

## Reflexivization across clause boundaries in Italian<sup>1</sup>

DONNA JO NAPOLI

*Department of Linguistics, Georgetown University*

(Received 4 May 1978)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

At first glance Reflexivization in Italian seems to obey the same restrictions we find in English. Thus, if we consider the proposal that reflexive pronouns and their antecedents must be clausemates in English, we find in Italian that the same clausemate condition holds and that for any two coreferential pronouns within the same clause, the second of them is a reflexive pronoun. If, on the other hand, we consider the proposal that a reflexive pronoun and its antecedent may be indefinitely far apart provided that certain circumstances are not present, such as an intervening specified subject or the reflexive's being in a tensed S to which the antecedent does not belong (as in Chomsky (1973)), again the same conditions hold for Italian Reflexivization; as illustrated in (1)-(3).

- (1) Carlo si guarda allo specchio.  
(cf. \*Carlo<sub>i</sub> lo<sub>i</sub> guarda allo specchio.)  
'Carlo<sub>i</sub> looks at himself (\*him<sub>i</sub>) in the mirror.'
- (2) \*Carlo ha detto che io si guardavo allo specchio.  
(cf. Carlo<sub>i</sub> ha detto che io<sub>i</sub> guardavo allo specchio.)  
'Carlo said that I was looking at \*himself (him<sub>i</sub>) in the mirror.'
- (3) \*Carlo mi invita a guardarsi allo specchio.  
(cf. Carlo<sub>i</sub> mi invita a guardarlo<sub>i</sub> allo specchio.)  
'Carlo invites me to look at \*himself (him<sub>i</sub>) in the mirror.'

For many Italians, however, there are contexts for reflexive pronouns which differ from those found in English. In this paper I examine such cases, concluding that the proposed conditions mentioned above cannot be maintained as universals.

[1] I would like to thank Judith Aissen, Ivonne Bordelois, Guglielmo Cinque, Nick Clements, Bob Di Pietro, Richard Kayne, Giulio Lepschy, Marina Nespor, Andrew Radford and Emily Rando for comments on earlier versions of this paper. I am particularly indebted to Roberto Severino. And for help at a very early point in this study I thank Dwight Bolinger, Susumu Kuno, David Perlmutter, Pasquale Taro and Paolo Valerio.

## 2. DISTANT REFLEXIVES

Consider the following sentence:

- (4) *La signora lascia che io giaccia presso di sé.*  
 'The woman allows that I lie near herself.'

(4) is a permissible sentence for many speakers, although most find it ungrammatical. The examples in this paper are typical of reflexivization in Classical Latin; witness examples such as:

- his mandavit ut quae diceret Ariovistus ad se referrent*  
 'he charged them to report to himself what Ariovistus should say'

(This example is taken from Hale & Buck (1903: 145). For more Latin examples, the reader can consult Mey (1970).) The same contexts for reflexive pronouns are also found in Old Provençal, as we see below.

- E si'm fezes tant de plazer*  
*Que'm laisses pres de si jazer,*  
*Ja d'aquest mal non moitra.*  
 'And if she would make me such a pleasure as to let me lie near herself I would not die of this malady.'

(This example is from Cercamon's poem 'er fin' Amor in'esjauzina', lines 53-55, found in Hamlin, Ricketts and Hathaway (1967).) I have not, however, found speakers of modern Romance languages other than Italian who use reflexive pronouns in these contexts. Some of the Italians who do use this reflexive tell me that it seems a bit 'archaic' to them. Others say it is 'highly emotional'. It is possible that this reflexive was more widely used in an earlier stage of Italian but is rapidly disappearing from the language.

I found no socioeconomic, geographic or age correlations with the use of this reflexive. In fact, three of my informants who used it quite naturally came from Bologna, Rome and a small town in Sicily. Thus, this use of the reflexive, while it is not frequent, is certainly an aspect of Italian grammar and, as such, requires analysis. Furthermore, many Italians who do not use this reflexive still judge the asterisked examples in this paper much better than the asterisked ones (although their judgments are, admittedly, extremely delicate). Thus, their hierarchy is consistent with that of my informants presented below and they are sensitive to the same distinctions my informants note.

Turning now to the syntax of (4), we find the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun *sé*, which is *la signora*, in the next higher clause. An alternative to (4) is (5), with a nonreflexive pronoun:

- (5) *La signora lascia che io giaccia presso di lei.*  
 'The woman allows that I lie near her.'

The use of the reflexive pronoun in (4) is unusual in that it is optional (both

(4) and (5) are good in contrast to the two sentences in (1)) and in the relative positions of the reflexive pronoun and its antecedent. The positioning poses a problem for analyses based on the claim that reflexive pronouns and their antecedents must be clausemates, since *sé* and its antecedent in (4) are not clausemates. It also presents a problem for Chomsky's extended standard theory (1973) in that a specified subject (*io* 'I') intervenes between the reflexive pronoun and its antecedent in (4) where the clause in which the reflexive pronoun appears in (4) is a tensed S.

Contrasting (4) to \*(2) and \*(3), we find that a reflexive pronoun may appear in a distinct clause from its antecedent only when a number of syntactic and semantic conditions are present. The rest of this section is devoted to exploring these conditions. Below, a reflexive pronoun whose antecedent is not a clausemate will be called a distant reflexive pronoun (drp) and the rule which accounts for such reflexives (whether it be interpretive or transformational) will be called Distant Reflexive (DR). (A discussion of this rule in contrast to Reflexive (the rule for 'close' reflexives) is found in §§ 3 and 4 below.)

2.1. *The target NP*

The NP that appears as a drp, the target NP, is most often (but see (12), (15) and (25) below) the object of a preposition. Thus, (6), in which the target is an accusative NP, is ungrammatical:

- (6) (a) \**La signora permette che io si baci.*  
 (b) \**La signora permette che io baci sé.*  
 'The woman permits me to kiss herself.'

However, not just any preposition will do. In (7) we find unsuitable prepositions, while in (8) we find suitable ones:

- (7) (a) \**La signora vuole che io telefoni a sé.*  
 'The woman wants me to telephone herself.'  
 (b) (\**)La signora comanda che io sieda davanti a sé.*  
 'The woman commands me to sit before herself.'  
 (c) (\**)La signora insiste che io sieda accanto a sé.*  
 'The woman insists that I sit beside herself.'

(The parentheses around the asterisks in (7b) and (7c) signify that some speakers find these examples acceptable. I will discuss this variation below, following the discussion about the speech of those who reject (7b) and (7c).)

- (8) (a) *La signora vuole che io vada con sé.*  
 'The woman wants me to go with herself.'  
 (b) *La signora comanda che io parli dopo di sé.*  
 'The woman commands that I speak after herself.'

- (c) La signora insiste che io giaccia presso di sé.  
'The woman insists that I lie near herself.'

(Speakers of Italian who accept drp's in (4) but not in (8) may be objecting to the choice of the matrix verb rather than to the use of *è* in this structural position. Such speakers should consider all the examples in this paper using *lasciare* 'let' as the verb of the antecedent's clause if possible, and see § 2.4 below for discussion.)

I will argue that the crucial factor for those speakers who reject all the examples in (7) is whether or not the target NP is in a cliticizable position. If the position is cliticizable, a drp cannot appear in it.

In Italian object pronouns most frequently appear as clitics to a verb, as in (9) below (where I will assume the analysis of clitic pronouns given in Kayne (1975) for French).

- (9) Già la conosco. (cf. \*La già conosco.)  
already her I know. her already I know.  
'I know her already.'

(10), instead, is much less frequent.

- (10) Conosco già lei. (cf. Conosco lei già. Già conosco lei.)  
I know already her. I know her already. already I know her.  
'I know her already.'

All the sentences in (10) are good, but only when the pronoun *lei* receives an intonation peak. While the semantic factors contributing to the cliticizability of a pronoun are a fascinating topic for discussion, I will not go into them here. Instead, I will just make use of the fact of whether or not a pronoun in a certain underlying structural position can, given proper semantic factors, appear as a clitic in the surface.

