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It is by now generally recognized that positions higher than IP and lower than Comp are available in the finite clause structure. Apart from the split of Infl into AgrS and T (e.g. Pollock 1989, Belletti 1990, Chomsky 1993), further evidence has been given for additional positions between AgrS and C. For some scholars, this evidence has been dealt with in terms of AgrS recursion (Belletti 1990, Cardinaletti & Roberts 1991, Roberts 1993, Poletto 1993, Zwart 1994, Cardinaletti 1994, and elsewhere), whereas others have argued for an Agr projection belonging to the Comp system, (e.g. Shlonsky 1992, Platzack 1994, Uriagereka 1995, Rizzi 1995). In the following pages, I will present parts of a work in progress based on Swedish and Italian data; some of these are new, most of them are well known. The novelty of this work therefore lies in the approach. I will show that certain word order patterns, concerning the distribution of subject and object pronouns and some adverbs, are substantially similar in Swedish and in Italian, and I will propose a unifying account for this parallelism. In particular, I will argue that the distribution of Swedish pronouns shows that there is a functional projection in the main clause, higher than AgrS but lower than Comp, which may be the target for pronouns and not for R-expressions. This difference in distribution between R-expressions and pronouns justifies the introduction in the theory of syntax of a semantic distinction, namely that between items that have person specification and those that do not, following a line of thought according to which the intrinsic third person specification of R-expressions is a default value rather than a person feature. I will suggest that this distinction is encoded in the syntactic component by the projection of a Person Phrase that may be the target only for items with a person specification, and that certain word order
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patterns are imputable to the checking process taking place here.\(^1\) As the relevant data are available in some but not all languages, the syntactic presence of the Person Phrase is likely to be parametrized across languages, whereas the corresponding semantic distinction may be universal. Moreover, the hypothesis outlined below will be compatible with the restrictive approach to X'-Theory formulated by Kayne (1994).

In section 1, I will first present the Swedish data and point at some conclusions that can be drawn from them. In section 2, I will show how the hypothesis accounts for the distribution of pronouns and some adverbs in Italian finite and absolute clauses. In the last section, I will point at some consequences of the analysis for word order patterns in Old Italian topicalization structures.

1. Subject and Object Pronouns in Swedish Main Clauses

1.1. Preliminary Observations

Two general classes of Scandinavian pronouns are recognized in the recent literature and generally referred to as weak and strong (cf. Holmberg 1986, 1991, 1993; Josefsson 1992, 1993; Cardinaletti 1994, 1995; Cardinaletti & Starke 1995; Holmberg & Platzack 1995, among many others). Weak and strong pronouns are morphophonetically identical and the distinction between them is based on stress: weak pronouns are unstressed and strong pronouns are stressed. They differ with regard to distribution.

First and foremost, object R-expressions may not undergo A-movement (overt object shift) in Mainland Scandinavian including Swedish (Vikner 1990, Holmberg & Platzack 1995). Object pronouns, on the contrary, may appear in three different positions in a Swedish main clause hosting a simple tense (disregarding the sentence initial position, the Topic); the examples of (1a)-(1b) are from Josefsson (1992, 62). Positions 2 and 3 are distinguished by the presence of negation (henceforth, object pronouns are indicated with

\(^1\) The idea of a split of the AgrS node is pursued by Poletto (1993, 90-97; Poletto makes a reference to unpublished work of Ur Shlonsky) and Bianchi & Figueiredo Silva (1993). A comment on the Person Phrase was made in Egerland (1996, 255) on the basis of data different from those that will be discussed in the present paper.
The examples (from Josefsson) are wh-structures with V2 subject inversion. That positions one and two are actually distinct becomes obvious in a subject inversion clause, as they appear on each side of the inverted subject. The pronoun is weak in positions one and two, and strong in position 3.\textsuperscript{2} Moreover, position one in (1) is not available in Norwegian and Danish. Thus, the data and the conclusions that follow are relevant only for Swedish.

Consider then the possible landing sites of a subject (disregarding as before the sentence initial position). Unlike R-objects, R-subjects are overtly moved and the subject positions that are of interest thus concern both pronominal and referential subjects. I call these positions A, B, and C in order to avoid confusion. Consider first the highest and the lowest of the subject positions (henceforth, subject pronouns are indicated with italics):

\textsuperscript{2} For reasons I shall not discuss, object pronouns raise overtly only in simple tenses and finite main clauses, not in compound tenses, subordinates, and infinitives; see Holmberg (1986) and Jonas & Bobaljik (1993). The demonstration is limited to main clauses with simple tenses. As for those, there is a possibility for some speakers to use a weak pronoun in position 3, but this should probably not be interpreted in the sense that weak pronouns are generally allowed to the right of negation in Swedish; cf. Holmberg 1991, 156 and see further the examples (12) and (13) below.
(2) The distribution of subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>posA</th>
<th>Neg</th>
<th>posC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2a) Varför kom</td>
<td>hon</td>
<td>inte?</td>
<td>igår?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why came</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>not?</td>
<td>yesterday?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2b) Varför kom</td>
<td>inte</td>
<td>HON</td>
<td>igår?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why came</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>SHE</td>
<td>yesterday?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the object pronoun, the subject carries stress when it appears to the right of negation in position C, inside VP. There is a third possibility (cf. Holmberg 1993, 32-33), a position B distinct from A, that emerges when there is an intervening sentence adverb like möjligen 'possibly'. There is a difference in distribution between R-subjects and pronominal subjects:

(3) The distribution of subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>posA</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>posB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3a) Har</td>
<td>Johan</td>
<td>möjligen</td>
<td>inte kommit än?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>not come yet?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3b) Har</td>
<td>möjligen</td>
<td>Johan</td>
<td>inte kommit än?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>not come yet?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3c) Har</td>
<td>han</td>
<td>möjligen</td>
<td>inte kommit än?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>not come yet?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3d) *Har</td>
<td>möjligen</td>
<td>han</td>
<td>inte kommit än?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>not come yet?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3e) Har</td>
<td>möjligen</td>
<td>inte HAN kommit än?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>not HE come yet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from (3a)/(3b) and (3c)/(3d) an R-subject may optionally appear on both sides of the adverb, whereas a pronominal weak subject may only be to the left of the adverb. Compare (3d) with (3e), which is grammatical, where the subject carries stress and stays to the right of negation (in position C).³

³. It should be pointed out from the beginning that the intonational properties of these constructions are
The analysis of these positions will depend on certain other assumptions about the the status of pronouns and the structure of the finite main clause, generally and in Swedish. I will go through these in I-IV:

I. The so called weak pronoun in Swedish corresponds to certain criteria for clitic hood. It cannot be conjoined, modified or stressed (as we have already said) when it appears in positions 1 and 2; cf. Holmberg (1991, 156); Josefsson (1992, 62; 1993). Unlike the object pronoun, the subject pronoun may be either weak or strong when it appears to the left of negation or the VP-adverb. It is possible to conjoin and modify the subject pronoun in the relevant position:

(4a) Varför kommer hon och Johan inte ikväll?
why come she and John not tonight?

