"RESTRUCTURING" AND FUNCTIONAL STRUCTURE*
Guglielmo Cinque (University of Venice)

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 25 years, numerous analyses have been proposed to explain why certain phenomena which 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 non-finite (see the 'climbing' of the clitic in (2)): [1]

(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.[2] Here I would like to propose an analysis which 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]

(3) $MoodP_{speech\ act}$ > $MoodP_{evaluative}$ > $MoodP_{evidential}$ > $ModP_{epistemic}$ > TP(Past) > TP(Future) > $MoodP_{irrealis}$ > $ModP_{alethic}$ > $AspP_{habitual}$ > $AspP_{repetitive(I)}$ > $AspP_{frequentative(I)}$ > $ModP_{volitional}$ > $AspP_{celerative(I)}$ > TP(Anterior) > $AspP_{terminative}$ > $AspP_{continuative}$ > $AspP_{retrospective}$ > $AspP_{proximative}$ > $AspP_{durative}$ > $AspP_{generic/progressive}$ > $AspP_{prospective}$ > $ModP_{obligation}$ > $ModP_{permission/ability}$ > $AspP_{Completive}$ > VoiceP > $AspP_{celerative(II)}$ > $AspP_{repetitive(II)}$ > $AspP_{frequentative(II)}$

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.[4]

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 which 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 fulfledged sentential complement (CP) - cf. (4)a), or 'functional' verbs, directly inserted in the head position of the corresponding functional projection (cf. (4)b):

(4)**a** [$_{CP}$...[$_{FP}$...[$_{FP}$...[$_{VP}$V$_{restr}$ [$_{CP}$...[$_{FP}$...[$_{FP}$...[$_{VP}$ V]]]]]]]]   **b** [$_{CP}$...[$_{FP}$... [$_{FP}$V$_{restr}$ [$_{FP}$...[$_{VP}$ 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 (4)b, and the obligatory *absence* of transparency effects in the biclausal structure (4)a.

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 *always* are functional verbs in a monoclausal configuration (*even in the variant which shows no transparency effects* - section 6). This implies that "restructuring" verbs have no other option but entering structure (4)b (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). [5]

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)a [$_{CP}$ io [verrò [$_{CP}$ a parlar**ti** di questi problemi]]]   RESTRUCTURING --->
    (I will come to talk-to-you about these problems)
    b [$_{CP}$ io [$_V$ **ti** verrò a parlare] 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. (5)b).

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

(6) [$_{CP}$ io [$_{AndativeP}$ **ti** verrò [$_{VP}$ a parlare [di questi problemi]]]]

This requires reassessing the arguments brought forth by Rizzi (1976a, 1978) in support of the constituency in (5)b. 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 (5)b. Let us consider these cases in turn.

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

(7)a E' proprio a parlar**ti** 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

This would seem to follow from the constituency in (5)b. Notice, however, that with other

fronting rules (such as Focus Movement and Topicalization) no such restriction obtains:

(8)a A PARLARE DEI SUOI PROBLEMI, **ti** verrà! Vedrai.[6]
    'To speak about his problems (focus), he'll to-you come! You'll see'
  b PORTARE A CASA, **lo** voleva!   'Take home (focus), he it wanted'
  c Leggere a tutti, non **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 (7)b is due to some other reason (not dependent on constituency). Note that quite severe restrictions exist on what can be clefted (cf. (9) and (10)) which 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 (7)b vs. (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'[7]
   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 (7)b 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 trasparency effects. See the contrast between (13)a and b:

(13)a Piero voleva - ma francamente adesso non so se vorrà ancora - parlar**ne** 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.[9]

In the framework in which Rizzi (1976a,1978) was working, Right Node Raising was considered a rightward movement rule (cf. Postal 1974,125-28). 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: *Piero voleva* ~~*parlarne 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 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? *Sì. Ho___

If Right Node Raising involves deletion, the first contrast reduces to the second. No such reduction is instead possible under the Movement analysis of Right Node Raising. In the more restrictive deletion analysis, which crucially relates (14) to (16)b, the ungrammaticality of (13)b can, then, be attributed not to the fact that *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 (1977,113) (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/complex constituent rightward, deriving for example (18)b from (18)a by moving the constituent *ad esporti la mia idea* to the right of the PP *a Firenze*.

(18)a Fra qualche giorno, verrò ad espor**ti** 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 espor**ti** la mia idea   'In a few days, I'll come to Florence to explain to-you my idea'

Rizzi 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 (19)b 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 (19)b which does not depend on the non-constituenthood of *ad esporre la mia idea*. (19)b is bad for the same reason that (20) is, namely because 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; 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 [$_{FP}$ V$_{restruct}$ …[$_{VP}$ V ZP]] and against the idea that the "restructuring" verb and the embedded infinitive come to form a constituent which 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 potendo**lo** [egli restituire a nessuno] 'Not being able it he to give back to anybody'
b*Non potendo**lo** restituire [egli a nessuno] 'Not being able it to give back he to anybody'

(22)a Ritenevamo non dover**ne** [egli parlare neanche con voi] 'We thought not to have he to talk not even with you'
b*Ritenevamo non dover**ne** parlare [egli neanche con voi]'We thought not to have to talk he not even with you'

3. Monoclausality vs. 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 biclausality, 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** aver**lo 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 vorrà **già** esser **loro già** stata presentata
      M. will already want to have to-them already been introduced
    b *Maria vorrà **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 while the b. variants are strictly monoclausal.[13]

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)). While 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 is 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, cooccurs with the "restructuring" verb *tendere* 'tend' (cf. *Lo tendo a credere anch'io* 'it I tend to believe myself'),[14] the only possible order for most speakers is *solere > tendere* (suggesting the order of heads $Asp_{habitual} > Asp_{predispositional}$):[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 soler evitare 'Certain things, them one tends to usually avoid'

When *tendere* and *volere* 'want' cooccur, the order is rigidly *tendere > volere*, in turn suggesting the order $Asp_{predispositional} > Mod_{volitional}$:

(28)a Lo tenderebbe a voler 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) cooccur, the order is *volere > smettere*, suggesting the order of heads: $Mod_{volitional} > Asp_{terminative}$

(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 cooccur the order is *smettere > continuare*, once again suggestive of the order of heads: $Asp_{terminative} > Asp_{continuative}$.[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 (fn.38) observes (cf. also Napoli 1981,855, Moore 1994,fn3, Rooryck 1994, 420ff, among others), the productivity of the construction is however severely limited. Among the predicates which take embedded interrogatives, only *sapere* (*come*) 'know (how)' allows it (compare (33) with (34)), and even it with 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 asked 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,fn38)
    b *[..] non lo saprei se consigliare o no
     'I him wouldn't know whether to advise or not' (Rizzi 1978,fn38)
    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* if either *sapere* means 'know how' ((33)c), or if the sentence allows for a rhetorical reading without the wh-phrase, and with *sapere* meaning 'be able' ((33)a is equivalent to *Non ti saprei dire niente* 'I to-you wouldn't be able to say anything'; (33)b 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).

More problematic would seem to be the apparent case of Clitic Climbing out of finite complements of "restructuring" verbs in certain varieties of Salentino, discussed in Calabrese (1993) and Terzi (1992,151ff;1994;1996), and in the varieties of Serbo-Croatian discussed in Progovac (1991, 1993) and Terzi (1996,289ff) (also see Stjepanović 1998).

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. (36)b, 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 non deletability 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 ?Milan **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/number agreement. In particular, no past (or periphrastic) tense forms are possible:[22]

(38)a ***Lu** vulia kattavu   (Salentino - Andrea Calabrese, p.c.)
    It wanted-1sg bought-1sg 'I wished I bought it'
  b *Ja bih **ga** voleo da sam posetio (Serbo-Croatian - Lijljana Progovac, p.c.)
    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 under a biclausal analysis of such structures. But it makes sense under 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 (39)a shows, when no Clitic Climbing is present, the subject of the embedded verb can be expressed by an overt (focussed) pronominal even when it is coreferential with the matrix subject. This possibility

is however lost in the presence of Clitic Climbing (Ljiljana Progovac, p.c.). See (39)b:

(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, (39)b 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 (37)a and b).[23]

4. The functional status of "restructuring" verbs in the presence of transparency effects.
One first 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, hence no arguments of their own.[24] Despite certain appearances, this will prove a welcome (and correct) consequence.

4.1 *The unavailability of internal arguments.* Kayne (1989b,248) observes that "[v]irtually all the standard cases of clitic climbing are cases of subject control or raising. What is conspicuously absent is object control."[25] 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."[26]
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 which the I to (C to) I hypothesis does not exclude.
Consider the case of a raising verb which 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. (41)a),[27] but, crucially, not if it takes a (dative) complement (cf. (41)b):[28]

(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):[29]

(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.[30]

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 (43)b 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*:[31]

(43)a Ne sono venuti molti a portar**ti** 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 come many to bring a present
        'Did many come to bring you a present?'

