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1. The Issue and some Preliminaries

This paper addresses the issue of how to characterize manner-of-motion verbs cross-linguistically, and more specifically, in Italian (a topic more fully developed in Zubizarreta & Oh (2007)). It is informative to begin by looking at manner-of-motion verbs in a serial verb language like Korean. In Korean, manner-of-motion verbs are unambiguously activity-denoting verbs; they do not encode directed motion. Compare the examples in (1) with the ones in (2). The locative -ey can denote the goal of the motion in the context of the light verbs ka- ‘go’ and o- ‘come’, as illustrated in (1). On the other hand, the locative –ey cannot denote the goal of motion in the context of manner-of-motion verbs such as run, walk, swim, fly, crawl, etc., as illustrated in (2).

(1) a. John-i pang-ey tul-e- ka-ss-ta
    John-Nom room-Loc into-L go-Past-Decl
    “John went into the room”

   b. John-i pang-ey tul-e- o-ass-ta
    John-Nom room-Loc into-L come-Past-Decl
    “John came into the room.”

(2) a. *John-i kongwen-ey talli-ess-ta
    John-Nom park-Loc run-Past-Decl
    “John ran to the park.”

Cf. John-i kongwen-eyse talli-ess-ta
    John-Nom park-Loc run-Past-Decl
    “John ran at the park”

* The material in this paper has been drawn from the book On the Syntactic Composition of Manner and Motion, MIT Press, 2007 (ML Zubizarreta & E. Oh). It appears here by permission of MIT Press.
In order to express manner-of-directed motion, Korean has recourse to the serial verb construction (SVC), exemplified in (3). In such SVC, the manner verb modifies the head of the directed motion construction, namely *ka-. We have shown elsewhere that in this type of SVC (which expresses one single event), *ka- is indeed both the morphological and the semantic head of the verbal structure.

(3) a. *John-i *kongwen-ey talli-e-ka-ss-ta
   John–Nom park-Loc run-L-go-Past-Decl
   “John ran to the park.”

b. John-i kongwen-ey kel-e ka-ss-ta
   John–Nom park-Loc walk-L go-Past-Decl
   “John walked to the park.”

It is also illuminating to note the evolution of manner-of-motion verbs in Nicaraguan Sign Language (or NSL). Senghas et al. (2004) report that the early generation of NSL, which was gestural and iconoclastic, represented manner and motion simultaneously, but that in later generations, when NSL develops into a linguistic system with discrete units and combinatorial rules, manner and path are represented sequentially. This evolution shows that the compositional nature of human languages is truly universal and suggests to us that, despite appearances, in the Dutch example in (4) and the Italian example in (5), the verb does not simultaneously encode manner and directed motion, but that at some abstract level, these two are represented independently.

(4) … dat Jan in twee uur *naar Groningen is gewandeld*  
that Jan in two hours to Groningen is walked  
“… Jan walked to Groningen in two hours.”

(5) Maria è corsa  *(fino) a casa*  in un’ora  
Maria is run-3rd p.s.fem. to the-house in an hour.  
“Maria has run to the house in an hour.”

As is well known, the apparent variable behavior of manner-of-motion verbs
in Germanic languages is exceptionless. Manner-of-motion verbs are generally activity-denoting verbs and as such, they function as unergative verbs. Indeed, as illustrated in (6a), the predicate is unbounded and it selects the *heben* auxiliary. If a goal-denoting PP is present, it has the status of an adjunct located outside the verbal projection, as shown by the contrast between (6a) and (6b).

(6)  a. *dat Jan naar Groningen twee uur lang heeft gewandeld*
    that Jan to Groningen two hours long has walked
    “… Jan walked in the direction of Groningen for two hours.”
    b. ??*dat Jan twee uur lang naar Groningen heeft gewandeld*
    that Jan two hours long to Groningen has walked

Similarly, manner-of-motion verbs in Italian are unbounded activity-denoting verbs associated with an unergative structure, as exemplified in (7). The selected auxiliary in such examples is *avere* and the temporal phrase (if present) must be unbounded.

