"Restructuring" and Functional Structure

1. Introduction

In what follows I would like to show how the articulated functional structure of the clause suggested in Cinque (1999) may shed new light on the "restructuring" phenomenon (Rizzi 1976a,b; 1978) and perhaps afford a deeper understanding of it. In the past twenty-five years, numerous analyses have been proposed to explain why certain phenomena that are otherwise clause-bound [such as Clitic Placement—see (1)] appear to be able to span over two clauses when the matrix verb is either a modal, an aspectual, or a motion verb and the complement is nonfinite [see the "climbing" of the clitic in (2)]:

(1)  a. *Lo detesto [vedere t in quello stato] ‘(I) him detest seeing in that state’
    b. *Lo ammetto [di conoscere t appena] ‘(I) him admit to barely know’
    c. *Lo rinuncio [ad avere t per me] ‘(I) it give up having for me’

(2)  a. Lo volevo [vedere t subito]‘(I) him wanted to see immediately’ (modal)
    b. Lo finisco [di vedere t domani]‘(I) it finish to see tomorrow’ (aspectual)
    c. Lo vengo [a prendere t domani]‘(I) it come to fetch tomorrow’ (motion)

Even if each of the proposed analyses captures one or another aspect of restructuring, it is fair to say that none of them manages to answer the two most basic questions that the phenomenon raises; namely, why it should exist at all, and why it should exist with those particular verb classes (modal, aspectual, and motion). The fact that
one finds transparency phenomena comparable to Clitic Climbing language after language, and with the same set of verbs (or subsets thereof), suggests that the phenomenon is universal and should thus follow from some general property of UG. Here I would like to propose an analysis that derives its universality and answers at the same time the two basic questions just mentioned. The analysis is a natural extension of proposals made in Cinque (1999), where, on the basis of the relative order of functional morphemes in head position and of the corresponding classes of AdvPs, I suggested that the functional portion of the clause, in all languages, is constituted by the same, richly articulated and rigidly ordered, hierarchy of functional projections, a subset of which is shown in (3):  

\[(3)\quad \text{MoodP} \_\text{speech act} > \text{MoodP} \_\text{evaluative} > \text{MoodP} \_\text{evidential} > \text{ModP} \_\text{epistemic} > \text{TP} \_\text{(Past)} > \text{TP} \_\text{(Future)} > \text{MoodP} \_\text{irrealis} > \text{ModP} \_\text{aesthetic} > \text{AspP} \_\text{habitual} > \text{AspP} \_\text{repetitive(I)} > \text{AspP} \_\text{frequentative(I)} > \text{ModP} \_\text{volitional} > \text{AspP} \_\text{polarative(I)} > \text{TP} \_\text{(Anterior)} > \text{AspP} \_\text{terminative} > \text{AspP} \_\text{continuative} > \text{AspP} \_\text{perspective} > \text{AspP} \_\text{proximate} > \text{AspP} \_\text{durative} > \text{AspP} \_\text{generic/progressive} > \text{AspP} \_\text{perspective} > \text{ModP} \_\text{obligation} > \text{ModP} \_\text{permission/ability} > \text{AspP} \_\text{completerive} > \text{VoiceP} > \text{AspP} \_\text{rerative(I)} > \text{AspP} \_\text{repetitive(I)} > \text{AspP} \_\text{frequentative(I)}\]

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

In previous work (Cinque 2001, 2002a, originally written and circulated in 1997, and Cinque 1998), I had suggested that this striking correspondence rendered the following hypothesis appealing: only those verbs that happen to match semantically the content of a certain functional head admit of two distinct possibilities. They are either regular verbs, heading a VP [in which case they take a fullfledged sentential complement (CP)—cf. (4a)], or functional verbs, directly inserted in the head position of the corresponding functional projection (cf. (4b)):  

\[(4)\quad a. \quad [\text{CP} \ldots [\text{FP} \ldots [\text{FP} \ldots [\text{FP} \ldots [\text{VP} \_\text{V received} \_\text{V}]]]])] 
   b. \quad [\text{CP} \ldots [\text{FP} \ldots [\text{FP} \ldots [\text{VP} \_\text{V}]]]]\]

Following the received opinion, I had also assumed that the presence or absence of transparency effects reduced to two mutually exclusive options: the obligatory presence of transparency effects in the monoclausal structure (4b) and the obligatory absence of transparency effects in the biclausal structure (4a).  

Here, after arguing that when transparency effects obtain, “restructuring” verbs are functional verbs in a monoclausal configuration (sections 2–5), I will explore the stronger and at first sight more difficult claim that they are always functional verbs in a monoclausal configuration (even in the variant that shows no transparency effects—section 6). This implies that restructuring verbs have no other option but to enter structure (4b) (ultimately, a consequence of their corresponding to the semantic content of a distinct functional head). This also requires interpreting the differences between the variant with and the variant without transparency effects in a different manner (section 7).  

2. The constituency issue

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

(5)  
\[ \text{a. } [\text{CP } \text{io } [\text{CP } \text{a parlarti di questi problemi }]] \text{ RESTUCTURING } \rightarrow \]  
\( \text{I will come to talk-to-you about these problems.} \)  
\[ \text{b. } [\text{CP } \text{io } [\text{VP } \text{ti verrà a parlare} \text{ di questi problemi }]] \]  

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

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

(6)  
\[ [\text{CP } \text{io } [\text{AndativeP } \text{ti verrà } [\text{VP } \text{a parlare } \text{di questi problemi }]]] \]  

This requires reassessing the arguments brought forth by Rizzi (1976a, 1978) in support of the constituency in (5b). He shows, for example, that when transparency effects obtain a number of operations apparently cease to apply to the sequence formed by the embedded verb and its complements, taking this to support the derived structure (5b). Let us consider these cases in turn.

2.1. Cleft Sentence Formation

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

(7)  
\[ \text{a. E’ proprio a parlarti di questi problemi che verrà} \]  
\( \text{‘It’s just to talk to-you about these problems that he’ll come.’} \)  
\[ \text{b. ‘E’ proprio a parlare di questi problemi che } \text{ti verrà} \]  

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

(8)  
\[ \text{a. A parlare dei suoi problemi, ti verrà! Vedrai,} \]  
\( \text{‘To speak about his problems (focus), he’ll to-you come! You’ll see’} \)  
\[ \text{b. portare a casa, lo voleva! ‘Take home (focus), he it wanted’} \]  
\[ \text{c. Leggere a tutti, non } \text{lo potevo ‘Read to everybody, I it couldn’t’} \]  

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

(9)  
  a.*Era bella che sembrava  
      It was beautiful that she seemed  
  b.*E' completamente che l'ha rovinato  
      It is completely that he ruined it  
  c.*E' tutti che li ha visti  
      It is all that he saw them  

(10)  
  a.*E' parlato di questo che (gli) avrà  
       'It's spoken about this that he (to-him) will have'  
  b.*Era parlando di questo che (gli) stavo  
       'It's speaking about this that I (to-him) was'  
  c.*E' stato portato a casa che è  
       'It's been taken home that he has'  

(11)  
  a. BELLA, sembrava  
       'Beautiful (focus), she seemed'  
  b. COMPLETAMENTE, l'ha rovinato  
       'Completely (focus), he ruined it'  
  c. Tutti, non li ha visti  
       'All, he hasn't seen them'  

(12)  
  a. PARLATO DI QUESTO, (gli) avrà!  
       'Spoken about this (focus), he (to-him) will have'  
  b. PARLANDO DI QUESTO, (gli) stavo!  
       'Speaking about this (focus), (to-him) I was'  
  c. Portato a casa, non era stato, ancora  
       'Taken home, he hadn't been, yet'  
  d. ?Stato portato a casa, non era, ancora  
       'Been taken home, he hadn't, yet'  

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

2.2. Right Node Raising

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

(13)  
  a. Piero voleva—ma francamente adesso non so se vorrà ancora—parlarne con Gianni  
       'P. wanted to—but frankly now I don't know if he still will—speak about it with G.'  
  b.*Piero ne voleva—ma francamente adesso non so se ne vorrà ancora—parlare con Gianni  
       'P. about it wanted to—but frankly now I don't know if he still will—speak about it with G.'
Once again this would seem to follow from the assumption that in the presence of Clitic Climbing the embedded verb and its complement do not form a constituent. But this conclusion is not necessary. Another possibility exists, which is compatible with the idea that the embedded verb continues to form a constituent with its complements.\textsuperscript{9}

In the framework in which Rizzi (1976a, 1978) was working, Right Node Raising was considered a rightward movement rule (cf. Postal 1974: 125–128). More recently, Kayne (1994: 67f.), following Wexler and Culicover (1980: 298ff.), has proposed to reinterpret it as a deletion rule deleting under identity the lefthand copy of the "raised" phrase: \textit{Piero voleva parlare con Gianni—ma francamente adesso non so se vorrà ancora—parlarne con Gianni}. The following contrasts between Italian and English indeed appear to support Kayne’s reinterpretation of Right Node Raising. As noted in Napoli (1981: 846), Right Node Raising of the complement of an auxiliary is impossible in Italian. See (14):

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

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

(15) Tony should have—and Pete probably would have—called Grace (Postal 1974: 126)

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

(16) a. Have you called John? Yes. I have______
   b. Hai chiamato John? *Si. Ho______

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

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

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

(18)  a. Fra qualche giorno, verrò ad esporti la mia idea a Firenze  'In a few days, I'll come to explain to-you my idea in Florence.'
       b. Fra qualche giorno, verrò a Firenze ad esporti la mia idea  'In a few days, I'll come to Firenze to explain to-you my idea.'

Rizzi (1976a, 1978) notes that this movement is no longer possible if Clitic Climbing has applied [cf.(19)], taking this to suggest that *ad esporre la mia idea* in (19b) cannot be moved because after Restructuring it is no longer a constituent:

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

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

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

Thus it seems that there is no reason to abandon the idea that the embedded infinitival and its complements form a constituent when transparency effects obtain, and hence no particular reason to assume that the "restructuring" and the infinitival verb come to form a complex predicate (cf. Hinterhölzl 1999 for a similar conclusion concerning the "restructuring" construction of Germanic).11

2.4. Aux-to-COMP

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

(21)  a. Non potendolo [egli restituire a nessuno] ‘Not being able it he to give back to anybody’
    b. *Non potendolo restituire [egli a nessuno] ‘Not being able it to give back he to anybody’

(22)  a. Ritenevamo non doverne [egli parlare neanche con voi] ‘We thought not to have he to talk not even with you’
    b. *Ritenevamo non doverne parlare [egli neanche con voi] ‘We thought not to have to talk he not even with you’

3. Monoclausality versus biclausality

In this section I examine some potential evidence (in addition to that recently discussed in Wurmbrand 1998, 2001) for the monoclausal nature of the construction when transparency effects obtain (sections 3.1–3.2), and consider in section 3.3 some of the apparent evidence for its biclausal nature, concluding that it is unconvincing.

3.1. Prohibition against using the same adverb twice

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

(23)  a. Maria vorrebbe *già* averlo *già* lasciato
       Mary would already want to have already left him.
    b. *Maria lo vorrebbe *già* aver *già* lasciato (Clitic Climbing)

(24)  a. Si vorrebbe *sempre* aver *sempre* esperienze come queste
       One would always want to always have experiences like these.
    b. *Esperienze come queste si vorrebbero *sempre* aver *sempre* (Long NP-Movement)

(25)  a. Maria verrà *già* esser loro *già* stata presentata
       M. will already want to have to-them already been introduced.
    b. *Maria verrà loro *già* esser *già* stata presentata (*Loro* Climbing)

(26)  a. Gianni *avrebbe sempre* voluto arrivare *sempre* tra i primi
       G. would always have liked to always arrive among the first.
    b. *Gianni *sarebbe sempre* voluto arrivare *sempre* tra i primi (Auxiliary Selection)
The contrast becomes understandable if the (a) variants contain two clauses and the (b) variants are strictly monoclausal.  

