

Introductory note to Lidia Lonzi's paper

Marina Nespors & Lorenzo Renzi

The following article was written by Lidia Lonzi, who died on December 23rd 2008. It is published in this Journal to honor her memory and highlight her work ^{1*}.

Lidia Lonzi was an internationally renowned scholar in the study of syntax.

In spite of the relevance of her work for the study of language, she never received a permanent position in an Italian University, a fact that left many of her colleagues extremely surprised. Beyond the thoughtfulness with which she built linguistic arguments, those who knew Lidia appreciated her painstaking attention to data collection and her subtle grammaticality judgments. She has made important contributions to the study of Italian syntax, especially in the areas of adverbial phrases and the gerund. On both topics, she wrote the relevant chapters for the *Grande Grammatica di Consultazione* (Renzi, Salvi and Cardinaletti (eds.) 1995-2006), an extensive work on the grammar of Italian, largely based on generative grammar.

Lidia Lonzi made important contributions also to other areas of syntax, particularly the syntax of Control (the topic of the paper featured here), the relevance of the theme-rheme structure for syntactic analysis, topic-focus structure, and the study of anaphoric constructions in relation to given vs. new information. Her analysis of adverbs and other control constructions is the topic of a book published in 1998 (*Avverbi e altre costruzioni a controllo*, il Mulino).

Lidia Lonzi was not only a theoretical linguist: she was also renowned for her work on agrammatism. She applied her knowledge of syntactic structure to investigate the linguistic representations of agrammatic patients. One of her best known papers, on the omission of prepositions in Agrammatism and Universal Grammar, was published in 1995 in *Brain and Language*; another one, on the recoverability of deletion in agrammatic production, was published in this

^{1*} The paper underwent the customary *Italian Journal of Linguistics* peer-review.

Journal in 2006. Her interest in aphasia also led her to translate Roman Jakobson's fundamental essay *Kindersprache und Aphasie* (1941) [in Italian, together with other essays on language acquisition, as *Farsi e disfarsi del linguaggio. Linguaggio infantile e afasia* (1971)].

Lidia's love for language went beyond linguistics: she loved language in all its expressions. Her career had, in fact, begun as a literary critic: her thesis on Foscolo's *Le Grazie* has been partly published in the journal *Paragone* 1964. She then worked on Pavese, Fenoglio, Pizzuto. During those years, she initiated a correspondence with Roland Barthes, and became the main translator of his work into Italian. The first book translated was *Mythologies* (in Italian *Miti d'oggi*, 1966), and many more followed. Although, in later years, the focus of her research was on syntax and agrammatism, she did not abandon her research on literature: in recent years she analyzed the *Diary* of Carla Lonzi – her sister and renowned art criticist – as well as the work of Virginia Woolf.

The present article, together with a few others, was found by Lidia's family among her files after her death. Most likely, it was written around 2004.

A note on the following paper.

Both anonymous reviewers agreed that this paper deserves to be published as is, in spite of the years elapsed since it was written. During this time, a number of analyses relevant to Lonzi's proposal were published. In particular, one reviewer, while finding Lonzi's proposal coherent and original, notes that today there is an alternative analysis in terms of conceptual structure, along the lines of Jackendoff and Culicover (2005), rather than syntax proper.

The other reviewer, while finding the paper interesting and presenting a subtle argument, suggests that Collin's (2005) analysis of passive has changed the perspective on both *by*-phrases and the nature of implicit arguments.

In the paper, as it appears below, we only corrected a few typos and made a few stylistic changes, as suggested by the reviewers.

Given the lapse of time between the writing and the publishing of this paper, we list here some selected references of recent publications that might be interesting to the reader:

- BOECKX Cedric & Norbert HORNSTEIN 2006. Control in Icelandic and theories of control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37. 591-606.
- COLLINS Chris 2005. A smuggling approach to the passive in English. *Syntax* 8. 81-120.
- CULICOVER Peter W. & Ray JACKENDOFF 2006. Turn over control to the semantics! *Syntax* 9. 131-152.
- DAVIES William D. & Stanley DUBINKSY (eds.) 2007. *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- GARCÍA Ismael & Iván TEOMIRO 2005. *Control & Syntactic Chains. The Timing of PRO*. MA thesis. Universiteit van Utrecht.
- JACKENDOFF Ray & Peter W. CULICOVER 2005. *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- JANKE Vikki 2008. Control without a subject. *Lingua* 118. 82-118.
- LANDAU Idan 2006. Severing the distribution of PRO from Case. *Syntax* 9. 153-170.
- LANDAU Idan 2008. Two routes of control: evidence from case transmission in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26. 877-924.
- POLINSKY Maria & Eric POTSDAM 2006. Expanding the scope of control and raising. *Syntax* 9. 171-192.
- SITARIDOU Ioanna 2007. Romance infinitives with subjects, subjunctive obviation and control theory. In Luis EGUREN & Olga FERNÁNDEZ SORIANO (eds.), *Coreference, modality, and focus. Studies on the syntax-semantics interface*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 191-219

Address for the Author

Marina Nespor, Università di Milano-Bicocca, Interdisciplinary
Center B. Segre of Accademia dei Lincei

<marina.nespor@unimib.it>

Lorenzo Renzi, Università di Padova, <Lorenzo.Renzi@unipd.it>

Argument control in Italian Expletive Constructions as CHAIN Control

Lidia Lonzi

In this paper it is argued that control in Italian expletive constructions is determined by the c-commanding expletive *pro*, sharing content and features with the associate DP. This analysis makes the correct predictions for control in sentences with unaccusative verbs and allows us to explain the general inability of the associate DP to function as an antecedent for PRO in passive expletive constructions, a phenomenon observed by various authors. My proposal is that these constructions have a peculiar “transitive” interpretation: the associate is interpreted like an object and the *pro* “subject” is construed as the relevant c-commanding impersonal antecedent for PRO.