(7)  a. *Maria ha corso fino a casa (*in un’ora)*
    Maria has run-3rd p.s.masc to the-house (in an hour)
    b. *Maria ha corso (per un’ora) fino a casa*
    Maria has run-3rd p.s.masc (for an hour) to the-house

The question then is how to account for the Dutch example in (4) and its English counterpart, as well as for the Italian example in (5). As we have mentioned earlier, there are good cross-linguistic reasons to assume that manner-of-motion verbs do not generally encode directed motion. We will therefore adopt the view that examples such as (4) and (5) are associated with a directed motion structure headed by an empty verbal head and that the manner-of-motion verb is a modifier of such a structure. Cf. also Mateu (2002). Two questions then arise:

(8)  1. First, why is the verbal head in the structures associated with (4) and (5) empty, in contrast with the Korean example in (3)?
    2. Second, why is the variable behavior of manner-of-motion verbs exceptionless in Germanic, but lexically-restricted in Italian?

Indeed, we know that in Italian only a relatively small sub-set of manner-of-motion verbs show the variable behavior exemplified by (5) and (7). As shown in (9), *camminare* ‘to walk’ does not exhibit such variability, and this is also
true for many other manner-of-motion verbs in Italian.

(9) a. Maria a camminato  (fino a casa)
    Maria has walked-3rd p.s.fem (to the house)
    “Maria has walked (to the house).”

    b. *Maria è camminata  (fino a casa)
    Maria is walked-3rd p.s.fem. (to the house)

Before we address the questions in (8), we must make explicit a few preliminary assumptions. Following Hale & Keyser (2002), we assume the existence of some basic syntactic structures, which encode eventive meanings like directed motion and causation of directed motion, and we refer to these as l-structures. The l-structure that encodes directed motion is given in (10) and the one that encodes causation of directed motion is given in (11). In this paper, we will only be concerned with the structure in (10). Note that we assume with Hale & Keyser op.cit. and other authors that a path-denoting PP has a complex structure whether or not it is realized overtly as such. More precisely, it is assumed that a path-denoting PP consists of a locative P embedded under a directional P.

(10) [ D [ V [ P_{dir} [ P_{loc} …]]]] (directed motion structure)
(11) [ D [ v [ D [ V [ P_{dir} [ P_{loc} …]]]]]] (cause directed motion structure)

Furthermore, we assume that a lexical item is composed of a number of different information: a pointer to a concept (call it C-feature), a bundle of phonological features (call it P-features), and possibly some formal features such as tense in the case of verbs. We also assume that a lexical item specifies the type of l-structure that it instantiates. Thus, arrive, depart, run, break, eat, love, fear, etc. are just convenient short-hand labels for complex objects. And not all the properties of lexical items are relevant to the syntactic composition of phrases. In particular, P-features and C-features are not. On the other hand, the l-structure that a lexical item instantiates (along with its formal features) play a fundamental role in the syntactic computation.

With this background in mind, we put forward the hypothesis that the verbs go and come (like ka- and o- in Korean) are not listed in the lexicon. They are the spell-out of V in a particular syntactic context; see (12)-(14):

(12) V is spelled out as go or come when it functions as the head of a “bare” directed motion construction, namely as go if P expresses a path away from the speaker and as come if P expresses a path towards the speaker.
A “bare” directed motion construction is one in which the structure that encodes directed motion, namely the structure in (10), is contained in a phase domain with no phonologically specified verbal head.

(14) CP and the highest verbal phrase in the (extended) l-structure are phases and phases constitute the domain of spell-out. (On phase domain as equivalent to spell-out domain, see Fox & Pesetsky (2004)).

We now return to the case of manner and directed motion. Obviously, there is something in common between the Germanic example in (4) and the Korean examples in (3). In both cases, the manner verb modifies the head of the directed motion construction, giving rise to a tight semantic relation between the two. In Korean, this is obtained by adjoining the l-structure of the manner verb to the head of the directed motion construction via the Generalized Transformation (GT) in (15):

(15) Merge a verbal l-structure with the head of another verbal l-structure.

Each verbal l-structure in an SVC constitutes an independent phase domain. Spell-out crucially applies to each verbal phase domain prior to the application of the GT stated in (15). Hence, the V that heads the directed motion l-structure gets phonologically realized. But (15) is not part of the grammar of Germanic languages. If it were, we should expect sentences like *They run go to the market*. However, Germanic has another mechanism which can achieve the same results. This is the productive use of Compound Rule (16):

(16) Merge two lexical categories of the same category type.

Snyder (1995), Snyder (2001), Beck & Snyder (2001) argued that the existence of resultatives in Germanic (such as the directed motion construction under discussion) is related to the productive use of compounds of the same category type (such as N-N compounding). We endorse here such a correlation.