3.2. The relative order of “restructuring” verbs

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

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

(27)  a. ?Certe cose, le si suole tendere ad evitare ‘Certain things, them one usually tends to avoid.’
    b. *Certe cose, le si tende a solere evitare ‘Certain things, them one tends to usually avoid.’

When tendere and volere ‘want’ co-occur, the order is rigidly tendere > volere, in turn suggesting the order Asppredispositional > Modvolitional:

(28)  a. Lo tenderebbe a volere fare sempre lui ‘He would tend to want to always do it he himself.’
    b. *Lo vorrebbe tendere a fare sempre lui ‘He would want to tend to always do it he himself.’

When volere and smettere ‘stop’ (related to what in other languages is a Terminative Aspect suffix or particle) co-occur, the order is volere > smettere, suggesting the order of heads: Modvolitional > Aspterminative.

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

A final example here (see Cinque 2001 for a more systematic investigation of these orderings) is the relative order of smettere and continuare ‘continue,’ the latter corresponding to the Continuative Aspect head morphology found in many languages. When they co-occur the order is smettere > continuare, once again suggestive of the order of heads: Aspterminative > Aspcontinuative.16

(30)  a. ?La smise di continuare a importunare ‘(He) her stopped continuing to bother’
    b. *La continuò a smettere di importunare ‘(He) her continued to stop bothering’
Putting together the various relative orders, one arrives at the order of verbs in (31), corresponding to the order of functional heads shown in (32): 17

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

(32) Asp_{habitual} > Asp_{predispositional} > Mod_{volitional} > Asp_{terminative} > Asp_{continuative} 18

3.3. Apparent cases of transparency effects across CP

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

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

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

As Rizzi himself (n. 38) observes (cf. also Napoli 1981: 855; Moore 1994: n. 3; Rooryck 1994: 420ff.; etc.), the productivity of the construction is, however, severely limited. Among the predicates that take embedded interrogatives, only sapere (come) ‘know (how)’ allows it [compare (33) with (34)], and even it has various limitations [cf. (35)]:

(34) a. *Me lo chiedevo come fare ‘I myself it wondered how to do’
     b. *Gli si domanda che cosa dare ‘He himself to-him asks what to give’
     c. *Me lo ha detto a chi dare ‘He to-me it told to whom to give’

(35) a. *Non ne saprei quando parlare ‘Of-it I wouldn’t know when to speak’ (cf. Rizzi 1978: n. 38)
     b. *[ . . . ] non lo saprei se consigliare o no
     ‘I him wouldn’t know whether to advise or not’ (Rizzi 1978: n. 38)
     c. *Non lo saprei perché fare ‘I it wouldn’t know why to do’

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

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

In sum, the very selective nature of Clitic Climbing across a wh-CP in mental ability contexts and the interpretation of it just sketched render the argument based on (33) for the biclausal character of restructuring very dubious. If anything, the properties of (33) point, once again, to the functional nature of the verb, a modal (and to the monoclausal character of the construction).


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

(36) a. Voggyu (ku) lu kkattu
   (I) want (I) it buy ‘I want to buy it’

   b. Lu voggyu (*ku) kkattu
   (I) it want (I) buy

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

(37) a. Milan želi da ga vidi
   M. want-3sg particle him see-3sg

   b. ŠMilan ga želi da vidi
   M. him want-3sg particle see-3sg
   ‘M. wishes to see him.’

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

First, in both Salentino and Serbo-Croatian, the apparently finite embedded verb of (36) and (37) displays severe restrictions on its form: it can only appear in the present tense, which is equal to the verb stem plus person and number agreement. In particular, no past (or periphrastic) tense forms are possible:\(^{22}\)

(38) a. *Lu vulia kattavu (Salentino—Andrea Calabrese, personal communication)
   It wanted-1sg bought-1sg ‘I wished I bought it.’

   b. *Ja bih ga voleo da sam posetio (Serbo-Croatian—Lijiljana Progovac, personal communication)
   I would him like PART be-1sg visited ‘I would like to have visited him.’
   (Cf. Ja bih voleo da sam ga posetio ‘I would like to have visited him.’)
This is unexpected in a biclausal analysis of such structures. But it makes sense in an analysis in which particle + stem agreement is treated as a surrogate form of infinitive (itself absent, or highly restricted, in these varieties). In fact, it is tempting to view agreement here as nothing other than a way to render the stem a well-formed morphological word. If so, the possibility arises again of viewing the sequence (particle +) stem-agreement as part of one and the same clause with the restructuring verb (in which case the observed unavailability of past tense on the embedded verb would follow from the fact that this is already marked on the restructuring verb or higher up).

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

(39) a. Milan želi da ga ON vidi ‘M. wishes HE HIMSELF to see him’
    b. *Milan ga želi da ON vidi ‘M. him wishes HE HIMSELF to see’

While unexpected under a biclausal analysis of “restructuring”/Clitic Climbing, the contrast follows from the monoclausal one proposed in the next section, where evidence is provided that even apparently ‘control’ verbs such as ‘want’ inherit, in “restructuring” contexts, their subject from the embedded lexical verb (as happens with auxiliaries). Under such a monoclausal analysis, (39b) is bad because either Milan or ON, but not both, can be generated in the subject position of the embedded verb vidi (Stjepanović 2001 also argues for the monoclausal character of both (37a and b)).

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

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

4.1. The unavailability of internal arguments

Kayne (1989b: 248) observes, “Virtually all the standard cases of clitic climbing are cases of subject control or raising. What is conspicuously absent is object control.” He takes his analysis of “restructuring” in terms of INFL raising from the embedded to the matrix clause (via COMP) to provide the required explanation. As INFL is coindexed with its Spec (containing the subject DP), the embedded INFL raising to the higher INFL will force coindexation of the lower with the higher subject. In object control structures, however, there would be “two AGR whose respective subjects are themselves not essentially coindexed.”
The analysis developed here instead takes the absence of object-control restructuring verbs to be a special case of a more general phenomenon, namely, the fact that no verb with an object complement (i.e., assigning a thematic role) can be used as a functional verb. This more stringent condition indeed appears to predict the non-existence of cases that the I-to- (C-to-) I hypothesis does not exclude.

Consider the case of a raising verb that can optionally take a complement. Sembrare ‘seem’ in Italian is such a verb:

(40) a. Gianni non sembra apprezzarlo ‘G. does not seem to appreciate it.’
   b. Gianni non ci sembra apprezzarlo ‘G. does not seem to us to appreciate it.’

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

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

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

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

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

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

(43) a. Ne sono venuti molti a portarti un regalo?
   Of-them are come many to bring to-you a present
   ‘Did many come to bring you a present?’
   b.*Te ne sono venuti molti a portare un regalo?
   To-you of-them are many to bring a present
   ‘Did many come to bring you a present?’
Again, in the I-to- (C-to-) I analysis it is not clear why Clitic Climbing should be blocked in this case, as the matrix and the embedded subjects are coinixed. The intervention of material between the “restructuring” and the embedded verb in (43b) should not matter. Various cases of intervening material, documented in the literature, do not block Clitic Climbing (see Napoli 1981: 865f.; Aissen & Perlmutter 1983: 395f.; & LaPolla 1988: 220), one being floating quantifiers: Ti sono venuti tutti a portare un regalo ‘All have come to bring you a present.’) It thus seems plausible to take the unavailability of Clitic Climbing in (43b) to depend on the fact that venire has an internal argument.33

4.2. Some apparent cases of object control
“restructuring” verbs

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

(44) a. Me permisió tocarla
    b. Me la permisió tocar ‘She allowed me to play it’ (Luján 1978: 123).

(45) a. Nos ordenaron verla
    b. Nos la ordenaron ver ‘They ordered us to see it’ (Suñer 1980: 318).

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

(46) a. Gli ho insegnato a farlo io
    b. Gliel’ho insegnato a fare io
       ‘I taught him (DAT) to do it.’

Kayne (1989b: 248), observing the general nonexistence of object control restructuring verbs, conjectures that the few existing cases [like (44)–(46) above] are actually hidden instances of the causative construction (which also has Clitic Climbing).36

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

(47) a. Gli ho insegnato a farlo lui
    b. Gliel’ho insegnato a farlo io
       ‘I taught him (DAT) to do it.’
(47) a. Juan le dejó/hizo/vio/oyó armarla ‘J. let/made/saw/heard him assemble it’
b. Juan se la dejó/hizo/vio/oyó armar ‘J. let/made/saw/heard him assemble it’

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

Now, exactly the same restriction has been observed by Luján (1978: 180f.), Contreras (1979: 181, n. 11), Pizzini (1982), and Moore (1990: 321ff.) to hold with permitir ‘allow’ and the other hidden causatives. Compare (44) with (49), and (45) with (50):

(49) a. Me permitieron saludarla ‘(they) me permitted to greet her’
b. *Me la permitieron saludar ‘(they) me her permitted to greet’

(50) a. Nos ordenaron saludarla ‘(they) us ordered to greet her’
b. *Nos la ordenaron saludar ‘(they) us her ordered to greet’

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

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

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

(52) a. Gianni e Mario insegnarono la procedura a Carlo/l’uno all’altro
   G. and M. taught C./each other the procedure
b. Gianni e Mario gli/*si insegnarono la procedura

(53) a. Gianni e Mario regalarono un disco a Carlo/l’uno all’altro
   G. and M. gave a disk to C/to each other
b. Gianni e Mario si regalarono un disco

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

4.3. The unavailability of external arguments

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

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

(54) a. La casa gli doveva piacere ‘The house had to appeal to him.’
   b. La casa non gli poteva piacere ‘The house could not appeal to him.’
   c. La casa gli tendeva ad apparire piccola ‘The house tended to appear little to him.’
   d. La casa gli smise di piacere, da allora ‘The house stopped appealing to him, since then.’
   e. La casa non gli riusciva ad apparire bella ‘The house did not manage to appear nice to him.’
   f. La casa gli stava per piacere ‘The house was about to appeal to him.’
   g. La casa gli stava dando molti dispiaceri ‘The house was giving him a lot of troubles.’
   h. La casa gli seguìo ad apparire piccola ‘The house continued to appear small to him.’
   i. La casa gli cominciò a piacere ‘The house started to appeal to him.’
   j. La casa gli finì per piacere ‘The house ended up being appealing to him.’
   k. La casa gli finì di apparire piccola ‘The house finished to appear small to him.’

(55) a.*La casa gli voleva appartenere ‘The house wanted to belong to him.’
   b.*La casa non gli osava piacere ‘The house did not dare to appeal to him.’
   c.*La casa non gli sapeva piacere ‘The house didn’t know how to appeal to him.’
   d.*La casa gli provò a piacere ‘The house tried to appeal to him.’

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

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

(56) Ne vorrebbero intervenire molti (Burzio 1986: 390)
    Of them would like to intervene many
    ‘Many would like to intervene.’

(57) a. Ne osarono rimanere solo due
    Of them dared to stay only two
    ‘Only two dared to stay.’
b. Ne seppero risalire ben pochi
   Of them knew how to climb up really few
   ‘Really few knew how to climb up.’

c. Ne provarono a intervenire solo un paio
   Of them tried to intervene only a couple
   ‘Only a couple tried to intervene.’