The assumptions concerning control that underlie this paper are given in (i)-(iii) below:

- (i) control is based on c-command (Lasnik 1992; Chomsky & Lasnik 1993);
- (ii) (infinitival) adverbials of different kinds have their respective positions at different levels of the tree;¹
- (iii) in canonical passives, argument control competes with the Implicit Argument (IA) control, that is control by the implicit agent of the passive morphology (Jaeggli 1986; Roberts 1987).²

Assumptions (i) and (ii) are rather conservative and hardly deserve to be mentioned. As for (iii), I emphasize that in canonical passives argument control does not give way to the IA control. On the one hand, ample evidence shows that control is by the argument subject – not by the IA – within higher adverbials (see footnote 1 for references). On the other hand, there is a predictable competition between the two candidate antecedents inside lower, VP area adverbials, unless excluded for lexico-semantic or pragmatic reasons. This competition explains why sentences like (1) are systematically ambiguous:³

- (1) Giovanni_i è stato visitato_j dal suo medico_j prima di PRO_{i/j} partire
G. has been visited by his doctor before leaving

In (1) both the argument subject and the IA are possible antecedent for PRO. The data to be presented here show that there is additional empirical support for these standard assumptions.

Other less obvious assumptions, concerning the much debated relation between passive morphology and *da*('by')-DP, are given in (iv)-(vi) below (Lonzi 1998a, and references therein):

- (iv) the *da*-DP is an adjunct with a referential identificational function: it provides the feature specifications for the IA, as originally suggested in Zubizarreta (1982). In turn, the IA can transmit these features to the PRO in thematic control constructions, an usual, but not obligatory, process;
- (v) even in presence of a *da*-DP, invariably bearing a direct Actor θ -role, it is possible that the feature matching between *da*-DP and the IA does not take place, given certain conditions. In this case, the IA can keep its causative θ -role and its default arbitrary (arb) features, and transmits them regularly to the PRO (PRO_{arb});⁴
- (vi) in no case has the *da*-DP any *direct* effect on PRO.

As it will appear from the discussion, PRO_{arb} is a PRO with a default specification of person, gender, and number (the latter varying across languages). In Italian: [+IIIperson], [+masculine], [+plural], plus the feature [+human] (see Rizzi 1986). PRO_{arb} is a PRO with an indefinite not a genuinely arbitrary interpretation.⁵ Since it can be argued that only obligatory control relations hold in Italian, in complement (Landau 2000) as well as adjunct control, the arb features bundle of PRO must be inherited from an antecedent bearing an indefinite interpretation (= 'somebody'), like for instance the argumental pro_{arb}, or the IA of passives which gets it by default (as stated in (v) above), if there is no *da*-DP specification made available by the usual feature matching (see footnote 3).

1. The puzzle of argument control

In Italian expletive constructions (ECs) the argument – the associate according to the terminology adopted here – determines agreement on the verb. See examples (2)-(3):

- (2) pro_i sono cadute tre persone_i
have fallen pl(F) three persons (F)
- (3) pro_i sono state investite tre persone_i
have been run pl(F) over three persons (F)

Now, if we try to verify the asserted correlation between agreement and control (Chomsky 1995; Cardinaletti 1997a), we see that the associate has the expected control properties in ECs with an unaccusative verb (henceforth unaccusatives), but not in passives. See the

acceptable (4a) versus the unacceptable (5a) (note that the gerundival adjunct is kept constant in each (a)-(b) pair):

- (4) a. *pro_i sono cadute tre persone_i PRO_i correndo verso l'uscita*
 have fallen three persons (while) running to the exit
 b. *Tre persone_i sono cadute PRO_i correndo verso l'uscita*
- (5) a. **pro_i sono state investite tre persone_i PRO_i camminando davanti all'uscita*
 have been run over three persons (while) walking in front of the exit
 b. *Tre persone_i sono state investite PRO_i camminando davanti all'uscita*

In the unaccusative (4a) the associate (*tre persone*) controls inside the adjunct as the preverbal subject in (4b), but this does not hold in the passive (5a) with respect to (5b). Given the c-command requirement, the two pairs (4) and (5) are problematic, whichever approach we choose between recent proposals concerning ECs. In Chomsky 1995, agreement with the associate is explained by covert raising to Infl of the formal features of the relevant D/NP (somehow a new version of expletive replacement according to Cecchetto 1999). Since these features would be adjoined to Infl, they would acquire “the essential formal properties of [Spec,AgrS]” (Chomsky 1995: 273). The relevant prediction that the associate should control is indeed fulfilled in (4a), but the ungrammaticality of (5a) finds no explanation.

On the other hand, in Chomsky (1998, 1999), the hypothesis of the movement of Agreement and Case features is abandoned in favor of a remote matching, and it is the grammaticality of argument control in unaccusatives like (4a) that requires an explanation, for the associate is too low in the structure to c-command the PRO, as (5a) would confirm. In this analysis, the expletive *pro* cannot delete the complete set of φ -features of Infl. The natural candidate is the associate, which does not move and, therefore, should not control. Chomsky (1998: 34) notes that features chains could be required for the case of “control contingent on long-distance agreement” although “the phenomena seem less clear for passives than unaccusatives (possibly because of interference from an implicit subject)”.

In the following, I try to show that there is a way out of this puzzle that does not require features movement. In Section 2, I argue that associate control must be analyzed as “inverse chain” control, and in 3 I offer an explanation for the failure of associate control in passives that is compatible with the proposed analysis. That in passives the associate should control in principle, is shown by control phenomena in the genuine passive forms examined in Section 4.

My main goal, here, is to help clarify the intricate issue of control in ECs, mainly on the descriptive, empirical side. It seems to me that the relevant data, although somewhat subtle, do form a consistent corpus to be taken into consideration by any further inquiry. Whichever alternative assumption about the location of the external argument a theory of passive can elaborate, as in a number of relatively recent proposals (Lappin & Shlonsky 1993; Goodall 1997, 1999; Dobrovie-Sorin 2000, among others), it must be consistent with the data presented here. If we assume, for instance, that in passives the external argument is syntactically represented as a subject, we must give a specific account of the fact that there are two competing antecedents for PRO inside certain adverbials as in (1), or the fact that in canonical vs. EC passives the external argument control behaves differently as far as higher adjuncts are concerned, as in (12)-(15) (see further).

2. Inverse Chains

Burzio (1986: Ch.2) suggested that the expletive-argument pair had to be viewed as a chain in an extended sense (see also Chomsky 1981; Rizzi 1982). The associate D/NP is bound by the expletive subject, but this does not produce a principle C violation because the coindexed *pro* is a non-argument, and binding principles, having the purpose of regulating coreference, merely concern cases where the antecedent is argumental. The *pro*-argument chain is an “inverse” chain: its foot is occupied by a D/NP, and its tail by a null category. It can be argued, in fact, that it satisfies the chain condition of Chomsky & Lasnik 1993, even if Case properties are somewhat problematic (Groat 1999):⁶

- (6) in an argument chain (a_1, \dots, a_n) , a_1 is a Case position and a_n a \emptyset -position

My proposal is that, independently from the technical treatment of agreement and Case, argument control applies if the *pro*-argument chain is sanctioned at LF (see below): the c-command relevant to control is by the expletive *pro*, sharing the relevant features with the argument by virtue of coindexation, or, possibly, matching. For instance, in (4a), c-command by the expletive with respect to PRO suffices to guarantee that its associate controls within the adverbial as the preverbal subject in (4b). In this proposal, the associate is predicted to control only by virtue of its relation to the *pro*.

