knock’, and *chiamare ‘call’ because, in given contexts, these verbs satisfy the mentioned criteria. Since these verbs encode agentive activities, agentivity is not the crucial factor in the licensing of non-contrastive VS order with bare predicates. Agentivity has, however, turned out to be more important in the licensing of locative inversion. Observe that the PSA of goal-entailing activities is contrastive in structures like *all’ufficio ha telefonato tua madre ‘it was your mother who phoned the office’ or *al campanello ha suonato il postino ‘it was the postman who rang the bell’. This suggests that, when an overt locational topic precedes a goal-entailing activity, this behaves like any other agentive activity (due allowance being made for journalistic prose, for the reasons explained above). Clearly, the examination of a wider and stylistically more comprehensive corpus than my own might reveal that agentive activities are occasionally admitted in locative inversion. However, the discrepancy noted with respect to goal-entailing activities is worthy of note.

As for non-agentive activities, it would seem that they are more widely used in locative inversion than in non-contrastive bare VS order, and this fact is related to the descriptive function of locative inversion. Bare VS sequences such as *brillava una stella ‘a star was sparkling’ and *volavano le *nuvole ‘the clouds were flying’ are grammatical. However, they are stylistically and contextually bound. They are typical of literary fiction, where they describe a topical scene in preparation for the narration of an event. Out of context, bare VS order with these verbs is either odd or suggests a
contrastive reading, especially in the present tense. In the context of locative inversion, however, VS order need not be contrastive:

(38) Oggi / in cielo volano le nuvole.
    Today in sky fly.3PL the clouds
    ‘The clouds are moving quickly today / in the clouds.’

In general, the locational or temporal topic contributes to the creation of the appropriate context for the introduction of a new participant in a description or a new event. Thus, the principal interest of locative inversion rests in the encoding of a pragmatic relation between a topical locational or temporal setting and a new element of a description or a narration. If these two kinds of information are not so related, the PSA is not postnuclear:

(39) Nella città vecchia anche i bambini di sei anni cominciano a parlarne.
    In the town old even the children of six years begin.3PL to talk.GCL
    ‘In the old part of the town even six-year old children are starting to talk about it.’
    (Calvino, Il sentiero dei nidi di ragno, p. 67–68)

VS order would be grammatical in (39). However, the pragmatic condition on word order is irrelevant, because the referent of the PSA is not focal, and the syntactic condition on word order prevails.

Crucially, not all Aktionsart types allow locative inversion. The findings of my analysis show that the predicate must be informationally light in order to license locative inversion. Non-agentive activity predicates can be sufficiently light. In addition, I have not identified a ban on any class of predicates that include a state. To conclude, as is the case with English (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995), locative inversion is not a diagnostic of split intransitivity, even though, in the vast majority of cases, it affects predicates which include a state, that is predicates whose PSA is an undergoer or an affected actor.
8.4.4 Non-contrastive VS order and *ne*-cliticization

In the treatment of non-contrastive VS order, it was pointed out that this is licensed by some activities, even though it is far more frequent with predicates which include a state, and it was concluded that it is not a diagnostic of split intransitivity. In this section, evidence is provided which indicates that *ne*-cliticization crucially differs from non-contrastive VS order in ways that suggest that only the former is a diagnostic of split intransitivity. This evidence is important vis-à-vis the tentative hypothesis, put forward by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 274–277), among others, on the basis of evidence brought to light by Lonzi (1986), that the distributional properties of *ne*-cliticization might purely depend on its association with a particular discourse function.

In Chapter 6, I identified a contrast between narrow- and sentence-focus constructions with *ne*-cliticization. It was the consideration of narrow focus which led some researchers to cite *ne*-cliticization as a diagnostic of split intransitivity, and the examination of sentence focus which led others to challenge this view. I showed that an existential reading can arise with predicates which include a state, regardless of the narrow- vs. sentence-focus contrast, whereas, with activity predicates, an existential reading is more likely to arise in sentence focus than in narrow focus. For this reason, the non-canonical examples of *ne*-cliticization are found in sentence focus. The discrepancy between narrow and sentence focus is crucial to the claim that there is a semantic principle at work in *ne*-cliticization (it originates from the lowest argument of a state).

In support of the idea that *ne*-cliticization is a diagnostic of split intransitivity, whilst VS order is not, consider the following examples:

(40) Qualcuno sta bussando?
    Somebody stay.3SG knock.GER
    Sì, sta bussando il postino.
    Yes stay.3SG knock.GER the postman
    ‘Is somebody knocking? Yes, the postman is knocking.’

(41) *Quanti ne stanno bussando?
    How.many QCL stay.3PL knock.GER
    *Ne stanno bussando due.
    QCL stay.3PL knock.GER two
    ‘How many *ne are knocking? Two *ne are knocking.’
The evidence in (40) and (41) indicates that, in narrow-focus structures, the covert location suffices to license non-contrastive VS order with a goal-entailing activity. This is because the location provides the backgrounded information for the introduction of a new element of information into discourse. Contrastingly, the understood location is not sufficient to license ne-cliticization with the same predicate in narrow focus. In accordance with the analysis developed in Chapter 6, I claim that this is because the understood location is not sufficient to elicit an existential reading in narrow focus. Observe now the facts in (42):

(42) a. Ha telefonato Pietro.
   'Peter has phoned.'

b. ?Ne hanno telefonato molti, di clienti, qui
   'Customers, many ne have phoned here'

*Telefonare* ‘phone’ is another goal-entailing activity, and thus it licenses non-constrative VS order in (42a). The selection of the perfective operator A is entirely acceptable in this example. Contrastingly, according to some informants, the perfective structure in (42b) is ungrammatical. In section 6.3.1.2, I claimed that this is due to the syntax-semantics mismatch that characterizes this structure. The contrast between (42a) and (42b) challenges the existential analysis of non-contrastive bare VS order. Sentence-focus constructions like (42b) receive an existential interpretation. The main predicate in the semantic representation is existential, and the PSA, which is its argument, is marked. Accordingly, the perfective operator E should be selected. However, the predicate which maps on to the nucleus in syntax, i.e., the only predicate which has an overt realization and bears aspectual modification, is an activity predicate. As a result, some native speakers reject the perfect in (42b) as ungrammatical. The fact that the perfective construction in (42a) is not equally problematic suggests that its predicate is not existential.

The contrasts between (40) and (41), (42a) and (42b) further undermine the locative analysis of ne-cliticization, which I rejected in 6.3.1. Recall that, according to this analysis, ne-cliticization involves a covert location by definition. In fact, it has been suggested that it is this location that licenses ne-cliticization (Saccon 1992). Assuming, as I do, following
Benincà (1988) and Tortora (1997, 2001), that *bussare* ‘knock’ and *telefonare* ‘phone’ entail a covert location which corresponds with that of the speaker, when followed by an immediately postnuclear PSA, the ungrammaticality of (41) and (42b) shows that it is not the topical location that licenses *ne*-cliticization.

Finally, consider the contrast between (43a) and (43b). Whereas non-contrastive VS order is not licensed with *partire* ‘leave’, in the absence of a locational or temporal binder, since *partire* ‘leave’ does not entail a goal (cf. (43b)), *ne*-cliticization is licensed by virtue of the Aktionsart of this predicate (cf. (43a)). Significantly, the quantifier of (43a) is not contrastive. This suggests that *ne*-cliticization contributes a presentational reading which would not otherwise arise with *partire* ‘leave’:

(43) a. *Ne partono molti.*
   QCL leave.3PL many
   ‘Many *ne* leave.’

b. *Parte Lucia.*
   Leave.3SG Lucy
   ‘It is Lucy who is leaving.’

Similar considerations hold for the relation between locative inversion and *ne*-cliticization. The former admits a wider range of Aktionsart types, as is suggested by the evidence in (44a), whilst not providing any compelling evidence in favour of an existential analysis:

(44) a. *Sul letto in fondo dormivano tre bambini.*
   On.the bed in back sleep.3PL.PST three children
   ‘Three children were sleeping on the bed at the back.’

b. *Sul letto in fondo ne dormivano tre.*
   On.the bed in back QCL sleep.3PL.PST three
   ‘Three *ne* were sleeping on the bed at the back.’

The evidence provided in this section corroborates the hypothesis that *ne*-cliticization is subject to a semantic condition (it targets the lowest argument of any state), whereas non-contrastive VS order is not.
8.5 Conclusion

This chapter has been concerned with the interaction of two principles which are at work in the determination of word order in Italian declarative main clauses. One of these principles is syntactic, and is concerned with the immediately prenuclear position inside the core, ensuring that the only argument which can occur in this position is the one that serves as the PSA. The nominal object of transitive predicates cannot compete for placement in this position. Since the immediately prenuclear position is the default position of the PSA, by virtue of the syntactic principle, this principle neutralizes the semantic contrast between undergoers / affected actors and other actors.

