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ABSTRACT

In the syntax of standard Italian, clitic elements appear in more than one position with a class of verbs called restructuring verbs (Rizzi 1982). This paper focuses on accounting for these different positions by studying the syntactic patterns in Italian. I have formulated an initial hypothesis about clitic locations in standard Italian following Rizzi’s (1982) proposal of clitic movement. This hypothesis suggests that in restructuring constructions there is an underlying biclausal structure present when the clitic is adjacent to the subordinate verb. This structure is transformed into a unique single verb complex that consists of both main and subordinate verb when the clitic is adjacent to the main verb. This hypothesis is extended to include Italian dialects by analyzing different clitic positions with restructuring verbs in the dialect Neapolitan. Due to the obligatory nature of clitic climbing in dialects such as Neapolitan, my initial hypothesis is modified. I propose a diminished internal verb structure that cannot host the clitic forcing it to move to a higher position in the syntactic structure. This is demonstrated with evidence from Neapolitan collected from literature and from field research.

1. Introduction

A clitic is described as a word that is not able to stand on its own, cannot bear stress, and therefore must be attached to or lean on a host word. However, a clitic’s status as a word is complicated because a ‘clitic’ incorporates a number of elements that are usually associated with individual words as well as other characteristics usually associated with affixes. Clitics are usually considered to be ‘weaker’ variants of a non-clitic counterpart, for example, within the categories of pronouns, auxiliaries, determiners, and negations elements, in addition to noun phrases.

1a. Io leggo il libro
   I read the book
   ‘I read the book’

1b. lo leggo
   cl-it-3rd mas. sg. (I) read
   ‘I read it’

Example of a clitic vs. full NP complement.

---

1 The criterion that distinguishes clitics from words or affixes is detailed in Zwicky (1985) and Zwicky and Pullum (1983). Research (Kayne 1975; Zwicky and Pullum 1983; Zwicky 1985) has demonstrated these peculiar characteristics of clitics and consequently an exact understanding of them may need to include a definition that spans more than one system of grammar (ie: syntax, phonology, and morphology).
In (1a) there is the full noun phrase direct object, *il libro*, ‘the book’ while in (1b) there is the direct object clitic, *lo* ‘it’.

In addition, the example below demonstrates an auxiliary clitic in English.

2. a. They **have** read the book  
    b. They’ve read the book

Observe in (2a) the auxiliary verb *have* and the weaker clitic variant in (2b) *ve*.

Clitics are usually divided between ‘simple’ forms and ‘special’ forms. ‘Simple’ clitics are those which are placed syntactically in the same position as their corresponding free word. In comparison, ‘special’ clitics show different syntactic placement from their corresponding free form. For example, the ‘special’ clitic is pre-verbal versus the post-verbal free word; a free form of a corresponding clitic cannot occur pre-verbally like the clitic can (cfr., (1a) vs (1b)). The placement of ‘special’ clitics in a syntactic structure is the focus of much debate in the study of Romance languages because of these specific differences.

1.1 **Overview of Romances Clitic and Restructuring in Standard Italian**

Romance clitics are considered to be special clitics because they are not located in the same position as their full-forms. In certain situations, clitics are adjacent to the verb that it is an argument of (3a), while in others, they are located adjacent to a verb that is higher in the clause (3b). This latter situation is called Clitic Climbing.

3. a. Maria **vuole** fare-*lo*     
    Maria wants to do-cl-it-3rd mas. sg.  
    b. Maria *lo* vuole fare  
    Maria cl-it-3rd mas. sg. wants to do  
    ‘Maria wants to do it’

Two cases in which the clitic is not adjacent to the verb where it originates from include past tense constructions and a certain class of verbs, called restructuring verbs. The latter situation will be the focus of this paper. An example of a past tense construction is below.
4.a. L’ho fatto (Italian)
cl-it-3\textsuperscript{rd}.mas. sg.(I) have done
b. *Ho fatto-lo
(I) have done-cl-it-3\textsuperscript{rd} mas. sg.
‘I have done it’

Observe that in (4a) the clitic is not adjacent to the verb fatto (infinitive: fare) where it originates, while in (4b) the clitic is adjacent to fatto, but the sentence is ungrammatical.

In standard Italian certain verbs that take infinitival complements behave in a different way than other Italian verbs that also take infinitival complements. In some cases the clitic is obligatorily adjacent to the verb that subcategorizes for it; with other verbs the clitic can be realized in one of two positions: either adjacent to a verb located higher in a clause or adjacent to the verb from where it originates. The latter are called restructuring verbs. Some examples of these verbs include: potere ‘can’, dovere ‘must’, volere ‘want’, cominciare ‘begin’, and finire ‘finish’.

With these verbs, a clitic can be found in one of two places. It can appear attached to the embedded verb, of which is it an argument:

5. Marco vuole leggere-lo
Marco wants to read-cl-it-3\textsuperscript{rd} mas. sg.
‘Marco wants to read it’

Or it can be found adjacent to the main verb:

6. Marco lo vuole leggere
Marco cl-it-3\textsuperscript{rd} mas. sg. wants to read
‘Marco wants to read it’

The verbs that permit the above constructions are called restructuring verbs. This example shows that the placement of the clitic is variable; it is grammatical either attached to the infinitive, or the main verb. The presence of a restructuring verb can trigger the clitic to move from the embedded infinitive to the main verb. This process is called Clitic Climbing.
In comparison, other standard Italian verbs that take an infinitive as a complement do not permit restructuring. Therefore, the clitic is always found adjacent to the infinitive (7a) and clitic climbing cannot occur (7b).

7.a. Marco decide di leggere-lo
     Marco decides to read-cl-it-3rd mas. sg.
   
   b. *Marco lo decide di leggere
     Marco cl-it-3rd mas. sg. decides to read
     ‘Marco decides to read it’

These verbs do not permit clitics to appear in more than one position. They must appear adjacent to the verb of which it is a complement.

1.2 Italian Dialects and Clitic Placement with Restructuring

The picture of clitic climbing and restructuring becomes more complicated when one considers the variation that exists within Italian dialects. As demonstrated above in example (1), in simple tensed clauses in standard Italian, clitics are not located in the same position as their corresponding free form. Instead, they move from a lower complement position to a higher position located immediately before the finite verb. The example in (1) is repeated here as (8).

8.a. Io leggo il libro
     I read the book
     ‘I read the book’
   
   b. lo leggo
     cl-it-3rd mas. sg. (I) read
     ‘I read it’

This pattern of full NPs following the verb (8a) and clitics appearing before the verb (8b) is not a consistent pattern found throughout Italian dialects. Cardinaletti and Shlonsky (2004) note that within Italy clitic climbing varies greatly due to significant dialectal differences. The dialects located in northern Italy generally lack clitic climbing and strongly prefer that the clitic remain in its complement position immediately after the verb (Cardinaletti & Shlonsky 2004). This is demonstrated below with the northern dialect of Borgomanerese spoken in the northern Italian region, Piedmont.
9. Clitic Placement in Borgomanerese (Tortora 2009)
   a) i porti la torta
      subject-clitic- I bring the cake
      ‘I’m bringing the cake’
   b) i porta-la
      subject-clitic-I bring-object clitic
      ‘I’m bringing it’
   c. *i la porti
      subject-clitic-I object-clitic bring
      (Tortora 2009)

   In this northern dialect, ungrammaticality results when clitic elements move past the finite verb
   from a lower position to an adjoined position higher in the structure. Example (9a) demonstrates a finite
   clause with the full NP, la torta, in complement position following the finite verb. Observe the phrase in
   example (9b), where the object clitic la follows the verb and is grammatical, while in (9c) this clitic
   appears before the verb and the phrase is ungrammatical.

   In contrast, the extreme opposite from the northern dialects are the southern ones where most
   varieties have obligatory clitic climbing (Cardinaletti & Shlonsky 2004). The following example is from
   Alianese, a southern dialect spoken in Aliano, a town in the province of Matera in the southern region of
   Basilicata.

    a. lu/ la/ lə ‘viðənə
       cl-him/her/them-m/f see-3rd pl
    b. *‘viðənə-lu/la/la
       see-3rd pl.-cl-him/her/them-m/f
       ‘They see him/her/them’

    In comparison to Borgomanerese where clitics cannot move past the verb, Alianese requires
    clitic movement to a higher position that immediately precedes the verb. This restriction is shown in
    (10b), where ungrammaticality results when clitics do not move, versus (10a) where the clitics have
    moved.
The pattern demonstrated by Alianese in (10) is seemingly similar to that of Italian in (1); in both examples clitics appear before the finite verb. However, the patterns diverge and the rich variety among standard Italian and Italian dialects is clearly delineated when clitics are placed in different syntactic constructions, specifically restructuring contexts. As noted earlier, restructuring is a syntactic process where clitics climb from their argument position of a subordinate infinitive to a location adjacent to the matrix verb (see the standard Italian example in 5 & 6). In standard Italian, there is an option where the clitic can be positioned; it can remain in its lower argument position, or climb next to the matrix verb. This option is not available to all Italian varieties. Recall the obligatory behavior of clitics to move in the southern dialect Alianese with simple tensed phrased. This behavior is not simply restricted to simple finite clauses, but seems to be a restriction on clitics within the grammar, specifically with restructuring verbs. Ledgeway (2000) notes that within many Romance languages, for example standard Italian, restructuring and clitic climbing are optional, but within the southern varieties, many dialects require clitic climbing with restructuring; it is ungrammatical in these dialects if clitics do not climb with restructuring verb (Ledgeway 2000).

11. Marsalese (Province of Trapani, region of Sicily) (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2003)
   a. u pozzu pigghiàri
      cl-it-3rd sg. mas. can-1st sg. fetch-INF
   b. *pozzu pigghiàllo
      can-1st sg fetch-INF-cl-it-3rd sg. mas.
      ‘I can fetch it’

12. Salentino (Province of Lecce, region of Apulia) (Monachesi 1999)
   a. lu pottsu kkattare krai
      cl-it-3rd sg. mas. can-1st sg. buy-Inf tomorrow
   b. *pottsu kkattarlu krai
      can-1st sb. buy-Inf-cl-it-3rd sg. mas. tomorrow
      ‘I can buy it tomorrow’

   a. ‘o jamm’ a chiammà
      cl- him-3rd sg. mas. go-1st pl. to call-INF
b. *jamm’a lo chiammà
go-1st pl. to cl-him-3rd sg. mas. call -INF
‘We are going to call him’

As demonstrated, restructuring and clitic climbing are obligatory in these southern Italian dialects. Observe the grammaticality of the (a) examples where the clitic has climbed from its subordinate position adjacent to the verb of which it is an argument, to a higher location adjacent to the matrix verb. In contrast, the (b) examples show that if the clitic fails to make this move, the phrases are ungrammatical.