Again, under 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 coindexed.[32] The intervention of material between the "restructuring" and the embedded verb in (43)b should not matter. Various cases of intervening material are documented in the literature which do not block Clitic Climbing (see Aissen and Perlmutter 1983,395f, Napoli 1981,865f, and 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 (43)b 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), Suñer (1980,318), and Gonzalez (1994,10ff), for example, analyse cases like the following, containing Clitic Climbing, as cases of "restructuring":[34]

(44)a **Me** permitió tocar**la**
     b **Me la** permitió tocar 'She allowed me to play it' (Luján 1978,123)

(45)a **Nos** ordenaron ver**la**
     b **Nos la** ordenaron ver 'They ordered us to see it' (Suñer 1980,318)

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

(46)a **Gli** ho insegnato a far**lo** io
     b **Gliel**'ho insegnato a fare io
     'I taught him (DAT) to do it'

Kayne (1989b,248), observing the general non existence 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 supporting his intuition. These putative "restructuring" verbs appear to be subject to restrictions which typically hold of the combination of a causative verb and its infinitival complement, and are not found with ordinary "restructuring" verbs. For example, as noted 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 Juan **le** dejó/hizo/vio/oyó armar**la**   '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 llamar**la**   '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,fn11), Pizzini (1982), 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 saludar**la** '(they) me permitted to greet her'
     b ***Me la** permitieron saludar '(they) me her permitted to greet'

(50)a **Nos** ordenaron saludar**la** '(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/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 exist 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. 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, e.g. *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 seguitò 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'
    l La casa gli finì per piacere 'The house ended up being appealing to him'
    m 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 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's (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 Picallo (1985,210). Also see 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,* etc. 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 Vorrebbero 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'
    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 noone
    c *Non ne seppe rifiutare nessuno
        Not of them knew how to refuse noone
    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 non-finite 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 esser**si** finalmente trovato il colpevole
    seems to be *si* finally found the culprit 'the culprit seems to have been found'
 b Non sembra esser**si** lavorato a sufficienza
  Not seems to be *si* worked sufficiently 'One does not seem to have worked sufficiently'

(62)a *Sembra esser**si** arrivati troppo tardi
    Seems to be *si* arrived too late
    'One seems to have arrived too late'
 b *Sembra non esser**si** stati apprezzati
    Seems not to have been appreciated
    'One seems not to have been appreciated'
 c *Sembra esser**si** preoccupato solo un genitore (irrelevantly good in the intransitive use of *preoccuparsi)*
    Seems to be *si* worried only one parent
    'One seems to have worried only one parent'
 d *Sembra non esser**si** benvenuti qui
  Seems not to be *si* welcome here
  'One seems not to be welcome here'
 e *Sembra risultar**si** 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 non-finite contexts (like those of (61)). Yet, whether they allow it or not depends entirely on the nature of the verb of their infinitival 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 transparent 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 esserglisi voluto dare sufficiente credito
        Not seems to be to-him *si* wanted to give sufficient credit
 b (?)Non sembra essersene voluto parlare molto, di questi problemi
        Not seems to be of-it *si* wanted to talk much, of these problems

(64)a *Non sembra esserglisi voluto/i venire in aiuto[40]
        Not seems to be him *si* wanted to come in support
 b *Non sembra esserglisi voluto/i essere presentati
        Not seems to be to-him *si* wanted to be introduced
 c *Non sembra esserglisi voluto/i essere fedeli
        Not seems to be to-him *si* wanted to be faithful
 d *Non sembra esserglisi voluto/i risultare simpatici
        Not seems to be to-him *si* wanted to appear nice

From the evidence just reviewed, the conclusion that (when transparency effects obtain)

"restructuring" verbs do not take external arguments seems inescapable, though it is in conflict with the evidence based on (55) above, where some such verbs appeared to impose selectional restrictions on the subject (giving the appearance that they take a subject of their own). A possible solution to the paradox (in the spirit of Zubizarreta's 1982,chapter 3, proposal that such predicates assign not primary, but adjunct, theta-roles) would consist in taking their selectional requirements to be a consequence of their semantics. If verbs like 'want', just like volitional adverbs such as *willingly, voluntarily*, etc. (cf. *The house willingly belonged to Bill*), or, for that matter, manner adverbs (cf. *The house hid the horizon carefully*), must be predicated of a sentient being, the ungrammaticality of (55) vs. (54) follows without having to assume that they take an external argument of their own.

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); Burzio (1986,393fn44); 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 (65)b, adapted from Rizzi (1978,132), where the clitic has failed to climb, vs. the grammaticality of (65)c, where it has climbed:

(65)a Si vorrebbe vender**gli** queste case a caro prezzo
     Si (one) would like to sell him these houses at a high price
  b *Queste case si vorrebbero vender**gli** 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 of all, as already noted in Rizzi (1976a,fn18;1978,fn26; also see Longobardi 1978,fn5) clitics may fail to climb in the presence of Auxiliary Change. See (66)a, from Rizzi (1978), and (66)b, from Boysen (1977,289):

(66)a Maria è dovuta venir**ci** molte volte
     M. is had to come-there many times
     'M. must have come there many times'
  b Un'ora più tardi sarebbe dovuto esser**vi** 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 (65)b appeared to show. The paradox, however, is only apparent as (65)b 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,fn22). 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 **son/*hanno** persi molti soldi 'A lot of money was/has been lost'

This also holds in infinitive 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 (71)a 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 (71)a must be due to Clitic Climbing.[42]
If so, the reason for the ungrammaticality of (65)b, 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):[43]

(72)a***Mi** sta dicendo**lo**
      (He) to-me is saying it
    b ***Lo** sta dicendo**mi**
      (He) it is saying to-me
      'He is saying it to me'

(73)a ***Mi** sta per dir**lo**
       (He) to-me is about to say it
    b ***Lo** sta per dir**mi**
       (He) it is about to say to-me
      'He is about to say it to me'

(74)a Sta dicendo**melo**
       (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 dir**melo**
       (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 (65)b indeed reduces to that of (72)-(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 alternations 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):[44]

(76) Ho **loro** cominciato ad insegnar**lo** 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 non-finite one (infinitive or gerund). From this point of view, it is past participles (the other non-finite 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*).[45] Differently from 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 - i.e. varieties in which Clitic Climbing (hence "restructuring") looks obligatory, like most Central and Southern Italian dialects (Beninca' 1986,131f, Monachesi 1995,200ff; Ledgeway 1998,2000), and Sardinian (Jones 1993) - and 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[46] – cf. Kayne 1977,chapter 2,fn7; Pollock 1978,fn18; Taraldsen 1983,308, Cinque 2002b) Long *Tough*-movement, and 'Long Passive' – see Kayne 1989b,250ff, Rochette 1988,245fn23, Cinque 2002b, and the examples given in the next note). Still other varieties display a clitic in both positions (i.e., a copy in the lower one- Beninca' 1986,130; Kayne 1989, fn37). See, for example, Chilean Spanish **Los vamos a verlos** 'Them (we) are going to see them' (from Uriagereka 1995,86,fn21), and Neapolitan **L'amu pruvatu a ru vida** 'Him (we) tried to him see' (from Ledgeway 1996, chapter 3,fn6).[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'
　　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'
　　b Si sarebbero loro dovute consegnare subito

5.3 *Auxiliary Change*.[48] The case of Auxiliary Change appears to be more complex. On one side, the ungrammaticality of (81)a (vs. (81)b), from Rizzi (1978,136), would seem to suggest that it is obligatory:

(81)a *?Maria **ci ha** dovuto venire molte volte
　　　'M. has had to come there many times'
　　b　Maria **c' è** dovuta venire molte volte

On the other, the acceptability of (82)a (alongside (82)b) would seem to point to its optionality (in that Auxiliary Change fails to apply even in the presence of *Loro* Climbing):[49]

(82)a Avremmo loro potuto rimanere più vicini　'We could have to-them remained closer'
　　b Saremmo loro potuti rimanere più vicini　'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 which, raising, effects the change *avere* → *essere* on the "restructuring" verb (whence the implication "Clitic Climbing → Auxiliary Change", in a language which has both, though not viceversa – cf. (66)).[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, or *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 *sembrare* 'seem' and motion verbs (which also have genuine lexical usages), "restructuring" verbs are always 'functional'; hence necessarily entering 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 *0* - 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 *Again 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)-(84) (and Hernanz and Rigau 1984,fn6 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 fulfledged 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 (84)b 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) vs. "strict" (exhaustive) Control.* Further evidence for the exclusive functional character of "restructuring" verbs appears to come from a property of (obligatory) Control recently discussed by Wurmbrand (1998,chapter 4) and Landau (1999, 2000, chapter 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 further argues that the class requiring strict identity coincides with the class of "restructuring" infinitives while the class allowing "imperfect" Control coincides with that of non-"restructuring" infinitives, and suggests that the difference follows from a difference between restructured and non-restructured 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 which lacks transparency effects, 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 concerts is beginning/finishing/continuing'

In all such cases, the verb, unlike what happens with functional verbs, does not take a non-finite verbal complement, but 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)-(88) are structurally more complex that it looks. Den Dikken, Larson and Ludlow (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, interpretations 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***. Different is the case of motion verbs and *sembrare* 'seem', which appear to have genuine usages as lexical verbs, in addition to their functional usage. We have seen above 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 (for example, they do not allow Clitic Climbing). See in particular (43), fn10, fn30, and (41),(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 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. fn10), are interpreted literally as verbs of locomotion, part of whose meaning is the means of transportation (cf. (90)a 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 (90)b, 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 fn4 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 vs. "restructuring" *sembrare* without one. The former literally means that a certain state of affairs seems true to someone (hence the perfectly non contradictory status of (91)a). 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 (91)b):[58]

(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 (owing to their semantics). But it shows that their functional and lexical usages should be kept distinct.

7. Presence vs. absence of transparency effects: syntactic contrasts. We 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, requires explaining them in ways that have nothing to do with constituency differences (such as the monoclausal vs. biclausal distinction).

Before attempting that (sections 7.2-3), 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 (fn54), 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$_i$ vuole.. [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ restare]
    b Gianni$_i$ vuole.. [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ OBTAIN [$_{CP}$ PRO$_i$ restare]]

This, we take, 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.[59]

The case of *sembrare* and motion verbs is different as 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 fn10) that such "Heavy NP Shift" contrasts as (18)b-(19)b, repeated below as (93)a-b, are not imputable to a constituency difference, but derive, for (93)b, either from an illicit application of scrambling of the PP *a Firenze*, or from an illicit extraction of the clitic out of the adjunct *ad esporre la mia idea*:

(93)a ..verrò a Firenze ad espor**ti** 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 (13)a-b, repeated here as (94)a-b, and in particular, the ungrammaticality of (94)b, reduce to the independent ungrammaticality of such cases as (17), repeated here as (95):

(94)a Piero voleva - ma francamente adesso non so se vorrà ancora - parlar**ne** 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.'