The other principle is pragmatic. It is concerned with the immediately postnuclear position inside the core, and establishes that this position is the default focal position, i.e., the position targeted by direct arguments which are focal but not contrastive. In intransitive clauses, non-contrastive focus affects primarily the PSA of intransitive predicates which are informationally light. The analysis of bare VS order and of locative inversion has revealed that for the most part these are predicates which belong to the classes of intransitives known as unaccusatives (in my account, intransitives which include a state). This result is not surprising, in the light of crosslinguistic work on presentational constructions, which suggests that such structures tend to exhibit verbs that encode existence and appearance on to the scene (Atkinson 1973; Bossong 1980; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Van Valin 1993; Wandruszka 1982).

In-depth investigation, however, yields some surprises. Thus, it has been pointed out (Benincà 1988 and others) that non-contrastive bare VS order is not entirely free with predicates which include a state (unaccusatives), whilst it is freerer than expected with a number of goal-entailing activities (unergatives). Capitalizing on Tortora’s (2001) observation that the constraints which affect unaccusatives are neutralized in the perfect, I have developed an account of non-contrastive bare VS order which is based on the idea that this order encodes primarily (though not exclusively) the introduction of new events into discourse. This account captures both the intricacies of immediately postnuclear behaviour and the fact that the relevant constraints are laxer in journalistic prose than in other styles.
The encoding of new events has also turned out to be an important function of locative inversion. However, this construction can also introduce a new element of information in a description. The descriptive function of locative inversion is a determining factor in the minor but interesting discrepancy which is found between the Aktionsart constraints on locative inversion and, on the other hand, non-contrastive bare VS order. This mismatch concerns a number of agentive activities, which are more likely to be found in non-contrastive bare VS order, and, on the other hand, the descriptive function of non-agentive activities and stage-level states, which are found in locative inversion.

With the support of corpus-based evidence, I have rejected the view that informationally-light predicates are redundant – or bleached – in Italian locative inversion. I have further rejected the hypothesis that a stage-level existential reading of the predicate is a defining trait of locative inversion. The same holds for non-contrastive bare VS order, as is suggested by the mismatch between this order and ne-cliticization. Therefore, neither locative inversion nor bare VS order can be regarded as diagnostics of split intransitivity in Italian, by contrast with ne-cliticization, in spite of the fact that they tend to be licensed by predicates which include a state. Whereas ne-cliticization is subject to two principles, a semantic one and a pragmatic one, non-contrastive VS order, including locative inversion, is only subject to a pragmatic principle. The discourse-based condition on ne-cliticization explains the ample margin of overlap between these phenomena. However, the absence of a semantic constraint on non-contrastive VS order results in a number of interesting differences between them.

To return to the two principles mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, it can be said that accusative alignment prevails over active alignment in the determination of Italian word order since predicate-focus structures exhibit SV order, regardless of the Aktionsart of the predicate, and hence the semantic function of the PSA. However, the syntactic principle, which strives to place the PSA in immediately prenuclear position, is systematically overridden in presentational constructions (as well as in structures with contrastive focus on the PSA). In presentational constructions, active alignment – or, better, the opposition of undergoers with unmarked actors – surfaces defectively as a side effect of the pragmatic constraint on word order.
Chapter 9
Conclusion

This book has provided an in-depth investigation of split intransitivity as it is manifested in Italian, testing the hypothesis that the diagnostics of split intransitivity which are found in this language are manifestations of active alignment, i.e., a type of alignment that marks arguments according to their semantic function rather than their grammatical relation to the predicate. The results of the analysis suggest that the manifestations of split intransitivity are primarily determined by the tension between a type of alignment which is based on syntactic principles (accusative) and another type of alignment, which is based on semantic principles (active). In addition, these manifestations are variously constrained by well-formedness conditions on the encoding of information structure.

The selection of the perfective operator (essere ‘be’ or avere ‘have’) indicates whether the clause has a Privileged Syntactic Argument that is unmarked from the point of view of accusative alignment. The notion of markedness is explained on the basis of Van Valin and LaPolla’s (1997) claim that the default Privileged Syntactic Argument of accusative languages or constructions is the highest-ranking macrorole argument in the semantic representation. The discussion of the perfective operator includes a treatment of a number of complex predicates, which accounts for the selection of perfective essere ‘be’ in complex transitive structures. Crosslinguistic and crossdialectal variation in operator selection is considered to be the synchronic manifestation of either of two diachronic processes: spread of ESSE and spread of HABERE. The verb classes which exhibit the synchronic alternation of the two operators in Italian have also been examined. It has been claimed that two out of four types of alternation are captured in terms of lexical decomposition.

The marking with si also signals the markedness of the Privileged Syntactic Argument. In fact, si indicates that the highest argument in the semantic representation is suppressed. In the light of the notion of markedness mentioned above, a clause cannot be unmarked in terms of its Privileged Syntactic Argument, if the highest macrorole position is filled by a suppressed argument. I have analysed a range of si-constructions – including reflexives, si-impersonals, si-passives and middles, claiming that
suppressed arguments are a subclass of unexpressed arguments. I have also proposed a classification of unexpressed arguments.

The vexed question of the status of clitic reflexives vis-à-vis unaccusativity does not arise as such from the perspective adopted in this work. Reflexives are characterized by the suppression of the highest macrorole argument (with one interesting exception, which I refer to as inherent reflexives), and thus are marked in terms of their Privileged Syntactic Argument. This explains why clitic reflexives select the perfective operator *essere* 'be' in Italian. In other languages, clitic reflexives display other patterns of perfective-operator selection, and this is a manifestation of parametric variation in the rule which governs the selection of the perfective operator.

Native-speaker judgements and the results of corpus-based analysis indicate that other diagnostics of split intransitivity, for instance past-participle agreement and *ne*-cliticization, divide reflexives into subclasses. Rather than undermining the hypothesis that reflexives are unaccusative (i.e., that the argument which plays the privileged syntactic function in the clause is not in the highest macrorole position in the semantic representation), these findings are explained on the basis of the classification of reflexives which is proposed in this work.

Since the selection of the perfective operator and the marking with *si* are exclusively concerned with a syntactic function (Privileged Syntactic Argument), neither of these diagnostics represents active alignment as it is defined above. The markedness of the Privileged Syntactic Argument is, however, determined in terms of its status in the semantic representation. The selection of the perfective operator and *si*-constructions are only minimally affected by discourse factors.

In a treatment of experiencer predicates, it has been pointed out that these are interesting vis-à-vis the theory of split intransitivity, in that they display two patterns of encoding of emotions, feelings and mental states. One strategy is consistent with accusative alignment, in that it neutralizes a restricted set of semantic relations for syntactic purposes, selecting the highest semantic argument as the Privileged Syntactic Argument of the clause. The other strategy is marked from the point of view of accusative alignment, in that it does not assign the privileged syntactic function to the highest argument in the semantic representation. This latter strategy corresponds to the pattern of encoding of predicate-argument relations which is known as inversion (Bossong 1998; Harris 1984a, b; Perlmutter 1984; Van Valin 1990). An analysis of a variety of complex experiencer predicates...
Conclusion

has been provided as part of the discussion of the encoding of emotions, feelings and mental states. The alleged problem of experiencer verbs, i.e., the view that they pose a challenge to Perlmutter and Postal’s (1984: 97–100) Universal Alignment Hypothesis or Baker’s (1988) Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis, is the by-product of an incorrect semantic analysis of these predicates.

In the chapter on agreement, number and gender agreement on the past participle of perfective (as well as absolute and passive) constructions has been distinguished from person and number agreement on the finite form of the verb. With the support of first-hand results from corpus-based analysis, it has been argued that the agreement on the past participle of the perfect is yielding to pressure from accusative alignment. It is my contention that the development that this type of agreement has undergone in the history of Italian cannot be properly understood unless the role of information structure is taken into account. In particular, the agreement on the past participle of the perfect has retrenched in the domains where it is grammatical, but not in those where it is anaphoric (Bresnan and Mchombo 1987, Bresnan and Kanerva 1989). The crossdialectal analysis of the person and number agreement on the finite form of the verb reveals that this is subject to pressure from comparable discourse factors.