Looking now to (6) above, we see that a drp cannot appear as an accusative NP. Accusative objects are cliticizable in general. (However, no NP that is a conjunct of a co-ordinate structure can be cliticized. This goes for accusative NPs as well as any other.)

- (11) \*La bacio e sua figlia. (cf. Bacio lei e sua figlia.)  
her I kiss and her sister. (cf. Bacio lei e sua figlia.)  
'I kiss her and her sister.'

And we find that a drp can appear as an accusative object if it is a conjunct of a co-ordinate structure:

- (12) La signora lascia che io baci sua figlia e anche sè (stessa).  
'The woman allows that I kiss her daughter and also herself.'

(Example (12) is due to Giulio Lepschy (personal communication).)  
There are other structures which block the cliticization of an accusative object.

Thus there is a construction in Italian which places *non* before a verb and *che* before some complement of that verb (similar to the French *ne . . . que* construction). exemplified in (13):

- (13) Non bacio che Maria.  
'I kiss only Maria.'

An accusative object within the scope of the *che* of this *non . . . che* construction cannot be cliticized:

- (14) \*Non la bacio che. (cf. Non bacio che lei.)  
'I kiss only her.'

Again, we find that a drp can appear as an accusative object if it is within the scope of this *che*:

- (15) La signora vuole che io non baci che sè.  
'The woman wants me to kiss only herself.'

If we turn now to (7), we find examples of PPs in which the object of the *a* can be cliticized with the concomitant disappearance of *a*, as in

- (16) Le telefono. (cf. Telefono a lei.)  
'I telephone her.'  
(17) Le rimase davanti. (cf. Rimase davanti a lei.)  
'It remained in front of her.'  
(18) Le sta accanto. (cf. Sta accanto a lei.)  
'It's beside her.'

(PPs like those in (17), (18) and (7b-c) have traditionally been called 'composite' PPs and are studied in Napoli (1976b).)

If the object of the *a* is a conjunct of a co-ordinate structure or within the scope of the *che* of the *non . . . che* construction, however, it cannot cliticize.

- (19) \*Le telefono e (a) Carlo.  
(cf. Telefono a lei e (a) Carlo.)  
'I telephone to her and Carlo.'  
(20) \*Non le telefono che. (cf. Non telefono che a lei.)  
'I telephone to her only.'  
(21) \*Le rimase davanti e (a) Carlo.  
(cf. Rimase davanti a lei e (a) Carlo.)  
'It remained in front of her and Carlo.'  
(22) (a) \*Non le rimase che davanti.  
(cf. Non rimase che davanti a lei.)  
(b) \*Non le rimase davanti che.  
(cf. Non rimase davanti che a lei.)  
'It remained in front of her only.'  
(23) \*Le sta accanto e (a) Carlo.

- (cf. Sta accanto a lei e (a) Carlo.)  
'It's in front of her and Carlo.'
- (24) (a) \*Non le sta che accanto.  
(cf. Non sta che accanto a lei.)  
(b) \*Non le sta accanto che.  
(cf. Non sta accanto che a lei.)  
'It's beside only her.'

(The sentences in parentheses under (22b) and (24b) are not acceptable for many speakers. The grammaticality of such examples is discussed and explained in Napoli (1976b).)

As expected, drp's can appear as the object of *a* in these structures precisely when the pronoun is a conjunct of a co-ordinate structure or when it is within the scope of the *che* of the *non*...*che* construction.

- (25) La signora vuole che io telefoni a Gigina e (a) sè.  
'The woman wants me to telephone Gigina and herself.'
- (26) La signora vuole che io non telefoni che a sè.  
'The woman wants me to telephone only herself.'
- (27) La signora comanda che io sieda davanti a sua figlia e (a) sè.  
'The woman commands that I sit in front of her daughter and herself.'
- (28) La signora comanda che io non sieda che davanti a sè.  
'The woman commands that I sit in front of only herself.'
- (29) La signora insiste che io sieda accanto a sua figlia e (a) sè.  
'The woman insists that I sit beside her daughter and herself.'
- (30) La signora insiste che io non sieda che accanto a sè.  
'The woman insists that I sit beside only herself.'

Finally, when we turn to (8), we find that the object of the preposition here can never be cliticized, even when no co-ordinate structure is involved and *non*...*che* is not involved.

- (31) \*Ti vado con. (cf. Vado con te.)  
'I'm going with you.'
- (32) \*Ti parlo dopo. (cf. Parlo dopo di te.)  
'I speak after you.'
- (33) \*Ti giaccio presso. (cf. Giaccio presso di te.)  
'I'm lying near you.'

((32) does have the good reading 'I'll speak to you afterwards', which is related to an S in which *ti* 'you' was not the object of *dopo* (*di*) 'after', but of the dative preposition *a* 'to'. This reading is not relevant to the discussion here.) And, as we saw in (8), a drp can appear as the object of these prepositions.

One more argument that the target NP is barred from cliticizable positions

is offered by data from dialectal variation. All speakers accept *a* phrases after a word such as *dietro* in:

- (34) L'ho messo dietro a lui.  
'I put it behind him.'

The pronoun *lui* in (34) is in a cliticizable position. Thus, corresponding to (34) we find,

- (35) Gliel'ho messo dietro.  
'I put it behind him.'

Some speakers also accept bare pronouns or *di* phrases after *dietro*:

- (36) L'ho messo dietro (di) lui.

It is shown in Napoli (1976b) that phrases of the type *dietro* (*di*) *lui* have the same syntactic structure and behave the same for all syntactic rules tested there as phrases of the type *dopo* (*di*) *lui*. Specifically, there is no S corresponding to (36) in which the (*di*) *lui* does not appear but a clitic on the verb does appear. Thus, the pronoun *lui* in (36) is not in a cliticizable position. We find that speakers reject drp's in an *a* phrase (a cliticizable position) after *dietro* but not in a *di* phrase (a non-cliticizable position) or just bare after *dietro*.

- (37) \*La signora lascia che io giaccia dietro a sè.  
(38) ?La signora lascia che io giaccia dietro (di) sè.  
'The woman allows me to lie behind herself.'

There are some speakers who allow both *a* and *di* after *dietro* who always find *di* highly preferable with an animate pronoun object. For these speakers, of course, the argument based on the contrast in (37)-(38) is vitiated.

Thus, we can conclude that for those speakers who reject all the examples of (7), drp's can appear only in non-cliticizable positions.

As noted above, however, there are some speakers of drp's who reject (7a), with the dative preposition *a*, but accept (7b) and (7c). These speakers have a weaker constraint on the target position. They allow drp's in any object position which does not highly favour cliticization. That is, accusative object position and dative object position highly favour cliticization; only in the presence of certain (very difficult to describe) semantic factors will these pronominal objects appear uncliticized. Thus, these speakers reject (6) and (7a). However, the object of a composite preposition like *davanti a* or *accanto a* may or may not be cliticized with no strong preference one way or the other (except, of course, in the presence of those same semantic factors that disfavour cliticization of accusative and dative objects, as well). Therefore, these speakers accept (7b) and (7c). The claim that cliticization is relevant to these speakers is borne out by the fact that they provide the same judgments for all the examples (8)-(38).

The description of the restriction on the position of the target NP as being sensitive to the possibility and likelihood of cliticization from that position seems particularly appealing when we note that in Napoli (1973) and, for independent reasons, in Cinque (1975) and Radford (1977a), it has been proposed that a constraint, called Constraint A, is needed in Italian which bars a reflexive pronoun from cliticizing to a verb whose subject is not coreferential with the reflexive pronoun. Note that if a drp were to appear in a cliticizable position and if it actually were cliticized, this constraint would be violated:

- (39) (a) \*La signora permette che io si baci.  
'The woman permits me to kiss herself.'  
(b) \*La signora permette che io si telefoni.  
'The woman permits me to telephone herself.'  
(c) \*La signora permette che io si giaccia davanti.  
'The woman permits me to lie in front of herself.'

