Placed, non-placed and anaphorically placed expressions

Elisa Di Domenico

This paper investigates the properties of the so-called Tense/Person Correlation, i.e. the co-occurrence of a Tense indication and a Person indication found in Finite Clauses in inflectional languages. The proposal is that the Tense/Person Correlation is a syntactic device employed to convey Displaced Reference, a fundamental property of human language. In particular, it is proposed that the Person feature is the one able to relate the sentence, with its Tense, to the speech event, signalling coincidence or non-coincidence with it. Support for this idea is mainly found in Imperative Clauses, which lack Tense/Person inflection and cannot be displaced, i.e. interpreted not in coincidence with the speech event in the relevant dimensions. A proposal concerning the internal organization of the 'Placement Layer' is presented.[*]

0. Introduction

It has been noted by many that the morphological expression of Tense is strongly interrelated with the morphological expression of Person. As stated in Greenberg's Universal 30 (Greenberg 1963), for instance, if a language has Person-Number categories, it always has Tense-Mood categories. On independent grounds, within a tradition stemming from Reichenbach (1947), it has been proposed that Tense must be related to the speech event for its interpretation.

More recent studies have introduced the notion of anchoring: for Enç (1987) Tense must be anchored, while Bianchi (2000, 2001) and SigurÐsson (2001) have underlined the fact that Person features, too, are anchored to the speech event. The proposal I outline here is that the Tense/Person Correlation (i.e. the co-occurrence of a Tense feature and a Person feature) is what allows sentences to be anchored, and that sentences anchoring (or 'placement', the term used here) is the device necessary to implement a property of human language: Displaced Reference.

In Section 1 I discuss Displaced Reference, i.e. the linguistic property which enables us to talk about things that are distant from us (Hockett 1958; Chomsky 1997).

In Section 2 I outline the basic idea of this work, namely that the Tense/Person indication found in Finite Clauses in inflectional lan-

guages has the function of placing and displacing what is said with respect to the speech event. I propose a characterisation of the Inflectional (Placement) Layer, organised in a hierarchy of Displaced Reference- oriented projections. Similarly grounded is a typology of pronominal and non-pronominal subjects that occupy these positions. Evidence is provided to support these claims. Finally, since a Tense/Person indication may lack in Embedded Clauses, I assume that Embedded Clauses can be Anaphorically Placed, i.e. placed with respect to the main clause's Placement Layer. This is in turn related to the positive or negative value of Fin°.

Section 3 is dedicated to Imperative Clauses. I show that they lack both Tense/Person inflection and the possibility of conveying Displaced Reference: they are Non-Placed expressions. As a consequence, they are identified with the speech event as far as the relevant coordinates (Tense and Person) are concerned. Imperative Clauses constitute therefore a strong support for the basic idea proposed here. With respect to clausal architecture, my conclusions are that in Imperative Clauses both FinP and IP are lacking (or inactive). This analysis is extended to child Root Infinitives and Matrix Infinitivals. Finally, it will be shown that the presence/absence of the Placement Layer has some interesting consequences as far as the nature of subjects is concerned.

1. Displaced Reference

One of the most intriguing peculiar properties of human languages is what has been traditionally called 'displacement'. According to Hockett:

(1) "A message is displaced to the extent that the key features in its antecedents and consequences are removed from the time and place of transmission. A great deal of human speech is displaced in this sense." [Hockett 1958: 579]

More recently, Chomsky (1997) has described 'displaced reference' in similar terms, namely as:

(2) "Our ability to talk about something that is remote from us in space or time" [Chomsky 1997: 1]

Displacement (or, better, Displaced Reference, in order to distinguish

it from 'displacement' as 'movement'), is not attested in animal language with a partial exception: bees language. According to seminal work by von Frisch (1962), bees can perform a dance to talk to their mates about a certain nectar which is not present in the situation where the 'speech event' takes place. A bee's repertoire includes at least two kinds of dance: the Round Dance and the Wagging Dance. The Round Dance is used for flowers near to the beehive and consists in right- and leftwards circles. No Displaced Reference is conveyed through this dance. The Wagging Dance is used for flowers far from the beehive and is used to transmit an exact description of the direction and distance of the goal, assuming the beehive as the starting point and proceeding in the same direction with respect to the sun that was pursued to reach the food. Besides the many differences in bees and human Displaced Reference [1] we can start our inquiry in human language assuming a mechanism that similarly relates what is said to the speech event.

2. *What makes Displaced Reference possible in human language*

The 'Cartographic' approach to the study of human language (Cinque 2002, Rizzi, 2004, Belletti, to appear) has revealed the existence of a universal hierarchy of functional projections. Basically owing its existence to recursion, this hierarchy represents, according to me, a further refinement in human language, in that each projection is specialised to convey a specific meaning slot. The hierarchy consists of three basic layers which Rizzi (1997) characterises as follows:

– a lexical layer (VP) headed by the verb, in which theta assignment takes place;

– an inflectional layer (IP) responsible for the licensing of argumental features such as Case and agreement

– a complementizer layer (CP) hosting topics and various operator-like elements such as interrogative and relative pronouns, focalised elements etc.

I suggest here that the specific meaning slot of the inflectional layer is that of implementing Displaced Reference in human language.

I assume that, in order to implement Displaced Reference, each sentence in human language must encode a fundamental information that makes clear what the relation is between what is said and the speech event.

This relation is expressed by signalling in what is said departure from or identity with the speech event, along two basic coordinates, i.e. Hockett's 'place and time', or Chomsky's 'space and time' (see (1) and (2)) but with a slight modification: 'place' is not a physical place of the Earth, but rather the set [speaker and hearer].

Two basic features, Tense and Person, are able to define departure from/coincidence with the speech event.[2] Present Tense and first/second Person signal a coincidence of what is said and the speech event. Past Tense(s) and Third person signal a departure of what is said from the speech event. We thus assume the hypothesis in (3):

(3)   Displaced Reference is implemented in human language by connecting a Person feature and a Tense feature of the Infl layer

2.1. The Tense / Person correlation

In languages that overtly show Tense and Person on the verb, some generalisations have been made in the literature:

(4)   Tense specification is strongly correlated with Person specification

(5)   An independent, declarative sentence must contain one specification of Tense.

As far as I know, the generalisation in (4) has been noted for the first time by Joseph Greenberg, and corresponds to his Universal 30:

(6)   Universal 30: If the verb has categories of person-number or if it has categories of gender, it always has tense-mood categories. [Greenberg 1963].[3]

The same fact has been captured by Guéron and Hoekstra (1992) in the following way:

(7)   Un affixe porteur du trait de Personne doit être gouverné par un opérateur de Temps [4]   [Guéron & Hoekstra 1992: 1]

The generalisation in (5) has become widely accepted at least since Enç (1987).[5]

(4) and (5) can be illustrated by a number of facts. In sentences with more than one verbal form, for instance, it is the tensed verb which is specified for Person; where Tense is left unspecified, Person is too, as shown in (8), from Italian:

(8) a. Maria pensa di andare al cinema
         M.   think3S to go to the cinema
         'M. is thinking about going to the cinema'
     b. Maria ha   pensato di andare al cinema
         M.   have3S thought to go to the cinema
         'M. has thought about going to the cinema'
     c. Ho   visto Maria andare al cinema
         have1S seen M.   to go to the cinema
         'I have seen M. going to the cinema'

Consider the matrix clause in (8a) and (8b). In (8a) the Tense/Person indication is on the unique verb (the lexical verb). In (8b), the Tense/Person indication is on the auxiliary verb, but not on the lexical one. In other words: a) it is not replicated b) it looks like a clausal rather than a verbal property.

The Embedded Infinitives in (8a), (8b) and (8c), on the contrary, don't have a Tense/Person indication.[6] They cannot occur as independent sentences, as shown in (9):

(9) a. * andare al cinema
         to go   to the cinema

This goes with the generalisation in (5), while (4) and (5) together are in line with (3): an independent sentence in human language must be related to the speech event in two dimensions, Tense and Person. In this way the sentence placement with respect to the speech event is made clear. For this reason, IP is re-named 'Placement Layer'.

2.2. On the internal structure of the Placement Layer and related elements

In this section I will investigate the internal structure of the Placement Layer and of other related elements: subjects and the verbal agreement morphology.

Various kinds of syntactic evidence seem to indicate that their internal structure reflects the placement-oriented differentiations outlined above (i.e. indication of coincidence or non-coincidence with the speech event), at least as far as Person is concerned.[7]

The data show, for instance, that subjects indicating coincidence *versus* non-coincidence with the speech event (i.e. 1st/2nd Person subjects *versus* 3rd Person subjects) occupy different positions in clause structure and that 1st/2nd *versus* 3rd Person verbal morphology can behave differ-

ently as far as the licensing and interpretation of null subjects is concerned. Another differentiation emerges from the data, between pronominal and non-pronominal subjects. I will account for these splits in a feature structure I propose for subjects, subject positions and verbal agreement morphology. After an examination of the relevant data (in 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3), I will outline my proposal in 2.2.4.

2.2.1. Subject positions

Shlonsky (2000) has revealed that in Modern Hebrew different types of subjects occupy different positions in the clause. Analysing Copular Constructions and sentences with a *ʔeyn-* negation,[8] he identifies four subject positions.

A lower subject position (Sub2) is considered the Spec of a non-nominative head and is restricted to non-pronominal subjects.

A higher position (Sub1) is the Spec of a (topical) nominative head. It may only host strong nominals, i.e. non-pronominal DPs and coordinated pronouns.[9] The two subject positions are occupied by the two referential expressions of an equative construction such as:

(10) Rina ʔeyn-(n)a gveret Levi
      Rina neg-3FS   Mrs. Levi
      'Rina is not Mrs. Levi'   [Shlonsky 2000]

In between these two positions, two additional positions are reserved to pronouns, where we find an interesting split between $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ Person pronouns and 3rd Person pronouns. 2nd Person pronouns, contrary to 3rd Person pronouns, cannot follow *ʔeyn* as shown by the reduced acceptability of (11.b) with respect to (11.a) and (11.c):

(11) a.   ʔeyn hi   gveret Levi
           not   she   Mrs. Levi
     b. ?? ʔeyn ʔani/ʔat gveret Levi
           not   I / you   Mrs. Levi
     c.   ʔani/ ʔat   ʔeyn-ni/ex gveret Levi
           I/ you   not-1S/2FS   Mrs. Levi
           'I / you am/are not Mrs. Levi'   [Shlonsky 2000]

The hierarchy of subject positions looks as follows:

(12) SUB 1   SUBweak1   SUBweak2   SUB2
     DP+ $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ P pron   3 P pron   DP
     Coord.
     Pron   [Shlonsky 2000]

Interestingly, a similar split is found in the subject-clitics system of some Northern Italian dialects.

