

# ITALIAN EMPHATIC PRONOUNS ARE POSTVERBAL SUBJECTS\*

Anna Cardinaletti

University of Bologna at Forlì - University of Venice

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In his discussion of Italian postverbal subjects, as in sentences like (1a), Burzio (1986) also analyses postverbal pronouns co-occurring with preverbal subjects, as in (1b) (see in particular his sections 2.3 and 2.4):

- (1) a. Interviene Giovanni.  
*intervenes Giovanni*  
b. Giovanni interviene lui.  
*Giovanni intervenes he*

Burzio takes *lui* in (1b) to be an “emphatic” pronoun, i.e., an anaphoric element coreferential with the preverbal thematic subject *Giovanni*.

Since Burzio does not link the subject doubling in (1b) to the pro-drop parameter, it is surprising that the same possibility does not exist in e.g. English: \**John will intervene he*.

The aim of this paper is to show that (1b) is not an instance of doubling, but an instance of subject “inversion” on a par with (1a). *Lui* in (1b) is not an emphatic pronoun, but a postverbal, thematic subject on a par with the DP *Giovanni* in (1a) (something special then needs to be said about the preverbal DP in (1b)). This analysis answers the question raised by the comparative observation above. A Non-Null-Subject language like English, which does not allow postverbal subjects, does

---

\*. Many thanks to Adriana Belletti for comments on a previous version of the paper.

not display any counterpart to (1b).

So-called emphatic pronouns also occur in infinitival clauses (cf. *Giovanni ha deciso di intervenire lui* ‘Giovanni has decided to intervene he’). Here, subject pronouns must be taken to be the only instance of overt subjects in Italian infinitival clauses. They occupy a ‘Middle-field’ subject position which is otherwise never used in Italian (but it is productive in some Southern Italian dialects and in Spanish). For Case-theoretic reasons, pronouns are the only overt subjects allowed in this context in Italian. This is another postverbal subject position restricted to Null-Subject languages, and expectedly English lacks this possibility, too. Personal pronouns are also ungrammatical in infinitival clauses: \**John decided to intervene he*.

In Italian, only those pronouns which are modified by the anaphoric element *stesso* (self) are ‘emphatic’ in Burzio’s sense: *Giovanni interverrà lui stesso*. In this respect, Italian is not different from languages like English, which makes use of the anaphor *himself* as an emphatic element: *John will intervene himself*.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, Burzio’s discussion of emphatic pronouns is reported. Some facts problematic for his analysis are pointed out, which will be the starting point of the present discussion. In section 3, the proposal is made that *lui* in (1b) is a postverbal subject pronoun. Section 4 presents new empirical evidence to support this proposal. An apparent counterexample is discussed in section 5, which turns out to contain an adverbial-like instance of personal pronouns. Section 6 is devoted to overt subjects in infinitival clauses. Section 7 concludes the discussion by comparing postverbal subjects with pronouns modified by *stesso*, the only instance of true emphatic elements found in Italian.

## 2. BURZIO’S ANALYSIS

### 2.1. Emphatic pronouns in trace positions

Burzio’s analysis of sentences like (1b) builds on his unaccusative hypothesis: *lui* occupies the object position left empty by the DP *Giovanni* raised to specIP. A parallelism is thus established between the trace in (2a) and the emphatic pronoun in (2b):

- (2) a. [IP Giovanni<sub>i</sub> interviene t<sub>i</sub> ].  
 b. [IP Giovanni interviene lui].

The similarity of emphatic pronouns and traces is not only distributional, but also functional. Burzio (1986:110) suggests that emphatic pronouns must be regarded as anaphors. The relation between the subject and the emphatic pronoun is local, similarly to the relation between a moved subject and its trace. In the following sentence, the emphatic pronoun must be the feminine pronoun *lei*, related to the embedded subject PRO controlled by *Maria*, and cannot be the masculine pronoun *lui* related to the matrix null subject:

- (3) Persuase Maria [a PRO intervenire \*lui / lei a risolvere il problema].  
*[he] persuaded Maria to intervene he / she to solve the problem*

Burzio (1986:112) thus assumes that a binding relation exists between the preverbal subject and the postverbal emphatic pronoun.

## 2.2. Emphatic pronouns in non-trace positions

The hypothesis that emphatic pronouns occur in trace positions can be questioned in both directions.

As Burzio (1986:112) notes, emphatic pronouns are also possible with transitive and intransitive verbs, whose subjects are not raised from the object position:

- (4) a. Esaminerà Giovanni il caso.  
*will-examine Giovanni the case*  
 b. Giovanni esaminerà lui il caso.  
*Giovanni will-examine he the case*
- (5) a. Ha telefonato Giovanni.  
*telephoned Giovanni*  
 b. Giovanni ha telefonato lui.  
*Giovanni has telephoned he*

With transitive and intransitive verbs, emphatic pronouns must be taken to be inserted in VP-adjoined position, where postverbal external subjects are taken to occur (cf. also Rizzi 1982).<sup>1</sup> In this way, the parallelism of emphatic pronouns with traces breaks down, but the parallelism with postverbal subjects becomes rather general (see section 3.1 below).

The parallelism between traces and emphatic pronouns also breaks down in the complement to raising verbs, both in full and small clauses. Emphatic pronouns cannot occur in the position of the trace of a raised subject (from Burzio 1986:116-118):

- (6) a. Giovanni sembrava [ t<sub>i</sub> conoscere la strada].  
 b. \*Giovanni sembrava [lui conoscere la strada].  
*Giovanni seemed (he) [to] know the way*
- (7) a. Giovanni sembrava [ t<sub>i</sub> ammalato].  
 b. ??Giovanni sembrava [lui ammalato].  
*Giovanni seemed (he) sick*

The contrast in (6) and (7) is unexpected and particularly problematic for the above hypothesis, as noted by Burzio himself. In order to accommodate these facts, Burzio (1986:119) explores a Case-theoretic solution: emphatic pronouns are assigned nominative Case under government by a verb. In (6b), Case-assignment cannot take

---

<sup>1</sup>. In Rizzi's (1982) and Burzio's (1986) framework, preverbal external subjects are generated in specIP. Notice that the relation between the emphatic pronoun and the DP it is related to is local also with transitive and intransitive verbs:

- (i) a. Persuade Maria [ a PRO esaminare \*lui / lei il caso].  
*[he] persuaded Maria to examine he / she the case*  
 b. Persuade Maria [ a PRO telefonare \*lui / lei a Giovanni].  
*[he] persuaded Maria to telephone he / she to Giovanni*

In (i), locality cannot be a consequence of (local) movement, but must depend on the binding relation (Principle A) established between the preverbal subject and the emphatic pronoun, which is functionally an anaphor.

place because of the intervening clause boundaries, and *lui* fails to receive Case. In (7b), however, the result should be perfect. Although (7b) is slightly better than (6b), it is surprisingly not fully grammatical. For this reason and, more particularly, for the reason that this solution, he admits, is “incompatible with the rest of our discussion”, Burzio abandons it and leaves (6) and (7) “unsolved”.

The aim of this paper is to provide a new analysis of so-called emphatic pronouns, which accounts for all the cases discussed by Burzio, thus also solving the “unsolved” cases in (6) and (7).