While overt V-V compounding is virtually inexistent in Germanic (presumably for principled reasons that we will not discuss here), the Compound Rule (16) is co-opted in Germanic to compose “manner” and “directed motion”. This is achieved by merging a fully specified lexical item (such as *dance, wobble, and run*) with a category V with no P-features and no C-features, as exemplified in (17).

(17) a. [dance V]
    b. [wobble V]
Such compounds can then function as the head of the directed motion construction, as shown in (18). (The PPpath is a short-hand notation for the complex PP structure in (10).)

(18) \[...[VP John [ [V wobbles V] [PPpath to the door ]]]\]

If the lexical verb were absent in (18), V would be spelled-out as go by Rule (12). On the other hand, V fails to be spelled-out if there is another verbal head in the l-structure that contains phonological material. This is indeed the case in (18). The presence of *wobbles* blocks spell-out Rule (12) from applying.

It has been noted by Talmy 1985 that Romance, unlike Germanic, does not generally allow manner-of-motion verbs to take a directional complement and to function as bounded predicates. Many other scholars that have investigated this topic have come to the same conclusion, among them Aske (1989), Morimoto (2001), Mateu (2002). We assume here that this is due to the fact that Romance (unlike Germanic) lacks a productive use of Compound Rule (16). Indeed, as noted by Roeper, Snyder & Hiramatsu (2002), N-N compounds in Romance (unlike N-N compounds in Germanic) can only have a fixed idiomatic meaning. To illustrate, consider the French compound *homme sandwich* and its English counterpart. In French, *homme sandwich* can only refer to a man that displays an advertisement board on the chest and on the back. In English, the compound *sandwich man* has an open-ended interpretation. For this reason, compounds like those in (17), which contain an empty V, cannot be interpreted in Romance. An idiomatic meaning can only be attributed to the combination of overt lexical items. It is then all the more pressing to understand how examples like (5) in Italian are generated. We now turn to this question, which is the focus of this paper.

2. Manner-of-motion verbs in Italian

Folli (2001) distinguishes three distinct classes of motion verbs in Italian, cited in (19). The verbs in (19a) denote directed motion by virtue of their lexical meaning: they obligatorily take a PP directional complement, they are bounded, and they are unambiguously associated with an unaccusative structure. The verbs in (19b) are activity-denoting verbs, they are unbounded, they do not take a directional PP complement, and they are unambiguously associated with an unergative structure. The third class of verbs, given in (19c), is assumed to be polysemous. These can behave like the inherent directional verbs in (19a) (with an unaccusative structure) or like the activity-denoting verbs in (19b) (with an unergative structure).
MANNER-OF-MOTION VERBS IN ITALIAN

(19) a. *entrare* (enter), *uscire* (exit), *arrivare* (arrive), *atterrare* (land),
     *partire* (depart), *tornare* (return), *scappare* (escape)

b. *galleggiare* (float), *camminare* (walk), *galoppare* (gallop), *danzare* (dance),
    *nuotare* (swim), *sciare* (ski), *passeggiare* (walk around),
    *vagabondare* (wander)

c. *correre* (run), *rotolare* (roll), *rimbalzare* (bounce), *scivolare* (glide, slide),
    *gattonare* (crawl), *saltare* (jump), *volare* (fly), *saltellare* (hop)

The challenge is to account in a principled way for the subset of verbs that have
a variable behavior in Italian, namely those in (19c). (We note though that
there are some idiolectal variations as to which verbs belong to this class. For
our informants, the directed motion reading is difficult to obtain with
*gattonare*. This could be due to variability in frequency of usage.)

The verbs in (19c) are typically unergative verbs and as such they select the
auxiliary *avere* ‘have’, as illustrated in (20).

(20) a. Maria ha corso nel parco
     “Maria has run in the park.”

b. Maria ha saltato per due ore
     “Maria has jumped for two hours.”

c. L’aereo ha volato per due ore
     “The plane has flown for two hours.”

d. La rana ha saltellato per la stanza
     “The frog has hopped around the room.”

e. La palla ha rimbalzato per dieci secondi
     “The ball has bounced for ten seconds.”

f. Il bambino ha gattonato per la stanza
     “The child has crawled around the room.”

