

Italian *faire-infinitives*: the special case of *volere**

Norma Schifano (University of Cambridge), Michelle Sheehan (Anglia Ruskin University)

Abstract

The first aim of this squib is to show that, under the correct syntactic configuration, *volere* ‘want’ can be embedded in Italian *faire-infinitives* (FI), contrary to traditional claims. Secondly, we show that want-FIs exhibit peculiar properties: (i) they disallow a full DP causee; (ii) they permit intermediate cliticisation onto *volere*; (iii) they allow optional splitting of clitic clusters, and (iv) they marginally permit an accusative causee in transitive contexts where the object is a clitic. We attribute these effects to defective intervention which bans a full DP causee and allows the creation of a biclausal ECM construction, where accusative is exceptionally licensed, and where the selection of a silent OBTAIN by ‘want’ creates an additional clitic position.

Keywords: Italian, *faire-infinitives*, want, clitics, ECM constructions

1. Introduction

The aim of this squib is to bring to light some curious facts regarding selection and case in the Italian *faire-infinitive* causative construction (FI) which have not, to our knowledge, been hitherto discussed. More specifically, we will show that there are contexts in which causative *fare* can embed the volitional restructuring verb *volere* ‘want’, contrary to the predictions of Cinque’s (2006) hierarchy of restructuring predicates, and more in line with biclausal analyses of causatives (see Brandi & Savoia 1990, Guasti 1993, Manzini & Savoia 2007 amongst others). Such examples have interesting syntactic properties, moreover, for which we sketch an analysis. We begin with some background on FIs in section 2. Section 3 presents the interesting syntactic properties of want-FIs. Section 4 outlines an analysis of the ban on full DP causees in terms of defective intervention. Section 5 turns to the possibility of ECM in contexts where both the object and the causee are cliticised. Section 6 addresses the splitting of the clitic cluster. Finally, section 7 concludes.

* The entire article is the result of joint work of the authors in all respects. For the administrative purposes of the Italian academia only, Norma Schifano takes responsibility for §1 to §3 and Michelle Sheehan for §4 to §7.

2. Embedding *volere* in Italian *faire-infinitives*

Based on extensive cross-linguistic evidence, Cinque (2003, 2004, 2006) proposes that functional predicates occupy dedicated positions within a strictly ordered hierarchy, as partially represented below (based on Ledgeway forthcoming):

- (1) [Mod_{Epistemic/Alethic} *dovere/potere* ... [Mod_{Volition} *volere* ...
 [Mod_{Obligation/Ability} *dovere/potere* [Mod_{Permission} *potere* ... [**Causative**
fare [Asp_{Inceptive} *cominciare* [Asp_{Andative} *andare* [Asp_{Completive} *finire* [_{VP} V . . .

Italian causative verbs like *fare* ‘make’, Cinque (2006: 72ff) places in a relatively low position, following the observation that they can be passivized (2a) but cannot embed a passive (2b), suggesting that Voice^o, which is placed very low in Cinque’s hierarchy (Cinque 1999:106), outscopes Causative^o (see (1) and smaller portion of the hierarchy in (3)):

- (2) a. Gli fu fatto leggere (Cinque 2006: 72)
 3SG.DAT= it.was made read.INF
 ‘He was made to read it’
 b. *Farò essere invitati tutti
 I.will be.INF invited all
 ‘I will make everybody be invited’
- (3) ... Voice^o > ... Causative^o > Asp_{inceptive(II)} / (Asp_{continuative(II)}) >
 Andative^o > Asp_{completive(II)} (based on Cinque 2006: 76)

A strong prediction of this approach is that restructuring verbs higher than Voice should not be able to be embedded under a causative verb. This is certainly the case for *avere/essere/venire* (Burzio 1986; Guasti 1993, 1996; Folli & Harley 2007):

- (4) *Farò aver riparato la macchina a Gianni, per domani
 I.will.make have repaired the car to Gianni by tomorrow
 (Guasti 1996: 298)
 Intended: ‘I will make Gianni have repaired the car by tomorrow’

