ON EXTRACTION FROM NP IN ITALIAN*

GUGLIELMO CINQUE

We will begin by illustrating what we take to be the representative paradigm of possible and impossible extractions from NP in Italian. The theory within which we will describe and interpret the relevant facts is a version of the Extended Standard Theory (EST) which comprises the two extraction rules of Wh-movement and Clitic Movement.¹

In section 1 we will present and discuss what appears to be the generalization underlying the facts of extraction. In section 2 we will relate it to the independent definitions of 'subject-of' and 'object-of' for a NP and propose what looks like the simplest and most straightforward way to derive the generalization from the independent principles of the theory, which we identify here with the system presented in Chomsky (1978) and related works. One problem which emerges in relation to one of the assumptions of the system adopted here will be discussed briefly (and rather inconclusively) at the end of the paper. We may also note, incidentally, that the general conclusions that will be arrived at in section 2 are, in one sense, neutral with respect to the question whether Clitic Movement or Wh-movement (or both) involve actual movement or not.

1. Compare the following cases, presented here with a partial indication of their (plausible) structure ('t' is the trace of the fronted PP):

(1) (a) Una persona [PP di cui] apprezziamo [NP la grande generosità t] (è Giorgio)

'A person of whom we appreciate the great generosity (is G.)'²

* We wish to thank, for their advice and observations, Adriana Belletti, Noam Chomsky, Giorgio Graffi, Richard Kayne, Giulio Lepschy, Vincenzo Lo Cascio and Lidia Lonzi. They are not necessarily committed to the ideas contained here.
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(b) * Il paese [PP a cui] ricordiamo [NP un/l’attacco t] (è la Polonia)
   ‘A country on which we remember an/the attack (is Poland)’
(c) * Non è posto [PP da cui] possano minacciarci [NP il licenziamento t]
   ‘It is not a position from which they can threaten us the dismissal’

(2) (a) [Ne] apprezziamo [NP la grande generosità t]
   ‘Of-him (we) appreciate the great generosity’
(b) * Tutti [vi/ci] condannerebbero [NP un/l’attacco t]
   ‘Everybody on-it would condemn an/the attack’
(c) * Ce [ne] hanno minacciato [NP il licenziamento t]
   ‘To us from-it (they) have threatened the dismissal’

(1) and (2) represent cases of extraction from a non subject post-
verbal NP: (1) represents cases of Wh-movement (in relatives, with cui pronouns; for simplicity we omit here the variant with quale pronouns)\(^3\); (2) of Clitic movement.\(^4\) (1) and (2) exem-
plify extraction of PPs only. In fact given that there are no (bare) NP complements to Ns but only PP complements — see below, p. 00, for relevant discussion — and given that no (simplex) pre-
position stranding is allowed in Italian, the result is that only PPs can be successfully extracted from NPs in Italian. If we compare
(1) and (2) the following conclusion appears natural: only PPs of
the form [di NP] (recall our assumption that ne is (also) a pro-
PP of the form [di NP(+ pro)]) can be extracted from NPs. Notice
that the ne which corresponds to [da NP] rather than [di NP] is
in fact not extractable. See (2c).

If we look in addition at cases of extraction from a preverbal
subject NP (cf. (3)) or a postverbal subject NP (cf. (4)–(5))
this conclusion seems to be reinforced.

(3) (a) ? Giorgio [PP di cui] [NP l’onestà t] è, credo, nota a tutti
   ‘G. of whom honesty is, I believe, known to every-
body’
(b) * Una persona [PP a cui] [NP l’attaccamento t] pot-
rebbe rovinarci . . .
   ‘A person to whom the attachment could ruin us . . .’
(c) * Quel posto [PP da cui] [NP un/il licenziamento] ci
è stato minacciato.\(^5\)

'That position from which a/the dismissal has been threatened . . .'

The somewhat marginal (or literary) status of (3a), under normal stress conditions, may be due to an external factor.\(^6\) This conclusion is reinforced by the perfect status of extraction from a post-verbal subject. See (4) and (5) which represent cases of Wh-movement and Clitic Movement, respectively (the lack of a Clitic Movement case corresponding to (3) above is due to the fact that Italian has no analogue of the French En-avant rule — for which see Ruwet (1972a), Kayne (1975, 2.13); that is, no Clitic Movement (from the subject to the verb) to the right is allowed in Italian).

(4) (a) Giorgio, [\(PP\) di cui] è nota [\(NP\) l'onestà t], . . .

'G., of whom is known the honesty, . . .'

(b) * Una persona [\(PP\) a cui] potrebbe rovinarci [\(NP\) l'attaccamento t] . . .

'A person to whom could ruin us the attachment . . .'

(c) * Il posto [\(PP\) da cui] è stato minacciato [\(NP\) il licenziamento t] . . .\(^7\)

'the position from which has been threatened the dismissal . . .'

(5) (a) [\(Ne\)] è nota [\(NP\) l'onestà t]

'Of-him is known the honesty'

(b) * [\(Gli\)] potrebbe valere [\(NP\) l'attaccamento t]

'To-him could be worthwhile the attachment'

(c) * [\(Ne\)] è stato minacciato [\(NP\) il licenziamento t]

'From-it has been threatened the dismissal'

Thus, extraction from NP in Italian, assuming these paradigms to be representative, seems to be characterized by the following observational generalization: Only PPs of the form [\(di\) \(NP\)] can be extracted (from subject and object NPs alike). If extraction is indeed involved in (3), the systematic possibility of extracting from preverbal as well as postverbal subject NPs in Italian (as opposed to, say, English) seems to require an account, for the problem of extraction in Italian rather different from that proposed for English in Chomsky (1977). To see this, consider the main lines of that approach. It essentially appealed to the
notion of subjacency under the assumption that $S$ instead of (or in addition to) $\bar{S}$ is a cyclic node for subjacency. The consequence is that in the normal case no extraction is allowed from NP (the extracted element would, in its way to COMP, cross the two cyclic nodes NP and S). The few apparently permitted cases of extraction from NP are analyzed there as not involving genuine extraction. They divide into two major classes. The first involves a base structure of the form (i) $V[N_P][P_PNP_2]$ rather than (in fact, in addition to) (ii) $V[N_P][P_PNP_2]$, so that the NP within the PP, or the PP itself, can move freely to COMP, crossing only one cyclic node, namely $S$. This reflects the basic idea of Horn (1975), Bach-Horn (1976), about a class of spurious cases of extraction. It is to be expected that a sequence of the form $V$ Det NP NP that has the structure of (i) will have the following properties: the NP can be wh-moved (questioned, relativized, etc.); the second and third terms, since they form a base generated constituent of the type NP, can be realized as a pronoun, can be wh-moved and NP-moved (e.g. in Passive). The same sequence with the structure shown in (ii) will have none of these properties. Sentences like (6)

(6) John wrote a book about someone

are a case in point. They are ambiguous between the two structures (i) and (ii). See Bach-Horn (1976), Chomsky (1977). The latter paper points out the existence of a somewhat more different class of exceptions to the analysis in terms of the modified version of subjacency just sketched. Note that this analysis incorporates Bach and Horn’s generalization (the NP Constraint) in a principled way, by having it follow from very general and independently needed principles of the theory, and by avoiding the empirical inadequacies of Bach and Horn’s analysis (like the possible extraposition from NP to the right as in $S[N_P a \text{ review}]$ was published $[P_P \text{ of Bill’s book}]$). This second type of exception is represented by such forms as (7)

(7) I saw a picture of someone

which do not display the same cluster of properties as (6). In particular, they do not show the independent ‘pronominalization’ or wh-movement of the sequence a picture:
(8) (a) *I saw it of John
(b) *What did you see of John?

although they allow for what prima facie is an extraction from NP:

(9) Who did you see a picture of?

Both of these properties of (7) are accounted for under the assumption that forms like (7) are base generated with structure (ii) and that an extraposition (or readjustment) rule may apply (in the initial structure, before transformations). See Chomsky (1977, pp. 114–116). Thus, neither class of exceptions is regarded as a case of genuine extraction. In essence Chomsky’s (1977) analysis shares with Bach-Horn’s (1976) the idea that the basic or unmarked case for English is that (wh-) extraction from NP is blocked and that the few apparent cases of extraction are essentially peripheral in that they involve more marked resources such as the readjustment rule mentioned above. Under this view, the fact that both ‘exceptions’ to the basic case are lexically ‘restrained’ (the first exceptional case is possible with write but not burn; the second with see, find but not destroy) and somewhat variable through idiolects, is somehow to be expected. If we turn back to the Italian case, now, we see that the facts so far reviewed do not seem to warrant the same interpretation. The readjustment analysis for the few cases of extraction in English makes it — as it were — natural (under standard assumptions) that in fact only post-verbal NPs, never subject NPs, will allow ‘extraction’. This is because subjects are not governed by Vs and thus should be unaffected by rules that are sensitive to the nature of the particular matrix V.9 Now, the fact that PPs can be extracted from subject NPs in Italian and, furthermore, under the same conditions that govern extraction from other types of NPs, seem to weaken the case for an analysis which involves a readjustment rule sensitive to the nature of the matrix V, for Italian. Also, extraction of PPs of the form [di NP] seems essentially systematic, not restrained by any kind of lexical idiosyncrasy. These considerations may suggest a shift of interpretation. Suppose we were to take the unmarked case in Italian to be that extraction from NP is actually free. This presupposes an independent explanation for why PPs of a form other than
[di NP] are not in fact extractable. Let us assume for the time being that one such independent explanation exists. We come to this directly.

Note, then, that this different interpretation of what is the marked and unmarked situation in the extraction facts of Italian is representable by taking NP and $\bar{S}$ (not S) as the cyclic nodes for subjacency in Italian: an assumption that has been argued on independent grounds by Rizzi (this volume). Extraction from NP in Italian would then be freer than in English since Wh-movement from NP (to COMP) would only cross one cyclic node, namely NP, and would thus be permitted.

An important part of the difference in the syntax of extraction from NP in English and Italian would thus reduce to a minimal difference in what counts as a cyclic node for subjacency in the grammar of the two languages.

This conclusion seems to be supported by the fact that extraction from NP through Clitic Movement, in Italian, is possible under exactly the same conditions as extraction through Wh-movement. If the problem of extraction in Italian were to crucially and exclusively involve the cyclicity (for subjacency) of S, as in English, we could in principle expect different results when extracting through Clitic Movement (which involves movement across just one cyclic node, NP) and through Wh-movement (which involves, except possibly for a few readjustment cases, two cyclic nodes, NP and $\bar{S}$). If on the other hand the cyclicity of S plays no role in the syntax of extraction in Italian, it becomes perhaps natural that the conditions governing extraction with Wh-movement should in no relevant way be different from those governing extraction with Clitic Movement. What remains to be determined, of course, is the exact nature of such conditions. Before we address this question we should mention some cases that appear to constitute prima facie counterexamples to the generalization stated above.

About the first class of cases, the so called Bach-Horn sentences, we will not say much since they are quite familiar and have already been referred to above. A relevant example is (10)

(10) Un autore [pp su cui] sono scritti molti articoli . . .
       'An author about whom many articles have been written . . .'
for which the plausible initial (VP) structure is \([VP \, V[NP] [PP \, P \, NP]]\). As we should expect the substitution of the V *scrivere* with a V such as *distruggere* in (10) leads to ungrammaticality (in the intended sense). As we should expect the following related forms are grammatical:

(11) (a)  Li abbiamo scritti su di lui
   'We have written them about him'

(b)  Che cosa avete scritto su di lui?
   'What have you written about him?'

(c)  Quattrocento e più libri sono stati scritti su Scott
   'More than 400 books have been written about S.'

A more interesting class of apparent counterexamples to the generalization that only PPs of the form [di NP] can be extracted is represented by such sentences as

(12)  La piazza [PP a cui] hanno interdetto l'accesso, ...
   'The square, to which they have blocked the access, ...

In such cases, there is little doubt that the (fronted) PP is closely connected to the NP. See the following forms where the PP and the NP behave as a constituent under NP-preposing:

(13)  L'accesso alla piazza era stato interdetto dalla polizia
   'The access to the square had been blocked by the police'

Furthermore, the selection of the preposition in the PP seems to depend on the head N of the related NP (in fact from the head lexical category of the neutral N/V entry, in an \(\bar{X}\) framework. Cf. *accedere alla piazza*). In contrast to such forms as (11) a-b, the independent 'pronominalization' or Wh-movement of the NP (connected to the PP) is not possible here. See:

(14) (a)  * Lo hanno interdetto alla piazza
   'they have blocked it to the square'

(b)  * Che cosa hanno interdetto alla piazza?
   'What did they block to the square?'