When these verbs are combined with a goal-denoting PP, the resulting
forms have the characteristics of unaccusatives; i.e. they select the auxiliary
*essere* ‘be’ to form the past perfect and they trigger participial agreement:

(21) a. Maria è corsa a casa
     Maria is run-3rd.p.s..fem. home

b. Maria è saltata nella piscina
     Maria is jumped-3rd. p.s.fem. into the pool

c. Maria è volata a Parigi
     Maria is flown-3rd p.s.fem. to Paris
Another well-known characteristic of unaccusatives is that they can appear in the absolutive construction. Compare the unaccusative *arrivare* in (22b) with the unergative *telefonare* in (23b).

(22) a. *Maria è arrivata* a casa
   Maria is arrived-3rd p.s.fem. home
   “Maria has arrived home.”
   b. i. *(Una volta) arrivata Maria a casa,*...
   ii. *(Una volta) arrivata* a casa *Maria,*...
      (Once) arrived-3rd p.s.fem (Maria) home (Maria),…

(23) a. *Maria ha telefonato a casa*
   “Maria has telephoned home.”
   b. i. *(Una volta) telefonata Maria a casa,*...
   ii. *(Una volta) telefonata* a casa *Maria,*...
      (Once) phoned-3rd p.s.fem. (Maria) home (Maria),…

The manner-of-motion verbs in (21) (*correre, saltare, saltellare*) can also appear in the absolutive construction, although there is apparently a slight contrast between the word orders VSPP and VPPS. With these verbs, the VSPP order in the absolutive construction is less than perfect. The presence of the adverb *una volta* ‘once’ facilitates the availability of the absolutive forms with these verbs in the case of the unmarked word order VSPP:

(24) a. *Una volta corsa Maria a casa,*...
   b. *Una volta corsa* a casa *Maria,*...
      Once ran-3rd p.s.fem. (Maria) to the-house (Maria),…

(25) a. *Una volta saltata Maria nella piscina,*...
   b. *Una volta saltata* nella piscina *Maria,*...
      Once jumped-3rd p.s.fem. (Maria) into the pool (Maria),…

(26) a. *Una volta volata Maria a Parigi,*...
   b. *Una volta volata* a Parigi *Maria,*...
      Once flown-3rd p.s.fem. (Maria) to Paris (Maria),…

(27) a. *Una volta saltellata la rana nella trappola,*…
   b. *Una volta saltellata* nella trappola *la rana,*…
      Once hopped-3rd p.s.fem. (the frog) into the-trap (the frog),…
The manner-of-motion verbs *correre, saltare, saltellare* are agentive in character; they require some volitionality on the part of the subject. These verbs contrast with manner-of-motion verbs *rotolare* ‘to roll’, *scivolare* ‘to slide’, *rimbalzare* ‘to bounce’, which are not intrinsically agentive. The adverb *una volta* ‘once’ is not needed to facilitate the absolutive construction with these verbs and the VSPP order is completely natural, as shown in (28b), (29b), and (30b). Perhaps these verbs are genuinely lexically ambiguous as proposed by Folli, although it deserves to be mentioned that some speakers much prefer the unaccusative use for the verbs *rotolare* and *scivolare*. (This is also true for their Spanish and French counterparts.)

(28) a. *La palla è rotolata sotto il tavolo*
   The ball is rolled under the table
b. *Rotolata la palla sotto il tavolo*,...
c. *Rotolata sotto il tavolo la palla*,...
   Rolled (the ball) under the table (the ball),...

(29) a. *La moneta è scivolata nel buco*
   The coin has slid in-the hole
b. *Scivolata la moneta nel buco*,...
c. *Scivolata nel buco la moneta*,...
   Slid (the coin) into the-hole (the coin),...

(30) a. *La palla è rimbalzata addirittura sotto quel tavolo*
   The ball has bounced even under that table
b. *Rimbalzata la palla sotto quel tavolo*.....
c. *Rimbalzata sotto quel tavolo la palla*,...
   Bounced (the ball) under that table (the ball),...

