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1. (Non emphatic) object tout ("everything"), in French, and its equivalent, in Italian, tutto, occupy different positions with respect to the past participle in compound tenses:

(1)  
a    Il a tout compris
b    *Lui ha tutto capito
c    *Il a compris tout
d    Lui ha capito tutto
    He has understood everything

Recently, it has been suggested (Belletti 1990,77ff) that this could be due not to a difference in the position of the object quantifier (which could, then, be taken to occupy the same A'-position at S-structure in the two languages), but rather to the different location of the past participle, which is known to move further to the left in Italian than in French (Cf. Pollock 1989, 411ff, Belletti 1990,78).\(^1\)

(2)  
a    Il a \[
      \begin{array}{l}
        \text{tout}\_j \[ \text{compris}\_tj\_j ]
      \end{array}
    \]

    b    Lui ha capito\_i \[
      \begin{array}{l}
        \text{tutto}\_i \[ \text{ti}\_j \_j ]
      \end{array}
    \]

Indirect support for this analysis comes from another set of facts to be discussed here which also suggest that tutto in Italian moves (may move) leftward in the syntax.
2. Consider the following contrasts:

(3)  a   Gli parve tutto facile  
       To-him appeared everything easy  
    b  *Gli parve qualcosa facile  
       To-him appeared something easy  

(4)  a   Credo che sia tutto in ordine, finalmente  
       I think that is everything in order, at last  
    b  *Credo che sia qualcosa in ordine, finalmente  
       I think that is something in order, at last

In (3)-(4), it is the grammaticality of the a. cases that is surprising, not the ungrammaticality of the b. cases. For it is known that in Italian (perhaps generally) no case is available to the subject of a small clause complement to a raising verb (see Burzio 1986, sect.2.4, and Belletti 1988,27f for an account)\(^2\).

To be assigned (nominative) Case, the small clause subject must either raise to the specifier position of the matrix Agreement ((5)a), or be in the "inverted subject" position of the small clause ((5)b), another case assignment position in Italian: \(^3\)

(5)  a   Qualcosa gli parve [ t facile ]  
       Something to-him appeared easy  
    b   Gli parve [ e facile qualcosa ]  
       To-him appeared easy something

This implies that _tutto_ in (3)a/(4)a does not fill the small clause pre-predicate subject position. Otherwise, the contrast with (3)b/(4)b would remain unexplained.

The contrast directly follows, instead, if _tutto_ has one more possibility than ordinary lexical DPs; namely, if it can (perhaps, must) move to an A’ position of scope already at S-structure.

Note that the origin of such movement cannot be the pre-predicate subject position of the small clause (cf. (6)a), as the trace would not be Case marked, just as _qualcosa_ in (3b/4b) is not. The origin of the leftward movement of _tutto_ can however be the "inverted subject" position occupied by _qualcosa_ in (5b), as indicated in (6)b:

(6)  a  (*) Gli parve tutto [ tj facile ]  
    b   Gli parve tutto [ e facile tj ]

The French equivalent of (3)a is instead ungrammatical (cf. (7)), since the putative sources of the movement of _touts_ are both ungrammatical. See (8)a-b:

(7)   *Il lui semblait tout facile  
(8)  a   *Il lui semblait quelque chose facile  
    b  *Il lui semblait facile quelque chose
3. What remains to be determined is the S-structure A'-position of tutto in (3)-(4), and, more generally, the factor that allows tutto (and tout) to move to one such position at S-structure, in contrast to other DPs (cf. Kayne 1975, chapter 1). I take up the two questions in turn.