(4b) Varför kommer bara han ofta och hälsar på?
why comes only he often and visits us?

Furthermore, a Swedish pronoun, both subject and object, may take a PP as its complement:

(5a) Hon med den röda klänningen kom på festen igår
she with the red dress came to the party yesterday

(5b) Känner du henne med den röda klänningen?
do you know her with the red dress?

A subject pronoun with a PP complement can appear in the inverted subject position to the left of negation as in (6a). However, there is a contrast between (6b) and (6c), suggesting that an object pronoun with PP complement must stay in situ.

sometimes hard to interpret. I will have little to suggest for focused pronouns. In many of the structures that follow, it is possible to focus the subject pronoun which in certain cases brings about an improvement of the examples. Presumably, focus makes available some positions in the clause structure that otherwise are not.
(6a) Igår kom *hon med den röda klänningen* inte på festen
yesterday came she with the red dress not to the party

(6b) ??Jag känner *hennes med den röda klänningen* inte
I know her with the red dress not

(6c) Jag känner inte *hennes med den röda klänningen*
I know not her with the red dress

The subjects and the objects of (4)-(6) are strong pronouns and have undoubtedly XP status. However, opinions diverge on the X’-status of weak pronouns. Vikner (1990), Holmberg (1991, 1993), Holmberg & Platzack (1995), Cardinaletti & Starke (1995) assume that weak pronouns adjoin to maximal projections as an XP. Josefsson (1992, 1993) argues instead that the weak pronoun is a head cliticizing to heads. Against the clitic approach, it is argued by Holmberg (1993, 31 f.n. 3) that the weak pronoun needs not be adjacent to the V - it is not in position 2, for instance. This argument is not compelling, however. Kayne (1991, 1994) argues that clitic elements may have the property to cliticize to empty functional heads. In historical and dialectal Romance, we know that pronouns that are arguably clitic can be separated from the finite V by certain adverbs such as French *bien*, or Italian *pure*; cf. Kayne (1991, 1994, 42), Benincà & Cinque (1993, 2324-2325), Egerland (1996, 295-296).

It should be pointed out that the analysis outlined below is viable regardless of the X’-status of weak pronouns.

II. When a main clause is introduced by a topicalized element or a wh-expression, the finite verb moves to Comp, the Topic occupies the specifier of Comp and the inverted subject is placed in the specifier of Infl.⁴

---

⁴ Note that this assumption does not depend on whether we assume a symmetric account of V2, based on V-to-Comp movement in all main clauses, or an asymmetric account, based on V-to-Comp movement only in topicalized structures or wh-questions; see Vikner (1990) and Holmberg & Platzack (1995) for the former view and Zwart (1993) for the latter.
III. I will start my demonstration by assuming the sentence structure proposed by Chomsky (1993):

(8) \[[\text{CP} \ C \ [\text{AgrSP AgrS} \ [\text{TP T AgrOP AgrO} \ [\text{VP V}]]]]\]

We will soon see that there are good reasons to modify the hypothesis expressed in (8). However, I will assume throughout that object pronouns in position 2 are in the domain of AgrOP.

Holmberg (1993, 33-34) assumes that both Spec T and Spec AgrS are available for the subject in Swedish, the difference being that weak subject pronouns must move to Spec AgrS whereas R-subjects move obligatorily to Spec T and may optionally continue to Spec AgrS. The sentence adverb möjligen in (3a)-(3e) adjoins to TP. Thus, in Holmberg’s (1993) hypothesis, subject position A is Spec AgrS and subject position B is Spec T. I will formulate an alternative to this view below.

IV. It is generally held that the negation inte divides the VP from the functional portion of the clause. Thus, negation is on top of VP, either in the sense that it is adjoined to VP as an adverbial or that the projection NegP has its fixed position in the tree, being the complement of AgrOP and taking VP as its complement (cf. Holmberg & Platzack 1995, Vikner 1990, Joseffson 1992, among others).
If antisymmetry is assumed, the analysis implies that elements appearing to the right of negation are under VP, whereas elements to the left of negation have moved out of VP.

The linear ordering of elements in relation to negation can thus be used as a criterion for establishing their positions in the tree. The same is presumably true for adverbs as *ofta* 'often' or *fullständigt* 'completely', that in a pre-antisymmetric framework would be VP-joined (cf. the lower adverbs of Belletti 1990 in section 2 below, examples (50)-(52)).

(10)  Han övertygade henne fullständigt. (weak pronoun in object position 2)  
      he convinced her completely

(11)  Han övertygade fullständigt henne. (strong pronoun in object position 3)  
      he convinced completely her

However, Holmberg (1993, 33-34) diverges from the standard view by assuming that negation may adjoin as an adverb either to VP or to TP. In the following discussion, this idea cannot be followed. First, Cardinaletti & Guasti (1992) argue that there is a structural difference between *sentence negation* and *constituent negation*. Sentence negation, which appears in the finite clause, is a phrase projected by the verb and is dependent on the presence of Tense according to the Negation Criterion formulated by Zanuttini (1991). Constituent negation is adverbal and appears in certain types of small clauses which are tenseless (Cardinaletti & Guasti 1992, 28). It follows from this distinction that the sentential negation of Swedish as well as other languages cannot be adverbal and that the appropriate structure is (9).\(^5\) Holmberg's (1993) suggestion may be natural if negation

\(^5\) For Scandinavian, at least. Cardinaletti & Guasti (1992, 4) assume a different ordering of the
behaves as an adverb, but ought to be ruled out by the hypothesis expressed in (9).

Furthermore, there are empirical doubts on the idea that negation optionally adjoins to TP. By this, Holmberg predicts that weak object pronouns could appear to the right of negation (namely if the negation adjoins to TP and the weak objects move to AgrOP). Consider now that, when there are two weak objects (one dative and one accusative), the linear ordering between them is free in many varieties of Swedish.

\[(12a) \quad \text{Hennes mor gav} \ \text{henne den inte} \quad \text{(dat-acc-neg)}
\]
\[\text{her mother gave} \ \text{her it not} \]
\[(12b) \quad \text{Hennes mor gav} \ \text{den henne inte} \quad \text{(acc-dat-neg)}
\]
\[\text{her mother gave it her not} \]

If we place negation to the left of these pronouns we obtain the following contrast:

\[(13a) \quad \text{Hennes mor gav inte} \ \text{henne den} \quad \text{(neg-dat-acc)}
\]
\[\text{her mother gave not} \ \text{her it} \]
\[(13b) \quad ??\text{Hennes mor gav inte} \ \text{den henne} \quad (*\text{neg-acc-dat})
\]
\[??\text{her mother gave not it her} \]

Apart from the fact that there is a clear difference in intonation - in my opinion - between the pronouns of (13a) and those of (12a) and (12b) (preferably, the dative pronoun in (13a) carries stress), word order is evidently not free. More precisely, the dative pronoun in (13b) must be introduced by a preposition (\ldots inte till henne \ldots not it to her\ldots), and I take this to be an indication that the dative pronoun in the final position is in its basic position.