The goal of this paper is to understand the different syntactic positions of clitics within phrases and within restructuring situations in standard Italian and Italian dialects, focusing specifically on the Neapolitan dialect. This paper is organized as follows. In part 2, I focus on outlining two current theories of the placement of clitics in Romance languages and discussing these theories and how they relate to restructuring in standard Italian. Next, after arguing for support for one of these theories, I present a preliminary hypothesis about restructuring in standard Italian that suggests two clitic positions. This hypothesis follows the approach of Rizzi (1982). In part 3, I focus on data from Neapolitan and other southern dialects. Due to the obligatory nature of clitic climbing in these varieties, they present a problem not only to the current theories on clitic placement and restructuring but also to my preliminary hypothesis. The Neapolitan data in section 1 of part 2 was acquired from two sources: written and oral. The written data comes primarily from the literature on the syntax of Neapolitan and the oral data was obtained through a formulated questionnaire that was given to two native Neapolitan speakers. Based on these data, I modify my hypothesis following Ledgeway (2000) developed in part one to capture the differences that exist between standard Italian and Neapolitan with respect to restructuring.
PART TWO: CLITIC PLACEMENT AND RESTRUCTURING IN STANDARD ITALIAN

In the following sections, I outline two theories on the placement of clitics in Romance languages. These theories affect the approach to restructuring contexts based on where the clitic is positioned in a syntactic structure. One of these theories follows Kayne (1975)’s movement approach to clitics, and the other is the base generation approach adopted from Rivas (1977). Next, I discuss restructuring in standard Italian. However, before analyzing the data, I present the correlation made by Kayne (1989) between null-subject languages and clitic climbing. I then extend this correlation to the syntax of restructuring. Following, I show one theory on the specific syntax of restructuring. I present the original idea of Rizzi (1978), arguing for a monoclausal structure formed from a biclausal one. Finally, I formulate a preliminary hypothesis (to be further developed in part two) about the syntax of restructuring in standard Italian arguing for two clitic positions. This hypothesis is based on the movement approach and follows Rizzi (1978).

1. APPROACHES TO CLITIC PLACEMENT

The question of why the surface position of clitics is different from full DPs is a matter of significant research in syntactic literature. In order to account for these two different positions, pre-verbal and post-verbal in Romance (and some Slavic languages) two questions need to be answered: which position are clitics generated in, if they move, to which position are they moving (Gerlach 2002). According to Sportiche (1993), the major theories about clitic placement can be put into two groups, movement derivation and base generation. An outline of these two theories follows.

1.1 MOVEMENT APPROACH

The movement approach to clitics was first posited by Kayne (1975) dealing with the special status of clitics in French. As already described in the introduction, “special” clitics in Romance are those

---

See Rezac (2005) for an article on clitic climbing in Czech.
that occupy a different syntactic position in comparison to their non-clitic, or full-form, counterpart. In French, as in Italian, direct object DPs follow the verb.

1. a. Marie connait **Louis**
   Marie knows Louis
   ‘Marie knows Louis’
   b. Marie conosce **Gianni**
   Marie knows Gianni
   ‘Marie knows Gianni’
However, if the object is a clitic it must precede the verb, (2b) and (3b), and is ungrammatical if it follows the inflected verb, (2a) and (3a).

2. a. *Marie connait **le**
   Marie knows cl-him-3rd mas. sg.
   b. Marie **le** connait
   Marie cl-him-3rd mas. sg. knows
   ‘Marie knows him’
3. a. *Marie conosce **lo**
   Marie knows cl-him-3rd mas. sg.
   b. Marie **lo** conosce
   Marie cl-him-3rd mas. sg. knows
   ‘Marie knows him’

Kayne argues for a movement approach to clitic placement due to the differences shown in (2a-b) and (3a-b). One motivation is based on the complementary distribution of clitics in French; full object DPs and clitics cannot co-occur in the same sentence. This is also true for standard Italian. In (4a) and (5a), the pronominal clitic precedes the inflected verb and is the only object, while in (4b) and (5b) the clitic co-occurs with the object DP resulting in an ungrammatical structure.

4. a. Marie **le** connait
   Marie cl-him-3rd mas. pl. knows
   b. * Marie **le** connait (a) **Louis**
   Marie cl-him-3rd mas. sg. knows (to) Louis
   ‘Marie knows him’
   (Sportiche 1993, from Kayne 1975)
5.  a. Maria lo conosce
   Maria him-cl-3rd mas. sg. knows
   ‘Maria knows him’
   b. * Maria lo conosce Gianni
   Maria him-cl-3rd mas. sg. knows Gianni

This information shows that both the clitic and full DP are apparently competing for the same grammatical function, that of direct object. In addition to this, and the fact that full DPs cannot occur preverbally (hence the ‘special’ status of clitics), Kayne suggests another mechanism in order to generate these sentences. He argues that clitics are base generated as arguments to the verb and move to left-adjoin to the appropriate verb higher in the tree (Kayne 1975, Sportiche 1993, Gerlach 2002), leaving a trace that is co-indexed with the clitic.

Kayne’s movement approach is supported by a number of arguments that I present below. Specifically, clitics obey constraints on movement and agree with past participles. Evidence for movement constraints comes from the types of constituents from which clitics can be extracted, for example PPs. Clitics, like full DPs in French, cannot be extracted out of a PP constituent where it is the argument of the preposition (Rossi 2007). Example (6) demonstrates this constraint in French with wh-movement of the direct object out of the prepositional phrase.

6.

   a. Jean a vote pour Maastricht
      Jean voted for Maastricht
      ‘Jean voted for Maastricht’
   b. *Quel traite Jean a-t-il vote pour t
      which treaty John voted for
      ‘Which treaty did John vote for?’
         (Sportiche 1993)

In (6a) the object of the preposition pour ‘for’ is the non-clitic DP Maastricht, no movement out of the PP has taken place. However, in (6b) it is shown that the object of the preposition pour ‘for’ is the wh-phrase Quel traite ‘which treaty’ (represented by the trace, t), which moves out of the PP resulting in
ungrammaticality. In other words, it is ungrammatical to extract an argument from the prepositional phrase.

The example that follows shows this restriction applied to French clitics.

7.

a. Jean a vote pour lui
   Jean voted for him
b. *Jean lui a vote pour
   Jean him voted for
   ‘Jean voted for him’
   (Sportiche 1993)

Similar to (6a), where there is an argument of a preposition, in (7a) the argument of the preposition pour ‘for’ is the clitic lui ‘him’. In (7b), it is demonstrated that the clitic cannot be extracted from its direct object position of the prepositional phrase to a higher position, like (7b).

In conclusion, these examples provide evidence that clitics cannot be extracted from a PP and obey similar constraints as full DPs.

In addition to movement constraints, participle agreement in French provides further evidence for a movement approach to clitic placement. Participle agreement can only occur when the direct object precedes the participle and not when it follows. This suggests movement of the clitic in order to agree with the past participle. This is also attested in Italian.

8.

a. Marco ha letto i giornali
   Marco has read-3rd mas. sg. the newspapers
   ‘Marco has read the newspapers’
b. *Marco ha letti i giornali
   Marco has read-3rd mas. pl. the newspapers
   ‘Marco has read the newspapers’
c. Marco li ha letti
   Marco cl- them-3rd, mas.pl. has read
   ‘Marco has read them’
d. *Marco lo ha letti
   Marco cl-it-3rd mas.sg. has read
   ‘Marco has read them’

(Rossi 2007)

In (8a) the full direct object complement of the past participle fatto (infinitive: fare ‘to do’) is found after the past participle and there is no agreement between the past participle and the full DP. While in (8b), it is ungrammatical to have agreement between the full DP complement and a past participle. Further, (8c) demonstrates that when a clitic is in a past tense construction, agreement is realized between the clitic and the past participle; here, agreement is between the direct object clitic li and the past participle fatti.

Ungrammaticality in (8d) results when the clitic does not agree with the past participle. These facts suggest a movement approach to clitics because agreement between clitic and past participle is only possible when the clitic precedes it.

However, an argument against the movement approach is clitic-doubling, seen in Spanish and Romanian (Gerlach 2002), as well as some French and Italian dialects (Sportiche 1993) among other languages like Arabic and Hebrew. Clitic-doubling is a phenomenon when both the direct object and the corresponding clitic appear in the same phrase. Observe the Spanish example below.

9. Lo vi a el
   (I) cl-he saw a him’
   ‘I saw him’

(Uriagereka 1995)

Sportiche (1993) summarizes that clitic-doubling is a problem for the movement analysis because if the clitic is moving from its argument position, how can the doubled DP occupy the same spot? ³

In addition, as pointed out in Sportiche (1993), in some constructions there is not a suitable source position for some clitics from which it could move.

³ Uriagereka (1995) presents an interesting solution to this problem in which the clitic is base generated in head position of DP and the doubled DP is in its specifier position.
10. Je t'acheterais un cadeau a Pierre
I tell ya, I would buy Peter a present

(Sportiche, 1993)

In this example, the clitic te is understood not to refer to any specific argument and is therefore not related to a full DP position. In this way, a construction like (10) would argue against a movement approach since the clitic does not have a source argument position.

This outline of the movement approach to clitics summarizes some of the basic points in support of the argument. The points included complementary distribution, clitics obeying the same movement constraints as full DPs, and participle agreement. Nonetheless, there are also arguments against this approach, such as clitic doubling.

1.2 Base Generation

The base generation approach to clitics departs from the movement approach in that it examines these clitics as originating in their surface structure position. This argument suggests that the clitic is co-indexed with a null pronominal element pro. As already mention and demonstrated in example (10), a motivation for base generation deals with whether or not there is a source position for clitics. A problem such as this would exclude the movement approach to clitic placement because of uniformity: movement of these clitics cannot be supported with evidence and therefore the general theory of movement must be abandoned since it cannot uniformly account for the phenomenon of clitic placement. Therefore, a base generation approach has been suggested.

The specific syntactic construction of a clitic originating in base position is suggested by Rivas (1977). He argues for a Phrase Structure Rule that generates a ‘superclitic’ (Rivas 1977) node that dominates all clitics. This node precedes vP (at the time VP) resulting in clitic-verb order in finite verb constructions. A benefit of this approach is seen with the problem of clitic-doubling, mentioned above.