To accept this idea we must view inverted chains as abstract representations of D/NPs whose “content and features are divided among their various links” (Shlonsky 1990: 271): the associate supplies the features that the expletive *pro* is lacking. Perhaps, we can view this transmission as a distant matching, like the one between the IA and the *da*-phrase in passives (which interestingly, as noted, sometimes does not take place).

As suggested in Cardinaletti 1997a, agreement with the associate could be due to the fact that *pro* cannot check nominative Case, being ambiguous between a subject and an object value, like German *es* and unlike French *il*, for instance. However, if we assume that *pro* is a link of a chain that satisfies the EPP and inherits the number and gender features of the ϑ -marked argument, perhaps we can also assume that it can perform all the agreement operations. In any case, the two important implications of the relevant generalization concerning Case checking in ECs (that is Cardinaletti’s *Nominative Agreement Hypothesis*) are still valid: (i) the best characterization of *pro* is in terms of Case underspecification, and (ii), when no other (competing) DP is present in the clause, the underspecified pronoun can check the Case feature of I, under the auxiliary hypothesis that Case checking is done by the more Case-marked element in the clause. The latter implication is in fact crucial for my analysis, as it will appear.

Working on arbitrary null object *pro*, Rizzi (1986) showed that the standard view of the *pro* module had to be modified, in such a way as to introduce a distinction between formal licensing and recovery of the content, which in the standard view were both performed through government by “strong” Agreement. See (7) below. Shlonsky (1990), on the basis of facts from Hebrew, capitalized on Rizzi’s distinction, slightly revising (7b) as in (8):

- (7) *Pro Module* [Rizzi 1986]
 a. *Formal Licensing*
 Pro is Case-marked by X_y° . [Rizzi, 1986: 524]
 b. *Feature Assignment / Recoverability*

Let X be the licensing head of an occurrence of *pro*: then *pro* has the grammatical specification of the features on X coindexed with it.
 [Rizzi 1986: 520]

- (8) *Feature Assignment / Recoverability Convention* [Shlonsky 1990: 270]
 Coindex *pro* with an element in *pro*’s CHAIN⁷ bearing phonologically discrete grammatical features (number and person).

It can easily be seen that the two distinct conditions – (7a) and (8) – pave the way to a potential bivalence of the expletive *pro*. As far as ECs are concerned, these conditions predict that *pro* can be licensed *in an independent way* by an inflectional head, and, as a further step, either (i) check a default set of features as an argument subject or (ii) be coindexed (form an inverted chain) with a full D/NP. Below, I argue that in passive ECs the former alternative applies as a side effect of the realization of the latter, given that the passive starts as a surface realisation of alternative (ii).

3. Control in passives

3.1. The blocking of the passive mechanism

In passive ECs *pro* interferes with the control relationship, inhibiting control by the associate. See the passive (9a) versus (10a), as usual with an unaccusative verb:

- (9) a. pro_{arb} è stato assunto Giovanni_i senza $PRO_{arb/*j}$ fare nessun esame
 has been hired G. without doing any examination
 b. Giovanni_i è stato assunto_j senza $PRO_{i/j}$ fare nessun esame
- (10) a. pro_j è arrivato Giovanni_i senza PRO_j avvertirci
 has arrived G. without informing us
 b. Giovanni_i è arrivato senza PRO_j avvertirci

I have argued recently (Lonzi 1998a) that the absorption mechanism standardly assumed for passives does not apply in ECs: the external ϑ -role is assigned to the *pro* and the internal argument gets accusative Case. The basic idea is that this *pro*, which satisfies the EPP and performs – at least – a partial feature checking (Chomsky 1998), is interpreted as a true argumental subject, a pro_{arb} , and the object checks structural Case with the participle in the relevant projection, presumably as in transitives. In more traditional terms: the perfect participle is able to assign accusative Case to the object.

The ability to assign accusative Case by the past participle was proposed years ago for French impersonal passives (Pollock 1981), and subsequently for various languages in the relevant literature (quoted in Baker, Johnson & Roberts 1989: 236, where this form is named “transitive passive” due to the accusative Case on the object). Also Lappin & Shlonsky (1995) have considered this phenomenon under the heading of “*in situ* transitive passives”, which they ascribe

to a specific binary-valued feature of the passive morpheme, namely [+/-strong Case absorber]. The values of this feature combine with the values of another binary-valued feature of the passive morpheme, that is: [+/- ϑ -role bearer], yielding four different types of languages with respect to absence/presence of intransitive and/or *in situ* transitive passive.⁸

According to Lappin & Shlonsky (1995), in a language where the passive morpheme bears the negative value for the feature [+/-strong Case absorber] – as, by assumption here, Italian – structural Case on the object is still inhibited, not however inherent Case. Although the logic of my analysis would straightforwardly involve structural Case, the technical treatment of Case and agreement, as noted at the beginning, is outside the scope of this study. For the time being, I have no reason to accept (or to reject) this proposal, which might even apply to the process of “transitivization” in the proper way.

An apparent counterexample is the unacceptable (11a) to be contrasted with (11b). If the passive participle could assign accusative Case, sentences like (11a) would be acceptable, contrary to fact (cf. Chomsky & Lasnik 1993: 558 ff):

- (11) a. * pro_{arb} è stato ritenuto_{SC}(Giovanni colpevole)
 has been considered G. guilty
 b. pro_{arb} hanno ritenuto_{SC}(Giovanni colpevole)
 have considered G. guilty

Here, I will not develop the relevant discussion. I will simply suggest the lines along which the unacceptability of (11a) could be accounted for, in order to become compatible with the present proposal. According to a well established analysis of sentences like (11b) and, in particular, of Case and ϑ -role assignment to its “object” DP, there is a splitting between assignment of structural Case on the one hand, which is regularly carried out by the verb, and of ϑ -role on the other, which can only be carried out by the adjective, the internal (propositional) ϑ -role of the verb being assigned to the embedded small clause. The result is that in (11a) there are two distinct accusative Case and internal ϑ -role bearers, respectively. Given this analysis, *Giovanni* is not the direct object of *ritenere* (‘consider’), since it does not receive the relevant ϑ -role. As a consequence, in (11a), there is no basis for the passive mechanism of absorption to get blocked in favor of the transitive interpretation shown, for instance, in (9a) above.