There are, however, at least two arguments against claiming that Constraint A is what explains the positions a drp may appear in. One is theoretical; the other, empirical. First, even if we assume that Constraint A can account for the ungrammaticality of (39), it is not clear how Constraint A could rule out the corresponding sentences in which the drp is not cliticized and which are to be read with an intonation peak on the drp:

- (40) (a) \*La signora permette che io baci sè.  
(b) \*La signora permette che io telefoni a sè.  
(c) \*La signora permette che io giaccia davanti a sè.

Yet the sentences of (40) are ungrammatical.

The second argument against using Constraint A to explain the possible positions for the target NP has to do with PP's of the form *di NP*. When S's with these PP's have corresponding S's with clitics instead of the PP, the clitic we find is *ne*. Thus *ne* in the brief exchange in (41) corresponds to *di lui*:

- (41) -Hai parlato di lui?  
'Did you speak about him?'  
-Sì, ne ho parlato, ma non molto.  
'Yes, I talked about him, but not a lot.'

(I am assuming here an analysis of *ne* similar to that of *en* in French by Kayne (1975), in which *ne* is a pro PP.)

My informants vary, however, as to whether or not *ne* may correspond to a PP involving the reflexive pronoun *sè*. Thus, for some speakers (42a) and (42b) are (nearly) synonymous while for others they are as different from each other as (42a) is from (43):

- (42) (a) Carlo parla sempre di sè.  
'Carlo speaks about himself all the time.'  
(b) Carlo ne parla sempre.  
'Carlo speaks about it all the time.'  
(43) Carlo parla sempre di lui.  
'Carlo speaks about him all the time.'

For the first set of speakers (those who can have *ne* corresponding to *di sè*), a drp cannot appear as the object of *di*. Thus they reject a sentence such as:

- (44) (\*) La signora fa in modo che io parli di sè.  
'The woman arranges it that I speak about herself.'

For the second set of speakers (those for whom *ne* cannot correspond to *di sè*), a drp can appear as the object of *di*. Thus they accept (44). (For this reason I have put parentheses around the asterisk in (44).)

The important point here is that *ne* is not a reflexive clitic. Instead, it is a pro PP. There is no evidence in Napoli (1973), Cinque (1975) or Radford (1977a) that Constraint A should apply to *ne*. Rather, Constraint A was formulated to apply to the reflexive clitic *si* only. Thus Constraint A would not rule out (44) even for those speakers for whom *ne* can correspond to *di sè*. Thus if we want to rule out all the impossible positions for the target NP with one explanation, we cannot appeal to Constraint A.

We must conclude, then, that a drp is barred from any position to which a rule of cliticization could apply (and, for some speakers, is very likely to apply) replacing that pronoun (and perhaps other elements as well, such as a whole PP) with a clitic. And we must hope that there is some syntactic property to which DR may be sensitive which designates a position as cliticizable or not. The result of this restriction is that drp's usually appear only as the objects of certain prepositions.<sup>2</sup>

[2] For one of my informants there is at least one exception to this claim. This speaker can cliticize the object of the preposition *su* 'up', 'on' as a dative clitic, as in:

- (i) Maria mette la coperta sul bambino.  
'Maria puts the blanket on the child.'  
(ii) (\*) Maria gli mette su la coperta.  
'Maria puts the blanket on him.'

Most of my informants rejected (ii) (thus I put an asterisk in parentheses there). This speaker, however, can get a drp after *su* when it is preceded by *di*, as in,

- (iii) La signora ordina che l'uccellino rimanga su di sè.  
'The woman orders the little bird to remain on herself.'

Besides this one speaker, only speakers who rejected (ii) accepted (iii).

Note that none of my informants accepted *su a NP*. Thus the problem with *su* is not the same as that with *dietro* (see the discussion around examples (34)-(38)). And in Napoli (1976b) it is shown that phrases with *su* are syntactically very different from those with *dietro*.

While I have no explanation for why the target position should be restricted in this way, it is interesting to note that drp's in German are restricted in a somewhat similar way. Reis (1973) shows that an intervening specified subject can block DR on case forms (genitive, dative and accusative) but only 'irregularly' and more 'weakly' on objects of prepositions. And in English drp's can be found occasionally in pp's:

- (45) Who would want such wrath brought down upon himself?  
 (46) (a) Kissinger declared that foreign policy cannot be conducted under the veil of doubts about himself.  
 (b) Pierre accepts Margaret's decision with regret and both pray that their separation will lead to a better relationship between themselves.

((45) is due to Dwight Bolinger (personal communication). (46a) is taken from the *Washington Post*, 1975: (46b) from the *Washington Post* 28 May 1977, Section A, 1. The particle from which (46b) is taken was reprinted from a Canadian newspaper.)

## 2.2. The antecedent

The NP that serves as an antecedent for a drp is the subject of its clause in underlying structure in most examples. Thus, the following examples in which the antecedent is never a grammatical subject at any point in the derivation are ungrammatical for most speakers:

- (47) \*?È piaciuto alla signora che io giacessi presso di sè.  
 'It pleased the woman that I should lie near herself.'  
 (48) ?\*Sarebbe utile per la signora se io giacessi presso di sè.  
 'It would be useful for the woman if I would lie near herself.'  
 (49) \*Ha sorpreso la signora che io giacessi presso di sè.  
 'It surprised the woman that I should lie near herself.'

A second apparent type of problem for this constraint on the target position is exemplified by (iv):

- (iv) (a) \*Maria ha permesso che io vivessi insieme a sè.  
 'Maria allowed that I live with herself.'  
 (b) Maria ha permesso che io vivessi insieme a lei.  
 'Maria allowed that I live with her.'  
 (c) Maria ha permesso che io \*le/?ci vivessi insieme.  
 'Maria allowed that I live with her (clitic).'

((iv) is due to an unidentified reader.) Here the drp sè cannot appear as the object of *insieme a*, yet this position is not a cliticizable one, as (iv(c)) shows. However, note that even the regular reflexive pronoun sè cannot appear as the object of *insieme a*:

- (v) \*Vuole Maria insieme a sè.  
 'He wants Maria (together) with himself.'

For some reason the reflexive pronoun sè, whether regular or distant, never appears as the object of *insieme a*. Thus the problem with (iv(a)) is irrelevant to the discussion of the possible positions for drp's in particular.

There is some variation here, however. All of my informants except one found (47) and (48) slightly better than (49). That is, objects of prepositions are slightly better than accusatives as antecedents for drp's. One of my informants found (47)-(49) all as good as (4). This speaker seems to have no grammatical rôle restrictions on the antecedent. Rather, as long as the verb expresses the emotional state of a given NP, that NP may serve as an antecedent regardless of its rôle in its own clause. (In § 2.4 below there is further discussion of the semantic restrictions on the verb of the antecedent's clause.)

However, for all my informants who use drp's, an NP in an agent phrase in a passive sentence may serve as an antecedent. Thus, in both (50), with an embedded tensed clause, and (51), with an embedded infinitival clause, we find drp's.

- (50) È stato ordinato dalla signora che io giacessi presso di sè.  
 'It was ordered by the woman that I should lie near herself.'  
 (51) Mi è stato ordinato dalla signora di giacere presso di sè.  
 'I was ordered by the woman to lie near herself.'

(Many of my informants prefer (51) to (50). This preference may be a reflection of the fact that in (50) both the Specified Subject Condition and the Tensed S Condition of Chomsky (1973) are violated, while in (51) only the former is violated.)

Given (50)-(51) in contrast to (47)-(49) we can postulate at least three possible conclusions. First, the antecedent must be plus some feature such as agentive and DR must be sensitive to this feature. In this case DR need not be ordered with respect to Passive from the data given above. Secondly, the antecedent must be the subject of its clause at the time DR applies. In this case DR must apply before Passive.<sup>3</sup> Third, the antecedent must be the subject of its clause at the

[3] I have found no way to test whether or not the surface subject of a passive sentence may serve as an antecedent for a drp. This is because I have found no sentences in which an accusative object which becomes the surface subject of its clause by way of Passive can serve as the antecedent for any kind of pronoun in a clause which fulfils all the requirements necessary for DR. (Only accusative objects are relevant here since Passive in Italian, as in Romance in general, applies only to accusative objects.) Thus there are no S's of the type:

- (i) \*Gesù è stato supplicato che noi fanciulli sedessimo presso di sè/luì.  
 'Jesus was begged that we children should sit near himself/him.'  
 although for many speakers there are S's of the type:

- (ii) \*Abbiamo supplicato Gesù che noi fanciulli sedessimo presso di lui/\*sè.  
 'We begged Jesus that we children should sit near him/himself.'