Poletto (2000) isolates four kinds of subject clitics on the basis of the set of morphological features they encode. Two classes of SCLs occur higher and two lower than a strong preverbal negative marker. On the basis of a number of tests, the author shows that pre-negative SCLs occur in two distinct positions in the CP layer, while post-negative SCLs occur in two distinct positions in the Infl layer. An additional position is postulated for the inflected verb, which moves higher than T° and lower than the SCLs positions. Leaving aside subject clitics in the CP layer, as far as clitic positions in the Infl layer are concerned, it is interesting to note that in most dialects they are based on a Person differentiation: namely, second Person subject clitics occur in a position which is lower than the one occupied by third Person clitics, as shown by the Type 3 coordination test (the same verb coordinated with a different prefix or tense with a shared object) exemplified below in the dialect of Venice:

(13) a. * Ti   lesi   e   rilesi   sempre el stesso libro
         SCL2P read2PPres and reread2PPres always the same book
     b. Ti   lesi   e ti rilesi   sempre el stesso libro
         SCL2P read2PPres and SCL2P reread2PPres always the same book
         'You read and reread always the same book'
     c. La   lese   e   rilese   sempre el stesso libro
         SCL3 read3PPres and reread3PPres always the same book
         'She reads and rereads always the same book'

                                                          [Poletto 2000]

As shown comparing (13 a. b.) and (13 c.), while the second Person SCL must be repeated, this is not the case for the third Person clitic: this suggests that the third Person clitic is in a higher position than the second Person clitic.

This Person split parallels the one found by Shlonsky (2000) for pronominal subjects in Hebrew, although the order of the two positions is the opposite in NIds with respect to Hebrew. We'll come back later to this latter difference.

Manzini & Savoia (2001), in their analysis of subject clitics in NIds, have found four positions, preceding IP, that lexicalise different kinds of subject clitics: the split 1st/2nd Person clitics versus 3rd Person clitics is confirmed, with the same order as in Poletto (2000).

One final consideration concerns the position of subject clitics with respect to the XP subject.

Subject clitics are pronominal heads which may co- occur with the lexical (or pronominal) XP subject. The lexical subject is higher than the subject clitic, as shown in (14) :

(14) La Maria la   parla
     the Maria SCL3P speak3PPpres
     'Maria speaks'

If we assume, as Poletto (2000) and Manzini & Savoia (2001; 2004), that the 'clitic string' precedes the inflected verb, we also have to assume that the lexical subject in (14) is not in [Spec, IP].

To sum up, in this sub- section we have seen evidence stemming from different languages which shows a split between 1st / 2nd Person and 3rd Person clitics and pronouns, i.e. a split between elements indicating coincidence (1st/2nd Person) and elements indicating non-coincidence (3rd Person) with the speech event, that occupy different positions in clause structure.

The data, however, also introduce a split between pronominal and non-pronominal subjects.

The split 1st/2nd *versus* 3rd is also attested in Partial *pro-* drop languages, while the one between pronominal and non-pronominal subjects is confirmed by some agreement phenomena. I examine these data in 2.2.2 and 2.2.3.

2.2.3. *Partial* pro-*drop*

A split between 1st/2nd Person on one side and 3rd Person on the other is also attested in the so called Partial *pro*-drop languages such as Modern Hebrew, where a null subject is allowed in the case of a 1st or 2nd Person verbal morphology, but not when the verb is in the 3rd Person:

(15) a. hu ʔaxal   ʔet ha-tapuʔax
         he eatPAST3SM   ACC the apple
         'He ate the apple'
     b. * ø ʔaxal   ʔet ha-tapuʔax
            eatPAST3SM   ACC   the apple
                                            [Borer 1986, quoted in Gilligan 1997]

Similarly, in Finnish the 3rd Person singular verbal morphology fails to identify a null pronoun, which can be interpreted only as indefinite (Hakullinen & Kartunnen 1973, quoted in Gilligan 1987):

(16) a. huomenna klo 5 hän vo-i   nukkua
        tomorrow   at 5 3S   canPAST3S sleep
        'Tomorrow at 5am he/she can sleep'
    b. huomenna klo 5 vo-i   nukkua
        tomorrow   at 5 canPAST3S sleep
        'Tomorrow at 5am one can sleep'

2.2.3. Agreement patterns

    The data of subject positions presented in 2.2.1, as we have seen, also suggests a difference between pronominal and non-pronominal subjects, there expressed in terms of different positions occupied by the two subject types. A similar difference is found in some agreement phenomena attested for instance in Standard Arabic and in some Italian dialects, where a non- pronominal post-verbal plural subject co-occurs with a singular verb:

(17) a. Naama   l- ʔ awlaad -u   Standard Arabic
        sleepPass3MS Det-boy-MPl   [Aoun, Benmamoun & Sportiche 1994]
    b. ʔ al- ʔ awlaad-u naamuu
        Det-boy-MPl   sleepPass3MPl
        'The boys slept'

(18) a. i   fants   i venan dopo   Casaccia [Manzini - Savoia 1998]
        the children SCL come afterwards
    b. dopo   al ven   i   fants
        afterwards SCL come the children
        'The children will come afterwards'

(19) a. Questo lo fa   sempre i bambini   Ancona [Cardinaletti 1997]
        this   it does always the children
    b. Questo i bambini   lo fanno sempre
        this   the children it do always
        'The children always do that'
    c. * Questo lo fa sempre loro
        this   it does always they

This agreement pattern is possible only with a non-pronominal subject: in the varieties examined here, it is impossible with a pronominal subject, even in the 3rd Person (19.c).[10]

    A similar phenomenon occurs in Belfast English, as shown in (20); named Singular Concord, it is optional, and it is not sensitive to the order of verb and subject.[11]

(20) a. These cars go/goes very fast   Belfast English (Henry 1995)
     b. The eggs are/is cracked
     c. *They goes very fast
     d. * They is cracked

These data strongly support the idea that there is a difference between pronominal and non-pronominal subjects, and that this difference is relevant for the grammar.

2.2.4. Refining the Placement Layer and related elements

The data examined in 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 show a split between $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ Person and 3rd Person and a split between pronominal and non-pronominal DPs. I will now take these facts into account in the structure I propose for the three elements related to the Tense/Person Correlation: subjects, subject positions and verbal agreement morphology. The structure of these elements appears variegated and their matching does not show a linear one-to-one correspondence.

Let's start with the analysis of subjects. The feature structure I propose for different kinds of subject is given in (21):[12]

(21) a. 1st Pers Pron   b. 2nd Pers Pron   c. 3rd Pers Pron   d. Non-pron DPs
     IN   IN   OUTPerson   OUT NonPers
     Person   Person   Person   (Definiteness)
     Speaker   Addressee   (Animate)   Number
     (Augmented)   (Augmented)   (Augmented)   (Animate)

As shown in (21), I introduce a first differentiation between subjects indicating participants or non-participants in the speech event. The first are endowed with what I call an IN feature, and correspond to 1st and 2nd Person pronouns. The latter are endowed with an OUT feature. Among them, I assume a further differentiation between what I call OUT/Person subjects and OUT/Non Person subjects. The first correspond to 3rd Person pronouns, the latter to non- pronominal DPs. Many authors, following Forchheimer (1953) and Benveniste (1966), consider 3rd Person as absence of Person. Here I suggest that 3rd Person is not absence of Person, but rather a Person which does not participate in the speech act. In all other respects, it is a Person feature: a 3rd Person pronoun is an indexical exactly as a 1st or a 2nd Person pronoun, and, in the same way, it has no fixed reference. All pronouns (but not non- pronominal DPs) share a Person feature which has to do with their referential properties, while the difference between $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ and 3rd Person pronouns is characterised as an IN/OUT difference.

'Augmented' means 'plus someone else'. This feature, originally proposed by Harley & Ritter (2002) for languages without Number but with plural personal pronouns, is here assumed to hold universally. The idea is that 'plurality' of pronouns does not entail true Number: in (21) Number is indeed a feature of the OUT-Non Person type only, i.e. of non-pronominal DPs. Harley & Ritter (2002) assume that there is no genuine 1st person plural since we never speak in choruses. Manzini and Savoia (p.c.) extend a similar claim to 2nd person, arguing that 'we' is not the plural of 'I' and 'you' is not the plural of 'you' in the same sense as 'chairs' is the plural of 'chair'.[13] Here I suggest that, similarly, 'they' is not the plural of 'he' or of 'she' in the same sense as 'chairs' is the plural of 'chair'. More precisely 'they' is 'he plus someone else' and not 'several instances of he', in the same sense in which 'we' is 'I plus someone else' and not 'several instances of I'.[14] This matches with the observation that, at the morphological level, in many languages there are different roots for the 'singular' and 'plural' form of a personal pronoun, as in English *I* and *we.* Assuming here a neutral position as to the way in which pluralisation is implemented (syntax *versus* lexicon), I assume, with the support of morphological evidence, that *I* and *we,* and, in general, the singular and the corresponding plural form of a pronoun, correspond to different lexical entries.

These different kinds of subjects occupy different positions in the Placement layer. The architecture I propose for the Placement layer is based on the already mentioned idea that this layer is the locus in clause structure where Displaced Reference is conveyed, i.e. the locus where what is said is related to the speech event with respect to time and to the set [speaker + hearer], the participants in the speech event. Leaving time aside for now, with respect to the set [speaker+ hearer], the position for 1st and 2nd Person pronouns signals a coincidence between the speech event and what is said. I call this position 'IN', assuming that this is the position for subjects endowed with the IN feature, as shown in (22):

(22) IN   OUT/Person   OUT/Non Person
     1st /2nd Pers pron   3rd Pers pron   Non-pron DPs

Non-coincidence of what is said and the speech event is signalled in two different positions, one for OUT/ Person subjects (i.e. 3rd Person pronouns) and one for OUT/ Non Person subjects (i.e. non-pronominal DPs).

The positions in (22) parallel three of the positions proposed by

Shlonsky (2000), namely IN corresponds to Shlonsky's SubWeak1, OUT/Person to SubWeak 2, and OUT/Non Person to SUB2.