Following the compositional approach developed in the present work, we suggest that while the non-agentive verbs *rotolare, scivolare*, and possibly *rimbalzare*, can actually instantiate a directed motion construction by virtue of their lexical meaning, the agentive verbs *correre, volare, saltare, saltellare, gattonare* cannot. These are unambiguously activity-denoting verbs. We therefore need an alternative account of the sentences in (21). To this end, we put forth the hypothesis in (31):

(31) Italian recruits the auxiliary position designated for the motion-class of ‘restructuring’ verbs in order to compose “directed motion” and “manner” in some lexically-restricted cases.
As is well-known, Italian and Spanish (but not Modern French) have a class of modals (e.g. potere ‘can’, dovere ‘must’, volere ‘want’), aspectual verbs (e.g. cominciare ‘begin’, continuare ‘continue’, solere ‘used to’), and motion verbs (e.g. venire ‘come’, andare ‘go’, tornare ‘return’) that trigger a phenomenon known as restructuring. We shall refer to these as the R-verbs (or $V_R$). Both in Italian and Spanish, the R-verbs give rise to clitic-climbing and long object-preposing in middle constructions. But even more remarkably, in Italian, these verbs trigger an “auxiliary-switch”, as illustrated by the examples in (32) (from Rizzi 1978). In a restructuring context (such as (32b)), the lowest verb (or more precisely, the I-structure of the lowest verb) determines the choice of auxiliary. In (32b), the lowest V is venire, which heads an unaccusative-structure and selects the auxiliary essere.

(32) a. Maria ha dovuto venirci molte volte
   Maria has modal come+loc.Cl many times
   “Maria has had to come there many times.”

b. Maria c’è dovuta venire molte volte
   Maria loc.Cl+is modal come many times

c. *?Maria ci ha dovuto venire molte volte
   Maria loc.Cl+has modal come many times

We suggest that the choice of auxiliary is what makes such recruitment process robust in Italian and gives a clear signal to the learner that a position designated for the motion R-verbs has been extended to a particular subset of manner-of-motion verbs.

Cinque 2004 (among many others) argues extensively for the functional or auxiliary status of R-verbs. Cinque develops a very fine-grained hierarchy of functional projections for the clause and locates different semantic sub-classes of R-verbs within such hierarchy. We will not dwell on that issue here, but will assume at least three main positions for R-verbs (some of which are recursive). These are the modals ($V_{MOD}$), the aspectuals ($V_{ASP}$), and the motion verbs ($V_{MT}$). Hopefully, the relative order (or scope) of these three classes of R-verbs (shown in (33)) will follow from their semantics.

(33) $[V_{MOD} \ [V_{ASP} \ [V_{MT} \ […V_{LEX}…]]]]$

Example (34) (from Rizzi 1978) illustrates all three types of R-verbs.

(34) Maria li avrebbe potuto stare per
   Maria acc.Cl would-have-been able (Mod) to be on the point (Asp) of
Returning to the unergative *correre*-class of verbs, these cannot license the presence of the auxiliary *essere*, nor can they license the presence of a goal-denoting argument. The presence of these elements indicates the presence of a directed motion structure headed by an empty V. Where then is *correre* located in the structure? We suggest that *correre* (as well as other agentive manner verbs in that class) recruits the position for motion R-verbs in (33). The structure of the sentence in (5), prior to undergoing Merge with T, will then be as shown in (36). In that structure, *correre* modifies the directed motion structure headed by an empty V. Furthermore, we make the assumption stated in (35), namely that the verbal phase in Italian is extended to the projection of the motion R-verb. Consequently, the verbal head of the directed motion construction remains phonologically unspecified. Indeed, recall that *go*, as well as its Italian counterpart *andare*, are the spell-out of the verbal head of the directed motion construction. Recall that this rule fails to apply when there is another verbal head within the phase that contains the directed motion construction (see (13)), which is indeed the case in (36). Recall furthermore that in restructuring contexts, the choice of auxiliary is determined by the I-structure of the most embedded verb, which in this case is the empty V.

(35) In Italian the verbal phase is extended to the V_MT projection.
(36) [Vasp è [VMT corsa [V Maria [ V [PPpath a casa]]]]]

The question is whether there is some evidence for the proposed analysis. More precisely, is there evidence that *correre* and other verbs in that class have the same syntactic status as the motion R-verbs when used in the directed motion construction? Some evidence is provided by the phenomenon of final -e deletion discussed by Cardinaletti & Shlonsky (2004) (C&S). These authors persuasively argue that there are two types of R-verbs: functional R-verbs (namely, the modals) and semi-functional R-verbs (these are the aspectuals, verbs of motion, and causatives). The semi-functional R-verbs have some properties of lexical verbs and some properties of functional verbs. One of the properties that distinguish functional R-verbs from purely lexical verbs is the phenomenon of final –e deletion in the infinitival form. C&S argue that the
final –e in lexical verbs in the infinitive form (such as, leggere in (37a)) is the morphological reflex of a functional category F associated specifically with infinitives. Furthermore, these authors suggest that the enclitic that appears on the infinitive is associated with that same F category. Consequently, when an enclitic is attached to the infinitive, the final –e is dropped, as in (37b).