Summing up so far, I assume that object position 3 and subject position C are the basic positions inside VP. Object position 2 is either the specifier or the head of AgrO, depending on the X'-status of the weak object pronoun. It remains to be settled where the object pronoun is placed in position 1 and what the difference is between the subject positions A and B.

---

projections for Italian and French.
1.2. Defining Object Position 1 and Subject Positions A and B

Josefsson (1992, 70) reaches the conclusion that the object pronoun in position 1 has right adjoined to Comp, as in (14): ⁶

(14)

```
C'  
/   \  
C   AgrSP
/ \   /
C  D Spec
|   |     
V   DP(S)
```

The structure obviously violates Antisymmetry, but this problem could be circumvented if we assume that there is an additional position between CP and AgrSP onto which the weak pronoun can left adjoin:

(15)

```
C'  
/   \  
C   XP
/     /
V   C X
|     |     
D Spec
|     |     
X DP(S)
```

Let us look closer on the properties of this construction. Consider (16a)-(16e) ((16a) and

---

⁶. The proposal is reminiscent of Platzack (1986) who assumes that weak subject pronouns are right adjoined to Comp; this idea is rejected by Holmberg (1991, 1993) as well as by Cardinaletti & Starke (1995).
(16b) from Josefsson 1992, 66; (16c) from Josefsson 1993, 24).

(16a) Förra veckan sände mig min fästman ett stort fång rosor.  
last week sent me my fiance a big bunch roses

(16b) På stationen mötte honom morfar och mormor med en fin present.  
at the station met him grandpa and grandma with a nice present

(16c) Därför ger mig Tutanchamons förbannelse inte någon ro.  
therefore gives me Tutanchamon's curse not any peace

(16d) Varför oroar sig Kalle inte mer än så?  
why worry himself Kalle not more than that

(16e) På sjukhuset besökte mig Maria ofta  
at the hospital visited me Mary often

There are certain restrictions on (16a)-(16e).7 The subjects of Josefsson's examples are somewhat heavy (cf. her comment 1992, 66). In my opinion, acceptability does not actually decrease if the subjects are less heavy:

(17a) Förra veckan sände mig Johan ett stort fång rosor.  
last week sent me John a big bunch roses

(17b) På stationen mötte honom Johan med en fin present.  
at the station met him John with a nice present

(17c) Därför ger mig Johan inte någon ro.  
therefore gives me John not any peace

More importantly, if the subjects of (16)-(17) are pronominal the acceptability decreases clearly (cf. Josefsson 1992, 80). There is a contrast between (18a)-(18g) and (16a)-(16e) above. Person and number specification of the pronouns does not seem to matter:

(18a) *Förra veckan sände mig han ett stort fång rosor.  
last week sent me he a big bunch roses

(18b) *Förra veckan sände er vi ett stort fång rosor  
last week sent you we a big bunch roses

(18c) *På stationen mötte honom jag med en fin present.  
at the station met him I with a nice present

(18d) *På stationen mötte *henne hon med en fin present
      at the station met her she with a nice present
(18e) *Därför ger *dig hon inte någon ro.
      therefore gives you she not any peace
(18f) *Varför oroar er ni inte mer än så?
      why worry you[sub.] not more than that?
(18g) *På sjukhuset besökte *henne jag ofta.
      at the hospital visited her I often

My judgments for all of (18a)-(18g) presuppose a weak, unstressed reading of the subject pronoun. They improve considerably if the subject is contrastively focused:

(19a) Förra veckan sände mig HAN ett stort fång rosor (och ingen annan)
      last week sent me HE a big bunch roses (and no one else)
(19b) På stationen mötte *henne HON med en fin present (men jag kunde inte komma)
      at the station met her SHE with a nice present (but I couldn’t be there)

In such cases, the subject is preferably to the right of the negation. I assume the subject in these constructions appears inside VP, position C of (2).

Furthermore, (20a)-(20c) are perfectly well formed with the subject pronoun preceding the object pronoun:

(20a) Förra veckan sände vi er ett stort fång rosor
      last week sent we you a big bunch roses
(20b) Därför ger hon *dig inte någon ro.
      therefore gives she you not any peace
(20c) Varför oroar ni er inte mer än så?
      why worry you[sub.] not more than that

The most natural assumption is that in (20a)-(20c), the object has stayed under AgrOP, that is, position 2 of (1a)-(1b) above; an option which always appears to be available for a weak object pronoun.

There are several conclusions to be drawn from these data. First of all, consider that (18a)-(18g) cannot be excluded by any general ban on VOS word order in the Swedish main clause, given the grammaticality of (16) and (17) above. It is also unlikely that the heaviness of the subject plays a role, since there is no significant contrast between (16a)-
(16c) and (17a)-(17c). Moreover, it is difficult to ascribe the ungrammaticality of (18a)-(18g) to any restriction on two unstressed pronouns appearing together. The sequence <weak subject-weak object> is perfectly well formed in (20a)-(20c) and so is the sequence of <weak dative object-weak accusative object>, see (12a) and (12b) above. An explanation of the contrast between (16a)-(16e) and (18a)-(18g) in terms of Case Theory or Theta Theory appears to be difficult to find; it may therefore be a warranted move to ascribe the difference to a violation of principles of X'-Theory. This is the alternative I wish to explore.

Suppose that (18a)-(18g) are excluded because the weak subject pronouns and the weak object pronouns are in competition for the same position and that the position in question is not a target for R-expressions. Suppose this position is within the projection indicated as XP in (15) above, given here as (21).

(21)

```
CP
  \-----\------
  Spec  C'
      \-----\------
      Comp  XP
            \-----\------
            Spec  X'
                \-----\------
                X  AgrSP
                      \-----\------
                      Spec  AgrS'
```

Judging from (21), it appears that XP may belong to the Infl system or to the Comp system. If we take the latter view, X may be, for instance, a Topic Phrase or a Focus Phrase in Rizzi's (1995) model. Both these options are excluded: the weak pronoun cannot be focused and in the main clause other elements cannot appear here as we would have expected if XP was a Topic Phrase. The temporal adverb is excluded as in (22a), the preposition phrase cannot be topicalized as in (22b), whereas a sentence adverb as
förmodligen 'probably' can appear here, witness (22c) (henceforth, the elements I assume to be topicalized are underlined):

(22a) *Därför mötte **igår** farmor och farfar honom inte på stationen.
therefore met **yesterday** grandma and grandpa him not at the station

(22b) *Därför mötte **på stationen** farmor och farfar honom inte igår.
therefore met **at the station** grandma and grandpa him not yesterday

(22c) Därför mötte förmodligen farmor och farfar honom inte på stationen igår.
therefore met probably grandma and grandpa him not on the station yesterday

If XP was a Topic phrase we would not expect any significant difference between (22a), (22b), and (22c), and we are thus in a position to conclude that the relevant position is not TopicP. I assume instead that XP is an agreement projection of some kind (though not AgrSP), in which the concomitant presence of subject and object pronoun is barred. There are two possibilities to consider: weak pronouns may either move as DP or as D'. In the former case, both subject and object adjoin to XP as in (23), in the latter they elicitize to X' as in (24).