(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 (7)a-b above. Depiante (1998), following Zubizarreta (1982), suggests that it is due to the kind of null anaphora licensed by "restructuring" verbs, which is a form of "deep anaphora", in Hankamer and Sag's (1976) 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,..), i) do not need an identical syntactic antecedent ; ii) can be pragmatically controlled; iii) cannot host "missing antecedents"; and iv) eliminate scope ambiguities (see Hankamer and Sag 1976, Depiante 1998). Bošković (1994,266f) and Depiante (1998) show that the null complement which 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]

(96)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 tradurre? B: No. Non riuscirò/*Non lo riuscirò

A: Will you manage to translate it? B: No. I will not manage.

c A: Gianni la vede? B: Sì. Ha ricominciato/*L'ha ricominciata

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 riparare? B: Sì. Ho provato/*L'ho provato

A: Have you tried to repair it? B: Yes. I have tried

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 (as their subject cannot enter any antecedent-trace relation with a category 'inside' the null complement).[61] 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, and our NCA. I take this to be no accident, and suggest that the NCA following "restructuring" verbs is literally the null counterpart of *do it* (with agentive 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$_k$ non posso…[$_{VP}$ t$_k$ [[$_v$far] [$_{DP}$lo]]] '..but I can't do it', with the subject *io* 'outside' of the pro-form *farlo* 'do it'; an analysis also compatible with our previous conclusion that "restructuring" verbs all involve raising. [62]

7.3 *Cleft Sentence contrasts.* Recall the different behavior of the variant with transparency effects and the variant without under Cleft Sentence Formation (ex. (7), repeated here as (97)):

(97)a E' proprio a parlar**ti** 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 basis of the well-formedness of the Focus Movement and Topicalization cases corresponding to (97)b (cf. (8) above), we concluded that the contrast in (97) cannot be due to constituency reasons, but has probably to do with 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 in the lefthand side of (98)a-e suggests that the unacceptability of the sentences in the righthand side of (98)a-e and (97)b, 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 riuscirò**/*E' a tradurre che **non lo riuscirò**

It's to translate it that I will not manage

c ?E' a vederla che **ha ricominciato**/*E' a vedere che **l'ha ricominciata**

It's to see her that he started again

d ?E' a vederla che **continuerò**/*E' a vedere che **la continuerò**

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 (97)b and (98)a-e with (99) and (100)a-e, respectively:

(99) A: Non credo che mi verrà a parlare di questo. B: Vedrai che verrà/*Vedrai che **ti** verrà
    '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 tradurre? B: **No. Non riuscirò/*Non lo riuscirò**
    A: Will you manage to translate it? B: No. I will not manage.
   c A: Gianni la vede? B: **Sì. Ha ricominciato/*L'ha ricominciata**
    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 riparare? 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 which can neither be stranded under Cleft Sentence Formation (cf.(101)), nor support NCA (cf. (102)):

(101)a *E' essere ubriaco che sembrava   (*sembrare*)
    'It is to be drunk that he seemed'
  b *E' essergli caro che deve   (epistemic *dovere*)
    It's be dear to-her that he must
  c *E comprandolo che stava   (progressive *stare*)
    It's buying it that he was
  d *E' per comprarla che sta   (prospective *stare per*)
    It's to buy it that he is about
  e *E per aiutarlo che finirà   ('delayed aspect' *finire per*)
    It's helping him that he will end up

(102)a A: Era ubriaco? B: ***?Sembrava**.
    A: Was he drunk? B: He seemed
   b A:Pensi che gli sia caro? B: ***Sì, deve**
    A: Do you think he is dear to him? B: Yes, he must
   c A: Sta comprandolo? ***Sì, sta**
    A: Is he buying it? B: Yes, he is
   d A: Sta forse per comprarlo? B: ***Sì, 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 one side, and (101)-(102), on the other, is not one between Control vs. 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 be 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 generalization about Clefts and NCA). Compare (101)a/(102)a 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. fn62). More accurately, the empty counterpart of (*do) it*, and the empty DP or PP, is perhaps what allows the correct operator-variable structure accompanying the "base generated" phrase in focus (in Chomsky's 1977,44ff analysis of Cleft Sentence Formation). Such cases as (106)a-c under this analysis would receive the derivation indicated in (107)a-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$_i$ che non può FARE ('DO') t$_i$

    (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$_i$ che non ha ancora finito t$_i$

    (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$_i$ che ho provato/non sono riuscito [$_{PP}$ P t$_i$]

    (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 (97)a and b (and the like) follows from the impossibility of construing the clitic with an appropriate trace in (97)b. See (108)b:

(108)a E' [$_{CP}$ proprio a parla**ti** di questi problemi] 0$_i$ che verrà [$_{PP}$ P t$_i$]

(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_i che **ti**_k verrà [_PP_ P t_i]

8. Some residual questions.

8.1 *"Restructuring" and null subjects.* Kayne's (1989b) analysis, in making both depend on the strength of INFL, formally related Clitic Climbing to the null subject character of the language (a relation originally conjectured in Kayne's 1980).[63] 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 XVII Century French Clitic Climbing is still a robust phenomenon while 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 (1994,56) (See also Sportiche 1983, and Tellier 1987).

8.2 *"Restructuring" and negation.* It is generally assumed (cf. the references cited in Kayne 1989,fn.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-Mahe (1994,209).[64] 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 where Clitic Climbing appears to cross over negation. See (110), and Napoli (1981,853):[65]

(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 [66]
      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_evidential (hence (110)a), but higher than most aspectual heads (hence (109)), with scope elements like modals activating different

positions of negation (hence (110)b-d). Cf. 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 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 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 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 between 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 "action 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 rather 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 and Rigau 1984,45), behave as "restructuring" verbs while 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 *cuider* '(lit.) believe', in Middle French, also used with the (prospective) aspectual 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 come 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 another, or, within one and the same language, for some speakers, but not others.

One case in point is 'seem', which is taken not to be a "restructuring" verb in Spanish (Zagona 1986,232), nor in Portuguese (Quicoli 1976,215; Pizzini 1981,427fn24), 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 (alternatively, it could be that the speakers Zagona and Pizzini based their conclusion on, as opposed other speakers, are like

the Italian speakers that do not have *sembrare* as a "restructuring" verb).

Much of the cross-linguistic and inter speaker variation involves verbs which belong 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', *preferire* 'prefer' as "restructuring" verbs, while others find them marginal, or outright impossible.[67]

These verbs appear to add specific nuances of meaning to the basic sense of 'volition'; hence complying to a lesser degree with the semantics of the corresponding functional head (ModP$_{volition}$): 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 finì per accettare* 'it (he) ended up accepting'; *lo avrà da riconsegnare entro domani* 'it (he) will have to give back by tomorrow') which introduce the non-finite 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: …F…[$_{PP}$ P [$_{INFP}$ Inf [$_{FP}$ F……[$_{VP}$]]]]. 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*).[68]

Notes

[1] Besides structure simplification approaches like Rizzi's (1976,1978), and, in a different framework, Aissen and Perlmutter's (1976,1983) (cf. also Rivas 1977 and Luján 1978), one may mention two other major families of analyses: the "double (Sentence/VP) subcategorization" analyses of Strozer (1976,1981), Fresina (1980/81,1982,1997), Picallo (1985,1990), Moore (1989,1990,1996), Pearce (1990), Rochette (1988,1990), Rosen (1990a,b), Bošković (1994), Wurmbrand (1998, 2001), among others, and the (embedded-)I-to-(matrix-)I biclausal analysis of Kayne (1989b), adopted, in different forms, by Martineau (1991), Rivero (1991), Terzi (1992,1994,1996), Rooryck (1994), Bok-Bennema and Kampers-Manhe (1994), Bonneau and Zushi (1994), Roberts (1993,1997). Other analyses that have been proposed for the "restructuring" phenomenon are the biclausal analyses of Burzio (1981, 1986), Baker (1988), Haverkort (1990, 1993), Sabel (1995a,b, 1996, 1999) in terms of VP raising to the left of the embedded subject; the parallel structure analyses of Zubizarreta (1982), Manzini (1983), Haegeman and Riemsdijk (1984), Goodall (1987), and Di Sciullo and Williams (1987,97ff). "Restructuring" has also received treatments in more recent minimalist terms (Watanabe 1993, Martins 1995), as well as in LFG (Andersen 1987), in Tree-adjoining Grammar (Bleam 1994, and Kulick 1997), in HPSG (Miller 1992, and Monachesi 1993,1995,1998), and in Categorial Grammar (Nishida 1991).

[2] Besides Romance, transparency effects have been reported to exist (with roughly the same

verbs) in Germanic (see Evers 1975; Haider 1986,1987,1992; Grewendorf 1988; Fanselow 1989; Bayer and Kornfilt (1990), Koopman and Szabolcsi 2000, among many others), in Slavic (George and Toman 1976,241ff; Dyła 1983; Spencer 1991,357f; Progovac 1993; Sabel 1995a,b,1996,1999; Veselovská (1995,377); Przepiorkowski and Kupš 1997; Stjepanović 1998,2001; Medová 2000; among others); in the African languages Abe (Tellier 1987), Bete (Sportiche 1983; Haverkort 1990,1993), and Édó (Stewart 1999); in Eskimo (Baker 1988,204ff); in Basque (Ortiz de Urbina 1989,26ff); in Turkish (Kornfilt 1996); in Japanese (Miyagawa 1986, Nishigauchi 1993; Zushi 1995; Wurmbrand 1998); in Malayalam (Baker 1988,204ff); in Chamorro (Chung 1988); in Tagalog (Kroeger 1993,167-207); in Hungarian (Choe 1998, 1989; Farkas and Sadock 1989, Koopman and Szabolcsi 2000); in Choktaw (Broadwell and Martin 1993,5ff); in Ancash Quechua (Cole 1984); in Chukchee (Spencer 1991,361; Baker 1999,369); in Hindi (Mahajan 1989,233ff; Zushi 1995); in Kashmiri (Wali and Koul 1994,988), among many other languages. The long distance agreement of Godeberi (Caucasian - Haspelmath 1993) has all the characteristics of "restructuring" too. For the claim that French also displays "restructuring" effects, see Taraldsen (1983,299f), Kayne (1989), Bok-Bennema and Kampers-Manhe (1994), and Cinque (2002b). Haïk (1985,76,fn49), Goodall (1991), Hornstein (1995,77f,85f), Roberts (1997), and Kayne (1998,fn.36) claim that restructuring effects are even detectable in English.