Despite some apparent evidence to the contrary, ne-cliticization has turned out to be a true diagnostic of split intransitivity, and hence a true manifestation of active alignment. In fact, this diagnostic is not affected by the syntactic role of the ne-cliticized argument, but rather only by its position in the semantic representation of the predicate, as well as its role in focus structure. I have examined critical evidence on ne-cliticization regarding (i) constructions with activity predicates (unergatives), (ii) constructions with adjectival, nominal and locative predicates, and, finally, (iii) clitic reflexives. I have concluded that some of the putatively problematic evidence is explained by the assumption that the semantic constraint on ne-cliticization is stricter than those which hold true for other diagnostics of split intransitivity. In particular, ne-cliticization is sensitive to the respective prominence of the arguments in the semantic representation. Other puzzling data are captured by the proposal that structures with ne-cliticization can receive an existential interpretation, subject to focus-structure restrictions, in which case the argument which surfaces as the argument of an activity predicate actually belongs to an existential predication in the semantic representation.
Past-participle behaviour provides evidence of a type of alignment which is based on semantic – rather than syntactic – functions. There are, however, participial constructions which are subject to semantic conditions that are stricter than those which define active alignment. The contrast between restrictive and descriptive attributive constructions illustrates this point (see *la ragazza uccisa*, lit. the girl killed, vs. *la uccisa ragazza*, lit. the killed girl). Unlike restrictive attributive constructions with past participles, where the past participle occurs postnominally within the noun phrase, and modifies an undergoer or an affected actor, descriptive attributive constructions only exhibit prenominal participles which denote quantifiable states. Accordingly, restrictive constructions provide an example of active-vs.-inactive alignment, whereas descriptive constructions simply exhibit a subset of the verbs which are known as unaccusative.

Predicative participles have also been subject to scrutiny. In particular, it has been proposed that the relatedness of resultant state predicates (referred to by others as adjectival passives) and correlated passive or active (perfect) constructions can be captured in terms of lexical decomposition; the resultant state predicate constitutes a portion of the semantic representation of the correlated passive or perfect. At the same time, however, it has been pointed out that resultant state predicates can be adjectival participles which differ semantically from their homonymous perfective correlates. In such cases, which are lexically constrained, decomposition does not suggest itself as an explanation. The analysis of predicative participles has included an examination of passive and resultative constructions with *venire*, lit. come, and *andare*, lit. go, as well as an analysis of absolute participial constructions. With respect to absolute participles, I have claimed that they provide two manifestations of active alignment. Both the controller of agreement on the participle and the direct argument which follows the participle immediately within its core can only be an undergoer or a marked actor.

Other aspects of the morphosyntax of Italian are subject to restrictions which are not strict enough from the semantic point of view to be regarded as manifestations of a semantic type of alignment. The placement of the Privileged Syntactic Argument in the position which immediately follows the nucleus (the syntactic locus of the predicate) is a case in point. I have claimed that the conditions which rule this type of word order are pragmatic, and that the relatedness of this type of word order to split intransitivity is only an epiphenomenon of the pragmatic conditions on word order. In the account of word order, I have further analysed the manifestations of a
syntactic principle which establishes that the immediately prenuclear position is the default position of the Privileged Syntactic Argument. In fact, other direct arguments cannot compete with the Privileged Syntactic Argument for this position. In this respect, the syntactic principle prevails over the pragmatic one in the determination of word order. In addition, the pragmatic conditions being equal (specifically, in predicate focus), the Privileged Syntactic Argument occurs in its default position regardless of the actor vs. undergoer split. This indicates that, unlike accusative alignment, active alignment is not directly involved in the determination of word order in Italian. In the last analysis, word order is not a diagnostic of split intransitivity.

The examination of manifestations of split intransitivity which are available in Italian and Italo-Romance has led to a reflection on apparent inconsistencies which are known in the literature as unaccusativity mismatches. Crosslinguistic and typological research suggests that split intransitivity is ultimately determined by semantic factors, and that the semantic parameters of the split vary across languages in interesting ways (Van Valin 1990). The micro-variation of the semantic parameters of split intransitivity is certainly significant vis-à-vis the unaccusativity mismatches which are exhibited by Italo-Romance, but it is not the only factor. Rather, an analysis of this group of closely related languages suggests that the unaccusativity mismatches arise primarily from the conflict of two driving forces; one is semantic, and is directly related to the semantic foundation of unaccusativity, whilst the other is syntactic, and strives to obliterate the manifestations of the semantic principle. Individual Italo-Romance languages manifest different synchronic results of the historical tension between these two forces. Specific phenomena may have lost their diagnostic power in a given language, but not in its sister languages, whilst other phenomena may still be diagnostics of split intransitivity in the given language. The approaches which deterministically associate each manifestation of unergativity (e.g., the perfective operator ‘have’ in Italo-Romance) with unergative syntax across languages are unlikely to capture the unaccusativity mismatches. In fact, the non-homogeneous outcomes of the conflict between the semantic and syntactic forces are also manifested in discrepancies which are found within individual languages and individual constructions. To capture both the crossdialectal mismatches and the discrepancies which are found within individual languages and constructions, I have assumed that the principles of mapping of semantics with syntax do not vary across sister languages. It is the conditions on individual diagnos-
tics of split intransitivity that vary as a result of the historical tension between the forces mentioned above. In addition, the semantic parameters of split intransitivity combine with construction-specific pragmatic and syntactic constraints to characterize each diagnostic in each language, and this also yields a certain amount of incongruency in the domains of given diagnostics both within and across languages. In accordance with my proposal, split intransitivity requires an account that is based on construction-specific rules and allows for the parametric variation of these rules across languages.

On the whole, Italian offers robust evidence in support of the claim that intransitive constructions divide into two principal types, and that this split is ultimately, though not exclusively, determined by the semantics of predicates.
Notes

1. The Italo-Romance languages are daughters of Latin which have developed in Italy alongside Florentine, the source of Standard Italian. These languages are usually called dialects, in that, for the most part, they have no official status. In this work, however, they are also referred to as languages, since they are not varieties of Italian.

2. The language of the examples is only specified if it is not Italian or English.

3. According to Lambrecht (1994: 222), focus structure is the conventional association of a sentence form with a focus meaning. I return to this concept in section 1.4.

4. These neutralizations are restricted, in that they are related to specific semantic positions. In Italian, they only concern the semantic positions which can be assigned a macrorole.

5. The term literary is used somewhat loosely to indicate that the authors of these texts are all involved in literary activity. See the references for a list of the primary sources consulted by the author.

6. The notion of periphery has been developed considerably in the last few years (see Van Valin 2005: 19–30), and includes far more than the periphery of the core. This issue is not central in this context, however, and will not be dealt with any further.

7. The status of clitic arguments in syntax is discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

8. DO signals that agency is part of the semantic representation of the verb rather than the interpretation that the highest argument receives in a given context. In English, the first argument of murder is an argument of DO, unlike the first argument of kill (see kill / *murder accidentally).

9. One exception is provided by a subgroup of si-constructions, which, in my treatment, are called intransitive-dative reflexives. The non-reflexive correlates of these structures have a dative argument which corresponds to the PSA of the reflexive construction: Flavia si risponde ‘Flavia replies to herself’. In section 4.2.6, I offer an explanation of this exception.

10. See Van Valin (2005: 115–127) for further discussion of this point.

11. I use small caps to mark the focal information unit.

12. An updated bibliography of work in RRG is available on the web site: linguistics.buffalo.edu/research/rrg.html.

13. Perfective operators are modifiers of the predicate which encode aspect. Recall from section 1.4 that, in Italian, there are morphological operators, which
cannot be predicative, and thus cannot form a semantically-defined syntactic
unit, such as nucleus or core, and syntactic operators, which form a syntactic
nucleus or core, in that they can be either pure modifiers or predicators and,
at the same time, modifiers of another predicate. Perfective operators are mor-
phological operators. Examples of syntactic operators will be given in section
2.5. Finally, there is a class of predicatars, in Italian, which cannot be pure
modifiers. However, they join with another predicate to yield an aspectually-
marked complex predicate. Examples of this class will also be provided in sec-
tion 2.5.

14. I use the term ‘synthetic’ to refer to one-word transitive predicates, thus dis-
tinguishing them from complex transitive predicates, which are formed with a
syntactic operator and a predicate or with two predicates (see section 2.5). Syn-
thetic and complex predicates alike can of course join with a morphologi-
cal operator such as A or E. The selection of A with synthetic transitives is
phrased as an elsewhere condition because the si construction exemplified in
(1) is transitive, in the sense of VVLP (150), in that it exhibits two macrorole
arguments. See Chapter 4 for a treatment of si-constructions.

15. In Italian, there are two kinds of cross-referencing of core arguments on the
predicate of the clause (recall that core arguments are those arguments which
are part of the semantic representation of the predicate). One type of cross-
referencing encodes grammatical person and number, and can solely appear on
a verb (whether auxiliary, operator, or predicate). The other type encodes
number and gender and figures on the past participle of verbs, subject to a
number of constraints, and on some non-verbal predicatars. I refer to the for-
mer type as finite agreement, and to the latter as non-finite agreement. See
Chapter 5 for a treatment of agreement.