IN and OUT/Person may be replicated to the left to host the clitic string. One consideration concerning the respective order of IN and OUT/Person is necessary at this point, since subjectc clitics in Northern Italian dialects display a reverse order than the one found in Hebrew Copular Constructions. We might hypothesise that the order of these two positions is language specific, or that subject clitics, for an unknown reason, display a reverse order with respect to the position for the verbal head. For the time being, I assume a hierarchy like (22) but with the extra assumption that the respective order of IN and OUT/Person might be different in some cases.[15]

Finally, as far as Shlonsky's SUB1 is concerned, my idea is that it corresponds to a higher position where non- pronominal DPs might move for reasons not related to the Placement Hierarchy. Possibly, it corresponds to the position called 'Subject of Predication' by Cardinaletti (1997; to appear). This is the position, I assume, occupied by the lexical subject cooccurring with subject clitics, as in (14) above.

As far as the difference between pronominal and non-pronominal subjects is concerned, I have characterised this difference assuming that non-pronominal DPs are not endowed with Person but share with 3rd Person pronouns the feature OUT. Furthermore, I have assumed that pronouns are not endowed with a Number feature but with an Augmented feature (which in turn triggers plural agreement). The further assumption that is necessary to explain the fact that agreement with a non-pronominal subject may lack Number (2.2.3), is that Number agreement and Person agreement are different kinds of agreement and that, in the absence of Person (as is the case of non- pronominal subjects) agreement relies on Number. More specifically, Number agreement requires strict locality [Spec, head] also after Spell-Out.[16] It is clear that inverted subjects cannot be in the Spec of the same projection of the verbal head. As far as subjects in Belfast English are concerned, we can assume that they too are not in the Spec of the same projection of the verb, but in the Spec of a higher projection.[17]

Languages thus differ parametrically in this respect: they may activate or not Number agreement with non-pronominal DPs. This in turn may be due to some property of agreement: in some languages agreement considers only the upper labels and so treats OUT subjects all alike, while in others it is sensible to the internal feature array and hence activates Number agreement (with its specific

requirements) in case of subjects endowed with true Number. I leave this question open for future research.[18]

I have started this section with the proposal that Displaced Reference is implemented in human language by placing what is said with respect to the speech event in two dimensions, time and participants, corresponding to two features, Tense and Person, which, as shown in Section 1, are strongly correlated. The further step has been to assume (and verify, as far as Person is concerned) that coincidence or non coincidence between what is said and the speech event is a significant information encoded in arguments (21) and in clausal projections (22). The data (concerning, however, very marked constructions) have confirmed the split between 1st /2nd Person on one side and 3rd person on the other, and introduced one between pronouns and non-pronominal DPs. These splits receive a natural explanation if we assume that they are Placement oriented. Thus, 1st and 2nd Person have an 'IN' feature; 3rd Person has an 'OUT' feature which is shared by pronouns and non-pronominal arguments. Furthermore, all pronouns (but not non-pronominal DPs) share a Person feature which has to do with the referential properties of pronouns, namely characterising them as indexicals. A feature array as the one proposed in (21) is at the base of the differentiation of subjects. Assuming that the data of Shlonsky (2000) can be generalised to all sentences, and that the split found among clitic subjects (Poletto (2000); Manzini & Savoia (2001)) is replicated for the verbal inflection portion of clause structure, we are allowed to say that an analogous feature differentiation corresponds to different positions for subjects in clausal architecture: this is what I call the Placement Layer. The positions in the Placement Layer do have interpretive content, so there is no principled reason to exclude them from clausal architecture.

Let's consider now what seems to be the third side of our coin, i.e. verbal agreement morphology.

I claim that verbal agreement morphology does not directly reproduce the feature array in (21) and (22) but rather makes use of (at least):

– a unique (3rd Person) suffix to match all OUT subjects and positions (whether Person or Non-Person).
– a unique (plural) suffix to match both Augmented and Plural subjects.

In this part of the work, I have not considered Tense, leaving for future research a precise re-interpretation of Tense Projection(s) in terms of its/ their signalling coincidence or non-coincidence in time of

what is said and the speech event. Since one might have non coinci-
dence in time and coincidence in participants (and vice-versa), one
possibility to explore is that Tense and Person are not projected
under the same head, in line with the Split-Infl hypothesis (Pollock,
1989).

2.3. Anaphoric Placement

Up to this point, we have established that matrix declarative
clauses are endowed with what we call the Placement Layer, with its
internal structure detailed in 2.2, which corresponds to the layer in
clause structure where the sentence is related to the speech event
(2.1).

One final point I would like to reconsider briefly is that the
Placement Layer is not necessarily present in embedded clauses,
which may be finite (23.b) or not (23.a):

(23) a. [Maria$_i$ pensa [di [PRO $_{i/*j}$ andare al cinema]]]
      M.   think3S to go to the cinema
   b. [Maria $_i$ pensa [che [PRO $_{i/j}$ andrà al cinema]]]
      M.   think3S that   will go to the cinema
   c. [Maria$_i$ pensava   [di [PRO $_{i/*j}$ andare al cinema]]]
      M.   thinkPAST3S to go to the cinema

I assume that non-finite embedded clauses (23.a) derive from a nega-
tive value of their Fin°, while finite embedded clauses like (23.b)
derive from a positive value of Fin°.[19]

In other words, a sentence' Placement Layer is selected by Fin°
[+fin]. When Fin° is [-fin], the Placement Layer is not selected, and
the sentence must necessarily be dependent, i.e. depend on another
sentence's Placement Layer.[20] I call the latter 'Anaphorically Placed'
sentences. They include at least Embedded Infinitives and, with some
differences, Subjunctive Clauses. As shown in (23) they reveal that in
the absence of the Placement Layer it is impossible to have an overt
and referentially independent subject.[21] Tense interpretation, fur-
thermore, is related to the tense of the main clause rather than to the
speech event (23.a; 23.c).

To deal extensively with Anaphoric Placement is beyond the
scope of the present work.[22]

3. Placed and Non-Placed expressions: On the structure of Imperative Clauses

One of the claims I made in the previous section, is that the Placement Layer characterises matrix independent clauses and may lack in embedded clauses. Some matrix clausal types too, however, look as not having a Placement Layer, as for instance Imperative Clauses

(24) a. Prendilo!
    b. Take- it!

(25) a. Parla!   (Italian)
    b. Speak!

In this section I analyse Imperative Clauses drawing mainly on three languages: Italian, English and German. A first, preliminary, consideration concerns a distinction between real imperatives and suppletive forms.

3.1. Real and Suppletive Imperatives

3.1.1. Imperatives in Italian

Rivero (1994) and Zanuttini (1997) use the term 'true imperatives' to refer to imperatives with a dedicated form, distinct from any other verbal form used for the same person in any other verbal paradigm. True imperatives are found in many languages. Taking Italian, (26a) is a true imperative, while (26b) a 'suppletive' one, as shown by the comparison with the corresponding indicative form (27):

(26) Imperative
    a. Canta!
    b. Cantate!

(27) Indicative Italian
    a. Tu canti
    b. Voi cantate

In Romance in general, true imperatives correspond to second person singular imperatives, with the exception of Sardinian and Spanish, where second person plural (as well as singular) imperatives have a dedicated form, as shown in (28) and (29) for Sardinian:

(28) Imperative
   Kánta!
   Kantáte!

(29) Indicative Sardinian
   a. Tue kantas
   b. Vois kantaes

According to Zanuttini (1997) true imperatives consist of the verbal root and the thematic vowel, while suppletive imperatives consist of the root, the thematic vowel and some other suffix:

(30) a. Parl*a*!
      speak!
   b. Parl*a*te!
      speakPL!
   c. Parl*a*re
      speakInf.

In the example above, -*a*- is the thematic vowel. True imperatives differ from other verbal forms in the amount of morphological specification they exhibit: While in some cases they may have an agreement morpheme (the second person plural in Spanish and Sardinian, which is a true imperative) they never exhibit morphological marking for tense and aspect. I would like to suggest that the 'agreement' morpheme of Spanish and Sardinian is rather a 'number' morpheme [23] and propose a more radical view of true imperatives: they don't exhibit morphological marking for person as well as for tense.

Another peculiarity of true imperatives is that in some Southern Italian varieties they may appear, as suggested by Floricic (2000), in a truncated form with respect to the corresponding indicative, a property shared by the vocative proper name that can co-occur with them:

(31) a. tie'/tieni
      'have it!'
   b. vie'/vieni
      'come!'

(32) Lucì/Lucia

(33) a. Lucì, vie' qua!
      'L., come here!'
   b. *Lucì vie' da Milano
      'L. comes from Milano'

I take the possibility of truncation as another sign of the absence of inflection: it is conceivable that the final portion of the imperative verb can be truncated in that it does not contain otherwise unrecoverable inflectional information.

In Italian, suppletive forms of various kinds are used with the illocutionary force of the imperative:

- An indicative is used with the second person plural (as shown in (26)), or with the first person plural in its inclusive meaning, i.e. in case of a 2nd person feature when there is not a dedicated form [24]

(34) Cantiamo!
Sing1PL

- A subjunctive is used when an imperative-like force is to be conveyed to a verb in the third person (singular and plural), i.e. when there isn't a dedicated form and a second person feature is not concerned:

(35) a. (Che) canti!
(That) sing3Ssubj
'Let him sing!'
b. (Che) cantino!
(That) sing3PLsubj
'Let them sing!'

In some cases, however, the subjunctive can substitute the indicative (but never the true imperative), when we want to give imperative force to a modal, which is impossible with a true/indicative imperative (as we shall see in (54), (55), (56)):

(36) a. Vogliatevi   bene
WantPLsubjCL2PL   goodness
'Love each-other'
b. *Vogliti bene
WantPLsubjCL2PL   goodness
'LoveS yourself'

An infinitive is typically used to negate a true imperative, but also to substitute a positive imperative giving it a sort of impersonal meaning (sometimes quasi- idiomatic):

(37) Non cantare!
Not singINF
'Don't sing!'

(38) Circolare!
Circulate~INF~
'Keep off! / Go away!' (instead of the usual meaning 'move' referred to liquids or vehicules)

(39) Muoversi!
Move~INF.REFL.CL~
'Hurry up!'   (instead of the usual meaning 'move')

3.1.2. Imperatives in German and English

Although in the literature concerning Germanic languages we don't find a distinction between true and suppletive imperatives, the second person singular and plural has an imperative form in many languages of this family. This imperative verb, according to Platzack & Rosengren (1998), is formed by the bare verb stem, in some languages augmented with an agreement morpheme, as in German:

(40) Hilf (du)   mihr!
Help (youS) me

(41) Helft   (ihr) ihm!   [Platzack & Rosengren 1998]
Help~PL~ (you~PL~) him

Again, I take the view that this morpheme is a number morpheme, rather than an agreement morpheme.

German has an infinitive/indicative form which can be used for the first person plural and for the 'polite' second person (Sie):

(42) a. Gehen wir!
go   we
'Let's go'
b. Gehen Sie!
Go   she/them
'Go!' (polite form)

In English, we have a bare stem for the imperative in the second person (singular and plural)

(43) Go!

