Michela Cennamo
13 Valency patterns in Italian

1 Introduction[1]

Italian is a Romance language, spoken in Italy – including the Republic of San Marino and the Vatican City – as well as in the Italophone canton Ticino and in the canton Grisons, in Switzerland (where it is one of the official languages). It is also spoken in Corsica, in some Italian-speaking communities of Venetian origins in Istria and Dalmatia, (marginally) in Malta, as well as in the Italian-speaking emigrant communities in the United States, Chile, Argentina and Brazil. It is also spoken as a L_2 in former Italian colonies, such as Eritrea and Ethiopia (Maiden 1995: 267–273; Lepschy & Lepschy 2006: 545; Voigt 2008: 223; among others).

The present chapter reviews the valency patterns of Italian, with reference to argument coding and valency changing strategies. The variety investigated is standard Italian. The data are taken partly from the written and partly from the spoken language (see Lepschy & Lepschy 2006: 546; among others).

The discussion is organized as follows. Section 2 illustrates the general characteristics of Italian morphosyntax. Section 3 describes the major valency patterns of Italian, explored in Section 4 in relation to argument encoding and with reference to valency changing operations in Section 5 and Section 6. Finally, Section 7 provides the conclusions.

2 Basics of Italian morphosyntax

2.1 General characteristics of Italian

Italian is a fusional language (making use of both prefixation and suffixation) characterized by a high degree of allomorphic variation, with morphs tending to encode several meanings simultaneously, and an ensuing difficulty in segmenting words (Iacobini 2006). The syntactic function of the core arguments is signalled by verb agreement, that singles out A/S vs P[2] (and R(ecipient) in three-argument verbs),

---

2 S, A, P/O are syntactic-semantic primitives, referring to the nuclear arguments of the clause, referring, respectively, to the sole participant of an intransitive predicate and to the Agent-like/

and, marginally, word order, with A/S occurring preverbally and P postverbally in unmarked declarative clauses. There are, in fact, no cases, apart from a residual oblique forms for clitic and (1/2/3 SG) tonic pronouns, used, respectively, for core and non-core arguments/adjuncts (e.g., recipients, locative adjuncts etc.). Most typically, non-core arguments and adjuncts are coded through adpositions (i.e. prepositions). Syntactically, Italian is an SVO language, characterized by relative syntactic freedom and pragmatic rigidity, with basic SV(O) order and default post-verbal position of focal P arguments in declarative main clauses (Vincent 1988: 305–306; Bentley 2006: 363, 368–370, 2008: 267–270 and further references therein). It is a nominative-accusative language, with some domains where the encoding of arguments follows an active-stative and even ergative orientation, and, although a dependent-marking language, both at the clause and NP level, it shows head-marking patterns in verbal syntax, with pronominal arguments coded on the verb.

2.2 Italian morphosyntax: Basic clause structure

Italian is a pro-drop language, characterized by the possibility of omitting subjects in topic and non-contrastive focus contexts, and by a rich system of nominal and verbal agreement. Nouns, determiners, adjectives and past participles (of transitive and unaccusative verbs) inflect for gender (masculine and feminine, respectively with the *-o* and *-a* endings) and number (singular and plural, the distinction being signalled by vowel alternation, respectively *-a/o* for the (feminine/masculine) singular and *-e/i* for the (feminine/masculine) plural – with a small class of nouns distinguishing between collective and non-collective plural (*-a* ending – a residue of the Latin neuter plural –, as in *ossa* 'bones' (e.g., of a skeleton) and *-i* ending, as in *ossi* 'bones', < *osso* 'bone') – according to the general paradigm illustrated below (Vincent 1988: 289; Thornton 2005; Lepschy & Lepschy 2006; Maiden & Robustelli 2007; among others, for further details):

Tab. 1: Number and gender inflection of nouns (from Vincent 1988: 289).

	Singular	**Plural**	
Masculine	*-o*	*-i*	*bambin-o* ~ *-i* 'child'
Feminine	*-a*	-e	*bambin-a* ~ -e 'child'
Masculine or Feminine	*-e*	*-i*	*mont-e* ~ *-i* 'mountain' (M)
			ment-e ~ *-i* 'mind'
Masculine	*-a*	*-i*	*sistema* ~ -i, *poeta* ~ -i
			(words of Greek or Latin origin)

Patient-like participants of a transitive predicate, following a well-established terminology (Comrie 1989: 125–126; Dixon 1994: 6–8; Mithun & Chafe 1999; Haspelmath 2011, among others).