16. The PSA is, however, marked in a class of transitive complex predicates
which will be discussed in section 2.5.

17. Bere ‘drink’ can, of course, be transitive, if its lowest argument is referential,
and in this case the second argument can be passivized (I vini italiani sono be-
vuti più in Italia che all’estero ‘Italian wines are drunk more in Italy than
abroad’). In this case, the predicate of the clause is an active accomplishment
(see section 1.4).

18. Although the selection of perfective sein ‘be’ and haben ‘have’ in German is
determined by principles which are comparable to those that are at work in
Italian, German kosten ‘cost’ requires perfective ‘have’. The discrepancy be-
tween Italian costare and German kosten might depend on the different condi-
tions for the selection of the perfective operator with stative predicates which
hold in the two languages (Bentley and Eythórsson 2003; Keller and Sorace
2003). On the other hand, it is to be noted that many such crosslinguistic mis-
matches concern experiencer verbs (Zaenen 1993), and other verbs which re-
quire inversion in the sense of Harris (1984a, 1984b) and Perlmutter (1979, 1984). Accordingly, the said mismatches may depend on the encoding of the same events as inversion constructions, i.e., bivalent constructions with one macrorole, or, alternatively, as constructions with two macroroles (for a treatment of some such alternations in Italian see Chapter 3). The selection of the perfective operator in German is beyond the scope of this discussion, and will not be dealt with here. I refer to section 2.4.2.2 for a discussion of the distribution of perfective ‘have’ and ‘be’ in French, which is comparable, to some extent, to the German pattern of distribution, due allowance being made for reflexive constructions. Unlike Italian and French reflexives, German reflexives select ‘have’ because they are not clitic reflexives (Haider and Rindler-Schjerf 1987).

19. In Italo-Romance, there are dialects in which a dative argument can be assigned the macrorole undergoer and be selected as the PSA in the passive voice (see Sicilian fu parrata ‘she was spoken to’). There are passive structures in Italian which might seem to require the same analysis (e.g., the passives with volere ‘want’ or avere ‘have’ plus a past participle), but in fact must be analysed differently. The passive with avere ‘have’ is discussed below in this section.

20. È già andata can also receive a resultative interpretation (‘she is already gone’, see Chapter 7), but this point is irrelevant to my present purposes.

21. The co-indexation in the semantic representation, which is not part of the original proposal by Van Valin 1990 (or of Centineo 1995 and VVLP: 411), indicates that the suppressed argument is co-referent with another argument in the semantic representation.

22. The RRG theory of predicate and clause linkage distinguishes between nexus, i.e., the syntactic relations between the linked syntactic units, and juncture, i.e., the type of units which are linked (nuclei, cores, etc.). Complex constructions must be defined in terms of both nexus and juncture (VVLP: 441–484). The type of nexus called co-subordination consists of two syntactic units joining under a syntactic node of the same type (see Figure 6), and is characterized by the sharing of operators at the level of juncture.

23. Lexical decomposition does not, of course, capture the facts in (22). In these sentences, the PSA is the undergoer of an achievement.

24. I do not refer to another notion of construction here (Goldberg 1995), i.e., a structure whose meaning is not completely understandable from the meaning of the component parts, since this notion does not fit the structures which are under scrutiny in the present context.

25. This is a verb-framed construction (see Talmy’s 1985 notion of verb-framed language) which essentially tests out as a transitive construction.
26. In the remainder of this work I shall continue to adopt VVLP’s representation of accomplishments (BECOME pred').

27. In dynamic construal, lexemes do not have meanings assigned to them. Rather, meanings arise as a result of constrained processes of construal, i.e., meaning construction, which take place in actual use. The basis of such processes is the purport, that is, the conceptual content which is associated with individual lexemes, but which under-determines any specific meanings which lexemes can take in context. The purport of individual lexemes arises as the result of previous experiences of the contextual use of those lexemes (Cruse 2004: 261–272). This effectively means that there can be default uses of lexemes and that, in theory, some notion of grammaticality can be defined in terms of the said defaults. Unlike the constructional approaches which I referred to above, some version of the dynamic-construal approach might at the same time succeed in capturing mismatches such as those which were discussed with respect to class (i) (see, for example, the different behaviour of correre ‘run’ and camminare ‘walk’), and in eschewing the need of separate lexical representations in cases such as those included in class (iv). To be sure, mismatches such as those which were discussed with respect to class (ii) are unlikely to be captured in terms of contextualized use, since they are based on speaker intuitions, rather than on usage. However, this issue goes beyond the scope of the present discussion, and will not be addressed at length here.

28. In Old Neapolitan I have found the following example which could be a manifestation of this type of alternation: Simmo tanto tardati a pparlare ‘We have (lit. are) waited so long to speak’ (Libru de la Destructione de Troya, p. 250: 31). Note, however, that in early Italo-Romance, there exists an impersonal use of tardare, in the sense of ‘seem late’. The occurrence of ‘be’ in the Old Neapolitan example could thus be due to interference from the impersonal pattern. Apart from this example, I am not aware of any evidence for the ESSE-based alternation in the early attestations of the vernaculars of Italy.

29. Phonosyntactic doubling (doubling of the first consonant of the past participle in the third person singular), which might be thought to cause the second and third persons to diverge, does not invalidate this hypothesis. See Bentley and Eythórsson (2001: 72, note 4) for an explanation of this point.

30. The tendency for the first and second persons to take the same operator may be related to a person hierarchy which is observed in linguistic change: the third person is the least likely to be affected by analogical change, possibly because of its pragmatic status as the non-person (Benveniste 1946; Kuryłowicz 1947).

31. The analysis of the selection according to person in Catalan is beyond the scope of this work, and will not be carried out here. However, I wish to mention some facts which seem to support an analysis along the lines of Bentley
and Eythórsson’s (2001) account of the phenomenon in Italo-Romance. As was pointed out above, at least in some Catalan dialects, ‘be’ is limited to the first person, whilst ‘have’ is generalized elsewhere (Arqués i Arrufat 1910: 92; Krüger 1913: 54–55). The first person singular of ‘have’ is (h)ay/(h)ei /he, whilst the second one is (h)as. In some dialects, the second person can also be pronounced [ai]. It appears, therefore, that a homonymic clash may have arisen between the first and second persons, and this may have led to the introduction of ‘be’ in the first person. This is simply a speculative hypothesis, which ought to be supported by further study. One interesting point is that, in Catalan, alternation according to person co-exists with generalized ‘have’, i.e., ‘have’ with all classes of verbs (Arqués i Arrufat 1910: 92). In Romance, generalized ‘have’ is a development of the HABERE-based distribution, which is discussed in section 2.4.2 below. Therefore, it is possible that, in the Catalan dialects in question, the HABERE-based distribution was followed by the generalization of ‘have’, which in turn was followed by the selection according to person, when ‘be’ entered the first person.

32. Instead of ‘have’, generalized ‘hold’ figures in some Romance languages (e.g., Portuguese ter). In addition, Modern Terracinese has generalized ‘be’, as I mentioned in passing, but this pattern pertains historically to the ESSE-based distribution.

33. This claim is based on the results of a survey conducted among a sample of native speakers from the province of Palermo. One exception is dòrmiri ‘sleep’, which allows nni-cliticization of its argument, according to some speakers.

34. The fact that, in some Romance languages, for instance Sicilian and Standard Catalan, the counterpart of ne-cliticization has resisted neutralization, by contrast with the selection of the perfective operator, may be due to the role that this type of cliticization has in information structure. I refer to Chapter 6 for an in-depth analysis of ne-cliticization.

35. In section 4.4, it will become clear that the formulation of the Italian rule in terms of PSA markedness also accounts for a type of PSA that is called pivot, i.e., the missing highest macrorole argument of infinitival clauses. In such clauses, A is selected if there is a pivot that is unmarked (a controlled unmarked actor).


37. French impersonals with on ‘one, we’, on the other hand, display the selection of the perfective operator rather than generalized ‘be’. The status of impersonal on in semantics and syntax will not be treated here.
38. In addition, like the alternations examined in section 2.3, idiosyncratic variation solely occurs if it is in accordance with the principle of PSA markedness. Consider the following authentic example drawn from a text outside my primary corpus: *tutti erano taciti* ‘they had (lit. were) all kept quiet’ (Dino Buzzati, *Il Deserto dei Tartari*, La Biblioteca di Repubblica, NOVECENTO, 34, Barcellona: BIBLIOTEX, S.L., 2002, p. 102; original edition, Milano: Mondadori, 1945). *Tacere* ‘keep quiet, avoid speaking’ generally patterns with activities or transitive active accomplishments, in Modern Italian. In the cited example, however, it is construed as a state to convey a sense of inertia, in accordance with the principal theme of the novel. The selection of the perfective operator indicates PSA markedness.