For other cases, the suppletive form is rather a 'periphrastic form' (*let* + accusative pronoun + verb stem):

(44) a. Let's go
   b. Let him go

Another possibility is to use a *Do-* imperative, as shown in (45). Two properties of this construction look interesting: a) first, it is very bad with the second person pronoun (*you*), as shown in (45.b); b) second, although used with the impersonal *someone*, *do* cannot carry a third person inflection, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (45.c):

(45) a. Do someone telephone him!
   b. ??/* Do you help him!
   c. * Does someone help him!

3.1.3. Summary

Summing up, we can draw a distinction between Real and Suppletive imperatives cutting across imperatives in all the three languages examined.

Real imperative verbs in all these languages consist in a morphologically meagre form (bare stem in German and English, stem + thematic vowel in Italian) whether dedicated or not**,** with a second Person feature. They can't be inflected for Person (since they are only second person, for other persons there being suppletive forms) nor for Tense: They are indeed incompatible with past tense adverbs, as shown in (46) from Italian:

(46) a. *telefonagli ieri
        *telephone-him yesterday
   b. telefonagli adesso/subito
        telephone-him now
   c. telefonagli domani
        telephone-him tomorrow   [Zanuttini 1997]

An important fact is that, although lacking a Tense/Person indication, Real imperative clauses can occur in matrix contexts, contrary to other clausal types containing verbal forms lacking Tense/Person, e.g. infinitives, which can occur in matrix contexts only when they are used with imperative force:[25]

(47) a. Telefona!
        telephoneImp
   b. *Telefonare
        to telephone
   c. Telefonare!
        Telephone!

Real imperatives exhibit a number of syntactic properties which I analyse here below.

3.2. Syntactic properties of Real Imperatives

3.2.1. Negation, modals and questions

As noted by Zanuttini (1996; 1997) true imperatives cannot be negated by a preverbal sentential negative marker:

(48) a. * Non telefona! Italian
     b. Non telefonate!

(49) a. * No habla!   Spanish
     b. * No hablad!

In English and German, imperatives can be negated:

(50) Don't call!

(51) Leg dich nicht   in mein Bett!
     Lay yourself not   in my   bed
     'Don't lie down in my bed!'

Han (2001) observes that the directive force contributed by the imperative cannot be negated: (55) means *I require that you not call* and not* *I do not require that you call.*

With respect to this issue, however, I agree with Luigi Rizzi's observation (p.c.) that negation does not take scope over declarative force as well:

(52) Non dormo.
     'I don't sleep'

(52) means indeed 'I declare that I don't sleep' and not 'I don't declare that I sleep'. In the end, it seems to me that, as far as negation is concerned, the original observation of Zanuttini (1996;1997) with respect to true imperatives remains valid, while it is impossible to find a generalisation concerning the behaviour of real imperatives as a whole.

Real imperatives behave uniformly as far as questioning is concerned, in that they cannot be questioned. The so called 'Wh- imperative' (Reis & Rosengren 1992, discussed in Platzack & Rosengren 1998), an imperative clause with a fronted wh-phrase, may be interesting in this respect:

(53) Wieviel   schätz   mal daß das Buch kostet!
     how much estimateIMP MP that the book cost3s
     'Please estimate how much the book costs!'

                                    [Platzack & Rosengren 1998]

Here the fronted wh- phrase has no influence on the imperative clause, despite its position. As argued by Platzack & Rosengren (1998), the reason might be that there is no interrogative feature in Imperative Clauses, the wh-phrase being fronted for pragmatic reasons.

Imperatives can't be used with a modal verb:

(54) * Will it!

(55) * Must it!

(56) * Vuommi/Voglimi aiutare!
     want-me   help
     * 'Want to help me!'

3.2.2. Null Subject Parameter exemption

Imperative clauses are exempt from the Null Subject Parameter. Even in non-Null Subject languages imperative clauses are typically subjectless:

(57) a. Mangia!   Italian
     b. Mange!   French
     c. 'Eat it!'

This robust generalisation may correlate to another one: imperatives (contrary to indicatives) can be used with a vocative without a co-referring pronoun (Moro 2002):

(58) a. Pietro, vieni qui
     b. P. come here
     c. *P. you come here

(59) a. Pietro, *pro* sei sempre in ritardo
     b. P. you are always late
     c. *P. are always late [26]

In the languages under scrutiny, a subject-like element may appear in imperative clauses, as shown below:

(60) a. (Tu) pensa a studiare, al   resto pensiamo noi
        (you) think   to study,   to-the rest think   we
        'Take care about studying, we'll take care of the other things'.
     b. Pensaci*(tu), a   studiare!
        Think-to-that   you, to study!
        'Take you care about studying!'

(61) German
     Hilf (du) mihr!
     Help (you) me
     'Help me!'

(62) Swabian German
     (Du) geh nicht dorthin!
                    [Ute Bonacker, quoted by Platzack & Rosengren 1998]
     (You) go not in-there
     'Don't go there!'

(63) English
     a. (You) call the police!
     b. Don't (you) bother him once more   [Platzack & Rosengren 1998]

This subject-like element is never obligatory, unless focussed.
     It is important to notice, however, that there are reasons to
believe that this subject-like element should always be present, at
least for thematic reasons. This means that it should be syntactically
active even when not phonologically realised. Beukema & Coopmans
(1989) have noticed indeed that imperatives with no overt subject dif-
fer from passives in having a syntactically active external argument of
the verb. The anaphor in (64.a) and the control infinitive in (64.c) indi-
cate the presence of an invisible NP in the imperative, which is absent
from the passive, hence the ungrammaticality of (64.b) and (64.d):

(64) a. Tell a story about yourself
     b. *A story was written about themselves
     c. Leave London [without going to BM]!
     b. *London was visited [without PRO going to the BM]

3.2.3. Embedding
     A well established property of Imperative Clauses is that they
cannot be embedded:

(65) a. *I ask you that sit quiet on the chair
     b. *Ich bitte dich, daß sitz still auf dem Stuhl
                              [Platzack & Rosengren 1998]

(66) *Ti prego di siediti tranquillo sulla sedia

It is true, however, that they can be embedded under certain verbs of saying:

(67) a. Ho detto siediti!
  b. ? I said sit down!
  c. ? Ich sagte sitzt dich!

However, this is probably a different kind of embedding (traditionally, 'direct speech' vs. 'subordination'), as shown by the improvement of the written form of the sentences from (67) to (68) and by the agrammaticality of (69):

(68) a. Ho detto: "Siediti!"
  b. I said: "Sit down!"
  c. Ich sagte: "Sitzt dich!" [27]

(69) a. *Ho detto che siediti!
  b. *I said that sit!
  c. *Ich sagte daß sitzt dich!

Informally, it seems to me that verbs of saying introduce a speech event (even if narrated) and this enables embedded Imperative Clauses to be tied to this speech event for their interpretation.
  Imperatives can embed any kind of sentence :

(70) a. Lascialo andare!
    let-him to go
    'Let him go'
  b. Digli che può   andare
    tell-him that may3SIndPres to go
    'Tell him that he may go'
  c. Digli che vada
    tell-him that go3SSubjPres
    'Tell him to go'
  d. Digli che sono   uscita
    tell-him that be3SIndPres gone out
    'Tell him that I'm not in'

3.2.4. Imperative verbs and clitic pronouns

  A final property, to which I'll come back also in the next section, is the position of the imperative verb with respect to object clitic pro-

nouns. In the languages under scrutiny here, this property is pertinent to Italian only. While in clauses that do not have imperative force the verb follows the object pronominal clitics, in Imperative Clauses it precedes them (Rooryck 1992) even though the verbal form is identical (Zanuttini 1997):

(71) a. Le telefonate   tutti i giorni?
         Her call2plInd   all   the days
         'Do you call her every day?'
     b. So   che le   telefonate tutti i giorni
         Know1sInd that her call2plInd all   the days
         I know that you call her every day
     c. Telefonatele tutti i giorni!   [Zanuttini 1997]
         callImpPl-her all   the days
         'Call her every day!'

Some Northern Italian dialects have subject clitics, which, in declarative sentences, co-occur with the subject. Although Northern Italian dialects are not part of the languages under scrutiny here, I think it is worth mentioning that a subject clitic is impossible in Imperative Clauses, as shown below in the dialect of Verona:[28]

(72) a. Ti te   magni   la pasta
         you SCL eatInd.3PS the pasta
         'You eat pasta'
     b. Magna la   pasta!
         eatImp the pasta
         'Eat pasta!'
     c. Ti magna   la   pasta!
         You eatImp   the pasta
         'Eat pasta!'
     d. *Ti te   magna la pasta!
         You SCL eatImp the pasta   [M. Nicolis, p.c.]

3.2.5. Summary

I summarise now the morphological and syntactic properties of Real Imperatives, outlined up to now. I have defined *real* imperatives as imperatives consisting of a morphologically meagre form (whether dedicated or not) used with a subject (whether overt or covert) containing a second person feature. Real Imperatives don't have a Tense/Person morpheme, I argued, but they can nevertheless be used in matrix context. They can and they must, we may say, since they typically cannot be embedded. They cannot be inflected for Person

and/or Tense, questioned or used with a modal verb. As far as their 'subject- correlated' properties are concerned, Imperative Clauses are Null Subject Parameter exempt (i.e. even in non-Null Subject languages they typically lack an overt subject); in languages with subject clitics, these cannot appear in Imperative Clauses; imperative verbs can be used with a vocative without a coreferring pronoun. The subject-like element that can appear in Imperative Clauses is never obligatory, unless when it is focussed. A final property concerns the position of the imperative verb, which must precede the clitic string. (73) summarises the properties of Real Imperatives:

(73) PROPERTIES OF REAL IMPERATIVES

i)   imperative verbs don't have a t/p morpheme but can be used in matrix contexts
ii)   they can't be inflected for person and tense
iii) imperative clauses are Null Subject Parameter exempt
iv)   they can be used with a vocative without a coreferring pronoun
v)   subject clitics cannot appear in imperative clauses
vi)   imperative clauses can't be questioned
vii) they can't concern a modal verb
viii) they cannot be embedded
ix)   imperative verbs precede the clitic string

The properties in (73) can be divided in three sub-groups. I maintain that properties from i) to v) are IP-correlated; properties vi) to viii) are FinP correlated; property ix) concerns the position of the imperative verb, a question that we must still address in details before we can give the exact structure of the Imperative Clause.

3.3. The position of the imperative verb

In Italian, as we have said, the imperative verb precedes object clitics:

(74) Telefonatele!
     Telephone-her!