Both of these configurations are ruled out by Antisymmetry, and the ungrammaticality of (18a)-(18g) could thus be accounted for on either of (23) and (24) (cf. Kayne 1994, 15-23). For our purposes, it is therefore not necessary to decide the X'-status of weak pronouns. The analysis could exclude (18a)-(18g) regardless of whether the weak
pronouns are heads or maximal projections.

In order to explain why (16)-(17) are well formed, suppose XP can be the target for pronominal arguments only. An R-expression stays in Spec AgrS, one step lower in the structure. There ought to be a principled reason behind such a difference. Consider that R-expressions carry φ-feature specification for number and gender but not for person, whereas pronouns are specified also for the person feature. Suppose XP is an agreement projection specified for person, hence, XP is a Person Phrase (henceforth: PersP). If this is so, the fact that pronouns and not R-expressions move there receives a natural explanation. We can assume that a personal pronoun introduces a person feature in the numeration that has to be checked during the derivation. We will come back to this conclusion within short.

This assumption will immediately account for some further peculiarities of the linear ordering of pronominal elements. As noticed by Holmberg (1991, 157) and Joseffson (1992, 67-68), the weak object pronoun den ‘it’ may not appear in position 1 to the left of the subject:

\[(25)\] *Såg den Anna inte?  
saw it Anne not?

Furthermore, in a sequence <den-R-expression>, the only available interpretation is one where den is understood as a subject (cf. Joseffson 1992, 68).

\[(26a)\] *Varför sköt den Lena?  
why shot it Lena? = why did Lena shoot it?

\[(26b)\] Varför sköt den Lena?  
why shot it Lena? = why did it shoot Lena?

These patterns receive a principled explanation on the following line of reasoning: if a pronoun in order to reach XP must carry a person feature, it is plausible that it is also carries the feature human. Suppose, in brief, that an item can be specified for person if and only if it is also specified human.8 As the pronoun den ‘it’ cannot refer to human

---

8. See, for a recent reference, Maling & Jónsson (1995) who argue on the basis of Icelandic data that the human feature has syntactic relevance.
beings, its presence in PersP would be excluded, and thereby also the possibility to understand *Anna* in (25) or *Lena* in (26) as subjects in Spec AgrS. The only interpretation will then be the one where *den* is a subject in Spec AgrS and *Anna* and *Lena* are objects left in their basic position.9

Furthermore, the impossibility of having a weak object pronoun in position one when immediately followed by a pronominal subject is probably not limited to the case where the subject pronominal is also weak. If we try to place a strong subject pronoun after a weak object pronoun in position 1, the result is still not perfect. The b-examples of (27), (28) and (29) are clearly better than the a-examples:

(27a) ??På sjukhuset besökte *henne* _du och jag_ inte at the hospital visited *her* _you and I_ not

(27b) På sjukhuset besökte *henne* _inte du och jag_ at the hospital visited *her* _not you and I_ not

(28a) ??Varför besökte *mig* _ni båda_ inte? why visited *me* _you both_ not?

(28b) Varför besökte *mig* _inte ni båda?_ why visited *me* _not you both?_

---

9. In many varieties of colloquial Swedish the nominative form of the third person masculine singular pronoun *han* ‘he’ has replaced its accusative counterpart *honom* ‘him’. Josefsson has noticed that in such varieties, the pronoun in a sentence like (i) can only be interpreted as subject - the interpretation of (ii) is not available - whereas *han* ‘he’ can have the function of an object elsewhere, as in (iii):

(i) Varför sköt *han* Lena? (Subj. - Obj.)
   why shot *he* Lena = why did he shoot Lena?

(ii) *Varför sköt han Lena?* (*Obj. - Subj.)
   why shot *he* Lena = why did Lena shoot him?

(iii) Varför sköt Lena *han* inte?
     why shot *Lena he*[Obj.] not?

I have no suggestions to make for this contrast. Presumably, the difference between (i)/(ii) and (26a)/(26b) in the text is related to the Case issue for which I have no ready analysis.
(29a) ??På stationen mötte honom hon med den röda klänningen inte
at the station met him she with the dress not

(29b) På stationen mötte honom inte hon med den röda klänningen
at the station met him not she with the red dress

At the S-structure of (27a), (28a), and (29a) the weak object pronoun would be in PersP, whereas the strong subject pronoun would target Spec AgrS. In my own variety of Swedish at least, the result of such a derivation is deviant, and I conclude from this that not only weak subject pronouns but also strong subject pronouns must reach PersP.10

Recall now Holmberg’s (1993) hypothesis: 1. subject position A is Spec AgrS and subject position B is Spec T; 2. the adverb joins to TP; 3. the weak subject pronoun moves obligatorily to Spec AgrS, whereas the subject R-expression moves optionally to Spec AgrS. This is a way to derive the data summarized in (3a)-(3e), but there is no principled explanation at hand as for why AgrSP is associated with pronouns and TP with R-expressions, nor why movement to Spec AgrS is optional for R-expressions. For theoretical reasons, it is desirable to make the stronger assumption that subject pronouns obligatorily move to XP - and not lower - and R-expressions obligatorily to Spec AgrS - and not higher. This forces us to modify the description of (3a)-(3e) along the lines indicated in (30):

(30) The distribution of subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>posA</th>
<th>posB¹</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>posB²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30a) Har has</td>
<td>Johan John</td>
<td>möjligen possibly</td>
<td>inte kommit än? not come yet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30b) Har has</td>
<td>möjligen possibly</td>
<td>Johan John</td>
<td>inte kommit än? not come yet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30c) Har has han he</td>
<td>möjligen possibly</td>
<td>inte kommit än? not come yet?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Recall that focused subjects make exception from this generalization. The a-examples of (27)-(29) improve slightly when the subjects carry focus, although the preferred position then is still to the right of negation in the author’s opinion. I can only repeat my conjecture from footnote 2 that additional positions in the tree become available for focused elements.
I suggest that position A is within XP (specifier or head of PersP), and that position B is Spec AgrS. The optionality in word order attested for R-subjects may instead be derived if: 1. the adverb adjoins to AgrSP; 2. AgrSP is recursive. B¹ and B² in (30) are thus recursions of AgrS. The justification for this assumption, and its details, will be given when we turn to the discussion of Italian in section 2 (structure (37)). There, it will also be discussed how to formulate the hypothesis in Antisymmetry.