### 3. SO-CALLED EMPHATIC PRONOUNS AS POSTVERBAL SUBJECTS

#### 3.1. So-called emphatic pronouns have the same distribution as postverbal subjects

Burzio observes more than once that emphatic pronouns occur in the same position as postverbal subjects. However, he does not conclude that subject doubling and inversion are one and the same syntactic phenomenon and assimilates emphatic pronouns to subject traces, in spite of the problems pointed out above. Burzio’s conclusion is due to the fact that there is one context in which postverbal subjects and emphatic pronouns behave differently. In infinitival sentences, pronouns are allowed but full DPs are ruled out (from Burzio 1986:104-105):

- (8) a. ?\*Sperava [di intervenire Giovanni [a risolvere il problema]].  
           *hoped to intervene Giovanni to solve the problem*  
       b. Sperava [di intervenire lui [a risolvere il problema]].  
           *hoped to intervene he to solve the problem*

My starting point is to abandon the hypothesis that so-called emphatic pronouns occur in trace positions, and to propose that so-called emphatic pronouns have the same distribution as postverbal subjects (the same proposal is made by Solà (1992) and Belletti (1998:6)).<sup>2</sup> The discussion of infinitival clauses and of the

---

<sup>2</sup>. In this paper, I take the view that postverbal subjects are VP-internal, i.e., they do not move out of the (leftward) specVP where they are generated; their postverbal position arises from the fact that the verb is moved across the subject (cf. Ordóñez 1998, Cardinaletti 1998). However, the proposal made

contrast in (8) is postponed to section 6 below, where I arrive at the conclusion that sentences like (8b) instantiate a construction different from finite clauses with postverbal subject pronouns.

This proposal accounts for all the facts presented so far. Further evidence is provided in (9)-(12). Emphatic pronouns undergo the same distributional restrictions as postverbal subjects. They can precede an embedded clause only with unaccusative verbs, (9b), where subjects occur in the basic object position (cf. (9a)), but they are not allowed with transitive verbs, (10b), where subjects cannot precede the object (cf. (10a)). Furthermore, the occurrence of both full subjects and emphatic pronouns in postverbal position is restricted to non-restructuring contexts, as shown by the contrast between (11) and (12) (examples from Burzio 1986:111):<sup>3</sup>

- (9) a. Interverrà Giovanni [a risolvere il problema].  
       *will-intervene Giovanni to solve the problem*  
       b. Giovanni intervorrà lui [a risolvere il problema].  
       *Giovanni will-intervene he to solve the problem*
- (10) a. ??Sperava Giovanni [di risolvere il problema].  
       *hoped Giovanni to solve the problem*

---

in this paper does not hinge on whatever analysis will turn out to be the correct one for postverbal subjects. In particular, if postverbal subjects are moved overtly to the specifier of a Focus position (cf. Ordóñez 1997, Belletti 1998), this should be true for postverbal subject pronouns as well.

<sup>3</sup>. More precisely, in restructuring contexts postverbal subject DPs and so-called emphatic pronouns must follow the infinitival clause:

- (i) a. Lo viene [a prendere] Giovanni.  
       *it comes to fetch Giovanni*  
       b. Giovanni lo viene [a prendere] lui.  
       *Giovanni it comes to fetch he*

Once again, postverbal subjects and so-called emphatic pronouns behave in a parallel way.

- b. ??Giovanni sperava lui [di risolvere il problema].  
*Giovanni hoped he to solve the problem*
- (11) a. Viene Giovanni [a prenderlo].  
*comes Giovanni to fetch-it*  
 b. Giovanni viene lui [a prenderlo].  
*Giovanni comes he to fetch-it*
- (12) a. \*Lo viene Giovanni [a prendere].  
*it comes Giovanni to fetch*  
 b. \*Giovanni lo viene lui [a prendere].  
*Giovanni it comes he to fetch*

Further evidence that so-called emphatic pronouns have the same distribution as postverbal subjects comes from the observation, due to Solà (1992:59) for Catalan, that the two cannot co-occur in postverbal position, in either order. This follows if they occupy one and the same position:

- (13) a. \*Interviene Giovanni lui.  
 b. \*Interviene lui Giovanni.  
*intervenes Giovanni he*

### 3.2. So-called emphatic pronouns ARE postverbal subjects

The second claim of the analysis proposed here is to strengthen the distributional observations made above: emphatic pronouns pattern with postverbal subjects not just because they occupy the same position as postverbal subjects, but because emphatic pronouns ARE postverbal subjects. Sentences like (1b) are not instances of subject doubling, but instances of subject inversion. In thematic terms, so-called emphatic pronouns are arguments.

If the pronoun in postverbal position is the thematic subject of the clause, the preverbal full subject cannot be argumental. The analysis of e.g. (1b) is the following, where the DP *Giovanni* occupies a sentence-peripheral position, presumably TopicP, while the canonical subject position is filled with expletive

*pro*:<sup>4</sup>

- (14) [TopicP Giovanni [IP *pro*<sub>expl</sub> viene lui]].

The sentence-peripheral DP behaves like a left-dislocated subject in that it can precede or follow a left-dislocated object:

- (15) a. Giovanni il convegno lo aprirà lui.  
*Giovann, the conference it will-open he*  
 b. Il convegno Giovanni lo aprirà lui.  
*the conference Giovanni it will-open he*  
 c. Giovanni a se stesso ci pensa lui.  
*Giovanni to himself there thinks he*  
 d. A se stesso Giovanni ci pensa lui.  
*to himself Giovanni there thinks he*

Notice that if so-called emphatic pronouns are thematic subjects, the problem raised by (6) and (7) dissolves (at least in the formulation above). A subject pronoun cannot occur in the subject position of the infinitival complement of *sembrare* for the same reason a DP cannot occur in that position. The illicit distribution of the

---

<sup>4</sup>. The present proposal differs from Belletti's (1998), (1999) proposal. She takes emphatic pronouns to double DPs in doubling structures of the type illustrated in (i) and the derivation to proceed as in (ii): the emphatic pronoun moves from specDP to the low specFocusP above VP (cf. fn. 2), and the DP moves to the preverbal subject position:

- (i) [ DP lui [ ... [DP Giovanni]]]  
 (ii) [IP [DP Giovanni]<sub>k</sub> *interviene*<sub>v</sub> [FocusP lui<sub>i</sub> [VP *t<sub>v</sub>* [ DP *t<sub>i</sub>* *t<sub>k</sub>* ]]]]

If this analysis is adopted, the data in section 4 below cannot be interpreted unitarily as ungrammatical attempts to put the DP in left-peripheral position. Their ungrammaticality must be found elsewhere.