We have also noted that the subject-like element that may appear in Imperative Clauses seems to precede or follow the imperative verb:

(75) Tu   porta   la valigia
     TOP
     You takeImp the suitcase

(76) a. Portala TU
      b. *TU portala
          FOC   FOC
          TakeImp- it you   You takeImp- it

To be more precise, it seems that, when the subject-like element is a
topic, it precedes the imperative (75), when it is a focus it follows the
imperative (76).

From this I conclude that the imperative verb in Italian is in a
position which is:

a) higher than the object clitic string (Manzini-Savoia, 2002);
b) higher than FocP
c) lower than (Spec), TopP

Let's turn now to German (77) and English ((78) and (79)):

(77) a. Dorthin geh nicht
      b. (Du) geh nicht dorthin (Swabian)
      c. Geh (du) nicht dorthin (all other dialects)
      d. Geh DU nicht dorthin
          go   you not   there
          'Don't go there'

(78) a. Do SOMEONE help him quickly!
      b. Someone do help him quickly!

(79) a. Come here!
      b1. No, YOU come here!
      b2. *No, come YOU here!

In German, the imperative verb seems to precede the subject-like ele-
ment in topic position obligatorily, as shown in (77.c). A different posi-
tion, in this respect, is occupied by the verb in Swabian German
which follows the topic (77.b). With respect to Focus, the verb appears
higher.

As far as English is concerned, the imperative verb appears in a
lower position with respect to Italian and German. More precisely,
the position occupied by the imperative verb in Italian is the same
occupied by the imperative *do* in English.

To sum up, the imperative verb in Italian surfaces in a position
between TopP and FocP. I assume that this position is Top°.

In English, the same position is occupied by the imperative *do*
while the lexical verb stays lower. In German the imperative verb is
higher than TopP.

This situation seems to reproduce exactly the same cross- linguistic differences observed with respect to verb movement in Declarative Sentences, as widely attested in the literature: *do* in English occupies the same position of the lexical verb in Italian, while in German, due to the V2 properties of this language, the verb moves higher.

3.4. *The structure of Imperative Clauses*

Most current accounts of Imperative Clauses assume that their structure is the same as the structure of Declarative Sentences, the difference consisting solely in the fact that the verb, in Imperative Clauses, moves higher than in Declarative Sentences. These analyses of Imperative Clauses (such as Roorick (1992), Rivero (1994), Rivero & Terzi (1995), Potsdam (1995), Zanuttini (1997)) do not connect properties of Imperative Clauses to their structure. Other proposals, such as Platzack & Rosengren (1998) assume that Imperative Clauses lack FinP and contain an IP without Tense; Belletti (1999) assumes a 'radically empty' Agr in Imperative Clauses.

Along the lines of these latter two proposals, I assume, for Imperative Clauses, a structure like (80):

(80) [ForceP   [TopP   [FocP   [VP…]]]]]

As (80) shows, Imperative Clauses lack Fin P. This explains why they can't be questioned nor used with a modal verb, properties connected to FinP (see Platzack and Rosengren 1998). Following a suggestion of Valentina Bianchi (p.c.), I assume that the lack of FinP is connected to another important property of Imperative Clauses, namely the fact that they cannot be embedded. I have assumed that FinP is the locus where a clause is either connected to previous discourse [-Fin] or to its own independent Placement Layer [+Fin]: lacking FinP, Imperative Clauses cannot be embedded (i.e. connected to another sentence's Placement Layer) nor contain their own Placement Layer. We can define Imperative Clauses 'Non-Placed expressions'. As such, they are identified with (rather than related to) the speech event. Hence, they cannot be displaced as far as the relevant dimensions (Tense and Person) are concerned: they are limited to Second Person and Present Tense. Lacking the Placement Layer, the restrictions on the overtness of the subject do not hold anymore: we may understand the Null Subject Parameter as a condition on [Spec, IP]. Lacking IP (i.e. a dedicated subject positions), Imperative Clauses in Italian as

well as in English and German do not impose conditions on the overtness of their subject. This correlates with properties iv) and v) in (73) above, i.e. with the fact that Imperative Clauses can contain a vocative without a co-referring pronoun, and with their impossibility of having subject clitics in subject clitic languages.

I have assumed that Top° is the position where the imperative verb goes in Italian and the *do* imperative goes in English, and where, presumably, the imperative verb in German passes by on its way to a higher position, possibly Force°, as argued by Platzack & Rosengren (1998).

This position is only compatible with a verb endowed with a second person feature, i.e. an IN, non- displaced feature. [29]

Thus far, I have assumed that Imperative Clauses have a structure where the VP is embedded under the Top/Foc layer and lacks the Placement Layer, i.e. the FinP- IP cluster.

Given this structure of Imperative Clauses, a crucial point which remains to be established is whether these Top/Foc projections are those assumed in the left periphery (Rizzi 1997) or those in the VP periphery (Belletti 2001).

In Belletti (2001) it is argued that the cluster TopP/FocP which, according to Rizzi (1997), is part of the Complementizer layer, is also present in the VP periphery. In Declarative Sentences the higher FocP is the one that carries contrastive meaning, while the lower carries the meaning 'new information':

(81) a. IL POLLO,   voglio, non il pesce
    the chicken want1S not the fish
    'It is chicken I want, not fish'
    b. Ho mangiato il pollo
    have1S eaten the chicken
    'I had chicken'
    c. * Il pollo, ho mangiato
    the chicken have1S eaten

It would be revealing if the focussed element in Imperative Clauses carried one of the two meanings. It seems to me however that in some cases it has a contrastive meaning (82) while in others it has a clear 'new information' meaning (83):

(82) a1.   Porta la valigia
           takeImp the suitcase
     a2.   No, Portala TU
           no   takeImp- it you
     a3.   *No, TU   portala
           no,   YOU take-it

(83) a1.   Chi vuoi che telefoni?[30]
     a2.   Telefona tu

This is however not surprising: if we assume the structure in (80) in Imperative Clauses there is only one focal position which necessarily has to carry both meanings, while the impossibility of (82a3) may be due to the fact that the imperative verb in Italian is in Top°, i.e. it cannot follow the focalised argument.[31] I leave this issue open for future research.

3.5. Extending the proposal

Imperative Clauses display a number of properties that led me to the proposal, shown in (80), that their structure lacks the FinP-IP layer. I have assumed that they are Non-Placed, i.e. not related to the speech event but rather identified with it: as such they are compatible only with a non-past interpretation and with subjects and verbs endowed with an IN feature.

This analysis supports the basic idea expressed in this work, namely that the Inflectional/Placement Layer, selected by FinP through the [±] value of Fin°, is the locus in clause structure where what is said is related to the speech event.[32]

A natural expansion of this proposal would be to extend (80) to all other clausal types that lack an overt indication of Tense/Person but still appear as matrix clauses. The situation, however, seems more variegated.

First of all, in Section 2 we have been dealing with Copular Constructions in Modern Hebrew, as in (10), here repeated as (84) for convenience:

(84)(=10)   Rina ʔeyn-(n)a gveret Levi
            Rina neg-3FS   Mrs. Levi
            'Rina is not Mrs. Levi'   [Shlonsky 2000]

As we can see, Copular Constructions lack an overt indication of Tense/Person, a possibility reserved to all sentences in the *benoni* (present tense) form in Modern Hebrew:

(85) Daniela toferet   smalot
     D.   sewBENONI.FS   dresses
     'Daniela sews/is sewing dresses'

However, it is precisely Copular Constructions which enabled us (in Section 2) to trace a sharp cartography of Person projections in the clause. We cannot thus imagine that these sentences lack the FinP-IP layer as Imperative Clauses do; rather, I assume that they are Declarative Sentences as far as their structure is concerned, but with a null auxiliary, as originally proposed by Shlonsky (1997) for *benoni* sentences, as shown in (86):

(86) Daniela Ø   toferet   smalot
     D.   bePRES3SF   sewBENONIFS   dresses
     'Daniela sews/is sewing dresses'   [Shlonsky 1997]

Other sentence types appear as matrix independent clauses with the verb in the infinitive form, thus, again, lacking a Tense/Person indication: They are Matrix Infinitivals (87) and child Root Infinitives (88) and (89):

(87) a. Oh, to forget your anniversary yesterday!
     b. Oh, for him to forget your anniversary yesterday! [Schütze 1997]
     c. Io fare questo? Mai!
        Me to do that? Never!   [Italian, Rizzi 1994a]

(88) a. Voir l'auto papa
        see the car daddy   [French, Wexler 1994]
     b. Papa shoenen wassen
        daddy shoes wash   [Dutch, Wexler 1994]

(89) Zähne pussen
     teeth   wash   [German, Hyams 2001]

Matrix Infinitivals and Root Infinitives share a number of properties with Imperative Clauses.

As far as Root Infinitives are concerned, their subject, as the subject of Imperative Clauses, is optional.[33] In the relevant corpora, there are no instances of interrogative Root Infinitives, and, as commonly held in the literature, Root Infinitives express the child's desire or intentions, rather than describing an ongoing or past event. Hyams (2001) uses the term 'unanchored expressions' to underline this property of Root Infinitives. Finally, Salustri (2003) has shown

that in child Italian Imperative Clauses appear in a similar percentage as Root Infinitives in child German.[34]

Matrix Infinitivals too seem to share with Imperative Clauses a number of properties, e.g. optional subject and incompatibility with past tense adverbs especially when they are interpreted as referring to something happened:

(90) a. Ah, camminare sulle foglie bagnate!
　　　　 Ah, to walk　　 on the leaves wet
　　 b. Ah, aver camminato sulle　 foglie bagnate!
　　　　 Ah, to have　walked　on the leaves wet
　　 c. ?? Ah, aver camminato ieri　　 sulle foglie bagnate!
　　　　 Ah,　to have walked yesterday　　 on the leaves wet

Contrary to Imperative Clauses, Matrix Infinitivals typically occur as questions (87.c). It must be noted, however, that it is a particular kind of question, maybe not really a question but rather a counterfactual statement.[35] Furthermore, as far as their temporal dimension is concerned, Matrix Infinitivals are interpreted not only as coincident with the speech event (as in (90)),[36] but also as non-defined, undetermined as shown in (87.c). This non-defined, undetermined placement indication seems to be possible also for child Root Infinitives: see, among others, Wijnen (1997), where this interpretation seems to be reserved to Root Infinitives with eventive predicates. This also holds for Matrix Infinitivals : in Italian they are possible both with eventive and non- eventive predicates (as shown in 91.a and 91.b respectively), but the former only allow an undetermined interpretation:

(91) a. Io mangiare carne?
　　　　 I to eat　　　 meat?
　　 b. Io essere stanca?
　　　　 I　 to be　 tired?