---

4 This approach has been suggested by Rivas (1977), Strozer (1976), Jaeggli (1982), and Borer (1984) (Monachesi 2005)
Following this, a clitic can surface by a Phrase Structure Rule before the verb under its clitic node, eliminating movement, and the doubled DP can be positioned as the argument of the verb, allowing for both to co-occur in a sentence. Further, after the Phrase Structure Rule is applied, the clitic and the full DP are both present in the sentence. If needed, a deletion rule will eliminate the clitic, the full DP, or neither depending on the phrase (Rossi 2007).

1.3 Summary

As outlined, the syntactic position of clitics is a well known problem within generative syntax. The two most common theories about clitic placement are movement derivation and base generation. The movement approach adopted by Kayne (1975) provides evidence motivating movement of the clitic from its argument position to a left-adjoined position of a specific verb higher in the tree. The base generation approach posits that clitics originate in their surface structure position, and do not move. This was first suggested by Rivas (1977), and it accounts for the problem of clitic-doubling.

2. Restructuring in Italian

With restructuring phenomena in standard Italian, clitics can appear in more than one position within a phrase. Clitics move within these constructions because there are two positions associated with it, one lower in the subordinate clause, and one higher in the main clause.

What follows is a summary of the problem of restructuring in standard Italian and how the theories of clitic placement outlined above affect the syntax of restructuring. Before analyzing an approach to restructuring, specifically Rizzi (1982), I discuss a correlation made by Kayne (1989) between null-subject languages and clitic climbing. I present this correlation because it has important consequences for the syntactic structure of clitic climbing and therefore would naturally affect the way in which restructuring syntax needs to be analyzed. After, I outline Rizzi’s (1982) approach to clitic climbing and restructuring. Lastly, I present my analysis.
2.1 NULL SUBJECT LANGUAGES, CLITIC CLIMBING, AND RESTRUCTURING

In Kayne (1989), he makes a correlation between null-subject languages like standard Italian and Spanish where the subject pronoun can be omitted, and non null-subject languages, like French, and the ability or not for these languages to have clitic climbing. Kayne argues that the difference between languages with null-subjects and their ability to have clitic climbing, and languages that obligatorily have subjects and lack clitic climbing, is specifically related to the properties of what he calls I(nflection) (IP). He proposes that in Romance languages that allow null-subjects, I’ is strong enough to Lexically mark (L-Mark) VP. To be lexically marked means that a lexical head theta-marks another category. In Kayne’s analysis after the VP is L-marked, the VP is no longer a barrier to antecedent government and the clitic can move out of VP as its first step in clitic climbing and properly govern its trace. In addition, in non null-subject languages I’ is not strong enough to L-mark VP and therefore if a clitic were to move out of VP the VP would remain a blocking category to proper government of the clitic’s trace (Kayne 1989).

The example below demonstrates clitic climbing in French, resulting in ungrammaticality.

11.

a) *Jean a promis de les bien faire
   John has promised to cl-3rd sg-them well do

b) Jean a promis de bien les faire

(Kayne 1989)

Observe in example (11a), the ungrammaticality when the clitic has moved out of the infinitival VP containing the infinitive faire ‘to do’ (noted in italics in the above example). According to Kayne (1989), in (11a) the clitic les ‘them’ is attached to I’ of the infinitival IP resulting in the sequence: Cl+I Adv VP (les+ I’ bien faire, above). In contrast, example (11b) shows that the clitic does not move out of the infinitival VP and is therefore grammatical.

Following Kayne’s explanation, the reason for the ungrammaticality in (11a) is directly linked to French being a non null-subject language. For the clitic in (11a) to be able to move out of the infinitival
VP containing the infinitive *faire* and attach to I°, the VP must be adequately L-marked by a strong I°. This would allow the infinitival VP to lose its barrierhood and the clitic would be able to grammatically move to I° and govern its trace. This is the crucial reason why (11a) is ungrammatical and why clitics in French are not able to climb; I° in French is not strong enough to L-mark VP. Assuming that in (11a) the infinitival verb does not leave VP and move up to the infinitival I°, both the verb and I° remain separate (the verb remains in VP). In addition, since the infinitival I° is not strong enough to L-mark VP, the clitic is not able to move out of the infinitival VP, since the VP remains as a barrier. In (11a), the clitic is attached to the infinitival I°, but the VP is still a barrier since it is not L-marked by I°, resulting in an improperly governed trace and ungrammaticality.

Kayne (1989) explains the grammaticality of (11b) as follows. Romance languages have two options for clitic attachment, either to V or to I°. This option converges in tensed phrases in French, as well as Italian, because *tensed* main verbs leave VP and move to I°; if a clitic adjoins to V in French, or Italian, and French tensed verbs move to I°, then once the verb with the attached clitic has moved, they will both presumably be in I°. However, in French infinitival phrases, the infinitive I° and V remain separate because French infinitives do not leave VP. More specifically, in contrast to French *tensed* verbs which move out of VP to I°, French infinitival verbs do not make this move. This is most clearly seen in (11b) with the adverb *bien* ‘well’. In French tensed phrases with adverbs, French main verbs appear before the adverb because they move out of VP, past the adverb, to I° resulting in the sequence: V+ I ADV. Observe in (11b), the position of the adverb *before* the infinitive (and the clitic): ADV CI V. This correctly suggests that the infinitive has not left VP; if it had, the adverb would appear after the verb, just like in main tensed phrases. This lack of movement is due to infinitival I° not being strong enough to L-mark the infinitival VP. If V has not left VP in (11b), then the clitic is attached to V and has not left VP either: I ADV CI+V.

This correlation between null subjects and clitic climbing made by Kayne (1989) is naturally related to restructuring. Restructuring contexts include a matrix verb and a subordinate infinitive. The
examples below demonstrate restructuring and clitic climbing in standard Italian and French, the latter resulting in ungrammaticality.

12.

a) * Jean les veut voir
   John cl-them-3rd mas. sg. wants to see
   ‘John wants to see them’

b) Gianni li vuole vedere
   John cl-3rd mas. sg. wants to see
   ‘John wants to see them’

(Kayne 1989)

The French restructuring example in (12a) shows that in French, a non null-subject language, clitic climbing of *les ‘them’* is not allowed, while in the restructuring example for standard Italian in (12b), the clitic *li ‘them’* does climb and the sentence is grammatical. As explained above, the French infinitival *I* is not strong enough to L-mark VP and therefore clitics are not able to climb out of the infinitival VP. The clitic has moved out of VP in (12a), therefore the sentence is ungrammatical. In contrast, standard Italian allows clitic climbing from the infinitival clause to the matrix verb, suggesting that infinitival *I* in standard Italian must be strong enough to L-mark VP allowing the clitic to climb.

There is a conclusion that needs to be made for standard Italian and the syntax of restructuring in order to capture this relationship between a strong *I* L-marking VP and clitic movement out of VP. Since, in standard Italian, clitics are able to leave an infinitival VP (ie, ‘climb’), then there must minimally be enough structure in the infinitival complement for IP in order to L-mark the VP. This will be demonstrated in my analysis in section 2.4.

2.2 ANALYSIS

As shown in the introduction and briefly summarized below, restructuring refers to a situation in which clitics can appear in more than one position, either adjacent to the verb it is an argument of, or
adjacent to a verb that is higher in the clause. The examples below are (5) and (6) respectively, from section (1) of the introduction and are repeated below.

13. Marco vuole legger-lo
    Marco wants to read-cl-it-3rd mas. sg.
    ‘Marco wants to read it’

14. Marco lo vuole leggere
    Marco cl-it-3rd mas. sg. wants to read
    ‘Marco wants to read it’

The clitic can be in one of two places, both resulting in a grammatical construction.

Given the acceptability of two clitic positions with restructuring verbs, are they base generated or do they move? Specifically, Rizzi’s (1982) original approach posits that restructuring verbs form a monoclausal structure from a biclausal, one and clitics move from their source position to a position that is adjacent to a verb in the higher clause.

Rizzi (1982) argues for a restructuring rule due to a certain set of syntactic phenomena in Italian, namely Clitic Climbing, Long Object Preposing and Change of Auxiliary. He suggests that the restructuring rule changes the syntactic nature of the clause allowing the clitic to move from its base argument position in a subordinate clause into a higher clause. He notes that restructuring occurs only with a specific class of verbs and this class can be divided into ergative, raising, and control verbs. Examples of these verbs are given below.

15. Based on Burzio (1986):

   a. Ergative: andare ‘go’, venire ‘come’

   b. Raising: dovere ‘have to’, potere ‘to able’ cominciare ‘begin’

   c. Control: volere ‘want’, sapere ‘know’, continuare ‘continue’

---

5 See Rizzi (1978) for a detailed analysis of “Long Object Preposing” and “Change of Auxiliary” which, although relevant, are not the focus of this current paper.
Further, Rizzi mentions that these main verbs transform an underlying biclausal structure ("bisentential structure") into a simple unique phrase that consists of both main verb and subordinate verb. Simply put, restructuring combines two different verbs into one single verb complex. Under this view, when the two verbs are realized as one single complex, the analysis of clitic movement can be applied; the clitic moves from its argument position and left-adjoins to the verb higher in the clause. In addition, if restructuring does not apply, then the only location for the clitic is enclisis, attached to the verb of the lower clause. A restructuring rules out options where the clitic moves within its subordinate clause and surfaces before the infinitive.

16. *Marie vuole lo leggere
   Marie wants cl-it-3rd mas. sg. to read
   ‘Marie wants to read it’

If restructuring does not apply, the main clause and the subordinate clause remain separate, and clitic climbing does not occur, and a clitic cannot surface in this intermediate position. However, it’s important to note that the above construction is permitted in some languages.

3. MOVEMENT AND TWO POSITIONS

I adopt Kayne’s (1975) movement approach of clitics because of strong evidence about past participle agreement. In addition, I follow Rizzi’s proposal that a monoclausal structure is formed during restructuring contexts. However, I do not adopt the approach that the clitic left-adjoins to the verb, as argued by Kayne (1975). Instead, I suggest that there are two clitic positions in the structure. One clitic projection is adjoined to matrix IP, in order to get the correct word order, and the second clitic projection is adjoined to the subordinate VP. Further, my suggested structure connects Kayne’s null-subject parameter to the syntactic structure of restructuring verbs; specifically I argue for the presence of an infinitival IP.
3.1. Past Participle Agreement

As shown in section 1.1, one major motivation for clitic movement is the agreement between the past participle and the clitic. Evidence shows that clitics must appear before the past participle and not after, in order for agreement features between the two to be present. An example of participle agreement in standard Italian is below.