The expectation also seems to be borne out by the data reported by Cinque (2006: 72ff) (see also Burzio 1981: 587). Compare (5), where *volere*, *dovere*, and *potere* apparently cannot be embedded under *fare* with (6), where aspectual *cominciare* ‘begin’, *andare* ‘go’ and *finire* ‘finish’, which are lower in (1), can be:

- (5) a. *La feci **voler** leggere a tutti
 3SG.ACC= I.made want.INF read.INF to everyone
 (Cinque 2006: 72-73)
 ‘I made everybody want to read it’
- b. *Lo faranno **dover** ammettere anche
 3SG.ACC= they.will.make must.INF admit.INF also
 a Gianni
 to G.
 ‘They will make Gianni too have to admit it’
- c. *Lo farò **poter** leggere a tutti
 3SG.ACC= I.will.make can.INF read.INF to everyone
 ‘I will make everybody be able to read it’
- (6) a. Gliela fecero **cominciare** a costruire
 3SG.DAT=3SG.ACC= they.made begin.INF to build.INF
 (Cinque 2006: 74)
 ‘They had him begin to build it’
- b. Ce lo fecero **andare** a prendere
 1PL.DAT= 3SG.ACC= they.made go.INF to fetch.INF
 subito
 immediately
 ‘They made us go and fetch it immediately’
- c. La fecero **finire** di costruire a Gianni
 3SG.ACC= they.made finish.INF of build.INF to G.
 ‘They had Gianni finish building it’

It is possible, however, to construct different examples with *volere*, which are far more acceptable:¹

- (7) a. È la cosa che ti fa **voler** scrivere la
 it.is the thing that 2SG.DAT= makes want.INF write.INF the
 storia
 history
 ‘It is the thing that makes you want to write history’
- b. Sono sicuro di non sapere, Herr Issyvoo, cosa
 I.am sure of not know.INF H. I. what
 le fa **voler** lasciare Berlino
 3SG.DAT= makes want.INF leave.INF Berlin
 ‘I’m sure I don’t now, Herr Issyvoo, what makes you

¹ Judgments vary considerably among speakers. The examples in (7) were retrieved from the Internet by the authors (1/09/2017). (7a)-(7b) were judged fully grammatical by 5/5 native speakers with who we carried out a preliminary questionnaire, while (7c) was judged fully grammatical by 3 of them and partially grammatical by 2. Note that the examples in (7) are also problematic also for Folli and Harley’s (2007) influential analysis of FIs as the causees are not agents.

- want to leave Berlin’
- c. E quindi, sì, questo mi fa voler
 and thus yes this 1SG.DAT= makes want.INF
 conoscere il mio vero padre, a volte
 know.INF the my real father at times
 ‘And thus, yes, this makes me want to meet my real father,
 sometimes’

One crucial difference between Cinque’s ungrammatical example in (5a) and the grammatical forms in (7) is the syntactic expression of the causee. While in (5a) the causee is realised as a full DP (cf. *a tutti*), in (7) it is cliticised onto *fare*. In what follows, we discuss this property of want-FIs and its repercussions, comparing them with prototypical FIs.

3. Want-FIs: syntactic properties

In a prototypical transitive FI like (8a), the direct object, if cliticised, must climb to *fare* (8b):

- (8) a. Il parroco fa costruire un tavolo da ping
 the priest makes build.INF a table of ping
 pong al falegname
 pong to.the carpenter
 ‘The priest makes the carpenter build a ping pong table’
 b. Il parroco **lo** fa costruire al falegname
 the priest 3SG.ACC= makes build.INF to.the carpenter
 ‘The priest makes the carpenter build it’

Similarly, the causee (S₂) if cliticised, must also climb to *fare*, being accusative with intransitive and dative with transitive caused events, as in (9):

- (9) Il parroco **gli / *lo** fa costruire un tavolo
 the priest 3SG.DAT=/ACC= makes build.INF a table
 da ping pong
 of ping pong
 ‘The priest makes him build a ping pong table’

If both the direct object and S₂ are clitics, both climb onto *fare* (10a). If only one of the two undergoes climbing, the sentence becomes ungrammatical, regardless of whether the stranded clitic is the accusative (10b) or the dative (10c), mimicking the behaviour of clitics in restructuring contexts:

- (10) a. Il parroco **glielo** fa costruire

- the priest 3SG.DAT=3SG.ACC= makes build.INF
- b. *Il parroco **gli** fa costruir**lo**
 the priest 3SG.DAT= makes build.INF.3SG.ACC=
- c. *Il parroco **lo** fa costruir**gli**
 the priest 3SG.ACC= makes build.INF.3SG.DAT=
 ‘The priest makes him build it’

If the same diagnostics are applied to what we will call ‘want-FIs’, we obtain different results. First, want-FIs with a non-pronominal S₂ are highly degraded/ungrammatical, whether the embedded object is a full DP (11a), or a clitic, and regardless of the latter’s placement (see Cinque’s 5a and 11b):

- (11) a. ?*Non so cosa fa voler lasciare Berlino
 not I.know what makes want.INF leave.INF Berlin
 al signor Herr
 to.the mister H.
 ‘I don’t know what makes Mr Herr want to leave Berlin’
- b. *Non so cosa **la** fa voler(**la**)
 not I.know what 3FSG.ACC= makes want.INF(3FSG.ACC=)
 lasciar(**la**) al signor Herr
 leave.INF(3FSG.ACC=) to.the mister H.
 ‘I don’t know what makes Mr Herr to want to leave it/her.’

Where S₂ is pronominal clitic, however, the sentence becomes grammatical, whether the clitic climbs onto *fare* (12a) or, more markedly, to *volere* (12b) (vs 12c).² Note that the S₂ clitic, as expected, obligatorily surfaces in the dative, where the object is a full DP, as this is a transitive context:

- (12) a. Non so cosa **gli** (/ ***lo**) fa voler
 not I.know what 3SG.DAT= (/3SG.ACC=) makes want.INF
 lasciare Berlino
 leave.INF Berlin
- b. (?)Non so cosa fa voler**gli** (/ ***lo**)
 not I.know what makes want.INF.3SG.DAT= (/3SG.ACC=)
 lasciare Berlino
 leave.INF Berlin
- c. *Non so cosa fa voler lasciarg**li/lo**
 not I.know what makes want.INF leave.INF.3SG.DAT=/3SG.ACC=
 Berlino
 Berlin
 ‘I don’t know what makes him want to leave Berlin’

² Further investigation is required to assess the acceptability of examples like (12b).

Finally, if both the direct object and S₂ are cliticized, they can climb as a cluster onto *fare* (13a), as with transitive FIs (see (10a) above), or, less preferably, to *volere* (13b) (vs (13c)):

- (13) a. Sono sicuro di non sapere cosa **gliela** fa
 I.am sure of not know.INF what 3SG.DAT=.3SG.ACC= makes
 voler lasciare
 want.INF leave.INF
- b. (?)Sono sicuro di non sapere cosa fa
 I.am sure of not know.INF what makes
 volergliela lasciare
 want.INF.3SG.DAT=.3SG.ACC= leave.INF
- c. *Sono sicuro di non sapere cosa fa voler
 I.am sure of not know.INF what makes want.INF
 lasciargliela
 leave.inf.3sg.dat=.3sg.acc=
 ‘I’m sure I don’t know what makes him want to leave it’

Interestingly, moreover, for some speakers, want-FIs also (marginally) allow a split option whereby only S₂ climbs to *fare*, leaving the object clitic attached to *volere* (14a) (vs 10b). Even more strikingly, in such contexts, S₂ can exceptionally surface as accusative (14b) (vs 9):³

- (14) a. ?Sono sicuro di non sapere cosa **gli** fa
 I.am sure of not know.INF what 3SG.DAT= makes
 volerla lasciare (/*?lasciarla)
 want.INF.3SG.ACC= leave.INF /leave.3SG.ACC=
- b. ?Sono sicuro di non sapere cosa **lo**
 I.am sure of not know.INF what 3SG.ACC=
 fa volerla lasciare (/*?lasciarla)
 makes want.INF.3SG.ACC= leave.INF /leave.3SG.ACC=
 ‘I’m sure I don’t know what makes him want to leave it’

Climbing of the direct object, leaving accusative/dative S₂ stranded, is banned for all speakers:

- (15) *Sono sicuro di non sapere cosa **la** fa
 I.am sure of not know.INF what 3SG.ACC= makes
 volergli(/lo) lasciargli(/lo)
 want.INF.3SG.DAT=(/3SG.ACC=) leave.3SG.DAT=(/3SG.ACC=)

³ Our preliminary survey with 5 native speakers revealed a great deal of variation in the acceptability of (14a)-(14b). Dative marking (14a) was rated ungrammatical by 3 speakers and partly or fully grammatical by 2 speakers and accusative marking (14b) was rated ungrammatical by 3 speakers and grammatical by 2 speakers. Further investigation is required to assess this point and to clarify whether regional variation may play a role.

The relevant patterns are summarised in Table 1.⁴

Table 1. Cliticisation in FIs and want-Fis

	clitic O		full O	
	full S ₂	clitic S ₂	full S ₂	clitic S ₂
FI	✓ (8b)	✓ both CC (10a) * 1 CC (10b)- (10c)	✓ (8a)	✓ S ₂ .DAT (9)
want-FI	* (11b)	✓ both CC (13a) (?) both on <i>volere</i> (13b) ? only S ₂ .DAT CC (14a) ? only S ₂ .ACC CC(14b)	?* (11a)	✓ S ₂ .DAT on <i>fare</i> (12a) (?) S ₂ .DAT on <i>volere</i> (12b)

These patterns raise four interesting questions: (i) why is it the case that the causee of *volere* can only be expressed as a clitic and never as a full DP (cf. (11) vs (12))?; (ii) why do want-FIs permit intermediate cliticisation onto *volere*? (12b, 13b)?; (iii) why is it the case that want-FIs allow split clitic climbing for some speakers (14)? and (iv) why is it the case that, with a split clitic cluster, S₂ can be accusative (14b) rather than dative (14a) for some speakers? In what follows, we suggest potential answers to some of these questions.

4. Clitic transitive causee: defective intervention

The fact that transitive causees can only occur as clitics in want-FIs (cf. i) might result from defective intervention.⁵ Abstracting away from some details, let us assume that in FIs, the object can usually be probed by *fare* and receive Case from it either through leapfrogging (16a) (McGinnis 1998; Sheehan, in progress) or smuggling (16b) (Collins 2005; Belletti & Rizzi 2012).⁶ In want-FI contexts, however, this facilitating movement does not

⁴ O = object; CC = clitic climbing.

⁵ Although Bruening (2014) raises certain objections against the data originally used to argue in favour of defective intervention, Marchis Moreno & Petersen (2016a,b) have defended its existence, albeit in a slightly different ‘linear’ form. For our purposes, what is crucial is that full DPs pose a problem for probing whereas clitics do not. We leave a full discussion of these matters to future research.

⁶ As an anonymous reviewer notes, this view departs from earlier approaches in which the object received Case from the entire verbal complex (complex predicate) (Guasti 1993), or by virtue of being in a single Case-domain with another argument (Folli & Harley 2007).

take place for some reason, and so the dative causee acts as a defective intervener for the Agree relation between *fare* and the embedded object (16c):

- (16) a. [*fare*_[uPHI] [*DP*<sub>[uCase]_i] **DP**<sub>DAT] *lasciare* [V *t_i*]]] (leapfrogging)
 b. [*fare*_[uPHI] [[V *DP*<sub>[uCase]_i]] **DP**<sub>DAT] *lasciare t_i*]]] (smuggling)
 c. [*fare*_[uPHI] [**DP**_{DAT] *volere lasciare* [V *DP*_{[uCase]_i]]]]] (defective intervention)}}</sub></sub></sub></sub>

The same problem arises in raising contexts and, in such cases, cliticisation of the dative removes the dative as a c-commander, bleeding the effect (Rizzi 1986; McGinnis 1998, 2000):

- (17) a. ??Gianni sembra a Piero [t fare il suo dovere]
 G. seems to P. do.INF the his duty
 (McGinnis 1998: 92)
- b. Gianni non **gli** sembra [t fare il suo dovere]
 G. not 3SG.DAT= seems do.INF the his duty
 (McGinnis 2000, citing Rizzi 1986)
 ‘Gianni does not seem to Piero / him to do his duty’

Arguably the same effect occurs with want-FIs: full DP causees block Agree between *fare* and the embedded object, whereas clitic causees do not. This explains why full *dative* DP causees are blocked, but it remains to be shown why full *accusative* DP causees should also be banned in the ECM construction (e.g. **Non so cosa fa Herr (voler) lasciare Berlino* ‘I don’t know what makes Herr (want to) leave it’). We consider this in the next section.