As noted by Wijnen (1997) for Root Infinitives, however, this 'freedom' is apparent, since it is subject to a sort of contextual disambiguation, where previous discourse or context drive their ongoing or past determination.[37] Again, we can extend this claim to Matrix Infinitivals.

Summing up, we can assume that Root Infinitives and Matrix Infinitivals, as Imperative Clauses, are Non-Placed expressions, i.e. lack FinP-IP. Contrary to Imperative Clauses, however, they don't need to be identified with the speech event, but can be also contextu-

ally (discourse) placed. This possibility may be related to the fact that their subject and verb don't have a 2nd Person feature.[38]

4. Conclusions

In this work I have tried to answer two main questions:
– Why is there a Tense/ Person indication in matrix clauses?
– What happens if this indication is missing?

I have proposed that the Tense/Person Correlation, a requirement concerning the verbal morphology of Finite Clauses in inflectional languages, has the function of placing (and/or displacing) a sentence with respect to the speech event to convey Displaced Reference. This idea, and the subsequent characterisation of clauses, is summarised in (92) and (93):

(92) a. An independent matrix clause must contain a Tense/Person specification (i.e. must be independently placed).
b. In the absence of a Tense/Person indication, an independent matrix clause is Non-Placed, and is identified with the speech event (in the relevant coordinates). As such, it cannot be displaced.
c. Dependent Clauses without a Tense/Person indication are Anaphorically Placed: they are interpreted, in the relevant coordinates, in relation to the Main Clause's Placement Phrase.

(93)

Placed Expressions:	Matrix and Embedded Finite clauses
Non- Placed Expressions:	Imperative Clauses; Matrix Infinitivals; Root Infinitives
Anaphorically Placed Expressions: Embedded Infinitives; Subjunctive Clauses	

If this line of reasoning is on the right track, then information concerning placement should be information relevant to the grammar, instantiated in the feature array of arguments, structural positions and verbal morphology. Concerning the typology in (93), I have proposed that in Finite Clauses the Inflectional Layer (which I have renamed 'Placement Layer') is organised in a hierarchy of Placement oriented positions whose Spec is occupied by correspondingly different kinds of subjects. The typology of subjects and subject positions, given in (21) and (22), is here repeated for convenience as (94) and (95):

(94) a.1st Pers Pron   b. 2nd Pers Pron   c.3rd Pers Pron   d. Non-pron DPs
     IN   IN   OUTPerson   OUT NonPers
     Person   Person   Person   (Definiteness)
     Speaker   Addressee   (Animate)   Number
     (Augmented)   (Augmented)   (Augmented)   (Animate)

(95)   IN   OUT/Person   OUT/Non Person
      ½ Pers pron   3 Pers pron   Non-pron DPs

As can be seen, (95) concerns Person features, but it is conceivable that an analogous placement oriented hierarchy should involve Tense projections as well. I leave this issue for future research.

Another issue not detailed here is that concerning Anaphoric Placement: here I have simply mentioned Anaphoric Placement, assuming that in Embedded Clauses the Placement Layer may be lacking, in that an Embedded Clause may be independently placed or not. This is in turn due to the [±] value of their Fin°. When Fin° is [+ Fin] the Placement Layer is selected: the embedded clause is Finite. When Fin° is [- Fin] the Placement Layer is not selected and the embedded clause (an infinitive or subjunctive clause, but the typology is not exhaustive) is Anaphorically Placed, i.e. placed with respect to the main clause's Placement Layer. The presence/absence of the Placement Layer in Embedded Clauses is tied to various properties, including the possibility/impossibility of having an overt and referentially independent subject and an independently interpreted Tense.

As far as Non – Placed Expressions are concerned, I have been dealing exhaustively with (Real) Imperative Clauses. Their analysis has led me to the proposal that their structure lacks both FinP and the Placement Layer, due to some properties of theirs, summarised in (73) and here repeated as (96) for convenience:

(96) PROPERTIES OF REAL IMPERATIVES

i)   imperative verbs don't have a t/p morpheme but can be used in matrix contexts
ii)   they can't be inflected for person and tense
iii)   imperative clauses are Null Subject Parameter exempt
iv)   they can be used with a vocative without a coreferring pronoun
v)   subject clitics cannot appear in imperative clauses
vi)   imperative clauses can't be questioned
vii) they can't concern a modal verb
viii) they cannot be embedded
ix)   imperative verbs precede the clitic string

While property ix) concerns the position of the imperative verb, property i) to v) are related to the absence of the Placement Layer (Tense included) , properties vi) to viii) to the absence of FinP. The structure I proposed for Imperative Clauses is given in (97) (which repeats (80)):

(97)   [ForceP   [TopP   [FocP   [VP…]]]]]

This structure has been extended to other clausal types, such as Matrix Infinitivals and child Root Infinitives.

To sum up, the compared analysis of Placed and Non-Placed expressions confirms our initial hypothesis subsumed in (98):

(98) In order to allow Displaced Reference, an independent clause must be independently placed, i.e. must contain a Tense/Person indication.[39]

At this point, however, one final question comes to mind:
– Why is the indication of Tense tied to the indication of Person, as detailed in 2.1?

The answer I'd like to propose for this question is that Person is the feature able to relate Tense to the speech event, i.e. to make Tense deictic.[40] As stated in Greenberg's Universal 30, Tense is expressed in languages with Person/ Number,[41] and in these languages Person and Tense indication are tied together. An interesting exception to the Tense/Person Correlation is instantiated by Tensed Infinitives (as e.g. in Latin), where Tense is expressed without Person.[42] The interesting fact is that, although the Tense of the embedded clause is overtly expressed, it cannot be interpreted in relation to the speech event, but only with respect to the Tense of the embedding clause, as shown by the only possible interpretation of (99):

(99)   Dicebant eum laudaturum esse   eam
        Say3SPast him to praiseFut be   her
        'They said he was going to praise her/
        *They said he will praise her'

An overt Person feature (tied to an overt Tense feature) seems to be necessary to drag Tense out of the anaphoric network and relate it to the speech event, allowing its non-anaphoric interpretation, thus independently placing the sentence.[43]

To conclude, I will touch a couple of final points.

The fact that Matrix Infinitivals are dis-preferred with respect to Finite Clauses in adult language, while in child language Root Infinitives (or Imperative Clauses, according to Salustri 2003) occur in a higher percentage, suggests that Placed expressions might be regarded as an evolutionary achievement, maybe in both meanings of the term, if we assume that ontogenesis recapitulates phylogeny. This observation is strengthened by the fact that the Tense/Agreement cluster seems to be an area of difficulty, as noticed in many sub-fields of linguistics: in aphasia (Friedmann-Grodzinsky 1997); in Specific Language Impairment (Rice 1994); in Second Language Acquisition (Prévost & White 2000).[44]

Another fact that emerges from my analysis is that only Finite Clauses (i.e. Placed Expressions) seem to obey the Null Subject Parameter. As we have seen in Section 3, even non-Null Subject languages like English have optional subjects when the Placement Layer is missing. We can assume that the Null Subject Parameter is a condition on the Specs of the positions in the Placement Layer. Drawing on Rizzi (1986), who suggested a difference concerning the pronominal/ non-pronominal nature of Person in *pro*-drop and non *pro*-drop languages respectively, and adapting his proposal, I understand 'pronominal' as meaning 'deictic'. In non *pro*-drop languages, I argue, the Person feature on verbs is not deictic enough to place a sentence with respect to the speech event. In non-*pro* drop languages, however, placement of a sentence is possible through an overt subject (with its IN or OUT feature) in the appropriate syntactic configuration. This explains why this overt subject is necessary only in Finite Clauses, i.e. only in sentences endowed with their own Placement Layer. Assuming 'deictic strength' as the relevant factor, also partial *pro*-drop phenomena as e.g. those attested in Hebrew (which does not allow a null subject with a 3rd Person verb, see 2.2.3) receive a natural explanation, assuming 3rd Person as less deictic than 1st and 2nd Person, being 3rd Person an OUT feature, as we saw in Section 2.[45]

Address of the Author:

Elisa Di Domenico, Facoltà di Lettere, Via Roma 47, 53100 Siena - Italy
    <didomenico@unisi.it>

Endnotes

[*] Parts of this work have been presented at the 26th Glow Colloquium (Lund, April 2003), at the 4th Asian Glow (Seoul, August 2003), at the 5th Conference on the Evolution of Language (Leipzig, March 2004) and in seminars and talks given at the University of Siena and the University of Geneva. I am grateful to the audience present in these occasions, as well as to the editors of this volume, for helpful comments and suggestions. Special thanks are due to Verner Egerland, Maria Rita Manzini, Genoveva Pu kas, Hàlldor SigurDsson. Finally, I thank Adriana Belletti, Valentina Bianchi and Luigi Rizzi for their encouragement, their example and the continuous and widening discussion I could exchange with them during the preparation of this work. Of course, all errors and shortcomings are my own.

[1] Among other things, place (but not time) is the only dimension in which Displaced Reference is conveyed in bees language, while location of food is the only possible 'subject of predication'.

[2] These features are two of the three classical deictic categories: person, spatial location and time reference, as e.g. in Anderson and Keenan (1985).

[3] The formulation of this universal is puzzling if compared to Greenberg's Universal 36, which states that if a language has the category of gender it always has the category of number. According to Universal 36 languages with gender but without number shouldn't exist. As far as I know a language with nominal classes but without number is Dyirbal (Dixon 1972), where the noun marker that precedes the noun carries not only the nominal class marker but also case and an indication of the spatial location of the noun. The verb in Dyirbal is inflected for tense (see Di Domenico 1997 for further details).

[4] An affix that bears the feature Person must be governed by a Tense operator.

[5] See also Bianchi (2001) and the references quoted there.

[6] But see Section 3.

[7] In this part of the work, I will not concern myself with Tense leaving for future research a Placement- oriented re-interpretation of Tense projection(s).

[8] ʔ*eyn-* is restricted to clauses with a present tense or a non-verbal predicate. Predicates of all tenses can be negated in Modern Hebrew by the particle *lo* , which is insensitive to the tense of the predicate or to its lexical category.

[9] Shlonsky argues that coordinated pronouns correspond to strong pronouns of Cardinaletti & Starke's (1999) typology. The distinction strong/weak is not morphologically evident in Hebrew, contrary to Italian and other languages. In Cardinaletti (1997; to appear) a higher subject position is identified, reserved to strong nominals only. See below.