17. Maria li ha mangiati
   Marie cl-them-3rd mas.pl. has eaten-mas.pl.
   ‘Marie has eaten them’

Here, the object clitic li ‘them’ agrees in gender and number with the past participle mangiati ‘eaten’. Further, it is understood that agreement relations are between a head and its specifier (Bok-Benhema 2006). Therefore, if the clitic was base generated in (17), there is no way that the clitic can be in a specifier-head relation in order to have proper agreement. In addition, this agreement also takes place with restructuring verbs when the clitic is found higher in the clause, adjacent to the matrix verb and not adjacent to the subordinate verb of which it is a complement. This suggests that not only has clitic movement occurred in order to get the relevant participle agreement, but also, following Rizzi (1982), that restructuring had to have taken place in order to allow the clitic to move.

18. Maria li ha voluti mangiare
   Maria cl-them-3rd mas. pl. has wanted-mas.pl. to eat
   ‘Marie has wanted to eat them’

(Bok-Benhema 2006)

For the agreement to occur between the clitic li ‘them’ and the restructuring verb volere ‘to want’ (past participle in (18) voluti) the clitic must have passed through the specifier of the past participle of volere giving this construction:
19. Maria li₃₁ ha [t₄ voluti [PRO mangiare t₄]]

Maria cl-them₃₁-3rd mas. pl. has [t₄ wanted [PRO to eat]]

(Bok-Benhema 2006)

One consequence of clitics moving through the specifier of the verb in order to have agreement is clitics will always do this movement in order to be consistent within a syntactic derivation. This further suggests that in the presence of a past tense construction, the past participle is headed by a specific argument projection. In this way, the clitic can pass through the specifier of the argument position in order to check agreement features.

### 3.2 Structural Analysis of Restructuring and Clitic Climbing

In consideration of past participle agreement as a strong motivation for clitic movement, I follow the movement approach to clitic placement. However, instead of following Rizzi’s (1982) argument for the clitic left-adjoining to the verb in restructuring contexts, I propose that there are two distinct clitic positions (CIP) available.⁶ In addition, I connect my suggested structures to Kayne’s (1989) null-subject theory; I show that there must be an intervening infinitival IP within the syntactic structure in order to license clitic movement from the subordinate clause to the matrix clause. First, I show where the two positions are located and then I present the two complete structures that I propose for restructuring.

### 3.2.1 Two Positions

The first clitic position that I suggest is adjoined to the matrix IP, below AGRsP. This is motivated by Italian, in which main tensed verbs move to Iⁿ; in order to get the correct word order, clitic-verb, the projection must be above IP in standard Italian. Below is a partial tree-structure of the first clitic position of my hypothesis:⁷

---

⁶ This is also suggested by Cardinaletti and Shlonskey (2004) who argue for two clitic positions based on whether a verb is functional or lexical.

⁷ I adopt Belletti’s (2003) tree structure incorporating AGRsP.
In addition, I propose that the second position for the clitic is adjoined to the subordinate verb. The clitic heads its own projection and is not a DP complement phrase. This is because although a clitic seems to obey similar movement constraints to full DPs, their behavior and properties are vastly different from their full form counterparts, suggesting that they are not simply a reduced form of a full DP counterpart.

In (21) I illustrate the lower structure of the second clitic projection of my hypothesis:
Due to the fact that clitics surface in two positions in restructuring situations and that both of these positions result in a grammatical phrase, a hypothesis for two clitic positions needs to be postulated. My hypothesis for these two distinct positions allows for the clitic to be placed either higher in the clause, after movement, or remain the argument of its verb, lower in the clause.

3.2.2 TWO STRUCTURES

In 3.2.3 I presented my proposed structure for two distinct clitic positions. In what follows is my hypothesis for the complete structures of restructuring verbs. I propose two different structures, one for when the clitic remains in its base position, and one for when the clitic moves. The below two structures differ in the presence of an intervening IP in the first one that needs to be present in order to L-mark the infinitival vP to allow clitic climbing.

The first structure I suggest is when the clitic remains in its base position. The matrix verb selects for a full infinitival IP complement. In this way there is an option for the infinitival IP to L-mark the subordinate vP to allow clitic climbing, or, the clitic can remain in its base position without the vP being L-marked. The structure below is when the clitic remains in the lower CIP projection.
Observe in this structure, the CIP located adjoined to the subordinate VP. In addition, note the presence of the infinitival IP. The infinitival IP has the option of L-marking the subordinate vP thus allowing the clitic to climb. When the clitic climbs, I adopt Rizzi’s analysis that a monoclausal structure is formed and therefore the clitic can easily move to the CIP higher in the tree structure. I postulate that in standard Italian before the syntactic structure enters into a monoclausal phrase, the clitic must first grammatically leave the CIP and make its first move to the infinitival I°. Following this initial movement, the structure enters into a monoclausal structure and the clitic can then move to the matrix CIP position. Note, however, that once the vP is L-marked by I° and the clitic makes its first move, it is not permitted to stop. In other words, after vP is L-marked and the clitic climbs to I° the structure enters into a monoclausal phrase where this intermediate position is no longer available, thus obligating the clitic to continue to the higher CIP position in the structure.

The trees below incorporate my hypothesis for two clitic positions within restructuring. The first tree is when the clitic remains adjacent to the subordinate verb (22 above) and the second tree is when the clitic climbs to the matrix clause, forming a monoclausal structure.
AGRsP
  CIP
    CIP'
      CIP'' IP
        I' vP
          v' VP
            v'' IP
              I' vP
                v' VP
                  v'' CIP
                    CIP'
                      CIP''
                        ...
                          clitic
In the following structure I use two full vP projections creating a structure for a restructuring verb. There is no intervening IP and the clitic is placed in the higher clitic projection.

Observe the first tree where the intervening infinitival IP is present to L-mark the subordinate vP. In the second structure, the clitic has moved from the infinitival vP through I', where the structure then enters into a monoclausal phrase and the clitic continues to climb to the higher clitic projection.
4. CONCLUSION

This part examines the problematic situation of clitic placement in Romance languages in addition to clitic placement in restructuring contexts focusing on standard Italian. I present two current theories on clitic placement and then discuss Rizzi’s approach to restructuring. Specifically, I present the movement approach from Kayne (1975) based on evidence from French syntax, extended to Italian, and the base generation approach from Rivas (1977). I then show how clitic placement is a problem for restructuring and discuss Rizzi’s (1982) original approach to restructuring forming a biclausal phrase into a monoclausal one based on the specific type of verb present. Finally, I present my hypothesis on clitic placement adopting Kayne’s movement approach and postulate two distinct clitic positions. These two positions allow for the correct word order in standard Italian, allow the clitic to move to a specific position within the tree structure resulting in past participle agreement, and also provide a position for the clitic when it does not climb within a restructuring phrase. Further, I incorporate Kayne’s (1989) theory on null-subject languages into my proposed syntactic structure. I show that an intervening infinitival IP is present in the structure in order to properly L-mark the subordinate vP; this allows the clitic to move and properly govern its trace. Lastly, I adopt Rizzi’s monoclausal structure. I show how after the clitic moves from its base position the structure is no longer biclausal, but monoclausal.

In the part that follows, I will extend this hypothesis to other Italian dialects and explore the differences between standard Italian and other Italian varieties, specifically those of southern Italy. In this way, I can strengthen my claim about the structure of restructuring verbs and find a common underlying structure for these verbs that exists between languages.
Part Three: Clitic Placement and Restructuring in Neapolitan

The present sections show data from southern Italian dialects, mainly from Neapolitan, that complicate the current approaches to clitic placement and restructuring, outlined in part one. Recall from the introduction the dichotomy that exists between standard Italian and southern Italian dialects when clitics occur with restructuring verbs (part 1). As detailed in the previous sections, clitics in standard Italian can grammatically appear in one of two positions. My hypothesis captured this fact by analyzing standard Italian as having two available positions for clitics with restructuring verbs, one located adjoined to VP and the other adjoined above the matrix IP. Clitics are able to leave infinitival phrases in standard Italian due to a strong I’ L-marking the infinitival VP, allowing clitics to move (c.f.r. section 2.1 in part one). Further, my hypothesis followed Rizzi (1982) where restructuring verbs enter into a monoclausal structure when clitic climbing occurs. In contrast, however, when my preliminary hypothesis for two clitic positions is extended to Neapolitan (among other southern dialects), it is clearly demonstrated that the hypothesis is no longer valid. Observe the example below taken from Ledgeway (2000).

1. a. ‘o jamm’ a chiammà
    [him go. PRES. 1 PL to call. INF]
   b. * jamm’ a lo chiammà
    [go. PRES. 1 PL to [him call. INF]]

In (1a) the clitic o ‘him’ is found adjacent to the matrix verb jamm ‘go’. However, note in (1b) the ungrammaticality due to the lack of clitic climbing from the subordinate clause to the main clause. An obstacle to my current hypothesis is the lack of availability for one of the two clitic positions, specifically the one located lower in the structure adjoined to VP. In Neapolitan, clitics cannot be located lower in the structure attached to the subordinate infinitive. This restriction is not only confined to Neapolitan, but is a consistent pattern throughout the dialects in southern Italy (Ledgeway 2000). For example, observe the
following two dialects spoken in the southern region Campania, one in the town Avellino, and the other spoken in the town Pozzuoli.

2. **Avellino**
   
   io m‘o voλλo accattà
   I cl-1\textsuperscript{st} sg.-me cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. mas.- it want buy-INF
   ‘I want to buy it’
   
   (Ledgeway 2000)

3. **Pozzuoli**
   
   u’vɔʒɔ və’rε
   cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg.-It want to see-INF
   ‘I want to see it’
   
   (Manzini & Savoia 2005)

The clitics in these two dialects are only allowed to be positioned adjacent to the matrix verb. Note, in (2) the location of the clitics m‘ and ´o, meaning ‘me’ and ‘it’ respectively, immediately before the matrix verb voglio ‘I want’. This is also evident in (3), where the clitic u ‘it’ is before the main verb and not attached to the subordinate infinitive. If these clitics are located in another position within the clause, the phrase is ungrammatical.