In the rest of the paper, I will not discuss this possibility any further and use the term "doubling" in (my understanding of) Burzio's (1986) sense, i.e., as indicating that the emphatic pronoun is generated as a constituent independently on the preverbal subject.



subject pronoun in (6) and (7) can in fact be observed with subject DPs as well (from Burzio 1986:116,118):

- (16) a. \*Sembrava [Giovanni conoscere la strada].  
*seemed Giovanni [to] know the way*  
 b. ?\*Sembrava [Giovanni ammalato].  
*seemed Giovanni sick*

### 3.3. Null subjects

Consider (17), where an emphatic pronoun co-occurs with a preverbal null subject:

- (17) Viene lui.  
*comes he*

According to Burzio (1986:114), (17) is “ambiguously a case of inversion or of doubling”. In the former analysis, depicted in (18a), *lui* is the postverbal subject, which bears the  $\theta$ -role, and the preverbal subject position is filled with an expletive *pro*; in the latter, (18b), *lui* is an emphatic pronoun which doubles the preverbal argumental *pro*:

- (18) a. [IP  $pro_{expl}$  viene lui].  
 b. [IP  $pro_{arg}$  viene lui].

In the present analysis, (18b) is excluded from being a grammatical possibility. The derivation which produces (18b) violates  $\theta$ -theory. I conclude that (17) only has the analysis in (18a).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>. Interestingly, Burzio (1986:171,fn.39) observes that “the ambiguity [of sentences such as (17)] may only be theoretical however since speakers seem to have no intuition that such cases are ambiguous”.

#### 4. SOME NEW EMPIRICAL FACTS

The proposal presented in section 3.2 not only accounts for all the facts discussed by Burzio, but also for some new facts, unexpected under Burzio's original analysis. The evidence concerns properties of both the subject pronoun itself and the preverbal DP it co-occurs with.

##### 4.1. On the focus properties of so-called emphatic pronouns

The first observation concerns the interpretation of so-called emphatic pronouns. They seem to do more than just providing emphasis. They have the same focus properties as Italian postverbal subjects.<sup>6</sup> Sentences with emphatic pronouns are incompatible with focus on constituents different from the emphatic pronoun itself. Consider (19b), where the contrasted object is *in situ*, and (20), where the object is moved to the sentence-initial focus position (cf. Rizzi 1997):<sup>7</sup>

- (19) a. Il Rettore aprirà LUI il convegno, non il suo rappresentante.  
*the Dean will-open he the conference, not his delegate*

---

<sup>6</sup>. Solà (1992:58; 69,fn.29) hints at the possibility that emphatic pronouns have a "Focus" interpretation, but he does not develop this idea.

<sup>7</sup>. Sentence (19b) sounds ungrammatical to me even in the context provided by Adriana Belletti (p.c.):

- (i) A: Il rettore ha detto che la seduta la aprirà lui.  
*the Dean has said that the meeting it-will-open he*  
 B: \*No no, il rettore (ha detto che) aprirà lui IL CONVEGNO, non la seduta.  
*no, no, the Dean (has said that) will-open he the conference, not the meeting*

In the grammatical reply to A, the pronoun *lui* must be omitted, as in (ii):

- (ii) A: Il rettore ha detto che la seduta la aprirà lui.  
*the Dean has said that the meeting it-will-open he*  
 B: No no, il rettore (ha detto che) aprirà IL CONVEGNO, non la seduta.  
*no, no, the Dean (has said that) will-open he the conference, not the meeting*

- b. \*Il Rettore aprirà lui IL CONVEGNO, non la seduta.  
*the Dean will-open he the conference, not the meeting*
- (20) a. \*Giovanni QUESTO ha fatto lui.  
*Giovanni this has made he*
- b. \*QUESTO Giovanni ha fatto lui.  
*this Giovanni has done he*

The ungrammaticality of (19b) and (20) follows straightforwardly if *lui* is a postverbal subject, which is necessarily focused in Italian, and if two foci are banned from one and the same clause. It would be more difficult to account for (19b) and (20) if *lui* were an emphatic pronoun doubling the DP in preverbal subject position.

An observation to the same point concerns the properties of the material that follows the postverbal pronoun. The object constituent *il caso*, which follows the pronoun *lui* in (4b), has the same properties as the object constituent *il caso* which follows the postverbal subject *Giovanni* in (4a): in both cases, the object is destressed (the same holds for the object constituent *il convegno* in (19a)). Italian postverbal subjects are always followed by destressed constituents (cf. Cardinaletti 1998). Although the reason of this restriction in Italian is not fully comprehended (but see section 6 below), the parallel behaviour of pronouns and DPs reinforces the proposal that so-called emphatic pronouns are instances of postverbal subjects.<sup>8</sup>

Like focused subject DPs, subject pronouns may enter an alternative word order: they may follow the object, giving rise to the typical VOS order of Italian:<sup>9</sup>

- (21) a. Esaminerà il caso Giovanni.  
*will-examine the case Giovanni*

---

<sup>8</sup>. Spanish differs from Italian in that postverbal subjects can be followed by focused material (see (43) in the text below). Cf. Ordóñez (1997), (1998) for the discussion of the properties of Spanish postverbal subjects.

<sup>9</sup>. These considerations on word-order have cross-linguistic validity: so-called emphatic pronouns occur in the postverbal subject position available in the language. Catalan behaves like Italian in having VOS, while VSO necessarily contains a destressed object; Romanian only has VSO; Spanish has both VSO and VOS (cf. Solà 1992:58,fn.13; 78).

- b. Giovanni esaminerà il caso lui.  
*Giovanni will-examine the case he*
- c. Aprirà il convegno il Rettore.  
*will-open the conference the Dean*
- d. Il Rettore aprirà il convegno lui.  
*the Dean will-open the conference he*

So-called emphatic pronouns are also excluded if the subject itself is focused:

- (22) a. \*GIOVANNI interverrà lui.  
*Giovanni will-intervene he*
- b. \*E' GIOVANNI che interverrà lui.  
*[it] is Giovanni that will-intervene he*

Under the hypothesis that emphatic pronouns double the DP subject and are inserted in its trace position, (22) is again an unexpected state of affairs. Under the present proposal, (22) is a  $\theta$ -theory violation. Two DPs compete for the same  $\theta$ -role, i.e., the subject DP *Giovanni* moved to the preverbal focus position and to the cleft position, respectively, and the postverbal subject pronoun *lui*.

#### **4.2. The incompatibility with some preverbal DPs**

Non-referential DPs such as quantifiers and *wh*-phrases, as in (23), and the weak pronoun *egli* in (24) (cf. Cardinaletti 1997a) are ungrammatical with so-called emphatic pronouns:

- (23) a. \*Nessuno è venuto lui.  
*nobody has come he*
- b. \*Qualcuno è venuto lui.  
*somebody has come he*
- c. \*Chi è venuto lui?  
*who has come he?*

- (24) \*Egli interverrà lui.  
*he will-intervene he*

Given the hypothesis above, (23) and (24) are ungrammatical because non-referential DPs and the weak pronoun *egli* cannot occur in sentence-peripheral position. This restriction is illustrated in (25), where they precede the left-dislocated object *Maria*:

- (25) a. \*Nessuno Maria (non) l'ha invitata.  
*nobody Maria [he] (not) her has invited*  
 b. \*Qualcuno Maria l'ha invitata.  
*somebody Maria [he] her has invited*  
 c. \*Chi Maria l'ha invitata?  
*who Maria [he] her has invited?*  
 d. \*Egli Maria (non) l'ha invitata.  
*he Maria [he] (not) her has invited*