For those speakers who reject (ii), (i) is no problem. But for those speakers who accept (ii) (with lui only; everyone rejects sè in (ii)), I do not know why Passive cannot apply to it to produce (i). Instead of (i), speakers say,

time DR applies and/or must be plus some feature such as agentive to which DR is sensitive. Again in this case DR need not be ordered with respect to Passive from the data given above.

There is evidence against both of the first two possible conclusions. First, let us consider some evidence against the purely feature sensitive proposal. An NP in subject position with a psychological adjective may serve as an antecedent. In the following examples we see this situation. (There are some speakers who reject the S's below (particularly (52a)) because of semantic conditions they impose on the matrix predicate, conditions discussed in § 2.4 below. For such speakers I have been unable to find suitable examples to test whether they allow drp's in structures like those in (52).)

- (52) (a) La signora era sorpresa che io giacessi presso di sé.  
'The woman was surprised that I should lie near herself.'  
(b) La signora era dispiaciuta che io giacessi presso di sé.  
'The woman was displeased that I should lie near herself.'  
(c) La signora era scontenta che io giacessi presso di sé.  
'The woman was discontent that I should lie near herself.'  
(d) La signora era infelice che io giacessi presso di sé.  
'The woman was unhappy that I should lie near herself.'

In the surface it may seem that (52a) and (52b) are similar to passive sentences because of the presence of the copula and the morphological shape of the verb. However, (52a) contrasts with the true passive sentence seen in (53):

- (53) La signora era sorpresa dal fatto che io giacevo presso di lei.  
'The woman was surprised by the fact that I was lying near her.'

In (53) we find an agent phrase (the *da* phrase) as well as the copula and the participial form of the verb. And *la signora* in (53) may not serve as the antecedent for a drp:

- (54) \*La signora era sorpresa dal fatto che io giacevo presso di sé.  
(iii) Gesù è stato supplicato di permettere che noi fanciulli sedessimo presso di sé/lui.  
'Jesus was begged to allow the children to sit near himself/him.'

- from:  
(iv) Abbiamo supplicato Gesù di permettere che noi fanciulli sedessimo presso di sé/lui.  
'We begged Jesus to permit the children to sit near himself/him.'

But (iii) does not necessarily show us anything new about the antecedent of a drp since *sé* in (iii) might be controlled by the subject of *permettere* (i.e. by a Pro, as in the analyses of various kinds of 'missing' subjects given in Chomsky, 1976) and not by the surface subject of the highest clause. See Section 4 below for a discussion of the ordering of DR with respect to other rules.

(Another complicating factor in (54) may be the mood, which is indicative. In § 2.5 below mood is discussed.) Likewise, a passive analysis of (52b) fails since (52b) has no corresponding active sentence in which *la signora* acts as the accusative object of the active verb *dispiacere* 'displease'. (Rather, the only active paraphrase of (52b) using *dispiacere* has *la signora* as the object of the preposition *a*.)

Lakoff (1970) proposed for English that the surface subject of sentences like (52a)-(52c) is, indeed, their deep subject. He says, 'We know this from our intuitions about what underlying subjects and objects are' (126). Likewise, Postal (1971) proposed for English that the surface subject of such sentences is their 'logical' subject. If Lakoff and Postal are correct (and Chomsky, 1970, and many other linguists), then we do expect *la signora* to be able to serve as the antecedent to a drp in (52a)-(52c) as long as the antecedent can be any subject. Furthermore, as far as I know, no one has questioned the deep subject status of the surface subject in (52d). Therefore, the acceptability of (52d), likewise, is expected as long as the antecedent for a drp can be any subject. (Note that with the analyses of Lakoff and Postal we need not at this point take a stand as to whether DR requires deep or surface subjecthood for the antecedent since the deep and surface subjects in (52) are the same.) However, if we are limited to antecedents which share the feature [+agentive] we cannot explain why the S's of (52) are good when those of (47)-(49) are bad, given that *la signora* is not more agentive in (52) than in (47)-(49). (Compare in particular (52a) and (49).) Given these sentences, then, I conclude that the antecedent can be a subject that is not necessarily agentive, and thus, that the first proposal is wrong. The conclusion that the structural factor 'subject' is sufficient (though not necessary) for the antecedent of a drp in Italian is similar to that reached by Mey (1970) for Eskimo. Mey analyses possessive reflexive suffixes in Eskimo that are not clause bound and argues for a structural requirement of subjecthood on the antecedent of the reflexive suffix. Thus, the Italian data are not unique.

There is also evidence that agentive NPs that are not subjects may serve as antecedents, thus proving the second proposal to be wrong. We can see this when we look at S's such as (55) and (56). (These examples use embedded infinitival clauses since Equi is (almost) obligatory here for many speakers, regardless of whether a drp or a non-reflexive pronoun is used.)

- (55) Ho ricevuto l'ordine della signora di giacere presso di sé.  
'I received the woman's order to lie near herself.'  
(56) Ho ricevuto l'ordine dalla signora di giacere presso di sé.  
'I received the order from the woman to lie near herself.'

In (55) l'ordine della signora di giacere presso di sé forms a constituent, as can be seen from the fact that it moves together as a single NP when Passive applies:

- (57) L'ordine della signora di giacere presso di sè è stato ricevuto.  
'The woman's order to lie near herself has been received.'

In contrast, in (56), *l'ordine* does not form a constituent with the words following it:

- (58) \*L'ordine dalla signora di giacere presso di sè è stato ricevuto.  
'The order from the woman to lie near herself has been received.'

And, in fact, we get NPs of the type given in (59a) but not of the type given in (59b):

- (59) (a) l'ordine della signora.  
(b) \*L'ordine dalla signora.

Thus, in (55) we have *della signora* acting as the underlying 'subject' (in Chomsky's (1970) terms) of the NP whose head is *l'ordine*, while in (56) *dalla signora* acts as a locative off the VP.

The fact that *la signora* can act as the antecedent of a drp in (55) could be taken to support Chomsky's (1970) claim that the node NP is cyclic and that the part of Passive which postposes agents may apply to it. Thus, if Chomsky is correct, (55) poses us no new problems; it is merely an example of the same type as (50) and (51). However, as we will see immediately below, (55) can be explained even without assuming that NP's are cyclic nodes.

The fact that *la signora* in (56) can act as an antecedent is a serious problem for the second proposal regardless of Chomsky's (1970) claims. At no point in the derivation of (56) is *la signora* the 'subject' of any cyclic node. Instead, it is the object of the locative preposition *da* 'from' and dominated by the VP at all points in the derivation. But we have already seen in (47) and (48) that objects of prepositions, in general, cannot freely serve as antecedents for drp's. For some reason locatives such as those in (56) are an exception to this statement. My informants tell me that (56) is good because the locative here tells us that the order emanates from *la signora*. When a non-reflexive pronoun is used in target position, as in

- (60) Ho ricevuto l'ordine dalla signora di giacere presso di lei.

we have two readings for the S. The most ready one is that *la signora* is doing the ordering. But there is a second reading in which *la signora* only sends the order but a third party (unnamed here) is doing the ordering. In (56), however, where the drp appears, only the first of these readings is present. Thus *la signora* in (56) is not only the one who sends the order but also the one who does the ordering. In this sense (56) is very similar to (55) in the agentive feature of the antecedent. Thus, NP's that are not subjects but that are agentive may serve as antecedents.

As Ivonne Bordelois (personal communication) has pointed out to me, features such as agentive and animate have been found to be significant in describing other syntactic problems. Chomsky (1973) notes for English that non-agentive subjects often behave differently from agentive ones with regard to his Specified Subject Condition. Clements (1974) proposes that SuperEqui is obligatory with animate NP's but optional with inanimates. Kayne (1975) notes that dative *tons* not preceded by *à* is better when the subject is agentive than non-agentive (159, footnote) and that agentiveness is relevant to the Specified Subject Condition in French (322). Thus, it is not surprising that agentiveness should be relevant here to the Italian phenomenon.