Similar facts are noted for Catalan in Piccallo (1985: 210). See also Rosen (1990b, 483):

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

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

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

(59) a. Vorrebbe intervenirne molti
   Would like to intervene of them many
   ‘Many would like to intervene.’

   b. Osarono rimanerne solo due
      Dared to stay of them only two
      ‘Only two dared to stay.’

   c. Seppero risalirne ben pochi
      Knew how to climb up of them really few
      ‘Really few knew how to climb up.’

   d. ?Provarono a intervenirne solo un paio
      Tried to intervene of them only a couple
      ‘Only a couple tried to intervene.’

(60) a. *Ce ne vorranno mangiare ben pochi
      There of them will want to eat really few

   b. *Non ne osò piangere nessuno
      Not of them dared to cry no-one

   c. *Non ne seppe rifiutare nessuno
      Not of them knew how to refuse no-one

   d. *Gliene provarono a parlare due
      To him of them tried to talk two

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

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

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

(61) a. Sembra essersi finalmente trovato il colpevole
seems to be si finally found the culprit
'The culprit seems to have been found.'

b. Non sembra essersi lavorato a sufficienza
Not seems to be si worked sufficiently
'One does not seem to have worked sufficiently.'

(62) a. *Sembra essersi arrivati troppo tardi
Seems to be si arrived too late
'One seems to have arrived too late.'

b. *Sembra non essersi stati apprezzati
Seems not to have been appreciated
'One seems not to have been appreciated.'

c. *Sembra essersi preoccupato solo un genitore (irrelevantly good in the intransi-
tive use of preoccuparsi)
Seems to be si worried only one parent
'One seems to have worried only one parent.'

d. *Sembra non essersi benvenuti qui
Seems not to be si welcome here
'One seems not to be welcome here.'

e. *Sembra risultarsi ignorare il problema
Seems to appear si to ignore the problem
'One seems to appear to ignore the problem.'

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

Now, if there were subject control (hence transitive or unergative) "restructuring"
verbs, one would expect them to allow si in nonfinite contexts [like those of (61)]. Yet,
whether they allow it or not depends entirely on the nature of the verb in their infiniti-
val complement. They do if the latter is transitive or unergative; otherwise they don't.
In other words, they appear to inherit their status from that of the embedded verb, which
again suggests that they do not have an external argument of their own but are trans-
parent to the arguments of the embedded verb, much like auxiliaries. See (63) and (64),
with the "restructuring" verb volere 'want':39

(63) a. (?|Non sembra essersigli voluto dare sufficiente credito
Not seems to be t -him si wanted to give sufficient credit
5. The optional character of transparency effects
   in (standard) Italian

5.1. The optionality of Clitic Climbing

It is widely assumed that Clitic Climbing obtains obligatorily in the “restructuring” configuration (cf. Rizzi 1976a, 1978, but see his notes 18 and 26, respectively for a different view; Burzio 1986: 393 n. 44; Rochette 1988: 96; Rosen 1990a: 144; among others). Evidence for that assumption primarily comes from the interaction of Long Object Preposing and Clitic Climbing. When Long Object Preposing obtains (indicating the presence of the “restructuring” configuration), Clitic Climbing must apparently also obtain. See the ungrammaticality of (65b), adapted from Rizzi (1978: 132), where the clitic has failed to climb, versus the grammaticality of (65c), where it has climbed:

(65) a. Si vorrebbe vendergli queste case a caro prezzo
   Si (one) would like to sell him these houses at a high price

b. *Queste case si vorrebbbero vendergli a caro prezzo
   These houses si would like to sell him at a high price

c. Queste case gli si vorrebbero vendere a caro prezzo

The evidence, however, is less solid than it appears. First, as already noted in Rizzi (1976a: n. 18; 1978: n. 26; see also Longobardi 1978: n. 5), clitics may fail to climb in the presence of Auxiliary Change. See (66a), from Rizzi (1978), and (66b), from Boysen (1977: 289):

(66) a. Maria è dovuta venirec molte volte
   M. is had to come-there many times
   'M. must have come there many times.'

b. Un'ora più tardi sarebbe dovuto esservi arrivato, ma nessuno lo vide (Silone)
   One hour later he should be had to be there arrived, but nobody saw him
   'One hour later he should have had to be there, but nobody saw him.'

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

In Italian, when an unergative or transitive verb (which takes auxiliary avere 'have' in the perfect) is in the impersonal(-passive) si form, the perfect auxiliary shifts to essere 'be' (Rizzi 1978: n. 22). See (67) and (68):41

(67) a. Gianni ha/#è lavorato molto 'G. has/is worked a lot'
   b. Si è/#ha lavorato molto 'One is/has worked a lot.'

(68) a. Gianni ha/#è perso molti soldi 'G. has/is lost a lot of money'
   b. Si sono/#hanno persi molti soldi 'A lot of money was/has been lost.'

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

(69) I colpevoli non risultano essersi/#aversi ancora trovati 'The culprits do not seem yet to si be found'

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

(70) I colpevoli si vorrebbero trovare subito 'the culprits si would want to find immediately'

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

(71) a. Questi libri gli si vorrebbero esser già dati
   These books to-him si (one) would like to be already given

   b. *Questi libri gli si vorrebbero aver già dato
   These books to-him si (one) would like to have already given

As there is no other reason why the auxiliary should be essere in (71a) except for si, we can infer that si must have originated with the embedded verb. In turn this means
that its appearing in front of the "restructuring" verb in (71a) must be due to Clitic Climbing.\textsuperscript{\textendash}22

If so, the reason for the ungrammaticality of (65b), which is an instance of impersonal(-passive) $si$ (see the agreement with the object), is different. It is the same reason that rules out (72) and (73), where only one of the two clitics has climbed [vs. (74) and (75), in which the clitics have not split]:\textsuperscript{\textendash}43

(72) a. *Mi sta dicendolo
   (He) to-me is saying it
b. *Lo sta dicendomi
   (He) it is saying to-me
   'He is saying it to me.'

(73) a. *Mi sta per dirlo
   (He) to-me is about to say it
b. *Lo sta per dirmi
   (He) it is about to say to-me
   'He is about to say it to me.'

(74) a. Sta dicendomelo
   (He) is saying to-me it
b. Me lo sta dicendo
   (He) to-me it is saying
   'He is saying it to me.'

(75) a. Sta per dirmelo
   (He) is about to say to-me it
b. Me lo sta per dire
   (He) to-me it is about to say
   'He is about to say it to me.'

If the ill-formedness of (65b) indeed reduces to that of (72) and (73) ($si$ has climbed, while $gli$ has not), it becomes possible to maintain Clitic Climbing in restructuring contexts as optional (with the two options possibly depending on factors distinct from the restructuring configuration). The optionality of Clitic Climbing is already indicated by (66), as noted, and by such cases as (74) and (75), for which no (literally) biclausal source appears plausible. It is also indicated by the fact that clitics may fail to climb in the presence of the climbing of the weak pronominal loro 'to-them' (for which see Rizzi 1978: 138ff.; Cardinaletti 1991):\textsuperscript{\textendash}44

(76) Ho loro cominciato ad insegnarlo più di un anno fa
   'I began to teach it to them more than a year ago.'

All of this suggests that clitics may appear in the same clause either on the finite verb or on the nonfinite one (infinitive or gerund). From this point of view, it is past participles (the other nonfinite form of Italian) that are surprising in not allowing
clitics to attach to them in the presence of a finite verb. See the impossible *Ho mangiatolo ‘I have eaten it’ (vs. L’ho mangiato).\textsuperscript{45} In contrast to Italian, which in “restructuring” configurations allows clitics to appear in either position, one finds Romance varieties where the clitic can only appear in the higher one, that is, varieties in which Clitic Climbing (hence “restructuring”) looks obligatory, like most Central and Southern Italian dialects (Benincà 1986: 131f.; Monachesi 1995: 200ff.; Ledgeway 1998, 2000) and Sardinian (Jones 1993), as well as varieties where the clitic can appear only in the lower position. This is the case of (modern) French, which displays no regular Clitic Climbing nor Long Object Preposing nor Auxiliary Change but has other restructuring effects—the marginal climbing of y ‘there’ and en ‘of it/them’ in more careful styles\textsuperscript{46} (cf. Kayne 1977: chap. 2, n. 7; Pollock 1978: n. 18; Taraldsen 1983: 308; Cinque 2002b), Long Tough movement, and Long Passive (see Kayne 1989b: 250ff.; Rochette 1988: 245, n. 23, Cinque 2002b; and the examples given in note 47). Still other varieties display a clitic in both positions, that is, a copy in the lower one (Benincà 1986: 130; Kayne 1989b: n. 37). See, for example, Chilean Spanish Los vamos a verlos ‘Them (we) are going to see them’ (from Uriagereka 1995: 86, n. 21), and Neapolitan L’amu pruvatu a ru vida ‘Him (we) tried to him see’ (from Ledgeway 1996: chap. 3, n. 6).\textsuperscript{47}

5.2 The optionality of Long Object Preposing and Loro Climbing

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

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

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

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

\hspace{1cm} b. Mi chiedo come sia loro potuta andare incontro

(80) a. Si sarebbero dovute consegnar loro subito
    They **si** would have to give to-them immediately
    ‘One would have had to give them back to them immediately.’

\hspace{1cm} b. Si sarebbero loro dovute consegnare subito
5.3 Auxiliary Change

The case of Auxiliary Change\textsuperscript{48} appears to be more complex. On one side, the ungrammaticality of (81a) versus (81b), (from Rizzi 1978: 136) would seem to suggest that it is obligatory:

(81) a. *Maria \textit{ci ha} dovuto venire molte volte
    \textit{M. has had to come there many times.}

   b. Maria \textit{c' è dovuta venire molte volte}

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

(82) a. Avremmo loro potuto rimanere più vicini \textit{We could have to-them remained closer}

   b. Saremmo loro potuti rimanere più vicini \textit{We could have to-them remained closer}

I tentatively interpret this paradox as showing that in Standard Italian, Auxiliary Change is per se optional (like all the other transparency effects) but is favored by Clitic Climbing in more careful styles of Italian. This could be made sense of if in these styles clitics climb via adjunction to the head, raising, effects the change \textit{avere} $\rightarrow$ \textit{essere} on the "restructuring" verb (whence the implication Clitic Climbing $\rightarrow$ Auxiliary Change in a language that has both, though not vice versa [cf. (66)]).\textsuperscript{50}

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

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

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

The existence of varieties where transparency effects are obligatory (such as most Southern Italian dialects) would already seem to suggest that restructuring verbs indeed are only functional. In this section, I consider some evidence supporting this first indication. We shall see that except for \textit{sembrare} 'seem' and motion verbs (which also have genuine lexical usages), restructuring verbs are always functional, and hence necessarily enter a monoclausal configuration. This has the conceptual advantage that such verbs
do not need to be marked in the lexicon as either lexical or functional, with the ensuing problem of having to account for the complete synonymy of the two uses and for what looks like a single subcategorization option (the uniform selection of either *di* ‘of,’ *a* ‘to,’ or *o* (cf. Rizzi 1978: 150). They need only be marked as functional.

In addition to this conceptual argument, there is some empirical evidence for their exclusively functional nature (see sections 6.1–3).