(37) a. *Li ho voluti legger*(e) a Maria = C&S (63)
   them-have wanted read to Maria
   “I wanted to read them to Maria.”
   b. *Ho voluti leggerli a Maria

In other words,

(38) The final –e in infinitivals and the enclitic are in complementary distribution because they are both associated with the same functional position. C&S 2004.

It is to be noted that the phenomenon of final –e deletion under discussion is not to be confused with the phonological rule known as “troncamento” (which deletes a vowel before a consonant in certain prosodic domains). For this reason, we avoid using prepositions that begin with a consonant.

In the case of functional R-verbs (such as the modals volere, potere, or dovere), final –e deletion is obligatory, as illustrated in (39). This follows from the fact that such verbs are purely functional and therefore lack an extended functional projection.

(39) *Lo vorrei poter(*e) fare andare a prendere a Maria = C&S (57c)
   it-would want be-able make go to fetch to Maria
   “I would like to be able to make Maria go fetch it.”

On the other hand, the semi-functional R-verbs (i.e. the motion, aspectual, and causative verbs) optionally drop the final –e, as shown in (40a-b). This is due to the fact that these verbs are optionally associated with the functional category F. Furthermore, a semi-functional infinitive cannot drop its final –e if it has another semi-functional infinitive to its left that has not undergone –e deletion, as shown in (40c). This presumably follows from the fact that all verbs without an extended F category are merged above verbs that do have an extended F category.
(40) a. *Li ho voluti fare andare a prendere a Maria = C&S (64)
   (I)them-have wanted make go to fetch to Maria
   “I wanted to make Maria go fetch them.”
   b. Li ho voluti far andar(e) a prendere a Maria
   c. *Li ho voluti fare andar a prendere a Maria

If the analysis we proposed for *correre* in (36) is correct, it predicts that this and others verbs in the same class should behave like the motion R-verb *andare*, i.e. it should trigger optional final –e deletion in the same contexts that *andare* does. According to our informants, the prediction is borne out; see (41)-(44). Note in particular the contrasts between the second and third forms in these paradigms, comparable to 2nd vs. 3rd forms in (40).¹

(41) a. *Li ho voluti fare correr(e) a prendere a Maria
   (I) them-have wanted make run to fetch to Maria
   “I have wanted to make Maria run fetch them.”
   b. Li ho voluti far correr(e) a prendere a Maria
   c. *Li ho voluti fare correr a prendere a Maria
   d. Li ho fatti correr(e) a casa
   them-have made run home
   “I made them run home.”

(42) a. Li ho voluti fare volar e a prendere a Maria
   them-have wanted make fly to fetch to Maria
   “I have wanted to make Maria fly fetch them.”
   b. Li ho voluti far volar(e) a prendere a Maria
   c. *Li ho voluti fare volar a prendere a Maria
   d. Li ho fatti volar(e) a casa
   them-have made fly home
   “I have made them fly home.”

(43) a. Li ho voluti fare saltare in braccio a te
   them-have wanted make jump onto lap yours
   “I have wanted to make them jump onto your lap.”

¹ A reviewer finds (41a-c) and (42a-c) ungrammatical. The contrast between *Maria li è corsa a prendere and Maria è corsa a prenderli* is also noted. In these sentences, *a prenderli* functions as the goal argument of an embedded unaccusative null V, which accounts for the choice of auxiliary and the impossibility of clitic climbing. It is possible that the reviewer only admits such an analysis for the cases under discussion in the text, and does not allow for an analysis in which *prendere* functions as the most embedded V in the R-verbal complex. It is also possible that there are regional phonological variations that affect the judgements on e-deletion (A. Cardinaletti, p.c.).
b. Li ho voluti far saltar(e) in braccio a te

c. ?*Li ho voluti fare saltar in braccio a te

d. Li ho fatti saltar(e) in braccio a te

   them-have made jump onto lap your
   “I have made them jump onto your lap”