[3] 'XP>YP' should be interpreted as 'YP is the complement of the head of XP'.

[4] In many languages, 'andative' ('itive/ventive'), or 'distantive', 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) Min mabb-it-ir-an-ilaw-**oy**-i   mo ngal sembe
   we close-REVERS-INSTR-BENEF-CELER-**DISTANTIVE**-PAST him it strength
    'We went and opened it for him with strength quickly'
Mishmi (Tibeto-Burman) verbs can likewise be "inflected for movement" (Devi Prasada Sastry 1984,156). Analogous "coming and going aspectual affixes" are attested 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 Jaeggli 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 there (see, now, Cinque 2001). Among these, particularly relevant here are *conative* aspect ('try'), *frustrative* or *'success'* aspect ('(not) manage'), *inceptive* aspect ('begin'), *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] Capital letters indicate focussed constituents. Incidentally, the grammaticality of (8) shows that the ungrammatiality of (7)b cannot be due to the fact that the clitic fails to c-command its trace (contra Zubizarreta 1980, 148ff). For the same conclusion, see Fresina (1981,chapter 2, fn2), Burzio (1981, chapter 6, fn2).

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 (7)b should be seen as related to that of sentences like (10) is also suggested in Fresina (1981,119 fn.62; 1982,289), and Moore (1996,48f).

⁸ Rizzi (1976a,fn8; 1978; 1982,fn14) 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 rimproverare)* 'It's thank that we him should, not scold'); a context which also improves the clefting 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,fn7) also involve either an explicit, or an implicit, contrastive phrase. These exceptions remain to be understood.
The constrast 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 PIU' 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 to me this implication.

⁹ On the basis of examples such as (i), it has sometimes been claimed that also non-constituents can be Right Node Raised, hence that the phenomenon is not a reliable diagnostic for constituency (Abbot 1976):
(i)Mary baked and George frosted, 20 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, note 16), who analyses it as derived by leftward movement of the adverbial PP into the auxiliary structure.
There is another potential derivation of (19)b which does not derive it from (18)a via Heavy NP Shift (or its leftward analogue). In (18)a the PP *a Firenze* either modifies just the embedded infinitive (and is interpreted as a locative), or both *venire* and the embedded infinitive (in which case it is interpreted as directional). In (18)b, instead, the PP *a Firenze* can only be interpreted 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 status of *ad esporti la mia idea* in (18)b 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$_k$ è venuto a Firenze ad esporti la sua idea t$_k$? (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 (iii)a and b, noted in Fresina (1981,285) also cast doubt on the presence of a systematic relation between (18)a 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 (19)b (*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 infinite and its complement do not pied pipe under wh-movement when transparency effects obtain, giving contrasts such as (i):
(i)a Questi argomenti, a parlarti 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 verrò al più presto,...
      'These topics, to talk about which I will to-you come soon, ...'
While there is some contrast between (i)a and b, there are cases just like (i)b that sound to me quite acceptable. See (iii):
(iii) Maria, presentare alla quale non lo vorrei,..
      'M., to introduce to whom I him wouldn't like ,..'
Secondly, 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, chapter 1). These, of course, would not discriminate between the two variants, with and without, transparency effects.

[13] See section 6.3 below for apparent 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 imprigionarli* '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 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 non finite form). Although I tend to share this intuition, the judgment is not very sharp, and speakers disagree. For critical discussion of this argument, see Wurmbrand (1998,214ff).

[14] This "restructuring" verb appears to correspond to the so-called Predispositional Aspect (head) found in American Sign Language (Klima and Bellugi 1979), and to the 'tendency' aspect suffix found in Southeastern Tepehuan (Willet 1991).

[15] For the apparent case of speakers also accepting (27)b, see the discussion in Cinque (2001,fn4).

[16] The adverbs which correspond to $Asp_{terminative}$ and $Asp_{continuative}$ 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** arrabbiato con me!
    I hope that you are no longer still angry at me
  b *Spero che tu non sia **ancora più** arrabbiato con me!
    I hope that you are still no longer angry at me
((i)b 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, *solere* should precede *volere, smettere* and *continuare*; *tendere* should precede *smettere* and *continuare*; etc. These expectations appear to be confirmed quite generally. Here, I only give a couple of 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 monoclausality would seem to come from Rizzi's (1976a,39;1978,155f) observation that transparency phenomena are blocked by an Aux $V_{participle}$ Aux $V_{participle}$ sequence. See, for example:
(i)a Avrei voluto aver*vi* 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 (i)b 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 $V_{participle}$ 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 (i)b 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 esser**vi** 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 ($Asp_{perfect}$ and $T_{anterior}$). 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", also see Chomsky (1973,fn.26).
The same limitations appear to hold for the analogous cases of Clitic Climbing out of wh-phrases in Serbo-Croatian (cf. (i)a-b, Nedzhad Leko and Ljljiana Progovac, p.c.):
 (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 (differently from 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,fn15): "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,§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,fn18) 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, chapter 5). It is also reminiscent of Rosen's (1990a,b) 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). Cf. also Emonds' (1999) idea that

verbs in "restructuring" contexts lack semantic features.

[25] See section 4.2 for 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 contraindexing or, with identical indices, 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$_{i/k}$ lo INFL$_k$ ha costretto lui$_k$ a PRO$_k$ t$_k$ fare
    G.   it has forced him to do
  b *Gianni$_i$ lo ha costretto il poveretto$_i$ 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 (2000,299fn15) informants, and for Burzio (1986,354), but not for Rizzi (1976b,173, and fn12), nor for Fresina (1981,49). My own judgment is that it allows it selectively; i.e. with 3rd person clitics (as in (41)a, or in *Non **gli**$_i$ sembra essere fedele* t$_i$ 'not to him (she) seems to be faithful', but not with 1st and 2nd pers. Clitics (**Non **mi*,**/ti**$_i$ sembra essere fedele* t$_i$ 'not to me/you (she) seems to be faithful', nor *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 alike (suggesting that it too is a case of "restructuring" - cf. Stowell 1991): *Non **gli**$_i$ sembra fedele* t$_i$ 'he to-him does not seem faithful' vs. **Non **mi**$_i$/ti$_i$ sembra fedele* t$_i$ 'he to me/you does not seem faithful'. The contrast between *Ne sembravate contenti* '(you) of-it seemed glad' and **Giorgio gliene sembrava contento* 'G. to-him-of-it seemed glad', **Giorgio ne sembrava a tutti contento* 'G. of-it seemed to everybody glad', with an overt dative complement of *sembrare*, noted in Cinque (1981/82,257), in fact exactly parallels that between (41)a and b. Other "restructuring" verbs apparently allowing 3rd person, but not 1st, 2nd person clitics and *si* are (for me): *preferire* (?*Lo preferì fare Gianni* 'G. preferred doing it' vs. **Se ne preferì 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'), among others. The phenomenology in question could have to do with the kind of empty category which 3rd person, on one side, and 1st, 2nd person clitics and *si*, on the other, cooccur 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):

(i)a Pierre avait **tous** menacé (*Marie) de les importer
    P. had   threatened (M.) to take them all away
  b Pierre avait tout promis (*à Marie) de lire
    P.   had promised (M.) to read everything

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 his is a control usage of *versprechen* falling 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. See:
 (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 taking a dative argument in certain varieties of Catalan noted in Rigau (2000, section 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. While 1st and 2nd person clitics, and *si*, are (marginally) possible (cf. (i)), (accusative) 3rd pers. clitics are to my ear ungrammatical (cf. (ii)a and (iii)a, which contrast with the potentially non-"restructuring" (ii)b and (iii)b, possible because the relative head can originate in the structural object position of the motion verb):
(i)a ?Le uniche persone venute**vi** a salutare.. 'the only persons come to greet you..'
  b ?[G.C.)]Un vicino venuto**mi** a chiedere un favore... (Burzio 1986,334)
      'A neighbor come to ask me a favor..'
  c ?L'unico ragazzo venuto**si** a presentare.. 'the only boy *si* come to introduce himself..'
(ii)a *L'unico ragazzo andato**lo** a prendere.. 'the only boy gone to fetch it..'
  b ??L'unico ragazzo andato a prender**lo**.. 'the only boy gone to fetch it..'
(iii)a *Le sole persone venute**lo** a raccogliere.. 'the only persons come to gather it..'
  b Le sole persone venute a raccoglier**lo**.. '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 1st and 2nd person clitics and *si*, but disallow (accusative) 3rd person clitics (cf. Beninca' and Cinque 1991,609; also see fn. 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) has 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,fn.50); or it may depend on the 'semi-functional' character of motion verbs, which, like causatives (cf. Cinque 2002a,fn19), contribute an argument even if entering a specific slot of the functional hierarchy. The different interpretation of the PP *da*

Torino 'from Turin' in (iv)a vs. (iv)b, below, indeed shows that it must be *venire* 'come' which 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 'semi-functional' predicates, also see Cardinaletti and Shlonsky (2000) (some of whose judgments, and conclusions, however, I do not share), Cardinaletti and Giusti (2000), and Wurmbrand (2001).