For the same reasons, the expletive *pro* cannot form a chain with the “object” DP. Contrary to what we find in genuine passive forms, the object position here is thematically vacant, hence the chain condi-

tion in (6) is not fulfilled. The expletive cannot be properly identified, as required by the Recoverability Convention in (8). Note, however, that the active counterpart of (11a) – *Giovanni è stato ritenuto colpevole*, ‘John has been considered guilty’ – is acceptable, possibly because the relevant verb, here, is the complex verb *consider guilty* (Chomsky 1986: 91ff), as in the acceptable EC passive: *pro è stato [ritenuto colpevole] Giovanni*.

Perhaps the most controversial aspect of my proposal is that a DP which triggers agreement with the verb receives accusative Case. This DP should rather be a subject, according to the well attested association between agreement and nominative Case in Italian. It seems however reasonable to assume that by Spell-Out the ϕ -features of T/Agr are checked/deleted by the associate, while structural Case is somehow reinterpreted according to a transitive pattern. My claim is that the trigger of this process can be detected inside the potential bivalence (between expletive vs. argument value) of the *pro*, although the principles involved could perhaps be extended to allow the correct generalization regarding control in *in situ* transitive passives of both Italian and other languages.

In this picture, agreement with the associate is a kind of fossil, a proof of the existence of the two levels Spell-Out and LF.⁹ I assume, in fact, that the *pro* subject comes into play at the syntax-semantics interface blocking control by the associate, that is by the inverted chain.

The specific assumptions made so far are summarized in (i)-(ii):

- (i) inverted chains – built up by coindexation, essentially (or, if one prefers, matching) – must be sanctioned at LF, as well as, by assumption, abstract Case;
- (ii) at LF the expletive satisfying the EPP can be interpreted as an argumental *pro*_{arb} with the relevant default features, while the object is handled by the lexical verb (cf. Groat 1999).

3.2. Control by *pro*_{arb}

One major argument in favor of this analysis concerns the acceptability of agent control in gerund structures. We know that “coordinate” gerunds (and, more generally, gerunds that are arguably adjoined to a higher functional projection of the clause, as for instance causal gerunds), do not admit agent control. This is shown in (12a)-(15a):

(12) a. **Giovanni era stato punito_i (dagli amici_i), PRO_i volendo in tal modo vendicare Paolo*

G. had been punished (by his friends), wanting this way to vindicate P.

- (13) a. *Gli attori sono stati presentati_i (dal regista_i), *PRO_i avendo deciso di aiutarli*
 the actors have been presented (by the director), having decided to help them
- (14) a. *Lo studente non era stato interrogato_i (dalla commissione_i), *PRO_i agendo correttamente*
 the student had not been examined (by the commission), behaving correctly
- (15) a. *Gli alunni sono stati contati_i (dall'insegnante_i), *PRO_i restando poi a disposizione dei genitori*
 the pupils have been counted (by the teacher), being afterwards at their parents' disposal

This unacceptability of agent control must be due to configurational reasons, as I have argued elsewhere (Lonzi 1998b: Ch.3), but what is of interest here is that this datum does not show up when the passive sentence is an EC, as in examples (12b)-(15b) below, to be read as EC variants of (12a)-(15a):

- (12) b. *pro_i era stato punito Giovanni, PRO_i volendo in tal modo vendicare Paolo*
 had been punished G., wanting this way to vindicate P.
- (13) b. *pro_i sono stati presentati gli attori, PRO_i avendo deciso di aiutarli*
 have been presented the actors, having decided to help them
- (14) b. *pro_i è stato interrogato un solo studente, PRO_i agendo correttamente*
 has been examined only one student, behaving correctly
- (15) b. *pro_i sono stati contati gli alunni, PRO_i restando poi a disposizione dei genitori*
 have been counted the pupils, being afterwards at their parents's disposal

The implicit agent (specified or not by the *da*-DP) cannot control in the (a) sentences, whereas it can in the (b) sentences. One possible explanation of this phenomenon is that in the (b) sentences control is not by the IA as such but by a constituent having the properties of an argumental subject (that is configurational and feature composition properties). Such a constituent can only be *pro*, and this implies that it does not form a chain with the associate. In the (b) sentences, the matrix clause requires an analysis like the one suggested above: a *pro*_{arb} subject and a direct object bearing accusative Case.

If, as an alternative explanation, the actual antecedent of PRO in the (b) sentences is not the *pro*_{arb} resulting from the expletive as a “by-product” of the transitivity of the passive, but a lower *pro*_{arb} sub-

ject, supposed to be present in passive sentences (as in Goodall 1997), why should it be operative only in the latter case? why should it not compete with the canonical subject in the (a) sentences, as we know that the implicit agent does, whichever its location is supposed to be, within lower adjuncts, as for instance in (1)?

It could be argued in fact that pro_{arb} interferes from a position lower than the position satisfying the EPP. This analysis would comply with the majority of recent analyses of passive, which assign a specific syntactic position to the external argument in the extended projection of verbs. However, the intuition that the “transitivization” mechanism involved in the EC passive is but the mirror image of the absorption mechanism hypothesized in the canonical passive, led me to endorse a more traditional analysis, which, as noted above, straightforwardly explains the distinct behavior of agent control with respect to higher adjuncts exhibited by the canonical vs. EC passives. This behavior suggests that the pro_{arb} position in the EC passive must be different (higher) than in the regular passive (in my analysis, the IA of the passive morphology), although it does not necessarily bear on the question whether the pro_{arb} position is the one satisfying the EPP or not.¹⁰

Do we have any specific evidence in favor of this stand? Yes. Evidence to the effect that in passive ECs control is by a constituent having the properties of an argumental subject and not by an implicit agent is lend by the possibility of anaphora to PRO in EC versus canonical passives.