6.1. More on the relative order of restructuring verbs

In section 3.2 above, we observed that restructuring verbs come in a rigid order when transparency effects obtain. The same rigidity is, however, found even in the absence of transparency effects. See (83) and (84) (and Hernanz and Rigau 1984: n. 6 for the similar rigid ordering of restructuring verbs in the absence of transparency effects in Catalan):

(83)  
a. *Suole provare a farle/provarle a fare* da solo  ‘He uses to try to do them by himself’

b. *Prova a soler farle/ solerle fare* da solo  ‘He tries to use to do them by himself’

(84)  
a. *Soleva smettere di vederla/ ?smetterla di vedere* ogni sei mesi  ‘He used to stop seeing her every six months.’

b. *Smetteva di soler vederla/solerla vedere* ogni sei mesi  ‘He stopped using to see her every six months’

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

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

Further evidence for the exclusively functional character of restructuring verbs appears to come from a property of (obligatory) Control recently discussed by Wurmbrand (1998: chap. 4) and Landau (1999, 2000: chap. 2). Wurmbrand (1998:163ff.) observes that the class of Control infinitives splits into two distinct subclasses: one in which the infinitive subject is referentially strictly identical to the controller, and one in which it only needs to include the reference of the controller (what she terms “imperfect” Control). This can be seen in the contrast between (85) and (86):

(85)  
a. *(They said that) John tried to meet in front of the Post Office.

b. *(They said that) John managed to gather at 6.

(86)  
a. *(They said that) John had planned to meet in the castle.

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

Wurmbrand (1998) further argues that the class requiring strict identity coincides with the class of restructuring infinitives, whereas the class allowing imperfect Control coincides with that of nonrestructuring infinitives, and she suggests that the difference follows from a difference between restructured and nonrestructured configurations. The latter have a subject PRO (which can be imperfectly controlled). The former have no syntactic subject, their understood subject being semantically controlled. I think Wurmbrand’s generalization is correct, but I would like to suggest that the strict referential identity between controller and controllee in the restructuring case requires no additional semantic mechanism. It is simply a consequence of the fact, already discussed, that restructuring configurations involve raising even in the few apparent Control cases of ‘want,’ ‘try,’ ‘dare,’ ‘know (how).’ In this view, the traditional notion of (obligatory) Control comes to coincide with imperfect Control, and what looks like strict Control is nothing but raising.52

Now, if the strict referential identity of the two subjects in restructuring contexts necessarily follows from their raising character, the fact that the two subjects are also strictly identical in the variant without transparency effects is a direct argument for the raising (and monoclausal) character of the configuration that lacks transparency effects, and hence for the exclusively functional character of the restructuring verbs involved. If the variant without transparency effects involved a biclausal structure with PRO, imperfect Control would be expected to be possible, contrary to fact (*Ho provato a incontrarsi alle 5 ‘I tried to meet at 5’).

6.3. Apparent lexical usages of volere and aspectual verbs

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

(87) Gianni vuole una bicicletta ‘G. wants a bicycle.’

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

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

(89) Gianni vuole [XP have [DP una bicicletta]]

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

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

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

6.4. Restructuring and lexical usages of motion
verbs and sembrare

The case of motion verbs and sembrare ‘seem,’ which appear to have genuine us-
ages as lexical verbs in addition to their functional usage, is different. We have seen
that when these verbs take an internal argument (either a directional PP or a subject,
for the former, and a dative PP for the latter) they cease to behave as restructuring
verbs (e.g., they do not allow Clitic Climbing). See, in particular, (43), notes 10 and
30, and (41) and (42), respectively.

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

Motion verbs, when they take a complement of their own and an optional adjunct
clause (cf. note 10), are interpreted literally as verbs of locomotion, part of whose meaning
is the means of transportation [cf. (90a) below]. When they are used as restructuring
verbs, instead, they are not verbs of locomotion for which one can ask the means of
transportation—whence the ungrammaticality of the answer to (90b), where come ‘how’
can only ask ‘the way he will (come to) paint the door.’ They merely indicate that some
distance is traversed before the action depicted by the lexical verb is carried out (much
as with the so-called distantive suffix of Fula/Fulfulde, seen in note 4 above):57

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

b. A: Come ti verrà a dipingere la porta? ‘How will he come to paint your door?’
   B:*In bicicletta ‘With his bicycle.’
Similar considerations hold for *sembrare* when it takes a dative argument versus restructuring *sembrare* without one. The former literally means that a certain state of affairs seems true to someone [hence the perfectly noncontradictory status of (91a)]. The latter is instead an evidential functional verb, which (mildly) commits the speaker to the truth of a certain state of affairs [whence the contradictory status of (91b)]:

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

b. #Gianni lo sembra apprezzare molto, ma io non credo che lo apprezzi  
   ‘G. seems to appreciate it much, but I don’t believe he appreciates it.’

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

7. Presence versus absence of transparency effects:
   Syntactic contrasts

I have argued so far that restructuring verbs are always functional, appearing in a monoclausal configuration with their infinitival complement whether or not they show transparency effects. This requires reassessing the syntactic contrasts noted in the literature between the variant with and the variant without transparency effects; and in particular, it requires explaining them in ways that have nothing to do with constituency differences (such as the monoclausal vs. biclausal distinction).

Before attempting that (sections 7.2 and 7.3), we should put to the side the few genuine (and irrelevant) cases of actual alternation between a monoclausal and a biclausal configuration, when a restructuring verb also has lexical usages.

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

As seen above (note 54), such cases as *Gianni vuole restare* ‘G. wants to stay’ are structurally ambiguous even if *volere* is exclusively functional. That depends, as seen, on the additional possibility for *volere* to be followed by an abstract verb (*obtain*), which itself takes the infinitival phrase as a complement:

(92) a. Gianni vuole ... [vp t, restare]

b. Gianni vuole ... [vp t, *obtain [cp pro, restare]]

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

The case of *sembrare* and motion verbs is different because they actually enter either a monoclausal or a biclausal structure, depending on whether they are used as functional or lexical verbs (section 6.4). We have already seen (section 2.3 and note 10) that such Heavy NP Shift contrasts as (18b) and (19b), repeated below as (93a
and b), are not imputable to a constituency difference but derive, for (93b), either
from an illicit application of scrambling of the PP a Firenze or from an illicit extrac-
tion of the clitic out of the adjunct ad esporre la mia idea:

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

7.2. Right Node Raising contrasts and ellipsis
       with restructuring

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

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

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

It is worthwhile examining more closely the ungrammaticality of (95) as it appears
to play a role in such Cleft Sentence contrasts as (7a and b) above. Depiante (1998),
following Zubizarreta (1982), suggests that it is due to the kind of null anaphora li-
censed by restructuring verbs, which is a form of “deep anaphora,” in Hankamer and
Sag’s sense: namely, an empty category with no internal syntactic structure. Deep
anaphors [pronominals, the pro-form do it, and null complement anaphora (NCA)],
as opposed to surface anaphors (like VP deletion, Gapping, Sluicing, etc.), (i) do not
need an identical syntactic antecedent, (ii) can be pragmatically controlled, (iii) can-
not host missing antecedents, and (iv) eliminate scope ambiguities (see Hankamer
& Sag 1976; Depiante 1998). Bošković (1994: 266f.) and Depiante show that the null
complement that follows restructuring verbs indeed behaves like a deep anaphor with
respect to these properties. If so, the contrasts in (96) follow from the fact that the
clitic cannot be paired with a trace within the (unstructured) elliptical constituent:60
Bošković (1994: 266f.) takes the deep anaphor status of the null complement of restructuring verbs to show that they must be able to assign an external theta role (because their subject cannot enter any antecedent-trace relation with a category inside the null complement). But this is not necessarily so. It depends on the precise analysis of the deep anaphor involved in NCA, which since Hankamer and Sag (1976) has been left rather vague. Deep anaphors are (beside pronominals) the do it pro-form, as well as our NCA. I take this to be no accident, and I suggest that the NCA following restructuring verbs is literally the null counterpart of do it (with agentic predicates, and perhaps be it with stative predicates). Thus ... ma io non posso 0 '... but I can't 0' will have the structure ... ma [Io: non posso ... [VP_tk [[v→aff] [DP_tk]]] '... but I can't do it,' with the subject io outside of the pro-form farlo 'do it,' an analysis also compatible with my previous conclusion that restructuring verbs all involve raising.

7.3. Cleft Sentence contrasts

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

(97) a. E' proprio a parlarì di questi problemi che verrà.
    It's just to talk to-you about these problems that he'll come.'

b. *E' proprio a parlare di questi problemi che ti verrà

On the bar's of the well-formedness of the Focus Movement and Topicalization cases corresponding to (97b) [cf. (8) above], we concluded that the contrast in (97) cannot be due to constituency reasons but probably to the selective character of Cleft Sentence Formation (which is less free than Focus Movement and Topicalization). We explore here what property of the construction may be responsible for such contrasts.

If restructuring verbs are always functional (whether transparency effects are present or not), the acceptability (or near acceptability) of the sentences on the lefthand side of (98a-e) suggests that the unacceptability of the sentences on the righthand side of (98a-e) and (97b), cannot be attributed to the fact that some illicit constituent (say, a functional XP, rather than DP, PP, or CP) has been clefted:

(98) a. E' tenerla per sé che non può/*E' tenere per sé che non la può
    It's to keep it for himself that he cannot

b. ?E’ a tradurlo che non riuscirebba/*E’ a tradurre che non lo riuscirebba
   It’s to translate it that I will not manage

c. ?E’ a vederla che ha riacominciato/*E’ a vedere che l’ha riacominciata
   It’s to see her that he started again

d. ?E’ a vederla che continuerà/*E’ a vedere che la continuerà
   It’s to see her that I will continue

e. E’ a ripararla che ho provato/*E’ a riparare che l’ho provata
   It’s to repair it that I have tried

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

(99) A: Non credo che mi verrà a parlare di questo. B: Vedrai che verrà/*Vedrai che ti verrà
   A: ‘I don’t think he will come to talk to me about this. B: You’ll see that he will come.’

(100) a. A: La può tenere per sé? B: No. Non può/*Non la può
   A: Can he keep it for himself? B: No. He can’t

b. A: Lo riuscirai a tradurlo? B: No. Non riuscirebbe/*Non lo riuscirebbe
   A: Will you manage to translate it? B: No. I will not manage.

c. A: Gianni la vede? B: Sì. Ha riacominciato/*L’ha riacominciata
   A: Does G. see her? B: Yes. He started again.

d. A: Gianni la vede ancora? B: Sì. Continua/*La continua
   A: Is G. still seeing her? Yes. He continues.

e. A: L’hai provato a ripararla? B: Sì. Ho provato/*L’ho provato
   A: Have you tried to repair it? B: Yes. I have tried.