In spite of this there is evidence for one derivation of such forms as (12) which does not involve genuine extraction. Alongside the passive form (13) a passive alternative such as the
following is also possible, in which the PP is 'left behind':

(15) L'accesso era stato interdetto solo alla piazza
    'The access had been blocked only to the square'

The situation illustrated by (12) through (15), which is both different from the Bach-Horn cases and the case of (1a)–(5a), recalls closely Chomsky's analysis of 'Who did you see a picture of?' and can be analysed along the following lines. Sentences like

(16) Hanno interdetto l'accesso alla piazza
    '(They) have blocked the access to the square'

are generated in the base with the structure NP[Vp V[Np N [pp ]]]. This accounts for the preposition selection property and for the NP-preposing case of (13), where l'accesso alla piazza behaves as a constituent. Suppose now that structures like (16) may also be subject (optionally) to a reanalysis in the base (before the application of transformations) which converts their structure to NP[Vp V NP PP]. Under this assumption the remaining basic properties of these sentences also follow. The NP-preposing (in Passive) of the NP alone will now be allowed, whereas the 'pronominalization' and the Wh-movement of the same NP will still not be possible given that pronouns and wh-phrases are base generated pro-NPs and thus could only stand for the whole [NP N PP] base structure of (16). This reanalysis process, like the English case discussed by Chomsky, is sensitive to properties of the matrix V. For example it is possible with interdire (l'accesso) but not with descrivere ('describe') (l'accesso) (Cf. *L'accesso è stato descritto solo alla piazza 'the access has been described only to the square' vs. (15). It is interesting to note that in this case extraction is likewise impossible: *La piazza a cui hanno descritto l'accesso 'The square to which they have described the access' vs. (12).) The two facts thus appear to correlate. This lexical dependency may be connected to the fact that such forms as (16) (interdire l'accesso but not descrivere l'accesso) are semi-idiomatic forms in Italian. In fact, interdire l'accesso (a) may well be substituted by the single V chiedere. The reanalysis process might thus be seen as a device to modify the cohesion of the constituents of certain sequences to adapt it to the interpretation of such sequences.
It may be possible to explain away all the known cases of apparent counterexamples to the generalization along these and similar lines. If so then the fact that of all PPs only those of the form [di NP] can be successfully extracted from NPs is a significant property of the grammar of Italian. The generalization states an 'only if' condition. It doesn't say that if a PP is of the form [di NP] then it can be extracted. It turns out in fact that the generalization can not be strengthened to an 'if and only if' statement. There are cases of [di NP] PPs that cannot be extracted. The conditions under which these PPs can not be extracted appear to be characterizable precisely. The relevant examples are:

(17) (a) *L'icôna, [PP di cui] è stato scoperto [NP il furto del custode t] . . .
   'The icon, of which has been discovered the custodian's theft; . . .'

   (b) *[Ne] è stato scoperto [NP il furto del custode t]
   'Of-it has been discovered the custodian's theft'

(18) (a) *L'icôna, [PP di cui] è stato scoperto [NP il tuo furto t] . . .
   'The icon, of which has been discovered your theft . . .'

   (b) *[Ne] è stato scoperto [NP il tuo furto t]
   'Of-it has been discovered your theft'

A comparison of (17)-(18) with the grammatical (19)

(19) (a) L'icôna, [PP di cui] è stato scoperto [NP il furto t] . . .
   'The icon, of which has been discovered the theft . . .'

   (b) [Ne] è stato scoperto [NP il furto t]
   'Of-it has been discovered the theft'

suggests the following conclusion: a PP of the form [di NP] can not be extracted if the NP from which it is extracted contains another PP of the form [di NP] or a possessive adjective. Note, however, that whereas this is invariably true for the case of possessive adjectives, it is not always true when PPs are present. See\textsuperscript{16}:

(20) (a) Il custode, [PP di cui] è stato scoperto [NP il furto dell'icôna t] . . .
   'The custodian, of whom has been discovered the theft of the icon . . .'


(b) [Ne] è stato scoperto [NP il furto dell'icona t]
'Of-him has been discovered the theft of the icon'

These are the basic facts.

We turn now to the question of how these facts can be derived from the principles of the explanatory theory.

2. We may begin by noting that, in Italian, PPs of the form [di NP] appear to introduce both the subject NP and the object NP of a N in a NP. For example in

(21) La descrizione di Giorgio dei particolari dell'incidente
'The description of G. of the details of the accident'

which corresponds closely to

(22) Giorgio ha descritto i particolari dell'incidente
'G. has described the details of the accident'

(di) Giorgio has the same relation to the N descrizione that Giorgio has to the V ha descritto in (22) (that of ‘subject-of’); and (de) i particolari dell'incidente bears the same relation to the N, in (21), that i particolari dell'incidente bears to the V in (22) (that of ‘object-of’). It might be fruitful to try to relate this property of [di NP] PPs (and possessive adjectives) to the other property that characterizes them, namely that they are the only type of PP that can be freely extracted from NPs (with the qualifications just made). We will explore this possibility. The specific hypothesis we will consider to relate these two properties is that the syntax of extraction from NPs, in Italian, is for the essential part reducible, under trace theory, to the opacity condition of Chomsky (1978). This condition of Logical Form (LF) blocks structures in which there is a free anaphor in α (α = S or NP) which is also in the domain of the subject of α, where ‘free in α’ means ‘not coindexed with a c-commanding category in α’.

Many more auxiliary assumptions need to be made explicit before we can have a hypothesis which is sufficiently precise to be checked in an interesting way against the facts. We will discuss them directly. It suffices for the moment to note that for this condition to have the desired consequences for the syntax of extraction in Italian, the trace of Clitic Movement and that of Wh-movement must both be interpreted as ‘anaphors’ (in the
technical sense of Chomsky (1978)). If this assumption is consistent with the original proposal put forth by Chomsky (1975, 1977) as part of the motivation for trace theory, and remains unchallenged for the trace of Clitic Movement (whose fundamental properties are essentially like those of other lexical anaphors such as reflexives, each other, etc.), it clashes with the interpretation of traces of wh-phrases given in Chomsky (1978), Rizzi (this volume) according to which by the time opacity becomes operative the trace of a wh-phrase has already been converted in LF into a variable (bound by the wh-quantifier) and as such is no longer sensitive to opacity. For relevant discussion, see the two papers cited. For the time being let us, nonetheless, continue to suppose that both the PP trace of Clitic Movement and that of Wh-movement are anaphors in the intended sense. Notice now what are the implications of this hypothesis for the extraction phenomena, if it should prove basically correct.

Assuming every NP to have an (overt or covert) syntactic subject position (an assumption that we will try to substantiate later) and given that the subject of an NP is introduced only by [di NP] PPs (and possessive adjectives), only [di NP] PPs will in fact appear to be extractable. Also, given that [di NP] PPs can introduce both the subject and the object NP of a N in a NP, only a subclass of [di NP] PPs will be extractable, i.e. only those that introduce the subject.

That is, we would simultaneously account for the generalization stated above and for the cases ((17)–(18)) that forbid the strengthening of the generalization to an ‘if and only if’ statement.

However, in order for the hypothesis to be empirically testable, we have to characterize in a precise way the notion of (syntactic) subject and object of an NP (in Italian) and determine, for the relevant classes of Ns in Italian, which phrase counts as its syntactic subject.20 We take up these two questions separately in 2.1 and 2.2, respectively.

2.1 It was observed informally above that the subject and the object of a NP may be introduced either by a [di NP] PP or by a possessive adjective. In the version of X theory we are assuming here the complement expansions of X (and X) are one and the same for each choice of X (V, N, A, P).21 In other words, Ns and
As will have the same range of complements that Vs and Ps have. Among these, (bare) NP complements. This decision has the advantage of maximizing the generality and uniformity of the $\bar{X}$ system. The obvious observation that Ns and As never come out with an actual (bare) NP complement is related, in this view, to the fact that Ns and As, contrary to Vs and Ps ($-N$), can not assign case and to the fact that lexical NPs have to be case-marked (see the discussion of the case filter in Rouveuret-Vergnaud (1978), Chomsky (1978)). Instead of bare NP complements, what we find are PPs, generally introduced by the preposition $di$ (‘of’) (see (22), (21) and $[VP\ \text{Ama}_{NP\ \text{il rischio}}]$ vs. $E'[\text{Amante}_{PP\ \text{del rischio}}]$). Loosely speaking, one might think of these PPs as a kind of suppletive form to save the generality of the $\bar{X}$ theory. To the extent that this suppletion process is regular one could propose a (transformational) rule inserting $[P\ \text{di}]$, that is an already available case-assigner for a NP that otherwise could not receive case.\textsuperscript{22}

For simplicity we also take the rule expanding the subject of $\bar{N}$ to be $\bar{N} \rightarrow \bar{N} \ [PP\ P\ NP]$ where the preposition $di$ is inserted under the empty $P$ for the same reasons that may motivate it for NP complements of Ns as just discussed. We leave the question open here whether this rule generalizes to the other major categories ($\bar{N}$, $\bar{A}$, $\bar{P}$).

Suppose further that the possessive adjective, which we take to be generated as such in the specifier position of $\bar{N}$ in the base, translates in LF as $di$ NP where the NP is a pronoun with the feature specification (person and number) ‘inherited’ from the adjective.\textsuperscript{23} This translation may extend straightforwardly to what Postal (1969) called Proper Pseudo Adjectives (PPA), which are plausibly base generated as As (Cf. Chomsky (1972)). This would meet the objections raised in Watt (1973).

Given this, let us define now the notions of (syntactic) subject and object of a NP. For convenience, we will define the subject of $\alpha$ ($\alpha = NP$) as the NP of a $[di\ NP]$ PP immediately dominated by $\bar{N}$ (a generalization of this definition to cover the case of the subject of $S$ seems possible but will not be explored here). Assuming, as seems natural, that the notion subject-of is relevant only at the level of LF (opacity, etc.), this definition will pick out correctly Giorgio and the pronoun concealed under sua as the syntactic subjects of the NP in (23a) and (23b),
respectively:

(23) (a) La partenza di Giorgio
‘The departure of G.’

(b) La sua partenza
‘His/her departure’

whose LF structure, under this analysis will be:

(24) (a)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{Det} \\
\text{la} \\
\text{partenza} \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{di} \\
\text{G.} \\
\end{array}
\]

(b)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{Det} \\
\text{la} \\
\text{(sua)} \\
\text{partenza} \\
\text{diNP} \\
\left[ + \text{pro} ight] \\
\left[ + 3\text{pers} \right] \\
\text{N} \\
\end{array}
\]

Although many general principles of the theory of LF still wait to be worked out fully, one may reasonably suppose that the ungrammaticality of forms like

(25) * La sua partenza di Giorgio
‘His departure of G.’

which under a phrase structure derivation of the possessive adjective are freely generated may be related to a violation of one very general LF requirement. The intransitive predicate partenza would end up with two subjects, a mismatch between syntactic positions and logical argument positions.

We further assume the definition of object of \( \alpha = \text{NP} \) to be: the NP of a [di NP] PP immediately dominated by \( \bar{N} \) (again the parallelism with the definition of object of \( \alpha = \text{S} \) is obvious.
A unification of the two, which is not attempted here, seems straightforward.

Under standard assumptions for the strict subcategorization frame of Ns like *descrizione* (see, however, 2.2 below) and the other assumptions made explicit above, a plausible (sub)logical form representation for

(26) (a) La descrizione degli avvenimenti di Giorgio

   'The descriptions of the events of G.'

(b) La sua descrizione degli avvenimenti

   'His description of the events'

is

(27) (a)

\[
\text{Det} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{PP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{N} \quad \text{PP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{P} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{NP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{la} \quad \text{descriz.} \quad \text{di} \quad \text{gli avv.} \quad \text{di} \quad \text{G.}
\]

(b)

\[
\text{Det} \quad \text{di NP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{N} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{P} \quad \text{NP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{la} \quad \text{(sua)} \quad \text{descriz.} \quad \text{di} \quad \text{gli avv.}
\]

The definition of subject and object will mark the NP *gli avvenimenti* as the object of the \( \tilde{N} \) in both (a) and (b) and *Giorgio*, and the NP under *sua*, as the subject of the \( \tilde{N} \) in (a) and (b) respectively.