Agreement with adjectives and determiners follows either a four-way (-*o*/*i*, -*a*/-*e*) or a two-way pattern (-*e*/-*i*), as exemplified in (1), with few uninflected ones (e.g., *rosa* 'pink') (Vincent 1988: 289):

(1) a. *buon-o/-i,*   *buon-a/-e*
         good-M.SG/-M.PL   good-F.SG/F.PL
         'good'   'good'

   b. *felic-e/-i*
       happy-M/F.SG/-M/F.PL
       'happy'

Past participles have a four-way pattern, for all conjugations, as shown in (2):

(2) *amat-o/-a*, *amati/-e* 'loved' (< *amare* 'love'),
    volut-o/-a, *volut-i/-e* 'wanted' (< *volere* 'want'),
    discuss-o/-a, *discussi/-e* 'discussed' (< *discutere* 'discuss'),
    udit-o/-a, *udit-i/-e* 'heard' (< *udire* 'hear')

Italian is a *nominative-accusative* language, with consistent morphological and syntactic alignment of A and S, which always agree with the finite verb, as illustrated in (3), and control argument deletion in coordination, as in (4):

(3) a. *Marco   distrusse   il   cassetto.*
         Mark(A) destroy.PST.3SG the.M.SG drawer.M.SG
         'Mark destroyed the drawer.'

   b. *Marco   partì   all'alba.*
       Mark(SP) leave.PST.3SG at.the.dawn.F.SG
       'Mark left at dawn.'

   c. *Marco   gridò   a lungo nel   parco.*
       Mark(SA) scream.PST.3SG at length in.the.M.SG park.M.SG
       'Mark screamed in the park for a long time.'

(4) (deleted S=A)
    Marco (A) pulì   la   stanza (P) e (SP) uscì.
    Mark   clean.PST.3SG the.F.SG room.F.SG and   leave.PST.3SG
    'Mark cleaned the room and left.'

There are, however, patterns of *active alignment*, with intransitive verbs subdividing into two subclasses, so-called unaccusatives/class S$_P$ verbs, unergatives/class S$_A$ verbs, reflecting their aspectual characteristics and the thematic role of the S argument, respectively the notions of "telic dynamic change" (i.e. telicity) and Patienthood and "atelic non-motional activity" (i.e. atelicity) and Agentivity (Sorace 2000; Cennamo & Sorace 2007: 67; and discussion in §3.3).

Syntactically, the active encoding of S manifests itself through a number of syntactic features such as (i) auxiliary selection – BE with S_P verbs and reflexives (§ 5.2), HAVE with S_A verbs –, as in (5a–b), as well as (ii) *ne*-cliticisation of a quantified postverbal subject, as in (6a), where the clitic *ne* 'of it' replaces the subject nominal *ragazzi* 'boys', (iii) participial absolute constructions, as in (6b), where *i ragazzi* 'the boys', the subject of the verb *partire* 'leave', heads the participial structure *partiti i ragazzi* '(having) left the boys', (iv) adjectival function of the past participle (6c). These patterns are only possible with (the subject of) unaccusatives/class S_P verbs (and the P argument of transitive verbs, as in (6d)) (Sorace 2000; Cennamo & Sorace 2007; among others and references therein):

(5) a. *I   ragazzi sono   partiti.*
    the.M.PL boy.M.PL be.PRS.3PL leave.PP.M.PL
    'The boys have left.'

   b. *I   ragazzi hanno   camminato   a lungo nel*
    the.M.PL boy.M.PL have.PRS.3PL walk.PP.M.SG at length in.the.M.SG
    parco.
    park.M.SG
    'The boys have walked in the park for a long time.'

(6) a. *Ne   sono   partiti   molti.*
    of.them be.PRS.3PL leave.PP.M.PL many.M.PL
    'Many of them have left.'

   a′. *Sono   partiti   molti   ragazzi.*
    be.PRS.3PL leave.PP.M.PL many.M.PL boy.M.PL
    'Several boys have left.'

   b. *Partiti/*camminati   i   ragazzi.*
    leave.PP.M.PL/walk.PP.M.PL the.M.PL boy.M.PL
    'The boys having left.' (lit. 'left the boys')
    *'The boys having walked.' (lit. 'walked the boys')

   c. *I   ragazzi partiti/*camminati   ieri   sono*
    the.M.PL boy.M.PL leave.PP.M.PL/walk.PP.M.PL yesterday be.PRS.IND.3PL
    amici   di Marco.
    friend.M.PL of Mark
    'The boys who left yesterday are Mark's friends.' (lit. 'the boys left yesterday ...')

   d. *Il   pesce   mangiato ieri,   che ...*
    the.M.SG fish.M.SG eat.PP.M.SG yesterday that
    'The fish eaten yesterday, that ...'

d′. *Ieri   ho   mangiato   il   pesce   che ...*
   yesterday have.PRS.1SG eat.PP.M.SG the.M.SG fish.M.SG that
   'Yesterday I ate the fish that ...'

Morphologically, the distinction is signalled by the presence of past participle agreement in compound tenses with unaccusatives, as in (5a) and its lack with unergatives, with which the past participle reverts to the unmarked masculine singular form, as exemplified in (5b).