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

(101) a. *E’ essere ubriaco che sembrava
   ‘It is to be drunk that he seemed’

   b. *E’ essergli caro che deve
   ‘It’s to dear to her that he must

   c. *E comprandolo che stava
   ‘It’s buying it that he was

   d. *E’ per comprarla che sta
   ‘It’s to buy it that he is about

   e. *E per aiutarlo che finirà
   ‘It’s helping him that he will end up

   A: Was he drunk? B: He seemed
b. A: Pensi che gli sia caro? B: *Si, deve
   A: Do you think he is dear to him? B: Yes, he must

c. A: Sta comprandolo? *Si, sta
   A: Is he buying it? B: Yes, he is.

d. A: Sta forse per comprarlo? B: *Si, sta
   A: Is he about to buy it? B: Yes, he is.

e. A: Finirà per accettarlo? B: *Non finirà
   A: Will he end up accepting it? B: He won’t end up

Note that the contrast between (98) and (100), on the one side, and (101) and
(102), on the other, is not one between Control and Raising predicates. This is shown
by the fact that certain unmistakably raising predicates can be stranded under Cleft
Sentence Formation [cf. (103)] and can be followed by NCA [cf. (104)]:

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

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

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

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

If the generalization connecting the strandability of certain predicates under
Cleft Sentence Formation and their ability to support NCA is correct, it becomes
tempting to say that it derives from the fact that the empty category following the
stranded predicate in Clefts is nothing other than an instance of NCA, whether the
empty counterpart of do it or of an empty DP or PP (cf. note 62). More accurately,
the empty counterpart of (do) it, as well as the empty DP or PP, is perhaps what
allows the correct operator-variable structure accompanying the base-generated
Such cases as (106a–c) under this analysis would receive the derivation indicated
in (107a–c):

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

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

(107) a. DP è [CP PRO tenerla per sé] 0, che non può FARE (‘DO’) ti
   (cf. E' tenerla per sé ciò che non può fare ‘It's to keep it for himself what he can't do')

b. DP è [CP PRO di ripararla] 0, che non ha ancora finito ti
   (cf. E' di ripararla ciò che non ha ancora finito ‘It's to mend it what he has not yet finished')

c. DP è [CP PRO a ripararla] 0, che ho provato/non sono riuscito [pp P ti]
   (cf. A ripararla, non ci ho provato/non ci sono riuscito ‘to mend it, there I did not try/I did not manage to')

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

(108) a. E' [CP proprio a parlarti di questi problemi] 0, che verrà [pp P ti]
   (cf. A parlarti, non ci verrà ‘To talk to you, he won't come to it/there')

b. E' [CP proprio a parlare di questi problemi] 0, che ti verrà [pp P ti]

8. Some residual questions

8.1. Restructuring and null subjects

Kayne's (1989b) analysis, in making both restructuring and null subjects depend on the strength of INFL, formally related Clitic Climbing to the null subject character of the language (a relation originally conjectured in Kayne 1980). The present analysis of restructuring instead establishes no necessary link between the two. It is thus important that subsequent work has shown the relation between Clitic Climbing and null subjects not to hold systematically. Haverkort (1993: 76f.) and Martins (1995: 229) both point out that in seventeenth-century French, Clitic Climbing was still a robust phenomenon, whereas null subjects had already been lost one century before. Haverkort (1993: 77) also discusses the case of Kru languages, which have Clitic Climbing but no null subjects, referring to Koopman (1984: 56) (See also Sportiche 1983 & Tellier 1987).

8.2. Restructuring and negation

It is generally assumed (cf. the references cited in Kayne 1989b: n.14) that negation blocks Clitic Climbing (and other transparency effects). This in turn is often taken to depend on the minimality violation caused by the crossing of the head of NegP by another head—arguably the clitic itself, in the case of Clitic Climbing, and a covert INFL or T, in the case of Long Object Preposing (an instance of XP-movement). See,
for example, Bok-Bennema and Kampers-Manhe (1994: 209). Although in principle compatible with the present approach (modulo the occurrence of head-movement within a single extended projection) such conclusion appears in need of further scrutiny. Alongside often-cited examples like (109), there are others in which Clitic Climbing appears to cross over negation. See (110) and Napoli (1981: 853).

(109) a. *Gianni lo smise di non mangiare (più)  
   'G. it stopped not eating it (any longer)'
   b. ??Lo sta per non amare (più)  
   '(She) was about not to love him (any longer)'
   c. *?Lo tornò a non apprezzare (affatto)  
   '(He) once again did not see him (at all)'
   d. *Gianni li vuole non vedere (Kayne 1989b: 243) (for me "?" if vorrebbe  
   replaces vuole)  
   'G. them wants not to see'

(110) a. Lo sembra non apprezzare affatto  
   '(He) it seems not to appreciate at all'
   b. Per stare meglio, la dovresti non rivedere più  
      To feel better, her (you) should not see any longer
   c. La potrebbe anche non rivedere mai più  
      (He) her could even not see ever again
   d. Non ci si può non pensare  
      One cannot not think about it

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

8.3. Variation in the membership of restructuring verbs

The often-made observation that the membership in the class of restructuring verbs varies across languages—and, within one language, even among speakers—would seem to go against the UG approach taken here and argue for an essentially lexical approach. This impression, however, is quite misleading. Consider, first, variation across languages. The idea that restructuring verbs correspond to distinct functional heads of a universal functional hierarchy does not per se entail that all languages should have a verb (a free morpheme) corresponding to each such head. It could well be that a language expresses a certain functional head via a bound morpheme (say, a suffix) or via no head category at all (but rather via an AdvP, arguably in the specifier of that head). Italian, for example, appears to instantiate the latter case when
compared to Spanish (or French). Spanish has a restructuring usage of *acabar de*
‘(lit.) finish,’ which seems to correspond to the so-called Retrospective Aspect (cf. 
Cinque 1999: 96–98, and references cited there):

(111)  Lo acabo de ver

(Lit.) Him (I) finish to see  ‘I have just seen him.’

The same aspect is rendered in French by the verb *venir de* [(Lit.) ‘come from’
(*Je viens de le voir*  ‘I have just seen him’)]. In Italian, however (and English, for
that matter), the only way to render such an aspect is by using the AdvP *appena* ‘just’
(in one of its uses) combined with the verb in the perfect form: *L’ho appena visto* ‘I
have just seen him.’ Such lexical variation among Spanish *acabar de*, French *venir
de*, and Italian 0 (or rather *appena*) is of little significance from a UG point of view.
It only obscures the fact that the three languages express one and the same functional
head through different morphological means. Another case in point is the restructuring
verb *faillir* in French (‘to almost’), which renders the grammatical notion of “ac-
tion narrowly averted,” variously expressed in the languages of the world (see Kuteva
1998), and to which in Italian and English no restructuring verb corresponds but,
instead, an AdvP (*quasi/almost*).

One could easily multiply such examples. The fact that Spanish *seguir* ‘(lit.)
follow’ (Zagona 1986: 236) or Catalan *procurar* ‘(lit.) procure’ (Hernanz & Rigau
1984: 45), behave as restructuring verbs, whereas the corresponding verbs of
Italian do not, is only of historical interest—of how a certain functional notion
(*Aspect* _continuative_, *Aspect* _conative_) has come to be “grammaticalized.” The same is true
of the restructuring verb *cuidar* ‘(lit.) believe’ in Middle French, also used with the
(prospective) aspeclual meaning of ‘be about to’ (Martineau 1991: 242f.), or of
*prendere* ‘(lit.) catch’ in colloquial Italian, which is also a restructuring verb with
the meaning of ‘start (suddenly)’: *lo prese ad insultare* ‘him (he) started (lit.
‘caught’) to insult.’ Again, such cases obscure the fact that the same set of functional
notions across languages comes to be expressed via different lexical means.

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

One example is ‘seem,’ which is taken not to be a restructuring verb in Spanish
but is a restructuring verb, at least for many speakers, in Italian (cf. note 27 above).
Even if true, this fact is not necessarily troublesome. It could mean that in Spanish
and Portuguese *parecer* has only the lexical usage seen in section 6.4 above (alter-
natively, it could be that the speakers Zagona and Pizzini based their conclusion on,
as opposed to other speakers, are as the Italian speakers that do not have *sembrare* as
a restructuring verb).

Much of the cross-linguistic and interspeaker variation involves verbs that be-
long to certain classes (typical is the class of ‘desideratives’), which are related to
particular functional heads without being the prototypical, or basic, exponent of the
class (volere ‘want’). Thus, many accept *desiderare* ‘desire,’ *amare* ‘love,’ *intendere*
‘intend,’ and *preferire* ‘prefer’ as restructuring verbs, whereas others find them
marginal or outright impossible. These verbs appear to add specific nuances of meaning to the basic sense of ‘volition,’ and hence complying to a lesser degree with the semantics of the corresponding functional head (ModPvolition): a probable cause of their oscillating status. If so, such variation is not incompatible with the general UG approach taken here.

8.4. The prepositional complementizers

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

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

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

\[(i) \text{Min mabb-it-ir-an-ilaw-oy-i mo ngal sembe} \]
\[
\text{we close-REVERS-INSTR-BENEF-CEREL-DISTANTIVE-PAST him it strength} \]
\[
\text{‘We went and opened it for him with strength quickly.’}\]

Mishmi (Tibeto-Burman) verbs can likewise be “inflected for movement” (Devi Prasad Sastry 1984: 156). Analogous “coming and going aspectual affixes” are attested to in a number of Australian languages (cf. Evans 1995: 311 and references cited there). Myhill (1988: 357) reports Georgian, Maricopa, Tarascan, Kiowa, and Nahuatl as having grammatical morphemes expressing the meaning of ‘go’ and ‘come.’ On the special syntactic properties of ‘come’ and ‘go’ verbs in English and in Sicilian, see Jaeggi and Hyams (1993) and Cardinaletti and Giusti (2000). In Cinque (1999: sect. 4.28), the existence of other aspectual heads is mentioned for which no order is provided (see, now, Cinque 2001). Among these, particularly relevant here are conative aspect (‘try’), frustrative or ‘success’ aspect [‘(not manage’], inceptive aspect (‘begin’), and predispositional aspect (‘tend’).

5. The approach taken here differs from most analyses of restructuring, which assume the phenomenon to be lexically governed and optional; but also from such analyses as Wurmbrand’s (1998), which share with ours the idea that it is universally based but take it to depend on a cluster of different semantic and syntactic properties of the restructuring verbs (for her, the semantic properties [-tense] and [-subject] and the syntactic property [-structural case] of their complement).

6. Small capital letters indicate focused constituents. Incidentally, the grammaticality of (8) shows that the ungrammartiality of (7b) cannot be due to the fact that the clitic fails to c-command its trace (contra Zubizarreta 1980: 148ff). For the same conclusion, see Burzio (1981: chap. 6, n. 2) and Fresina (1981: chap. 2, n. 2).

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

8. Rizzi (1976a: n. 8, 1978, 1982a: n. 14) notes that, under special conditions, a bare infinitive can sometimes be clefted in the presence of Clitic Climbing. Such conditions appear to crucially involve a contrastive phrase [E' *ringraziare che lo dovremmo. *(non
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rimproverare) ‘It's thank that we him should, not scold’], a context that also improves the
cleaving of an infinitive plus its complement [?E’ ringraziare per ciò che ha fatto che lo
dovremmo, *(non per ciò che non ha fatto) ‘It's thank for what he did that we him should,
not for what he didn't do']. The cases mentioned in Napoli (1981: n. 7) also involve either an
explicit or an implicit, contrastive phrase. These exceptions remain to be understood. The
contrast in (i), noted in Rizzi (1982b) and attributed by him to the Empty Category Principle
(ECP), may also have to do with the selective character of Cleft Sentence Formation:

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

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

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

I thank Richard Kayne for pointing out this implication.

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

(i) Mary baked and George frosted twenty cakes in less than one hour.