We are now in a position to make some general conclusions about PersP:

1. As said above, if there is a pronominal subject in the clause, this subject must reach PersP.
2. If there is no pronominal subject in the clause, but a weak object pronoun, this object pronoun can optionally move to PersP.
3. R-expressions do not move to Spec Pers but stay in Spec AgrS.
4. Since R-expressions do not reach the specifier of the Person Phrase, it is clear that the checking process taking place in PersP is dissociated from nominative Case checking. Since object pronouns move there optionally, it is clear that person checking is also dissociated from accusative checking which arguably takes place in AgrOP.

There are two possible interpretations of this last point. It could be that pronouns check nominative and accusative and then move on to check person in addition to their structural Case; obligatorily for the subject, optionally for the object. We could also assume that pronouns carry lexical Case and hence do not check nominative or accusative at all. I will leave this question open.

However, the conclusions of point 1 and 4 are somewhat paradoxal. On the one hand, subject pronouns are prominent; they prevail over weak objects when there are two pronouns in competition for PersP. Intuitively, the subject’s precedence over the object may be related to the fact that Swedish is a Nominative-Accusative language; we leave open the possibility that in an Ergative-Absolutive language the state of affairs could be the opposite. On the other hand, PersP does not seem to be relevant for nominative Case checking. We will see below, however, that both of these conclusions can be independently justified.

Moreover, it is plausible that the presence of the PersP as well as it properties are subject to cross-linguistic variation, given that the relevant position is not a possible target for object pronouns in Danish and Norwegian. The Scandinavian languages thus differ on the points listed above.
The interest of these data is primarily that they show that the assumption of a richer functional structure is empirically founded also in a language like Swedish, where the finite V does not carry overt $\phi$-features. In the following sections, I will confront our conclusions based on Swedish with data from standard Italian. The purpose of the comparison is to show at parallel patterns in Swedish and Italian and to enlighten some of the properties of the projection under discussion.

2. On the Distribution of Pronouns in Italian

I will begin this section with a comment on the distribution of subject pronouns in the Italian finite clause, after which I will turn to absolute small clauses.

A sentence adverb like *probabilmente* 'probably' can typically occur both in sentence initial position (31a), and between the subject and the finite verb (31b) ((31a) and (31b) from Belletti 1990, 41):

(31a) Probabilmente Gianni telefonerà alle 5.
     probably Gianni will call at 5
(31b) Gianni probabilmente telefonerà alle 5.
     Gianni probably will call at 5

Belletti explains this on the assumption the finite AgrP (AgrSP in our terms) is recursive, and gives the following structure (cf. Belletti 1990, 54; see also Cardinaletti & Roberts 1991, Cardinaletti 1994, and Zwart 1994):
Belletti's approach is based on the recursion of AgrSP and adverbial adjunction to AgrSP. If Antisymmetry of Kayne (1994) is assumed, adjunction as illustrated in (32) will not be allowed. If we wish to maintain the intuition behind this analysis, we may then assume that the adverb may occupy the specifier of AgrSP rather than being adjoined to it, and the structure we arrive at is (33) in analogy with the proposal of Belletti (1990):
An alternative to (33) can be based on Rizzi’s (1995) proposal for the Comp field. A case of optionality in word order such as ours could be analyzed in terms of recursion, but not of AgrSP. Rather, the adverb as well as the R-expression could end up in Topic projections in Rizzi’s Comp field. The Topic Phrase is recursive and the word order of topicalized elements is not restricted in Italian (Rizzi 1995).
In both (33) and (34) the data are derived on the assumption of free recursion; in (33) AgrSP is recursive, in (34) the Topic Phrase is recursive. The obvious difference between these accounts is that (34) locates the subject and the adverb higher in the clause than (33); according to (34), these elements target a position in the Comp system, whereas for (33) they remain in the Infl system. Although a recursive Topic projection ought to be assumed in Italian for independent reasons (cf. Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1995), I will argue that (33) has advantages over (34) for the present issue. The reasons why we should prefer (33) are by and large two:

First, we wish to arrive at a unified account for certain word order patterns in Italian and Swedish. We have already seen that the Swedish subject and a sentence adverb have the same optionality in word order as the one we have attested in Italian. I repeat (30a) and (30b) from above:

(30a) Har Johan möjligen inte kommit än?
has John possibly not come yet
(30b) Har möjligen Johan inte kommit än?
has possibly John not come yet

But we have also seen that the relevant position is not a generally available target for topicalized elements. Consider again (22b) (and compare (22c) above):

(22b) *Därför mötte på stationen farmor och farfar honom inte igår.
therefore met at the station grandma and grandpa him not yesterday

The recursive-Topic-analysis thus fails to capture the parallelism between Swedish and Italian.

The second reason why (33) should be preferred over (34) is that there are empirical counterarguments to (34) also in Italian. Consider the behaviour of personal pronouns. Cardinaletti (1994 and forthcoming) holds that egli ‘he’ is a weak subject pronoun in Italian. Unlike R-subjects, egli cannot be separated from the finite V by an intervening topicalized object (examples from Cardinaletti 1994, 76; topicalized object in bold face and underlined):

(35a) *Egli questa iniziativa non l’appoggerebbe.
he this initiative not it-would support

(35b) Gianni questa iniziativa non l’appoggerebbe.
John this initiative not it-would support

Thus, a weak pronoun as egli cannot be topicalized. If the topicalization approach to subject pronouns and adverbs is pursued as in (34), we thereby predict that egli could not be placed to the left of the adverb. The prediction is not carried out, witness (36a) and (36b) (Anna Cardinaletti p.c. and forthcoming).

(36a) Egli probabilmente telefonerà alle cinque
he probably will call at five

(36b) Probabilmente egli telefonerà alle cinque
probably he will call at five

(36b) can be taken care of in terms of topicalization of the adverb alone, assuming egli to be lower than the Topic Phrase. The crucial problem here is the contrast between (36a)
and (35a). Suppose that the R-subjects check or receive nominative in Spec AgrS, that AgrSP is recursive as suggested by Belletti (cf. (33)), and that the weak subject pronoun must move to PersP:

(37)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C'} \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\text{Comp} \quad \text{PersP} \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\text{Spec} \quad \text{Spec} \\
\text{Subj.} \quad \text{Gianni/} \\
\text{weak} \quad \text{probabilmente} \\
\text{pron} \\
\text{Pers} \\
\text{AgrSP}^2 \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\text{AgrS}^2 \quad \text{AgrS}^1 \\
\text{Gianni/} \\
\text{probabilmente} \\
\text{AgrS}^1
\end{array}
\]

I assume with Rizzi (1995) that Topic Phrases are in the Comp field, hence above PersP. (37) expresses the same hypothesis that I proposed for the Swedish examples in (30) above. As in the previous case, (37) offers a principled explanation for the observation that weak subject pronouns generally occur in the highest Agr projection, if the highest Agr is to be identified with PersP (cf. Cardinaletti & Starke 1995, 46 f.n. 19; Rizzi 1995, 45 f.n. 21). I assume that R-subjects may appear higher than a weak subject pronoun only if dislocated. In (35a) and (35b), thus, both the subjects and the objects are topicalized, and the contrast between (35a) and (35b) derives from the possibility to topicalize the R-subject but not the weak pronoun. In (36a), the weak subject pronoun is
in Spec Pers and the adverb in some recursion of AgrSP. In (36b) finally, the weak pronoun is in Spec Pers and the adverb is topicalized.