Even more relevant is work on reflexivization in other languages that shows the acceptability of a reflexive pronoun being sensitive to similar semantic factors. Jackendoff (1972: 167) argues that in English certain reflexives in relativized clauses are acceptable when the main clause subject (the antecedent) is agentive and unacceptable otherwise. Kuno (1972 & 1973) argues that in Japanese the reflexive pronoun *zibun* can appear in an embedded clause with its antecedent in the matrix S only if the clause which *zibun* appears in 'represents an action or state that the referent . . . is aware of at the time it takes place or has come to be aware of at some later point' (1973: 322). Thráinsson (1976) takes the position that drp's in Icelandic appear only when the 'point of view' of the antecedent (which must be a higher subject) is expressed in the given sentence. Many of the examples he gives there are typical of the kinds of distinctions made by some speakers of drp's in Italian (see also § 2.4. below). Thus, in all four languages (English, Japanese, Icelandic and Italian), distant reflexivization is acceptable when the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun is somehow involved in the action or state of the clause the reflexive pronoun appears in.

I conclude, then, that the most straightforward solution would say that the antecedent must be the subject of its clause at the time DR applies and/or it must be agentive.

One interesting result of the above analysis (pointed out to me by Emily Rando (personal communication)) is that it accounts for the fact that drp's are much more natural in S's in which Passive has applied in the target's clause than in active transitive S's. Thus (61b) is preferred to (61a):

- (61) (a) La signora lascia che io metta il bimbo presso di sè.  
'The woman allows that I put the child near herself.'  
(b) La signora lascia che io bimbo sia messo presso di sè.  
'The woman allows that the child be put near herself.'

The application of Passive on the lower cycle in (61b) removes an agentive NP (*io*) from the left of *sè*. Since DR automatically considers all agentive NP's to the left of *sè* for reference with *sè* (see § 4 below), (61b) is preferred to (61a) given that *il bimbo* in (61b) need be considered only because it is a subject,

but *io* in (61a) need be considered both because it is a subject and because it is agentive. Because neither *il bimbo* nor *io* can be antecedents for *sè*, (61b), the S in which we linger least over the consideration of an incorrect antecedent is preferred.

Note that at this point there is no evidence that DR must be ordered with respect to Passive.

### 2.3. Relative position of antecedent and target.

The antecedent of a drp must command and precede the target at the point at which DR applies. To see this, first note that *la signora* in (62) cannot serve as an antecedent for a drp since it does not command that reflexive:

- (62) \**La signora non vuole un compagno, ma ciò nonostante io voglio che tu vada con sè.*  
 'The woman doesn't want a companion, but, all the same, I want you to go with herself.'

Since the clause the target appears in is usually dominated by the VP of the antecedent's clause, the antecedent precedes the target as well as commands it in the surface in most cases. However, the clause the target is in must be dominated by the VP of the antecedent's clause for some Italians but not for others. Thus, some speakers accept (63a).

- (63) (a) *La signora se ne andò prima che io potessi giacere presso di sè.*  
 'The woman went away before I could lie near herself.'

If adverbial clauses like that introduced by *prima che* in (63a) are positioned to the right of the main clause VP and dominated only by the topmost S at the time DR applies, then we can conclude that the antecedent always precedes its target. But if the adverbial clause in (63a) can be shown to be to the left of *la signora* at the time DR applies, then the only restriction is that the antecedent command the target. Certainly for those speakers who accept (63a), (63b) is also good:

- (63) (b) *Prima che io potessi giacere presso di sè, la signora se ne andò.*  
 'Before I could lie near herself, the woman went away.'

But (63b) in itself is not evidence that the antecedent need not precede the target when DR applies, since it is not clear where the *prima che* clause is at the time DR applies. Only if it can be shown that (63a), or, alternatively, (63b) is the structure we have at the time DR applies do these sentences offer evidence about whether or not precedence is a factor here. As far as I can see, the question involves an analysis of adverbial clauses that would take us far beyond the scope of this paper.

There is other evidence that precedence is a factor, however. Consider the contrast between (64a) and (64b):

- (64) (a) ?\**Mi è stato ordinato di mettere il gatto presso di sè<sub>i</sub> da Maria<sub>i</sub>.*  
 'I was ordered to put the cat by herself by Maria.'  
 (b) *Mi è stato ordinato da Maria<sub>i</sub> di mettere il gatto presso di sè<sub>i</sub>.*  
 'I was ordered by Maria to put the cat by herself.'

The only difference between (64a) and (64b) is the position of *da Maria*. When *da Maria* is to the right of *sè*, we cannot understand *sè* as being coreferential with *Maria*. But when *da Maria* is to the left of *sè*, we do get coreference. (See also contrasts like that between (88a) and (88b) in Section 4 below for further evidence.) Thus, the antecedent must precede the target at the time of DR.

Also, while the antecedent is found most often in the next higher clause to that of the target, this is not a necessary condition for many speakers:

- (65) (?) *Il capitano ha fatto in modo che io lasciassi che tu andassi con sè.*  
 'The captain arranged it that I let you go with himself.'

And, finally, while the antecedent is most often found in the matrix clause, this need not be so:

- (66) *L'uomo ha detto che Gesù voleva che noi fanciulli sedessimo presso di sè.*  
 'The man said that Jesus wanted us children to sit near himself.'

For the speakers who get (65), (66) is ambiguous between *sè*'s being coreferential with *l'uomo* or *Gesù*. For the speakers who reject (65), (66) is read only with *sè* coreferential with *Gesù*.

Thus, we can conclude from the data in this section that the antecedent must command its target and precede it at the time DR applies.

### 2.4. Restrictions on the antecedent's V

For some speakers who get drp's there seems to be no semantic or syntactic restriction on the V of the antecedent's clause (unless the condition on mood of the lower clause, discussed in § 2.5. below, and the condition of agentiveness on the antecedent discussed in § 2.3 above, can be shown to follow from this V). However, for other speakers, sentences that are identical except for differing V's in the antecedent's clause have different degrees of acceptability. Thus some speakers rate (67a) better than (67b), which is, in turn, better than (67c), which is better than (67d), which is better than (67e):

- (67) (a) *La signora ha lasciato che io restassi ancora presso di sè.*  
 (b) *La signora ha preteso che io restassi ancora presso di sè.*  
 (c) *La signora ha ordinato che io restassi ancora presso di sè.*

- (d) La signora ha permesso che io restassi ancora presso di sè.  
'The woman allowed/insisted/ordered/permitted that I remain beside herself still.'
- (e) La signora ha negato che io fossi restato presso di sè.  
'The woman denied that I had remained beside herself.'

Speaking informally, it seems that the speakers who see a gradation in acceptability from best to worst in (67a) through (67e) use a drp more readily when the desires of the antecedent with respect to the target's clause are clear from the choice of the verb. Those desires are clearest in (67a) and totally unknown in (67e), according to my informants. Such speakers accept the drp in (68a) but not in (68b):

- (68) (a) Ho detto che Gesù voleva che noi bambini andassimo con sè,  
perché me l'ha detto proprio lui.  
'I said that Jesus wanted us children to go with himself, because he himself told me so.'
- (b) Ho detto che Gesù voleva che noi bambini andassimo con sè, ma  
mi sono sbagliato.  
'I said that Jesus wanted us children to go with himself, but I was wrong.'

And such speakers either reject (69) or accept it only with the reading in which the father got up so that the children would not be able to sit near him:

- (69) Il papà si alzò prima che noi bambini potessimo sedere presso di sè.  
'Daddy go up before we children could sit near himself.'

Thus (69) is good for them only if we understand it as conveying the desires of the antecedent with respect to the action of the target's clause.

The distinctions discussed here, however, are very slight and many of my informants did not note them. Thus, for many of the Italians who use drp's, all the S's in this section are well-formed.

#### 2.5. The mood of the target's clause

The target's clause must be either subjunctive or infinitival in surface structure.