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

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

Another potential derivation of (19b) does not derive it from (18a) via Heavy NP Shift
(or its leftward analogue). In (18a) the PP a Firenze either modifies just the embedded infiniti-
ve (and is interpreted as a locative) or both venire and the embedded infinitive (in which
case it is interpreted as directional). In (18b), instead, the PP a Firenze can only be inter-
preted as a directional complement of venire, used as a lexical verb (cf. section 6.4), with ad
esporti la mia idea an adjunct purpose clause rather than a CP complement. The adjunct sta-
tus of ad esporti la mia idea in (18b) is shown by the fact that no complement or adjunct can
be extracted from it (which would be unexpected if it were a complement CP). Compare (i)
with (ii), which nothing prevents from containing restructuring venire (and a complement CP
following it):

(i) a. *A chi è venuto a Firenze ad esporre la sua idea? ‘Whom did he come to F.
to clarify his idea?’
b. *Come è venuto a Firenze ad esporti la sua idea t? (Molto chiaramente)
   ‘How has he come to Florence to illustrate his idea to you? (Very
   clearly)

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

If so, Clitic Climbing out of the adjunct is (a fortiori) impossible. Contrasts such as those
between (iiia and b), noted in Fresina (1981: 285) also cast doubt on the presence of a sys-
tematic relation between (18a and b):
(iii) a. Vengo da te a riportarti i libri  ‘I come by you to bring back to you the books’
b. *Vengo a riportarti i libri da te  ‘I come to bring back the books to you by you’

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

11. Rizzi (1976a, 1978) also claims that the infinitive and its complement do not pied-pipe under wh-movement when transparency effects obtain, giving contrasts such as (i):

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

First, although there is some contrast between (ia and b), there are cases just like (ib) that sound quite acceptable. See (iii):

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

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

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

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

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

13. See section 6.3 below for lexical usages of *volere. Another potential argument for monoclausality involving adverbial modification is suggested in Napoli (1981: 873ff.). In the absence of transparency effects, certain adverbs appear capable of modifying either the matrix or the embedded verb. Voglio di nuovo imprigionarti  ‘I want again to imprison them’ is compatible with a context where I never imprisoned them before though I had the intention (here, di nuovo ‘again’ modifies just voglio ‘I want’); but it is also compatible with a context where I imprisoned them before (though I may not have wanted to), and now I want to send them back to prison (di nuovo in this case modifies the embedded verb). Napoli claims that when Clitic Climbing obtains (Li voglio di nuovo imprigionare  ‘them I want again to imprison’) di nuovo ‘again’ can only modify the two verbs together (as in a simple sentence with an auxiliary and a nonfinite form). Although I tend to share this intuition, the judgment is not very sharp, and speakers disagree. For critical discussion of this argument, see Wurmbbrand (1998: 214ff.).

14. This restructuring verb appears to correspond to the so-called Predispositional Aspect (head) found in American Sign Language (Klima & Bellugi 1979: 253ff.) and to the ‘tendency’ aspect suffix found in Southeastern Tepehuan (Willett 1991).
15. For the apparent case of speakers also accepting (27b), see the discussion in Cinque (2001: n. 4).

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

(i) a. *Spero che tu non sia più ancora arrabbiaito con me!*
   ‘I hope that you are no longer still angry at me.’

b. *Spero che tu non sia ancora più arrabbiaito con me!*
   ‘I hope that you are still no longer angry at me.’

[(ib) is grammatical in the irrelevant reading in which *ancora* directly modifies *più* “even more angry at me”].

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

(i) a. Certe cose si sogliono voler fare subito ‘Certain things *si* use to want to do immediately’

b. *Certe cose si vogliono soler fare subito* ‘Certain things *si* want to use to do immediately’

(ii) a. La tenderebbe a continuare a vedere tutti i giorni ‘(He) her would tend to continue to see every day’

b. *La continuerebbe a tendere a vedere tutti i giorni* ‘(He) her would continue to tend to see every day’

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

(i) a. Avrei voluto avervi conosciute prima
   ‘I would have liked to have met you earlier.’

b. *Vi avrei volute aver conosciute prima*
   ‘They you would have liked to have met earlier’

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

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

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

Boysen (1977: 289) reports another such case with Auxiliary Change rather than Clitic Climbing: *Un’ora più tardi sarebbe dovuto esservi arrivato, ma nessuno lo vide* (Silone) ‘One hour later, he should have had to be there, but nobody saw him.’ This may suggest that (active)
Aux V PARTICIPLE can actually correspond to two distinct functional heads (AspPERFECT and TANTERIOR). See Cinque (1999) for some discussion, but more work is needed on this question.

19. This may suggest a reason for the often-made observation that the presence of negation is crucial for the well-formedness of (33). On the special status of the locution “know how,” see also Chomsky (1973: n. 26). The same limitations appear to hold for the analogous cases of Clitic Climbing out of wh-phrases in Serbo-Croatian [cf. (i a and b), Nedzad Leko and Ljiljana Progovac, personal communication):

(i) a. *Ja mu to ne bih znao kako da objasnim
   I him it not would know how to explain ‘I wouldn’t know how to explain it to him.’

   b. *Ja sam ih pitala (Milana) kako da predstavim
   I have them asked (M.) how to introduce ‘I asked (M.) how to introduce them.’

20. A similar assumption (a single CP layer over the functional XP complement of the deontic modal) might be appropriate for Spanish Los tiene que ver ‘(He) them has to see’ if que is a complementizer. Its alternation with de in Portuguese (Tenho que vê-lo, Tenho de vê-lo ‘I have to see him’—Martins 1995: 226) would make it appear closer to prepositional ‘complementizers,’ which may not be instances of clausal CP (see section 8.4 below).

21. Ku can (but need not) be missing when the matrix and embedded subjects are coreferential (Terzi 1992, 1994, 1996). When ku is present, no Clitic Climbing is possible (in contrast to what happens in Serbo-Croatian; see below):

(i) a. Voggyu ku lu kkattu
   want-1sg particle it buy-1sg

   b. *Lu voggyu ku kkattu
   It want-1sg particle buy-1sg
   ‘I want to buy it.’

22. Cf. Terzi (1996: n. 15): “The verb of the embedded clause can only occur in the present Tense.” Furthermore, as Terzi (1994: 116f.) herself notes, “Salentino subjunctive subordinates appear to demonstrate fewer Tense dependences than their standard Romance counterparts—i.e. they are not subject to the usual Tense dependencies of Romance subjunctives.”

23. Another transparency phenomenon, which at first sight appears to be able (for many, though not all, speakers) to cross the FINITE (subjunctive) CP complement of restructuring verbs, is L-TOUS in French. See (i), from Kayne (1977: para. 1.11), and (ii):

(i) a. Il faut toutes qu’elles s’en aillent ‘it is necessary that they all go’

   b. Il faut tous qu’on se tire ‘it is necessary that we all shoot’

(ii) a. Il faut tout qu’on lui dise ‘it is necessary that we tell him everything’

   b. Il veut tout qu’on lui fasse ‘he wants that we make him everything’

Such cases have quite peculiar restrictions (Kayne 1977: 69f.), which led Déprez (1997: n. 18) to conclude that “they do not seriously threaten the generalization that tous à gauche is essentially clause-bounded.” Cinque (2002b), in fact, argues that in French Quantifier and Adverb, Climbing (as opposed to EN and Y Climbing and Long Movement in easy-to-please constructions) are not dependent on Restructuring.

24. This recalls Fresina’s (1981, 1982, 1997), Napoli’s (1981), and Rochette’s (1988) idea that in their restructuring use these verbs act much like auxiliaries (cf. also Ledgeway 2000: chap. 5). It is also reminiscent of Rosen’s (1990a, 1990b) notion of “light verb” (without the need for an unspecified argument structure and a process of argument structure “merger”
with the arguments and event specification of the embedded verb). See also Emonds’s (1999) idea that verbs in restructuring contexts lack semantic features.

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

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

(i) a. *Gianni_lo INFL_k ha costretto lui_k a PRO_k t_k fare
G. it has forced him to do
b. *Gianni, lo ha costretto il poveretto, a fare
G. it has forced the poor guy to do

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

(ii) Gianni ha costretto se stesso a farlo

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

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

27. Sembrare allows Clitic Climbing for Radford’s (1976), Napoli’s (1981: 883), and Ledgeway’s (2000: 299, n. 15) informants, as well as for Burzio (1986: 354) but not for Rizzi (1976b: 173 and n. 12) or Fresina (1981: 49). My own judgment is that it allows selectively, that is, with third-person Clitics, as in (41a) or in Non gli, sembra essere fedele t_i ‘not to him (she) seems to be faithful,’ but not with first- and second-person Clitics: *Non mi/te, sembra essere fedele t_i ‘not to me (you) seems to be faithful’ or si (impersonal or other): *Quelle case si sembrano poter costruire con poche spese ‘those houses si seem to be able to build inexpensively’ (Rizzi 1976b: 173). Sembrare followed by a small clause appears to pattern in the same way, suggesting that it, too, is a case of restructuring (cf. Stowell 1991): Non gli, sembra fedele t_i ‘he to-him does not seem faithful’ versus *Non mi/te, sembra fedele t_i ‘he to me (you) does not seem faithful.’ The contrast between Ne sembrate contenti ‘(you) of-it seemed glad’ and *Giorgio gliene sembrava contento ‘G. to-him-of-it seemed glad,’ as well as *Giorgio ne sembrava a tutti contento ‘G. of-it seemed to everybody glad,’ with an overt dative complement of sembrare (noted in Cinque 1981/1982: 257), in fact exactly parallels that between (41a and b). Other restructuring verbs that apparently allow third-person, but not first- and second-person Clitics and si, are (for me) the following: preferire [*Lo preferi fare Gianni ‘G. preferred doing it’] vs. *Se ne preferi andare ‘(He) preferred to go away’], scordare ‘forget’ [Lo scordò di fare ‘(He) forgot to do it’] vs. *Mi scordai di presentare all’esame ‘I forgot to appear at the exam’], stentare ‘to be hardly able’ [Lo stento a credere ‘I am hardly able to believe it’(?him)] vs. *Lui ci stenta a credere ‘He is hardly able to believe us’], sperare ‘hope’ [*Lo spera di poter fare anche lui ‘(He) hopes to be able to do it himself’ vs. *Ce la spera di fare anche lui ‘He hopes to make it himself’], and so on. The phenomenon in question could have to do with the kind of empty category that third-person, on the one hand, and first- and second-person Clitics and si, on the other hand, co-occur with (pro or trace, respectively, as proposed in Kayne 1999b).

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

29. Raising menacer ‘threaten’ and promettre ‘promise’ (roughly ‘unpleasantly) appear to’ and ‘(pleasantly) appear to’) behave analogously, as noted in Pollock (1978: 84f.):
Likewise, Wurmbrand (1998: 306) notes that Scrambling is only possible with versprechen 'promise' when it has no dative argument. Sabel's (1999) observation that Scrambling out of the infinitival complement of versprechen is possible even in the presence of a dative can perhaps be reconciled with Wurmbrand's if Sabel's is a control usage of versprechen that falls in the same category as that of the hidden causatives discussed in section 4.2.

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

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

Again, this is expected if functional verbs cannot take arguments. For evidence that the infinitival constituent following andare and venire is an adjunct clause when these take a directional complement, see note 10 above. A potential problem is constituted by the possibility of Clitic Climbing out of the infinitival complement of certain impersonal verbs that take a dative argument in certain varieties of Catalan, noted in Rigau (2000: sect. 6):

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

Such cases would cease to be problematic if, as Richard Kayne pointed out to me, the dative DP were in fact the subject of the lexical V, raising with cal and similar verbs to a dative (rather than nominative) subject position.