If the preverbal subjects of (23) and (24) were ordinary subjects doubled by an emphatic pronoun, it would be hard to account for the ungrammaticality of these sentences. (24) is a particularly interesting case. Under Burzio's analysis, it would be parallel to (17) in the analysis (18b). Since (17) is grammatical, (24) is surprisingly ungrammatical. Notice that the reason of the ungrammaticality of (24) cannot be a constraint banning the co-occurrence of two pronouns or banning the focalization of *egli*. These constraints should apply to *pro* in (18b) as well, since *egli* and *pro* belong to the same grammatical class, the class of weak pronouns (cf. Cardinaletti and Starke 1999). Whatever reason prevents *egli* from co-occurring with an emphatic pronoun should also prevent *pro* from doing the same, but only (24) is ungrammatical, while (17) is a good sentence. As said above, in the present proposal (24) is ruled out because *egli* cannot be left-peripheral.<sup>10</sup>

Notice also that the sentence *Lui interverrà lui* "he will-intervene he", displaying a strong pronoun in preverbal position, is perhaps redundant, but not

---

<sup>10</sup>. Since *pro* cannot be left-peripheral either, (i) is another impossible analysis of (17):

(i) \**pro* [<sub>IP</sub> *pro*<sub>expl</sub> viene lui].

ungrammatical. This is not surprising: strong pronouns can occur in left-peripheral position. Compare (25) with *Lui Maria l'ha invitata* “he Maria [he] her has invited”.

### 4.3. Complementizer Deletion and Aux-to-Comp

A third new empirical observation is that emphatic pronouns are ungrammatical in contexts which exclude sentence-peripheral subjects. Two such contexts are Complementizer Deletion and Aux-to-Comp constructions (cf. Cardinaletti 1997a):

- (26) a. \*Credo Gianni intervenga lui.  
           [I] think Gianni intervene-SUBJ he  
       b. \*Essendo Gianni intervenuto lui, ...  
           being Gianni intervened he, ...

The ungrammaticality of (26) follows immediately under the present proposal. It is due to the fact that the preverbal DP *Gianni* cannot be sentence-peripheral. If it occurs sentence-internally, a  $\theta$ -theory violation arises. Once again, it is hard to think of a constraint to the effect of banning emphatic pronouns from Complementizer Deletion and Aux-to-Comp constructions.

Notice that these sentences are possible both with preverbal and postverbal subjects. The subject can be either a DP or a pronoun, as usual:

- (27) a. Credo Gianni / lui intervenga.  
       b. Credo intervenga Gianni / lui.  
  
 (28) a. Essendo Gianni / lui intervenuto, ....  
       b. Essendo intervenuto Gianni / lui, ....

Following my discussion of (18), the postverbal pronouns in (27b) and (28b) are not instances of emphatic pronouns doubling a preverbal null subject, but thematic subjects on a par with the full DP *Gianni* with the same distribution. In (27b) and (28b) the preverbal position is occupied by expletive *pro*.

#### 4.4. Small clauses

Consider small clauses. They are possible both with pre-predicate and post-predicate subjects, the subject being a DP or a pronoun:

- (29) a. Ritengo [Gianni / lui intelligente].  
           [I] consider Gianni / he intelligent  
       b. Ritengo [intelligente Gianni / lui].  
           [I] consider intelligent Gianni / he

Like Complementizer-Deletion and Aux-to-Comp constructions, small clauses do not allow left-dislocated elements: cf. \**Ritengo [a Gianni Maria fedele]* derived from *Ritengo [Maria fedele a Gianni]* “[I] consider Maria faithful to Gianni”. The fulfilled prediction is that post-predicate pronouns cannot co-occur with pre-predicate DPs:

- (30) \*Ritengo [Gianni intelligente lui].  
       [I] consider Gianni intelligent he

The ungrammaticality of (30) is thus due to the wrong placement of the pre-predicate DP *Gianni*. It cannot occur in a clause-peripheral position. The alternative analysis, where *Gianni* occupies a position internal to the small clause, represents a violation of  $\theta$ -theory since two DPs, *Gianni* and *lui*, compete for one and the same  $\theta$ -role.<sup>11</sup>

Notice that this is another context where so-called emphatic pronouns do not share the same distribution as subject traces (cf. section 2.2 above). (30), repeated as (31b), contrasts with (31a): *lui* cannot occur in the position of the trace of the raised

---

<sup>11</sup>. Notice that under no theory could the post-adjectival pronoun in (29b) be analysed as an emphatic pronoun doubling a null subject. Referential null subjects are impossible in small clauses:

- (i) \*Ritengo [pro intelligente].  
       [I] consider [him] intelligent

For the ungrammaticality of referential null subjects in small clauses, cf. Rizzi (1986) and Cardinaletti and Guasti (1991).

small clause subject:<sup>12</sup>

- (31) a. Ritengo [Gianni<sub>i</sub> intelligente t<sub>j</sub>].  
           [I] consider Gianni intelligent  
       b. \*Ritengo [Gianni intelligente lui].  
           [I] consider Gianni intelligent he

Under the trace-analysis of so-called emphatic pronouns, the ungrammaticality of (30) would be at least surprising. The more so since other languages display emphatic elements in post-predicate position. Consider the following English example (from Solà 1992:172):

- (32) They consider [Bill stupid himself].

Since true emphatic pronouns are elements left floating by the raised subject DP (cf. section 7 below), they can appear in the post-predicate position of small clauses.

#### 4.5. A typological observation

The present proposal also allows us to make sense of a typological generalisation by Solà (1992). He arrives at the conclusion that Null Subject and Non-Null Subject languages have categorially different emphatic pronouns: the former languages have emphatic pronominals, the latter have emphatic anaphors.<sup>13</sup>

Given what will be concluded in section 7 below, Solà's generalisation

---

<sup>12</sup>. I take the subject of the small clause to raise from the base position (i.e., the specifier of the adjectival head) to a functional position inside the small clause (cf. Cardinaletti and Guasti 1991, 1995). The small clause predicate raises as well, as shown in sentences like (29b), where it ends up in a position which precedes the *in situ* subject.

<sup>13</sup>. In this respect, Solà's proposal differs from Burzio's (1986:110) proposal that Italian emphatic pronouns, although formally pronominals, must be regarded as anaphors.

Solà's generalisation is based on the following Null-Subject languages: Basque, Catalan, Greek, Italian, Occitan, Portuguese, Rumanian, and Spanish, and on the following Non-Null-Subject languages: Danish, English, French, German, Icelandic, Swedish, and West Flemish.



should be partly rephrased. Both types of languages have emphatic anaphors, while only Null-Subject languages have emphatic pronouns.

This generalisation follows straightforwardly from the proposal defended here that the so-called emphatic pronouns of Null-Subject languages are personal pronouns occurring in postverbal subject position. Since Non-Null-Subject languages do not have postverbal subjects, subject pronouns are not found in postverbal position.