There also occurs a *split ergative coding pattern* in the compound tenses of transitive verbs when the P argument, the object, is pronominalized, as in (7):

(7) *Marco li (=i ragazzi)   ha   visti.*
   Mark   they.CL. M.ACC(=the boys) have.PRS.3SG see.PP.M.PL

   (> Marco ha   visto   i   ragazzi.)
      Mark   has.PRS.3SG seen.PP.M.SG the.M.PL boy.M.PL
   'Mark has seen them.'

Thus, verb agreement is always with the A/S argument in simple tenses. In compound tenses there occurs split agreement when P is realized by a pronoun: the finite verb always agrees with A, whilst the past participle agrees with the pronominal P (ergative orientation). In compound tenses the past participle agrees with S if the verb is unaccusative, reverting instead to the unmarked masculine singular if the verb is unergative (active alignment).

Although typically a dependent-marking language, Italian, like other pro-drop languages, shows patterns of head marking, as exemplified in (8), where the arguments (A, P and R) are coded on the verb, through agreement for A, and the dative and accusative clitics for R and P, respectively (*gli* 'to him'-DAT and *li* 'they'-ACC), with the independent NPs optionally occurring, but extranuclear:

(8) *Glieli   diede   ieri   (Lucio i   libri*
   he.DAT.CL.it.M.PL.ACC.CL give.PST.3SG yesterday (Luke   the.M.PL books.M.PL
   a Marco).
   to Mark)
   'He gave them to him yesterday.' (lit. to him them (he) gave yesterday)

2.3 Argument coding

Arguments in Italian are coded by means of verb agreement, – that singles out A/ S from P – and adpositions, which occur with non-core arguments (e.g., recipient/ beneficiary phrases) and adjuncts (e.g., goal phrases). The adpositions (i.e. prepositions) which most typically occur to mark arguments are the following: *a* 'to', *su*

'on', *di* 'of', *in* 'in', *da* 'from', *con* 'with'. Marginally, word order too plays a role, differentiating A from P when they cannot be identified on the basis of agreement, as in (9). There are, in fact, no cases in Italian, apart from a residual case system in clitic pronouns, illustrated in (10)–(11) for clitics (Vincent 1988: 291; Salvi & Vanelli 2004: 196–199; among others and § 2.1):

Tab. 2

	1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl	3pl
ACC	mi	ti	lo (M)/la (F), si (REFL)	ci	vi	li (M)/le (F) si (REFL)
DAT	mi	ti	gli (M)/le (F) si (REFL)	ci	vi	gli (loro) si (REFL)

(9) a. *Maria (A) vide   Marco (P).*
     Mary   see.PST.3SG Mark
     'Mary saw Mark.'

   b. *Marco (A) vide   Maria (P).*
     Mark   see.PST.3SG Mary
     'Mark saw Mary.'

(10) a. *Maria mi   /ti   /lo   /la   /si   /ci   /vi*
     Mary I.ACC /you.ACC /he.ACC /she.ACC /REFL /we.ACC /you.PL.ACC
     /li   /le   vide.
     /they.M.ACC /they.F.ACC see.PST.3SG
     'Mary saw me/you/him/her/herself/us/you/them.'

(11) *Gli   studenti   mi   /ti   /gli   /le   /ci*
     the.M.PL student.M.PL I.DAT /you.DAT he.DAT /she.DAT /we.DAT
     /vi   /si   comprarono un libro.
     you.DAT.PL REFL buy.PST.3PL a.M book.M.SG
     'The students bought me/you/him/her/us/you.PL/themselves a book.'

2.4 Voice and valency rearranging ~ valency changing patterns and markers

Italian has a rich and very productive system of valency rearranging and valency changing strategies. Among the valency rearranging constructions, (i) **the oblique subject alternation**, involving an oblique argument surfacing as subject (§ 4.2) and (ii) the **body-part possessor ascension** (§ 4.3) are most widely used, unlike (iii) the **conative** (where the unattained P is marked adpositionally, headed by the

preposition *di*) (§ 6.1), (iv) the *locative* (§ 6.2), and (v) the **applicative** alternations (§ 6.3), which are marginal instead. The valency changing patterns comprise (i) **object omission** (§ 4.1), (ii) the **factitive** construction (formed with the verbs *fare* 'do/make', *lasciare* 'let' + infinitive) (§ 5.1), (iii) the **reflexive/reciprocal/middle** pattern, marked by the reflexive morpheme *si*, signalling coreference between the A and P arguments (§ 5.2), (iv) **anticausatives**, subdividing into three classes, according to the presence, absence or optionality of an overt marker of reduced transitivity, the reflexive morpheme *si* (§ 5.3), (v) the **reflexive passive**, formed from the third person singular/plural reflexive morpheme *si* plus a verb in the active voice and a Nominal agreeing with it (§ 5.4), (vi) **impersonal reflexives**, marking defocusing of A/S and P, signalled by the reflexive morpheme *si* (§ 5.5), (vii) **impersonal of** (lexicalized) **reflexives**, with the defocused A/S signalled by the 1st person plural oblique clitic pronoun *ci* (§ 5.6), (viii) the **analytic passive** (formed with the auxiliaries *essere* 'be', *venire* 'come', *andare* 'go' + the past participle of the lexical verb) (§ 5.7).