3.3. Restrictions on embedded anaphors

The first phenomenon is given in (16): IAs are not “amenable to reflexivization” (Burzio 1989: 15). Without the features provided by the *da*-phrase, there cannot be anaphora to the IA (that is *sé/si*, the arb reflexive pronouns (REFL) required by the IA, are not allowed). See (16) versus (17):

(16) *I medici_j furono informati_i su di sé_i
Doctors were informed about REFL

(17) ?I medici_j furono informati_i dai pazienti_i su di sé_i
Doctors were informed by the patients about REFL

Since we cannot appeal to a c-command requirement satisfied by the *da*-DP to explain the acceptability of (17) vs. (16), we are bound to

admit that the IA must be supplemented with discrete grammatical features in order to allow an anaphor. This does not hold for passive ECs however: *pro*_{arb} admits reflexivization:

- (18) *pro*_i furono informati i medici_j su di sé_{i/*j}
 were informed the doctors about REFL

Given this datum, I would maintain that the IA cannot be considered an argumental/syntactic antecedent, but only a thematic/semantic one, as originally proposed in Jaeggli (1986).

Similarly, anaphora to PRO in certain IA control adverbials is only acceptable when there is a *da*-phrase features specification (Lonzi 1997). Anaphora to PRO inside purpose adverbials vs. complement-type adverbials requires that the IA be supplemented with discrete grammatical features in order to be made more visible within the higher projections of V (see Williams 1985):

- (19) ?La gente_i è stata ingannata_j *(da Perot_j) per PRO_j farsi_j eleggere
 the public has been misled by Perot to get himself / REFL elected

Apparently, in the canonical passive (19), the *da*-phrase cannot be suppressed and, again, in the EC passive (20), the embedded anaphor is completely acceptable.

- (20) *pro*_i è stata ingannata la gente per PRO_i farsi_i eleggere
 has been misled the public to get REFL elected

The conclusion we can draw from the pair (19)-(20) is that in the EC passive the controller is different in nature with respect to the IA in the canonical passive. More precisely, the EC passive does not contain any IA technically. In the present framework, this means that the past participle cannot be considered passive. On the other hand, the features composition of the *pro* must be fixed by the construction as a regular arb features bundle. The properties that differentiate *pro*_{arb} from the IA are argumenthood and, somehow, grammaticalization.

4. Control in genuine passives

4.1.1. The case of “restructuring” passives

Interestingly, there are cases in which this *pro* interference does not take place and the associate is capable to control. These cases are

“restructuring” passives, that is sentences exhibiting a passivized “restructuring” verb.

Cinque (1997) has shown that this kind of passive – also called “long passive” – is only possible with few verbs (like *finire* ‘finish’ or *iniziare* ‘begin’) that check their specific aspectual feature below the Voice projection, where they land for the relevant morphological checking. Although, according to many linguists, the Italian past participle can raise to a higher projection (Belletti 1990; Guasti & Rizzi 1999), this phenomenon has no effect on the possibility for other aspectual “restructuring” verbs to undergo passivization. More precisely, passivization is not possible for verbs whose aspectual feature must be checked in a projection higher than Voice, and this suggests that this kind of feature must be checked *before* the checking in Voice.

In the partial sequence of functional heads given in (21) (from Cinque 1997), the completive (II) Aspect is opposed to a completive (I) Aspect higher than Voice, as well as the inceptive(II) Aspect is opposed to an inceptive (I) Aspect higher than Voice: the heads completive(II) and inceptive(II) concern a natural point where a process ends or begins; completive(I) and inceptive(I) an arbitrary point. In Cinque’s analysis it is the relative order of the aspectual heads with respect to Voice that explains the possibility of passivization which is manifested by certain “restructuring” verbs:

- (21) Voice > ... Perception^o > Causative^o > Asp_{continuative(II)} / Asp_{inceptive(II)} / Andative^o / Asp_{completive(II)} (V)

The impossibility of “long passives” with a completive(I) value, is shown in (22), with *spingere* (“push”), a verb denoting an unbounded process, hence involving a different value of the “restructuring” verb *finire*. Now, (22), versus (23) with *costruire* (‘build’), a prototypical verb of bounded activity (see Cinque 1997), shows that the relevant aspectual projection (completive I) is higher than Voice:

- (22) *La macchina fu finita di spingere alle 5
 the car was finished to push at 5

- (23) Quella casa fu finita di costruire nel 1950
 that house was finished to build in 1950

Rather surprisingly, associate control is possible in (25), with a “restructuring” passive, to be compared to the predictably unacceptable (24), with a simple passive:

- (24) * pro_i sono state costruite le nostre due case_i, PRO_i portando il loro contributo al paesaggio circostante
 have been built our two houses, bringing their
 contribution to the surrounding landscape
- (25) ? pro_i sono state [finite di costruire] le nostre due case_i, PRO_i portando il loro contributo...
 have been finished to build our two houses, bringing
 their contribution...

In this construction, in which the projection of Voice seems to be crucial, the passive participle, which checks its morphology in it, seems to have the expected properties of absorption. More precisely, the external argument of the lexical verb is absorbed in the passive morphology by means of “restructuring”. In a sense, while the aspectual verb has no external θ -role to assign (nor, for that matter, internal: Cinque 2000), the verb complex has one, which is spent in passivization. For this very reason pro_{arb} cannot interfere: the expletive cannot be reinterpreted as an argumental subject, and the associate forms the required chain with it, as in unaccusatives. As a confirmation, note that in “restructuring” passives arb control within higher adverbials (preceded by a pause) is in turn unavailable, that is control by pro : it can be shown that arb control is only possible in lower adverbials, that is control by the IA, as in canonical passives, see (26). The unacceptable (26b,c) contrast with the acceptable (12b)-(15b), with ECs and argument control, and match the unacceptable (12a)-(15a), with canonical passives:

- (26) a. pro_i furono (finite di costruire)_j le nostre due case_i, PRO_j lavorando ininterrottamente
 were finished to build our two houses working
 incessantly
- b. * pro_i furono (finite di costruire)_j le nostre due case_i, PRO_j ricordandole poi come un lavoro immane
 were finished to build our two houses, remembering them
 afterwards as a huge work
- c. * pro_i furono (finite di costruire)_j le nostre due case_i, PRO_j avendo trovato i fondi
 were finished to build our two houses, having found
 the money

This means that the IA is indeed available in “restructuring” passives: presumably, the external argument of the main verb is

absorbed in the passive morphology of the thematically transparent aspectual verb and controls locally. To strengthen this claim, one more point needs to be verified.

Recall that certain adverbials impose the condition of a *da*-phrase specification in order for anaphora to PRO to apply in cases of IA control. Therefore, the contrast in (27) can be explained with the requirement of a *da*-DP specification to license an embedded anaphor to PRO and must be taken as a confirmation of this analysis.