31. For this reason I do not share Burzio's (1981: sect. 6.2.1, 1986: 333f.; cf. also Schroten 1986) conclusion that "matrix ergative verbs do not 'lose' their direct object when restructuring applies" (Burzio 1981: 555). His argument, based on small clause relatives (in which only structural direct objects can be relativized), actually gives contradictory results. Whereas first- and second-person clitics and si are (marginally) possible [cf. (i), (accusative)] third-person clitics are to my ear ungrammatical [cf. (iia) and (iia), which contrast with the potentially nonrestructuring (iib) and (iib), possible because the relative head can originate in the structural object position of the motion verb):

(i) a. *Le uniche persone venutevi a salutare ... 'the only persons come to greet you ...',
   b. *[G.C.])Un vicino venutomi a chiedere un favore ... (Burzio 1986: 334)
      'A neighbor come to ask me a favor ...',
   c. *L'unico ragazzo venutosi a presentare ... 'the only boy si come to introduce himself ...',

(ii) a. *L'unico ragazzo andatolo a prendere ... 'the only boy gone to fetch it ...',
    b. *L'unico ragazzo andato a prenderlo ...  'the only boy gone to fetch it ...',

(iii) a. *Le sole persone venute a raccoglierlo ... 'the only persons come to gather it ...',
    b. Le sole persone venute a raccoglierlo ...  'the only persons come to gather-it ...'
This divide in clitic types is reminiscent of that found with present participles in Italian, which allow for first- and second-person clitics and si but disallow (accusative) third-person clitics (cf. Benincà and Cinque 1991: 609; see also note 27 above). As for Burzio’s argument based on auxiliary selection, which is essere ‘be’ even in the presence of Clitic Climbing [Lo è venuto a prendere ‘(He) is come to fetch it’], we do not have a clear answer. It may prove to depend on the proper analysis of Auxiliary Change (cf. the discussion in Kayne 1993: n. 50); or it may depend on the semifunctional character of motion verbs, which, like causatives (cf. Cinque 2002a: n. 19), contribute an argument even if entering a specific slot of the functional hierarchy. The different interpretation of the PP da Torino ‘from Tu..in’ in (iva) and (ivb), below indeed shows that it must be venire ‘come’ that contributes a source argument to venire a operare ‘come to operate’:

(iv) a. Lo verranno a operare da Torino ‘(They) will come to operate him from Turin’
   b. %Lo opereranno da Torino ‘(They) will operate him from Turin’

On the notion of semifunctional predicates, see also Cardinaletti and Shlonsky (2000) (some of whose judgments and conclusions, however, we do not share), Cardinaletti and Giusti (2000), and Wurmbrand (2001).

32. The account sketched in Kayne (1989b: n. 52) of the similar contrast between *Lo è andato Gianni a prendere ‘It has gone G. to fetch’ and Lo è andato a prendere Gianni ‘It has gone to fetch G.’ (cf. Burzio 1986: 333 and 386, n. 11) is incompatible with the antisymmetric framework because it crucially rests on rightward extraposition of a prendere around Gianni.

33. As a matter of fact, there is evidence that when venire ‘come’ has an inverted subject (as in (43a), the infinitival clause is an adjunct; an even stronger reason for why Clitic Climbing fails... (cf. note 10 above). This is shown by the impossibility of extracting an argument PP from it: *A chi ne sono venuti molti a portare un regalo? ‘To whom have many of them come to bring a present?’ Acceptable sentences are Molti ti sono venuti a portare un regalo; (?)Ti sono venuti a portare un regalo molti ‘Many have come to bring you a present,’ for which the absence of ne ‘of-them’ makes it possible for molti to originate not as the internal subject of unaccusative venire ‘come,’ but as the external subject of the unergative portare ‘bring,’ with venire functional. Ne is licit when the embedded verb is unaccusative, which is again compatible with venire being a complementless functional verb. Compare Te ne sono venuti a morire vicino molti ‘Many of them have come to die near you.’ The same reason may account for the nonrestructuring nature of mettersi a ‘start’ (vs. cominciare a); see (i), and other verbs with (‘inherent’) si, if this si betrays a necessarily unaccusative origin of the subject (namely, its generation in an internal argument position):

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

Ledgeway (1998: 531), however, lists metterse a among the restructuring verbs of Neapolitan.

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

35. This is a case of indirect object control, as are the Spanish cases discussed in the text. As far as I can tell, Italian (the same is true for other languages: Bordeloi 1988: 73; Sabel 1999) does not allow Clitic Climbing with any direct object control verb (see, e.g., *Me lo invitarono/aiutarono a leggere ‘They invited/helped me to read it’; *Me lo cosparirono/obbligarono/forzarono a leggere ‘They forced me to read it’; *Me lo convinsero/
persuaserò a leggere ‘They convinced me to read it’). An exception appears to be mandare ‘send,’ as in Me lo mandarono a prendere ‘They sent it for me.’ This, however, is not related to Mi mandarono a prendersi ‘They sent it to get it’ (via Climbing of lo), for mi must be dative (cf. Glielo mandarono a prendersi ‘They sent it to get it for him’). Rather, it seems related to Mandarono a prendersi ‘They sent (scilicet: someone) to get it for me,’ though climbing is impossible if the implicit object of mandare (‘someone’) is present: *Me lo mandarono qualcuno a prendere ‘They sent someone to get it for me.’ Mandare ‘send’ appears to be the causative of ‘go’ but can also render ‘cause to go (by saying): Mi ha mandato al diavolo ‘(He) sent me to hell (lit. to the devil)’ can be used to report someone saying to the speaker vai al diavolo! ‘go to hell.’

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

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

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

(i) a. *Ne sarebbero voluti morire molti ‘Many would have liked to die.’
   b. *Ne vorrebbero essere ricevuti pochi ‘Few would like to be welcomed.’
   c. *Ne vorrebbero esser noti molti ‘Many would like to be well known.’

The contrast is plausibly an effect of the selectional requirement of volere ‘want’ and the ability or inability of the ‘inverted’ subject to be interpreted volitionally. The same requirement can perhaps account for why purely presentational contexts like ce ne sono molti ‘there are many of-them’ are unacceptable in this construction (vs. the one with raising dovere ‘must,’ which does not impose any volitionality requirement). See (iia and b), from Burzio (1986: 362), which in this view no longer instantiate a control versus raising contrast:

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

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

(iii) a. *Un interprete ciascuno vorrebbe essere assegnato a quei visitatori, ‘One interpreter each would want to be introduced to those visitors.’
   b. Un interprete ciascuno potrebbe essere assegnato a quei visitatori, ‘One interpreter each could be introduced to those visitors.’

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

(iv) *A quei visitatori, vorrà forse andare incontro un interprete ciascuno, ‘To those visitors will want to go up one interpreter each’
Rizzi (1976b: 172ff.) mentions the existence of another Control versus Raising contrast in the restructuring construction. Raising, but not Control, verbs would seem to allow for the impersonal *si on the embedded infinitival. See (v), given with Rizzi's judgment:

\[(v) \quad \text{a. Queste case devono/possono costruirsi alla svelta} \quad \text{These houses must/can *si build quickly} \]
\[\quad \text{b. *Questa case vogliono costruirsi alla svelta} \quad \text{These houses want to *si build quickly} \]

I (and other speakers), however, find such cases as (vb) not to be impossible, and actually quite natural, with other moods and lexical choices: *Certe esperienze vorrebbero potersi fare subito 'Certain experiences would want to be able to do *si immediately.' The (near-) impossibility of the other case given by Rizzi (the one with *andare: *Questa medicine vanno a comprarsi in farmacia 'These medicines go to *si buy at the chemist's') can perhaps be due to the fact that impersonal *si is located higher than the functional head hosting motion verbs (indeed a very low one: cf. Cinque 2002a). Similar considerations may apply to the (near-) impossibility of *Certe esperienze vorrebbero/dovrebbero poter farsi subito 'Certain experiences would want to/should be able to *si do immediately,' where the clitic is found on the lexical verb.

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

40. The presence of Clitic Climbing is meant to exclude the lexical use of volere (for which see section 6.3 below). Plural number agreement on volere also appears to exclude it (*Sembra essersi voluti andare volentieri 'Seems to be *si wanted to go willingly') because 'lexical' volere is followed by an abstract predicate taking an object clause (cf. section 6.3), whence third-person singular agreement on the participle. The third-person singular agreement, indeed, is acceptable in the same context: Sembra non essersi voluto andare incontro a nessuno 'Seems to be *si wanted to go toward nobody."

41. In addition to impersonal(-passive) *si, which absorbs the external theta role and Accusative Case (thus forcing a direct object, when present, to become the subject), another *si exists (cf. Cinque's 1988 [—arg st]), which absorbs no external theta role or Accusative, only Nominative, and which can thus render impersonal those predicates that have no external theta role or Accusative Case (unaccusative, passive, psych-, copular, and raising verbs). When this *si applies to transitives, there is no object promotion to the subject (Cinque 1988: Dobrovie-Sorin 1998):

\[(i) \quad \text{a. Si è perso molti soldi 'One has lost (sing.) a lot of money (pl.).'} \]
\[\quad \text{b. Li si è persi 'them one has lost'} \]
This construction (which is somewhat marked with transitive verbs, giving rise to a special interpretation in specific time reference contexts) is the only possible one when there is no agreement [as in (ia)], the object is cliticized [as in (ib)], it contains the ci si form (replacing an impossible si si sequence), or it has floating tutti ‘all’ (cf. Cinque 1988; see also the next note).

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

(i) a. Si vorrebbe averle (*esserle) vendute a un prezzo più alto ‘One would have liked to have sold them at a higher price.’
b. Si vorrebbe loro averle (*esserle) già vendute ‘One would like to have already sold them to them.’

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

(ii) a. Si stava convincendolo tutti a restare ‘We were all convincing him to stay.’
b. **Stava convincendolosi tutti a restare

(iii) a. Questi articoli si stanno vendendo a prezzi stracciati ‘These items are being sold very cheap.’
b. ?Questa articolostanno vendendosi a prezzi stracciati

(iv) a. Loro si stanno scrivendo dei biglietti ‘They are writing cards to each other.’
b. Loro stanno scrivendosi dei biglietti

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

43. The requirement of “uniform cliticization” found in Italian in restructuring contexts (Rizzi 1976b: n. 18), in the progressive and prospective periphrasis of (74) and (75), and in negative imperatives (Kayne 1992: n. 5—cf. *Non gli dateolo vs. Non dateglielo or Non glielo date ‘Don’t give it to-them’) remains to be understood, especially given the fact that it is not found in other Romance languages or dialects (Kayne 1989 ν 248, 256, n. 34) or in Serbo-
Croatian (Stjepanović 1998). The presence/absence of the requirement could turn out to depend on whether clitics form a cluster (i.e., each one is adjoined to the next) or not. That the ill-formedness of (65b) may have to do with one but not the other clitic climbing up is also found in Longobardi (1979: n. 7) and Burzio (1981: chap. 6, n. 4).

44. Taraldsen (1982: 273) gives *Maria deve loro averlo già dato* ‘M. must to-them have it already given’ as ungrammatical, but this and similar sentences seem to me quite acceptable. The optionality of Clitic Climbing in ‘long’ tough-movement contexts, also a diagnostic for the restructuring configuration (Rizzi 1978: 140ff.), is not easy to check. Although examples such as *Questa tavola è difficile da poter venderti* ‘this table is difficult to be able to sell to you’ are, according to Zubizarreta (1980: 154, 175) accepted by some native speakers on a par with *Questa tavola è difficile da poterti vendere* ‘this table is difficult to be able to sell,’ for others, myself included, clitics (in either position) are quite marginal. In this connection, see also Radford (1977: 109), Napoli (1981: 850f.) and Rizzi (2000: 101). Additional evidence for the optionality of Clitic Climbing is provided by the paradigms in (i) (prompted by an observation of Anna Cardinaletti), and (ii), adapted from Longobardi (1980: n. 5):

(i) a. Gianni lo tornò a salutare  ‘G. greeted him again.’
b. Gianni tornò a salutarlo  ‘G. greeted him again’ or ‘G. came back to greet him.’