3 Valency patterns

3.1 Identification of valency classes

Two useful syntactic tests for differentiating non-core arguments from adjuncts in Italian are: (i) preposing/free permutation, that is only possible with adjuncts in unmarked focus, as shown in (12b) vs. (13b, d), and (ii) variation in the number and type of adposition(s), possible with adjuncts, but not with arguments, as illustrated in (12a) vs. (13a). The locative phrase *per Roma* in (13a) is, in fact, an argument, with the preposition selected by the verb, unlike *a Roma* in (12a), that is an adjunct, and as such it can be replaced by another locative phrase (Salvi 1988: 32–35; Mereu 2010; Cennamo and Lenci 2011):

(12) a. *Ieri   ho   incontrato   Marco a Roma / in treno.*
       yesterday have.PRS.1SG meet.PP.M.SG Mark   at Rome / in train
       'Yesterday I saw Mark in Rome/on the train.'

   b. *Ieri a Roma ho incontrato Marco. / A Roma ieri ho incontrato Marco.*

(13) a. *(Ieri)   sono   partito   per Roma / *a Roma.*
       yesterday be.PRS.1SG leave.PP.M.SG for Rome / *in Roma
       'Yesterday I left for Rome.'

   b. **(Ieri) per Roma sono partito.*

c. *Carlo parlò di politica tutta la sera.*
Charles talk.PST.3SG of politics.F.SG all.F.SG the.F.SG evening.F.SG
'Charles talked about politics for the whole evening.'

d. **di politica parlò Carlo tutta la sera*

The possibility of occurring as a core argument (subject) in a related transitive pattern, as in (14), helps one to detect the argument status of an instrumental adpositional phrase (Van Valin 2001: 94), that behaves as an adjunct with respect to the preposing test (14c) (see however Cennamo & Lenci 2011 for the non-full reliability of preposing/free permutation as a test for adjunthood/argumenthood in Italian):

(14) a. *Marco ruppe la finestra con un sasso.*
Mark break.PST.3SG the.F.SG window.F.SG with a.M rock.M.SG
'Mark broke the window with a rock.'

b. *Un sasso ruppe la finestra.*
a.M rock.M.SG break.PST.3SG the.F.SG window.F.SG
'A rock broke the window.'

c. *Con un sasso Marco ruppe la finestra.*
with a.M. pebble.M.SG Mark break.PST.3SG the.F.SG window.F.SG
'Mark broke the window with a pebble.'
(lit. 'With a pebble Mark broke the window.')

d. *Marco mangiò la pasta con le mani.*
Mark eat.PST.3SG the.F.SG pasta.F.SG with the.F.PL hands.F.PL
'Mark ate the pasta with his hands.'

e. **Le mani mangiarono la pasta.*
the.F.PL hands.F.PL eat.PST.3PL the.F.SG pasta.F.SG
*'The hands ate the pasta.'

f. *Con le mani Marco mangiò la pasta, con*
with the.F.PL hand.F.PL Mark eat.PST.3SG the.F.SG pasta.F.SG with
la forchetta la carne.
the.F.SG fork the.F.SG meat.F.SG
'Mark ate pasta with his hands, meat with the fork.'

Thus the ungrammaticality of (14e) as opposed to (14b), shows that only instrumental phrases that are the semantic argument of a verb can occur as subject.

3.2 Avalent verbs (coding frame: ((S) > V.subj[3SG/S]))

This class includes different subtypes of predicates and constructions denoting me-tereological phenomena (e.g., *piovere* 'rain', *grandinare* 'hail', *nevicare* 'snow', *tuonare* 'thunder', *lampeggiare* 'lighten', etc.) (see (69) in the Appendix) and astro-nomical events (*albeggiare* 'dawn', *imbrunire* 'grow dark', *far giorno* 'daybreak', *far notte* 'get dark', etc.) (Salvi 1988: 56, 70; La Fauci 2009: 60–61; Cennamo 2010 and further references therein):

(15) *Piove   a_dirotto.*
    rain.PRS.3SG heavily
    'It is pouring with rain.'