The conclusion that postverbal subject pronouns occurring in finite clauses are instances of postverbal subjects and not of emphatic pronouns has the theoretical advantage of not stipulating a further difference between Null-Subject languages and Non-Null-Subject languages.<sup>14</sup>

##### 5. AN APPARENT COUNTEREXAMPLE

A potential counterexample to the present analysis is provided by the following Italian sentence, built on a Catalan sentence discussed by Solà (1992:147) (*Els nois s'han fet tots el llit ells*):

- (33) I ragazzi si sono fatti tutti il letto loro.  
*the children SI are made all the bed themselves*  
 “The boys have all made their bed themselves”

*Loro* in (33) cannot be a postverbal subject pronoun because floating quantifiers cannot co-occur with postverbal subjects (as pointed out by Rizzi 1987):<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>. Solà (1992:125) derives his generalisation by assuming different case-assignment properties in the two types of languages ( $\pm$ case-assignment to the postverbal subject position). This analysis cannot be accepted here. Cf. Cardinaletti (1997a) for discussion.

<sup>15</sup>. Sentence (34b) is grammatical if it is considered to be the counterpart of (33) with a null subject instead of *i ragazzi*. In order to exclude this interpretation and to force the postverbal subject interpretation of *loro*, a modifier can be added to the subject pronoun *loro*, as in (i):

- (34) a. \*Si sono fatti tutti il letto i ragazzi.  
*SI are made all the bed the children*
- b. \*Si sono fatti tutti il letto loro.  
*SI are made all the bed they*

Is *loro* in (33) an emphatic pronoun? The answer seems to be negative. *Loro* in (33) must be considered as an adverbial-like pronoun meaning “da soli” (by themselves, with no help). This usage of the pronoun *loro* is incompatible with stative predicates, which do not designate an activity. With these predicates, it cannot be claimed whether the event designated by the verb is performed by themselves or with somebody’s help:

- (35) a. \*I ragazzi amano tutti la musica loro.  
*the children love all the music themselves*
- b. \*I ragazzi si rassomigliano tutti loro.  
*the children SI resemble all themselves*

No such restriction is found with the postverbal subject pronouns discussed in the previous sections, which expectedly are compatible with any type of predicate:

- (36) a. (I ragazzi) amano la musica loro.  
*the children love the music they*
- b. (I ragazzi) si rassomigliano loro.  
*the children SI resemble they*

In conclusion, since *loro* in (33) cannot be considered an emphatic pronoun, (33) is not a counterexample to the claim that in Italian so-called emphatic pronouns are postverbal subjects.

---

(i) \*Si sono fatti tutti il letto solo loro.  
*SI are made all the bed only they*

## 6. POSTVERBAL SUBJECT PRONOUNS IN INFINITIVAL CLAUSES

I now turn to infinitival clauses, where, as pointed out in section 3.1 above, full DPs are ungrammatical but pronouns are possible. Consider the following contrasts, taken from Burzio (1986:104, 105, 114):<sup>16</sup>

- (37) a. ?\*Sperava [di intervenire Giovanni [a risolvere il problema]]. (=8)  
*hoped to intervene Giovanni to solve the problem*  
 b. Sperava [di intervenire lui [a risolvere il problema]].  
*hoped to intervene he to solve the problem*
- (38) a. \*[Andarci Giovanni] sarebbe un errore.  
*go-there Giovanni would-be a mistake*  
 b. [Andarci noi] sarebbe un errore.  
*go-there we would-be a mistake*

### 6.1. A Case-theoretic account

Following Burzio (1986:114), I interpret the ungrammaticality of (37a) and (38a) in Case-theoretic terms. Since infinitival clauses are not a context of Nominative Case checking, full DPs are excluded. But why are pronouns in (37b) and (38b) ruled in? As in (37a) and (38a), no Case is checked by the subject pronouns in (37b) and (38b). A confirmation comes from the ungrammaticality of the weak pronoun *egli* in this context. Under the hypothesis that weak pronouns must be Case-licensed in overt syntax (cf. Cardinaletti and Starke 1999), (39) represents a Case-theory violation:

---

<sup>16</sup>. This asymmetric behaviour is true of subjects internal to the infinitival clause, as in (37) and (38), where the presence of a post-subject object guarantees that the subject is clause-internal. No asymmetry is found when the subject occurs after the infinitival clause as a postverbal subject of the matrix predicate:

- (i) a. Sperava [di intervenire (a risolvere il problema)] Giovanni.  
*hoped to intervene (to solve the problem) Giovanni*  
 b. Sperava [di intervenire (a risolvere il problema)] lui.  
*hoped to intervene (to solve the problem) he*

- (39) \*Sperava [di intervenire egli [a risolvere il problema]].  
*hoped to intervene he to solve the problem*

Burzio (1986:114) suggests that the pronouns in (37b) and (38b) can survive in infinitival clauses because, being emphatic, they are non-argumental, hence they do not need to be Case-marked (in this respect they seem to differ from emphatic pronouns in finite clauses, whose Case is a property of the chain built with the preverbal subject, cf. Burzio (1986:119)).

I follow the spirit of Burzio's Case-theoretic account, not the details though. Differently from Burzio, I do not take these pronouns to be "emphatic" and non-argumental, doubling the argumental subject PRO. Rather I take them to be the thematic subject of the infinitival clause, themselves controlled by the matrix subject. They represent the only instance of overt subjects in Italian infinitives.<sup>17</sup>

Contrary to DPs, pronouns can survive in infinitival clauses because they are intrinsically Case-marked. The notion of intrinsic Case-marking can be formalised by suggesting that pronouns can check their Case feature DP-internally. Under the hypothesis that noun phrases have essentially the same structure as clauses and their highest projection is CP, which contains Case features (cf. Cardinaletti and Starke 1999:Section 5.2), I suggest that NP or DP moves to specCP to check Case. Thus, the difference between DPs and pronouns is that the latter but not the former allow DP-internal Case checking and can thus survive in contexts where DP-external Case checking does not take place.

---

<sup>17</sup>. Since expletive PRO does not seem to exist, as shown for example by the sentence in (i) taken from Belletti (1998:6, fn.16):

- (i) \*Maria è partita senza PRO essere certo che fosse necessario.  
*Maria has left without being certain that [it] was necessary*

Infinitival clauses like (37b) and (38b) should not contain any preverbal expletive PRO. It thus appears that no element occurs in preverbal subject position in this case. Although this seems to be an unwelcome consequence of the present proposal, notice that the same problem arises in languages such as Logudorese, which have full subjects in infinitival clauses (see (42) in the text below). Since the question is quite general and goes beyond the scope of this paper, I will leave it open.

As clearly shown by the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular pronoun, which distinguishes morphologically between nominative and accusative, pronouns occurring in infinitivals display nominative Case (*Andarci io /\*me sarebbe un errore* “go-there I/me would-be a mistake”). In Burzio’s words, “this forces us to assume that nominative is the unmarked form in Italian”. Similarly, Belletti (1998:6) takes nominative Case in sentences like (37b) and (38b) to be a default realization for the subject pronoun.

## 6.2. On the “Middle-field” subject position

Notice that the present analysis treats both postverbal pronouns in finite clauses and postverbal pronouns in infinitival clauses as thematic subjects. However, it is necessary to distinguish the two with respect to other properties and to conclude that *lui* in (37b) and *noi* in (38b) are not the same type of postverbal subjects as the subject pronouns occurring in finite clauses.