We have thus reached an analysis where pronominal subjects, R-subjects, and adverbs have their specific, designated positions. The differences in word order patterns are derived on the assumptions that: 1. pronominal subjects reach PersP and R-subjects AgrSP; 2. sentential adverbs occupy the specifier of AgrS; 3. AgrSP is recursive. This explanation has the advantages of giving a unified account to Swedish and Italian data, and of being compatible with Antisymmetry. The observation (made in Holmberg 1991, 1993; Cardinaletti 1994; Cardinaletti & Starke 1995, and elsewhere) that pronominal subjects move higher in the clause than R-subjects has received a principled account.

We are now in a position to repeat, for Italian, three of the conclusions that were reached for Swedish:

1. If there is a pronominal subject in the clause, this subject must reach PersP.
2. R-expressions do not move to Spec Pers but stay in Spec AgrS.
3. Since R-expressions do not reach the specifier of PersP, the checking process taking place in PersP is dissociated from nominative Case checking.

Consider the last point: I speculated in section 1.2. that the prominence of subjects in PersP is somehow related to the Nominative-Accusative character of the languages under discussion. An interesting piece of evidence in this connection comes from the distribution of pronouns in Italian participial absolute small clauses (henceforth PASC). The construction in question is illustrated in (38) and (39). In (38) an ergative past participle is followed by a subject to which it arguably assigns nominative (witness the contrast (39a)/(39b)), and in (40) a transitive past participle is followed by an object to which it assigns accusative (witness the contrast (41a)/(41b)) (examples from Belletti 1990, 89, 97, 103):

(38) Arrivata Maria, Gianni se ne andò. arrived Mary, John left

(39a) Arrivata io, …
      arrived I[nom.], …
(39b) *Arrivata me, …
      arrived me[acc.], …

(40) Conosciuta Maria, Gianni ha cambiato il suo stile di vita known Mary, John has changed his lifestyle
A salient feature of Nominative-Accusative languages is the prominence of nominative over accusative; if in a given clause structure there is only one argument to Case mark, this argument will be marked nominative. In this sense, the transitive PASC of (40) displays an unusual pattern as the single argument carries accusative.11

As for the derivation of such constructions, there are mainly two approaches in the literature that I will refer to as the asymmetric and the symmetric account. Belletti (1990) holds that the ergative participial V overtly moves to a Comp node inside the participial clause in (38), and the subject carrying nominative to the specifier of an Agr node, that I take to be AgrS since nominative is assigned:

In the transitive PASC (40), Belletti suggests that the participle moves overtly to the Agr

---

11. Rita Manzini (Class Lectures, 1994) put forth the idea that these constructions could be considered a fragment of an Ergative-Absolute Case system in the Italian grammar which is otherwise clearly of the Nominative-Accusative kind. On the syntax of PASC and a remark on Ergative-Absolute Case systems, see Cocchi (1995, 20-22, esp. f.n. 11).
head - which will be AgrO in this case - whereas the object stays in situ. V raises to C and the object to Spec Agr in LF.

(43)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{Comp} \\
\text{AgrOP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{AgrO'} \\
\text{AgrO} \\
\text{Conosciutaj} \\
\text{V} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{ti} \\
\text{DP(O)} \\
\text{Mariaj} \\
\end{array}
\]

Belletti’s account is asymmetric in the sense that it proposes two different derivations in overt syntax for (38) and (40). According to the symmetric account the participle V raises overtly to C and the lexical argument to Spec Agr in both (38) and (40); this is the view taken in Kayne (1989), Cinque (1990), and Egerland (1996).

Considering the distribution of pronouns and adverbs, there are some empirical reasons to question an asymmetric analysis of transitive and ergative PASCs. Belletti makes a distinction between different classes of adverbs in Italian and identifies a group she calls lower adverbs. An adverb like completamente ‘completely’ belongs to this category, and in Belletti’s model this implies that it is adjoined to VP (Belletti 1990, 60-67). Such an adverb can be added to the transitive PASC. Since the noun carrying accusative stays in situ according to Belletti’s asymmetric account, it is predicted that completamente can appear between the participle (in AgrO) and the object (in the complement of V), but not to the right of the object unless it right adjoins to VP.
The data do not carry out this prediction, however, and there is an interesting difference between pronominal objects and R-objects. Consider first that there is a contrast between (45a) and (45b) and that the contrast is the opposite to what the asymmetric account predicts:

(45a) Rovinato me completamente, ...
ruined me completely, ...

(45b) *Rovinato completamente me, ...
ruined completely me, ...

When the object is an R-expression, its placement appears to be optional:

(46a) Rovinata Maria completamente, ...
ruined Mary completely, ...

(46b) Rovinata completamente Maria, ...
ruined completely Mary, ...

The first conclusion to be drawn is that the object pronoun in (45a) has indeed moved in overt syntax to a position higher than the adverb.\textsuperscript{12} Consider first that the optionality

\textsuperscript{12} Anna Cardinaletti (p.c.) accepts both (i) and (ii), which are comparable to the examples (45a) and (45b) given in the text, with the difference that the pronoun must be stressed when it appears in rightward position:
illustrated in (46a) and (46b) may readily be explained on the assumptions Belletti makes for ‘sentence adverbs’ in the finite clause; they adjoin to AgrSP which is recursive. If the Italian AgrS has this property, we might of course assume that the same thing holds for AgrO in Italian participial clauses. The analyses of sentence adverbs and lower adverbs would be maximally unified if the lower adverb *completamente* is not adjoined to VP but occupies the specifier of (a recursion of) AgrOP. The analysis of (37) above would then carry over to (46a) and (46b):

\[
(47) \\
C' \\
  \text{Comp} \\
  \text{AgrOP}^2 \\
  \text{Spec} \\
  \text{Maria/} \\
  \text{completamente} \\
  \text{AgrO}^2 \\
  \text{Spec} \\
  \text{Maria/} \\
  \text{completamente} \\
  \text{AgrO}^1 \\
  \text{AgrOP}^1 \\
  \text{VP}
\]

(i) Conosciuta me completamente, ...
    known me completely, ...