Concerning the first, one may note that (non-emphatic) tutto and tout precede a (temporal) VP initial adverb in both Italian and French, modulo the past participle's position, which is further to the left in Italian:

(9) a I bambini hanno detto tutto subito alla mamma
    b Les enfants ont tout dit immédiatement a leur mere

The children have told everything immediately to their mother

In this light, consider the following two sentences:

(10) a Gli e' parso subito tutto facile
    To-him appeared immediately everything easy
    b Gli e' parso tutto subito facile
    To-him appeared everything immediately easy

In (10)a, but not in (10)b, subito modifies the matrix verb ("everything immediately appeared to him easy"), which suggests that in (10)a, though not in (10)b, the adverb is located in the Spec of the matrix VP. This, in turn, implies that tutto has not moved to the same (Spec) position hosting object tutto in the participial phrase, to the left of the VP adverb (cf. (9)a and b). Otherwise, (10)b, in which tutto is to the left of the adverb, should also allow for the same reading. But (10)b only admits the reading in which the adverb modifies the adjective, suggesting that it has not left the adjectival small clause ("Everything appeared to him immediately easy").

If subito in (10)b is in the Spec of the functional head selecting the AP, tutto has presumably moved to the Spec of a higher functional phrase:

(11) ... parso [AGR... [Fptutto]_ [Fpsubito]_ [AP ti] facile ...

Consider the second question. Why can tout/tutto and no other quantifier or quantified DP move leftward to an A'-position?

(12) a Lui ha apprezzato tutto molto
    b *quelcosa
    c *qualcuno
    d *tutti i libri

He appreciated everything/something/someone/all the books much

(13) a Il a tout vu
    b *quelche chose
    c *quelqu'un
    d *tous ces livres

He has everything/something/someone/all these books seen
As observed by Kayne (1984, chapter 4), contrasts such as (14)a-b suggest that the trace of *tout (tutto), as opposed to that of the clitic, is a variable since it does not need to be locally bound.6

(14) a Marie a tout; voulu faire t
Marie has everything wanted to do
b *Marie l’a voulu faire t
Marie it has wanted to do

The A'-position occupied by *tout/tutto at S-structure, however, must not be a position open to any (quantificational) XP. Otherwise, one would not expect the asterisks of (12/13). This is especially true of qualcosa/qualcuno in Italian, which can bind a variable from one such position: the A'-position of the "Clitic Left Dislocation" construction. See (15) and the discussion in Cinque (1990, chapter 2):

(15) a Qualcosa, credo che faranno
Something, I think they will do
b Qualcuno, troverò
Someone, I’ll find

We would have an answer if only *tout/tutto, among XPs, could move to what appears to be an adverbial-like A'-position (as Kayne 1975, sect. 1.3, originally suggested), while retaining their ability to bind a variable (a nominal-like expression).

Here, I will suggest a possible implementation of this idea, elaborating on a suggestion made in Cinque (1986).

Something that uniquely characterizes tutto/-i/-a/-e 'all masc. sing./ masc.pl. / fem.sing./ fem.pl.' is that it takes a full DP as its complement, itself being the head of a distinct QP projection ([QPtutto [DP libri]] 'all the book'; [QPtutti [DPi libri]] 'all the books', etc.). See Giusti (1991), and Bianchi (1992) for evidence that tutto/-i/-a/-e is a head embedding a DP and Shlonsky (1991) for similar conclusions concerning its analog in Hebrew.

Both DPs and QPs act as arguments, hence as variables as well. See (16)a-b:

(16) a [DPi LIBRI], ha letto [DP]
The books (focus) he/she has read
b [QP TUTTI [DPi LIBRI]], ha letto [QP]
All the books (focus) he/she has read

In (16)b, the QP qualifies as an "extended projection" of N, in the sense of Grimshaw (1991) (after receiving +N,-V features from its complement via percolation).7

If only QPs could freely occur in the adverbial-like L-tous position (as well as in argument position), because they alone can be categorically neutral between a nominal (i.e. +N,-V) projection and an adverbial-like projection, we would have part of the answer for (12/13).8 First, the b and c cases would be excluded as they contain a DP, not a QP, in the L-tous position.
The difference between (12a) on one side and (12d) and (17) below, on the other, would also follow if in (12a) *tutto is a bare QP, unspecified for the features +/-N, +/-V, while in the latter two cases the QP head, as a consequence of taking a +N,-V complement, from which it inherits the features, becomes a nominal projection. See (18) and (19): 9