Thus (70a) and (70b) are fine, while (70c) is out:

- (70) (a) La signora dice che io giaccia presso di sè.  
subjunctive  
'The woman orders that I lie near herself.'
- (b) La signora mi dice di giacere presso di sè.  
infinitive  
'The woman orders me to lie near herself.'

- (c) \*La signora dice che io giaccio presso di sè.  
indicative  
'The woman says (states/asserts) that I am lying near herself.'

*Dire* with the meaning of 'tell' or 'order' can take a subjunctive or infinitival complement. But *dire* with the meaning of 'say' or 'report' takes an indicative complement, and, for some speakers, an infinitival in cases of Equi with a subject controller.

For many speakers a S like (71) allows a drp (as noted in § 2.4 above):

- (71) (= 69) Il papà si alzò prima che noi bambini potessimo sedere presso di sè.  
subjunctive  
'Daddy got up before we children could sit near himself.'

In (71) the subjunctive is due to the adverbial conjunction *prima che*, which always requires a subjunctive verb in the clause it introduces. Thus, the verb of the matrix sentence in (71) in no way affects the possibility of having a drp.

It has been argued for Italian that semantic factors enter into the choice of the mood of an embedded clause (Saltarelli (1974a, 1974b), Napoli and Nespor (1976), among others). However, it has also been pointed out for Romance that various syntactic processes are sensitive to mood (Ronat (1973), Napoli (1976a), among others). Thus it is not at all clear whether the constraint that the verb of the target's clause not be indicative is semantic or syntactic. Determining such an issue would take us far astray from the goals of this paper, thus this question must be left for future research.

Also, for most of the examples I found of drp's in infinitival clauses, there was a corresponding S with a drp in a subjunctive clause. Clearly one could make arguments in support of a transformation which derives infinitivals, such as that seen in (70b), from subjunctive clauses, such as that seen in (70a) (or vice versa, see Bordoilois (1972)). However, there are infinitivals which do not have corresponding full subjunctives, such as:

- (72) (a) La signora mi invita a giacere presso di sè.  
'The woman invites me to lie near herself.'
- (b) \*La signora invita che io giaccia presso di sè/lei.  
subjunctive
- (c) \*La signora invita che io giaccio presso di sè/lei.  
indicative

In other words, *invitare* never takes a tensed *che* complement clause. Perhaps one could make a case that the rule relating (70a) and (70b) has applied obligatorily in (72a). In any case, more work needs to be done to establish whether the restriction on the type of clause a drp may appear in allows two environments (in the case that subjunctives and infinitivals are not (always) transformationally

related) or one environment (in the case that all relevant infinitivals can be transformationally derived from subjunctives, or vice versa). Whether or not (70b) is transformationally related to (70a), we know that the *sè* in (70b) is a drp since it is optional and observes all the restriction noted in § 2.1 through 2.4 above.

Finally, we note that the restriction of drp's to subjunctive or infinitival clauses is not a restriction on modality for most speakers. Thus *potere* 'can', which may be used to express the modality often associated with subjunctive or indicative clauses, can appear in the target's clause, but not as an indicative for most speakers:

(73) (a) (\*) *La signora dice che io posso giacere presso di sè.* (Present indicative.)

'The woman says that I can lie near herself.'

(b) (\*) *La signora dice che io potrò giacere presso di sè.* (Future indicative.)

'The woman says that I will be able to lie near herself.'

(c) (\*) *La signora ha detto che io potrei giacere presso di sè.*

'The woman said that I could lie near herself.'

(74) *La signora spera che io possa giacere presso di sè.*

subjunctive

'The woman hopes that I can lie near herself.'

The constraint, then, is on mood, not on modality for most of my informants. In conclusion, the V of the target's clause must be subjunctive or infinitival. Further work needs to be done to figure out whether this is two environments or one and whether this restriction is semantic or syntactic.

### 3. CLOSE REFLEXIVES

While DR occurs only in very highly constrained environments (i.e. the target must be in a position which is noncliticizable or does not highly favour cliticization, the antecedent must be agentive and/or the subject of its clause at the time of DR, the antecedent must command and precede the target at the time of DR; for some speakers the antecedent's verb must convey the desires of the antecedent with respect to the action or state of the target's clause; the target's clause must be subjunctive or infinitival), close (or 'regular') reflexivization, which we can call Ref, occurs under various other conditions. In the following discussion I have chosen to speak of clauses and a clausemate constraint for ease of exposition though one could as well frame the questions other ways. I cannot here go into the precise conditions governing which antecedents and which targets are suitable for Ref, and, indeed, I do not pretend to understand these conditions. Still, it is useful to take a brief look at Ref in order to compare it with DR.

In (75) we find typical cases of Ref, in which the antecedent and target are clausemates.

(75) (a) *Giorgio si guardava allo specchio.*

*Giorgio guardava sè allo specchio.*

'George was looking at himself in the mirror.'

(b) *Giorgio si domandava se valesse la pena (di) farlo.*

*Giorgio domandava a sè (stesso) se valesse la pena (di) farlo.*

'George was wondering (asking himself) if it was worth the trouble to do it.'

(c) *Ho rivelato Giorgio a sè stesso.*

'I revealed George to himself.'

(d) *Giorgio mi ha invitato per sè (stesso).*

'George invited me for himself (as his partner).'

When a reflexive pronoun appears in a cliticizable position (as in (75a) and (75b)), it usually cliticizes. Thus, the first sentence of (75a) and (75b) is much more frequently found than the second sentence of each example. In (75c), however, the reflexive pronoun, although a dative, cannot cliticize because of Constraint A (the constraint that blocks reflexives from cliticizing to a verb whose subject is not coreferential with the reflexive). Note that when a reflexive pronoun cannot be cliticized and when its antecedent is a clausemate, it usually (almost always) appears with *stesso* following it (as in (75c) where *stesso* is obligatory and in (75d)). Drp's, however, rarely, if ever, appear with *stesso*. I do not know whether the rule Ref inserts *stesso* at the time it applies or whether *stesso* is present in the deep structure.

Ref is by no means a simple rule to understand in Italian. For one thing, it is not clear exactly which kinds of NP's may serve as antecedents for which kinds of targets in this rule. Certainly subjects are good antecedents for any target (as seen in (75a), (75b) and (75d)). But in (75c) we see that an accusative object may serve as an antecedent for a dative target. Yet not any old NP may be an antecedent for any old target, as we see in (76):

(76) \**Ho parlato a Gianni di sè (stesso).*

'I talked to Gianni about himself.'

In (76) a dative antecedent and an object of *di* target cannot go together.

Furthermore, there are instances when a non-reflexive pronoun can be understood as coreferential with some other NP in the same clause. These cases are infrequent and involve targets which are objects of prepositions and antecedents which are usually not subjects, as in:

(77) *A Gianni è piaciuta la coperta su di lui.*

'to Gianni pleased the blanket on him.'

'Gianni liked the blanket on him.'

(77) is ambiguous with one of its readings being that in which *lui* is coreferential with *Gianni*. I have not been able to isolate the relevant factors in determining which prepositions this requirement is suspended with. Also, I noted that the pronoun *loro* (third person plural) can be used for many speakers in positions where we normally expect the third person reflexive pronoun *sè*. (See also Napoli, 1973, on this point.) Sentences like (77), as far as I know, always have alternative S's in which a reflexive pronoun does show up, as in:

- (78) A Gianni è piaciuta la coperta su di sè.  
'Gianni likes the blanket on himself.'

However, some speakers prefer (77) to (78) with the relevant reading. Unlike most other cases of reflexivization within clauses without cliticization of the reflexive pronoun, *stesso* does not usually appear after *sè* in these optional cases, but it may:

- (79) A Gianni è piaciuta la coperta su di sè stesso.

A first attempt at accounting for the epitonal nature of the reflexive in S's like (78) might be to say that instead of Ref's applying here (a variation of) DR is applying within a clause here. If this were the case, the fact that the target must be the object of a preposition and that *stesso* rarely occurs in these cases would follow from the same facts about drp's. However, while drp's can occur in any non-subject position which does not highly favour cliticization (see § 2.1. above), these optional reflexives can occur only after a handful of prepositions. And in various other ways these reflexives differ from drp's. Thus, unfortunately, I have no insights to offer for these special cases.