(ii) Conosciuta completamente ME/*me, ...
    known completely ME/*me, ...

This state of affairs strongly resembles the difference between weak and strong pronouns in Swedish. Note that there is no such difference in reading associated with (46a) and (46b), when the object is an R-expression. The grammaticality of (i), (45a), and (46a) is already a compelling argument for an overt movement analysis if Antisymmetry is assumed.
The account of Belletti, reformulated in Antisymmetry, enables us to capture these patterns along the lines already suggested. Suppose that the R-expression as well as the adverb are in the specifier of a recursive Agr, and that the object pronoun and the participial V move higher in the structure:

(48)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{Comp} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{pron. object} \\
\text{X} \\
\text{AgrOP} \\
\end{array}
\]

The syntax of Italian past participles thus lends further support to the idea of a position in the tree higher than the Agr phrase but lower than Comp. The word order patterns attested are familiar from the above discussion, and I suggest that our previous conclusions carry over to this case. As before, PersP is the target for pronouns and not for R-expressions. The curiosity of the transitive PASC is that the patterns are attested with accusative marked objects. The transitive PASC hosts a single lexical argument which obligatorily moves to PersP if pronominal. Since R-objects do not move to Spec Pers, the checking taking place here is dissociated from accusative Case checking.

That the Person Phrase introduces a checking procedure in principle independent of Case checking is supported by a further, somewhat surprising data: it is commonly held that two lexical arguments are ungrammatical in the transitive PASC, regardless of word order:

(49a) *Salutata Maria Gianni, … greeted Mary John, …
(49b) *Salutata Gianni Maria, … greeted John Mary, …
However, it has been noticed by Rita Manzini (Class Lectures, 1994) that two lexical arguments are possible in a structure such as (50):\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{align*}
\text{(50)} & \quad \text{Restituiti } io \text{ i libri, } \\
            & \quad \text{returned[participle] } I \text{ the books, } \\
\end{align*}

The lexical subject of (50) must be pronominal. Acceptability decreases if \textit{io} is replaced by an R-subject:

\begin{align*}
\text{(51)} & \quad \text{*Restituiti } Maria \text{ i libri, } \\
            & \quad \text{returned } Mary \text{ the books, } \\
\end{align*}

If we accept that the ungrammaticality of (49a)/(49b) and (51) is due to a violation of the Case filter, it follows that the pronoun in (50) may escape the Case filter. This conclusion gives support to the idea that pronominal subjects may be endowed with lexical Case and therefore do not have to check structural nominative, unlike R-subjects. One might ask of course why this is not always possible, that is, why it is not possible to insert nominative pronouns in any structure in violation of the Case filter. In most cases however such insertion of a nominative subject would be ruled out as a violation of the $\theta$-criterion. This goes for active structures with a lexical argument carrying nominative such as \textit{*He the man is coming tonight} (which is independently excluded by binding theoretic conditions), and in the verbal passive, \textit{*He the letters were written}, under the assumption that the external argument is assigned to the passive morphology; then, the lexical subject and the passive morpheme will be in competition for the same $\theta$-role. As for the lexical pronominal subject of (50), I conclude that it is not ruled out by $\theta$-Theory. This implies that the external argument of the participial predicate in (50) is neither given to the participial morphology, nor to PRO or any other empty category in the subject position of the small clause.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{13} See also Cocchi (1995, 20 f.n. 9). The example of (50), and the contrast with (49a)/(49b) and (51), raise a problem for the accounts of Belletti (1990) and Egerland (1996). The issue was left unexplored in Egerland (1996, 186, 244 f.n. 7).

\textsuperscript{14} This analysis is coherent with the suggestion made in Egerland (1996, 269-270), that the external argument of the transitive PASC is presyntactically suppressed, and must be so because of the incapacity of the participle to structurally Case mark two lexical arguments. If, however, the external argument carries lexical Case, nothing in principle would block its being projected in syntax. In order to exclude structures such as \textit{*it is important he to understand} it must be assumed here that the
3. The Person Phrase, Verb Second, and Resumptive Clitics

The last section of this paper is dedicated to the relevance of the Person Phrase for the analysis of Verb Second phenomena and so called Clitic Left Dislocation or Topicalization, discussed by Cinque (1990) and Rizzi (1995). More precisely, I will show that there are data from historic stages of Italian that point at the presence of a projection that was the target for pronominal subjects and which had properties distinct from the canonical subject position. First, I will present some background to the problem of Clitic Left Dislocation and its properties in Old Italian as analyzed by Benincà (1994). Then I will present some new data and discuss what implications they have for the general analysis.

A well-known property of Modern Italian, and other Romance varieties, is that left dislocated or topcalized objects must be repeated by a resumptive clitic as in (52). Omission of the clitic as in (53) yields an ungrammatical structure:

(52) Questo libro, lo leggo.
    This book, (I) it[cl.]-read

(53) *Questo libro, _ leggo.
    This book, (I) read

The construction is studied by Cinque (1990; ch. 2) and Rizzi (1995) to whom the reader is referred. I will henceforth make reference to the construction as topicalization. Topicalization is different from a contrastive Focus, which does not involve a resumptive clitic:

(54) QUESTO LIBRO, leggo (e non quell’altro)
    THIS BOOK, (I) read (and not the other one)

Cinque suggests that the difference between Focus and topicalization, is that only Focus

relevant projection that hosts io in (50), the PersP, is not available in the infinitival clause. I will not speculate about this structural deficiency of the infinitive.
involves DP movement, and hence an Operator in Spec C. Topicalization constructions are not derived through movement of the dislocated DP, but through base generation of the DP in some Topic position to the left of AgrSP. In the Focus case (54), the empty category is A'-bound by the Operator and licensed as a variable. In (52) it is not, and the clitic is therefore needed, turning (52) into a clitic-trace dependency. The dependency in (53) is excluded since it can neither be interpreted as clitic-trace nor as Operator-variable.

Old and Modern are different on this point, as the resumptive clitic was not needed in Old Italian topicalization structures. In (55) (early 14th century) three topicalized nouns are not repeated by resumptive clitics:

(55)  ... gli occhi non ti _pote’ chiudere; le ferite non ti _pote’ lavare;
    your eyes I could not close (them); your wounds I could not clean (them)
    e le tue membra, che giacciono nude in terra, non ti _pote’ ricoprire...
    and your limbs, that lies naked on the ground, I could not cover (them)’

(I fatti di Enca; XXXVII)

The lack of resumptive clitics in Old Italian is brought up by Benincà (1994; ch. 10) who relates the phenomenon to the fact that Old Italian shows verb second tendencies. Benincà makes a distinction between V2 languages of a strict kind, to which Old French belongs together with many modern Germanic languages, and V2 of a broader type under which enter some historic Italian varieties (her study deals with Old Piedmontese, Old Venetian and Old Florentine). Assuming that Old Italian, as V2 languages generally, has V-movement to C in topicalization structures, the crucial difference consists in the fact that Old Italian varieties also had the property of multiple topicalization, hence a recursive Topic node. This property does not seem to be present in Old French and Modern Germanic V2 languages. Benincà proposes the following structure to capture the V2 properties of Old Italian:

(56)  ([TOP ... )[CP Spec [C V] ...]]