(ii) a. ??Dovrebbe detestare studiare questa materia  ‘He should detest studying this subject.’
b. ??Vorrebbe potere fare questo anche lui  ‘Even he would like to be able to do this.’
c. Lo vorrebbe poter(??e) fare anche lui  ‘Even he it would like to be able to do’
d. Vorrebbe poter(??e) farlo anche lui

In (ia), with Clitic Climbing (which forces the restructuring configuration), *tornare* ‘(lit.) go/come back’ is unambiguously interpreted as a marker or ‘iterative aspect’ (= ‘do again’). In (ib), where the clitic is on the embedded infinitival, *tornare* is ambiguous between the literal meaning ‘go/come back’ and ‘do again.’ This suggests that the restructuring option is available even when the clitic does not climb. (iia and b) exemplify a constraint against the sequence of two infinitives, one of which is the complement of the other (Longobardi 1980); (iic) shows that with restructuring verbs that display Clitic Climbing the constraint becomes inoperative, provided that the final vowel of the first infinitive is deleted. But the same is true of (iid), even though the clitic has not climbed. This suggests that (iid) is a case of restructuring despite the lack of Clitic Climbing [note that deletion of the ‘e’ of *detestare* in (iia) does not improve its status; retention of the –e in (ii) is better than the retention of the –e with enclitics: **Farelo sarebbe difficile  ‘To do it would be difficult’]. See also Monachesi (1999) for experimental evidence that restructuring verbs and their infinitival complement form a prosodic unit whether or not Clitic Climbing has applied.

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

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

47. One context where Clitic Climbing appears obligatory is Long Passive, a construction only possible with restructuring verbs (Rizzi 1976a: n. 21; Aissen and Perlmutter 1983:
postscript; Burzio 1986: 373ff; Cinque 2002a). Here, a clitic cannot remain on the infinitive. See (ib) (a similar observation is made in Rizzi 2000: 101):

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

But even this obligatoriness may prove illusory. As noted in the above references, Long Passive in Romance is restricted to restructuring verbs of ‘finishing,’ ‘beginning,’ and (more marginally) ‘motion’ and ‘continuation’—in fact, a subset of these (cf. Cinque 2002a). In that article, I argue that such limitations can be understood if restructuring verbs are taken to be functional verbs inserted directly under the corresponding functional heads. In such cases it is to be expected that only those restructuring verbs that correspond to aspectual heads lower than Voice (completive, inceptive, continuative, and motion) will be able to be passivized (in addition to the lexical verb). All other aspectual, modal, and mood heads higher than Voice cannot be passivized, as lowering is barred. If that is correct, the ungrammaticality of (ib) could be due, then, not to the obligatory character of Clitic Climbing but to the fact that no clitic position is available (in Italian) under Voice. Although the same generalization concerning Long Passive in restructuring Romance languages appears to hold in French (The only cases cited in Grevisse 1993: 1124f. are with ‘finish’-type verbs: *Le chateau n’était pas achevé de meubler* ‘the castle was not finished furnishing’; *une boîte qui n’était pas tout à fait finie d’installer* ‘a box which was not at all finished installing’) and Japanese (Nishigauchi 1993), Wurmbrand (1998: 34f., 119ff.) notes that in German Long Passive is not as restricted as in Romance. For example, it is also found with such restructuring verbs as ‘try,’ ‘manage,’ ‘dare,’ and so on. Rather than taking the contrast to depend on the different location of these aspectual heads, I conjecture it may depend on the higher location of passive morphology in German, which corresponds more to an impersonal than to a personal Voice (it can, e.g., affect unergative verbs, like Italian *si*, which, interestingly, also “passivizes” ‘try,’ ‘manage,’ ‘dare,’ etc.). For further discussion on this topic, see Taraldsen (2002).

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

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

(i)  
   a. Giovanni le ? sarebbe dovuto essere fedele  ‘G. would have had to be faithful to her.’
   b. Giovanni le ? avrebbe dovuto essere fedele  ‘G. would have had to be faithful to her.’

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

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

(iii)  
   a. Maria c’ha (*ci ha*) dovuto venire molte volte  ‘M. there had to come many times’
b. Gli hai per caso potuto andare incontro? ‘him could you by chance go toward?’
c. Non ne ha mai voluto venir fuori ‘he from-it has never wanted to get out’

(iv) ??Laura ci ha cominciato ad andare un mese fa ‘L. has begun to go there a month ago’

(v) a. Me son volgut venjar ‘I wanted to take revenge’
b. M’ai volgut venjar

Concerning the contrast *ci ha vs. c’ha [i[a] in (iii), note that (81b) and the like also degrade considerably with ci è in place of c’è.

50. In this connection, Pearce (1990: 21) reports that Auxiliary Change was lost in the history of French more or less at the same time (early seventeenth century) that Clitic Climbing began to be lost (which is also the time when Aux-to-COMP apparently was lost: Roberts 1993a: 203).

51. Landau (1999, 2000) draws a comparable distinction between what he calls “exhaustive” Control (with implicative, aspectual, and modal predicates) and “partial” Control (with factive, propositional, desiderative, and interrogative predicates). I’ll come back to his analysis, as he explicitly claims that exhaustive Control does not coincide with restructuring (contrary to what I am proposing below).

52. Landau (2000: chap. 2, sect. 6) explicitly claims that ‘strict,’ or in his terms, ‘exhaustive,’ Control does not reduce to raising (because of the Control character of some of the modal and aspectual verbs), nor does it coincide with restructuring (given that exhaustive control is a property of modal, aspectual, and implicative verbs, regardless of whether they are in a restructuring context or not, and given that some of the implicative verbs that show exhaustive control are not, according to him, restructuring). In the context of my analysis, none of these arguments is compelling. For one thing, we saw above evidence for the raising character of even apparent Control restructuring verbs like ‘want.’ As to the second claim, I am suggesting that restructuring verbs enter a restructuring (monoclusal) configuration even in the absence of transparency effects; that is, they enter only restructuring contexts—whence their exclusively raising character (which derives their exhaustive Control property in all situations). Finally, the claim that there are nonrestructuring implicative verbs, which still display exhaustive Control, does not seem to be substantiated by the facts. Among implicative verbs, we find that only the restructuring ones (riuscire ‘manage,’ dimenticare ‘forget,’ mancare ‘fail,’ and osare ‘dare’) display exhaustive control [cf. (i)]. Nonrestructuring ones (all the others) appear to us to allow (in Italian) partial Control [cf. (ii)]:

(i) *Loro dissero che Gianni non riuscì a (dimenticò di/mancò di/osò) incontrarsi alle 5
‘They said that G. did not manage (/forgot/failed/dared) to meet at 5.’

(ii) Gianni fece in modo di/ritenne opportuno/accondiscese a/evitò di incontrarsi alle 5
‘G. made sure/saw fit/condescended/avoided to meet at 5.’

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

(iii) Gianni costrinse/forzò Maria a incontrarsi alle 5 ‘G. compelled/forced M. to meet at 5.’
53. Here, I in fact assume, immaterially for the argument, that the abstract understood verb is something like **obtain** (= [come [ to have]]). ‘**Vorrei DP,**’ as opposed to ‘**Vorrei avere DP,**’ cannot be interpreted as ‘I would like to be in the state of having DP.’ Cf. **Vorrei *(avere)* vent’anni** ‘I would want (to have) 20 years.’

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

(i) Gianni vuole [VP **obtain** [CP che Maria resti]]

This introduces a systematic ambiguity in infinitival cases such as (iiia), which can thus instantiate either the structure in (iib), or that in (iic):

(ii) a. Gianni vuole restare ‘G. wants to stay.’
    b. Gianni, vuole . . . [VP t, **obtain** [CP PRO, restare]]
    c. Gianni, vuole . . . [VP t, restare]

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

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

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

57. As is perhaps to be expected, motion verbs without an overt directional PP are still ambiguous between the lexical and the restructuring use. This can be seen from the double possibility they allow under **fare** (cf. Rizzi 1978: 153; Burzio 1986: 388, n. 26):

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

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

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

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

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

(i) a. *Maria deve già averlo già lasciato* ‘M. already must have already left him.’
    b. *Maria comincia già ad esserci già antipatica* ‘M. already begins to already be unpleasant.’
60. Non (*la) può [0] ‘He (it) cannot’ of (96a) thus contrasts with Mangiare fredda, non la può ‘eat cold, he it cannot,’ which has a structured empty category ([X,Mangiare la fredda] non la può [mangiare la fredda]) under the copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1995: 3.5).

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

62. The partial visibility of the internal structure of the null complement in NCA (the subject, but not the verb and its complements, “covered” by do it) is also shown by the possible appearance of benefactive PPs (and other adjuncts) modifying the understood predicate (problematic in an opaque ’[CPNP 0]’ pro-form) versus subcategorised PPs. See (Porterai da mangiare?) Potrò, solo per qualcuno ‘(Will you bring something to eat?) I will be able [to do it] only for someone’ versus *Potrò, solo a qualcuno ‘I will be able [to do it] only to someone.’ The NCA appears not to be reducible to an abstract do it in all cases. In addition to restructuring verbs, many other predicates allow null complements. See (i), adapted from Grimshaw (1979: 288ff.):

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

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

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

What all the different types of NCA appear to have in common is some kind of pronominal element (‘it,’ pro-PPs, ‘do it,’ etc.): the exponents of ‘deep anaphora.’ The possibility of Je sais ‘I know’ in French is perhaps related to that of Ça, je sais ‘That, I know.’

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

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

65. Note that the sentences in (110) do not require the special intonation discussed in Rizzi (1976a: n. 9), which rescues even the negation between an auxiliary and a participle. It remains to be determined whether Long Object Preposing and Auxiliary Change are less sensitive to the intervention of negation than Clitic Climbing (as claimed in Watanabe 1993: 366 and Kayne 1989b: 253, respectively). I do not find any appreciable difference between Watanabe’s example (30)—(3)?Quei libri si potrebbero non leggere subito ‘these books SI would-be-able not read immediately’ and Li potresti non leggere subito ‘Them you could not read immediately’—or between Kayne’s example (45)—(4)?Sarebbe voluto non andare al mare ‘(He) would-be wanted NEG to go to the seaside’ and ?Ci sarebbe voluto non andare subito ‘There (he) would-be wanted NEG to go immediately.’

66. This sentence was pointed out to me by Richard Kayne.

67. For example, Fresina (1981: 49) does not accept Clitic Climbing with desiderare, while Monachesi (1998: 362 n. 9) does. For Spanish, Roldán (1975: 344) does not allow Clitic Climbing with preferir, whereas Luján (1978: 105) does. Some Italians have pensare ‘think’ as a restructuring verb, not in its propositional meaning [cf. (ia)] but in its volitional
one, of intending/planning to [cf. (ib)]. For an analogous contrast in Spanish, see Suñer (1980: 314):

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

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

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

68. We abstract here from the possibility, argued for in Kayne (1999a), that such prepositions are in fact higher than the selecting verb and act as attractors of the infinitival phrase to their Spec, then raising to the next higher head, and attracting the remnant to the higher Spec (cf. also the rollup derivation proposed in Koopman & Szabolci 2000 for restructuring verbs in Hungarian and Dutch). We also abstract from additional projections that may make up such “small clauses,” which include the agreement heads discussed in Kayne (1993) and possibly Topicalization and Focalization projections, if such restructuring cases with “middle field” Focalization and Topicalization are possible: *Avrebbero loro voluto I SOLDI riconsegnare al più presto (non i vestiti) ‘(they) would have to-them wished the money (focus) hand back immediately (not the suits)’; *Avrebbero loro voluto, i soldi, poterli riconsegnare più avanti ‘(they) would have to-them wished the money to be able to hand back later.’
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