The inverted order of the PPs of (26) (a) (: *La descrizione di Giorgio degli avvenimenti*), also possible, is simply obtained, we assume, from the structure underlying (26) (a) through a postposition or more likely Heavy Constituent Shift of the 'object'
PP (in fact, the inverted order seems in many cases more natural if the ‘object’ PP is heavier than the subject PP). In those cases for which only one of the two reciprocal orders of PPs is possible (i.e. where the postposition rule is for some reason inapplicable) that order is ‘object’ PP—‘subject’ PP, never the converse. See, for example:

(28) (a) Il desiderio di rivincita di Giorgio
     ‘The desire of revenge of G.’
     (b) * Il desiderio di Giorgio di rivincita

This is exactly what one would expect if the ‘object’ PP were generated under N and the ‘subject’ PP under N, as we have assumed above.

Finally note that under the assumption made earlier, that the possessive adjectives are base generated as such in a single position (that of ‘specifier of N’) they will be interpreted only as introducing the subject of the NP, never the object (given the definitions of subject and object of NP adopted here). This result will be seen later to have some interesting and desirable consequences for the syntax and semantics of NPs.

2.2 The next question to be considered concerns the lexical properties (if any) of the relevant classes of Ns in Italian; specifically the question of what counts as the syntactic subject of each class.

Within an X conception of the lexicon, what one should expect to find, perhaps as the least marked situation, in a related pair of V and N, is that their subcategorization frames be identical or very closely corresponding, that the semantic role of the subject of the V be the same as that of the subject of the related N, etc. All this can be expressed in terms of very general principles of the lexicon. Within the same conception one also expects to find, in certain cases, lack of correspondence in some or all of the aspects of the relation between N and V. These idiosyncrasies would have to be listed in the lexical items themselves (this being perhaps the most marked situation). Any subregularity, a quite common situation in this domain, would be expressed in terms of redundancy rules.

In the classes of Ns that we will discuss (in relation to the corresponding Vs) we will find in general a systematic correspondence in properties of Ns with the related Vs. Furthermore it seems that in those case where such correspondence fails, clear subregularities are found.
It is important to try to determine what counts as the syntactic subject of each class on grounds (syntactic and semantic) which are independent of the question of extraction. In this way, we will be able to check the predictions deriving from the hypothesis made above for the facts of extraction. It will be seen, in particular, that a careful examination of what counts as the syntactic subject of each class will show the perfect consistency of the hypothesis with cases that otherwise could have been taken as counterexamples.

We will begin by comparing the class of ‘intransitive’ Ns (related to intransitive Vs) with one class of Ns related to transitive Vs. This latter class is the class of predicates termed in Postal (1971) ‘psych-movement’ verbs. The basic properties of these two classes are illustrated in (29) and (30), respectively:

(29) (a) La partenza di Giorgio (da Roma per l’Egitto)
        ‘The departure of G. (from Rome to Egypt)’
(b) La sua partenza (da Roma per l’Egitto)
    ‘His departure (from Rome to Egypt)’
(c) La partenza (da Roma per l’Egitto)
    ‘The departure (from Rome to Egypt)’
(d) * ? La partenza di te (da Roma per l’Egitto)
    ‘The departure of you (from Rome to Egypt)’

(30) (a) Il desiderio di Anna
        ‘The desire of A.’
(b) Il desiderio di te
    ‘The desire of you’
(c) Il tuo desiderio
    ‘Your desire’
(d) Il mio desiderio di te
    ‘My desire of you’

Much of what we say about (29) has already been anticipated above. In (29) (a) Giorgio is understood as the ‘subject’ of partenza much in the same way as Giorgio, in the sentence (31):

(31) Giorgio parte (da Roma per l’Egitto)
    ‘G. leaves (from Rome to Egypt)’

is understood as the ‘subject’ of the related V partire. In (29) (b) it is the NP concealed under the possessive adjective that corresponds to the subject of the related V. It appears that whenever
a possessive adjective is possible a 'subject' [di NP] PP is also possible, except for one marginal case. Possessive adjectives and [di NP] PPs are in (quasi-)complementary distribution within NPs. Possessive adjectives are pronominal forms standing for a 1st, 2nd and 3rd person (± plural) pronoun (contrary to English, they do not mark the gender of the pronoun but agree in gender with that of the head they modify). Subject [di NP] PPs, on the other hand, are wellformed if the NP is lexical, but not if the NP is a pronoun, unless it is coordinated to another NP or is heavily contrasted (cf. (29)(a) with (29)(d) — for a more detailed discussion see Belletti (1978)

One might want to account for this (quasi-)complementary distribution with a (semi-)obligatory spelling out or Cliticization rule which turns a (subject) [di Pro] PP into a possessive adjective (and moves it to pre-head position). This is the course taken in Belletti (1978). Another possibility, one assumed earlier, is to consider possessive adjectives directly generated as such in the base (in fact they do not seem to differ in the relevant respects from ordinary adjectives) and to attribute the non perfect status of [di NP] PPs where the NP is a pronoun to some as yet to be stated external principle. We are not taking a definite stance here between these two possibilities and in fact both are compatible with the analysis to be sketched below. For concreteness and without much justification we adopt the latter here. All that we say below can accommodate the other assumption with only minor changes. A third possibility will be discussed in section 2.3.

Note that it is implicit in what we have assumed so far that the rule 'Move NP' (of the Passive, etc.) has no role in the syntax internal to the NP in Italian. Its absence in this domain may perhaps be related to the fact that the bare NP complement to the N is not marked for case in its base position nor can it receive it in the specifier position to the left of the N (we assume this latter case to be what differentiates Italian from English). See section 2.3 for a somewhat more detailed discussion of this issue. As a consequence of this more of the work will have to be put on redundancy rules. However, when the relation between Ns and Vs is taken into account, as it should, such redundancy rules will be seen to be needed largely independently of the decision to keep 'Move NP' out of the syntax of NP in Italian.
Before comparing (29) with (30) we should discuss briefly one last rather crucial assumption for our analysis.

In cases like (29)(c) where no overt subject appears, either in the form of a [di NP] PP or a possessive adjective, we still assume there to be a syntactic subject position in LF. We may think of it for convenience as a kind of zero adjective which translates in LF as di NP as with other overt possessive adjectives: a special form for the arbitrary interpretation of subjects of NPs. This is in fact how (29)(c) is actually interpreted, with an unspecified subject just as in ordinary infinitival structures with arbitrary control (Non era chiaro per dove partire ‘It wasn’t clear for where to leave’). Consider now (30). (30)(a) (as opposed to (29)(a)) is ambiguous between a subject reading (‘A. desires so./st.’) and an object reading (‘So. desires Anna’). The two single readings are represented in Il desiderio di Anna fu esaudito ‘Anna’s desire was fulfilled’ and Il desiderio di Anna lo porterà alla rovina ‘the desire for Anna will ruin him’, respectively. (30) (b) (= Il desiderio di te) is no longer ambiguous. It has only the object reading. Note that there is no restriction here comparable to that involving (29)(d) (in fact what was said before about (29) (d) holds here with respect to the subject reading for (30) (b)).

(30)(c) (= Il tuo desiderio), on the other hand, has only the subject reading (‘You desire so./st.’). It can not mean ‘So. desires you’. Finally (30)(d) (= Il mio desiderio di te) has just one reading, corresponding to ‘I desire you’.

Under the approach taken here, there seems to be a simple way to account for these two separate clusterings of facts. Suppose that partenza, like all ‘intransitive’ Ns is subcategorized only for ‘oblique’ complements, if any. We are assuming that Ns, just like Vs, are not strictly subcategorized by their subject (P) NPs, simply because NPs (like Ss) always have a subject. Suppose, on the other hand, that Ns of the class of desiderio are subcategorized for an object (P) NP (in fact optionally) (this being no doubt related to their corresponding to transitive Vs).

From these quite natural assumptions, and the assumption that the prohibition against [di Pro] PPs is restricted to those that mark the subject (whatever the proper account for it is – see the discussion above), the clustering of properties of (29) and (30) follow directly.

So, for example, the ambiguity of Il desiderio di Anna (= (30)
(a), as opposed to the non ambiguity of _La partenza di Giorgio_ (29)(a) derives from the fact that the PP [di Anna] can be generated either under N (the subject reading) or under N (the object reading), given the subcategorization frame for _desidero_. In (29)(a), on the other hand, [di Giorgio] can only be generated under N, given the subcategorization frame of _parte_. If the restriction on pronominal NPs is limited to PPs that introduce the subject (under N), the asymmetry between *la partenza di te (= (29)(d)) vs. _Il desiderio di te (= (30)(b)) also follows.*

As expected, _Il desiderio di te_ is not ambiguous, in contrast to the ambiguity of _Il desiderio di Anna_. Its subject reading being excluded by the restriction against subject [di Pro] PPs, it will be wellformed only with [di te] generated under N (the object). And, indeed, only the object reading is available (‘Someone desires you’).

Finally the non ambiguity of (30)(c) and (30)(d) falls out too. Given that the possessive adjective is generated under N, the NP under it will only be interpreted as the subject of the NP. So the fact that (30)(c) _Il tuo desiderio_ and (30)(d) _Il mio desiderio di te_ only mean, respectively, ‘You desire so./st.’ and ‘I desire you’ (not ‘So. desires you’ or ‘You desire me’) is in fact expected.

We will extend now the framework built so far to the other classes of Ns that are related to transitive Vs. For ease of reference, let us designate the class of intransitive Ns above class I and the class of Ns like _desiderio_ class II. Consider now the relevant properties of another class of transitive Ns, which we will refer to as class III:

(32) (a) La cattura del soldato  
‘the capture of the soldier’

(b) *La cattura di te  
‘the capture of you’

(c) Le tua cattura  
‘you capture’

(d) *La nostra cattura del soldato  
‘Our capture of the soldier’

The first thing to note about this class of transitive Ns is that (32)(a), contrary to the corresponding case of the other class of transitive Ns seen above, (30)(a), is not ambiguous. It has only the object reading (‘So. caught the soldier’). The subject reading
(‘The soldier caught so.’) is impossible.

Prima facie we could take Ns like *cattura to be subcategorized for an object (P) NP (just like the related V catturare) but to lack a subject (P) NP (contrary to our earlier assumption that every NP has a syntactic subject position). This conclusion would seem to be reinforced by the ungrammaticality of (32)(d) which shows an overt possessive adjective (introducing the subject). Under this interpretation, however, the remaining properties of cattura would turn out to be rather puzzling when confronted with those of desiderio (class II) which was also analyzed as being subcategorized for an object (P) NP. For example, given that cattura del soldato has an object reading (is subcategorized for an object (P) NP) we could expect (32)(b) (= *la cattura di te) to be possible just as (30)(b) il desiderio di te is possible. But this is not the case. (32)(b) is impossible with either a subject or an object reading. Analogously, we could expect (32)(c) la tua cattura to be impossible with an object reading (just as il tuo desiderio were impossible with that reading.) But (32)(c) admits of an object reading. In fact it has only the object reading ‘So. caught you’.

All this could well be taken to show an incoherence in the conclusions drawn above on the basis of the properties of class I and II. A rather simple and natural assumption exists that makes the incoherence disappear. Retaining all the particular assumptions made so far, suppose we say that Ns of the class of cattura (class III) are, as it were, ‘lexically’ or ‘inherently passive’. More concretely, this may mean that in the neutral entry cattur- (common to both the N cattura and the V catturare) the subcategorization for an object NP will not be common to both +N and +V, but will be specified only under +V. A lexical redundancy rule, sensitive to the semantic properties of this class of Ns (see below), will associate to the +N ‘subentry’ the subcategorization

In other words, we take it that the N cattura is not subcategorized for an object. Rather, it will have the property that the initial syntactic object of the related V corresponds systematically to its syntactic subject. With this single assumption added, the facts about cattura, shown in (32), become perfectly coherent with those of desiderio and are in fact expected.

For example, if cattura is not subcategorized for an object, it
will follow that (32) (a) *la cattura del soldato* will not be ambiguous. *Del soldato* can occupy just one syntactic position, that of the subject of the NP, under N. The "object reading", in fact the only possible interpretation of (32) (a), will be now a consequence of the fact that the syntactic subject of the N corresponds to the initial object of the related transitive V (by the redundancy relation).

This interpretation also entails that (32) (b) *?la cattura di te* should pattern like (29) (d) *?le partenza di te* rather than (30) (b) *il desiderio di te*, since *di te* marks the syntactic subject of the NP in the former two phrases but the syntactic object of the NP in the latter.