39. The predicate need not be a verb. I discuss some complex predicates in which the second unit is not verbal in Chapter 3 and Chapter 6.

40. The selection of the perfective operator in Nuorese and Logudorese Sardinian can be characterized in terms of PSA markedness, even though there are some interesting mismatches between Sardinian and Italian, which mainly concern si-constructions and presentational focus. These mismatches will be treated later in this work (Chapter 4 and Chapter 5).

41. The dialects of Brindisi and Taranto (Salento, Puglia) provide an apparent exception to this view of the placement of clitic arguments. In these dialects, verbs of ordering, fearing, requesting, and desiring (including ‘want’) are followed by a finite verb, whether or not the controller of this verb is co-referent with the controller of the verb of desiring, etc. The second verb hosts the clitic *ku*, which can only be separated from this verb by other clitics (e.g. the negation and object clitics): *lu Maryu ole ku bbene krai*, lit. Mario wants *ku* s/he comes tomorrow (Calabrese 1993: 45). Interestingly, *ku* is optional if the controllers of the two verbs are co-referent: *voggyu (ku) kkattu nu milune* ‘I-want (ku) I-buy a melon’ (Calabrese 1993: 82). In addition, the modal can only be preceded by a clitic if *ku* is deleted: *voggyu (ku) lu kkattu*, lit. I-want (ku) it I-buy vs. *lu voggyu kkattu*, lit. it I-want I-buy. Structures like *lu voggyu kkattu* may be thought to indicate that the placement of the clitic before the modal or aspectual unit is possible out of a clause (Monachesi 1999: 181), and thus to invalidate the view of clitic placement as a diagnostic of nuclear juncture. However, crosslinguistic evidence indicates that the morphology of one unit can spread to the other units of a complex predicate (Bickel 2003). Accordingly, it can be assumed that *lu voggyu kkattu* simply exhibits the spreading of the first person singular present morphology across the units of the complex predicate, i.e., the repetition of the same inflectonal material on every conjunct within the nucleus. Thus, *lu voggyu kkattu* is a nuclear juncture, whilst *voggyu ku lu kkattu* is not.
42. In the discussion that follows I shall be concerned primarily with deontic and volitional modals. Epistemic modals are incompatible with perfective aspect, which is marked on the infinitive that follows them: deve essere andata via ‘she must have gone away’, può averlo fatto lei ‘it is possible that it was her who did it’. The contrast between, on the one hand, deontic and volitional modals and, on the other hand, epistemic modals is in accordance with the view that epistemic modals have wider scope than deontic modals (VLP: 49). Epistemic modals will only be considered in passing in section 2.5.3.

43. The idea that restructuring verbs license two kinds of structure has been advocated by Monachesi (1999: 148). My proposal differs from Monachesi’s in that it rests on the view that there is a crucial difference between the complex predicates which are formed with class-(ii) aspectuals and those which are formed with class-(i) aspectuals or modals. This difference principally hinges on the level of juncture which is involved in the linkage. Moreover, unlike Monachesi, I claim that class-(ii) aspectuals obligatorily form a nuclear co-subordination with the following predicate, i.e., they obligatorily require restructuring, regardless of the position of the clitic. The case of class-(i) aspectuals and modals is different, as will be explained below.

44. Unlike co-subordinated units, co-ordinated ones do not share operators at the level of juncture (some Italian examples will be given in section 6.2.3).

45. Of course, this hierarchy is only valid if both the modal and the aspectual unit modify the infinitival predicate. Thus, in Lucia comincia a volerci andare ‘Lucy begins to want to go’, the aspectual unit precedes the modal one, since it only modifies the latter (it does not follow from this example that Lucy begins to go).

46. Of course, a vast number of experiencer verbs have si-reflexive counterparts, and these are marked structures from the point of view of accusative alignment, for reasons which will be explained in full in Chapter 4.

47. Alba-Salas (2004: 304) claims that avere does not make a semantic contribution, and that the verbal noun is the only predicator, in the experiencer predicates dealt with above. I assume that a predicator may simply contribute an argument to the semantic representation. The assumption that avere ‘have’ is a predicator explains why the predicate-argument contributed by the noun can be ne-cliticized in the experiencer predicates with avere ‘have’, as will be pointed out below, but not in predications in which a noun provides the only predicate in the clause, that is, structures with the copula ‘be’ and a nominal predicate: *ne sono studenti due ‘two ne are students’ (see section 6.4.2).

48. Robert Van Valin (p. c.) has suggested that the nominals of the periphrases with avere or sentire plus noun should be represented in argument positions in the semantic representation, but their qualia properties would tie them to the predicate. I have not followed this suggestion, since it is not clear to me how
the qualia roles of the predicate-arguments would tie them to the predicate, and stop them from being passivized, but not from being quantified. In addition, the proposed analysis reflects the fact that the nominal component of the predicates with *avere* ‘have’ and *sentire* ‘feel’ behaves more like a predicate than like an argument.

49. Since the resultative component of these verbs is punctual, they should be called active achievements (Van Valin 2005: 44–45). However, I adopt the standard terminology that is used in much of the relevant literature.

50. Needless to say, the lack of agentivity of the highest argument of bivalent predicates need not be marked morphosyntactically, as witnessed by type-(i) experiencer verbs in Italian (e.g., *amare* ‘love’).

51. Some native speakers disagree with Pesetsky’s judgement on English *please*, and this further supports my point that the notion of pleasing can – but need not - be encoded by causative predicates.

52. The complex predicates with *venire* ‘come’ and *scappare* ‘escape’ are not to be confused with the complex predicates formed with *(ri)prendere* ‘(re)take’ plus a noun: *mi ha ripreso la febbre alta* ‘I have high fever again’ (Maraini, *Memorie di una ladra*, p. 54). These are not inversion constructions, but rather transitive ones.

53. Van Valin has suggested to me that the use of inversion in Romanian could be an areal influence from its Slavic neighbours.

54. Other Romance languages allow three specified variables in the semantics of non-monadic reflexives (Loporcaro 2004; Tufi 2005).

55. BECOME is the marker of non-punctual telicity. Since it is not the case that all telic predicates are inchoative, it could be argued that inchoativity should be represented differently in the semantic representation of predicates. However, this technical detail goes beyond the scope of the present analysis.

56. An old-fashioned word for the causative verb ‘thin’ is *dimagrare*, which has virtually been replaced by *dimagrire* in current Italian (Cortelazzo and Zolli 1999).

57. The clitic *ne* would seem to be inherent, i.e., idiomatic, in such predicates, similarly to the reflexive morpheme. In fact, whilst it co-occurs obligatorily with the inherent reflexives, it is ruled out with some non-reflexive counterparts: *me *{ne} vado* ‘I am leaving’ vs. *(ne) vado* ‘I am leaving’.

58. I adopt the notation SE to refer to the outcomes of the Latin reflexive morpheme. In my treatment of Italian *si*-passives (see section 4.3.2), I shall introduce evidence which suggests that, in early Italian, *si*-passives allowed the expression of the highest argument. I shall argue that, if the actor of *si*-passives appears in a peripheral phrase (as a ‘by’-adjunct), it is not suppressed, but rather modulated in semantics-syntax mapping, like the actor in the ‘by’-phrase of analytic passives.
59. Vincent (1982) also points out that Romanian does have a modern ‘be’-passive, which results from the imitation of nineteenth-century Italian and French literary models.

60. Robustelli (1996) has found a small number of reflexives embedded in Old Italian fare-causatives: *la grande infermitate fece l’anima sobria e ricordarsi di Dio* ‘the terrible illness made the soul sober and reminded it of God’ (*Bibbia Volgare*, cited in Robustelli 1996: 279, note 15). Old Italian fare-causatives, however, do not constitute nuclear junctures. Observe that, in the cited example, the infinitive *ricordarsi* ‘remember’ is separated from *fare* by another predicate, i.e. *sobria* ‘sober’, as well as the argument *l’anima* ‘the soul’. Accordingly, the *fare*-causer is not shared by the following predicate, which can have a suppressed highest argument of its own. The comparable results which are reported in Cennamo’s (2005a) study of thirteenth-century Italian also suggest that Old Italian fare-constructions involve more structure than their Modern Italian correlates.

61. As has already been mentioned, unspecified causal activities are standardly indicated as [(do) (Ø, Ø)] in RRG. I indicate the unspecified argument as χ, in this context (see also section 4.3.3), to differentiate it from the suppressed argument. I leave to future research in RRG the theoretical issue of the exact domains of χ- and Ø-variables.