- (27) a. ?**pro*_i furono (finite di costruire)_j le nostre due case_i per *PRO*_j farsi eleggere
 were finished to build our two houses in order to
 have REFL elected
- b. ?*pro*_i furono (finite di costruire)_j le nostre due case_i dalla locale amministrazione per *PRO*_j farsi rieleggere
 were finished to build our two houses by the municipality
 in order to have itself re-elected

The conclusions are summarized in (28):

(28)

<i>Controller</i>	<i>in lower adjunct</i>	<i>in higher adjunct</i>	<i>embedded anaphor</i>
<i>pro</i> -argument pair	OK	OK	OK
Implicit Agent	OK	bad	bad
<i>pro</i> _{arb}	OK	OK	OK

My conclusion is that the familiar process of passivization, that is the process of external ϑ -role and accusative Case absorption, takes place obligatorily in “restructuring”, imposing the formation of the *pro*-argument chain vs. the impersonal transitive passive form. In this way, the mysterious datum in (25) is consistently accounted for.

4.1.2. Evidence from Bare Nouns

A confirmation of the reality of the absorption process in “restructuring” passives can perhaps be detected in the postverbal Bare Nouns (BNs) behavior. While in simple passives, unmodified BNs with episodic or characterizing predicates are systematically allowed (Longobardi 2000), see (29), in “restructuring” passives they are not so. In this construction, BNs are subject to the modification restriction, as shown in (30), where, crucially, marked intonation can be dispensed with:

- (29) a. Furono restaurati palazzi
were restored mansions
b. Sono spesso restaurati palazzi
are often restored mansions
- (30) a. Furono finiti di costruire palazzi *(principeschi)
were finished to build princely mansions
b. Sono spesso precipitosamente finiti di costruire palazzi *(principeschi)
are often hurriedly finished to build princely mansions

According to Longobardi, the explanation of the simple passive phenomenon is that the postverbal subject in (29) is in a governed position, hence the modification required to license a BN in an ungoverned position is no more needed. If this is so, we are bound to say that, in a “restructuring” passive like (30), the postverbal subject is not properly governed, hence it must be considered as a true syntactic subject.

Note that this phenomenon has no effect on the generalizations concerning the BNs interpretation. Given the possibility of a neutral intonation, the existential reading of the BN is assured, fulfilling Longobardi’s prediction, not only in presence of the episodic (30a) but also of the characterizing value of the predicate (30b), where also the generic reading is predictably available. Therefore, no specific semantic status of the BN can be invoked to explain the datum in (30). Whether this is due to the lack of proper government or to the thematic properties of the aspectual verb involved and of the resulting verb complex, is a question for further study. What is important is that, in the light of the BNs analysis, it can be maintained that postverbal subjects of “restructuring” passives have an intrinsically acquired syntactic status of subjects.

Finally, it must be noted that the unacceptability of unmodified BNs in sentences like (30a,b), has been imputed to the unbounded process interpretation of *costruire* associated to this kind of object nouns (Cinque 1997). To endorse this alternative analysis, however, one should also give an account of the acceptability of modified BNs in the same contexts. As a conclusion, since the “licensing effect of modification on BNs is, strictly speaking, still unexplained” (Longobardi 2000: 693), the whole question must be left open.

4.2. Control by the nominative pronominal form

We have seen that *pro* is in a position to control, either as a (link of a) chain or as an argument. I have shown that when it controls as a (link of a) chain, associate control obtains and the IA competes as a

local controller, as usual. When it controls as an argument, the clause has only this arb controller for the PRO. These modalities follow, on the one hand, from the traditional notions of syntactic and thematic control introduced by Jaeggli (1986), and, on the other hand, from the distinction introduced by Rizzi (1986) between licensing and interpretation of *pro*, the latter providing two alternative ways of features recovery.

Indirect evidence in favor of these claims is lend by cases where the associate is a nominative pronominal form. Given that the “transitivization” of the passive is based on the possible interpretation of the associate as an object, overt nominative Case on the associate should not be compatible with this analysis (see, however, Lappin & Shlonsky 1993: ftn.18). The nominative pronoun must be able to control both in (31a), where it occupies the canonical subject position *and* in (31b,c), where it forms a chain with *pro*. This prediction is fulfilled:

- (31) a. Io_i sono stata visitata PRO_i tenendo le mani sopra alla mia testa
I have been visited (while) keeping DET hands above my head
b. pro_i sono stata visitata IO_i, PRO_i tenendo le mani sopra alla mia testa
c. ?pro_i sono stata visitata io_i (,) PRO_i tenendo le mani sopra alla mia testa

Now, according to standard assumptions, there is a distinction between two postverbal subject constructions, one basic and the other derived (Longobardi 2000 and references), also called Free and Triggered Inversion respectively (Shlonsky 1990). Since this structural distinction corresponds to two distinct patterns of control (Lonzi 1998a: 5), the datum in (31b,c) could lend decisive evidence in favor of the present analysis if the nominative pronoun could enter an informationally unmarked construction, as hypothesized in (31c) versus (31b). In fact, the inverted subject of the derived form in (31b) can be seen either as a rightward moved DP subject, according to the traditional analysis (Belletti & Rizzi 1982; Moro 1997; Shlonsky 1990), or as a DP in the subject position crossed to the left by the predicate, according to more recent analyses (Longobardi 2000, among others). In any case, in (31b), movement is supposed to have applied, involving marked intonation phenomena. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that control in (31b) behaves like in (31a) *before movement*.

In (31c), the subject is analyzed instead as being in its base position. The hypothesis that (31c) does exist as an informationally unmarked construction is, however, difficult to defend. Whereas an intonational difference is possible between (31b) and (31c) (as suggested by the capital versus small character, respectively), the rel-

to Infl, that is the correlation between nominative Case and control (Cardinaletti 1997a).

5. Conclusion

Inverted chains are loose chains, deriving from some sort of matching, not movement. Failure of associate control in simple passives is failure of the LF sanction for the relevant chain. I have assumed a reassignment of external ϑ -role and accusative Case as an interpretive process, made possible by the distinction between licensing (hence EPP satisfaction), and identification of the *pro*.

Since this identification can apply by default, yielding *pro*_{arb}, once licensed as an expletive the *pro* in Free Inversion constructions is a potentially autonomous controller. In any case, the relevant c-command is by *pro*: either as a link of a chain, or as an argumental *pro* with a default arb interpretation, satisfying the condition on argumenthood (Rizzi 1986).