[10] Manzini & Savoia (2001) mention however some Northern Italian dialects where the relevant difference is not pronominal / non pronominal but 1st / 2nd *versus* 3rd. Valentina Bianchi (p.c.) also informs me that she has found one single Florentine speaker which accepts non-agreement with inverted *loro* .

[11] For other peculiarities of Belfast English Singular Concord see Henry (1995).

[12] My characterization of the featural content of different kinds of subjects is not a feature geometry, in the sense of Harley (1994): in the frame I propose, features are not hierarchically ordered.

[13] The idea that number is absent from 1st and 2nd Person is developed in Wechsler (to appear).

[14] 'They' is also endowed with an optional 'Animate/Human' feature (in the absence of Speaker or Addresse). As suggested by one of the referees, either all the referents are animate or they aren't:

(i) *they= he and his car.

[15]   The order 1st / 2nd above 3rd is also assumed for object arguments by Bianchi (2003).

[16]   The idea of two types of agreement is not new: see Balari Ravera (1992) in the HPSG framework. Here I assume that Number agreement may also concern subject verb agreement with non- pronominal DPs, and not only DP internal agreement as Concord (the analogue of my Number agreement) does for Balari Ravera.

[17]   For Henry (1995) subjects in Belfast English occupy Spec, TP.

[18]   I analyse more in detail these agreement phenomena in Di Domenico (in prep.a).

[19]   This, in turn, selected by the superordinate verb.

[20]   I assume therefore that there is no IP without FinP. This might explain why, as assumed by Chomsky (2001), TP is not a strong phase.

[21]   See Bianchi (2001).

[22]   See Bianchi (2001), Di Domenico (in prep.b).

[23]   It is maybe relevant in this respect that *-s* is the usual plural marker both in Spanish and Sardinian nominal morphology.

[24]   *Cantiamo!* Can only refer to 'you, (he) and me' but not to 'he and me without you'. A similar idea is expressed in Belletti (1999)

[25]   Leaving aside for the moment Matrix Infinitivals which will be discussed in Section 3.5.

[26]   See also Section 3.2.4 (ex. (72)) where it is shown that, in languages with subject clitic pronouns, the subject clitic can never appear in Imperative Clauses.

[27]   H. Thráinsson (p.c.) mentions me an imperative in Old Icelandic which could be embedded under any kind of verbs. This imperative also has the peculiarity of having an obligatorily overt subject. Unfortunately, I haven't yet been able to access the relevant data up to this moment.

[28]   The data in (72) are also relevant for the question of the 'subject' of imperatives (see section 3.2.2 above).

[29]   Furthermore TopP is not an agreement position. This might entail that 2nd Person should be considered a default value since this feature is shared by the imperative verb and the imperative subject. Interestingly, the restriction to second Person holds for the subject, but does not concern the object of real imperative verbs, as shown for instance in (27) here repeated for convenience:

i)   Prendilo!
     take-it!

We'll come back later to this property.

[30]   The example is due to Adriana Belletti.

[31]   The comparison of two varieties of English could shed some light on this issue. As noted by Henry (1995), in Belfast English the verb displays movement properties which appear similar to those of the verb in Standard English as far as Declarative Sentences are concerned. Namely, the verb occupies a position lower than frequency adverbs and negation in both varieties:

(i) a. *BE/*SE   He went not away
    b. *BE/*SE   He went always away

In Imperative Clauses, on the contrary, the verb moves higher in Belfast English than in Standard English, since it may appear to the left of the subject:

(ii) a. BE/SE   You go away
     b. BE/*SE Go you away

These facts receive a natural explanation, I think, assuming that Imperative Clauses occupy the lower portion of clause structure and that, in all clausal types, the verb in Belfast English is able to move up to Top°, while in Standard English it remains in the VP, as commonly assumed. Henry (1995) assumes instead a con-

struction- specific movement (i.e. only in Imperative Clauses) of the verb in Belfast English.

[32] A comparison with the two dances of the honey bee comes to mind: Imperative Clauses can be compared to the bees Round Dance, used to signal flowers close to the beehive; when it is necessary to 'talk' about distant flowers, the bee places its dance with respect to the beehive (the Wagging Dance) and the position and distance of food can be thus calculated. Finite clauses are similarly placed with respect to the speech event.

[33] Rizzi (1994b) uses the term 'early null subject' to refer to this phenomenon, and shows that it is different from the drop of subjects in adult grammatical systems like Italian, in that it may not occur in embedded contexts.

[34] As noted by Guasti (1994), Root Infinitives are virtually absent in child Italian.

[35] A different case is, according to me, the one reported in Rizzi (1994a) and illustrated below:

(i) Che cosa dire in questi casi?
    What to say in these cases

In this wh-question infinitive, (which, according to Rizzi, does not seem to occur naturally in English), an overt/referentially independent subject is not possible, as in Embedded Infinitives and not in Matrix Infinitivals:

(ii) *Che cosa io/tu/lui dire in questi casi?
     What   I/you/he to say in these cases?

I advance the hypothesis that in this construction there is actually a covert modal under which the infinitive clause is embedded.

[36] (90.b) looks like having a past tense indication, namely the Past Participle. The indication given by the past participle, however, looks for me aspectual rather than temporal, in that it points to the conclusion of the event described at the moment of the speech act. This intuition is confirmed by the incompatibility of a past tense adverb, hence the very low acceptability of (90.c).

[37] Of course, this previous sentence need not be produced by the child herself, but can also be produced by the child's interlocutor.

[38] This analysis is not at all incompatible with the Truncation Hypothesis proposed by Rizzi (1994a) for Root Infinitives, especially if the TopP and FocP involved in (80) are the ones discovered by Belletti (2001), i.e those in the VP periphery. With respect to Root Infinitives, in Di Domenico (2003) I suggest that they also share important properties with Declarative Sentences in isolating languages, which, as it is well known, lack Tense/Person indications. My claim there is that Root Infinitives might indeed be the result of a 'Chinese-like' initial setting of the Nominal Mapping Parameter. Finally, Declarative Sentences in isolating languages deserve a detailed analysis which I do not pursue here. See Di Domenico (2003) where I claim that it is the particular setting of the Nominal Mapping Parameter (Chierchia 1998) that prevents an overt Tense/Person indication.

[39] With this I mean 'grammaticalised' Displaced Reference. Of course spatial and temporal deictic expressions are able to lexically transmit a certain kind of Displaced Reference. This kind of 'lexical' Displaced Reference, indeed, is also possible in Isolating Languages, see footnote 38.

[40] Bonomi & Zucchi (2001) remark that the notion 'point of view' is not relevant to Tense. The proposition 'Event X occurred before Event Y' does not change its truth value whatever the temporal collocation of the speaker might be.

[41] With the exception of Dyirbal (see footnote 3) and as far as I know, of Japanese. Interestingly, however in these two languages there is another deictic feature in the verbal morphology: locative in Dyirbal and honorific in Japanese.

This may support the idea that Tense indication must be tied to the indication of a deictic feature such as Person in inflectional languages, or, in the absence of Person, a locative or honorific indication.

[42]   The other exception, as far as I know, is instantiated by Inflected Infinitives as in European Portuguese (Raposo 1987). On Latin Infinitives see Cecchetto & Oniga (2002).

[43]   Person, on the contrary does not need a Tense feature to be related to the speech event, i.e. to be placed. As noted by one of the referees, the interpretation of individuals mentioned in non-placed contexts such as Imperative Clauses and Matrix Infinitivals is anchored to the speech event, even in the absence of the Placement Layer.

[44]   I deal with these issues in Di Domenico (2004).

[45]   Another point concerns the nature of null subjects in non-finite main clauses, i.e. in Imperative Clauses, Matrix Infinitivals, Root Infinitives. With respect to the subject of Root Infinitives, Rizzi (1994b) has defined them 'Null Constants' assuming that they can occur in the specifier of the root.

This analysis, which captures the properties of early null subjects under the Truncation Hypothesis, is maybe extendable to the null subjects of other non - finite main clauses: in order to do so, however, either we have to assume that ForceP is lacking in all non-finite main clauses (so that their subjects are root subjects) or we have to assume that ForceP does not act as a potential identifier. I leave these matters for future research.

Bibliographical References

ANDERSON, Stephen R. & Edward L. KEENAN (1985), "Deixis", in SHOPEN (1985: 259-308).

AOUN, Joseph, Elabbas BENMAMOUN & Dominique SPORTICHE (1994), "Agreement, Word Order and Conjunction in Some Varieties of Arabic", *Linguistic Inquiry,* 25: 195-220.

BALARI RAVERA, Sergio (1992), "Two Types of Agreement", *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics,* I: 1-43.

BELLETTI, Adriana (1999), "Italian/Romance clitics: Structure and derivation", in VAN RIEMSDIJK (1999: 543-579).

BELLETTI, Adriana (2001), "Inversion as focalization", in HULK & POLLOCK (2001: 60-90).

BELLETTI, Adriana (2004), "Aspects of the Low IP Area", in RIZZI (2004: 16-51).

BELLETTI, Adriana, ed. (to appear), *Structures and Beyond - The Carthography of Syntactic Structures, Vol. 3,* New York, Oxford University Press.

BELLETTI, Adriana & Luigi RIZZI, eds. (1996), *Parameters and Functional Heads*, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press.

BENNIS, Hans, Martin EVERAERT & Eric REULANDS, eds. (2000), *Interface Strategies*, The Hague, HAG.

BENVENISTE, Emile (1966), *Problèmes de Linguistique Générale*, Gallimard, Paris.

BEUKEMA, Frits & Peter COOPMANS (1989), "A Government-Binding perspective on the Imperative in English", *Journal of Linguistics,* 25: 417-436.

BIANCHI, Valentina (2000), "On finiteness and Nominative Case licensing", *Quaderni del Laboratorio di Linguistica*, 1/2000, Pisa, Scuola Normale Superiore.

BIANCHI, Valentina (2001), "On Person Agreement", Ms. Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa.

BIANCHI, Valentina (2003), "On the syntax of personal arguments", Talk delivered at the XXIX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa, Urbino 13-15 February 2003.

BONOMI, Andrea & Alessandro ZUCCHI (2001), *Tempo e linguaggio*, Milano, Mondadori.

BORER, Hagit (1986), "I- subjects", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 17: 375-416.

CARDINALETTI, Anna (1997), "Subjects and Clause Structure", in HAEGEMAN (1997b: 33-63).

CARDINALETTI, Anna (2004), "Towards a cartography of Subject positions", in RIZZI (2004: 115-165).

CARDINALETTI, Anna & STARKE, Michal (1999), "The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of three classes of pronouns", in VAN RIEMSDIJK (1999: 145-233).

CECCHETTO, Carlo & ONIGA Renato (2002), "Consequences of the Analysis of Latin Infinitival Clauses for the Theory of Case and Control", *Lingue e Linguaggio*, 1: 151-189.