Ref looks only to the left for an antecedent. In order to see that Ref chooses an antecedent to the left of the reflexive pronoun, we can look at passive S's. Consider first (80) and (81),

- (80) È stato costruito per Carlo da Maria.  
'It was built for Carlo by Maria.'  
(81) È stato costruito da Maria per Carlo.  
'It was built by Maria for Carlo.'

The agent phrase *da Maria* may precede or follow the *per NP* phrase. However, if the *per NP* phrase is *per sè (stessa)*, the agent phrase must precede it:

- (82) ??È stato costruito per sè (stessa) da Maria.  
'It was built for herself by Maria.'  
(83) È stato costruito da Maria per sè (stessa).  
'It was built by Maria for herself.'

And if the agent phrase is *da sè (stessa)*, it must follow the *per NP* phrase:

- (84) È stato costruito per Maria da sè stessa.  
'It was built for Maria by herself.'  
(85) \*È stato costruito da sè (stessa) per Maria.  
'It was built for herself by Maria.'

These facts follow if Ref applies after Passive's Agent Postposing and looks only to the left for an antecedent.<sup>4</sup>

#### 4. INTERACTION OF DR AND REF

There are many sentences in which we can understand a reflexive pronoun as being coreferential with any one of various possible antecedents. Examples of this sort are given in (86).

- (86) (a) Maria<sub>i</sub> permette che il capitano<sub>j</sub> racconti queste storie su di sè<sub>i,j</sub>.  
'Maria permits that the captain tell these stories about herself/himself.'  
(b) Maria<sub>i</sub> ha lasciato che il capitano<sub>j</sub> ti trovasse presso di sè<sub>i,j</sub>.  
'Maria let the captain find you near herself/himself.'

[4] Kayne (1975) argues for French that Ref precedes Passive and, therefore, Ref precedes the agent postposing part of Passive. One of His arguments is generally as follows (using Italian examples). Consider,

- (i) Tutti gli amici hanno abbandonato Gianni a sè stesso.  
'All the friends abandoned Gianni to himself.'

The reflexive pronoun in (i) cannot be cliticized because of Constraint A. New Passive may apply, yielding:

- (ii) Gianni è stato abbandonato a sè stesso da tutti gli amici.  
'Gianni was abandoned to himself by all the friends.'

Now *Gianni* is in subject position and the reflexive pronoun is a dative object. Thus we expect cliticization, but it cannot occur:

- (iii) \*Gianni si è stato abbandonato (a stesso) da tutti gli amici.

Kayne says the proper way to prevent (iii) is to order clitic placement of reflexives before Passive. Thus Ref, which precedes clitic placement of reflexives (or perhaps, is all part of one rule with it), also precedes Passive.

The above argument does not hold for Italian, however, since *sè* is blocked from cliticization in (i) and (ii) by the presence of *stesso*, regardless of all other factors. None of my informants accepted (i) without *stesso*. And no sentence I have found which absolutely requires *stesso* with *sè* in a strong position has a corresponding sentence (with or without *stesso* and) with a clitic reflexive pronoun. Thus *stesso* blocks the cliticization of *sè* in general, and in specific with regard to (i) and (ii). (Note that a local statement of this constraint requires that *stesso* be present in the deep structure in order for it to be there at the time Passive applies, if Passive precedes Ref.) I have found no examples to test Kayne's argument which do not require *stesso*. And the other evidence offered for Ref before Passive by Kayne does not have corresponding evidence in Italian. Thus, Italian offers no evidence against applying Passive's Agent Postposing before Ref.

- (c) La signora<sub>i</sub> vuole che io faccia mettere da Maria<sub>j</sub> il gatto presso di sè<sub>i,j</sub>.  
'The woman wants me to make the cat be put by Maria near herself/ herself.'
- (d) Il capitano<sub>i</sub> ha ordinato che la signora<sub>j</sub> lasciasse che tu giacessi presso sè<sub>i,j</sub>.  
'The captain ordered that the woman allow that you lie near himself/ herself.'
- (e) Il capitano<sub>i</sub> ha ordinato che la signora<sub>j</sub> lasciasse che la ragazzina<sub>k</sub> ti trovasse presso di sè<sub>i,j,k</sub>.  
'The captain ordered that the woman allow that the little girl find you near himself/herself/herself.'

In (86a)-(86c) we find ambiguity between a clausemate antecedent and a non-clausemate antecedent. In (86d) we find ambiguity between two non-clausemate antecedents. In (86e) we find the three-way ambiguity between a clausemate antecedent and two non-clausemate antecedents.

The sentences in (86) and many others like them allow us to answer questions about the ordering of DR and Ref (whether these be two rules or one) with respect to other rules.

First let us consider the possibility that one or both rules is precyclic. As the discussion in Section 3 above mentioned, certain facts about Ref follow nicely if Ref applies after the cyclic rule of Passive's Agent Postposing. But Ref must follow not only this rule, but also the rule I will call Highlighting, which takes the passive agent phrase *de Maria* in (86c) and moves it from S final position to its surface position in (86e). We can see this if we look at (87), in which Passive's Agent Postposing has applied but Highlighting has not:

- (87) La signora<sub>i</sub> vuole che io faccia mettere il gatto presso di sè<sub>i,j</sub> da Maria<sub>j</sub>.  
'The woman wants me to make the cat be put near herself (the woman, not Maria) by Maria.'

Sè in (87) cannot be understood as coreferential with *Maria*. The only difference between (86c) and (87) is the position of *da Maria*. Thus Ref, which can follow the rules of Passive's Agent Postposing and Highlighting, cannot be precyclic.<sup>5</sup>

[5] With respect to (86c) and (87), see Kayne (1975) for an analysis of causatives in French. See Cinque (1975) and Radford (1977a) for an analysis of causatives in Italian. In Kayne we find arguments that sentences with *par* 'by' phrases embedded under *faire* should not be derived by way of Passive's Agent Postposing followed by the causative rule (which I call Fare-Inf). Instead, the *par* phrase under *faire*, although it shares many properties with the passive *par* phrase, should be generated in the base with an empty object (*par* Δ) which is later filled by the Faire-Par transformation. In Radford (1977b) we find many arguments that Passive has, indeed, applied in examples like (86c) and (87). In this paper I will take the position (after Radford) that Passive's Agent Postposing has applied in the S<sub>2</sub> cycle in (86c) and (87). The choice between the two analyses,

DR, likewise, can be shown to follow both Agent Postposing and Highlighting. Consider the contrast between (88a) and (88b):

- (88) (a) Gli<sub>i</sub> è stato ordinato di mettere il gatto presso di sè<sub>i,j</sub> da Maria<sub>j</sub>.  
'He was ordered to put the cat near himself/herself by Maria.'  
(b) Gli<sub>i</sub> è stato ordinato da Maria<sub>j</sub> di mettere il gatto presso di sè<sub>i,j</sub>.  
'He was ordered by Maria to put the cat near himself/herself.'

Thus DR cannot be precyclic.

While we can quickly eliminate the possibility that these two rules are precyclic, the data against proposing that they are cyclic (see also footnote 4) are less strong, though still rather persuasive. If we suggest that Ref and DR are cyclic, we must keep them from applying before the cyclic rule of Agent Postposing in (87) and (88a), respectively, in order to block the reading in which sè is coreferential with *Maria*. Thus we need an extrinsic ordering statement. If we accept the idea that extrinsic ordering statements are to be avoided whenever possible, the proposals that DR is cyclic and that Ref is cyclic are not very satisfactory. Furthermore, if Ref and/or DR are cyclic, since they must be able to follow Highlighting (as (86c) and (88b) show), this requires that Highlighting be a cyclic or precyclic rule. But there is no independent evidence that I can find for this ordering. In fact, all evidence I know of points to the conclusion that Highlighting is a late rule. Thus the proposal that Highlighting is cyclic or precyclic is totally *ad hoc*. For these reasons, I reject this alternative.