In what follows, I aim to analyze clitic placement with restructuring verbs in Neapolitan and to account for the differences that exist between standard Italian and Neapolitan. In addition, I make comparisons to other southern dialects, demonstrating that these patterns that diverge from standard Italian exist in a variety of dialects and are not isolated only to Neapolitan. This part is organized as follows. First, in section 1 I present my data on restructuring from Neapolitan. I discuss the data and outline the situations in which clitics climb to the matrix clause. These data come from both written literature on Neapolitan and from my own field research with two native Neapolitan speakers. Then, in section 3 I present a theory about the data formulated by Ledgeway (2000) analyzing how to treat the syntax of restructuring verbs in Neapolitan. He argues for a monoclausal structure where the matrix verb selects for a vP. He proposes this structure based on various syntactic tests that I discuss. Following, in section 4 I present my analysis of the Neapolitan data. In line with Ledgeway (2000), I adopt his analysis
of a monoclausal structure for Neapolitan restructuring verbs. However, I connect this structure to Kayne’s null-subject parameter and present a reason as to why clitics obligatorily climb in Neapolitan, as opposed to standard Italian. I suggest that the difference is directly connected to the amount of structure present in both languages. I suggest that in Neapolitan there is no intervening IP. Instead, Neapolitan has a monoclausal structure with a diminished vP that obligates the clitic to climb. Lastly, I connect my proposed structure to other southern Italian dialects.

1. NEapolitan Data

1.0 Data From Written Sources

The first Neapolitan data sets I present come from various sources on either Neapolitan or southern Italian dialects. Monachesi (1999) notes that clitics in the Neapolitan dialect have similar qualities to clitics in standard Italian. Specifically, clitics in both standard Italian and Neapolitan occur in ‘special’ positions (‘special’ clitics/preverbal), attach to a verb and follow a particular rigid order (Monachesi 1999). However, a further important difference that is noted, which has been observed throughout this paper, is that clitics in Neapolitan are found exclusively pre-verbally (Monachesi 1999). Before presenting data that demonstrates this point, below is a table that summarizes clitics in Neapolitan adopted from Monachesi (1999).
Table 1: Neapolitan Clitic Paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I S</th>
<th>II 2</th>
<th>III 3</th>
<th>I P</th>
<th>II P</th>
<th>IIIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>mə</td>
<td>tə</td>
<td>lə/ (n)tʃə</td>
<td>(n)tʃə</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td>lə/ (n)tʃə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>mə</td>
<td>tə</td>
<td>o (m/n procl) a (f procl) (l)l (procl) lə (m encl) lə (f encl)</td>
<td>(n)tʃə</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td>e (procl) (l)l (procl) lə (encl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td></td>
<td>ə</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ə</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>nə</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n)tʃə</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart organizes the clitics in Neapolitan. Ledgeway (2000) notes that there are various types of object complementation in Neapolitan that receive different case markings. This can be seen in the above chart. Ledgeway (2000) further states that the different case marking of the object is reflected in the corresponding clitic pronoun. Therefore in the examples that follow, different object clitics will be present depending on their case marking.

The verbs that permit restructuring in Neapolitan include: vulé(re) ‘to want’, preferi(re) ‘to prefer’, desiderà(re) ‘to desire, ji(re) ‘to go’, venì(re) ‘to come’, manna(re) ‘to send’ and, riusci(re) ‘to manage’ In addition to these, the modals puté(re) ‘can, may’, avé(re d)’a ‘must’, sapé(re) ‘can, know how’, and the aspectual verbs stà(re) ‘to be about to’, stà(re) a ‘to be X-ing’, fernì(re) ‘to finish’, (i)ncommenzare a ‘to begin’, and cintinuà(re) a ‘to continue’ (Ledgeway 2000). The examples below highlight clitic placement with these verbs (both clitic and restructuring verb are in bold). These examples

---

8 Note that m stands for masculine, f stands for feminine, n stands for neutral, procl stands for proclitic, and encl stands for enclitic.

9 Ledgeway (2000) calls the different cases: unmarked accusative, prepositional accusative and structural dative. He further makes the generalization that objects marked accusative (either unmarked accusative or prepositional accusative) are referenced by the clitic ‘ə and those objects bearing structural dative case are referenced by (n)ce (above table: (n)tʃə). The motivation for mentioning this is the differences will be seen within the examples. However, they are not the focus of this paper and therefore I will not make note of them.
(4), (5), and (6) were taken from Ledgeway (2000) and Monachesi (2005). In both of these sources the ungrammatical counterparts of the following phrases were not given. However both sources emphasize that their non-clitic counterparts are ungrammatical.

4.  

A. ‘o vulimmo vedé
   cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} mas. sg.-him (we) want to see
   ‘We want to see him’

B. nun te va propeto
   not cl-2\textsuperscript{nd} sg. DAT-you go-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. right
   ‘you don’t like it at all’

C. me riesce difficile
   cl-1\textsuperscript{st} sg.-me turn-out-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. difficult
   ‘I find it difficult’

D. chillo ve mannaje na lettera
   that-one cl-2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.DAT.-you send-PST-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. a letter
   ‘he sent you a letter’
   (Ledgeway 2000)

Observe the consistent placement of clitics in the above examples. In each example, the clitic is always placed before the verb. A crucial point is that placing the above clitics in another location within the phrase, specifically in the subordinate clause, is ungrammatical (Ledgeway 2000). The restructuring verbs in (4) all obligatorily require clitic climbing. The Neapolitan phrase below further emphasizes this point with another example with the restructuring verb vulé(re) ‘to want’.

5. me bbulite dá
   cl-1\textsuperscript{st} sg. DAT-me cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} pl.-them want to give
   ‘You want to give them to me’
   (Monachesi 1994)

This above example delineates the point that clitic placement with restructuring verbs in Neapolitan is always before verb. Additional examples are given below.
6.

A. io andao a vedere
   cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. mas.-him go-PST-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. to see-INF
   ‘she went to see him’

B. io ve voria incarecare
   cl-2\textsuperscript{nd} pl.-you like-COND-1\textsuperscript{st} sg. involve-INF
   ‘I would like to involve you’

C. se ncze vole intrare in quisto bagno
   if cl-LOC-there want enter in this bath
   ‘if one wants to enter into this bath’

D. m’ o vollo leggere
   me it want-PRES-1\textsuperscript{st} sg. to read
   ‘I want to read it’
   (Ledgeway 2000)

Again, note the placement of the clitic pronouns before the matrix verb and not adjacent to the subordinate infinitive.

The examples that follow in (7) are ones that employ modal and aspectual restructuring verbs. Their corresponding ungrammatical counter-part is given. The data below provides additional strong evidence for obligatory clitic climbing in Neapolitan. Ledgeway (2000) states “clitics must invariably climb to the modal-aspectual verb” (156).

7.

A. Modal: puté(re) ‘can, may’

a) nce pô parlà
   cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} pl-them be-able-1\textsuperscript{st} sg. to speak-INF

b) * pô nce parlà
   be-able-1\textsuperscript{st} sg. cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} pl-them to speak-INF
   ‘he can speak to them’

B. Modal: avé(re d)’a ‘must’

a) nce hadda parlà
   cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} pl-them must-PRES-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. to speak-INF

b) *hadda nce parlà
   must-PRES-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} pl-them to speak
   ‘he must speak to them’
C. Modal: *sapē(re) ‘can, know how’

a) nce sà parlà  
   cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} pl-them knows how to speak-INF

b) nce sà parlà  
   knows how cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} pl-them to speak-INF
   ‘he knows how to speak to them’

D. Modal: *vulē(re) ‘to want’

a) nce vô parlà  
   cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} pl-them want-PRES-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. to speak-INF

b) nce vô parlà  
   want-PRES-3\textsuperscript{rd} sg cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} pl-them. to speak-INF
   ‘he wants to speak to you’

Examine the above examples and note the placement of the clitic in each. The (a) examples in (A-D) all demonstrate grammatical sentences with the clitic adjacent to the matrix modal verb. While the (b) examples in (A-D) are all ungrammatical due to the lack of clitic climbing. Note the placement of the clitic in the ungrammatical examples, adjacent to the subordinate infinitive.

The Neapolitan data given in examples (4-7) clearly demonstrate the point that clitics obligatorily climb with restructuring verbs in the dialect of Neapolitan. The ungrammatical phrases all show that clitics cannot remain adjacent to the subordinate verb. This is in strong contrast with standard Italian where clitics can optionally climb or remain in the embedded clause with restructuring verbs. Recall the restructuring examples from section 1 where, if the clitic remains adjacent to the subordinate infinitive or is placed before the main verb, both options are grammatical.

1.1 Data from two native Neapolitan Speakers

In this section I present data acquired from interviews with two native speakers of Neapolitan. I created a questionnaire in standard Italian that tests clitic placement with restructuring verbs. I asked both speakers to translate the phrases from standard Italian into Neapolitan. I tested restructuring verbs in the present tense and the gerund, and the interaction between clitics and other elements, such as negation, as
well as having the restructuring verb placed after prepositions. Interestingly, with restructuring verbs both speakers were not able to place clitics in any other position accept adjacent to the matrix verb. For example, the standard Italian *lo voglio fare* ‘I want to do it’ was the only acceptable form that both speakers were able to translate into Neapolitan; *voglio farlo* ‘I want to do it’, was always ungrammatical for both. I compared the grammatical phrases from the speakers and found that each grammatical sentence had the same syntax. The ungrammatical versions were provided by one speaker but, the other speaker had difficulty formulating the ungrammatical counterpart (i.e., placing the clitic adjacent to the subordinate infinitive), and, therefore, I only focused on acquiring the grammatical phrases from this speaker. The ungrammatical examples below are only from one speaker and not both. I present the data and relate it to the examples presented in section 1.1. Note that the examples alternate between standard Italian and the corresponding Neapolitan translations; the first example in the pair (a) is standard Italian and the second example (b) is Neapolitan. In addition, the standard Italian phrases are not all possible but simply provided the speakers with options for clitic placement.

8.