Analogously, in (32) (c), *tua* marks the syntactic subject position of the NP, as so far assumed (the object reading of *tua* being again a consequence of the systematic relation with the initial object of the related transitive V). The asymmetry in interpretation or grammaticality between (30) (a) and (32) (a), (30) (b) and (32) (b), (30) (c) and (32) (c) turns out thus to be innocuous. Finally it follows that (32) (d) is out, because it would have two subjects, the NP under the possessive adjective and *il soldato*, which can not qualify as a syntactic object, for reasons just discussed. (32) (d) is in fact ruled out for the same reasons that (25) is. In as much as the clustering of facts in (32), and no other imaginable combinations of them, is a consequence of the framework of assumptions developed so far, the framework receives a significant corroboration. The inherent passive status of Ns like *cattura* appears to be reinforced by the existence of forms like (33):

(33)  
La cattura del soldato da parte del nemico

'The capture of the soldier by the enemy'

in which the *da parte di NP* PP (lit.: on the part of) is the analogue in NPs of the [da NP] PP of passive sentences which expresses the agent in a passive form (this, incidentally, requires a slight extension of the redundancy relation discussed in fn. 32 which adds the systematic relationship between *da parte di NP* and the (initial) syntactic subject of the related V).

(33) should be compared with the impossible (34):

(34)  
*Il folle desiderio di Anna da parte di Mario

'The mad desire of A. by M.'
whose illformedness can plausibly be related to the fact that class II Ns can not be inherently passive and thus have no access to the redundancy rule posited for class III Ns.

A somewhat more complex case of ‘transitive’ Ns is represented by Ns like descrizione: what we shall call class IV Ns. The relevant properties are illustrated in (35):

(35) (a) La descrizione di Giorgio
   ‘The description of G.’
(b) La descrizione di te
   ‘The description of you’
(c) La tua descrizione
   ‘Your description’
(d) La tua descrizione di Giorgio
   ‘Your description of G.’

(35) (a) is ambiguous between a subject reading and an object reading, just like class II Ns (cf. il desiderio di Anna). It may mean ‘G. described so./st.’ or ‘So. described G.’. (35) (b), again like class II Ns (cf. il desiderio di te) is not ambiguous. It has only the object reading. (35) (c), on the other hand, in contrast to both class II Ns (il tuo desiderio has only the subject reading) and class III Ns (la tua cattura has only the object reading) is ambiguous between a subject and an object reading, just like (35) (a). Note that given the ambiguity of both (35) (a) and (35) (c) (between a subject and an object reading) a priori one could expect (35) (d), which combines the two to be equally ambiguous; that is, interpretable both as ‘You described G.’ and as ‘G. described you’. But (35) (d) has only the former meaning, with the NP under the possessive adjective interpreted as the subject.

Class IV Ns thus appear to share some of the properties of class II Ns (cf. (35) (a) with (30) (a), (35) (b) with (30) (b) and (35) (d) with (30) (d) ) and some of class III Ns (cf. (35) (c) in one of its senses with (32) (c) ). The facts of class IV, apparently heterogeneous with respect to those of class II and III, can be reduced just to the properties of these two latter classes if we assume that what we called class IV is in fact not a genuine independent class but the result of one lexical item participating in two distinct entries: an ‘active’ one as represented by class II Ns and a ‘passive’ one as represented by class III Ns.33 Under this view, the otherwise new and possibly disturbing fact represented
by the ambiguity of (35)(c) (la tua descrizione) is reduced to already familiar assumptions. The subject reading of (35)(c) is a consequence of descrizione belonging to the ('active') entry of class II Ns (see the discussion about Il tuo desiderio). The object reading is instead a consequence of descrizione belonging (as well) to the ('passive') entry of class III Ns (see the discussion about la tua cattura). Note that under both interpretations of (35)(c) tua marks the syntactic subject position, as necessitated by the assumption that possessive adjectives are base generated directly under N, and by the definition of subject of NP adopted here.

Note also that such dual analysis for Ns like descrizione, given the above definition of subject of NP will predict, as required, that (35)(d) is not ambiguous (something that needed to be accounted for given the ambiguity of both (35)(a) and (35)(c)) but has, as its only interpretation, 'You described G.'). This follows from the fact that the possessive adjective tua, under N, can only be interpreted as marking the syntactic subject of the NP. Consequently di Giorgio can only qualify as the syntactic object (generated under N). Hence the unique meaning it has. If di Giorgio too were generated under N, descrizione would end up with two subjects in LF, thus leading to a violation. As expected, a substitution of a personal pronoun for Giorgio in (35)(d) is also possible, just as in (30)(d): la tua descrizione di me 'your description of me'.

The classes of transitive Ns reviewed so far were all cases of action or event 'nominalizations'. Let us briefly consider now the relevant properties of those Ns that have sometimes been called 'object nominalization' and 'agent nominalization'.\(^34\) Hereafter class V and VI, respectively. A representative member of the former is scoperta ('discovery')\(^35\):

(36) (a) La scoperta di Lavoisier (non fu subito utilizzata)
   'The discovery of L. (wasn’t immediately exploited)'

(b) *La scoperta di te (non fu subito utilizzata)
   'The discovery of you (idem)'

(c) La tua scoperta (non fu subito utilizzata)
   'Your discovery (idem)'

(36)(a) has only a subject reading and so has (36)(c). (36)(b) is illformed with the same provisos that (29)(d) La partenza di te
is illformed. These facts can be accommodated straightforwardly by taking object minimalizations to be ‘intransitive’ Ns (just as class I Ns). This is quite plausible given the meaning relation between an object nominalization and the corresponding transitive V. The object is somehow incorporated into the N. We are assuming that some very general feature of the word formation (or redundancy rule) component will have just that effect. The meaning of an object nominalization (\(\epsilon x \text{ such that } y \text{ Verbed } x\)) seems in any event systematically derivable from that of the related V). The redundancy rule relating an object nominalization to the corresponding transitive V might be of the form, following Wasow’s proposal, of \(X_{VN}(I) = I; (II) = \phi\) (where ‘X’ stands for the various morphological suffixes object nominalizations take).\(^{36}\)

A representative paradigm of class VI Ns (agent nominalizations) is:

(37) (a) Il protettore di Giorgio
   ‘The patron of G.’
   (b) * Il protettore di te
   ‘The patron of you’
   (c) Il tuo protettore
   ‘Your patron’

(37) patterns like (36) (cf. (36)(b) and (37)(b)) except that where (36) allows for a subject reading only, (37) allows for an object reading only. In (37)(a) Giorgio is the person such that there is someone that protects him and in (37)(c) you are the person such that there is someone that protects you. Under the assumptions held so far, these facts are best analysed via a general redundancy rule relating agent nominalizations with their related transitive Vs. For example, something of the form \(X_{VN}(I) = \phi; (II) = I\). This means that class VI Ns will also be ‘intransitive’ Ns (just like class I, III and V), their object reading interpretation deriving from the form of the redundancy rule that has the (initial) syntactic object of the V correspond systematically to the syntactic subject of the related agent nominalization.

The last case we consider now is somewhat more complex.

So far we have discussed only Ns that have a systematic relation to a V. We have also assumed that part of the work of the redundancy rule component consists in specifying which
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syntactic positions (and relations) of the N correspond to which syntactic positions (and relations) of the related V. There are also Ns that relate to no other category (V, Adv., etc.). In this set, we will assume that the syntactic subject position of the concrete object is represented by the (P) NP (or possessive adjective) that refers to the actual possessor of the concrete object. Thus, we take di
(c) La tua fotografia
   'Your picture'

(d) La tua fotografia di Giorgio/me (al mare)
   'Your picture of G./me (at the sea-side)'

(e) * La tua fotografia di Giorgio di me (al mare)
   'Your picture of G. of me (at the sea-side)'

(40) (a) is in fact three ways ambiguous. It may mean 'the picture that Giorgio has taken' (the subject reading); 'the picture in which Giorgio is depicted' (the object reading) and 'the picture that belongs to Giorgio' or 'that Giorgio has temporarily' (the possessor reading). (40) (b), on the other hand, has only one reading, the object reading, in which I am the person who is depicted in the picture. (40) (c) is again three ways ambiguous, just as (40) (a). (40) (d) is instead two ways ambiguous only. It may either mean 'the picture in which Giorgio/I are depicted which you took' (tua introducing the subject of the related V and Giorgio/me the object of the related V) or 'the picture in which Giorgio/I are depicted which you have' (where tua introduces the possessor and Giorgio/me the object of the related V).

As in the similar situation found with class IV Ns (descrizione), given the threefold ambiguity of (40) (a) and the equally threefold ambiguity of (40) (c), a priori we could expect phrases like la tua fotografia di Giorgio (one case of (40)d), which combine (40)(a) and (40)(c), to be six ways ambiguous.40

If, for convenience, we designate with A what we have called the 'subject reading', with O the 'object reading' and with P the 'possessor reading', and if we take into account the two syntactic positions available (that of the possessive adjective and that of the [di NP] PP expansion) we get the following six theoretical possibilities, schematized in (41):41

(41) Possessive Adj (N) di NP
    A     (N) O
    A     P
    O     (N) A
    O     P
    P     A
    P     O

40
41
42
However, the only combinations allowed are the first and the last one (the ones circled here). This is something that needs to be accounted for. As to the ‘*’ of (40) (e) see below.

The analogies between the properties of *fotografia* and *descrizione* above would seem to be close enough to warrant a parallel treatment of the two, the additional readings of *fotografia* being plausibly a consequence of the fact that *fotografia* admits of a possessor too (more readily than *descrizione*). There is, however, one interesting difference between the two. Alongside *la tua descrizione* under the object interpretation of *tua* (‘you have been described’) one also finds, with the same reading, expansions such as *la tua descrizione da parte del testimone oculare* ‘your description by the eye-witness’ with a by-phrase (interpreted above as a consequence of the inherent passive status of (one of the senses of) *descrizione*). *La tua fotografia*, on the other hand, although admitting of an object interpretation of *tua* (‘the picture in which you are depicted’) cannot be followed by a by-phrase (see: *La tua fotografia da parte di Cesare* ‘your picture by C.’). This difference may be related to an independent semantic difference between *descrizione* and *fotografia*. Whereas the first is in general interpreted as an action nominalization, *fotografia* has no reading in which it corresponds to an action nominalization of *fotografare*. Rather it designates the concrete object resulting from such an action (compare it with *il fotografare* ‘the photographing’ which has an action nominalization interpretation).43 Suppose now we interpret *fotografia* along the lines of *descrizione* but with the required modification; namely as having a transitive (active) (sub-)entry related to the transitive verb *fotografare* (see, however, note 41) with its syntactic subject corresponding to the syntactic subject of the V and its object corresponding to the syntactic object of the V. In addition to this (and in place of the passive sub-entry of *descrizione*) it will have one object nominalization subentry in which its syntactic subject is systematically related to the syntactic (initial) object of the V.44

Finally suppose that, since it represents a concrete thing it can freely have a possessor position (either in the form of a possessive adjective or of a [di NP] PP). Recall that such a possessor position appeared above to _behave_, with both forms, as a syntactic subject of the N, under Ń. See the discussion about (39).

Granting these rather natural assumptions, all of the properties
of (40) follow directly. For example, the threefold ambiguity of (40)(a) is a consequence of the fact that *di Giorgio* can be (1) the subject of the transitive subentry, under $N$ (which corresponds to the subject of the related V and is interpreted as the agent); (2) the subject of the object nominalization subentry, generated under $N$, too, and related to the object of the related V (the 'patient' depicted in the picture); (3) the possessor of the picture, a NP again qualifying as the syntactic subject of the N, generated under $N$.$^{45}$

The non ambiguity of (40)(b) (which has only the object reading) also follows from these assumptions. Recall the general prohibition against a [di NP] PP under $N$, where the NP is a pronoun. This means that the readings (1), (2) and (3) of (40)(a) just discussed will be unavailable for (40)(b). The only possibility left to (40)(b) is that discussed in note 45 whereby *di me* is the syntactic object of the N (corresponding to the syntactic (initial) object of the related V). Being generated under $N$, it is not sensitive to the general prohibition against pronominal [di NP] PPs. Hence the only reading of (40)(b) with the pronoun interpreted as the object of the N.

The threefold ambiguity of (40)(c) derives from the same causes as that of (40)(a), so we will not go over them again.

It remains to be seen how the only two readings, out of the six potential ones, of (40)(d) and the illformedness of (40)(e) follow from the same set of assumptions.