62. It is worth mentioning that, unlike Spanish *olvidar* ‘forget’, Italian *dimenticare* ‘forget’ and *ricordare* ‘remember’ do not admit the assignment of the syntactic role of PSA to the lowest argument: *Se me ha olvidado el bolígrafo* ‘I forgot my pen’, lit. my pen forgot to me. This Spanish structure requires inversion on a par with type- (iii) experiencer verbs (see section 3.4).

63. In theory, there could be inherent reflexives which lack the semantics that underlies PSA markedness. In such cases, the argument which is marked as suppressed would not appear in a semantic position which justifies the assignment of the macrorole undergoer and the selection of perfective ‘be’ (French *se promener* ‘(take a) walk’ might be a case in point). Assuming for the sake of argument that such reflexives really exist, the selection of ‘be’ is consistent with the marking of the highest argument as a suppressed argument, i.e., a marked PSA. Other split intransitivity diagnostics might treat such reflexives differently.

64. Whilst in Italian the reflexive morpheme always agrees with the PSA in person and number, in other Romance languages, the third person of SE has extended to other persons. This process has occurred in some Italo-Romance dialects, specifically Northern Italo-Romance, Tuscan, Umbrian, and central dialects: e.g., Lucchese *noi si alziamo* ‘we get up’, Roman *s’arzamo* ‘we get up’ (Rohlfs 1968: 159–160). See Benincà and Poletto (2005) for an account of the spread of the third person within the paradigm.
65. The underlining in the semantic representation of the possessive noun phrase marks the head of the phrase (VVLP: 190–192).


69. Lepschy (1984: 70–71) states that the selection of the perfective operator in Modern Venetan reflexives is subject to pressure from standard Italian. Paola Benincà (p. c.) notes a preference for ‘have’ in the third-person singular and plural and in the first-person plural. This is part of the ESSE-based distribution discussed in section 2.4.1.

70. In her seminal work on SE-constructions, Wehr (1985) argues against the use of the terms impersonal and passive with respect to the constructions which are the focus of this section. In her account, such constructions should not be called impersonal, but rather indefinite, insofar as they involve an unspecified human argument. In addition, these structures are not passive, insofar as they do not (necessarily) topicalize a patient. My treatment of *si*-impersonals is in accordance with Wehr’s (1995) analysis, in that it rests on the claim that the suppressed argument is obligatorily [+human] as well as in some sense visible to the semantics of the clause, even though suppressed (see section 4.3.1). However, I use the term impersonal to indicate the lack of a PSA in the grammar. As for the term *si*-passive, it refers to constructions with PSA modulation, i.e., one of the two defining features of passives, in the theoretical framework adopted in this work.

71. The example in (54b) can also be interpreted as a non-monadic reflexive (‘S/he buys two pens for herself / himself’), although this point is irrelevant in the present context.

72. The grammaticality of (62a) does not undermine the assumption that *si* marks the suppression of the highest direct core argument, but rather indicates that the suppressed argument of *si*-impersonals must be the highest argument available for macrorole assignment. Type-(iii) experiencer verbs are also allowed in impersonal constructions without *si*: *non piace essere in ritardo* ‘one does not like to be late’. Such constructions, which lack an experiencer, are comparable to Modern Italian *bisogna* ‘need’ (see section 3.4).

73. A da- ‘by’-phrase can of course occur in structures like *si è apprezzati dagli studenti* ‘one is appreciated by the students’, which are *si*-impersonal correlates of analytic passives; see Wehr’s (1995: 52) treatment of the *SE-
Konstruktion im Passiv ‘si-construction in the passive’. In analytic passives, argument modulation leaves the second direct core argument available for PSA modulation. In the structures under consideration, this argument is suppressed instead of being modulated.

74. According to Lepschy (1978: 35), si-passives in which the finite form of the verb agrees with a plural accusative clitic are also grammatical: le si comprano ‘one buys (lit. buy.3PL) them’. In this case, there is a clash between the coding properties of the pronoun (case marking) and its behavioural properties (control of agreement). However, the construction in question is normally deemed to be ungrammatical by native speakers.

75. “Dans les deux premières personnes, il y a à la fois une personne impliquée et un discours sur cette personne. «Je» désigne celui qui parle et implique en même temps un énoncé sur le compte de «je»: disant «je», je ne puis ne pas parler de moi… La forme dite de 3e personne comporte bien une indication d’énoncé sur quelqu’un ou quelque chose, mais non rapporté à une «personne» spécifique. L’élément variable et proprement «personnel» de ces dénominations fait ici défaut… La conséquence doit être formulée nettement: la «3e personne» n’est pas une «personne»; c’est même la forme verbale qui a pour fonction d’exprimer la non-personne (Benveniste 1946: 4).” [In the first two persons, there is at the same time a designated person and an utterance about this person. «I» indicates the speaker while implying an utterance about I: saying «I», I cannot not speak about myself… The form which we call third person does involve an utterance about somebody or something, but this is not referred to a specific person. The variable and properly «personal» element of these designations is missing here… The consequence must be formulated bluntly: the «third person» is not a «person»; it is the verb form whose function is to express the non-person].

76. Nocentini (2003: 277) denies the existence of such structures in standard Italian, whilst noting that a referential first person plural reading of reflexive si-impersonals is possible in Tuscan Italian (Ci si compra qualcosa ‘we buy something for ourselves’, which corresponds to ci compriamo qualcosa). I adhere to a traditional view which considers the structures with ci si to be part of the standard.

77. The reader should bear in mind that standard Italian originated from fourteenth century Florentine, a Tuscan dialect, and that Tuscan has since continued to play the role of a prestigious model in the history of Italian.

78. In some varieties of Italian, accusative and reflexive clitics can precede locative or dative clitics: e.g., ti (OCL) ci (LCL)porto ‘I take you there’, non mi (OCL) ci (LCL)metto ‘I will not put myself in it (i.e., I shall not attempt this)’, and, from Maraini, Memoria di una ladra, à p. 57, mi (RFL) ci (DCL)sono attaccata ‘I attached myself to them (i.e., I became fond of them)’. Two points
should be made, in this respect. First, the linearization rules vary due to dialect influence. Secondly, my account of clitic ordering in si-constructions is meant to be construction-specific. Whilst the same pressures influence the development of clitic ordering in all structures, different constructions may exhibit different outcomes of these pressures.

79. See Santangelo and Venneman’s (1976) account of the development of sequences of dative and direct-object clitics in Italian.

80. Infinitival structures like those in (85) and (86b) could be analysed as infiniti sostantivati, i.e., arguments provided by nominal forms derived from infinitives. I opt for the analysis proposed above, in that the infinitival forms of (85) and (86b) bear aspectual modification and display the alternation of the per

fective operator.

81. The notions of finite and non-finite agreement were introduced in Chapter 2. The reader should bear in mind that these notions are to be distinguished from the notion of finiteness which holds for clauses. Thus, the clause è uscita, lit. she is.3SG gone. FSG out, is finite, but it exhibits both finite agreement (on the perfective operator) and non-finite agreement (on the past participle).

82. The agreement of the past participle of the perfect with a dative argument is not attested in Italian and rare in Romance. It is found in the Engadinish dialects of Swiss Rhaeto-Romance and, more sporadically, in some varieties of Gascon (Salvioni 1911: 376–378; J. C. Smith 1991: 345). An exceptional case of past-participle agreement with a non-macrorole argument is found in Italian intransitive-dative reflexives (see section 4.2.6).

83. The reader should note that the masculine singular inflection represents agreement with a masculine singular argument, which I indicate in the glosses as MSG, or a neutral inflection which indicates lack of agreement.

84. These are verbs which occur frequently in the everyday language (e.g., fare ‘do’, dare ‘give’, vedere ‘see’, avere ‘have’, ricevere ‘receive’). In addition, the object of dire ‘say’ and objects which include the word cosa ‘thing’ (e.g., ogni cosa ‘everything’) may fail to trigger past-participle agreement.

85. The ten texts in the corpus amount to 1,900 pages each of which has a length of between 160 and 320 words.

86. The other two texts are Sciascia’s A ciascuno il suo and Masina’s Il volo del passero. Each of these texts only displays one occurrence of past-participle agreement with the core-internal nominal undergoer of a construction with a non-monadic reflexive.

87. Whilst Italian grammars state that past-participle agreement with a clitic undergoer is obligatory in non-monadic reflexives, Lepschy (1978: 37–38) points out that agreement with the marked actor is also found in non-monadic reflexives with a clitic undergoer, when the marked actor is realized by a plural argument. In my corpus, I have found one example of this structure: se lo
sono presi i polacchi ‘The Poles have taken it’ (Lucarelli, L’estate torbida, p. 47). This kind of agreement is interesting from the perspective taken in this study since it would seem to represent a further step towards syntactically-principled past-participle agreement.

88. As was pointed out in section 4.3.2, the first and second persons also play a role in discourse which differs from that of the third person. This contrast is likely to have a bearing on agreement or lack thereof.