Interestingly, the present analysis makes the same predictions that the features movement analysis (ultimately, expletive replacement) as far as control is concerned, if we accept the idea that in passive ECs the direct object keeps its object status. While in the present analysis this implies that the object does not form an inverted chain, hence control is by *pro*_{arb}, in the features movement analysis, this implies that the object cannot receive nominative Case, hence cannot raise to Infl.

On the other hand, while it has been argued that the features movement hypothesis could explain the different behavior of the associate with respect to binding and control (Cecchetto 1999), it is not evident that the present analysis could as well. I would expect, however, that the relevant “recalcitrant data” could find single individual explanations, as suggested by Chomsky (reported in Cecchetto 1999),¹³ obviously a topic for further research.

Notes

* I am indebted to Luigi Rizzi and Ian Roberts for helpful comments, and to Anna Cardinaletti and Idan Landau for detailed remarks and suggestions on a previous version of the paper.

¹ In recent works – like Haegeman 2004 – the distinction between (at least two) levels of attachment of adverbials, which was common in the 70’s, is being refreshed.

² Following Cinque (1997, 1999), I assume that the passive participle suffix is checked in the functional projection of Voice. As we will see, Cinque’s specific pro-

posal about functional structure can explain the control phenomena observed in “restructuring” passives, to be examined further on.

³ IA control inside time adverbials – as in (1) – requires the *da*-phrase specification. This can be due to the fact that whereas in manner and instrument adverbials the sameness of the two “agents” involved (IA and PRO) is intrinsically assumed (by definition), in time adverbials it is not (Lonzi 1998b: Ch.3). Conversely, argument control applies regularly only inside time adverbials, where it is perceived as the preferable standard form.

Note, however, that in time adverbials with no *da*-DP, as in (i) below, ambiguity of control can also arise, yielding however a manner interpretation associated with the IA control (‘the style of the visit was familiar’), along with a genuine time interpretation associated with the argument control (‘the patient was visited while he was talking idly’):

- (i) Giovanni è stato visitato PRO chiacchierando
 G. has been visited talking idly

⁴ See evidence in Lonzi 1997, concerning arb control inside purpose adverbials in cases where the *da*-DP cannot provide a proper antecedent.

⁵ Like the subject in the active, the IA is the highest level Agent – the Causer – if there is one. Hence, (i) and (iii) below are interpreted with a [+human] agent, although they could be supplemented by a [-human] *da*-DP, denoting a non-volitional Actor, as in (ii) and (iv):

- (i) Il muro è stato sporcato
 the wall has been soiled (by somebody)
 (ii) Il muro è stato sporcato dall'albero
 the wall has been soiled by the tree
 (iii) L'animale è stato intrappolato
 the animal has been entrapped (by somebody)
 (iv) L'animale è stato intrappolato dai rami
 the animal has been entrapped by the branches

⁶ To avoid the condition C problem, Lasnik (1992: 246) has considered the possibility that the expletive is unindexed: the relevant property of the expletive-argument pair would be non-distinctness, “satisfied between two items when one is simply unspecified for a feature that the other has a value for”. As a consequence, under the necessary assumption that agreement is freely assigned, “if the values of agreement happen to match those of the argument, non-distinctness will be satisfied.” See Chomsky (1995: 157) for a different solution.

⁷ As in Chomsky 1986, the term CHAIN includes expletive-argument pairs.

⁸ The four language types are as follows: intransitive impersonal passives only (positive value for both features [+/-strong Case absorber] and [+/- θ -role bearer]); *in situ* transitive passives only (negative value for both features); *in situ* transitive and intransitive impersonal passives (negative and positive value, respectively); neither ones (the inverse). Hebrew is a language with *in situ* transitive passives only, and so could be Italian, if the present analysis proves correct.

⁹ It has been suggested that long-distance agreement in Italian obeys specific normative rules rather than UG principles (Guasti & Rizzi 1999). When there is no raising of the subject, agreement can be freely determined either by the associate or by default. The variability in the application of the agreement with the associate should be taken as evidence that a normative grammar is at work. By contrast, in English, agreement with the (plural) associate in *there* sentences has been judged a virus, named “*there* virus” (Sobin 1997). For Schütze (1999), instead, singular agreement is an alternative default form allowed by the grammar (rather than a simple “frozen option”, as in Chomsky 1995: 384).

¹⁰ As for cases where this interference does not show up, only the long passive case – to be examined further – would require an explanation, which could be lent by the peculiar thematic structure of the “restructuring” verb (Cinque 2000). Sentences with a nominative pronominal associate could simply fall under principles that are different from the ones that are invoked here (see section 4.2. and footnote 11).

¹¹ Longobardi’s generalization concerning the possibility of unmodified BNs in postverbal positions, cuts across the passive/unaccusative vs. inergative distinction. From my data, however, it appears that passives with respect to unaccusatives require some further precisions. If the present analysis is correct, in simple passives the postverbal subject should be considered as a true object. In the “restructuring” passives, instead, possibly the only genuine passive form, it behaves like a true subject, even inside an episodic predicate, as noted.

¹² The relevant paradigm is given in (i):

- (i) a. **pro_i sono stato visitato IO/io, PRO_i restando poi a disposizione degli altri pazienti*
have been visited I being afterwards at the other patients disposal
- b. **pro_i sei stato visitato TU/tu, PRO_i restando poi...*
have been visited you
- c. **pro_i siamo stati visitati NOI/noi, PRO_i restando poi...*
have been visited us
- d. **pro_i siete stati visitati VOI/voi, PRO_i restando poi...*
have been visited you

Now, while no sensible improvement can be found in plural (i c-d) vs. singular (i a-b) I/II person pronouns, III person pronouns seem slightly more acceptable (see (ii a-b)). This datum, however, seems to be dependent on the deictic use of the pronoun allowing a neutral reading:

- (ii) a. ?*pro_i è stata visitata lei, PRO_i restando poi...*
has been visited she/her, being afterwards...
- b. ?*pro_i sono stati visitati loro, PRO_i restando poi...*
have been visited they/them, being afterwards...
- (iii) a. *pro_i sono stati visitati (i pazienti più gravi)_i, PRO_i restando poi...*
have been visited the most severe patients, being afterwards...

For some speakers, however, only (iii) is (relatively) acceptable.