Given that *tua* can only be analysed as introducing the subject of the N (recall the assumption that possessive adjectives are generated only under $N$) *di Giorgio/me* can only be analysed as introducing the syntactic object of the N, under $N$. If it too were generated under $N$, to the right of N, there would be two subjects in LF with obvious consequences for grammaticality. Thus *di Giorgio/me* can only get the object interpretation of the transitive subentry (whereby *Giorgio/me* are the people depicted in the picture). As to the interpretation of *tua* only two possibilities are open: that it be the subject of the transitive subentry (the agent interpretation) or that it be the possessor (possibilities (1) and (3) of (40)(a) discussed above). It is easy to see how all the other a priori possible combinations of readings for *tua* and *di Giorgio/me* (see note 40) are ruled out on principled grounds. Given that the possessor can be realized only as the syntactic
subject of the N, under $\overline{N}$, and that the agent can likewise only be realized as the subject of N, under $\overline{N}$, no combination of the two should be expected to be possible in that it would lead to the presence of two subjects in LF. This rules out readings (a) and (d) of note 40. On the other hand, 

_**tua**_ even when it gets the object reading in the object nominalization subentry will qualify as the syntactic subject of the N generated under $\overline{N}$ so that it will be incompatible with the expression of a possessor or an agent to the right of the N if these too have to be generated under $\overline{N}$, as assumed here. This rules out the existence of the remaining readings (b) and (c) of note 40. The explanation for (40)(e) is also straightforward. Again it reduces to the fact that both the possessor and the agent can only qualify as the syntactic subject of the N, so either one or the other will appear but not both simultaneously. (40)(e) is thus ruled out for the same reasons that ruled out (29) * _la sua partenza di Giorgio_*: the presence of two subjects in LF.*

This ends the rather long diversion on the question of determining what counts as the syntactic subject for the major classes of Ns in Italian. If in trying to deal with this question one takes into account the problem of relating the classes of Ns with the classes of related Vs, the lexical approach taken here to the former question becomes somewhat more natural. If lexical redundancy rules are needed anyway to relate (the properties of) classes of Ns to (the properties of) the classes of related Vs, it may be reasonable to expect such relationships between the V and the related N as the active / passive one that was proposed above in the case of _catturare/cattura, descrivere/descrizione_ (2) (quite parallel to the ordinary active / passive relation of V/A pairs such as _read/readable_, etc.).

As a final remark it may be noted that the classes of action nominalization Ns which have been isolated above on the basis of the particular relations holding between the grammatical relations of the arguments of the N and the related V are fairly naturally characterizable on independent semantic terms. Leaving aside class I, which contains all the intransitive Ns, the class of transitive Ns that were discussed seem to have the following general properties. Class II comprises Ns like _desiderio_ ('desire'), _paura_ ('fear'), _opinione_ ('opinion'), _concetto_ ('conception'), etc., in which the subject of the related V is an 'experiencer' and the
object a 'patient': the class of Postal's (1971) 'psych-movement' Vs and Anderson's (1978) class of mental statives. Class III comprises Ns such as cattura ('capture'), fucilazione ('execution by shooting'), distruzione ('destruction'), allontanamento ('removal'), etc., whose related Vs have an 'agentive' subject, a 'patient' for object and where such a patient is describable, in some intuitive sense, as having been changed, or affected by the action.

The presence vs. absence of such change of the object seems to constitute the crucial difference between this class and class IV (descrizione 'description', interpretazione 'interpretation', annuncio 'announcement', lettura 'reading', acquisto 'purchase', etc.) which shows the same thematic structure but for which the 'patient' cannot be described sensibly as having been changed or affected by the action. The precise characterization of what 'change' or 'affect' must be understood to imply remains to be determined, of course. (See also Anderson (1978).) Such correlation of redundancy properties and semantic properties of the N/V pairs seems quite typical of the internal structure of the lexicon and shows the presence of clear subregularities.

2.3 Recently, in the literature a somewhat different approach has been suggested for these properties of the internal structure of NPs (in English) which is based on an essentially similar subdivision of classes of Ns; it crucially resorts, however, to the transformational rule 'Move α' applying within the NP. One can plausibly wonder whether such an alternative approach can be extended to the facts of Italian. Reasons of space prevent us from going into a detailed comparison of the two approaches, but a few observations may be worthwhile.

It should be stressed, in any event, that the ultimate choice between the 'lexical' and the 'transformational' approach is essentially immaterial for the major point of this discussion: the hypothesis regarding the problem of extraction from NP. From this narrow point of view it is of no relevance whether the determination of what counts as the syntactic subject of each class of Ns is based purely on lexical redundancy regularities or on the interaction of some such regularities with the transformational rule 'Move α'; at least as long as both approaches arrive at the same relevant conclusions about what is the syntactic subject of each N (class).

The essential features of Mona Anderson's analysis are the
following: transformations cannot specify their domain of application as part of the rule, the canonical domains of application being the cyclic categories NP and S. Thus NP-preposing (a subcase of ‘Move α’) will apply both in S and NP if its structural description, as well as other conditions, is met. The anomalies in the application of NP-preposing within NPs are reduced to independent external restrictions on the application of NP-preposing. She notes that objects of prepositions (other than of) can never be NP-preposed in NPs. For example, no sentence like *This leader’s reliance on was a mistake can be derived from The reliance on this leader was a mistake through NP-preposing.\textsuperscript{49} It seems thus reasonable to assume that no object of a preposition can ever be NP-preposed (see note 49). Superficially it appears that the object of the preposition of can be NP-preposed with some Ns but not others (cf. the rehabilitation of the criminal / the criminal’s rehabilitation, vs. the enjoyment of the play / *the play’s enjoyment). Anderson proposes that those Ns in which the object of the preposition of appears not to be prepositional are in fact subcategorized for a [of NP] PP, whereas those Ns that admit of NP-preposing are in fact subcategorized for a bare NP (which acquires the preposition of later in the derivation). The property of preposability vs. non-preposability of the object NP appears to correlate with an independent semantic distinction. Those object NPs which are in fact prepositional are somehow affected by the action expressed in the N; those that are not prepositional are not likewise ‘affected’, where ‘affected’ means ‘changed, moved, altered in status or created’ (see Anderson’s paper for discussion). It appears thus possible to define a lexical/semantic principle predicting which complement a certain N will have, either a PP or a bare NP. Note, incidentally, that the correlation holds ‘observationally’ between the preposability property of the object NP and the semantic property of the NP of being affected by the head N or not. The idea that prepositional objects are bare NPs and non-prepositional objects belonging to a base generated PP is a theoretical hypothesis to reduce the problem to an independently available solution. Certainly a very interesting hypothesis. No evidence however is available in Anderson’s paper to substantiate the hypothesis on syntactic grounds, e.g. by showing one but not the other of NP sequence to have a true PP status.
We will not attempt a general discussion of this proposal here but will limit ourselves to consider the implications of an application of it to (part of) the Italian facts discussed above. The observations made below should not be taken to extend straightforwardly to the English case, although some may be relevant.

There are certain clear differences between the two languages that need to be accounted for in a principled manner. But we will not address this question here.

We recall the basic facts observed above couching them in Anderson’s terms. Notice that the most patent difference between Italian and English regarding NP-preposing within NPs is that no full NP appears to be preposable in Italian (cf. *La (di) Giorgio descrizione ‘G.’s description’). At most only pronominal NPs, later spelled out as possessive adjectives, can. This may relate, we have assumed, to Italian having no case assignment in the specifier position of a NP. Thus the reference to NP-preposing in Italian NPs will only be understood here to involve pronominal NPs. The class of Ns that, within these terms, does not allow for NP-preposing in class II of mental statives (cf. *il desiderio di te vs. *Il tuo desiderio; the ‘*’ pertains to the same meaning of the former). All other classes of Ns related to transitive Vs appear to allow NP-preposing (class III: la cattura del fuggiasco ‘the capture of the fugitive’ / la sua cattura; class IV: la descrizione dell’incidente ‘the description of the accident’ / la sua descrizione; class VI: il protettore di Giorgio ‘the patron of G.’ / il suo protettore; class VII: la fotografia della casa ‘the picture of the house’ / la sua fotografia).

The object NP of class II, in fact, can be characterized as not being affected by the N, in Anderson’s meaning of the term. In general it is also the case that the object NP of those Ns that appear to be NP-preposable is characterizable as being affected by what the N expresses. Thus apart from the modifications required by the case mentioned in note 51, we may extend Anderson’s correlation to Italian. Within this framework, class II (desiderio) objects would be PP only; class III (cattura) objects bare NP only; class IV (descrizione) objects either PP or bare NP (apparently one needs to further stipulate that if the phrase da parte di NP occurs then the object can only be a bare NP (see the example of p. 73) and (33)); class VI objects (protettore)
again only NP and class VII (fotografia) objects again either PP or bare NP.

Suppose we were to make the following additional assumptions: subjects are always bare NPs. Possessive adjectives arise from underlying bare NPs only. If the NP-preposing of a pronominal subject (part of the possessive formation rule) is taken to be (semi-)obligatory, there is a way to derive the (semi-)complementary distribution of [di (full) NP] phrases and possessive adjectives.

This would explain the unique reading of il mio desiderio di te (= (30)(d)), since the only bare NP that can ‘become’ a possessive is the subject NP (desiderio being subcategorized for an object PP). To explain the impossibility of *la mia cattura di te (cf. (32)(d)) (and the unique reading of la mia descrizione di Giorgio) one would have to assume something like the following: a NP, NP_X, governed by N, acquires the genitive case in (i) [NP N (PP) NP_X] but not in (ii) [NP N NP NP_X]. Furthermore, a possessive adjective derives only from a +genitive pronoun. In this case the subject NP of cattura (the NP_X of (ii)) will not get case (nor will it, consequently, be possessivizable, nor, presumably, will it get the preposition di) and the phrase will be excluded by the case filter. Certainly the approach can be refined and completed but we will stop here. We restrict ourselves to a couple of very general observations that will not do full justice to the issue. For one thing, there is no independent reason why class III (cattura) objects should only be bare NPs, whereas class II (desiderio) objects are only PP and class IV (descrizione) objects both. Furthermore, the fact that class IV objects can be both NP and PP, but NP only in case a da parte di NP phrase co-occurs, receives no principled account either.

More generally this approach appears to be not easily compatible with a generalization of the X rules that expand complements. According to this generalization all lexical categories have a bare NP complement, only later supplemented, for some of them (Ns and As) by a PP, for case requirements. In addition to that the needed split in the lexicon to the effect that some Ns subcategorize for [di NP] PPs and others for bare NPs makes it appear an accident, as it were, that the preposition inserted transformationally before (+genitive) bare NPs is identical to the preposition base generated in the base generated PP.
We will leave the question here, keeping in mind that however it is going to be settled it will be of no consequence for our main concern here: the problem of extraction from NP, to which we return now.

3. Granting that we have characterized in section 2 a way to tell, on grounds independent from extraction, which NP position counts as the syntactic subject for essentially each class of relevant Ns, we are now in a position to test the hypothesis about extraction that we tentatively suggested at the beginning of section 2. The hypothesis was that the problem of extraction in Italian is essentially reducible to opacity. We have assumed for convenience that both the trace of Clitic Movement and that of Wh-movement count as anaphors and that every NP has a syntactic subject position (either overt or concealed). If we can indicate univocally for each N (class) which NP position counts as the syntactic subject of the NP, a clear prediction will be available: namely that, of all the NP positions of a NP, only that particular position that qualifies as the syntactic subject of the NP will be extractable, under ordinary circumstances. Given that the syntactic subject position of a NP is realized as a [di NP] PP, the observational generalization stated in section 1 above turns out to be a necessary consequence of the explanatory hypothesis.

Consider now how this general prediction is articulated more precisely in each case.

Given that possessive adjectives, which introduce the (pronominal) syntactic subject, have no way to be extracted, we will restrict out attention to the extractability properties of [di NP] PPs. Since [di NP] PPs happen to introduce both the syntactic subject and the syntactic object of a N we are lead to expect, by the hypothesis, that only those [di NP] PPs that qualify as the syntactic subject, not those that qualify as the syntactic object, will be extractable. We have seen, for class I Ns, that the only [di NP] PP possible with that class is the syntactic subject of the N. Thus extraction should be possible, and indeed is, systematically. See:

(42) (a) Giorgio, [PP di cui] è stata annunciata [NP la partenza t] . . .
   ‘G., of whom has been announced the departure . . .’