[32] The account sketched in Kayne (1989,fn52) 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,fn11) is incompatible with the antisymmetric framework as 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 (43)a), the infinitival clause is an adjunct; an even stronger reason 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. Cf.: *Te ne sono venuti a morire vicino molti* 'Many of them have come to die near you'.
The same reason may account for the non-"restructuring" 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 legger**lo**
    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 (but the same is true for other languages – Bordelois 1988,73; Sabel 1999) does not allow Clitic Climbing with any *direct* object control verb (see, for example, **Me lo invitarono/aiutarono a leggere* 'They invited/helped me to read it'; **Me lo costrinsero/ obbligarono/forzarono a leggere* 'They forced me to read it'; **Me lo convinsero/persuasero a leggere* 'They convinced me to read it', etc.).
An exception appears to be *mandare* 'send', as in *Me lo mandarono a prendere* 'They sent to get it for me'. This, however, is not related to *Mi mandarono a prenderlo* 'They sent me (ACC) to get it' (via Climbing of *lo*), for *mi* must be dative (cf. *Glielo mandarono a prendere* 'They sent to get it for him'). Rather, it seems related to *Mandarono a prendermelo* '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 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, see however Landau (1999,forthcoming). The evidence below concerning control "restructuring" verbs argues for movement into a non-theta 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 (i)a-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/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 (ii)a-b, from Burzio (1986,362), which under this view no longer instantiate a control vs. 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 (iii)a and b (also from Burzio1986,389) can analogously be attributed not to control vs. 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$_i$ vorrebbe essere assegnato a quei visitatori$_i$
    'One interpreter each would want to be introduced to those visitors'
    c Un interprete ciascuno$_i$ potrebbe essere assegnato a quei visitatori$_i$
    'One interpreter each could be introduced to those visitors'
When such subject is more easily interpretable as volitional, the contrast indeed tends to disappear:
(iv) ?A quei visitatori$_i$ vorrà forse andare incontro un interprete ciascuno$_i$
    'To those visitors will want to go up one interpreter each'
Rizzi (1976b,172ff) mentions the existence of another Control vs. Raising contrast in the "restructuring" construction. Raising, but not Control, verbs would seem to allow for impersonal *si* on the embedded infinitival. See (v) (given with his judgment):
(v)a Queste case devono/possono costruir**si** alla svelta
    'These houses must/can *si* build quickly
    b *Queste case vogliono costruir**si** alla svelta
    These houses want to *si* build quickly
I (and other speakers), however, find such cases as (v)b not to be impossible, and actually quite natural, with other moods and lexical choices: *Certe esperienze vorrebbero poter**si** 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*: **Queste 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'). This is because 'lexical' *volere* is followed by an abstract predicate taking an object clause (cf. section 6.3), whence 3rd person singular agreement on the participle. 3rd 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 towards 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 subject), another *si* exists (cf. Cinque's 1988 –arg *si*) which absorbs no external theta-role, nor Accusative, but only Nominative, and which can thus render impersonal those predicates that have no external theta-role nor Accusative Case (unaccusative, passive, psych-, copular and raising verbs). When this *si* applies to transitives, there is no object promotion to subject (Cinque 1988, Dobrovie-Sorin 1998):
(i)a Si è perso molti soldi 'One has lost (sing.) a lot of money (pl.)'
   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 (i)a), or the object is cliticized (as in (i)b), or contains the *ci si* form (replacing an impossible *si si* sequence), or has floating *tutti* 'all' (cf. Cinque 1988; also see 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 Preposing 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. (i)b):

(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 (i)b, and the Clitic Climbing variant of (i)a (***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 only absorbs Nominative Case, and which renders impersonal unaccusative, passive, psych-, copular and raising verbs. (i)b 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 (ii)b, with the [-arg] impersonal *si* of note 41, and (iii)b,(iv)b, with impersonal(-passive) *si*:

(ii)a **Si** stava convincendo**lo** tutti a restare 'We were all convincing him to stay'

   b **Stava convincendo**losi** tutti a restare

(iii)a Questi articoli **si** stanno vendendo a prezzi stracciati 'These items are being sold very cheap'

   b ?Questi articoli stanno vendendo**si** a prezzi stracciati

(iv)a Loro **si** stanno scrivendo dei biglietti 'They are writing cards to each other'

   b Loro stanno scrivendo**si** dei biglietti

Examples (72),(74) in the text below show that the progressive periphrasis in Italian, like other contexts, does not allow split clitics. (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* (Beninca', ibidem) (and *Lo si stava convincendo*) cases of Clitic Climbing.

[43] The requirement of "uniform cliticization" found in Italian in "restructuring" contexts (Rizzi 1976a,fn18), in the progressive and prospective periphrasis of (74), (75), and in negative imperatives (Kayne 1992,fn5 – cf. **Non **gli** date**lo** vs. *Non date**glielo** 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 varieties (Kayne 1989b,248,256,fn34), nor 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 (65)b may have to do with one but not the other clitic climbing up is also found in Longobardi (1979,fn7), and Burzio (1981, chapter 6,fn4).

[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 like *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 you to sell', for others, myself included, clitics (in either position) are quite marginal. In this connection, also see Radford (1977,109), Napoli (1981,850f), 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's), and (ii), adapted from Longobardi (1980,fn.5):

(i)a Gianni **lo** tornò a salutare 'G. greeted him again'

  b Gianni tornò a salutar**lo** '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) far**lo** anche lui

In (i)a, 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 (i)b, 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.

(ii)a-b exemplify a constraint against the sequence of two infinitives, one of which is the complement of the other (Longobardi 1980). (ii)c shows that with "restructuring" verbs displaying Clitic Climbing the constraint becomes inoperative, provided that the final vowel of the first infinitive is deleted. But the same is true of (ii)d, even though the clitic has not climbed. This suggests that (ii)d is a case of "restructuring" despite the lack of Clitic Climbing (note that deletion of the 'e' of *detestare* in (ii)a 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').

Also see 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 mangiatolo*" is possible in other Romance varieties (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) mangiatolo, 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,section 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,fn21; Aissen and Perlmutter 1983, postscript; Burzio 1986,373ff; Cinque 2002a). Here, a clitic cannot remain on the infinitive. See (i)b (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 consegnar**gli** 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 paper, I argue that such limitations can be understood if "restructuring" verbs are taken to be functional verbs inserted directly under the corresponding functional heads. For in such cases it is to be expected that only those "restructuring" verbs which 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 instead cannot be passivized as lowering is barred. If that is correct, the ungrammaticality of (i)b 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. While 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 boite 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', etc. 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, for example, 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 viceversa), and with a subset of the "restructuring" verbs (*volere* 'want', *potere* 'can', *dovere* 'must', and *cominciare,iniziare* 'begin', *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 (i)a and b, and (ii)a 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 and 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 towards?'
    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* [tʃa] in (iii), note that (81)b and the like also degrade considerably with *ci è* in place of *c'è*.

[50] Interestingly 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 17th 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, chapter 2, section 6) explicitly claims that 'strict', or, in his terms, 'exhaustive', Control does not reduce to raising (due to 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, irrespective of whether they are in a "restructuring" context or not, and given that some of the implicative verbs which show exhaustive control are not, according to him, "restructuring"). In the context of our analysis, none of these arguments are 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, we are suggesting that "restructuring" verbs enter a "restructuring" (monoclausal) configuration even in the absence of transparency effects; i.e. can only enter "restructuring" contexts; whence their exclusively raising character (which derives their "exhaustive Control" property in all situations). Finally, the claim that there are non-"restructuring" implicative verbs, which still display exhaustive Control, does not seem to us to be substatiated by the facts. Among implicative verbs, we find that only the "restructuring" ones (*riuscire* "manage", *dimenticare* "forget", *mancare* 'fail', *osare* 'dare') display exhaustive control. (cf. (i)). Non-"restructuring" 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 section 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 (ii)a, which can thus instantiate either the structure in (ii)b, or that in (ii)c:
(ii)a Gianni vuole restare 'G. wants to stay'

b Gianni$_i$ vuole.. [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ OBTAIN [$_{CP}$ PRO$_i$ restare]]
    c Gianni$_i$ vuole.. [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ 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 '..*to hate/*to appreciate/etc.'); similarly, *John finished the beer* can be interpreted as '..finished drinking', but not '..*pouring/*selling/etc.'.

[56] In the case of (88)c, 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,fn26):
(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 sencond, 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 *sembrare* is not due to the presence of an optionally deleted dative *a me/mi* 'to me' is shown by the fact that no "restructuring" use is possible any longer 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 (96)a thus contrasts with *Mangiare fredda, non la può* 'eat cold, he it cannot', which has a structured empty category ([$_{XP}$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 our 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 '[$_{CP/IP}$ 0]' pro-form) vs. 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', vs. **Potrò, solo a qualcuno* 'I will be able [to do it] only to someone'. 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/Italian contrast between empty operators and resumptive clitics in Topicalization/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 surpised'

What all the different types of NCA appear to have in common is some kind of pronominal element ('it', pro-PPs, 'do it',..): 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 (1989b), the presence of null subjects, not viceversa.

[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 sentencea in (110) do not require the special intonation discussed in Rizzi (1976a,fn.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 ex. (30) (?)*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 ex. (45) ??*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 (1998,362fn9) does. For Spanish, Roldán (1975,344) does not allow Clitic Climbing with *preferir*, while Luján (1978,105) does. Some Italians have *pensare* 'think' as a "restructuring" verb; interestingly not in its propositional meaning (cf. (i)a), but in its volitional one, of intending/planning to (cf. (i)b) (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 abtract 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 roll-up derivation proposed in Koopman and Szabolci 2000 for "restructuring" verbs

in Hungarian and Dutch).

We also abstract from additional projections which 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'.