A.

a. *lo* voλλo fare
   cl-3rd mas. sg.-it want-1st sg. to do-INF
b. *’o* bbολλə fá
   cl-3rd mas. sg.-it want-1st sg. to do-INF
   ‘I want to do it’

B.

a. voλλo far-*lo*
   want-1st sg. to do-cl-3rd mas. sg.-it
b. *bbολλə* far l
   want-1st sg. to do-cl-3rd mas. sg.-it
   ‘I want to do it’

C.

a. non *lo* voλλo fare
   not cl-3rd mas. sg.-it want-1st sg. to do-INF
b. nun *’o* bbολλə fá
   not cl-3rd mas. sg.-it want-1st sg. to do-INF
   ‘I don’t want to do it’
D.

a. lo vollo poter fare
   cl-3rd mas. sg.-it want-1st sg. to be able-INF to do-INF
b. *o bvollo puté fá
   cl-3rd mas. sg.-it want-1st sg. to be able-INF to do-INF
   ‘I want to be able to do it’

E.

a. vollo poter-lo fare
   want-1st sg. to be able-INF cl-3rd mas. sg.-it to do-INF
b. *bvollo puter-l fá
   want-1st sg. to be able-INF cl-3rd mas. sg.-it to do-INF
   ‘I want to be able to do it’

F.

a. vollo poter-far-lo
   want-1st sg. to be able-INF to do-INF cl-3rd mas. sg.-it
b. *bvollo puter-far-l
   want-1st sg. to be able-INF to do-INF cl-3rd mas. sg.-it
   ‘I want to be able to do it’

G.

a. non lo vollo poter fare
   not cl-3rd mas. sg.-it want-1st sg. to be able-INF to do-INF
b. nun ’o bvollo puté fá
   not cl-3rd mas. sg.-it want-1st sg. to be able-INF to do-INF
   ‘I don’t want to be able to do it’

H.

a. vollo non poterlo fare
   want-1st sg. not to be able-INF cl-3rd mas. sg.-it to do-INF
b. *bollo nun puter-l fá
   want-1st sg. not to be able-INF cl-3rd mas. sg.-it to do-INF
   ‘I want not to be able to do it’

I.

a. vollo potere non farlo
   want-1st sg. to be able-INF not to do-INF cl-3rd mas. sg.-it
b. bollo puté nun ’o fá
   want-1st sg. to be able-INF not cl-3rd mas. sg.-it to do-INF
   ‘I want to be able not to do it’

J.

a. vollo poterlo non fare
   want-1st sg. to be able-INF cl-3rd mas. sg.-it not to do-INF
b. *bollo puter-l nun fá
   want-1st sg. to be able-INF cl-3rd mas. sg.-it not to do-INF
   ‘I want to be able not to do it’
This data set presents the placement of clitics in Neapolitan with a matrix restructuring verb. The first two examples (8.A.a-b) demonstrate that Neapolitan follows standard Italian in the placement of the clitic before the finite matrix verb. However, notice in examples (8.B.a-b) the dichotomy that arises between standard Italian and Neapolitan. In (8.B.a), standard Italian can grammatically place the clitic adjacent to the infinitive, while in (8.B.b) the Neapolitan phrase is ungrammatical when the clitic remains adjacent to the infinitive. This is consistent throughout the rest of the examples that follow. For instance, the examples that include more than one restructuring verb (8.D-J), both vulé(re) ‘to want’ and puté(re) ‘can, may’, show that Neapolitan does not allow the clitic to be placed in any intermediate position but, instead, only before the matrix verb. Note examples (8.F.a-b) where the clitic does not move and remains adjacent to the subordinate infinitive, and examples (8.E.a-b) where the clitic moves to an intermediate position. The corresponding Neapolitan phrases are all ungrammatical in these positions (i.e.: adjacent to the subordinate infinitive, or attached to an intermediate infinitive) demonstrating that clitics do not have an option in placement; they must climb before the matrix verb (8.D.a-b). In addition, examine the phrases that have a negation element, (8.C, H, I, J). In (8.C.a-b), the Neapolitan phrase (b) is identical to the standard Italian counterpart (a) where the negation element begins the phrase and is followed by the clitic; clitic climbing occurred in both languages. Further, examine (8.G.a-b) with more than one restructuring verb present. Again, the clitic climbs to the main verb, immediately after the negation. Example (8.H) shows that the clitic cannot be located on the intermediate infinitive, even with a negation element present. However, there are two crucial examples with negation elements in the above data set, (8.I) and (8.J). In (8.I) one speaker was able to grammatically place the clitic before the lowest infinitive. This is interesting because from all the other examples the clitic was not able to be in a position such as this one. The other important example is (8.J.) where the clitic appears before the negation element and it is ungrammatical. This example shows that a clitic is not able to move past a negation element in Neapolitan. In addition, it must be noted that both speakers expressed that these phrases are strange in Neapolitan and would strongly prefer to say (8.G) and not say any of the other phrases presented to them.
This, however, makes sense. If clitics are not able to move past negation elements when the negation is within the phrase (not phrase initial, like 8.G), recall example (8.J), then in the above examples, the clitic does not have any other positions available to it besides for an intermediate infinitive, or the lowest lexical verb in the structure. However, since the examples show that clitics in Neapolitan cannot be placed in an intermediate position, the ungrammaticality of the examples with clitic elements on other infinitives, either before or after a negation element, and not adjacent to the matrix verb, is a logical judgment that is consistent with other Neapolitan data. Clitics must be adjacent to the main verb and cannot be located anywhere else. The exception is example (8.I) where the clitic is adjacent to the infinitive. This phrase was only provided by one speaker. Considering this phrase is in stark contrast with the other grammatical judgments of the speakers, I am analyzing it as perhaps a misunderstanding between my actual question and the answer given or a language interference between standard Italian and Neapolitan.

The next data set I present focuses on restructuring verbs after a preposition. Note the grammatical phrases and the consistent placement of the clitic before the first restructuring verb.

9.

A.  
   a.  per poterlo fare  
       for to-be-able-INF-cl-3rd mas. sg.-it to do-INF  
   b.  *pa puterl fá  
       For to-be-able-INFcl-3rd mas. sg.-it to do-INF  
       ‘In order to be able to do it’  

B.  
   a.  per poter farlo  
       for to-be-able-INF to do-INF-cl-3rd mas. sg.-it  
   b.  *pa puté farl  
       for to-be-able-INF to do-INF-cl-3rd mas. sg.-it  
       ‘In order to be able to do it’  

C.  
   a. per poterlo non fare  
       for to-be-able-INF-cl-3rd mas. sg.-it to do-INF  
   b. *pa puterl nun fá  
       for to-be-able-INF-cl-3rd mas. sg.-it to do-INF  
       ‘In order to be able to do it’
D.  

a. per poter non farlo
   for to-be-able-INF not to do-INF cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} mas. sg.-it
b. *pə puté nun farl
   for to-be-able-INF not to do-INF cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} mas. sg.-it
   ‘In order to be able to not do it’

E.  

a. *per lo poter fare
   for cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} mas. sg.-it to-be-able-INF to do-INF
b. p’o puté fá
   for cl-3\textsuperscript{rd} mas. sg.-it to-be-able-INF not to do-INF
   ‘In order to be able to do it’

These examples demonstrate that even with prepositions, clitics are still obligated to climb to the main verb of the phrase. Observe the examples with the various placements of the clitic with a preposition present. The clitic must climb adjacent to the main verb (9.E) and cannot be anywhere else in the phrase (9A-D). This is further seen with the preposition a ‘to’, where the clitic can climb past the preposition to the main verb. This is demonstrated in the examples below

10.  

a) andiamo a chiamarti
   come-1\textsuperscript{st} pl. to call-INF-cl-2\textsuperscript{nd} sg.-you
b) jammə a truvart
   come-1\textsuperscript{st} pl. to call-INF-cl-2\textsuperscript{nd} sg.-you
   ‘We are going to call you’

11.  

a) ti vengo a trovare
   cl-2\textsuperscript{nd} sg.-you come-1\textsuperscript{st} sg. to call-INF
b) to vəŋgə a truvá
   cl-2\textsuperscript{nd} sg.-you go-1\textsuperscript{st} sg. to call-INF
   ‘I am coming to find you’
Observe the clitic placement after the infinitive verb *chiamare* ‘to call’ in the standard Italian example in (10a). The corresponding Neapolitan translation is ungrammatical when the clitic remains in this position. Instead, the phrase is grammatical when the clitic climbs past the preposition and is adjacent to the matrix verb (11b). This provides further evidence of obligatory clitic climbing in Neapolitan.

One interesting translation from standard Italian to Neapolitan is the phrases that include a restructuring verb in the gerund followed by an infinitive. Both speakers consistently placed the clitic at the end of the either the gerund or the infinitive. This behavior is peculiar. One would expect the clitic to not remain adjacent to the infinitive. After exploring this point in more detail, both speakers noted that if they were to express these phrases they would not use the gerund at all, suggesting that the Neapolitan translations they provided were not accurate representations of the spoken language. In fact, Monachesi (1999) notes that in Neapolitan the gerund is rarely used when speaking. The examples are provided below. Note the placement of the clitic in each.

12.

a) duvendə far-1
   having-GER to-do-cl-3rd sg.mas.- it
   ‘having to do it’

b) duvendələ fá
   having-GER- cl-3rd sg.mas.- it to do
   ‘having to do it’

1.2 COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE FROM OTHER SOUTHERN DIALECTS

The data presented in section 1.1 all demonstrate that in Neapolitan clitics obligatorily climb to the matrix verb. This is not restricted to only Neapolitan and is a phenomenon seen in other southern Italian dialects. In what follows I present additional evidence for obligatory clitic climbing in a selection of southern Italian varieties. Manzini & Savoia (2005) observe that the following dialects always have a
systematic positioning of the clitic in preverbal position where enclisis is ungrammatical. In other words, that in data that follows, if the clitic were to occur post verbally, or adjacent to the infinitive, the sentence is ungrammatical.