The states of affairs described by these verbs can be conceptualized as processes, that is as dynamic situations lacking a final point, and therefore compatible with *for X time* adverbials, specifying the duration of an event, as in (16a), or they can be conceptualized as events with a telic endpoint, as shown by their cooccurrence with *in X time* adverbials, specifying the completion of the event, focusing on its final point, as in (16b):

(16) a. *Piovve   per tutto   il   giorno.*
       rain.PST.3SG for all.M.SG the.M.SG day.M.SG
       'It rained for the whole day.'

    b. *Piovve   in cinque minuti.*
       rain.PST.3SG in five   minute.M.PL
       'It rained within five minutes.'

The different conceptualization of the process as telic or atelic corresponds to a different auxiliary choice in compound tenses, respectively BE and HAVE/BE, as in (16c–d):

(16) c. *Mi   è/*ha   piovuto   sulla   testa*
       I.DAT be.PRS.3SG/*have.PRS.3SG rain.PP.M.SG onto_the.F.SG head.F.SG
       'It has rained on my head.'

    d. *È/ha   piovuto   per giorni.*
       be.PRS.3SG/have.PRS.3SG rain.PP.M.SG for day.M.PL
       'It has rained for days.'

Weather verbs such as *lampeggiare* 'lighten', *tuonare* 'thunder', respectively a verb of light emission and of sound, however, tend to select the auxiliary HAVE in com-

pound tenses, regardless of the punctuality/durativity of the event, as shown in (17):

(17) a. *Oggi   ha   lampeggiato   tutto   il   giorno*
today have.PRS.3SG lighten.PP.M.SG all.M.SG the.M.SG day.M.SG
/? è   lampeggiato tutto   il   giorno.*
/*? be.PRS.3SG flash.PP.M.SG all.M.SG the.M.SG day.M.SG
'Today it lightened all day.'

　　b. *Questa   mattina   alle   cinque ha   lampeggiato.*
this.F.SG morning.F.SG at.the five   have.PRS.3SG lighten.PP.M.SG
/?è   lampeggiato.*
/*?be.PRS.3SG flash.PP.M.SG
'This morning it lightened at five.'

Several weather verbs allow also an intransitive use (18a), sometimes with a partial change of meaning (18b–e), with inanimate, definite or indefinite subjects (18a–c, e) less frequently with animate ones, as in (18d), most typically in post-verbal position if the subject is indefinite, as in (18c) (but see (18e), with an indefinite preverbal subject), and in pre/post-verbal position, if definite, as in (18a) (La Fauci 2009: 61; Cennamo 2010). For instance, the verb *lampeggiare* 'lighten' takes up the meaning of 'emitting intermittent light' in (18b) and *piovere* 'rain', becomes a telic change of location, with the meaning 'come down, fall', selecting the auxiliary BE in compound tenses, as shown in (18c–d):

(18) a. *Il   cielo   ha   lampeggiato   minacciosamente.*
the.M.SG sky.M.SG have.PRS.3SG lighten.PP.M.SG threateningly
'The sky lightened threateningly.'

　　b. *Il   semaforo   lampeggiava.*
the.M.SG traffic_light.M.SG flash.IMPF.3SG
'The traffic-light flashed.'

　　c. *Piovvero   granate/sono   piovute   granate   da*
rain.PST.3PL granade.F.PL/be.PRS.3PL rain.PP.F.PL granade.F.PL from
tutte   le   parti.
all.F.PL the.F.PL areas.F.PL
'There were (lit. rained) granades from everywhere.'

　　d. *Mario è   piovuto   a casa   mia   alle   tre*
Mario be.PRS.3SG rain.PP.M.SG at house.F.SG my.F.SG at.the.F.PL three
di notte.
of night
'Mario unexpectedely turned up at three o clock at night.'

e. *Vetri   grandinavano dal   cielo.*
 piece_of_glass.M.PL hail.IMPF.3PL from.the.M.SG sky.M.SG
 'There hailed down pieces of glass from the sky.'

Weather verbs denoting light emission such as *lampeggiare* 'lighten' also allow a transitive use under the meaning 'flash', with both an adpositional argument ([±animate], headed by the preposition *a*), as in (19a), and a canonical object (19b):

(19) a. *Ho   lampeggiato alla   macchina di fronte /a Marco.*
  have.PRS.1SG flash.PP.M.SG to.the.F.SG car.F.SG in front.of /to Mark
  'I flashed at the car in front of me/at Mark.'

 b. *Ho   lampeggiato i   fari.*
  have.PRS.1SG flash.PP.M.SG the.M.PL light.M.PL
  'I flashed the lights.'

There also occur complex predicates consisting of the verb *fare* 'do, make' in the third person singular form, and a nominal (e.g., *notte* 'night', *buio* 'dark'), in fixed patterns such as *far giorno* 'daybreak', *far buio* 'get dark', in alternation with the pattern with the reflexive morpheme *si*, as in (20):

(20) a. *Ha   fatto   giorno.*
  have.PRS.3SG make.PP.M.SG daylight
  'It is already daylight.'

 b. *Si è   fatto   giorno.*
  REFL be.PRS.3SG make.PP.M.SG daylight
  'It is already daylight.'