(b) [Ne] è stata annunciata [NP la partenza t]
(43) (a) Giorgio, [PP di cui] apprezziamo [NP l'onestà t] ... ‘G., of whom we appreciate the honesty ...’
(b) [Ne] apprezziamo [NP l'onestà t]

Class II Ns which comprise transitive Ns corresponding to so-called ‘psych-movement’ predicates was analyzed as having the following properties: The PP with the subject reading qualifies as the syntactic subject; the PP with the object reading qualifies as the syntactic object of the NP. Thus we will expect all [di NP] PPs with a subject reading, and no [di NP] PP with the object reading, to be extractable (just as the possessive adjective of these Ns has a subject reading only). This is confirmed by the facts. See:

(44) (a) Anna, [PP di cui] abbiamo ricordato [NP il desiderio t]
     ... ‘A., of whom we have recalled the desire ...’
(b) [Ne] abbiamo ricordato [NP il desiderio t]

(45) (a) * Anna, [PP di cui] abbiamo ricordato [NP il vostro desiderio t] ...
     ‘A., of whom we have recalled your desire ...’
(b) * [Ne] abbiamo ricordato [NP il vostro desiderio t]

In (45)(a)–(b) the subject is introduced by the overt possessive adjective (which has the ‘subject’ reading) and di cui, ne can only introduce the object (with the ‘object’ reading). These two sentences are thus predicted to be out, since they display an extraction of the object (P) NP which leaves a free anaphor in the domain of the subject of the NP, leading to a violation of opacity. The same reasons account for the non ambiguous character of (44)(a)–(b). In fact the unique interpretation of di cui, ne as having the subject reading (paraphrasable as ‘Anna desires so./st.’; in no way as ‘So. desires Anna’) is a consequence of the analysis sketched above. Di cui, ne with an object reading would qualify, in this class, as the syntactic object of the NP, the subject position being in this case a ‘zero’ possessive adjective. Thus this reading is blocked just as (45)(a)–(b) were blocked. Di cui, ne are instead extractable when they introduce the subject, under N (hence their ‘subject’ reading).

Class III Ns (cattura) were analyzed above as being inherently ‘passive’, with their syntactic subject corresponding systematically
to the (initial) syntactic object of the related V (the syntactic initial subject of the V corresponding to the object of the complex preposition *da parte di*). We should thus expect the [di NP] PP with the ‘object’ reading to be extractable with such Ns, since it qualifies as their syntactic subject. This is indeed the case. See:

(46) (a) L’unica persona, [PP di cui] avevano annunciato [NP la cattura t] . . .
   ‘The only person of whom they had announced the capture . . .’

(b) [Ne] avevano annunciato [NP la cattura t]

Note that extraction of *da parte di NP* phrases (with the ‘subject’ reading) is, as expected, impossible, since it would leave a free trace in the domain of the subject:

(47) (a) * I carabinieri, [PP da parte dei quali] avevano annunciato [NP la (su) a cattura t] . . .
   ‘The c., by whom they had announced (his) capture . . .’

(b) * I carabinieri, [PP da parte dei quali] avevano annunciato [NP la cattura di Giorgio t] . . .
   ‘The c., by whom they had announced the capture of G. . . .’

Consider now class IV Ns (such as descrizione). They were analyzed above as involving two separate subentries, one identical to class II, the other identical to class III. We may thus expect to find the extraction properties of both classes. A consequence of this analysis for class IV is that the PP with the ‘object’ reading can qualify as the syntactic subject of the NP only if there is neither a possessive adjective (which, being under N, would automatically qualify as the syntactic subject) nor another [di NP] PP (with the ‘subject’ reading). If either one of these two elements is present, extraction of the [di NP] PP with the ‘object’ reading is predicted to be impossible (just as with class II Ns). This is what we find:

(48) (a) * Giorgio, [PP di cui] abbiamo messo in ridicolo [NP la tua descrizione t]
   ‘G., of whom we have made fun of your description.’
(b) * [Ne] abbiamo messo in ridicolo [NP la tua descrizione t] 55

(49) (a) Giorgio, [PP di cui] abbiamo messo in ridicolo [NP la descrizione di Anna t]
    'G., of whom we have made fun of the description of A.'
(b) ? [Ne] abbiamo messo in ridicolo [NP la descrizione di Anna t]

(48) (a)–(b) are impossible as expected, since di cui and ne can not qualify as the syntactic subject of the NP, being a possessive adjective present in the NP. (49) (a)–(b) are also illformed under the interpretation in which di cui, ne have the ‘object’ reading (‘Anna described Giorgio/him’) and again for the same reasons that ruled out (48) (a)–(b). They have not been marked as illformed since they are perfectly good under a different interpretation; that in which di cui, ne are understood as designating the person who “does the description of” Anna (the ‘subject’ reading). Again this is what we should expect under the hypothesis we have advanced above.

If, on the other hand, no possessive adjective appears, nor any other [di NP] PP, a [di NP] PP with the ‘object’ reading appears to be extractable (this being the subentry corresponding to class III Ns such as cattura). In fact we find that in forms like:

(50) (a) Giorgio, [PP di cui] ricordiamo perfettamente [NP la descrizione t]...
    'G., of whom we remember perfectly well the description...
(b) [Ne] ricordiamo perfettamente [NP la descrizione t]

di cui, ne can perfectly well have the ‘object’ reading (according to which Giorgio is the person being described). 56 The same forms can be complemented by a da parte di NP phrase, again as expected. Class V and VI Ns also confirm the prediction. With object nominalizations (class V) the [di NP] PP (corresponding to the syntactic subject of the related V) qualifies as the syntactic subject of the NP. So extraction is expected to be possible. See, in fact:

(51) (a) Lavoisier, [PP di cui] non si utilizzò subito [NP la scoperta t]...
'L., of whom wasn't immediately used the discovery...'
(b) Non se [ne] utilizzò subito [NP la scoperta t]

With agent nominalizations such as _protettore_ (class VI) the [di NP] PP corresponding to the (initial) syntactic object of the related V, as was argued, introduces the syntactic subject of the N in the NP. Thus extraction should be possible and in fact is. See:

(52) (a) Giorgio, [PP di cui] conosco [NP il protettore t]...
'G., of whom I know the patron...'
(b) [Ne] conosco [NP il protettore t]

Finally consider class VII Ns (such as _fotografia_). Recall that (40)(a) _la fotografia di Giorgio_ was three ways ambiguous, with _Giorgio_ qualifying as the syntactic subject of the NP for each of them. Thus we should expect the extraction of _Giorgio_ in (40) (a) to retain the same threefold ambiguity, which is indeed the case. _Di cui, ne_ in (53) can in fact be interpreted as designating either the possessor of the picture or the one who took it, or the one who is depicted in it:

(53) (a) Giorgio, [PP di cui] ho sporcato [NP la fotografia t]...
'G., of whom I have dirtied the picture...'
(b) [Ne] ho sporcato [NP la fotografia t]

In (40)(d) (_la tua fotografia di Giorgio/me_), _Giorgio/me_ qualify as the syntactic object of the NP so it will be expected that their extraction is blocked. See:

(54) (a) *Giorgio, [PP di cui] ho sporcato [NP la tua fotografia t]...
'G., of whom I have dirtied your picture...'
(b) *[Ne] ho sporcato [NP la tua fotografia t]

In those cases where two [di NP] PPs appear instead of a [di NP] PP plus a possessive adjective, a similar situation obtains. In (55)

(55) (a) Giorgio, [PP di cui] ho sporcato [NP la fotografia di Cesare t]...
'G., of whom I have dirtied the picture of C. ...
(b) ?[Ne] ho sporcato [NP la fotografia di Cesare t]

_di cui, ne_ can only be interpreted as either the possessor of the picture or the one who took it (with _Cesare_ being the one
depicted in it). No other reading is permitted, for principled reasons. Since the explanation is parallel to that given for (49) and is in any event derivable from the discussion about (40), we will not go over it again.

We have seen that a more careful analysis of the internal properties of the different classes of Ns (or rather N/Vs) has enabled us to explain away a number of facts that prima facie could be taken to constitute counterexamples to the hypothesis presented here: in particular, the fact that in such forms as (46), (50), (52) what appears to have been extracted is a [di NP] PP introducing the ‘object’ (reading) of the NP. The hypothesis suggested here, that what counts as the syntactic subject of an NP may in fact correspond systematically (lexically) to the syntactic object of the related V, has made it possible to overcome such apparent anomalies.

A further class of cases (cf. the analogous French facts noted in Ruwet (1972b, p. 273)) which appears to be in direct contrast with the prediction of the hypothesis about extraction is:

(56) (a) Il cataclisma, [di cui] possediamo solo [una/la sua descrizione] . . .
   ‘The cataclysm, of which we have only a/the his description . . .’

   (b) Il cataclisma, [di cui] possediamo solo [una/la descrizione di Plinio] . . .
   ‘The cataclysm, of which we have only a/the description of Pliny . . .’

(57) (a) [Ne] possediamo solo [una/la sua descrizione]
   ‘Of-it (we) have only a/the his description

   (b) [Ne] possediamo solo [una/la descrizione di Plinio]

In (56) (a), (57) (a) di cui, ne, respectively, appears to have been extracted from a NP which has a possessive adjective qualifying as the syntactic subject of the NP. In (56) (b), (57) (b), di cui, ne have been extracted from a NP which contains another di NP PP which, having the subject reading, qualifies for this class as the syntactic subject of the NP. And yet these sentences seem to be wellformed. If we were forced to analyse them as involving extraction we would be confronted with a patent violation of opacity. Some considerations, however, cast doubts on this interpretation. For one thing, the substitution of possedere, in
(56)–(57) with a different predicate renders these forms ill-formed, perhaps with varying degrees of illformedness. See

(58) (a) * II cataclisma, [\text{PP di cui}] ho usato [\text{NP una/la \langle sua \rangle descrizione \langle di Plinio \rangle \text{t}}]

'The cataclysm, of which I used a/the (his) description (of Pliny) . . .'

(b) * II [Ne] ho usato [\text{NP una/la \langle sua \rangle descrizione \langle di Plinio \rangle \text{t}}] . . .

(59) (a) * II cataclisma, [\text{PP di cui}] avevano interrotto [\text{NP la \langle sua \rangle descrizione \langle di Plinio \rangle \text{t}}]

'The cataclysm, of which (they) interrupted the (his) description (of Pliny)'

(b) *[Ne] avevano interrotto [\text{NP la \langle sua \rangle descrizione \langle di Plinio \rangle \text{t}}]

Secondly, and more importantly, there is evidence that a quite different derivation is available to (56)–(57); in fact, one which does not involve extraction. With Vs like possedere which allow such forms as (56)–(57), the following forms are also possible:

(60) La descrizione che ne possedevano (del cataclisma) era imperfetta.

'The description that of-its (they) had (of the cataclysm) was faulty.'

where the N descrizione appears to have been wh-moved independently of its object [di NP] PP (del cataclisma). The latter here is in fact cliticized independently to the V.

On the basis of such forms it seems reasonable to posit a structure like V [\text{NP una descrizione di Plinio} [\text{PP del cataclisma}] underlying (56)–(57) rather than V [\text{NP una descrizione [PP del cataclisma] [PP di Plinio]}], at least where the V belongs to a certain class of Vs, including possedere, avere, leggere ('own', 'have', 'read'), etc.\textsuperscript{58} If the NP and what looks like its 'object' PP are in fact base generated as separate constituents, their autonomy in undergoing movement rules is directly explained as is the apparent violation of opacity in (56)–(57).

In what has been said so far, the explanation is implicit for one observation made at the beginning of section 2; namely for the observed asymmetry between the two cases that forbid a strengthening of the generalization about extraction. It was
noted there that a [di NP] PP may not be extractable if (i) there is another [di NP] PP present in the NP or (ii) if there is a possessive adjective. It was also noted, however, that whereas extraction is invariably blocked in the presence of a possessive adjective, it is not always blocked in the presence of another [di NP] PP. The explanation for this is now obvious. Whereas a possessive adjective can only qualify as the syntactic subject of the NP, thus blocking the extraction of any other PP in the same NP, a [di NP] PP can qualify as either the syntactic subject or the syntactic object of the NP according to the conditions reviewed above. Thus a [di NP] PP which qualifies as the syntactic subject can be extracted even if another [di NP] PP is present within the NP, but the opposite will not be permitted. The contrast between (18)–(19) and (21) is thus to be expected.

The hypothesis formulated above about extraction thus appears to provide a principled account for a significant range of facts. One non trivial theoretical problem remains; namely the crucial assumption that the trace of wh-movement behaves in the same way as the trace of Clitic Movement with respect to opacity. Although in other domains of facts the motivated conclusion seems to be that the trace of wh-movement (or rather the variable substituted for the trace) is not sensitive to opacity (see Chomsky (1978) for a general discussion) here the opposite assumption appears to have the right consequences, in underlining, among other things, the exactly symmetrical behavior of extraction through Clitic Movement.