REFERENCES

Abbot, Barbara (1976) "Right Node Raising as a Test for Constituenthood", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 7.639-642

Aissen, Judith and David Perlmutter (1976) "Clause Reduction in Spanish", in *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp.1-30

Aissen, Judith and David Perlmutter (1983) Postscript to republication of "Clause Reduction in Spanish", in D.Perlmutter (ed.) *Studies in Relational Grammar 1.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 383-396

Andersen, Peggy M. (1987) "Restructuring in Italian: an LFG Analysis", in *Proceedings of the Third Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, The University of Pittsburgh, pp.13-24

Baker, Mark (1988) *Incorporation. A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing.*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Baker, Mark (1999) "Clitic climbing and the boundedness of head movement", in H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, pp.369-373

Bayer, Joseph and Jaklin Kornfilt (1990) "Restructuring Effects in German", in E.Engdahl, R.Cooper, M.Mellor and M.Reape (eds.) *Parametric Variation in Germanic and Romance. Proceedings from the DYANA Workshop, September 1989.* Center for Cognitive Science, University of Edinburgh, pp.21-42

Belletti, Adriana (1981) "Frasi ridotte assolute", *Rivista di grammatica generativa,* 6.3-32

Belletti, Adriana (1990) *Generalized Verb Movement*. Turin, Rosenberg e Sellier

Beninca', Paola (1986) "Punti di sintassi comparata dei dialetti italiani settentrionali", in G.Holtus and K.Ringger (eds.) *Raetia antiqua et moderna. W.Th.Elwert zum 80. Geburtstag.* Tübingen, Niemeyer, pp.457-79 (cited from republication in Beninca' 1994)

Beninca', Paola (1989) "Friaulisch", in G.Holtus, M.Metzeltin, and C.Schmitt (eds.) *Lexicon der romanistischen Linguistik. 1.Grammatik,*Tübingen, Niemeyer, pp.563-585

Beninca', Paola (1994) *La variazione sintattica. Studi di dialettologia romanza.* Bologna, Il Mulino

Beninca' Paola and Guglielmo Cinque (1991) "Il participio presente", in L.Renzi e G.Salvi (eds.) *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, vol.II, Bologna, Il Mulino, pp.604-609

Benucci, Franco (1990) *Destrutturazione. Classi verbali e costruzioni perifrastiche nelle lingue*

romanze antiche e moderne. Padova, Unipress

Bleam,Tonia (1994) "Clitic Climbing and the Power of Tree Adjoining Grammar", to appear in A.Abeillé and O.Rambow (eds.) *Tree Adjoining Gramars: Formalism, Interpretation and Linguistic Analysis*. Stanford, CSLI

Bok-Bennema, Reineke (1981) "Clitics and Binding in Spanish", in R.May and J.Koster (eds.) *Levels of Syntactic Representation*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.9-32

Bok-Bennema, Reineke and Brigitte Kampers-Manhe (1994) "Transparency effects in the Romance Languages", in M.L.Mazzola (ed.) *Issues and Theory in Romance Linguistics,* Washington (D.C.), Georgetown University Press, pp.199-217

Bonneau, José and Mihoko Zushi (1994) "Quantifier Climbing, Clitic Climbing and Restructuring in Romance", *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics*, 8.1-37

Bordelois, Ivonne (1974) *The Grammar of Spanish Causative Constructions*, Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT

Bordelois, Ivonne (1988) "Causatives: From Lexicon to Syntax", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 6.57-93

Bošković, Željko (1994) "D-Structure, Theta-Criterion, and Movement into Theta-Positions", *Linguistic Analysis*, 24.247-286

Boysen, Gerhard (1977) "L'emploi des verbes auxiliaires **essere** et **avere** avec les verbes modaux en italien", *Studia Neophilologica*, 49.287-309

Broadwell, George Aaron and Jack Martin (1993) "The Clitic/Agreement Split: Asymmetries in Choctaw Person Marking", in *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (Special Session on Syntactic Issues in Native American Languages)*, Berkeley, Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp.1-10

Burzio, Luigi (1981) *Intransitive Verbs and Italian Auxiliaries*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT

Burzio, Luigi (1986) *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht, Reidel

Calabrese, Andrea (1993) "The Sentential Complementation of Salentino: A Study of a Language without Infinitival Clauses", in A.Belletti (ed.) *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*. Turin, Rosenberg e Sellier, pp.28-98

Cardinaletti, Anna (1991) "On Pronoun Movement: The Italian Dative *Loro*", *Probus*, 3.127-153

Cardinaletti, Anna and Giuliana Giusti (2000) "'Semi-lexical' motion verbs in Romance and Germanic", to appear in N.Corver and H. van Riemsdijk (eds,) *Semi-lexical categories. On the function of content words and content of function.* Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter

Cardinaletti, Anna and Ur Shlonsky (2000) "Restructuring in Italian, clitic positions and clausal strata", University of Bologna and Venice and University of Geneva

Choe, Hyon-Sook (1988) *Restructuring Parameters and Complex Predicates. A Transformational Approach.* MIT Ph.D. Dissertation

Choe, Hyon-Sook (1989) "Restructuring in Korean and Hungarian", in L.Maràcz and P.Muysken (eds.) *Configurationality*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.267-292

Chomsky, Noam (1977) "On Wh-movement", in P.Culicover, T.Wasow and A.Akmajian (eds.) *Formal Syntax*. New York, Academic Press, pp.71-132

Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press

Chung, Sandra (1988) "Restructuring, Passive and Agreement in Chamorro", talk given at Stanford, July 1988

Cinque, Guglielmo (1981/82) "On the Theory of Relative Clauses and Markedness", *The Linguistic Review*, 1.247-294

Cinque,Guglielmo (1988) "On *si* Constructions and the Theory of Arb",*Linguistic Inquiry*,19.521-581

Cinque, Guglielmo (1990) "Ergative Adjectives and the Lexicalist Hypothesis", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 8.1-39

Cinque, Guglielmo (1998) "On Clitic Climbing and Other Transparency Effects", talk given at NYU and MIT, February/March 1998

Cinque, Guglielmo (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-linguistic Perspective*, New York, Oxford University Press

Cinque, Guglielmo (2001) "Restructuring and the order of aspectual and root modal heads", in G.Cinque e G.Salvi (eds.) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, Amsterdam, Elsevier, pp.137-155

Cinque, Guglielmo (2002a) "The interaction of passive, causative, and "restructuring" in Romance, in C.Tortora (ed.) *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*. New York, Oxford University Press, pp.50-66

Cinque, Guglielmo (2002b) "A Note on 'Restructuring' and Quantifier Climbing in French", to appear in *Linguistic Inquiry* 33 (4)

Cole, Peter (1984) "Clause Reduction in Ancash Quechua", in E.-D. Cook and D.B.Gerdts (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 16: The Syntax of Native American Languages*. New York, Academic Press, pp.105-121

Contreras, Heles (1979) "Clause reduction, the Saturation Constraint, and clitic promotion", *Linguistic Analysis*, 5.161-182

Depiante, Marcela (1998) "On the Interaction between "Ellipsis" and Restructuring in Spanish and Italian", ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs

Déprez, Viviane (1997) "Two Types of Negative Concord", *Probus*, 9.103-143

Devi Prasada Sastry, G. (1984) *Mishmi Grammar*. Central Institute of Indian Languages, Manasagangotri, Mysore

Dikken, Marcel den, Richard Larson, and Peter Ludlow (1996) "Intensional 'transitive' verbs and concealed complement clauses", *Rivista di Linguistica*, 8.331-348

Di Sciullo, Anna-Maria and Edwin Williams (1987) *On the Definition of Word*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1998) "Impersonal *se* Constructions in Romance and the Passivization of Unergatives", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 29.399-437

Dyła, Stefan (1983) "Evidence for S'-Deletion in Polish", *Folia Linguistica*, 17.327-337

Emonds, Joseph (1999) "How clitics license null phrases: A theory of the lexical interface", in H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, pp.291-367

Evans, Nicholas D. (1995) *A Gramar of Kayardild*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter

Evers, Arnold (1975) *The Transformational Cycle of Dutch and German.* Ph.D. Dissertation, Utrecht University

Fanselow, Gisbert (1989) "Coherent Infinitives in German: Restructuring vs. IP-Complementation", in C.Bhatt, E.Löbel and C.Schmidt (eds.) *Syntactic Phrase Structure Phenomena in Noun Phrases and Sentences*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp.1-16

Farkas, Donka and Jerrold M. Sadock (1989) "Preverb Climbing in Hungarian", *Language*, 65.318-338

Frantz, Donald G. (1976) "Equi-Subject Clause Union", in *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp.179-187

Fresina, Claudio (1981) *Aspects de la grammaire tranformationnelle de l'italien.* Thèse de troisième cycle. Université de Paris VIII

Fresina, Claudio (1982) "Les verbes de mouvement et les aspectuels en italien", *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 6.283-331

Fresina, Claudio (1997) "L'auxiliation en italien", *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 21.97-138

George, Leland and Jindrich Toman (1976) "Czech Clitics in Universal Grammar", *Papers from the 12th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society, pp.235-249

Gerdts, Donna B. (1988) "Semantic Linking and the Relational Structure of Desideratives", *Linguistics*, 26.843-872

Gonzalez, Nora (1986) "Interaction of Inversion and Clause Reduction in Spanish", *Proceedings of the Second Eastern States Conference of Linguistics*, Dept. of Linguistics, Ohio State University, pp.80-91

Gonzalez, Nora (1988) *Object and Raising in Spanish*, New York, Garland

Gonzalez, Nora (1990) "Unusual Inversion in Chilean Spanish", in Paul M.Postal and Brian D. Joseph (eds.) *Studies in Relational Grammar 3*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp.87-103

Goodall, Grant (1987) *Parallel Structures in Syntax. Coordination, causatives, and restructuring*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Goodall, Grant (1991) "*Wanna*-contraction as Restructuring", in C.Georgopoulos and R.Ishihara (eds.) *Intersciplinary Approaches to Language. Essays in Honor of S.-Y.Kuroda*. Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.239-254

Grevisse, Maurice (1993) *Le bon usage (Grammaire française refondue par André Goosse. 3e édition revue)* Paris, Duculot

Grewendorf, Günther (1987) "Kohärenz und Restrukturierung", in B.Asbach-Schnitker und J.Roggenhofer (hrsg.) *Neuere Foschungen zur Wortbildung und Historiographie der Linguistik*, Tübingen, Narr, pp.123-144

Grimshaw, Jane (1979) "Complement Selection and the Lexicon", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 10.279-326

Haegeman, Liliane and Henk van Riemsdijk (1986) "Verb Projection Raising, Scope, and the Typology of Rules affecting Verbs", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 17.417-466

Haider, Hubert (1986) "Fehlende Argumente: Vom Passiv zu kohärenten Infinitiven", *Linguistische Berichte*, 101.3-33

Haider, Hubert (1987) "Nicht-sententiale Infinitive" *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik*, 28.73-114

Haider, Hubert (1992) "Fakultativ kohärente Infinitivkonstruktionen im Deutschen", *Arbeitpapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340, Nr. 17*, Universität Stuttgart