Whereas in the pattern with the reflexive morpheme *si* there occurs the auxiliary BE in compound tenses, as in (20b), in the structure without *si* there occurs the auxiliary HAVE, as in (20a) (see also § 5.2).

3.3 Monovalent verbs (coding frame: <S>V.subj[S])

This class comprises verbs of different aspectual and lexico-semantic properties, whose interplay determines their variable morphosyntactic behaviour in relation to indexing properties such as past participle agreement and auxiliary selection in compound tenses (i.e. perfective tenses), discussed in § 2.2 with reference to the existence of semantically determined patterns of active alignment in Italian and their manifestations.

In particular, monovalent verbs in Italian subdivide into two subclasses, so-called unaccusatives/class S_P verbs, and unergatives/class S_A verbs, characterized by the presence/lack of past participle agreement with the S argument, the subject, and the choice of auxiliary, respectively BE/HAVE, as shown in (21):

(21) a. *I   bambini   hanno   giocato   sul   prato.*
the.M.PL child.M.PL have.PRS.3PL play.PP.M.SG on.the.M.SG lawn.M.SG
'The children played in the lawn.'

b. *I   ragazzi sono   partiti   ieri   mattina alle*
the.M.PL boy.M.PL be.PRS.3PL leave.PP.M.PL yesterday morning at.the
sei.
six
'The boys left yesterday morning at six o'clock.'

Semantically, unaccusatives/class S_P verbs are characterized by an Undergoer (patient/theme) subject, as with inherently telic change of state and motion verbs, i.e. achievements/accomplishments such as *nascere*, 'be born', *morire* 'die', *scoppiare* 'burst', *esplodere* 'blow', *partire* 'leave', *andare* 'go' and verbs denoting the existence and continuation of a state/position (e.g., *bastare* 'suffice', *esistere* 'exist', *restare* 'remain'). Unergatives/class S_A verbs on the other hand, have an Actor/ agent subject and denote a dynamic situation lacking a final point, as with activities (both motional and non-motional): *camminare* 'walk', *giocare* 'play', *lavorare* 'work'. The distinction, however, is not clear-cut, with several examples of mismatches between the syntactic and semantic planes, whereby for instance non-agentive indefinite change verbs (i.e. verbs which do not specify a telic endpoint (Sorace 2000: 864)) such as *arrossire* 'blush', and internally caused verb of change of state, select either auxiliary, as illustrated in (21c) and agentive motion verbs such as *correre* 'run', *saltare* 'jump', select BE when the direction of motion is overtly expressed, i.e. when they are telicized, as in (21d).

(21) c. *Maria ha   arrossito   /è   arrossita.*
Mary have.PRS.3SG blush.PP.M.SG /be.PRS.3SG blush.PP.F.SG
'Mary blushed.'

d. *Maria ha   corso   nel   parco   /è*
Mary have.PRS.3SG run.PP.M.SG in.the.M.SG park.M.SG /be.PRS.3SG
corsa   a casa.
run.PP.F.SG to home.F.SG
'Mary ran home.'

The imperfect correspondence between the semantics of predicates and their syntax suggests that the distinction is a gradient, the choice between the different

indexing strategies reflecting a number of different dimensions, namely telicity, control and affectedness of S, animacy, as well as the abstract/concrete nature of the situation described by the verb. The interplay among these parameters allows one to locate monovalent verbs along a lexico-aspectual continuum, illustrated in Figure 1, characterized by verbs denoting a telic dynamic change and an Undergoer subject at one pole and atelic (non-motional) activity and an Actor subject at the opposite pole. They realize the core of the categories of unaccusativity/unergativity, consistently showing BE selection and past participle agreement, and HAVE selection plus lack of past participle agreement, respectively (*morire* 'die', *andare* 'go', *partire* 'leave', *cadere* 'fall' and *giocare* 'play', *ridere* 'laugh', *urlare* 'scream', *abitare* 'live' in the Appendix):

Change of location (It. *arrivare* 'arrive')   **Unaccusatives** (consistent selection of BE)
Change of Condition (It. *nascere* 'be born' (def.)
Indefinite Change of Condition *marcire* 'rot', *arrossire* 'blush' (indef.)
Continuation of a Pre-existing Condition (It. *rimanere* 'remain', *durare* 'last')
Existence of a Condition (It. *esistere* 'exist')
Uncontrolled Process
    Bodily function (it. *tossire* 'cough')
    Emission (of substance/light/smell) (it. *squillare* 'ring', *rimbombare* 'resound/roar',
             profumare 'smell')
    Weather verbs (It. *piovere* 'rain', *nevicare* 'snow')
Controlled Process (motional) (It. *camminare* 'walk', *nuotare* 'swim')
Controlled Process (non-motional)
    Controlled, affecting (It. *abdicare* 'abdicate', *cedere* 'yield')
    Controlled, unaffecting (It. *lavorare* 'work', *giocare* 'play')
                      Unergatives (consistent selection of HAVE)