(12a) Lui ha apprezzato tutto molto
He appreciated everything much
(12d) *Lui ha apprezzato tutti i libri molto
He appreciated all the books much
(17) (A proposito di quei libri) *Lui ha apprezzato tutti molto
(Concerning those books) He appreciated all much
(18) ... apprezzato [QP tutti [DP libri ]] molto
+[N,-V] [+N,-V]
(19) ... apprezzato [QP tutti [DP ]] molto
+[N,-V] [+N,-V]

That *tutto in (12a) is a bare QP (with no DP complement, and with default neuter agreement) is supported by the following observation: when *tutto is followed by the overt neuter pro-DP *cio’ ‘it’, it cannot move to the L-tous position. Thus (12a) (see (20a)) sharply contrasts with (20b): 10

(20a) Lui ha apprezzato [QPtutto] molto [QP ]
(20b) *Lui ha apprezzato [QPtutto [DPcio’ ]] molto [QP ]
He appreciated all it much

The same holds for subject *tutto. See (3a), repeated here as (21a), and (21b):

(21a) Gli parve [tutto]i facile ti
To him appeared all (everything) easy
(21b) *Gli parve [tutto cio’]i facile ti
To him appeared all it (everything) easy

Notice that (21a) is interpreted differently from (22), which contains a “floating” instance of *tutto:

(22) Cio’ gli parve tutto facile
It to-him appeared all easy

In (22), *tutto can only be interpreted as ‘entirely’, not as ‘everything’. Of course, this interpretation (alongside the ‘everything’ interpretation) is also available in (21a) given the possibility, in Italian, of moving the null counterpart of the overt neuter pronominal *cio’ to the Spec of the matrix AGRP.
But this suggests that the analysis of (21a) cannot be reduced to a simple floating quantifier analysis along the lines of (22) with a null *ciao*. If that were the case, (21a) should have only the ‘entirely’ reading, contrary to fact.

The fact that other (apparently bare) neuter quantifiers such as molto, poco, troppo, etc. cannot occur in the L-to-S position (cf. (23)-(24)), would follow if these obligatorily required a complement DP:

\[(23)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{Diede} \quad \begin{cases} \text{tutto} \\ *\text{moltos} \\ *\text{poco} \\ *\text{troppos} \end{cases} \quad \text{subito ai poveri} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Gli parve} \quad \begin{cases} \text{tutto} \\ *\text{moltos} \\ *\text{poco} \\ *\text{troppos} \end{cases} \quad \text{facile} \\
\end{align*}
\]
He/she gave everything/much/little/too much to the poor
To him appeared everything/much/little/too much easy

This need not be stipulated. Differently from tutto/i/a/e, which transmits to the DP the case it receives, indefinite Qs assign partitive case (see Cardinaletti and Giusti 1991), and this must presumably be discharged on a DP.\(^{11}\)

The above evidence only showed that (non-emphatic) tutto in Italian can move to an A’-position at S-structure (presumably anticipating in the syntax what must in any event happen in Logical Form, where quantifiers have to move to scope positions). Whether it must remains still to be determined.

FOOTNOTES

* I thank Adriana Belletti, Paola Benincà, Anna Cardinaletti, Richard Kayne and Cecilia Poletto for helpful comments and criticism.

1. For empirical evidence that (non-emphatic) object tutto occupies, at S-structure, a position to the left of its base position, see Belletti (1990), incorporating suggestions by Kayne and Rizzi, and Rizzi (1991).