(44)   a. L’ho lasciato saltellar(e) in una trappola

   (I) them-have let hop into a trap
   “I have let them hop into a trap.”

   b. Li ho voluti far saltellar(e) in una trappola

   them-have wanted make hop into a trap
   “I have wanted to make them hop into a trap.”

   c. ?*Li ho voluti fare saltellar in una trappola

More to the point, arrivare, being unambiguously a lexical verb, does not allow final –e deletion, no more than telefonare does:

(45)   Gianni è voluto arrivar*(e) a casa tard

   Gianni is wanted arrive home late
   “Gianni has wanted to arrive home late.”

(46)   Gianni ha potuto telefonar*(e) a casa

   Gianni has been able phone home
   “Gianni has been able to phone home.”

On the other hand, the possibility of final –e deletion with manner-of-motion verbs should vary with the interpretation. Indeed, we predict that in a “restructuring context” in which a manner-of-motion verb is associated with a directed motion reading, final –e deletion should be possible, while in a “restructuring context” in which a manner-of-motion verb is associated with an activity reading, final –e deletion should not be possible. According to our informants, the predicted contrasts, although subtle, do exist. The contrast is exemplified in (47) with correre (for further examples, see Zubizarreta & Oh (2007).

(47)   a. Gianni ha potuto correr*(e) a Boston, alla maratona (loc.)

   Gianni has been-able run in Paris, in-the marathon
   “Gianni has been able to run in Boston, in the marathon.”

   b. Gianni è potuto correr(e) a Boston (dir.)

   Gianni is been-able run to Boston
   “Gianni has been able to run to Boston.”
We conclude that the verbs in the *correre*-class have the grammatical status of a semi-functional category when they appear in the directed motion construction.

3. Some final remarks and conclusion

We stated in (35) that, in Italian, the verbal phase can be extended to include the motion R-verb, thus giving rise to structures such (36). The question then arises as to why it cannot be extended beyond the motion R-verb to include higher functional categories, such as the modal R-Verb. One possibility is that if “phasal extension” occurs, it can do so only minimally within the functional hierarchy in (33). More precisely, we can entertain the hypothesis in (48):

(48) Only the verbal functional category immediately above the lexical verb in the schema in (33) can be included in the verbal phase.

Interestingly, Wurmbrand 2004 argues that in German there are two types of “restructuring”: one functional (in which the “restructuring” verb has a functional status as suggested by Cinque) and one lexical (in which the “restructuring” verb is a lexical verb that takes a small VP complement), and that, furthermore, only the modal verbs have a functional status. Therefore, for German, the schema in (33) should be replaced by the one in (49):

(49) $[\text{V} Mod \ldots \text{V}lex\ldots]$ (German)

If Wurmbrand is correct and if indeed “phasal extension”, when it occurs, can only be extended to include the functional verb immediately above the lexical verb, then we can expect to find among the Germanic languages a spell-out domain that includes the modal R-Verb. The prediction is borne out. Van Riemsdijk 2002 has provided evidence for the existence of a phonologically empty verb in the directed motion construction in Dutch, German, and Swiss German in the context of modals, illustrated in (50) and (51). One of the arguments that van Riemsdijk puts forth in favor of an empty V is that it explains a number of word order puzzles, such as the apparent right-edge position of directional PPs in subordinate clauses, as shown in (51). Indeed, if the PPs in these examples are to the left of an empty final V, then the observed word order is readily accounted for.
(50) a. Du darfst nach house (German)
you may to home
“You may <go> home.”

b. Moeten wij nog de stad in (Dutch)
must we still the town in
“Do we still need <to go> to town?”

(51) a. ….wil si het muese i d scheul (Swiss German)
because she would-have-had-to into the school
“…because she should have <gone> to school.”

b. …das mer noni hand doorfe hai
that we not-yet have may(p.part) home
“…that we were not allowed <to go> home yet.”

To conclude, we have argued in favor of a syntactic-based compositional analysis of manner and motion within the verbal phase. This can be overtly observed in SVC languages. Germanic languages (which are not SVC languages) make use of the Compound Rule to compose manner and motion. The Romance languages cannot do so because in Romance compounding is lexically-determined and semantically frozen. Italian recruits the functional position for verbs of motion in “restructuring” structures to compose manner and directed motion in some lexically restricted cases.
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