Though it is far from being inconsequential, we will leave this problem open here. The limited goal of this article was to show that wh-extraction from NP in Italian appears to obey the same condition that limits extraction through Clitic Movement. In spite of the obvious problem, we have argued here that this condition coincides with the opacity condition of Chomsky (1978). It may be noted that the theoretical problem would turn out to be spurious if the observed behavior that 'opacity' was here intended to account for followed from some other principle(s) of the theory for which the trace of Wh-movement and that of Clitic Movement act as the same entity. In Cinque (in preparation) we argue in fact that the Theory of Government, as recently developed, may indeed play a crucial role in explaining this problem away.
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FOOTNOTES

1 A detailed discussion of the form of these two rules, which will be presupposed here, is to be found in Chomsky (1977) and Kayne (1975). Their application to Italian poses no problems of substance or principle. See Rizzi (1978a) for a discussion of Italian data involving the latter rule and Cinque (1978) for a discussion of the former rule (in Italian relatives).

2 Literal glosses rather than translations will be provided where the interpretation is transparent enough.

3 In accord with the wh nature of the fronted constituents, these forms display all the essential diagnostic properties of Wh-movement: (a) presence of a gap; (2) unboundedness, with apparent violation of PIC and SSC ('Un fatto [pp di cui] molti credono [§ di essere in grado [§ di valutare [NP l'importanza t]]] 'A fact of which many believe they can evaluate the importance'); (3) sensitivity to the Complex NP Constraint (CNPC) ("* Un fatto [pp di cui] penso di aver conosciuto [NP il ragazzo [§ che ha saputo valutare [NP l'importanza t]]] 'A fact of which I know the one who could evaluate the importance'); as to the last diagnostic property of Chomsky (1977), namely, sensitivity to the wh-island constraint, see Rizzi (this volume) for a discussion of its essential irrelevance in Italian.

These extractions also appear to be sensitive to the (absolute) A/A principle (and/or subjacency, if PP is a cyclic node for subjacency; we will be assuming that S, not S, counts for subjacency in Italian -- cf. the text below): * Un fatto [pp di cui] siamo tutti convinti [pp del [NP l'importanza t]] ... 'A fact of which we are all persuaded of the importance' -- see Kayne (1975, 2.7) for comparable French facts.

4 We are assuming here that ne is the clitic form of a PP of the form [di NP] 'of NP' or [da NP] 'from NP' where the NP is a 3rd person generally non human pronoun, cf. Ne sono contento 'I am glad of it /* her/* him'; Ne sono stato allontanato 'I have been removed from it/* her/* him'; the latter ne (da NP) is rather literary when the understood pronounal NP refers to concrete objects. We assume ci/vi to be the clitic form of a PP of the form [a NP] 'at/in/to NP' when the NP, as a 3rd person non human pronoun. We further assume, for concreteness, that [pp ne] and [pp ci/vi] are directly generated as such in the base and later cliticized to the V from the postverbal position. These forms recall the French analogous forms en, y studied in detail in Kayne (1975).

5 Note that all of the ungrammatical forms of (3) become (irrelevantly) grammatical if the PP, instead of being extracted from the NP, is fronted along with it (Una persona [NP l'attaccamento alla quale] (potrebbe rovinarcì) ... , cf. (3)(b), etc.). Independent, principled, reasons having no bearing on the questions at issue here are responsible for the fact that in the pied piping variant of (3)(b)-(d) as well as in that of (3)(a) (Giorgio, l'onestà del quale / * di cui è nota a tutti ...) cui pronouns are not allowed but only quale pronouns are. Cf. Cinque (1978).

6 This is a peripheral issue here and will be dealt with briefly. It seems that the output of Wh-movement (out of NPs) in Italian must conform to the further requirement that the 'fronted' PP be construable with the
‘mutilated’ NP in a partitive-like fashion. This may be the reason why the meaning of (1)(a) and similar forms is roughly paraphrasable as: ‘the person x such that of x’s properties we appreciate the generosity’ rather than ‘the person x such that we appreciate the generosity of x’. Perhaps a variant of Babaud’s (1976) partitive rule may be appropriate here. A further (pragmatic) condition on such a construal process seems to be that the NP with which the ‘fronted’ PP is construed must be the focus of the sentence. A preverbal subject position in Italian may not qualify as the focus of the sentence (cf. Guéron (1977, chapt. 4) for relevant discussion) unless it is ‘exceptionally’ stressed. Interestingly, forms such as (3)(a) become virtually perfect if the preverbal subject NP is heavily stressed. Note also that a postverbal subject NP may qualify as the focus of the sentence. This should be compared with the perfect status of extraction out of postverbal subject NPs. 

7 There is an irrelevant good reading to some of these sentences in which the fronted PP is construed with the matrix V rather than with the NP.

8 Note that under this approach PP cannot be a cyclic node for subjacency. If it were so, no movement of NP to COMP would be allowed, even in the case of (i), as it would entail the crossing of two cyclic nodes, PP and S. The undesirable consequence would be that only the PP itself would be movable to COMP.

9 This conclusion is not accepted by everybody. See Koster (1978, p. 564).

10 He himself notes the consequences that derive for the problem of extraction from NPs from taking S and NP as the only cyclic nodes for subjacency in Italian.

11 An additional parameter is represented by the possibility in English, but not in Italian, of stranding prepositions. See Riemsdijk (1978) for relevant discussion.

12 We could, for example, expect extraction of any clitic to be totally free, or at least governed by conditions different from those governing wh-extractions. Which is not the case. See (1)–(5).

13 With such cases no autonomous pronominalization, Wh-movement or NP-movement (in the Passive) of the NP is permitted, thus supporting the idea that genuine extraction is involved. Cf. *La apprezziamo sempre di Giorgio ‘We always appreciate it of G.’, *La generosità sarà apprezzata di Giorgio, anche ‘The generosity will be appreciated of G., too’.

14 A derivation of (15) through PP extraposition from the subject NP seems unlikely for Italian, which systematically lacks extraposition of PPs (and, for that matter, relative clauses) in the contexts that allow them in English (see Guéron (1977): *Un uomo è entrato dai capelli bianchi ‘A man came in with white hair’, *Un uomo è venuto che conosci bene ‘A man has come that you know well’.

15 Clearer cases of idiomatic reanalysis are forms such as:

(i) L’unico [PP a cui] dimostravano [NP attaccamento] ‘The only one to whom they showed attachment’
L’unico [pp in cui] riponevamo [NP fiducia]
‘The only one in whom we put trust’

Here the special connection between the NP and the V is further indicated by the impossibility for possessive adjectives to freely occur in the NP, and by special restrictions on the use of determiners. See:

(iii) * Dimostrano il mio attaccamento a Giorgio
‘They show my attachment to G.’

(iv) (a) * Riponevamo la vostra fiducia in lui
‘We put your trust in him’
(b) * Riponevano la/una fiducia in me
‘They put a/the trust in me’
(ok: una grande fiducia in me ‘a great trust in me’)

16 (17) through (20) are reminiscent of some French facts first pointed out in Ruwet (1972b).

(20)(a)–(b) are perhaps slightly marginal, maybe because the preferred subcategorization for *furto* is a (passive) intransitive one. That is, *Il furto dell'icôna da parte del custode* is generally preferred to *Il suo furto dell'icôna del custode*. What is crucial here, in any event, is the relative contrast in acceptability between (20) and (17)–(18).

17 A similar observation is valid for possessive adjectives. They too can introduce the subject of a N. Compare (i)

(i) La sua descrizione dell’incidente
‘(the) his description of the accident’

with

(ii) Lui/lei ha descritto l’incidente
‘He/she described the accident’

Prima facie, they also appear to introduce the object (pronominal) NP of a N. See (iii)

(iii) La tua descrizione non era fedele
‘Your description was not faithful’

which has a meaning corresponding to ‘They haven’t described you faithfully’. See, however, section 2 for a different interpretation and a more detailed discussion of possessives.

18 This is, in essence, the original proposal put forth in ‘Conditions on Transformations’ (Chomsky, 1973) to treat the extraction facts of English as well as such interpretive phenomena as the *each other* cases in

(i) (a) The men saw pictures of each other
(b) * The men saw John’s pictures of each other

and the negation scope phenomena represented by:

(ii) (a) I didn’t see pictures of many of the children
(ambiguous: the negation may be associated with either *see* or
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many, at least for some people)

(b) I didn’t see John’s pictures of many of the children
(unambiguous: the negation may be associated only with see)

The ‘Conditions . . . ’ analysis made reference to the predecessor of opacity, the Specified Subject Condition. Facts similar to (i) and (ii) hold for Italian but they will not be reviewed here in any detail. Chomsky (1977) presents a partially alternative analysis for the extraction facts (see above), which invokes opacity only obliquely. In this paper we will not consider a reassessment of the SSC (opacity) account for the extraction facts of English.

19 For the notions ‘anaphor’ and ‘c-command’, see Chomsky (1978) and references cited there.

20 Note that the crucial notion for an hypothesis that invokes opacity is the definition of the (surface) syntactic subject (of a NP), not the definition of the deep syntactic subject or one of ‘semantic’ subject (agent, etc.). For relevant discussion, see Chomsky (1978).

21 This is a natural extension of the position taken in Chomsky (1970), Jackendoff (1977, 4.2.3) and has been suggested in lectures by Chomsky at Pisa, April 1979.

22 In Chomsky (1970) and Jackendoff (1977) the rule is interpreted as inserting the preposition of (or a specified grammatical formative which happens to be homophonous to the preposition — see Jackendoff (1977, 4.2.3)) with no creation of a PP structure. Note however that those ‘di NP’ sequences in Italian behave as ordinary PP. They are moved by ‘Move α’, have PP pro-forms (ne) and are sensitive to the principle that forbids preposition stranding. It seems thus reasonable to accord them a PP status. A position consistent with both the (base generated) PP structure and the di insertion rule, as pointed out by N. Chomsky, would be a general rule inserting di in the (base generated) empty position of P in the PP complement of Ns and As. Essentially the same position is taken in Jackendoff (1974). A similar idea was suggested as early as Chomsky (1955). On the non-full generality of the di insertion rule see section 3. In English the evidence for a PP structure in comparable of NP sequences is not as clear as it is in Italian. See Jackendoff (1977, chapt. 4, fn. 13).

23 This assumption is not really crucial. An alternative could be base generation of di NP structures, later spelled out as As if NP is a pronoun. The existence of such forms as ‘La [pp di lui] dipartita’ (the of him death) could be taken as supporting evidence. The extremely marked character of these forms, however, may suggest a separate treatment for them, as a marked option of the base rules.

24 Sentences like this have an alternative, irrelevant, parsing with the second PP within the NP of the first PP.

25 The present section is an extension of work reported in Cinque (1979).

26 This case is represented by a literary (or very formal) fully productive nominalization process, roughly corresponding to the English His refusing the offer construction, in which possessive adjectives may appear but there is no [di NP] PP alternative with a lexical NP. See:
Il suo divenire celebre ‘His becoming famous’

vs.

Il divenire celebre di Antonio ‘The becoming famous of A.’

(cf. Fornaciari (1881, p. 195f.)). Instead of (ii) we find: Il divenire Antonio celebre which recalls the marked construction discussed in detail in Rizzi (1978b). The construction exemplified by (i) should not be confused with superficially identical forms like Il suo tramontare repento (‘its rapid setting’) which show a [di NP] PP alternative to the possessive adjectives (Il tramontare repento del sole ‘The rapid setting of the sun’). The latter case has all the properties of lexical nominals, perhaps analysable through a (scarcely productive) word formation rule such as \([v_{\text{inf}}] \rightarrow [N]\).

An essentially identical proposal is tentatively suggested for French in Milner (1977, p. 85, fn. 29) within an analysis of [de NP] PPs and extraction from NP in French that has some points in common with the analysis presented here. His account of extraction is also in terms of the SSC (see fn. 18 above) but he restricts the subject of the NP to the NPs introducing the possessor (cf. pp. 83–88 of the cited paper). We will not try to compare the two approaches but will simply refer to some striking parallelisms between French and Italian that emerge from a comparison of Milner’s paper and the present one. In fact we will assume (without providing much justification) that the corresponding French facts are compatible (with few modifications) with the approach taken here.

The fact that in sentences like Giorgio era preoccupato perché mancavano poche ore alla partenza ‘G. was worried because few hours were left for the departure’, the subject of partenza can be understood to refer to (include) Giorgio, appears to be best treated through some kind of pragmatic inference rather than coindexing. The effect of this pragmatic inference is that, contextually, Giorgio may be in the set of unspecified people leaving as one of the members or as the only member. The subject of partenza may also be understood as disjoint in reference with Giorgio. Interestingly, the same state of affairs holds across discourse.