¹³ See for instance (i)-(ii) below, corresponding to (12)-(13) in Cecchetto (1999), with minor modifications:

- (i) a. (Le foto di (mio padre)_i) *gli_i sono arrivate al compleanno*
the pictures of my father to him have arrived at the birthday
- (ii) a. **pro_j gli_i sono arrivate (le foto di (mio padre)_i)_j al compleanno*
to him have arrived at the birthday the pictures of my father

Possibly, the logic of the argument that the associate should bind in (iia) as it does in (ia) is to be rejected, if any version of expletive replacement should apply (including the present analysis in terms of *pro*-argument chain). In neither sentence is the candidate antecedent in a c-commanding position with respect to the pronoun. In fact, the only principle relevant to the acceptability of (ia) could be principle B, for we can consider the binding relation in (ia) as pragmatically construed (notably, the suppression of the adverbial decreases the acceptability of this example: ?**Le foto di mio padre_i, gli_i sono arrivate*). The implications of the lack of c-command by the candidate antecedent in (i)-(ii) are shown in the (b) sentences below:

- (i) b. (Le foto di (mio padre)_i)_j *sono arrivate, PRO portando il proprio_{y_i} / suo_i fascino*
the pictures of my father have arrived bringing his own / his glamour
- (ii) b. *pro_j sono arrivate (le foto di mio padre)_i)_j PRO portando il proprio_{y_i} / suo_i fascino*
have arrived the pictures of my father bringing his own / his glamour

While control of the subject DP applies in both cases, this is not the case for the DP embedded in it: in neither sentence there is the possibility of an anaphor through PRO to the embedded DP, because this does not c-command the PRO. It can be argued that for this type of sentences, no special explanation is required whenever binding fails.

Bibliographical References

- BAKER Mark, Kyle JOHNSON & Ian ROBERTS 1989. Passive arguments raised. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20. 219-252.
- BELLETTI Adriana 1990. *Generalized Verb Movement*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- BELLETTI Adriana & Luigi RIZZI 1981. The syntax of *ne*: some theoretical implications. *The Linguistic Review* 1. 117-154.
- BURZIO Luigi 1986. *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- BURZIO Luigi 1989. On the non-existence of disjoint reference principles. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 14. 3-27.
- CARDINALETTI Anna 1997a. Agreement and control in expletive constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28. 521-533.
- CARDINALETTI Anna 1997b. Subjects and Clause Structure. In HAEGEMANN Liliane (ed.). *The New Comparative Syntax*. London: Longman.
- CECCHETTO Carlo 1999. Without Expletive Replacement? In LEMA José & Esthela TREVINO (eds.). *Semantic Issues in Romance Syntax*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 21-37.
- CHOMSKY Noam 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- CHOMSKY Noam 1986. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- CHOMSKY Noam 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY Noam 1998. Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework. In MARTIN Roger (ed.). *Step by Step. Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY Noam 1999. Derivation by Phase. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 18. MITWPL.
- CHOMSKY Noam & Howard LASNIK 1993. Principles and Parameters in Linguistic Theory. In JACOBS Joachim, Arnim VON STECHOV, Wolfgang STERNEFELD & Theo VENNEMANN (eds.). *Syntax: an International Handbook of Contemporary Research*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- CINQUE Guglielmo 1997. *The Interaction of Passive, Causative, and "Restructuring" in Romance*. In TORTORA Christina (ed.). *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- CINQUE Guglielmo 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CINQUE Guglielmo 2000. "Restructuring" and Functional Structure. Ms. University of Venice. Paper presented at the Issues in the Study of Language: A State of the Art Workshop, Pontignano, University of Siena. November 26-27. 1999.

- DOBROVIE-SORIN Carmen 2000. Eventive and generic predicational readings of SE-passives and the Theory of “little v”. *GLOW Newsletter* 44.
- GOODALL Grant 1997. θ -Alignment and the *By*-Phrase. In DAINORA Audra, Rachel HEMPHILL, Barbara LUKA, Barbara NEED, & Sheri PARGMAN (eds.). *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- GOODALL Grant 1999. Passives and Arbitrary Plural Subjects in Spanish. In AUTHIER J.Marc, Barbara E. BULLOCK & Lisa A. REED (eds.). *Formal Perspectives on Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- GRIMSHAW Jane 1990. *Argument Structure*. Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press.
- GROAT Erich 1999. Raising the Case of Expletives. In EPSTEIN Samuel David & Norbert HORNSTEIN (eds.). *Working Minimalism*. Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press.
- GUASTI Maria Teresa & Luigi RIZZI 1999. *Agreement and Tense as distinct syntactic positions: evidence from acquisition*. Ms. Università di Siena.
- JAEGGLI Osvaldo 1986. Passive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17. 587-622.
- LANDAU Idan 2000. Partial control and Agr-to-C. *GLOW Newsletter* 44.
- LAPPIN Shalom & Ur SHLONSKY 1993. Impersonal passives. *Linguistics* 31. 5-24.
- LASNIK Howard 1988. Subjects and the θ -Criterion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6. 1-17.
- LASNIK Howard 1992. Two Notes on Control and Binding. In LARSON Richard, Sabine IATRIDOU, Utpal LAHIRI & James HIGGINBOTHAM (eds.). *Control and Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- LONGOBARDI Giuseppe 2000. “Postverbal” subjects and the mapping hypothesis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31. 691-702.
- LONZI Lidia 1997. On Lasnik’s subject role. *Lingua e Stile* 32. 3. 397-432.
- LONZI Lidia 1998a. Il controllo argomentale nelle costruzioni espletive passive. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 23. 3-18.
- LONZI Lidia 1998b. *Avverbi e altre costruzioni a controllo*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- MORO Andrea 1997. *The raising of predicates: Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- POLLOCK Jean-Yves 1981. On case and impersonal constructions. In MAY Robert & Jan KOSTER (eds.). *Levels of Syntactic Representation*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- RIZZI Luigi 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- RIZZI Luigi 1986. Null objects in Italian syntax and the theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17. 501- 557.
- ROBERTS Ian 1987. *The Representation of Implicit and Dethematized Subjects*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- SCHÜTZE Carson 1999. English expletive constructions are not infected. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30. 467-484.
- SHLONSKY Ur 1990. *Pro* in Hebrew subject inversion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21. 263-275.
- SOBIN Nicholas 1997. Agreement, default rules, and grammatical viruses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28. 318-343.

Lidia Lonzi

WILLIAMS Edward 1985. PRO and subject of NP. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3. 297-315.

ZUBIZARRETA Maria Luisa 1982. *On the Relationship of the Lexicon to Syntax*. Ph.D. Dissertation MIT.