89. In support of the idea that the change which has affected agreement with wh-arguments is part of the drift towards accusative alignment, observe that, in Italo-Romance, past-participle agreement with the head of a transitive relative clause is only obligatory in those dialects which exhibit past-participle agreement with the core-internal nominal undergoer of transitive clauses (Loporcaro 1998: 14).

90. Note that a clitic that is co-referent with a core-external topic cannot be hosted by the infinitive in the complex predicates under investigation here.

91. I use the term absolute in a traditional sense which highlights the absence of an auxiliary or a non-predicating operator in the participial construction. In Chapter 7, I shall discuss a different use of the same term.

92. The passive analysis is adhered to by Lucchesi (1962–1963: 224–229), who points out, however, that agreement is sometimes missing in Old Italian absolute participles (e.g., veduto la bellezza ‘see the beauty’), and argues that the absence of agreement depends on the possibility of an active reading of these structures.

93. See also Loporcaro, Pescia and Ramos (2004) for comparative Romance evidence in support of the passive analysis.

94. In the discussion of complex experiencer predicates formed with avere ‘have’ or sentire ‘feel’ plus a noun (see section 3.2), I noted that the reason why the predicative argument of these constructions receives a macrorole and behaves as an argument, albeit only in some respects, remains an unresolved issue. Copular constructions with an adjectival or nominal predicate behave differently from the complex experiencer predicates, insofar as their predicator does not receive a macrorole and does not behave as an argument. The rationale of the contrast between the two types of construction is clear: the predicative argument is the only predicator of the constructions with the copula ‘be’, whereas the predicative argument of complex experiencer predicates combines with another predicator (have or feel). Evidence that have and feel are predicators was given in Chapter 3.

95. The data discussed below were collected from interviews and the administration of questionnaires to a small sample of Logudorese (Log.) speakers from Bonorva, Bono and Buddusò. Additional evidence is based on La Fauci and Loporcaro (1993, 1997) and Jones (1993). La Fauci and Loporcaro (1993,

96. Sornicola (1996) and Ledgeway (2002: 124) have noted that a number of Italo-Romance dialects which do not require overt referential subjects, thus classifying as null-subject or pro-drop languages, do exhibit overt expletive subjects, principally in presentational constructions and with avalent predicates (e.g., Neapolitan (i) *killo vantutta* / *kello vantutta fidduna e a mučēra*, lit. that came.PL / that came.SG my son and wife, and (ii) *arò vaja? kella kjwal*, lit. where are you going? That’s raining!; cf. Sornicola 1996: 331, 336). The distribution of Sardinian *bi*, however, does not correspond to the distribution of the overt expletive subjects of the dialects in question, since *bi* is not found with avalent predicates, whereas it can co-occur with overt referential subjects in prenuclear position (cf. (67)).

97. The results of corpus-based research on existentials have led Beaver, Francez and Levinson (2006) to claim that the definiteness effects are not categorical, but gradient, and that they are to be explained in terms of a hierarchy of subject properties of noun phrases which determine their likelihood of occurrence in existentials. An interesting topic for future research is the investigation of the relation between the pragmatic conditions on agreement which are outlined by studies like the present one and the semantic properties of prototypical subjects discussed in the work of Beaver, Francez and Levinson (2006).

98. There are also semantic and pragmatic criteria (e.g., person) which interact with the syntactic principle (marking of PSAhood) in the determination of finite agreement by subject clitics in Northern Italo-Romance varieties. For simplicity, I abstract away from these criteria in the present context.

99. Resultative constructions express a state which implies a previous event (Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988: 6). An analysis of these constructions is provided in Chapter 7. In this context the reader should note that the fact that the copula *essiri* ‘be’ appears in the perfective form (*ha statu* ‘has been’) provides evidence that *partuta* ‘left.FSG’ in (80b) is not a perfective past participle. In fact, this could not be a double-composed form of the perfective operator (see section 2.2), since Sicilian bans the double-composed perfect.

100. Note, however, that I have no data on past-participle agreement in non-monadic reflexives of the dialect of San Tommaso.

101. The data are not sufficient to determine whether the system of adverbial agreement exemplified above realizes active vs. inactive alignment or active vs. non-active alignment.

102. *Ne* can also realize the partitive complement of a nominal or quantifier head (*Mi piace un certo numero dei tuoi amici* ‘I like a number of your friends’, me
ne piace un certo numero ‘I like a number of them’), and this is why it is normally regarded as a partitive clitic. The partitive and other uses of ne will be considered in section 6.6. With ne-cliticization I refer exclusively to the cliticization with the ne which originates from a quantified noun phrase.

103. In the glosses, I refer with QCL to the ne which originates from a quantified noun phrase.

104. Topical elements of information are not necessarily elements which have been introduced previously in discourse. Rather, they can simply be information units which are taken for granted or which are treated as if they had already been mentioned in discourse: “What is presupposed in a topic-comment relation is not the topic itself, nor its referent, but the fact that the topic referent can be expected to play a role in a given proposition, due to its status as a center of interest or matter of concern in the conversation” (Lambrecht 1994: 151).

105. The second, inherent, argument of bivalent activities (e.g., leggere libri ‘read books’) is banned from ne-cliticization because it is not quantifiable. In previous chapters, I discussed a number of bivalent constructions which are hard to classify, in that their second argument behaves partly as an inherent argument (for instance, it normally bans passivization) and partly as the second macro-role argument of a transitive clause. Ne-cliticization is only grammatical if the quantification of the second argument is licensed (Paura ne ho avuta molta ‘fear, I had much ne’). Ne-cliticization treats this argument as the second argument of the state predicate of a transitive clause.

106. That the only argument of intransitive predicates embedded under fare is an undergoer is shown by other kinds of cliticization (Li faccio scrivere ‘I make them write’) and by past-participle agreement (Li ho fatti scrivere ‘I have make.PP.MPL them.MPL write’).

107. The notions of internal and external argument have changed radically, since the late 80s, as a result of the formulation of the VP-internal Subject Hypothesis, which has later developed into the idea that some arguments which used to be regarded as external are not arguments of the verb phrase at all. These technicalities of some syntactic theories will be disregarded in the discussion that follows, as they are not strictly relevant to my account. Observe that, in the mentioned syntactic theories, it is still only the argument of unaccusatives which is said to be generated internally to the verb phrase.

108. In addition, the ungrammaticality of the ne-cliticization of the only argument of some stative predicates would seem to suggest that the set of predicates which license ne-cliticization of their argument is also too small, as is the case with locative inversion (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 223). I discuss the relevant data in section 6.4.
109. Atkinson (1973) offers a corpus-based analysis of the constraints on the French construction formed with *il* plus a verb and a postcopular argument. In the light of his findings, this construction turns out to denote *staged activities*: “the reader has the impression, not of being informed by the author of what is happening, but rather of being ‘on stage’ himself” (Atkinson 1973: 15). By comparison with another construction with the same function (verb plus postverbal subject), the impersonal construction with *il* is much more restricted in terms of the semantics of the verb, the animacy of the argument, and the syntactic structures in which it can be embedded.

110. With respect to the French constructions under scrutiny, Jones (1996: 127) suggests that the semantic content of the predicate is made redundant by the locational adjunct, and thus the external argument can be identified with a postnuclear direct object. Jones’ account is comparable to Lonzi’s proposal on the allegedly deviant uses of *ne*, and with a great number of studies of presentational constructions which assume that the postnuclear argument is a direct object (see, among others, Bresnan and Kanerva 1989; Platzack 1983). This assumption is problematic, if applied indiscriminately to all languages, as has been pointed out by Börjars and Vincent (2005) and Lazard (1998: 69). A more promising approach is that of Beaver, Francez and Levinson (2006), who identify a hierarchical set of semantic subject properties which the postnuclear argument of existential constructions tends to lack.

111. Unlike Sardinian, Italian does not provide any evidence that the selection of *A* might be the result of well-formedness conditions on the encoding of information structure. To begin with, Italian existentials only admit *essere* ‘be’ (*Ce ne sono / *hanno / *ha due* ‘there are two *ne*’). Secondly, there is finite agreement in Italian existentials, as well as in structures with *ne*-cliticization. Finally, the canonical constructions with *ne* do not require *A* with states, achievements and accomplishments, thus following the default pattern of perfective-operator selection.

112. A similar claim is made by Bennis (2004) with respect to Dutch. For our current purposes it is interesting to note that, in the light of the data discussed by Bennis, the behaviour of Dutch adjectives appears to parallel the behaviour of the Italian adjectives described by Cinque (1990).