5. Accusative transitive causee: ECM construction

Regarding (iii), the exceptional accusative marking of clitic *S*₂, we claim that this configuration instantiates a biclausal ECM construction. This may seem an odd state of affairs, given that Italian, on a par with French and unlike some Spanish varieties, notably does not allow ECM complements to *fare* (e.g. Guasti 1993; Folli & Harley 2007:221, fn 23; Sheehan 2016: 985):

- (18) a. *Ho fatto Herr lasciare Berlino
 I.have made C. leave.INF Berlin
- b. L’ho fatto lasciare Berlino
 him=I.have made leave Berlin

Under such approaches, there should be no defective intervention effect and the ban on DP causees would need to be explained in some other way.

‘I made Herr / him leave Berlin’

Interestingly, ECM does occur, however, in another causative context in Italian, suggesting that an ECM-analysis for accusative S₂ in want-FIs may be on the right track. As widely observed in the literature, Italian is subject to the ‘person-case constraint’ (PCC), banning a 3rd person indirect clitic with 1st/2nd person direct one (see Perlmutter 1971; Bonet 1991) (19a). This effect extends to causative constructions, as shown in (19b):⁷

- (19) a. *Lui **mi** **gli** presenta
 he 1SG.ACC= 3SG.DAT= introduces
 ‘He introduces me to him’
 b. *Questa notizia **gli** **ci** ha fatto
 this news 3SG.DAT= 1PL.ACC= has made
 chiamare
 call.INF
 ‘This news made him call us’

A curious difference between PCC in ditransitives and causatives is that in causatives even a full indirect object DP is banned with 1st/2nd person direct object clitic, as noted by Sheehan (2017), unlike in ditransitive contexts, where only clitics are problematic (as in (19a)):

- (20) a. *Maria **mi** fece picchiare a Carlo
 M. 1SG.ACC= made beat.INF to C.
 b. ***Mi** **gli** fece picchiare
 1SG.ACC= 3SG.DAT= he.made beat.INF
 Intended: ‘M. made Carlo/him beat me’

One possible repair for (20b), for some speakers, is to make the causee accusative. In such cases, only S₂ climbs, suggesting that this is a biclausal ECM construction (21a). Climbing of the direct object, instead of S₂ (either dative or accusative), yields ungrammaticality (21b), as does climbing of both clitics:⁸

- (21) a. **Lo** / ***gli** fece picchiarmi
 3SG.ACC= 3SG.DAT= she.made beat.INF.=1SG.ACC
 ‘She made him beat me’
 b. ***Mi** fece picchiargli/lo
 1SG.ACC= she.made beat.INF=3SG.DAT/3SG.ACC

⁷ The examples in (19) are adapted from Roberts (2016: 789-790).

⁸ Speakers’ judgements vary also in this domain. 3 out of 5 speakers judged the accusative in (21a) as completely grammatical, while 2 judged it ungrammatical. 5 out of 5 speakers judged the dative option ungrammatical. This is consistent with the claim that not all speakers have ECM available as a repair mechanism.