13. Alianese (province of Matera, region of Basilicata)
   a. sono venuto per ti venire a vedere
to be-1st sg. came-PST for cl-2nd sg. to come-INF to see-INF
   b. eddɔ nɔ'nutɔ pɔ tɔ nɔ'nì a nɔ'de
   to be-1st sg. came-PST for cl-2nd sg. to come-INF to see-INF
   ‘I came into to see you’

14. Terranova Pollinese (province of Potenza, region of Basilicata)
   a. non lo vollo vedere
not cl-3rd sg. mas. want-1st sg. to see-INF
   b. o lu ‘vulɔ lɔ vi:ða
not cl-3rd sg. mas. want-1st sg. to see-INF
   ‘I don’t want to do it’
   c. lo vollo vedere
cl-3rd sg. mas. want-1st sg. to see-INF
   d. u ‘vulɔ lɔ ca’me
cl-3rd sg. mas. want-1st sg. to see-INF
   ‘I want to do it’

15. Nocarese (province of Cosenza, region of Calabria)
   a. lo vollo chiamare
cl-3rd sg. mas. want-1st sg. to see-INF
   b. u ‘vulɔ lɔ ca’me
cl-3rd sg. mas. want-1st sg. to see-INF
   ‘I want to do it’
   c. non lo vollo vedere
not cl-3rd sg. mas. want-1st sg. to see-INF
   d. lu ‘vulɔ lɔ ca’me
not cl-3rd sg. mas. want-1st sg. to see-INF
   ‘I don’t want to do it’

The above examples all clearly demonstrate that clitics must obligatorily climb. It has been noted that the enclisis counterparts to these examples are ungrammatical (Manzini & Savoia 2005).
that obligatory clitic climbing is a phenomenon that is present in numerous dialects and is not restricted to Neapolitan. This is important because it shows that there must be a common underlying structure governing these dialects that obligate clitic climbing. I now turn to one hypothesis about this structure suggested in Ledgeway(2000).

2. LEDGEWAY’s (2000) THEORY ON NEAPOLITIAN SYNTAX

In Ledgeway’s ‘A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy’, he examines the syntax of infinitival complementation with ‘a closed class of verbal predicates’ that have auxiliary status (Ledgeway 2000). These verbs are the modal and aspectual ones presented in section 1.1 and are repeated here: vulé(re) ‘to want’, preferí(re) ‘to prefer’, desiderà(re) ‘to desire, ji(re) ‘to go’, venì(re) ‘to come’, manna(re) ‘to send’ and, riuscí(re) ‘to manage’, puté(re) ‘can, may’, avé(re d) ‘a must’, sapé(re) ‘can, know how’, stà(re) ‘to be about to’, stà(re) a ‘to be X-ing’, fernì(re) ‘to finish’, (i)ncommenzare a ‘to begin’, and cuntinuà(re) a ‘to continue’. A property of these predicates, specifically of the modals and aspectual ones, is that they provide evidence for a monoclausal structure. Ledgeway arrives at this conclusion through the consideration of a number of phenomena that can only occur with simplex clauses. He concludes that the structure of these verbs is different from other verbs that take infinitival complements and that the former do not select for a full argument complement. An overview of the argument and Ledgeway’s proposed structure is given below. After, I will present my analysis of restructuring in Neapolitan connecting specific points from Ledgeway’s suggested structure to my own.
2. Reduced Infinitival Structure

Based on a specific set of local phenomena, such as cliticization and binding, Ledgeway (2000) demonstrates that modal and aspectual verbs that permit restructuring have a monoclausal structure. These two arguments will be discussed below.

2.1 Cliticization

Ledgeway notes, “as in all Romance varieties, Neapolitan clitic pronouns must cliticize to the verb of their clause” (Ledgeway 2000; 156). Regular verbs in Neapolitan that take an infinitival complement do not permit clitics to move from the subordinate verb to the matrix verb; if the clitic did move to the matrix clause, they would no longer cliticize to the verb of their clause, but instead to the verb of a different clause (i.e., the matrix clause). This is ungrammatical.

16.

a. *nun s’ ‘o fida ‘e leggere
   not himself it feel-like-PRES-3rd sg. of [cp t read-INF]

b. nun se fida ‘e ‘o leggere
   not himself feel-like-PRES- 3rd sg. of [cp it read-INF]
   ‘he doesn’t feel like reading it’

In (16a) the clitic ‘o ‘it’, moves from the embedded CP where it is a complement to the verb leggere ‘to read’, to the matrix verb fida ‘feel like’, not the trace in the embedded clause. When the clitic leaves the embedded clause and cliticizes to the matrix verb, the sentence is ungrammatical. In contrast, example (16b) demonstrates that when the clitic remains in its clause and is adjacent to the subordinate verb, the phrase is grammatical.

---

10 The other arguments used to demonstrate a monoclausal structure include focus constructions and passiviser se constructions. These are not presented here because cliticization and binding are the two most relevant ones for my purposes.
Ledgeway compares these structures to modal and aspectual verbs that only permit the clitic to be adjacent to the matrix verb, suggesting that the structure is actually monoclausal. The examples include the restructuring verbs vulé(re) ‘to want’ puté(re) ‘can, may’, avé(re d) ‘a ‘must’, sapé(re) ‘can, know how’, stà(re)pe ‘to be about to’, stà(re) a ‘to be X-ing’ fernì(re) ‘to finish’, (i)ncommenzare a ‘to begin’, and cintinuà(re) a ‘to continue’. Some of the data was already presented in section 1.0 and is repeated below as (17).

17.

A. Aspectual: (i)ncommenzare a ‘to begin’
   a. nce accummenci a parlá
      cl-3rd pl-them begin-3rd sg. to speak-INF
   b. * accummenci a nce parlá
      begin-3rd sg. to cl-3rd pl-them speak-INF
      ‘He begins to speak to them’

B. Aspectual: cintinuà(re) a ‘to continue’
   a. nce cutinu a parlá
      cl-3rd pl-them continues-3rd sg. to speak-INF
   b. * cutinu a nce parlá
      continues-3rd sg. to cl-3rd pl-them speak-INF
      ‘He continues speaking to them’

C. Aspectual: fernì(re) ‘to finish’
   a. nce fernesce e parlá
      cl-3rd pl-them finish-3rd sg. to speak-INF
   b. * fernesce e nce parlá
      finish-3rd sg. to cl-3rd pl-them speak-INF
      ‘He finished speaking to them’

D. Aspectual: stà(re) pe ‘to be about to’
   a. nce stà pe parlá
      cl-3rd pl-them is about to-3rd sg. to speak-INF
   d. *stà pe nce parlá
      is about to-3rd sg. to cl-3rd pl-them speak-INF
      ‘He is about to speak to them’
E. Aspectual: *stà(re) a ‘to be X-ing’*

a. nce stà a parlà
   cl-3rd pl-them to be 3rd sg. to speak-INF
b. * stà a nce parlà
to be-3rd sg. cl-3rd pl-them to speak-INF
   ‘he is speaking to them’

Examine the verbs and the specific placement of the clitic in (17). Observe the first example in each set where the clitic is adjacent to the matrix verb, while in the second example in each set the clitic remains in the subordinate clause and results in ungrammaticality. Based on the idea that clitics cliticize to the verb of their clause, Ledgeway concludes that the examples above all have an underlying monoclausal structure. For example, in (17 a), *nce accumenci a parlà* ‘He beings to speak to them’, the clitic is adjacent to the matrix verb. Under Ledgeway’s analysis, this verb is the main verb of the entire phrase and *accumenci a nce parlà* is ungrammatical because the clitic has not cliticized to the main verb. This is a consistent pattern found throughout the examples above. Additional examples follow.

18.

A. Modal: *puté(re) ‘can, may’*

a. nce pô parlà
   cl-3rd pl-them be-able-1st sg. to speak-INF
b. *pô nce parlà
   be-able-1st sg. cl-3rd pl-them to speak-INF
   ‘he can speak to them’

B. Modal: *avé(re d) ‘a ‘must’*

a. nce hadda parlà
   cl-3rd pl-them must-PRES-3rd sg. to speak-INF
b. *hadda nce parlà
   must-PRES-3rd sg. cl-3rd pl-them to speak
   ‘he must speak to them’

C. Modal: *sapé(re) ‘can, know how’*

a. nce sà parlà
   cl-3rd pl-them knows how to speak-INF
b. *sà nce parlà
knows how cl-3rd pl-them to speak-INF
‘he knows how to speak to them’
D. Modal: vulé(re) ‘to want’
a. nce vó parlà cl-3rd pl-them want-PRES-3rd sg. to speak-INF
b. *vó nce parlà want-PRES-3rd sg cl-3rd pl-them. to speak-INF
‘he wants to speak to you’

These examples provide further evidence that when a clitic in Neapolitan does not cliticize to the main verb of its clause, the result is ungrammaticality.

2.2 BINDING

In addition to cliticization as a test for a monoclausal structure in Neapolitan, Ledgeway also uses the binding of anaphors as a diagnostic tool to further substantiate his argument. He states ‘according to Principle A of the Binding theory…an anaphor must be bound within its complete functional complex (CFC)’ with the CFC being “the clausal within which the anaphor itself occurs” (157-158). The binding of anaphors is governed by strict locality conditions and their restrictions can be used as a test for identifying a monoclausal structure. The examples below show that when the anaphor is in a different clause the phrase in ungrammatical, while when an anaphor is in the same clause as its binder, the sentence is realized as grammatical.

19. lavo a me stesso
   pro, wash, pres 1st sg. me selfi
   ‘I wash myself’

20. *avviso a Giuanne ‘e lavá a me stesso
    pro, warn, pres 1st sg Giuanne, of [cp t, wash-INF me selfi]
    ‘I warn Giuanne to wash myself’

Example (19) shows that when the anaphor me stesso ‘myself’ is in the same clause as its binder (note the coindexed proi (null subject) with the anaphor) it is grammatical. In contrast in (20), observe
that the anaphor me stesso ‘myself’ is in the embedded clause, while its binder, pro, is in the main clause and the sentence in ungrammatical.

Ledgeway demonstrates that modal and aspectual verbs with an infinitival complement have a monoclausal structure by embedding a clause with an anaphor under a restructuring verb and observing the grammatical placement of the clitic. If the phrase is ungrammatical then it is presumed that the clitic is not in the same clause as its binder. His examples provide evidence that restructuring modal and aspectual verbs are actually monoclausal phrases due to the grammaticality of these phrases with anaphors. Examine the examples below and the placement of the anaphor with respect to its binder.

21. pozzo lavà me stesso
   pro, be-able-1st sg. wash-INF to me self,
   ‘I can wash myself’

22. aggia lavà a me stesso
    pro, must-1st sg. wash-INF to me self,
    ‘I must wash myself’

23. saccio lava a me stesso
    pro, know-1st sg. wash-INF to me self,
    ‘I know how to wash myself’

24. accummenci’ a lavà me stesso
    pro, begin-1st sg. to wash-INF me self,
    ‘I begin to wash myself’

25. fernesco ‘e lavà me stesso
    pro, finish-1st sg. of wash-INF me self,
    ‘I finish washing myself’

Observe the grammaticality of the above examples with the presence of an anaphor. If there were a biclausal structure present with these restructuring verbs, the anaphor would not be in the same clause as
its coindexd binder and therefore the phrases would be ungrammatical. Ledgeway (2000) concludes that based on the grammaticality of these phrases there is really an underlying monoclausal structure with these verbs and not a biclausal one.