113. Cinque (1990) mentions other tests, but these do not yield clear-cut results. For instance, whereas *nato* ‘well-known’ figures in sentences with *come* ‘how’ plus ‘be’ (*Com’è nato, il tasso di natalità è basso in questo paese* ‘as is well-known, the birth-rate is low in this country’), and *buono* ‘good’ contrasts with *nato* ‘well-known’ in this respect (*Com’è buono, il tasso di natalità è basso in questo paese* ‘as is good, the birth-rate is low in this country’), other adjectives which pattern with *nato* in *ne*-cliticization, do not do so vis-à-vis the other tests (*Com’è certo, il tasso di natalità è basso in questo paese* ‘as is
certain, the birth-rate is low in this country’). Clearly, these tests must be governed by a more complex set of conditions. I shall not explore these facts any further in the present context.

114. I use the expression *resultative predicate* in the sense of Nedjalkov and Jaxon-tov (1988: 6) “verb forms that express a state implying a previous event”.

115. The contrasting behaviour of related adjectival and verbal pairs which denote colour was first brought to my attention by Asya Perel'svaig.

116. *Ne*-cliticization with inherent reflexives deserves some comment. In particular, according to a great deal of speakers, the sentence in (49a) is only acceptable with the interpretation ‘many get ill with it (with this illness).’ I leave the treatment of this matter to section 6.5.

117. The possessive dative and *ne*-cliticization also differ in that there are no focus-structure constraints on the possessive dative, but I disregard this point here for simplicity.

118. Other adjectives in –*bile* seem to rule out *ne*-cliticization altogether: *ne sono apribili due* ‘two can be opened’, *ne sono tascabili due* ‘two are pocket-size’. This is probably due to the fact that these adjectives are not experiencer predicates, and thus they are not represented semantically as $\text{be}^\varepsilon (x, [\text{pred}^\varepsilon (y)])$ but rather as $\text{be}^\varepsilon (x, [\text{pred}'])$ (see *?apribile da tutti and *tascabile da tutti).

119. Convincing evidence that passives and resultative state predicates are related in the way illustrated in (53a) and (53b) is offered by Dubinsky and Simango (1996), on the basis of data from Chichewa, which distinguishes morphologically these two types of predicate.

120. To my knowledge, before my account (Bentley 2004b), the import of perfective aspect on *ne*-cliticization with adjectives had hardly received any attention. It was only mentioned in passing by La Fauci (1988: 109, note 6), who suggested that unaccusativity might be related to aspect, without, however, providing a fully-fledged analysis of adjectival behaviour.

121. The highest argument of *sembra* ‘seem’ is usually overt when the lowest one is *ne*-cliticized. This is a recurrent pattern of the behaviour of type-(iii) experiencer predicates vis-à-vis the diagnostics which target the lowest-ranking argument. In section 7.2, I explain this pattern with reference to Bossong’s (1998) analysis of inversion.

122. It is interesting that my findings are in agreement with the very few French and Italian data which are provided by Reinhart and Siloni (2004: 172).

123. As a native speaker, I find acceptable the *ne*-cliticization of the only argument of inherent reflexives. The analysis offered here reflects the judgement of the majority of my informants.
124. As is the case with quantified *ne*, well-formedness conditions on information structure affect the realization with type-(a) *pro-di ne* of the lowest argument of type-(iii) experiencer adjectives. I disregard this point here for simplicity.

125. Since the position of the past participle with respect to the modified nominal is significant in my analysis, I give the literal translation of the examples of attributive constructions.

126. Georg Bossong suggests that this construction is not, strictly speaking, a relative clause, but rather a participial construction. The point which is important in my analysis is that the participle figures in prenominal position alongside its lowest argument (*ein Buch* ‘a book’), whereas the modified argument is the highest one. Observe further that it is the present participle that occurs in this construction.

127. A possible counterexample is *riuscito*, which would seem to be the past participle of *riuscire* ‘succeed’. Note, however, that, when occurring prenominally, *riuscito* means ‘successful’ (*il riuscitissimo esperimento* ‘the very successful experiment’). Thus, we are not dealing with an experiencer verb in this case.

128. Incidentally, three of the past participles listed in (32) are also gradual-completion verbs: *aumentare* ‘augment’, *approfondire* ‘deepen’, and *diffondere* ‘spread’.

129. Observe that the postnominal modification by the past participle of a non-monomadic reflexive is not acceptable, at least in the informal styles: *la persona pettinatasi i capelli* ‘the person (who has) combed her / his hair’. This rules out the marked actor of two-macrorole constructions. Incidentally, in my variety of Italian, the past participles of inherent, (anti)causative and non-causative non-inherent reflexives are all admitted in the restrictive construction: *la casa bruciatasi ieri* ‘the house which burned down yesterday’; *la persona pentitasi ieri* ‘the person who repented yesterday’; *la persona uccisasi ieri* ‘the person who killed herself yesterday’; *la persona lavatasi ieri* ‘the person who washed herself yesterday’.

130. For the synchronic and diachronic relatedness of passive and resultative constructions see Comrie (1981b), Haspelmath (1990), and Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988).

131. Interestingly, the participles discussed in 7.3.1 are also banned from the absolute construction, which further suggests that they are separate adjectival entries (*Fumata la ragazza, si preoccuparono i genitori* ‘the girl being stoned, her parents got worried’).

132. In my variety of Italian, the example in (53) is ungrammatical, unless the participle is preceded by an adverbial indicating telicity: *(non) appena* ‘as soon as’, *una volta* ‘once’, etc.

133. See Egerland (2000: 606–607) for the claim that absolute participles can also be concessive in Old Italian.
134. Note that *malcapitato* ‘unlucky’ literally means ‘happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time’, and cannot be considered to be a direct correlate of the verb *capitare* ‘happen (to)’, which requires inversion.

135. The V2 hypothesis is assumed to hold for Medieval Romance in general. Since I am only concerned with aspects of word order in Modern Italian, I shall not deal with it here. For some discussion, I refer to Benincà (1983/1984, 1994, 1997); Lombardi and Middleton (2004); Salvi (2000); Vanelli (1986); and, for a skeptical opinion, Sornicola (2000: 107) and references therein.

136. In RRG terms, the prominent argument of *DUE SOLUZIONI ci sono* ‘There are two solutions’ does not occur in the immediately prenuclear position, but rather in the Pre-Core Slot. Contrastingly, the only argument of existential *esserci* ‘there + be’ occurs in the core-internal immediately prenuclear position if it is topical, which is not normally the case (cf. (18) below).

137. The ungrammatical structure *il premio ha vinto quello studente*, lit. the prize has won that student, must not be confused with a different, grammatical, construction: *IL PREMIO ha vinto quello studente* ‘It is the prize that that student has won’. In this case, the nominal undergoer bears contrastive prominence and occurs in the Pre-Core Slot.

138. The passive can also exhibit a focal undergoer, of course, but this is beside the point (Wandruszka 1982: 11): *furono distribuiti i viveri* ‘the provisions were handed out’, lit. were handed out the provisions.

139. It is essential to bear in mind that I am distinguishing between locative inversion and bare VS order.

140. The reason why contrastive narrow focus is sometimes translated with a cleft-sentence is purely to differentiate between contrastive and non-contrastive focus in Italian. It is not within the scope of the analysis to ascertain if contrastive focus in Italian is entirely comparable to the type of focus which is expressed with cleft sentences in English.

141. There exist counterparts of these structures with contrastive focus of the post-nuclear argument (*Manca IL SUO VISTO STAMPATO, non…*) ‘It is your seal of approval that is missing, not…’). However, a contrastive interpretation is not imposed by the predicates shown in (17).

142. Bossong (p.c.) suggests that it is the existential predicate that exceptionally receives the focal weight in (18), and thus the respective order of *c'è* and of the argument is *syntagmatically* inverted. From the theoretical perspective taken in this work, existential *c'è* will always figure in the nucleus, whether or not syntagmatic inversion applies.

143. *Brillare* ‘sparkle’ (cf. (35d)) is semelfactive. Thus, it is only atelic to the extent that it denotes no resultant state.

144. The imperfect indicative can also have a narrative function in locative inversion, introducing a past event into discourse as if this were an on-going state of
affairs, typically when the event is already common knowledge: *Due anni fa scompariva Luigi Pirandello* ‘Two years ago disappeared. IMPERFECT (died) Luigi Pirandello’ (Tabucchi, *Sostiene Pereira*, p. 10).

145. I note an example with *suonare* ‘play (music)’ in Bernini’s (1995: 60) corpus: *Al conservatorio suona l’Orchestra*... ‘At the Conservatoire the Orchestra will be playing...’. Bernini’s corpus consists of journalistic prose, and is thus expected to exhibit a wider variety of predicates in constructions with VS order than other corpora.

146. This would be an example of locative inversion with an agentive activity, even though this predicate would be part of a complex unit formed together with *cominciare* ‘begin’.