Fig. 1: *The Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy* (ASH) (adapted from Sorace 2000, 2004).[3]

Variation in auxiliary selection occurs as one moves away from the core of the categories and is maximal in the middle of the hierarchy, i.e. at the stative centre, where telicity is irrelevant and the subject has no/low agentivity and control. The degree of variation in auxiliary selection therefore reflects the position of the verb along the hierarchy: it increases as one moves away from the core of the categories, i.e. with the decrease in the aspectual specification of the situation expressed by the verb and in the degree of agentivity and control of the subject, being also sensitive to animacy, as shown in (22a), where the verb *cedere* 'yield' alternates HAVE/BE if the subject is inanimate, whilst it selects only HAVE if the subject is animate.

---

3 We follow a slightly modified version of the ASH, consistent however with its parameters and implicational paths, since synchronic and diachronic evidence from some southern Italian varieties as well as diachronic data from other domains in Late Latin (e.g., pleonastic reflexives and accusative subjects) point to the core of unaccusatives as realised by telic changes of state (Cennamo 1999, 2001, 2002, 2008, 2009).

This accounts for auxiliary alternation with stative verbs (*giacere* 'lie', *scarseggiare* 'be short of', *vivere* 'live'), continuation of states (*sopravvivere* 'survive'), and with verbs denoting uncontrolled process (activity) (*attecchire* 'catch on', *squillare* 'ring') (22b), including weather verbs (*piovere* 'rain', *nevicare* 'snow') (see discussion in § 2.1). Variation also occurs with indefinite change, i.e. verbs which do not encode a telic endpoint (Sorace 2000: 864) (e.g, *marcire* 'rot', *arrossire* 'blush') (23c) and manner of motion verbs (*volare* 'fly', *atterrare* 'land', *saltare* 'jump', *correre* 'run') (21d):

(22) a. *Marco ha   ceduto   /il   pavimento*
          Marco have.PRS.3SG give-in.PP.M.SG /the.M.SG floor.M.SG
          è ~ ha   ceduto.
          be~have.PRS.3SG yield.PP.M.SG
          'Mark has given in/the floor has yielded.'

   b. *I   telefoni   hanno   squillato   /sono*
       the.M.PL phone.M.PL have.PRS.3SG ring.PP.M.SG /be.PRS.3PL
       squillati.
       ring.PP.M.PL
       'The phones have rung.'

Some monovalent verbs, both unergative and unaccusative (*dormire* 'sleep', *piangere* 'cry', and *scendere* 'go down', *salire* 'go up' in the Appendix, respectively), allow also transitive uses, although only with a restricted range of Ps, as shown in (23a–c) and in some cases only with so-called cognate objects, expressing semantic features of the verb, as in (23d–e) and often based on the verbal lexeme/root itself (23f) (Salvi 1988: 60; Lo Duca 2000: 220–221).

     The transitive use of unaccusatives denoting telic and directed motion, such as *scendere* 'go down', *uscire* 'go out', *salire* 'climb, go up' (23g) and continuation of a pre-existing condition, such as *rimanere* 'remain' in Neapolitan (23h), has however strong diatopic connotations, being characteristic of southern varieties (Serianni 1989: 380; Jezek 2003: 88; Cennamo 2011b).

(23) a. *Marco non ha   ancora lavorato   quella   pratica.*
          Mark   not have.PRS.3SG yet   work.PP.M.SG that.F.SG file.F.SG
          'Mark has not worked at that file yet.'

   b. *Marco lavora   il   legno.*
       Mark   work.PRS.3SG the.M.SG wood.M.SG
       'Mario works wood.'

c. *Marco (si) lavorerà il capoufficio /lavorerà il*
Mark   RFL work.FUT.3SG the.M.SG boss.M.SG /work.FUT.3SG the.M.SG
capoufficio ai fianchi.
boss.M.SG at.the.M.PL hip.M.PL
'Mark will (try to) convince his boss.'

d. *Pianse lacrime amare.*
cry.PST.3SG tear.F.PL bitter.F.PL
'He cried bitter tears.'

e. *Dormì il sonno del giusto.*
sleep.PST.3SG the.M.SG sleep.M.SG of.the.M.SG just_man.M.SG
'He slept the sleep of the just.'

f. *Marco ha vissuto una vita difficile.*
Mark   have.PRS.IND.3SG live.PP.M.SG a.F life.F.SG tough.F.SG
'Mark lived a tough life.'

g. *Devo scendere /salire la spesa.*
must.PRS.1SG go_down.INF /go.up.INF the.F.SG shopping.F.SG
'I must take the shopping down/up.'

h. *Ho rimasto le chiavi a casa.*
have.PRS.1SG remain.PP.M.SG the.F.PL key.F.PL at home.F.SG
'I left my keys at home.'