Ledgeway (2000) uses the two tests presented above as a diagnostic to capture the underlying syntactic structure of modal and aspectual verbs with infinitives. Based on these tests, he observes that in Neapolitan the structure of modal and aspectual verbs followed by an infinitive is actually an underlying monoclausal structure. This point will be reflected in my analysis of restructuring verbs, to which I now turn.

3. ANALYSIS

The above sections 1-2 present data in Neapolitan, as well as other southern dialects, in addition to a suggested theory about the syntactic structure of Neapolitan modal/aspectual and infinitive constructions (restructuring). Ledgeway (2000) suggests restructuring verbs, specifically modal and aspectual ones, in Neapolitan are in a monoclausal structure (i.e., begin in a monoclausal structure) and provides various tests to support this theory. In addition, due to the structure being monoclausal he also argues for a diminished structure for restructuring verbs which explained the motivation for clitic climbing.

My analysis of restructuring in Neapolitan adopts Ledgeway’s suggestion for a monoclausal structure. However, my analysis incorporates additional properties about Neapolitan that need to be borne out in the syntactic structure. Namely, Neapolitan is a null-subject language and therefore I will connect Kayne’s (1989) null-subject parameter to the syntactic structure of Neapolitan (c.fr., part one section 2.1). In addition, I use this correlation to provide evidence for the reason clitics in Neapolitan obligatorily climb.

3.1 MONOCLAUSAL STRUCTURE AND THE NULL-SUBJECT PARAMETER: OVERVIEW

As shown in my analysis of restructuring verbs in part one, standard Italian selects for an infinitival IP when the clitic does not climb and it remains adjacent to the subordinate infinitive. In my structure, the
clitic is placed in the lower adjoined position to VP. Due to standard Italian being a null-subject language, I analyze clitic climbing as occurring after the subordinate vP is L-marked by the infinitival I', allowing the clitic to make its first move to I' without vP being a barrier to trace government, and then it continues to move adjacent to the matrix verb. In addition, when the clitic climbs, the syntactic structure enters into a simple verbal complex. In other words, once the clitic has left the infinitival vP and moves from the infinitival I' to the matrix clause the structure becomes monoclausal where both matrix verb and subordinate verb are in one single clause and not two.

In standard Italian, the syntactic structure is more complex with restructuring verbs in comparison to Neapolitan in order to account for standard Italian’s two different positions for clitic placement. In standard Italian, the matrix verb selects for a full infinitival IP argument, with the lower clitic position available. In contrast, my analysis explains that in Neapolitan, restructuring verbs do not select for a full argument and instead selects for a diminished vP, similar to Ledgeway’s proposal, that does not have a complement structure to host a clitic. In my structure, therefore, the lower adjoined clitic position is not available for clitics to remain positioned, only the higher clitic projection is still available for clitics to be hosted. Further, I take into consideration that Neapolitan is a null-subject language and I reflect this within the syntactic structure. Specifically, due to the diminished vP structure, the matrix IP (and only IP) is in a close relationship with the infinitive and the clitic, and therefore able to L-mark the diminished structure. Once the vP is properly L-marked both the verb and the clitic are obligated to move to a more complete structure where the infinitive becomes incorporated with the matrix verb, and the clitic, being attracted to the higher position available for it in the structure, moves.

3.2 Analysis and Syntactic Structure

My analysis is as follows. I propose that in Neapolitan, there is only one structure available with restructuring verbs, instead of two like standard Italian. The first clitic position adjoined to the matrix IP suggested in part one is still present in the same location in Neapolitan. However, the lower clitic position adjoined to the subordinate VP structure is not present. Due to the diminished complement structure to the
verb, the clitic adjoins to the right of the infinitive $V^\circ$. Further, the matrix verb does not select for an intervening IP, as in standard Italian, and since the structure is monoclausal, there is only a vP clause present. As a result of this reduced structure, the matrix IP is in a close relationship with the infinitival vP and is therefore able to L-mark it. Due to the infinitive’s diminished structure, the subordinate verb moves to left adjoin to the matrix verb, and the clitic moves to the clitic position adjoined to IP. Tree structures further detailing this are below.

26. Neapolitan structure

Observe the location of the clitic left-adjoined to the infinitive verb. In addition, note the lack of an intervening IP. Due to this structure, the IP present can L-mark vP allowing for the clitic to move to a complete clitic projection higher in the structure. This final structure is shown below.
The infinitive is to the right of the main restructuring verb, where they both move to I°; main verbs move to I° in standard Italian. The clitic moves to the clitic projection higher in the tree after it leaves vP.

Note the differences between standard Italian and Neapolitan. The major divergence between the two is essentially tied to the type of complement that the matrix IP selects. In standard Italian, due the optional nature of clitic climbing, the structure is reasonably more complex due to there being a requirement for a specific clitic position lower in the clause when the clitic does not climb. In standard Italian both the lower and higher positions are available for clitics. However, this is not the case in Neapolitan where there is only one option for clitic placement with restructuring verbs, adjacent to the matrix verb. The higher clitic position adjoined to IP in standard Italian is still present in Neapolitan. The only difference is that the suggested lower clitic position is not available. Instead of selecting for a full complement like in standard Italian, the matrix IP in Neapolitan selects for a diminished verbal structure. This structure does not have a specific location for clitics, as can be seen in the syntax trees above, and therefore once the vP is L-marked by the matrix IP, the clitic is obligated to move to its own projection.
4. ANALYSIS EXTENDED TO OTHER SOUTHERN DIALECTS

My analysis can naturally be extended to other southern Italian dialects that exhibit the same patterns of clitic placement. The examples given in section 1.2 of part 1 all demonstrate similar behavior to Neapolitan in the placement of clitics with restructuring verbs; namely, adjacent to the matrix verb. My suggested structures for other southern varieties that obligate clitic climbing can easily be applied. For example, the dialect Nocarese spoken in the province Cosenza, is exactly the same to Neapolitan with regard to clitic placement.

27. Nocarese (province of Cosenza, Calabria)
   a. lo vollo chiamare
      cl-3rd sg. mas. want-1st sg. to see-INF
   b. u’ vu.j ca’mɛ
      cl-3rd sg. mas. want-1st sg. to see-INF
      ‘I want to do it’

28. Neapolitan
   a. lo vollo fare
      cl-3rd mas. sg.-it want-1st sg. to do-INF
   b. ’o bogliọ fá
      cl-3rd mas. sg.-it want-1st sg. to do-INF
      ‘I want to do it’

Given this similarity, I can adopt my suggested monoclausal structure for the dialect in (28). In addition, Nocarese is a null-subject language, therefore allowing my analysis of L-marking to naturally apply.
5. Part Two Conclusion

This part explores the syntax of restructuring in Neapolitan and other southern Italian dialects. I present how my preliminary hypothesis for the syntactic of restructuring made in part one cannot be fully extended to Neapolitan. This is specifically due to Neapolitan’s requirement on clitic climbing with restructuring verbs. I present data from Neapolitan as well as other southern dialects that provide strong evidence of the obligatory nature of clitic climbing in these Romance varieties. In order to capture the stark difference between standard Italian and southern dialects, I analyze the syntactic structure of restructuring verbs in light of one theory made by Ledgeway (2000). Based on evidence from various local phenomena, he concludes that these verbs are really monoclausal structures. I adopt this view and suggest a diminished vP complement that does not have a full argument structure. In this way, I am able to easily connect Neapolitan’s null-subject property to the obligatory nature of clitic climbing. Once the vP is L-marked by IP, the clitic, which is not in its own projection but is instead left adjoined to the infinitive, must climb to a more complete clitic projection higher in the structure. The structure presented for Neapolitan does not radically differ from my initial hypothesis for standard Italian. The only difference between the two structures is that in Neapolitan, the main IP selects for a reduced vP structure, whereas in standard Italian, the matrix argument selects for a full IP complement. This is due to two clitic positions in standard Italian and therefore a more complex structure.
CONCLUSION

Clitic placement and restructuring is a complicated syntactic process that does not exhibit consistent patterns across languages. This paper explores the different patterns between standard Italian and a southern Italian dialect, Neapolitan, as well as other southern dialects. Examining these two closely related varieties bears evidence to the great syntactic variation that exists within the world’s languages. This paper first presents theories of clitic placement and restructuring in Romance languages, focusing specifically on standard Italian. I develop a preliminary hypothesis of the underlying syntactic structure of restructuring in standard Italian that connects three theories of clitic placement and restructuring. These theories are Kayne’s (1975) movement approach to clitics, Rizzi’s (1982) theory about restructuring and standard Italian, and Kayne’s (1989) null-subject parameter. I then analyze Neapolitan in light of the dialect’s requirement for clitic climbing with restructuring verbs and suggest a syntactic structure that accounts for these differences. Extending my preliminary hypothesis to Neapolitan and other southern Italian varieties highlights a syntactic difference. Specifically, these Romance varieties obligate clitic climbing, where in standard Italian clitics can be located lower or higher in the structure. My proposed structure for Neapolitan captures this difference without having to change the initial structure suggested for standard Italian. The structures suggested for both standard Italian and Neapolitan are only different in the lower complement to the main verb (the restructuring verb). In standard Italian, a full argument is selected to account for the lower clitic projection. If the clitic does not climb, a biclausal structure is present; if the clitic climbs, the structure enters into a monclausal one. In contrast, Neapolitan is a monoclausal structure, due to the reduced argument structure, that forces the clitic to climb to its own projection higher in the tree.

Directions for further research include a more in-depth microscopic study of clitic placement in other Italian varieties. This paper explores the differences between only standard Italian and Neapolitan and clitic placement with restructuring verbs. My analysis would benefit from conducting a closer
examination of the southern Italian dialects to provide additional data on restructuring. In this way, the interactions between specific elements in the syntax will easily be seen. Further, my analysis of standard Italian and Neapolitan, and other southern varieties, does not account for the peculiarities of clitic placement found in the northern varieties. As noted in the introduction in part one, the northern Italian dialects exhibit even greater diversity with clitic placement (recall Borgomanese) where clitics were not permitted to climb. Therefore, my hypotheses would be greatly strengthened by analyzing the northern dialects and finding a common underlying structure that can account for all three varieties of clitic climbing: obligatorily clitic climbing, optional clitic climbing, and obligatory enclisis (i.e., no clitic climbing).
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