CHIERCHIA, Gennaro (1998), "Reference to kinds across languages", *Natural Language Semantics*, 6: 339-405.

CHOMSKY, Noam (1997), Language and Mind: Current Thoughts on Ancient Problems, http://www.utexas.edu, forthcoming in Jenkins (2004).

CHOMSKY, Noam (2001), "Derivation by Phase", in: M. KENSTOWICZ (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language,* Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

CINQUE, Guglielmo (1999), *Adverbs as Functional Heads*, New York, Oxford University Press.

CINQUE, Guglielmo, ed. (2002), *The structure of DP and IP- The Carthography of Syntactic Structures, Vol. 1*, New York, Oxford University Press.

CORUM, Claudia, Cedric SMITH-STAKK & Anne WEISER, eds. (1973), *Papers from the 9th annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago, CLS.

DI DOMENICO, Elisa (1997), *Per una teoria del genere grammaticale*, Padova, Unipress.

DI DOMENICO, Elisa (2003), "Displaced Reference and Tense/Person Marking in Isolating Languages", in: YOON (2003: 87-112).

DI DOMENICO, Elisa (2004), "Imperative Clauses: An Archaic CP?", *Poster presented at the 5th Conference on the Evolution of Language*, Leipzig, 31 March - 3 April 2004.

DI DOMENICO, Elisa (in prep.a), "To agree or not to agree: a unified analysis of Singular Concord and Anti-agreement."

DI DOMENICO, Elisa (in prep.b.), "Matrix and Embedded Infinitives."

DIXON, Robert M.W. (1972), *The Dyirbal Language of North Queensland*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

ENÇ, Mürvet (1987), "Anchoring Conditions for Tense", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18: 633-657.

FLORICIC, Frank (2000), "De l'impératif italien *sii* (sois!) et de l'impératif en général", *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris*, XCV-1: 227-266.

FORCHHEIMER, Paul (1953), *The Category of Person in language,* Berlin, De Gruyter.

FRIEDEMANN, Marc Ariel & Luigi RIZZI, eds. (2000), *The Acquisition of Syntax*, London, Longman.

FRIEDMANN, Na'ama & Yosef GRODZINSKY (1997), "Tense and Agreement in Agrammatic Production: Pruning the Syntactic Tree", *Brain and Language*, 56: 397-425.

VON FRISCH, Karl (1962), "Dialects in the Language of the Bees", *Scientific American*, 207: 79-87.

GABRIELE, Leslie, Debra HARDISON & Robert WESTMORELAND, eds. (1995), *Proceedings of the 6th Annual Meeting of the Formal Linguistic Society of Midamerica,* Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club Publications.

GILLIGAN, Gary M. (1987), *A cross-linguistic approach to the pro-drop parameter*, PhD Dissertation, University of Southern California.

GREENBERG, Joseph H. (1963), "Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements", in: GREENBERG (1963: 73-113).

GREENBERG, Joseph H., ed. (1963), *Universals of language*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.

GUASTI, Maria Teresa (1994), "Verb Syntax in Italian Grammar: Finite and Non- Finite Verbs", *Language Acquisition*, 3: 1-40.

GUÉRON, Jaqueline & Teun HOEKSTRA (1992), *Chaînes temporelles et phrases réduites*, in: OBENAUER & ZRIBI-HERTZ (1992: 1-17).

HAEGEMAN, Liliane, ed. (1997a), *Elements of Grammar,* Dordrecht, Kluwer.

HAEGEMAN, Liliane, ed. (1997b), *The New Comparative Syntax,* London, Longman.

HAKULLINEN, Auli & Lauri KARTUNNEN (1973), "Missing Persons: On Generic Sentences in Finnish", in: CORUM, SMITH-STARK & WEISER (1973: 157-171).

HAN, Chung-Hye (2001), "Force, negation and imperatives", *The Linguistic Review*, 18: 289-325.

HARLEY, Heidi (1994), "Hug a Tree: Deriving the Morphosyntactic Feature Hierarchy", *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 21: 289-320.

HARLEY, Heidi & Elizabeth RITTER (2002), "Person and number in pronouns: A feature geometric analysis", *Language,* 78(3): 482-586.

HENRY, Alison (1995), *Belfast English and Standard English*, New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press.

HOCKETT, Charles F. (1958), *A Course in Modern Linguistics,* New York, The Mac Millan Company.

HOEKSTRA, Teun & Bonnie SCHWARTZ, eds.(1994), *Language Acquisition Studies in Generative Grammar,* Amsterdam, Benjamins.

HULK, Aafke & Jean-Yves POLLOCK, eds. (2001), *Inversion in Romance*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

HYAMS, Nina (2001), "Unanchored Expressions in Child Language", in: INOUE & HASEGAWA (2001: 211-236).

Elisa Di Domenico

INOUE, Kazuko & Nobuko HASEGAWA, eds. (2001) *Linguistics and Interdisciplinary Research: Proceedings of the COE International Symposium*, March 2001.

JENKINS, Lyle, ed. (2004), *Variation and Universals in Biolinguistics,* Elsevier, North-Holland Linguistics Series Vol. 62.

LIGHTFOOT, David & Norbert HORNSTEIN, eds. (1994), *Verb Movement*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

MANZINI, Maria Rita & Leonardo SAVOIA (1998), "Clitics and auxiliary choice in Italian dialects: Their relevance for the person ergativity split", *Recherches Linguistique de Vincennes* 27: 115-128.

MANZINI, Maria Rita & Leonardo SAVOIA (2001), "Parameters of subject inflection in Northern Italian Dialects", in: SVENONIUS (2001: 159-201).

MANZINI, Maria Rita & Leonardo SAVOIA (2004), "Clitics: cooccurrence and mutual exclusion patterns", in: RIZZI, ed. (2004: 211-250).

MORO, Andrea (2002), Notes on Vocative Case: a case study in clause structure, Ms. Università "Vita-Salute" San Raffaele, Milano.

OBENAUER, Hans Georg & Anne ZRIBI-HERTZ, eds. (1992), *Structure de la phrase et théorie du liage*, Vincennes, Presse de l'Université de Vincennes.

PLATZACK, Christer & Inger ROSENGREN (1998), "On the subject of imperatives: A minimalist account of the imperative clause", *The Journal of Compartive Germanic Linguistics* 1: 177-224.

POLETTO, Cecilia (2000), *The Higher Functional Field: Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*, New York - Oxford, Oxford University Press.

POLLOCK, Jean-Yves (1989), "Verb Movement, UG and the Structure of IP", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20: 365-424.

POTSDAM, Eric (1995), "Phrase Structure of the English Imperative", in: GABRIELE, HARDISON & WESTMORELAND (1995: 143-154).

PRÉVOST, Philippe & Lydia WHITE (2000), "Truncation and Missing Inflection in Second Language Acquisition", in: FRIEDEMANN & RIZZI (2000: 202-235).

REICHENBACH, Hans (1947), *Elements of symbolic logic,* New York, The Free Press & London, Collier-Macmillan.

RAPOSO, Eduardo (1987), "Case Theory and Infl to Comp: The Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese", *Linguistic Inquiry,* 18/1: 85-109.

REIS, Marga & Inger ROSENGREN, I. (1992), "What do Wh-Imperatives Tell us about Wh-Movement?", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 10: 79-118.

RICE, Mabel L. (1994), "Grammatical Categories of Children with Specific Language Impairment", in: RICE & WATKINS (1994: 69-88).

RICE, Mabel L. & R.V. WATKINS, eds. (1994), *Specific Language Impairment in Children*, Baltimore, Brooks.

VAN RIEMSDIJK, Henk, ed. (1999), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

RIVERO, Maria Luisa (1994), "Negation, imperatives and Wackernagel effects", *Rivista di Linguistica*, 6-1: 39-66.

RIVERO, Maria Luisa & Arhonto TERZI (1995), "Imperatives, verb movement and logical mood", *Journal of Linguistics*, 31: 301-32.

RIZZI, Luigi (1986), "Null Objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*", *Linguistic Inquiry,* 17: 501-557.

RIZZI, Luigi (1994a), "Some notes on linguistic theory and language development: The case of Root Infinitives", *Language Acquisition,* 3-4: 371-393.

RIZZI, Luigi (1994b), "Early Null Subjects and Root Null Subjects", Hoekstra & Schwartz (1994: 151-176).

RIZZI, Luigi (1997), "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery", in: HAEGEMAN (1997a: 281-337).

RIZZI, Luigi, ed., (2004), *The Structure of CP and IP- The Carthography of Syntactic Structures, Vol. 2.* New York, Oxford University Press.

ROORYCK, Johan (1992), "Romance enclitic ordering and universal grammar", *The Linguistic Review*, 9: 219-250.

SALUSTRI, Manola (2003), *The Onset of Bilingualism,* PhD Dissertation, University of Siena.

SCHAEFFER, Jeannette, ed. (1997) *The Interpretation of Root Infinitives and Bare Nouns in Child Language,* MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics, 12.

SCHÜTZE, Carson T. (1997), *INFL in Child and Adult Language: Agreement, Case and Licensing*, MIT PhD. Dissertation.

SHLONSKY, Ur (1997), *Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic: An Essay in Comparative Semitic Syntax,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

SHLONSKY, Ur (2000), "Subject positions and copular constructions", in: BENNIS, EVERAERT & REULANDS (2000: 325-347).

SHOPEN, Timothy, ed. (1985) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. III: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

SIGURDSSON, Halldòr (2001), Case: abstract vs. morphological, *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax,* 67: 103-151.

SIGURDSSON, Halldòr (2002), Agree and Agreement, *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax,* 70: 101-1.

SVENONIUS, Peter, ed. (2001), *Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP,* New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press.

WECHSLER, Stephen (to appear)," Number as Person", *Proceedings of the 5th Synatx and Semantics Conference in Paris*.

WEXLER, Kenneth (1994), "Optional Infinitives, Head Movement and the Economy of Derivation in Child Grammar", in: LIGHTFOOT & HORNSTEIN (1994: 305-350).

WIJNEN, Frank (1997), "Temporal reference and eventivity in Root Infinitivals", in: SCHAEFFER (1997: 1-25).

YOON, Hang-Jin, ed. (2003), *Generative Grammar in a Broader Perspective: Proceedings of the 4th Glow in Asia 2003,* Seoul, Hankook.

ZANUTTINI, Raffaella (1996), "On the relevance of Tense for sentential negation", in: BELLETTI & RIZZI (1996: 181-207).

ZANUTTINI, Raffaella (1997), *Negation and clausal structure*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.