Haïk, Isabelle (1985) *The Syntax of Operators*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT

Hale, Ken and S.Jay Keyser (1993) "On the Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relations", in K.Hale and S.J.Keyser (eds.) *The View from Building 20*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, pp.53-109

Hankamer, Jorge and Ivan Sag (1976) "Deep and Surface Anaphora", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 7.391-426

Haspelmath, Martin (1999) "Long distance agreement in Godoberi (Daghestanian) complement clauses", *Folia Linguistica*, XXXIII (1-2), pp.131-151

Haverkort, Marco (1990) "Clitic Climbing and Barrierhood of VP", in J.Hutchinson and V.Manfredi (eds.) *Current Approaches to African Linguistics*, 7, Dordrecht, Foris

Haverkort, Marco (1993) *Clitics and Parametrization.* Eurotyp Working Papers, VIII, (University of Tilburg)

Hernanz, Maria L. and Gemma Rigau (1984) "Auxiliaritat i reestructuració", *Els Marges*, 31.29-50

Hinterhölzl, Roland (1999) *Restructuring Infinitives and the Theory of Complementation*, Ph.D. Dissertation, USC

Hornstein, Norbert (1995) *Logical Form. From GB to Minimalism.* Oxford, Blackwell

Hornstein, Norbert (1999) "Movement and Control", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 30.69-96

Jackendoff, Ray (1997) *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press

Jaeggli, Osvaldo and Nina Hyams (1993) "On the Independence and Interdependence of Syntactic and Morphological Properties: English Aspectual *come* and *go*", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 11.313-346

Jones, Michael (1993) *Sardinian*. Routledge, London.

Kayne, Richard (1977) *Syntaxe du français.*Paris, Editions du Seuil

Kayne, Richard (1980) "Vers une solution d'un problème grammatical: **Je l'ai voulu lire, j'ai tout*

voulu lire", *Langue française*, 46.32-40

Kayne, Richard (1989a) "Facets of Past Participle Agreement", in P.Beninca' (ed.) *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.85-103

Kayne, Richard (1989b) "Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing", in O.Jaeggli and K.Safir (eds.) *The Null Subject Parameter*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.239-261

Kayne, Richard (1991) "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22.647-686

Kayne, Richard (1992) "Italian Negative Infinitival Imperatives and Clitic Climbing", in L.Tasmowski and A. Zribi-Hertz (eds.) *Hommages à Nicolas Ruwet*. Ghent, Communications et Cognition, pp.300-312

Kayne, Richard (1993) "Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection", *Studia Linguistica*, 47.3-31

Kayne, Richard (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press

Kayne, Richard (1998) "Overt versus Covert Movement", *Syntax*, 1.128-191

Kayne, Richard (1999a) "Prepositional Complementizers as Attractors", *Probus*, 11.39-73

Kayne, Richard (1999b) "Clitic Doubling and pro", class lecture, University of Venice, May 1999

Klima, Edward and Ursula Bellugi (1979) *The Signs of Language*, Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Press

Koizumi, Masatoshi (1995) *Phrase Structure in Minimalist Syntax*, Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT

Koopman, Hilda (1984) *The Syntax of Verbs*. Dordrecht, Foris

Koopman, Hilda and Anna Szabolcsi (2000) *Verbal Complexes*. Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press

Kornfilt, Jaklin (1996) "NP-Movement and 'Restructuring'", in R.Freidin (ed.) *Current Issues in Comparative Grammar*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.120-147

Kroeger, Paul (1993) *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Stanford, CSLI Publications

Kulick, Seth (1997) "Generalized Transformations and Restructuring in Romance", in J.Austin and A. Lawson (eds.) *Proceedings of the 14th Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, pp.103-114

Kuteva, Tania (1998) "On Identifying an Evasive Gram: Action Narrowly Averted", *Studies in Language*, 22.113-160

Landau, Idan (1999) *Elements of Control*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT

Landau, Idan (2000) *Elements of Control. Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions.* Dordrecht, Kluwer

LaPolla,M. (1988) "Clitic Movement in Spanish and the Projection Principle", in D.Birdsong and J-P.Montreuil (eds.) *Advances in Romance Linguistics*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.217-231

Larson, Richard (1988) "On the Double Object Construction", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19.335-391

Ledgeway, Adam (1996) *The Grammar of Complementation in Neapolitan*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Manchester

Ledgeway, Adam (1998) "La ristrutturazione in napoletano", in Giovanni Ruffino (ed.) *Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza.* Centro di Studi filologici e linguistici siciliani. Università di Palermo 18-24 settembre 1995. Sezione 2 Morfologia e sintassi delle lingue romanze. Tübingen, Niemeyer, pp.529-541

Ledgeway, Adam (2000) *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: a Minimalist Approach*. Oxford, Blackwell

Lefebvre, Claire and Pieter Muysken (1982) *Mixed Categories. Nominalizations in Quechua*, Dordrecht , Kluwer

Longobardi, Giuseppe (1978) "Doubl-inf", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 3.173-206

Longobardi, Giuseppe (1979) "Postille alla regola di ristrutturazione", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 4.213-228

Longobardi, Giuseppe (1980) "Remarks on Infinitives: A Case for a Filter", *Journal of Italian Linguistics*, 5.101-155

Luján, Marta (1978) "Clitic Promotion and Mood in Spanish Verbal Complements", *Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics*, 10.103-190 (also in *Linguistics*, 18 (1980) pp.381-484)

Mahajan, Anoop (1989) "Agreement and Agreement Phrases", in I.Laka and A.Mahajan (eds.) *Functional Heads and Clause Structure*. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, vol.10, pp.217-252

Manzini, M. Rita (1983) *Restructuring and Reanalysis*, Ph.D.Dissertation, MIT

Manzini, M.Rita and Anna Roussou (2000) "A Minimalist Theory of A-movement and Control", *Lingua*, 110.409-447

Martineau, France (1991) "Clitic Climbing in Infinitival Constructions of Middle French", in D. Wanner and D.A.Kibbee (eds.) *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp.235-251

Martins, Ana Maria (1995) "A Minimalist Approach to Clitic Climbing", *Proceedings of the 31st Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society (vol. 2: The Parasession on Clitics), pp.215-233

Medová, Lucie (2000) *Transparency Phenomena in Czech Syntax*. Hovedfagsoppgave, University of Tromsø

Miller, Philip H. (1992) *Clitics and Constituents in Phrase Structure Grammar*, New York, Garland

Miyagawa, Shigeru (1986) "Restructuring in Japanese", in T.Imai amd M.Saito (eds.) *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.273-300

Monachesi, Paola (1993) "Restructuring Verbs in Italian HPSG Grammar", in *Proceedings of the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.* Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society, pp.281-295

Monachesi, Paola (1995) *A Grammar of Italian Clitics*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Tilburg University

Monachesi, Paola (1998) "Italian Restructuring Verbs: A Lexical Analysis", in E.Hinrichs, A.Kathol and T.Nakazawa (eds.) *Complex Predicates in Nonderivational Syntax*. New York, Academic Press, pp.313-368

Monachesi, Paola (1999) "Phonological Phrases in Italian", in *Recherches de linguistique française et romane d'Utrecht*, 18.79-89

Moore, John (1989) "Spanish Restructuring and Psych Verbs: A Case for VP-Complementation", in E.J.Fee and K.Hunt (eds.) *Proceedings of the 8th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, pp.262-275

Moore, John (1990) "Spanish Clause Reduction with Downstairs Cliticization", in K.Dziwirek, P.Farrell, and E.Mejías-Bikandi (eds.) *Grammatical Relations. A Cross-Theoretical Perspective*, Stanford, CSLI, pp.319-333

Moore, John (1994) "Romance Cliticization and Relativized Minimality", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 25.335-344

Moore, John (1996) *Reduced Constructions in Spanish*, Garland, New York

Munro, Pamela and Dieynaba Gaye (1997) "Introduction", *Ay Baati Wolof. A Wolof Dictionary*. UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics, 19, pp.iii-xiii

Myhill, John (1988) "The Grammaticalization of Auxiliaries: Spanish clitic climbing", *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp.352-363

Myhill, John (1989) "Variation in Spanish Clitic Climbing", in Thomas J. Walsh (ed.) *Synchronic and diachronic approaches to linguistic variation and change (Georgetown University Roundtable '88)*. Washington (D.C.), Georgetown University Press, pp.227-250

Napoli, Donna J. (1981) "Semantic Interpretation vs. Lexical Governance: Clitic Climbing in Italian", *Language*, 57.841-887

Nishida, Chiyo (1991) "A non-transformational analysis of clitic climbing in Spanish", in A. Halpern (ed.) *Proceedings of the Ninth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Stanford, pp.395-409

Nishigauchi, Taisuke (1993) "Long Distance Passive", in N.Hasegawa (ed.) *Japanese Syntax in Comparative Grammar*, Tokyo, Kuroshio Shuppan, pp.79-114

O'Neil, John (1995) "Out of Control", *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society*, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, pp. 361-371

O'Neil, John (1997) *Means of Control: Deriving the Properties of PRO in the Minimalist Program.* Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT

Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. (1989) *Parameters in the Grammar of Basque*, Dordrecht, Foris

Pearce, Elisabeth (1990) *Parameters in Old French Syntax. Infinitival Complements.* Dordrecht, Kluwer

Pesetsky, David (1991) *Zero Syntax II: An Essay on Infinitive,* ms., MIT

Picallo, Carme (1985) *Opaque Domains.*Ph.D. Dissertation, CUNY

Picallo, Carme (1990) "Modal Verbs in Catalan", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 8.285-312

Pizzini, Quentin A. (1981) "The Placement of Clitic Pronouns in Portuguese", *Linguistic Analysis*, 8.403-430

Pizzini, Quentin A. (1982) "The Positioning of Clitic Pronouns in Spanish", *Lingua*, 57.47-69

Pollock, Jean-Yves (1978) "Trace Theory and French Syntax", in Samuel Jay Keyser (ed.) *Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press, pp.65-112

Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989) "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP", *Linguistic Inquiry,* 10.365-424

Postal. Paul (1974) *On Raising*. Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press

Progovac, Lilijana (1991) "Polarity in Serbo-Croatian: Anaphoric NPIs and Pronominal PPIs", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22.567-572

Progovac, Lilijana (1993) "Locality and Subjunctive-like Complements in Serbo-Croatian", *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 1.116-144

Przepiórkowski, Adam and Anna Kupš (1997) "Verbal Negation and Complex Predicate Formation in Polish", *Texas Linguistic Forum*, 38.247-261

Pustejovsky, James (1995) *The Generative Lexicon.* Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press

Quicoli, Carlos (1976) "Conditions on Clitic-Movement in Portuguese", *Linguistic Analysis*, 2.199-223

Radford, Andrew (1976) "Constraints on Clitic Promotion in Italian", ms., Oxford University

Radford, Andrew (1977a) *Italian Syntax: transformational and relational grammar.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Radford, Andrew (1977b) "La teoria della traccia, la condizione del soggetto specificato e la salita dei pronomi nelle lingue romanze", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 2 (2).241-315

Rigau, Gemma (2000) "Number Agreement Variation in Catalan Dialects", ms., UAB, Barcelona

Rivas, Alberto (1974) "Impersonal Sentences and their Interaction with Clitic Movement in Spanish", unpublished ms., MIT

Rivas, Alberto (1977) *Clitics in Spanish*. Ph.D.Dissertation, MIT

Rivero, Maria Luisa (1991) "Clitic and NP Climbing in Old Spanish", in H.Campos and F.Martínez-Gil (eds.) *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*, Washington (D.C.), Georgetown University Press, pp.241-282

Rizzi, Luigi (1976a) "Ristrutturazione", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 1.1-54

Rizzi, Luigi (1976b) "La MONTEE DU SUJET, le *si* impersonnel et une règle de restructuration dans la syntaxe italienne", *Recherches Linguistiques,* 4.158-184

Rizzi, Luigi (1978) "A Restructuring Rule in Italian Syntax", in S.J.Keyser (ed.) *Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press, pp.113-158 (also in Rizzi 1982a)

Rizzi, Luigi (1981) "Nominative marking in Italian infinitives and the Nominative Island Constraint", in F.Heny (ed.) *Binding and Filtering*, London, Croom Helm, pp.129-157

Rizzi, Luigi (1982a) *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris

Rizzi, Luigi (1982b) "Comments on Chomsky's Chapter 'On the Representation of Form and Function'", in J.Mehler, E.C.T.Walker and M.Garrett (eds.) *Perspectives on Mental Representation*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, pp.441-451

Rizzi, Luigi (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery", in L.Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.281-337

Rizzi, Luigi (2000) "Some Notes on Romance Cliticization", in L.Rizzi *Comparative Syntax and Language Acquisition*, London, Routledge, pp.96-121

Roberts, Ian (1993a) *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris

Roberts, Ian (1993b) "Restructuring, Pronoun Movement and Head-Movement in Old French", ms. University of Wales, Bangor

Roberts, Ian (1997) "Restructuring, Head Movement and Locality", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28.423-460

Rochette, Anne (1988) *Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Romance Sentential Complementation*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT

Rochette, Anne (1990) "On the Restructuring Classes of Verbs in Romance", in A.Di Sciullo and A.Rochette (eds.) *Binding in Romance. Essays in Honour of Judith McA'Nulty*. Special Publication of the Canadian Linguistic Association. Ottawa, pp.96-128

Rochette, Anne (1999) "The Selection Properties of Aspectual Verbs", in K.Johnson and I.Roberts (eds.) *Beyond Principles and Parameters. Essays in Memory of Osvaldo Jaeggli*. Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.145-165

Roldán, Mercedes (1975) "Clitic Climbing and Unrelated Matters", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 6.342-346

Rooryck, Johan (1994) "Against Optional Movement for Clitic Climbing", in M.L.Mazzola (ed.) *Issues and Theory in Romance Linguistics,* Washington (D.C.), Georgetown University Press, pp.417-443

Rosen, Sara T. (1990a) *Argument Structure and Complex Predicates*. New York, Garland

Rosen, Sara T. (1990b) "Restructuring verbs are light verbs", *Proceedings of the Ninth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Stanford, pp.477-492

Sabel, Joachim (1995a) "A Unitary Account of Long Scrambling and Clitic Climbing in restructuring contexts: Parallels between German, Polish and Spanish", in *ConSOLE II*, pp.210-226

Sabel, Joachim (1995b) "On Parallels and Differences between Clitic Climbing and Long Scrambling and the Economy of Derivations", *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society*, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, pp 405-423

Sabel, Joachim (1996) *Restrukturierung und Lokalität*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag (Studia Grammatica 42)

Sabel, Joachim (1999) "Coherent Infinitives in German, Polish, and Spanish" *Folia Linguistica*, XXXIII (3-4), pp.419-440

Schroten, Jan (1986) "Ergativity, Raising and Restructuring in the Syntax of Spanish Aspectual Verbs", *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 10.399-465

Spencer, Andrew (1991) *Morphological Theory*. Oxford, Blackwell

Sportiche, Dominique (1983) "Bete Reciprocals and Clitic Binding", in J.Kaye, H.Koopman, D.Sportiche and A.Dugas (eds.) *Current Approaches to African Linguistics*, vol.2. Dordrecht,, Foris, pp.297-316

Sportiche, Dominique (1996) "Clitic Constructions", in J.Rooryck and L.Zaring (eds.) *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp.213-276

Stewart, Ó. Thompson (1999) "Infinitive Clauses, Restructuring, and the Modal-Aspectual Verb Construction", *Linguistic Analysis*, 29.87-136

Stjepanović, Sandra (1998) "On the Placement of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: Evidence from Clitic Climbing and VP Ellipsis", in Ž.Bošković, S.Franks and W.Snyder (eds.) *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. The Connecticut Meeting 1997*, Ann Arbor, Michigan Slavic Publications, pp.267-286

Stjepanović, Sandra (2001) "Clitic Climbing without Climbing out of Seemingly Finite Clauses and Implications for Restructuring", abstract of a paper presented at the *Workshop on Slavic Pronominal Clitics*, ZAS, Berlin. February 8-9 2001

Stowell, Tim (1991) "Small Clause Restructuring", in R.Freidin (ed.) *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, pp.182-218

Strozer, Judith (1976) *Clitics in Spanish*, Ph.D.Dissertation, UCLA

Strozer, Judith (1981) "An Alternative to Restructuring in Romance Syntax", in H.Contreras and J.Klausenburger (eds.) *Proceedings of the Tenth Anniversary Symposium on Romance Linguistics* (*Papers in Romance*, Supplement II, vol.3). Published by the University of Washington, Seattle, pp.177-184

Suñer, Margarita (1980) "Clitic promotion in Spanish revisited", in F.Neussel (ed.) *Contemporary Studies in Romance Languages*, Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club, pp.300-330

Taraldsen, Tarald (1982) "Remarks on Government, Thematic Structure and the Distribution of Empty Categories", in R.May and J.Koster (eds.) *Levels of Syntactic Representation*, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.253-291

Taraldsen, Tarald (1983) *Parametric Variation in Phrase Structure: A Case Study*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Tromsø

Taraldsen, Tarald (2002) "Complex Passives in Germanic and Romance", talk given at the 25th GLOW Colloquium, Amsterdam

Tellier, Christine (1987) "Restructuring and Complement Order in Abe infinitives", in D.Odden (ed.) *Current Approaches to African Linguistics*, vol.4, Dordrecht, Foris, pp.369-381

Terzi, Arhonto (1992) *PRO in Finite Clauses. A Study of the Inflectional Heads of the Balkan Languages*, Ph.D. Dissertation, CUNY

Terzi, Arhonto (1994) "Clitic Climbing from Finite Clauses and Long Head Movement", *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics*, 3 (2).97-122

Terzi, Arhonto (1996) "Clitic climbing from finite clauses and tense raising", *Probus*, 8.273-295

Tsujimura, Natsuko (1993) "Adjuncts and Event Argument in Restructuring", in S.Choi (ed.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 3*, Stanford, CSLI, pp.121-136

Uriagereka, Juan (1995) "Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 26.79-123

Van Tiel-Di Maio, M.Francesca (1975) "Una proposta per la sintassi dell'italiano: V -Raising", in *La grammatica. Aspetti teorici e didattici*, Roma, Bulzoni, pp.445-477

Van Tiel-Di Maio, M.Francesca (1978) "Sur le phénomène dit du déplacement 'long' des clitiques et, en particulier, sur le constructions causatives", *Journal of Italian Linguistics*, 3 (2).73-136

Veselovská, Ludmila (1995) *Phrasal Movement and X° Morphology*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Palacky University, Olomouc

Wali, Kashi and Ashok Kumar Koul (1994) "Kashmiri clitics: the role of case and CASE", *Linguistics*, 32.969-994

Watanabe, Akira (1993) "The Role of Equidistance in Restructuring Verbs: Italian vs. French", *Proceedings of the 10th Eastern State Conference on Linguistics*, pp.360-371

Wexler, Ken and Peter Culicover (1980) *Formal Principles of Language Acquisition*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press

Willet, T.L. (1991) *A Reference Grammar of Southeastern Tepehuan*, Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington

Wurmbrand, Susanne (1998) *Infinitives*. Ph.D.Dissertation, MIT

Wurmbrand, Susanne (2001) *Infinitives. Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter

Zagona, Karen (1986) "Las Períphrasis de gerundio y la restructuración", *Revista Argentina de Lingüística*, 2.232-244 (Mendoza, Arg.)

Zubizarreta, Maria-Luisa (1980) "Pour une restructuration thématique", *Recherches Linguistiques*, 9.141-187

Zubizarreta, Maria-Luisa (1982) *On the Relationship of the Lexicon to Syntax*, Ph.D.Dissertation, MIT

Zushi, Mihoko (1995) *Long-distance Dependencies*, Ph.D. Dissertation, McGill University