- c. ***Me** **lo** fece picchiare
 3SG.ACC= 3SG.ACC= she.made beat.INF.1SG.ACC=
 Intended: ‘She made him beat me’⁹

Want-FIs in PCC-contexts behave in exactly the same way: a full indirect object DP is banned (22a), only S₂ can climb (22b) and it is obligatorily case-marked accusative (22c), while non-PCC want-FIs allow climbing of both, or marginally climbing of dative/accusative S₂ only (see Table 1):¹⁰

- (22) a. ***Mi** fece voler picchiare a Carlo
 1SG.ACC= she.made want.INF beat.INF to Carlo
 b. ***Mi** **gli** fece voler picchiare
 1SG.ACC= 3SG.DAT= she.made want.INF beat.INF
 c. **Lo** (/ ***gli**) fece volermi picchiare
 3SG.ACC= 3SG.DAT= she.made want.INF.1SG.ACC= beat.INF
 ‘She made Carlo / him to want to beat me’

All patterns thus far are summarised in Table 2:

Table 2. Cliticisation in FIs and want-FIs: PCC and non-PCC contexts

	clitic O		full O	
	full S ₂	clitic S ₂	full S ₂	clitic S ₂
FI	✓ (8b)	✓ both CC (10a) * 1 CC (10b)- (10c)	✓ (8a)	✓ S ₂ .DAT (9)
FI (PCC)	* (20a)	* both (20b) ✓ only S ₂ .ACC CC (21a)		
want-FI	* (11b)	✓ both CC (13a) (?) both on <i>volere</i> (13b) ? only S ₂ .DAT CC (14a) ? only S ₂ .ACC CC (14b)	?* (11a)	✓ S ₂ .DAT on <i>fare</i> (12a) (?) S ₂ .DAT on <i>volere</i> (12b)
want-FI (PCC)	* (22a)	* both (22b) ✓ only S ₂ .ACC CC (22c)		

⁹ (21c) is ungrammatical in the intended meaning under which *me* is accusative and *lo* dative. Note that the switch from *mi* to *me* simply follows from the morphophonemic adjustment of /i/ to /e/ before sonorants to which Italian clitic clusters are subject (Vincent 1988: 291-292).

¹⁰ 3 out of 5 speakers judged the accusative option in (22c) fully grammatical, 1 judged it partially grammatical and 1 ungrammatical. 5 out of 5 speakers judged the dative option ungrammatical.

It should be clear from Table 2 that both FI and want-FI are subject to the PCC in the same way and yet in other contexts behave very differently. This poses certain challenges for analyses of the PCC which we will not go into here (see authors, in progress). For our purposes here, these facts illustrate that ECM is available under causative *fare*, though it is highly restricted. It remains unclear why it is so restricted. In PCC contexts, it can be considered a repair strategy, but with want-FIs it does not have this function as accusative clitic causees alternate with datives. It also remains unexplained why ECM is *only* possible with embedded clitic objects and not full object DPs (cf. 12a).

A further remaining question, mentioned above, is the following: as Italian allows ECM constructions in want-FIs (cf. 14b), why is the case that the causee of *volere* cannot be expressed as a full DP in ECM configurations (cf. **Non so cosa fa Herr voler lasciare Berlino* ‘I don’t know what makes Herr (want to) leave it’)? This cannot be attributed to defective intervention (cf. §4) as ECM constructions are biclausal, with the embedded object being licensed in the lower clause and S₂ in the higher clause, by *fare*. We leave these intriguing questions open here.

6. Intermediate cliticisation: silent OBTAIN

We conclude by addressing the two issues raised by want-FIs in relation to cliticisation, i.e. the fact that for some speakers they marginally allow intermediate cliticisation onto *volere* (cf. ii, 12b, 13b) and splitting of the clitic cluster (cf. iii, 14). Starting from intermediate cliticisation, this is particularly surprising given that: (i) *fare* usually forces clitic climbing (Kayne 1975; Rizzi 1976:42, fn4; Burzio 1986:260ff; Cardinaletti & Shlonsky 2004:543; Ledgeway 2016: 224; Roberts 2016: 800; Sheehan 2016: 986); (ii) if more than one restructuring predicate is present (here *fare* and *volere*), the clitic must climb onto the highest (e.g. *lo devo riuscir(**lo) a fare* 3SG.ACC= I.must manage(3SG.ACC=) to do, Ledgeway 2016: 223). As Cardinaletti & Shlonsky (2004) note, descriptively speaking, prototypical functional verbs embedded in restructuring contexts do not allow intermediate climbing (unless restructuring stops at the intermediate position), because they are not associated with a clitic position. The only verbs to be associated with a clitic position are: (i) lexical verbs (cf. *voglio mangiarlo* ‘I want to eat it’), and (ii) a special class of functional verbs, which they call ‘quasi-functional’, which includes causative, motion and

perception verbs.¹¹ These verbs exceptionally introduce an extra clitic position, thus allowing intermediate climbing, as shown by the contrast below, where *andare* ‘go’ (23a) but not *potere* ‘can’ (23b) can host the clitic:

- (23) a. Sarei voluto poter andar**lo** a trovare
 I.would wanted can.INF go.INF.3SG.ACC= to meet.INF
 b. *Sarei voluto poter**lo** andare a trovare
 ‘I would have wanted to be able to go and visit him’
 (Cardinaletti & Shlonsky 2004:541)

We observe here that the same contrast applies to causatives: when *fare* combines with lower functional verbs, *cominciare* cannot host a clitic (24), whereas semi-functional *andare* can (25):

- (24) a. *Il parroco fece cominciarg**li** a costruire
 the priest made start.INF.3SG.DAT= to build.INF
 un tavolo da ping pong
 a table of ping pong
 b. Il parroco **gli** fece cominciare a costruire
 the priest 3SG.DAT= made start.INF to build.INF
 un tavolo da ping pong
 a table of ping pong
 ‘The priest made him start building a ping pong table’

- (25) a. **Mi** fecero andar**la** a prendere subito
 1SG.DAT= made GO.INF.3SG.ACC= to fetch.INF immediately
 b. **Me la** fecero andare a prendere subito
 1SG.DAT= 3SG.ACC= made go.INF to fetch.INF immediately
 ‘They made me go to fetch her immediately’

As intermediate clitic climbing is also allowed when *fare* combines with *volere* (12b, 13b), we must conclude that *volere* too is associated with an extra clitic position. This is unexpected, as *volere* is neither a lexical verb, nor a verb falling into the quasi-functional category of Cardinaletti & Shlonsky’s (2004) classification. However, as Cinque (2006: 17) notes, *volere* is unique with respect to other functional verbs in other ways too. For example, it is alone in allowing two uses of adverbs like *già* ‘already’ and *sempre* ‘always’ with an infinitive complement (such examples are disallowed with *dovere/cominciare*):¹²

¹¹ There is a further clitic position, in addition to the one associated with lexical and semi-functional verbs, which is a high position in the IP, where the clitic appears in contexts of climbing (e.g. *lo voglio mangiare* ‘I want to eat it’) (Cardinaletti & Shlonsky 2004).

¹² An anonymous reviewer points out that data like (26) extremely interesting for the cases of defective vs. linear intervention and should be regarded and compared to other adverbs.

- (26) Maria vorrebbe **già** averlo **già** lasciato
 Maria want.COND already have.3SG.ACC= already left
 ‘Maria would already want to have already left him’
 (Cinque 2006: 17)

To account for this difference, Cinque proposes that *volere*, unlike other restructuring verbs, can take a silent lexical OBTAIN (see also Ross 1976; Kayne 1993; Harley 2004; Harves 2008; Harves & Kayne 2012; Grano 2015). In the current context, we assume that it is not *volere* but OBTAIN which, being lexical, is associated with its own clitic position, on a par with lexical verbs in prototypical restructuring contexts (e.g. *voglio mangiarlo / lo voglio mangiare* ‘I want to eat it’). It remains unexplained, however, why the clitic causee is then optionally allowed to leave the intermediate position and climb on its own onto *fare*, leaving the object stranded in its intermediate position (cf. 14).

7. Conclusions

In this squib, we have shown that, under the correct syntactic configuration, *fare* can embed the light verb *volere*. This amounts to cases in which S_2 is not realised as a full DP (cf. i) and can be attributed to defective intervention and a ban on full DPs in (some) ECM contexts in Italian. We have also shown that when both DO and S_2 are cliticised, want-FIs exceptionally allow an accusative S_2 when the object is stranded (cf. iv), giving rise to a biclausal ECM construction. Although Italian usually disallows ECM complements to *fare*, this is also used as a repair strategy for argument licensing in PCC-contexts. Finally, we have speculated that the possibility of attaching the clitic to *volere* (cf. ii), optionally followed by climbing of one clitic only (cf. iii), arises from the additional clitic position created by the silent lexical OBTAIN selected by ‘want’ (Cinque 2006).