More precisely, the lexical entry will be part- under X requirements; an entry neutral with respect to the choice V and N. Note that in this case we have the optimal situation by any standard evaluation metric. The respective subcategorization features (and basic meaning) are identical for the two choices and need be specified only once.

Once again we assume that the lexical entry will in fact be one and the same for the N and the related V: specifically desider- (for desiderio and desiderare). In this case, too, the subcategorization features and the meaning are identical across V and N except for the obligatory character of the (object) NP subcategorizing the V vs. the optional character of the (object) NP subcategorizing the N. The object NP of the N will actually ‘surface’ as a [di NP] PP for reasons discussed above: Again a (nearly) optimal situation in terms of any X evaluation metric.

Under the alternative analysis alluded to at p. 000 which derives the impossibility of [di Pro] PPs from the (semi-)obligatory character of the spelling out/cliticization of such PPs, the asymmetry would follow if the
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application of such a rule were limited to PPs immediately dominated by $\bar{N}$.

32 A more precise and compact formulation seems possible within the rather narrow and natural limitation of the expressive power of redundancy rules proposed in Wasow (1977) according to which redundancy rules differ crucially from transformations in that the former may involve changes only in the relational structure of lexical categories. If we take I to refer to the subject, II to the direct object, III to the indirect object, etc., the lexical relation may be stated in a first approximation as: $V_N(II) = I$; $(I) = \phi$. See Wasow (1977). In fact, under Wasow's system it is expected that such relations between Ns and Vs such as these should be realized in some language.

One should also mention the fact that for some speakers (32)(a) has (marginally) a subject reading too (corresponding to 'the soldier captured (s.o.)'). This may mean that for such speakers Ns belonging to this class (marginally) enter also an 'active' subcategorization frame, perhaps in analogy with other transitive Ns that do (class II). It is interesting, in any event, to find that for the same speakers, consistently, (32)(a) has also a (marginal) subject reading and that (32)(b) and (32)(d) become (marginally) acceptable.

33 This situation should not be particularly puzzling. It is not uncommon for a lexical item to have two different senses with partially different syntactic (and semantic) properties. We shall see later that Ns like costruzione, invenzione, etc. have two quite distinct entries. We are, however, leaving the question open here whether this dual behavior of a lexical item should be best represented with two separate entries or with two subspecifications within one and the same entry.

34 The former corresponds to McCawley's 'result nominalization' (see McCawley 1973, pp. 127, 159-160); the latter to Lees' (1960) 'agentive nominalization'.

35 In fact, Ns representing 'object nominalizations' are often identical to Ns which represent the corresponding 'action nominalizations'. This holds for example for scoperta (invenzione, costruzione, rappresentazione, etc.). We should thus expect to find such Ns in the contexts allowed by the particular class of 'action nominalizations' they belong to (class IV, or rather class II and III together) as well as those allowed by the class of 'object nominalizations'. In general a clear difference of interpretation correlates with the two clustering of properties. Compare in fact the properties of (36), consistent with an object nominalization reading, with the following, which parallel those of (35):

(i) (a) La scoperta del cantante
      'the discovery of the singer' (ambiguous)
      (b) La scoperta di te (object reading only)
      (c) La tua scoperta (ambiguous)
      (d) La tua scoperta del cantante
           (meaning 'you discovered the singer')
      (e) La tua scoperta da parte dall'impressario
           (meaning 'you have been discovered by the manager')
Thus (36)(a) and (36)(c) are (irrelevantly) ambiguous between an object nominalization and an action nominalization and (36)(b) is (again irrelevantly) grammatical with an action nominalization interpretation.

36 It may be hoped that a precise formulation of the redundancy rule may exclude on principled grounds impossible forms such as *La scoperta da parte di Lavoisier non fu subito utilizzata 'The discovery by L. was not immediately used', if da parte di NP structures are admitted only in concomitance with II to I shifts (as class III Ns).

37 Recall that we have assumed very generally above that all NPs have a syntactic subject position (be it overt or covert).

38 In fact this is a convenient limitation. In many cases, along with a real ‘possessive’ reading of the (P) NP (or possessive adjective) there is another reading that may vary depending on the encyclopedic knowledge about the object, from an agent interpretation to a more contingent connection between the (P) NP structure and the N (e.g. il ristorante di Giorgio may also mean ‘the restaurant where G. usually goes to eat’, ‘the restaurant that G. has painted, dreamed,’ etc., depending on context. We will follow Chomsky’s convenient label for this kind of interpretation referring to them briefly as ‘intrinsic connection’. It seems likely that a precise determination of the range of interpretations such connections may take lies outside of formal grammar proper, as is interpreted within EST. More crucially for our purposes, it seems that these interpretations have in general the same syntactic effects as the real ‘possessive’ interpretation, whenever they can co-occur with it. So no undesirable consequences will derive from leaving them out of consideration here.

39 The same situation holds for French photo as observed by Milner (1977, p. 74): ‘Les suites de trois [combinaisons de génitifs] paraissant inacceptables en performance, nous ne les étudierons pas’. We will instead analyze the impossibility of three [di NP] PPs as due to grammatical factors. See below, the discussion about (40)(e).

40 The remaining logically possible but unavailable interpretations being (a) the picture that you took which G. possesses; (b) the picture that depicts you that G. took; (c) the picture that depicts you that G. possesses; (d) the picture that you possess that G. took.

41 Compare this presentation with the partially similar one given in Milner (1977, p. 79, (38)). The only difference between the two languages in this domain, granting the correctness of the judgements expressed there and here, appears to be that French, but not Italian, allows the possessive adjective to express the possessor when the [di NP] PP expresses the ‘agent’ (here called the ‘subject of the related V’). In fact the observation that the same threefold interpretation and clustering of properties are found with Ns that are related to no V (or A) (e.g. quadro ‘painting’: for example il tuo quadro di Giorgio has the same interpretation of la tua foto di Giorgio) seems to suggest, within the general approach taken here, that the determination of what counts as the syntactic subject, object, etc. of a N may not be derivative (through redundancy rules) from that of a related category as assumed here for simplicity. It may be plausibly linked directly with thematic roles (agent, patient, etc.) as attempted in Anderson (1977).
See that paper for relevant discussion. Nonetheless we will continue to talk about 'subject' (of the related V) rather than 'agent', etc.

42 Note that the same schema holds in case two [di NP] positions occur rather than a possessive adjective plus a [di NP] position. That is La fotografia di Giorgio di Anna has the same two readings (out of six) that La tua fotografia di Giorgio has.

43 Strictly speaking descrizione, in addition to the (passive) action nominalization reading discussed above also has what we may call a 'result nominalization' (as in the case of fotografia). This reading is illustrated by a sentence such as La tua descrizione è la sul tavolo 'Your description is there on the table' which forces the interpretation of a concrete object reporting a (written) description of you. As expected, in such sentences by-phrases are felt as awkward or downright impossible (cf. * ?la tua descrizione da parte di Anna è la sul tavolo).

44 The postulation of a separate object nominalization subentry for fotografia with the property that the object depicted is the syntactic subject, may perhaps be supported by the existence of lexical items (of the same picture-type class) that have this entry as their only entry; e.g. immagine ('image'): la tua immagine 'your image'; *l'immagine di te 'the image of you'; *la mia immagine di te 'my image of you'.

45 There is a fourth possibility, which, however, has the same interpretation of (2), for di Giorgio can be generated under N, as the syntactic object of the transitive subentry (corresponding, as in (2) to the syntactic object of the related V). This is the only structural possibility available for forms like (40)(b). See the text.

46 Note that three [di NP] PPs are possible if the one that is not the subject or the object is open to a 'place' interpretation rather than to a real 'possessor' interpretation. Thus contrast Il ritratto di Monna Lisa di Leonardo del Louvre with * Il ritratto di Monna Lisa di Leonardo di Carlo (è evidentemente falso) 'the picture of M.L. of L. of C. (is obviously false). A few cases seem in fact to admit of a combination of possessor and 'agent', apparently in contrast to the analysis sketched here, but they are rather marginal and perhaps stereotyped to some degree: ??I miei quadri di Picasso 'my paintings of Picasso' (better: i miei Picasso).

Also quite marginal appear forms like i miei quadri suoi 'my pictures his' with two possessive adjectives where the preferred reading is with the first referring to the possessor and the second to the agent. Since the second adjective is a sort of an adjunct, it may well be analyzed as being outside of the 'core' NP structure.

47 Note that not all the Ns that correspond to psych-movement Vs or As have the object (corresponding to the object of the V or A) introduced by the preposition di. For a significant set of them the object is introduced by per (see: G. ama A. 'G. loves A.'; il suo amore per A. 'His love for A.'; G. odia A. 'G hates A.'; il suo odio per A. 'His hatred for A.'; di instead of per is not allowed). Perhaps there is some subregularity governing the phenomenon. This observation may weaken the idea that it is a productive transformational process that is responsible for the presence of di (or per) in front of the object NP of this N class. It is at least conceivable that the
ultimate choice of *di or *per be lexically determined by the subcategorization features of the relevant subclass of class II Ns, directly. Note that, perhaps as should be expected under this view from the fact that Ns are not subcategorized by their subjects, the subject of Ns is always introduced by *di, with no exceptions.
49 This seems to be related to a similar restriction in Ss discussed by Chomsky (1978). In many cases the object of a preposition cannot be NP-preposed in Ss either. See:

(i) * The church was run into by the boys

Within the system proposed in Chomsky (1978) this restriction follows from the theory of case marking which would be generalizable to nominals. See also Riemsdijk (1978), Anderson (1978).
50 Note that granting this, the lexical approach taken here is perfectly compatible with Anderson's theoretically desirable assumption that NP-preposing (or, in fact, any transformation) should not be relativized to certain domains of application only. Thus it might be the case that NP-preposing simply 'appears' to be inapplicable within NPs in Italian because it gives rise to no wellformed output (for unsatisfied case requirements).
51 One difference between English and Italian, however, shows up in our class IV Ns which allow NP-preposing. This class comprises Ns that are neither moved nor changed nor altered in status nor created which nonetheless admit of NP-preposing, contrary to English. Compare these Italian examples with the English (ungrammatical) analogues: La discussione di questo problema / L'/una sua discussione vs. The discussion of this problem / * This problem's discussion; l'inseguimento della volpe / il suo inseguimento vs. The pursuit of the fox / The fox's pursuit.
52 Cf. also Milner (1977 p. 79): 'avec un adjectif possessif dénotant l'object, le génitif Agent ne peut être introduit que par par*.
53 We are indebted to Richard Kayne for many observations relevant to this alternative approach.
54 Something more needs to be specified to prevent the subject NP of Ns like *cattura from getting genitive case in the absence of the object NP which is not obligatory (cf. temevano la cattura 'they feared the capture'), and thus to be possessivized, if a pronoun. For la loro cattura 'their capture' can never mean that 'they captured someone'.
55 A different choice of matrix verb may lead to a better sentence. See below for a discussion of such cases that we argue are only apparent counterexamples to the hypothesis discussed here.
56 Of course, they can also be interpreted with a subject reading (in the subentry corresponding to class II Ns. Cf. Anna, di cui/Ne ricordiamo il desiderio (. . .), also allowing for the subject reading of di cui, ne).
57 The interpretation of (57)(b) according to which *ne has the subject reading and Pliny the object reading poses instead no problem to the hypothesis on extraction.
58 Note that such forms as (60) are impossible with Vs like *usare and *interrompere that were shown above to render (56)–(57) also impossible:
(i) * La descrizione che ne abbiamo usato (del cataclisma) ... 'The description that of-it we have used ...'
(ii) * La descrizione che ne abbiamo interrotto (del cataclisma) ... 'The description that of-it we have interrupted ...'
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RIASSUNTO

Lo scopo centrale dell’articolo è di caratterizzare quale classe di elementi di un sintagma nominale (SN) può essere estratto da tale SN attraverso, ad es., le regole di cliticizzazione e spostamento di wh-dell’italiano. Il punto di partenza dell’analisi è l’osservazione che tra tutti i costituenti interni di un SN risultano essere estraibili solo sintagmi preposizionali (SP) della forma di SN. Questa proprietà è poi avvicinata ad una seconda proprietà degli SP di SN, cioè al fatto che essi introducono il soggetto e l’oggetto sintattici di un SN. Segue una caratterizzazione indipendente (per ciascuna delle principali classi di N dell’italiano) di quale SP di SN si qualifichi come soggetto sintattico del (SN in cui si trova l’) N. L’osservazione che tra tutti i SP di SN solo quelli che introducono il soggetto sintattico di un SN sono da questo estraibili è provvisoriamente attribuita alla condizione di ‘opacità’ della Teoria.