Evidence that past participles move further to the left in Italian than in French is provided by their positioning with respect to certain negative adverbs, such as più ‘plus (“anymore”)’ (Cf. Pollock 1989, sect. 6.3, Belletti 1990, 77ff), at least under the reasonable assumption that such adverbs are, for scope reasons, generated in the same base position in the two languages, and are not moved in one but not the other language:

\[(i)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{Non ho mangiato più} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Je n’ai plus mangé} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Additional evidence to the same effect comes from the distribution of floating quantifiers (FQ). Sportiche (1988,427) notes that in a French sentence consisting of an auxiliary, a participle and an object, a FQ can be found between the auxiliary and the participle ((ii)a), but not between the participle and the object ((ii)b):

\[(ii)\]
(ii) a  Les enfants ont tous vu ce film
    The children have all seen this film
b  *Les enfants ont vu tous ce film
    The children have seen all this film

Sentences corresponding to (ii)b in Italian are instead perfectly grammatical:

(iii)  I bambini hanno visto tutti questo film
    The children have seen all this film

Once again, this can be taken not as an additional independent difference between the two languages but simply as another manifestation of the same abstract difference: the participle can move further to the left in Italian than in French, only in the former crossing over the FQ, as it does over the negative adverb in (i).

2. Standard cases showing this restriction are:

(i) a  *Sembrano [molti studenti intelligenti]
    Seem many students intelligent
b  *Sono [molti studenti intelligenti]
    Are many students intelligent
Belletti's account is based on the unaccusative character of raising verbs and on the assumption that unaccusative verbs assign inherent case; hence only to DPs which are thematically related to them (cf. Chomsky 1986). Since the subject of the small clause complement of the unaccusative verb is not thematically related to it, and does not receive case from anything else, it is in violation of the Case Filter.

3. On analogy with full clauses, I assume that case assignment to the inverted subject position of the small clause in (5)b is by the (abstract) head T(ense) (cf. Roberts 1991 for discussion). 'e', an expletive pronounal, also needs case, and may receive it if it raises to the matrix subject position. Whence the contrast between (i)a and b:

(i) a  [ e; sembrano [ t; esser arrivati molti]]
    Seem to be arrived many
b  *[[ e esser arrivati molti] e' preoccupante]
    To be arrived many is worrying

4. On the DP (Determiner Phrase) analysis of NPs, cf. Abney (1987), Longobardi (1991) and references cited there. In French, rien 'nothing' too moves in the syntax. Clear evidence that niente, its equivalent in Italian, moves leftward in the syntax is however lacking. V.:

(i) a  *Non ci pare niente in ordine
    Not to us seems nothing in order
   'Nothing seems to us in order'
b  *Non apprezza niente molto (cf. Apprezza tutto molto)
    He/she does not appreciate nothing much

Also see Belletti (1990,138,fn.72).

5. Tutto follows loro in the small clause (i) as it does in the full clause (ii):

(i) a  Non so se sia loro tutto chiaro
I do not know whether is them(DAT) everything clear  
b  *Non so se sia tutto loro chiaro  
I do not know whether is everything them(DAT) clear
(ii)  
a Diremo loro tutto bene  
We will tell them(DAT) everything well  
b  *Diremo tutto loro bene  
We will tell everything them(DAT) well

It is not clear what prevents *tutto in (10) from moving ‘successive cyclically’ to the higher position it could fill in the participial phrase, thus making (10b) acquire the reading of (10a), in which the adverb modifies the matrix verb. Some factor appears to make leftward movement of *tutto in Italian clause bound, as is overtly visible from the following systematic contrasts with French:

(iii)  
a J'ai tout voulu faire  
b  *Ho voluto tutto fare  
I have everything wanted to do
(iv)  
a ?Il faut tout que tu fasses  
b  *Bisogna tutto che tu faccia  
It is necessary everything that you do

Parallel contrasts involve the leftward movement of *tous and of certain ‘VP-initial’ adverbs (Kayne 1975,chapter 1, fn. 29; Kayne 1991, fn. 23), suggesting the existence of a single deep-seated difference between the two languages:

(v)  
a Il a tous fallu qu'on les lise  
b  *Ci e' tutti voluto che li leggessimo  
It has all been necessary that we read them
(vi)  
a J'ai mal dò raccomodare  
b  *Ho male dovuto riapprendere  
I have had to hang up badly

This remains as an open problem.