References

- Belletti, Adriana & Rizzi, Luigi. 2012. Moving verbal chunks in the low functional field. In *Cartography of syntactic structures 7*, Laura Brugè, Anna Cardinaletti, Giuliana Giusti, Nicola Munaro & Cecilia Poletto (eds), 129-137. New York: Oxford University Press.

However, the only other adverb which can be tested is ‘always’ (*si vorrebbe sempre aver sempre esperienze come queste* ‘one would always want to always have experiences like these’, Cinque 2006: 17), while all the others seem to be excluded for semantic reasons.

- Bonet, M. Eulàlia. 1991. *Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Brandi, Luciana & Savoia, M. Leonardo. 1990. Proprietà morfosintattiche e assegnazione del caso nel causativo arbëresh. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 15: 29-121.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1981. Intransitive Verbs and Italian Auxiliaries. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax*. Reidel: Dordrecht.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Shlonsky, Ur. Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35(4): 519-557.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2003. The interaction of passive, causative, and 'restructuring' in Romance. In *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Cristina Tortora (ed), 50–66. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. 'Restructuring' and functional structure. In *Structures and Beyond*, Adriana Belletti (ed), 132-91. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, Chris. 2005. A smuggling approach to the passive in English. *Syntax* 8: 81-120.
- Folli, Raffaella & Harley, Heidi. 2007. Causation, obligation, and argument structure: on the nature of little v. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 197–238.
- Grano, Thomas. 2015. *Control and restructuring*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guasti, Maria Teresa. 1993. *Causative and perception verbs: a comparative study*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Guasti, Maria Teresa. 1996. Semantic restrictions in Romance causatives and the incorporation approach. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 294–313.
- Harley, Heidi. 2004. Wanting, having, and getting: A note on Fodor and Lepore 1998. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 255–267.
- Harves, Stephanie. 2008. Intentional transitives and silent HAVE: Distinguishing between want and need. In *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Natasha Abner & Jason Bishop (eds), 211–219. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Harves, Stephanie & Kayne, Richard. 2012. Having *need* and needing *have*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43: 120-132.
- Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 1993. Towards a modular theory of auxiliary selection. *Studia Linguistica* 47(1): 3-31.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. Italian, Tuscan, and Corsican. In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), 206-227. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ledgeway, Adam. Forthcoming. 'The verb phrase: VP-related functional projections'. In *The syntax of Italian*, Giuseppe Longobardi (ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manzini, M. Rita & Savoia, Leonardo M. 2007. *A unification of morphology and syntax*. Routledge: London & New York.
- McGinnis, Martha. 1998. Locality in A-movement. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- McGinnis, Martha. 2000. Phases and the syntax of applicatives. In *Proceedings of NELS 31*, Min-joo Kim & Uri Strauss (eds), 333-349. University of Massachusetts, Amherst: GLSA Publications.
- Perlmutter, David. 1971. *Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1976. Ristrutturazione. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 1: 1-54.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. On chain formation. In *Syntax and Semantics 19. The syntax of pronominal clitics*, Hagit Borer (ed), 65-96. New York: Academic Press.
- Roberts, Ian. 2016. Clitics. In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), 786-801. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, John R. 1976. To 'have' and to not have 'have'. In *Linguistic and literary studies in honor of Archibald A. Hill*, Mohammad Ali Jazayery, Edgar C. Polomé & Werner Winter (eds), 263-270. The Hague: Mouton.
- Sheehan, Michelle. 2016. Complex predicates. In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Adam, Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), 981-993. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sheehan, Michelle. 2017. PCC effects in causatives and ditransitives and the dative/locative distinction. Manuscript, Anglia Ruskin University.
- Sheehan, Michelle. In progress. A parameter hierarchy for the Romance *faire-infinitif*. Manuscript, Anglia Ruskin University.
- Vincent, Nigel. 1988. Italian. In *The Romance Languages*, Martin Harris & Nigel Vincent (eds), 279-313. London: Routledge.