First, in infinitival clauses overt pronouns occur in a postverbal subject position that precedes objects, and give rise to VSO sequences:<sup>18</sup>

- (40) a. Il Rettore ha deciso [di aprire lui il convegno].  
           *the Dean has decided to open he the conference*  
       b. \*Il Rettore ha deciso [di aprire il convegno lui].  
           *the Dean has decided to open the conference he*

---

<sup>18</sup>. Sentence (40b) is grammatical with a different structure, where *lui* is the postverbal subject of the matrix predicate and the preverbal DP is left-peripheral (cf. section 3.2 above):

- (i) Il Rettore ha deciso [di aprire il convegno] lui.

In order to make sure that the subject pronoun belongs to the embedded clause, an indirect object is added in (ii). As in (40), the subject pronoun can only precede the object (notice that in (iib), given the restriction on Italian postverbal subjects mentioned in section 4.1, the dative object is distressed):

- (ii) a. Gianni ha deciso [di consegnare lui il pacco a Maria].  
           *Gianni has decided to deliver he the packet to Maria*  
       b. \*Gianni ha deciso [di consegnare il pacco lui, a Maria].

This distribution correlates with another property of overt subject pronouns occurring in infinitival clauses: contrary to postverbal subjects of finite clauses, they are not necessarily focused. This is shown by the fact that they can co-occur with a focused element. The following sentences contrast with (19) above:<sup>19</sup>

- (41) a. \*Il Rettore ha deciso [di aprire LUI il convegno, non il suo rappresentante].  
*the Dean has decided to open he the conference, not his delegate*
- b. Il Rettore ha deciso [di aprire lui IL CONVEGNO, non la seduta].  
*the Dean has decided to open he the conference, not the meeting*

To sum up: overt subject pronouns occurring in infinitival clauses are not to be assimilated to postverbal subject pronouns. They have a different distribution, which correlates with different focus properties.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>. Pronouns occurring in infinitival clauses can also be focused. Cf. the following question-answer pairs, taken from Belletti (1998:6,fn.15):

- (i) A: Chi pensa di parlare a Gianni?  
*who thinks to speak to Gianni?*
- B: Penso di parlare io a Gianni.  
*(I) think to speak (I) to Gianni*

Notice that in B., the presence of the distressed object *a Gianni* guarantees that the subject *io* belongs to the infinitival clause (cf. fn. 16).

Since overt subject pronouns occurring in infinitival clauses need not be focused, the ungrammaticality of (39) cannot be attributed to the impossibility of focusing the weak pronoun *egli*.

<sup>20</sup> Consider (i), from Vincent (1999), which contains a 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular pronoun:

- (i) Vorrei chiederti se ti farebbe piacere [aprire tu il congressino].  
*[I] would-like [to]ask-you if [it] you would please [ [to] open you the workshop]*

The form *tu*, unambiguously nominative, confirms the Case generalization on subject pronouns stated in 6.1. It also allows us to construct another empirical argument for the particular status of subject pronouns found in infinitival clauses. In Italian, the form *tu* is also used in postverbal contexts: *Hai*

In order to better understand the distribution of subject pronouns in infinitival clauses, consider the fact that languages which productively display overt subjects in infinitival clauses seem to use the same subject position as the pronoun in (40). Consider the following sentences, from Logudorese, a Sardinian dialect (data thanks to the courtesy of Lucia Molinu, p.c.). As in (40), the overt subject must precede the object:

- (42) a. Kelzo a faeddare {tue / ?Pedru} kin Mario {\*tue / \*Pedru}.  
           *[I] want to speak you / Pedru with Mario*  
       b. Kelzo a bennere {tue / ?Pedru} a ddomo {\*tue / \*Pedru}.  
           *[I] want to arrive you / Pedru to home*

The pre-object subject position is also productive in Spanish finite clauses (cf. fn. 8) (from Ordóñez 1997:31):

- (43) Ayer ganó Juan la lotería.  
           *yesterday won Juan the lottery*

Ordóñez (1997:93ff) takes the subject in (43) to occupy a Neut(ral) projection

---

*vinto tu* (have won you = you have won). Thus, (i) could in principle be compatible with an analysis which takes *tu* to be a postverbal subject. In the Central Italian variety I speak, however, *tu* cannot be used in postverbal subject position, where it is replaced by *te*, identical with the accusative form of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular pronoun (cf. *Ho visto solo te* “[I] have seen only you”):

- (ii) Hai vinto \*tu / te.  
           *have won you (= you have won)*

Now, in infinitival clauses, the form *te* is ungrammatical:

- (iii) \*Vorrei chiederti se ti farebbe piacere [aprire te il congressino].  
           *[I] would-like [to]ask-you if [it] you would please [to] open you the workshop*

The ungrammaticality of (iii) confirms that in infinitival clauses, the subject pronoun is not a postverbal subject of the same type as the postverbal subject pronouns occurring in finite clauses.

(above VP and below TP) that presumably has the capacity of assigning nominative Case. Belletti (1998:15) makes a similar proposal by assuming that “languages like Spanish would dispose of an extra Case position, different from the preverbal one(s), where (nominative) Case can be assigned/checked”. Similar proposals could account for the Logudorese facts in (42).

Adopting a terminology coming from the Germanic tradition, specNeutP can be called the “Middle-field” subject position. In both Ordóñez’ and Belletti’s proposals, the absence of VSO in Italian is attributed to the lack of the functional projection hosting Middle-field subjects. This proposal however fails to account for overt pronominal subjects in infinitival clauses, as in (37b) and (38b).

A partially different hypothesis, which also accounts for (37b) and (38b) and, furthermore, is compatible with the universal clause structure view defended in Cinque (1999), is to attribute the difference between Spanish and Italian not to a difference in structure, but to a difference in the properties of the relevant functional head. Suppose that in Italian, NeutP is also structurally present, but it does not have the capacity of checking Nominative case. In Italian finite clauses, subjects must be raised all the way up to specIP to overtly satisfy nominative Case checking. Under the hypothesis that checking is a requirement on the checking head (cf. Chomsky 1995, Cardinaletti 1997b), both (44a) containing a pronoun and (44b) containing a DP are ungrammatical because the Case features of the Inflection head are not checked (see also (19b) above):<sup>21</sup>

- (44) a. \*Apre lui il convegno.  
           *opens he the conference*  
       b. \*Apre Giovanni il convegno.  
           *opens Giovanni the conference*

In Italian infinitival clauses, however, specNeutP can be occupied by intrinsically case-marked subject pronouns. (The further constraint operative in Italian, but not in Logudorese, that the overt pronoun in (37b) and (38b) be controlled by the matrix subject will not be discussed here). Hence, we get the contrast between pronouns

---

<sup>21</sup>. Economy restrictions on derivations forbid that a subject raised overtly to specNeutP raises covertly to specIP. Postverbal subjects occurring in the base specVP position before Spell-Out – cf. fn. 2 – can check Case covertly, see Chomsky (1995) and Cardinaletti (1997b).



and DPs observed in (37) and (38) above. The structure of e.g. (40) is the following:<sup>22</sup>

(45) Il Rettore ha deciso [<sub>CP</sub> di aprire<sub>v</sub> [<sub>NeutP</sub> lui<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>v</sub> il convegno]]]

Since they make use of a postverbal subject position, overt subject pronouns in infinitival clauses are restricted to Null-Subject languages and ungrammatical in Non-Null-Subject languages, as shown by English in (46a). The latter can only make recourse to the floating construction (46b) (from Solà 1992:191), to which I turn in section 7 below:

- (46) a. \*John decided [to do it him] / [to do him it].  
 b. John decided [to do it himself].