This leaves us with the proposal that both DR and Ref are postcyclic rules, a proposal which seems feasible. If the two rules are transformational, then no problem arises in any of the examples given in this paper.<sup>6</sup> We could just say

however, is not crucial to the discussion here. If, instead, we were to assume that Fare Da (analogous to Kayne's Faire Par) had applied in (86c) and (87), then Ref would have to follow Fare Da in both examples. Since Fare Da would have to be a cyclic rule, Ref could not be precyclic. Note further that Fare Da would not be defined until the S<sub>2</sub> cycle. Thus Ref could also not be cyclic under this analysis. Again, this result is no problem, since the conclusion reached in the text of this paper is that both Ref and DR are postcyclic.

[6] At one point I was convinced that DR had to be interpretive because of an intervention constraint similar to Grinder's (1970) for SuperEgqui that I believed to be operating in S's, such as

- (i) La signora<sub>i</sub> permette che Maria<sub>j</sub> porti la carrozzella a casa con sè<sub>i,j</sub>.  
'The woman allowed Maria to bring the carriage home with herself (Maria, not the woman).'

My argument was very similar to Clements' (1974) argument for an interpretive rule of SuperEgqui based on the intervention problem. (See Napoli, 1974.) However, as an unidentified reader pointed out to me, the reading in which sè is coreferential with *la signora* in (i) is blocked not because of any intervention constraint, but because X portare Y a casa con sè is a fixed phrase that requires coreference between X and sè. Another piece of data that is a more promising bit of evidence for an interpretive analysis for both DR and Ref is seen in (ii).

Ref is obligatory and DR is optional and everything would work out. If the two rules are interpretive (where I am using the notion of 'interpretive rule' presented in Jackendoff (1972) and Wasow (1975), among others) then we can account for all the examples in this paper by making both rules optional. Each rule would look to the left for a proper (as described in §§ 2 and 3) antecedent. Then, in the case of an S which has the environment for Ref but not DR, Ref optionally applies. If it fails to apply, the *sè* receives no interpretation and the S has no reading. In a sentence which has the environment for both Ref and DR, either rule may apply. Once *sè* is assigned reference, however, for most speakers it cannot be assigned reference again (see footnote 6 and the discussion about example (ii)). Again if neither rule applies, the *sè* receives no interpretation and the S fails. Thus, examples like (86) are ambiguous. In an S which has the environment for DR but not Ref, DR optionally applies. If it does not apply, once more the S fails because of the uninterpreted *sè*.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

We have seen that reflexivization in Italian offers us counter examples to the previously proposed condition that reflexive pronouns and their antecedents must be clausemates, on the one hand, and to the Specified Subject and Tensed-S conditions (proposed universals), on the other hand. Chomsky (1975) claims that anaphora phenomena involving discourse properties are not subject to his conditions. However, sentence grammar is subject to these conditions. But, as far as I can see, DR looks for antecedents only within the overall S and is, thus, a rule of sentence grammar, not of discourse grammar. Therefore, DR should be (according to Chomsky) but is not subject to these conditions. The question

- (ii) Maria, ha preteso che il capitano, raccontasse queste storie su di se<sub>i,j,i+1</sub>,  
'Maria insisted that the captain tell these stories about herself/himself/them-selves.'

Here the split controller problem (discussed in Green, 1973) arises. If DR and Ref are transformational, then we need to do some careful acrobatics (and we will still probably break a leg) to account for the reading in which *sè* is coreferential with both Maria and *il capitano*. If, instead, the rules are interpretive and optional, then we can assign j reference to *sè* and i reference to *sè* by a process of adding on reference optionally each time the structural description for the rules is met. (This kind of adding on of reference is argued for in Clements, 1974.) However, most speakers say they would avoid (ii) with the i+j reading of *sè*, and instead use (iii):

- (iii) Maria ha preteso che il capitano raccontasse queste storie su di loro.  
'Maria insisted that the captain tell these stories about them.'

The great preference for (iii) over (ii) makes me shy away from basing any analysis on such examples.

Thus, I see no reliable data that make us choose one analysis over the other. Rather, with enough ingenuity one could defend a transformational or an interpretive analysis equally as well.

as to why anaphora phenomena such as DR are not subject to such proposed universals is one that demands future research. Furthermore the semantic and structural conditions necessary for the application of DR described here raise new and interesting questions about what kinds of factors rules can be sensitive to and give us an intriguing starting point for further study.

## REFERENCES

- Bordeleis, I. (1972). Untitled mimeo on infinitives in Spanish, French and English, MIT.
- Chomsky, N. (1970). Remarks on Nominalization. In Jacobs, R. A. & Rosenbaum, P. S. (eds), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Waltham, Mass: Ginn, 184-221.
- Chomsky, N. (1973). Conditions on Transformations. In Anderson, S. & Keenan, P. (eds) *Festschrift for Morris Halle*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 232-286.
- Chomsky, N. (1975) *Reflections on language*, New York: Pantheon.
- Chomsky, N. (1976). Conditions on rules of grammar. *Linguistic Analysis* 2, 303-351.
- Cinque, G. (1975). On the cyclicity of verb raising. Unpublished mimeo. Padova, Italy.
- Clements, G. (1974). Super-Bqui and the Intervention Constraint. *North Eastern Linguistic Society* (Harvard University), 5, 13-28.
- Green, G. (1973). Some remarks on split controller phenomena. *CLS* 9, 123-135.
- Grinder, J. (1970). Super-Equi-NP-Deletion. *CLS* 6, 297-317.
- Hale, W. & Buck, C. (1903). *A Latin grammar*. Forge Village, Ma.: University of Alabama Press.
- Hamlin, F., Ricketts, P. & Hathaway, J. (1967). *Introduction à l'étude de l'ancien Provençal*. Geneva: Droz.
- Jackendoff, R. (1972). *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. (1975). *French syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kuno, S. (1972). Pronominalization, reflexivization, and direct discourse. *LIn* 3, 161-196.
- Kuno, S. (1973). *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1970). *Irregularity in syntax*, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Mey, J. (1970). The Cyclic Character of Eskimo Reflexivization. *AL* 13, 1-31.
- Napoli, D. J. (1973). *The two s's of Italian*. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard. Available through Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Napoli, D. J. (1974). Reflexivization across S in Italian. Paper presented at the winter meeting of the ISA.
- Napoli, D. J. (1976a). Infinitival relatives in Italian. In Luján, M. & Hensey F. (eds), *Current Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 300-329.
- Napoli, D. J. (1976b). A look at some adverbs and prepositions in Italian. Presented at the Sixth Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages at the University of Montreal.
- Napoli, D. J. & Nespor, M. (1976). Negatives in comparatives. *Lg* 52, 811-838.
- Postal, P. (1970). On Coreferential Complement Subject Deletion. *LIn* 1, 439-500.
- Postal, P. (1971). *Cross-over phenomena*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Radford, A. (1977a). *Italian syntax: transformational and relational grammar*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Radford, A. (1977b). Agentive causatives in relational grammar: accessibility versus ergativity. Mimeo.
- Reis, M. (1973). A note on German reflexives. Mimeo, MIT.
- Ronat, M. (1973). Three deep structures in French complementation. In Corum, C. et al., *You take the high note and I'll take the low note*. Parvolumne to *CLS* 9, 200-210.
- Ruwet, N. (1972). A propos d'une classe de verbes psychologiques. *Théorie syntaxique et syntaxe du français*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 181-231.

DONNA JO NAPOLI

- Salterelli, M. (1974a). Reference and mood in Italian. In Campbell, J. et al. (eds) *Linguistic studies in romance languages*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Salterelli, M. (1974b). Postulati per una teoria semantica delle preposizioni comparative. *Fenomeni morfologici e sintattici nell'italiano contemporaneo*. Rome: Bulzoni. 283-300.
- Thráinsson, H. (1976). Reflexives and subjunctives in Icelandic. *Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics* 6. University of Montreal. 225-240.
- Wasow, T. (1975). Anaphoric pronouns and bound variables. *Lg* 51. 368-383.