The availability of the leftmost (recursive) TOP position is parametrized; in Old Italian varieties it was present, in Old French and Modern Germanic it is not. The crucial observation supporting Benincà’s thesis is the following: in the Old Italian texts where a preposed object does not require a resumptive clitic, the preposed object is the only
constituent preceding the verb, or at least strictly adjacent to the verb; in either case the subject is in postverbal inverted position. If the preposed object is not adjacent to the verb, the resumptive pronoun is again found. Thus Benincà has attested structures of the kind (57a), with the object preposed and immediately adjacent to the verb, the subject in inverted position, and with no resumptive clitic. This corresponds by hypothesis to the structure (57b):

\[(57a) \ \text{DP(O), Verb, DP(S) ...} \]
\[(57b) \ [\text{CP DP(O)i [C V] [AgrS DP(S)...ti ]}] \]

The preposed DP(O) is in Spec C, a position from which it obviously A'-binds its trace, and triggers the V2 effect. In the Old Italian dialects, preposing of the object can be of the type illustrated in (57), in which case V2 is triggered. Alternatively, the object may be in a Topic position external to CP. In this case, the V2 effect is not realized (Spec C is free to be occupied by the subject); the topicalized object cannot A'-bind its trace and the resumptive object pronoun is therefore obligatory, so as to make it possible to interpret the dependency as a clitic-trace dependency. A string such as (58a) corresponds to the structure (58b):

\[(58a) \ \text{DP(O), DP(S), clitic, Verb ...} \]
\[(58b) \ [\text{TOP DP(O) [CP DP(S) [C cl+V] ...]]} \]

There are data that in an interesting way contradict the generalization expressed in (57b) and (58b). In Tuscan texts from the late 13th to the mid 14th century, constructions such as (59a)-(59g) are attested, where an object has been preposed without being copied by resumptive clitic and without triggering subject inversion. In these cases, however, the subject is pronominal.

\[(59a) \ \text{Questa parole io } _{\text{ri}} \text{ ripuosi ne la mente con grande letizia ...} \]
\[\text{these words I put in my mind with great joy} \]
\[(\text{Vita Nuova; XVIII}) \]

\[(59b) \ \text{le tue valentine } _{\text{tu}} \text{ hai sempre nella tua lingua ventosa e nelli piedi ...} \]
\[\text{your qualities you have always in your windy tongue and in the feet} \]
\[(\text{I fatti di Enea; XLVII}) \]
(59c) La tua figliuola, o ottimo padre, io accetto ...  
your daughter o great father, I accept ...  

(I fatti di Enea; LIX)

(59d) Cari e fedeli cittadini, le vostre profferte noi ...  
dear and faithful citizens, your offerings we receive gladly  

(Cronica; II:5)

(59e) ... ma il convito e le vivande ella sola volle ordinare.  
but the dinner and the food she alone wanted to order  

(Decameron; I:5)

(59f) ... e però la vostra profferta io accetto volentieri, ...  
and therefore your offer I accept willingly  

(I fioretti di San Francesco; V)

(59g) ... e questo ch’io ho ora, voi avrete ancora.  
and the one that I have now, you will have again  

(I fioretti di San Francesco; VI)

Benincà’s generalization thus holds when the subject is an R-expression, not when it is pronominal. I believe this difference between R-expressions and pronouns gives further support to the analysis proposed above.

It follows from my above argumentation that Swedish is a modern verb second language where the Person Phrase is structurally present. It is therefore of interest to know that structures such as those in (59) are ungrammatical in Swedish, see (60):

(60) *Ert anbud jag accepterar gärna.  
your offer I accept gladly

In the previous theoretic framework, it was assumed that overt verb raising could apply either to Infl or to Comp and that various cross-linguistic variations in word order could be explained on this difference. When proliferated structures are assumed in the Infl field as well as in the Comp field, we must accept that the target for V-raising may vary cross-linguistically between any of the heads contained within these two portions of structure,
that is, to any of the projections contained within the Infl field and the Comp field. Certain differences in superficial word order have been attested between Old and Modern Italian, on the one hand, and also between Old Italian and a modern V2 language such as Swedish, on the other. The most straightforward way of accounting for these differences appears to be that of assuming that V-raising is triggered to three different positions in the three grammars under discussion. Consider (61):

```
(61)  
    CP
      \  /  
     C'  
    /\  /\  
   Comp PersP 
  /\  /\  /\  
 Spec  Pers Spec
     pron. subject Pers AgrSP
       \  /  
        Spec
         R-subject
```

Suppose that the Swedish finite verb in a main clause raises to Comp in the structure (61) and that a topicalized element goes to Spec C. It then follows that a weak subject pronoun cannot appear to the left of the finite V in a topicalization structure. As for the finite V in Modern Italian, I assume that it generally targets AgrS. I thus follow the classical analysis

15. Presumably, there is at least one Topic position external to CP available also in Swedish. A construction such as (i) is possible, where the topicalized object is repeated by a weak pronoun inside the clause:

```
(i)  Ert anbud, jag accepterar det gärna
     your offer, I accept it gladly
```

The pattern is perfectly parallel with the Old Italian one as discussed by Benincà.
of differences in word order between those grammars that display verb second phenomena and those that do not. It appears that the finite verb in Old Italian targets an intermediate position, which in the present framework is likely to be the head of PersP. If this is so, the data of (59) follow. If in Old Italian an element is topicalized so as to appear in the highest portion of structure in (60) and the verb targets the head Pers, a pronominal subject that reaches the specifier of Pers will appear to the left of the verb; this is what we have attested in (59). Referential subjects are correctly predicted to remain in Spec AgrS, that is, superficially to the right of the finite V. The analysis is only adumbrated, however; it remains to be established if and how Rizzi’s (1995) analysis of the Comp field carries over to Modern Swedish and Old Italian. This issue goes far beyond my present aims.

**Conclusion**

The hypothesis of the Person Phrase permits a unified treatment of certain facts of pronominal distribution in two grammars as different as Italian and Swedish. If the result of my demonstration is interesting when a broader array of languages are taken into consideration remains to be seen. I conclude by stating that the proposal - if it would prove tenable when faced with other cross-linguistic data - would shed some light on the principles underlying pronominal syntax and the parameters of functional structure distinguishing between grammars.
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