---

<sup>22</sup>. An alternative to be explored is that there is more than one Middle-field subject position: one specialized to host pronouns and the other specialized for DPs. Independent evidence for the existence of two Middle-field subject positions comes from Hebrew. In negative equative sentences, only pronominal subjects are allowed (cf. Shlonsky 1999:312):

- (i) a. 'eyn hi gveret Levi.  
       *not she Mrs. Levi*  
       "she is not Mrs. Levi"  
       b. \* 'eyn Rina gveret Levi.  
       *not Rina Mrs. Levi*

As suggested by Shlonsky, in (i) the Middle-field subject position devoted to DPs is occupied by the predicative DP *gveret Levi*, which bans the occurrence of a DP subject, but not of a pronominal subject.

To account for the similar contrast found in (37) and (38), the suggestion can be made that in Italian infinitival clauses, only the highest Middle-field position is accessible to (pronominal) subjects, while in Spanish finite clauses both Middle-field subject positions are available. Further comparative research is however needed in order to understand the massive language variation in the postverbal subject positions (whereas preverbal subject positions seem to be more uniform across languages, cf. Cardinaletti 1997a).



- (50) a. [Lui stesso] è venuto.  
*he self has come*  
 b. È venuto [lui stesso].  
*has come he self*
- (51) a. [Gianni stesso] è venuto.  
*Gianni self has come*  
 b. È venuto [Gianni stesso].  
*has come Gianni self*

I take (50b) to contain a postverbal modified subject pronoun, on a par with the modified subject DP in (51b). Sentences such as *Gianni è venuto lui stesso* are parallel to (50b), with an extra left-peripheral DP.

---

Like *stesso*, *in persona* cannot be stranded under subject raising (ii) and cannot precede the DP it modifies, (iii):

- (ii) a. \*Lui<sub>i</sub> / Il Rettore<sub>i</sub> è venuto [ t<sub>i</sub> stesso].  
 b. \*Lui<sub>i</sub> / Il Rettore<sub>i</sub> è venuto [ t<sub>i</sub> in persona].
- (iii) a. \*[Stesso lui / il Rettore] è venuto.  
 b. \*È venuto [stesso lui / il Rettore].  
 c. \*[In persona lui / il Rettore] è venuto.  
 d. \*È venuto [in persona lui / il Rettore].

*In persona* differs from *di persona*, which is a DP-external modifier, parallel to the adverb *personalmente* (personally):

- (iv) a. \*[Lui / Il Rettore di persona / personalmente] è venuto.  
*he / the Dean of person / personally is come*  
 b. Lui / Il Rettore è venuto di persona / personalmente.  
*he / the Dean is come of person / personally*  
 c. È venuto di persona / personalmente lui / il Rettore.  
*is come of person / personally he / the Dean*

Modified pronouns can also appear in the position between auxiliary and past participle, (52a). This position is not open to full DP subjects, as shown by (52b):<sup>24</sup>

- (52) a. Gianni ha lui stesso fatto questo.  
           *Gianni has he self done this*  
       b. \*Ha Gianni (stesso) fatto questo.

*Lui stesso* can also occur with simple tenses, in a position between the main verb and the object. Once again, full DPs are ungrammatical in this context:

- (53) a. Gianni fa lui stesso questo.  
           *Gianni does he self this*  
       b. \*Fa Gianni (stesso) questo.

In (52a) and (53a), the pronoun is necessarily accompanied by the anaphoric modifier *stesso*. Consider the ungrammatical (54):<sup>25</sup>

- (54) a. \*Gianni ha lui fatto questo.  
           *Gianni has he done this*  
       b. \*Gianni fa lui questo.  
           *Gianni does he this*

Thus, *lui stesso* in (52a) and (53a) is morphologically different from postverbal subject pronouns, which need not be modified by *stesso*. I take *lui stesso* in (52a) and (53a) to be a true emphatic element. As in English, Italian emphatic elements contain an anaphoric modifier, *stesso*. Along the lines of Sportiche's (1988) analysis of floating quantifiers, emphatic elements are left floating by DP movement to

---

<sup>24</sup>. Sentence (52a) is taken from Solà (1992:62,fn.20), where it is attributed to Luigi Rizzi.

<sup>25</sup>. (54a) and (54b) are also ungrammatical under the analysis in which *lui* is the thematic subject (while *Gianni* is a left-peripheral DP). As shown by (52b) and (53b), the position between the auxiliary and the past participle is not available to subject DPs.

Notice that (54b) must be read with focus on the object. If the subject pronoun is focused and the object is destressed, this sentence is parallel to (19a) above.

specIP (cf. Solà 1992:68ff):<sup>26</sup>

- (55) a. Gianni<sub>i</sub> ha [t<sub>i</sub> lui stesso] fatto questo.  
 b. John<sub>i</sub> has [t<sub>i</sub> himself] done it.

Emphatic elements can also follow the past participle, but in this case they follow the object as well (English examples from Solà 1992:57; 58,fn.13):

- (56) a. ??Gianni<sub>i</sub> ha fatto [t<sub>i</sub> lui stesso] questo.

---

<sup>26</sup>. Here, I will not analyse the cross-linguistic difference concerning the morphological make-up of emphatic elements. Only notice that the facts do not enter the generalisation discussed in section 4.5. above, because they cut across Null-Subject and Non-Null-Subject languages. Whereas in English, French and Rumanian the modifier is accompanied by a pronominal both when it is DP-internal and when it is stranded (examples from Solà 1992:69,fn.28; 73), in Italian the anaphoric modifier *stesso* is accompanied by the pronominal *lui* only when it is stranded (cf. (51)):

- (i) a. [John \*(him)self] did the work.      a': John<sub>i</sub> did the work [t<sub>i</sub> \*(him)self].  
 b. [Jean \*(lui)-meme] a fait cela.      b': Jean<sub>i</sub> a fait cela [t<sub>i</sub> \*(lui)-meme].  
*Jean he self has done that*  
 c. [Ion \*(el) insusi] a scris acest      c': Ion<sub>i</sub> a scris [t<sub>i</sub> \*(el) insusi] acest project.  
 project.  
*Ion he self has written this project*  
 d. [Gianni (\*lui) stesso] ha fatto il      d': Gianni<sub>i</sub> ha [t<sub>i</sub> \*(lui) stesso] fatto il lavoro.  
 lavoro.  
*Gianni he self has done the work*

Germanic languages behave like English, French and Rumanian in that the emphatic element has the same form in the two positions, but they differ from these languages in that the emphatic element only consists of the anaphoric modifier. Here, I provide a German and a Danish example, taken from Solà (1992:66):

- (ii) a. [Hans selbst] hat es gemacht.      a': Hans<sub>i</sub> hat es [t<sub>i</sub> selbst] gemacht.  
*Hans self has it done*  
 b. [Hans selv] har gjort det.      b': Hans<sub>i</sub> har gjort det [t<sub>i</sub> selv].  
*Hans self has done it*

- b. Gianni<sub>i</sub> ha fatto questo [t<sub>i</sub> lui stesso].
- (57) a. \*John<sub>i</sub> has done [t<sub>i</sub> himself] it.  
b. John<sub>i</sub> has done it [t<sub>i</sub> himself].