6. The fact, noted in Obenauer (1992), that tout does not license parasitic gaps from the L-tous position (*Il a tout envoyé à sans relire e ‘He has everything sent without checking’) is not problematic for the A’ status of that position if parasitic gaps have pronominal features (cf. Cinque 1990, chapter 3) incompatible with tout (cf. *Tout est tombé parce qu'il était mal attaché ‘Everything fell because it was hitched up badly’ - from Kayne 1975,1.3).

7. See also Abney’s (1987) notion of f-selection

8. Concerning the feature content of such a projection, we can assume for concreteness, and begging certain questions, that Q is U(nspecified) N, U(nspecified) V.

That QPs can possibly inherit categorial features from their complements (with important limitations, in Italian) is indicated by the fact that they can be ‘extended Ns’ (tutti i libri ‘all the books’), ‘extended A’s’ (una casa tutta sporca ‘a house all dirty’) and even ‘extended Ps’ (E’ piovuto tutto dentro ‘it rained all inside’). In French, though not in Italian, they can in certain cases be extended adverbs (J'ai marché tout doucement ‘I walked quite slowly’).

9. The DP complement in (17)/(19) is presumably necessitated to host a pronominal, required for interpretive reasons. In addition to transmitting its +N,-V features to QP (hence rendering the QP unsuitable for the L-tous position), this pro also fails to be properly identified.
Notice that *Lui ha apprezzato tutti molto* 'He has appreciated all much' is grammatical with a (necessarily) arbitrary human interpretation. In the present context, this implies that the Q takes no DP complement, acquiring, as a consequence of that, a default human interpretation. Independent evidence for this assumption is discussed in Belletti and Rizzi (1981, fn.9) and Cinque (1986, fn.12). I differ here from Cinque (1988, fn.36).

10. As Cardinaletti (1991, fn.19) notes, *tutto* can be preceded by a specifier such as *quasi* 'almost':

   (i)  Lui ha apprezzato quasi tutto molto  
       He appreciated almost all much

Thus, the unacceptability of (20b) cannot be imputed to heaviness factors. (i) also suggests that *tutto* in the L-*tous* position is not a head (Q) but a full XP (QP), as Cardinaletti observes, with its specifier optionally filled (cf. (i) vs. (12a)).

11. If Sportiche's (1988) analysis of FQs as Qs "stranded" under NP- and Clitic-movement is correct, then the well-formedness of (i)-(ii), which contain QP with a DP complement in the L-*tous* position, requires a modification of the analysis assumed in the text.

   (i)  [ppl bambini] sono stati apprezzati [qgntti [p]] molto [qp]  
       The children have been appreciated all much
   (ii) Noi li abbiamo apprezzati [qgntti [p]] molto [qp]  
       We them have appreciated all much

The relevant generalization can no more be that only bare (intransitive) QPs can fill the L-*tous* position by virtue of their non-distinctness with adverbial phrases. What distinguishes *tutto* from floating *tutti* (and floating *tutto*) is that the former, though not the latter, has to bind a variable.

Capitalizing on this difference, it could be suggested, then that the generalization is that the XP in L-*tous* position may not have a complement just in case it must bind a variable.

A possible reason for it is that the L-*tous* position counts as an operator position only when it is filled by an U(nspecified)N, U(nspecified)V QP, namely, when the QP is not an extended projection of N. Movement of [qgQ [pp]] to the L-*tous* position, an A'-position, must occur after DP-movement has stranded the Q. For relevant discussion, see Cardinaletti (1991, fn.23).
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