I take (56b) and (57b) to be obtained through VP movement across the emphatic element:

- (58) a. Gianni<sub>i</sub> ha [fatto questo]<sub>j</sub> [t<sub>i</sub> lui stesso] t<sub>j</sub>.  
b. John<sub>i</sub> has [done it]<sub>j</sub> [t<sub>i</sub> himself] t<sub>j</sub>.

If this is correct, the analysis of sentences like (50b) and *Gianni è venuto lui stesso* must be partially rephrased. These sentences are ambiguous: they can contain either a postverbal modified subject pronoun co-occurring with an extra left-peripheral DP, or a true emphatic element left stranding by the raised DP subject.

Emphatic elements are compatible with non-referential DPs. Compare (59) (from Solà 1992:70) with (23) above:

- (59) a. Everybody did the work herself / himself / themselves.  
b. Nobody did the work herself / himself / themselves.

Emphatic elements are expected to be just emphatic and not focused or contrastive, an expectation which is borne out. Contrary to the postverbal pronoun *lui* seen above in (19b), *lui stesso* is not incompatible with a contrasted element in the same clause:

- (60) a. Il Rettore ha lui stesso aperto IL CONVEGNO, non la seduta.  
*the Dean has he self opened the conference, not the meeting*  
b. Gianni ha lui stesso fatto QUESTO, non quello.  
*Gianni has he self done this, not that*  
c. Gianni fa lui stesso QUESTO, non quello.  
*Gianni does he self this, not that*

*Lui stesso* in (52a) and (53a) also differs from postverbal subjects in that it

can appear clause-internally in restructuring contexts (61) and is not excluded from Complementizer Deletion and Aux-to-Comp constructions, (62) (compare (61) with (12) and (62) with (26) above):

- (61) a. Giovanni lo è lui stesso venuto a prendere.  
*Giovanni it is he self come to fetch*  
 b. Giovanni lo viene lui stesso a prendere.  
*Giovanni it comes he self to fetch*
- (62) a. Credo Gianni intervenga lui stesso.  
*[I] think Gianni intervene-SUBJ he self*  
 b. Essendo Gianni lui stesso intervenuto, ...  
*being Gianni he self intervened, ...*

Finally, notice that a weak pronoun such as *egli*, which cannot occur as a postverbal subject, (63), can occur as emphatic, (64a). Like any emphatic element, *egli* must be modified by the anaphoric *stesso*, (64a) vs. (64b):

- (63) a. \*Gianni ha fatto egli questo / questo egli.  
*Gianni has done he this / this he*  
 b. \*Ha fatto egli questo / questo egli.  
*[he] has done he this / this he*
- (64) a. Gianni ha egli stesso fatto questo.  
 b. \*Gianni ha egli fatto questo.  
*Gianni has he (self) done this*

Since they are floating elements, emphatic elements are not restricted to finite clauses. They can also occur in infinitival clauses, where they are stranded by the raised PRO subject. *Egli* and a null subject in the matrix clause are possible (compare (65b,c) with (24) above):

- (65) a. Gianni crede [di PRO aver lui stesso fatto questo].  
*Gianni thinks to have he self done this*

- b. Egli crede [di PRO aver lui stesso fatto questo].  
*he thinks to have he self done this*
- c. pro crede [di PRO aver lui stesso fatto questo].  
*[he] thinks to have he self done this*

However, emphatic elements cannot occur in the preverbal position of raising complements (English example from Solà 1992:233):

- (66) a. \*Gianni sembra [lui stesso aver fatto questo].  
 b. \*John seems [himself to have done it].

The preverbal position of raising complements is not a position for floating elements:

- (67) a. \*I ragazzi sembrano [tutti aver fatto questo].  
*the boys seem all [to] have done this*  
 b. \*The boys seemed [all to have done it].

## 8. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, the distribution and properties have been discussed of postverbal subject pronouns called emphatic by Burzio (1986). I have shown that they are not emphatic pronouns doubling a preverbal subject DP, but postverbal subjects that co-occur with a left-peripheral DP. This explains why they are only found in Null-Subject languages, thus making sense of part of a generalisation made by Solà (1992): he concluded that emphatic pronouns are never found in Non-Null-Subject languages.

Both types of languages have what I think qualify as true emphatic elements, which are non-thematic and consist of anaphoric elements alone or combined with a pronominal.



**REFERENCES**

- Belletti, Adriana (1998) ““Inversion” as focalization”, ms., University of Siena.
- Belletti, Adriana (1999) “Aspects of the Low IP Area”, Talk given at the Workshop on the Cartography of Syntactic Positions and Semantic Types”, Certosa di Pontignano, November 1999.
- Burzio, Luigi (1986) *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach*, Dordrecht, Reidel.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (1997a) “Subjects and clause structure”, in L. Haegeman (ed.) *The New Comparative Syntax*, Longman, London-New York, 33-63.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (1997b) “Agreement and control in expletive constructions”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 28.3, 521-533.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (1998) “A second thought on *emarginazione*: Destressing vs. “Right Dislocation””, in *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 8.2, 1-28 (to appear in G. Cinque and G. Salvi (eds.) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, The Hague).
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Maria Teresa Guasti (1991) “Epistemic Small Clauses and Null Subjects”, in *ESCOL '91. Proceedings of the Eighth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, The Ohio State University, 23-33.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Maria Teresa Guasti (1995) “Small clauses: Some controversies and issues of acquisition”, in A. Cardinaletti and M.T. Guasti (eds.) *Small Clauses. Syntax and Semantics, Volume 28*, Academic Press, New York, 1-23.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Michal Starke (1999) “The typology of structural deficiency. A case study of the three classes of pronouns”, in H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, EALT/EUROTYP 20-5, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 145-233.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Oxford University Press, New York-Oxford.
- Ordóñez, Francisco (1997) *Word Order and Clause Structure in Spanish and Other Romance Languages*, PhD Dissertation, CUNY.
- Ordóñez, Francisco (1998) “Postverbal Asymmetries in Spanish”, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 313-346.

- Rizzi, Luigi (1982) *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1986) "Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*", *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 501-557.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1987) "Three issues in Romance dialectology", Talk given at the GLOW Workshop on Dialectology, 10<sup>th</sup> GLOW Colloquium, Venice.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997) "The fine structure of the left periphery", in L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 281-337.
- Shlonsky, Ur (1999) "Subject positions and copular constructions", to appear in H. Bennis, M. Everaert and E. Reuland (eds.), *Interface strategies*, HAG, The Hague.
- Solà, Jaume (1992) *Agreement and Subjects*, PhD Dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Sportiche, Dominique (1988) "A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure", *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 425-449.
- Vincent, Nigel (1999) "Il gerundio in napoletano antico e in toscano antico", Talk given in Padua, February 1999.