3.4 Bivalent verbs (coding frame: A > V.subj [A] (con+I)

Verbs sharing this coding frame belong to different subclasses, varying both in their aspectual characteristics and in the inherent (e.g., animacy) and relational properties of the A and P arguments (e.g., control and affectedness). They comprise achievements (e.g., *spezzare* 'crack'), different types of accomplishments (e.g., *aprire* 'open', *affondare* 'sink', *guarire* 'heal', including degree achievements/gradual completion verbs like *aumentare* 'increase', i.e., verbs denoting the gradual approximation to a telos that may not be reached (Bertinetto & Squartini 1995), activities (e.g., *colpire* 'hit', *lavare* 'wash') and states (e.g., *amare* 'love', *vedere* 'see') (Cennamo 2003, 2011c and references therein).

The various subtypes of bivalent verbs are identified by means of three syntactic tests in Italian: passivization, anticausativization and optionality of the object. Resultatives ((causative) achievements and some accomplishments) – i.e. bivalent verbs denoting a non-reversible definite change of state on an inanimate, referential, definite, rhematic P argument, carried out by a highly agentive definite, animate, thematic A, with a high degree of control over the situation described by the

verb/predicate –, allow both passivization and anticausativization, but do not allow omission of the object, as shown in (24a–c):

(24) a. *La   finestra   fu   rotta   da Marco.*
     the.F.SG window.F.SG be.PST.3SG break.PP.F.SG by Mark
     'The window was broken by Mark.'

   a′. *Marco ruppe   la   finestra.*
     Mark   break.PST.3SG the.F.SG window.F.SG
     'Mark broke the window.'

   b. *La   finestra   si   ruppe.*
     the.F.SG window.F.SG REFL break.PST.3SG
     'The window broke'

   c. **Marco ruppe.*[4]
     Mark   break.PST.3SG
     'Mark broke.'

Other bivalent verbs, for instance accomplishments with an animate object such as *uccidere* 'kill', *nutrire* 'nourish', allow, instead the omission of the object, with an habitual interpretation, as in (25a) or to refer to a general property/ability, as in (25b):

(25) a. *Ha   ucciso   (più   volte), ecco   perché è   in*
     have.PRS.3SG kill.PP.M.SG (more times) that_is why   be.PRS.3SG in
     carcere.
     jail.M.SG
     'He has killed (several times), that is why he is in jail.'

   b. *Il   latte   nutre.*
     the.M.SG milk.M.SG nourish.PRS.3SG
     'Milk is nourishing.' (lit. 'nourishes')

Interestingly, these verbs do not occur in the anticausative alternation: the corresponding intransitive pattern with the original object as subject can only have a

---

4 This sentence is only acceptable in the informal style in some contexts with a different meaning of the verb *rompere* 'break', that is no longer an achievement, but an activity, meaning 'bore, wear out':

   (i) *Marco ha   rotto/   rompe.*
     Mark   have.PRS.3SG break.PP.M.SG/ break.PRS.3SG
     'Mark has worn me out/wears people out.' (lit. has broken me/breaks).

reflexive/middle[5] interpretation, depending on the verb, as shown in (26a–b). It can never denote the spontaneous manifestation of an eventuality, characteristic of anticausatives, unlike resultatives (achievements/accomplishments) with an inanimate P like *rompere* 'break', *spezzare* 'crack', *aprire* 'open' (see further discussion in §5):

(26) a. reflexive

La   giovane   si   è   uccisa.
the.F.SG   young-woman.F.SG REFL be.PRS.3SG kill.PP.F.SG
'The young woman committed suicide.'

    b. reflexive/middle

I   giovani   si   nutrivano   di bacche.
the.M.PL   young_man.M.PL   REFL nourish.IMPF.3PL of berry.F.PL
'The young men used to feed themselves on berries.'

Bivalent resultative verbs with an animate object and a highly thematically specified A (i.e. agentive) such as *assassinate* 'murder' do not allow instead object omission and a corresponding intransitive pattern, with either A or the original object, P, surfacing as subject, as illustrated in (27a–b):

(27) a. *Marco assassinò   (<*Marco assassinò*   *il*
Mark   assassinate.PST.3SG (<Mark   assassinate.PST.3SG the.M.SG
ladro)
thief.M.SG)
'Mark assassinated'

    b. **Il   ladro   si   assassinò.*
the.M.SG   thief.M.SG   REFL assassinate.PST.3SG
'The thief assassinated himself.'

With some bivalent verbs, therefore, inherent characteristics of the P argument, for instance animacy and the agentivity of A, appear to block the occurrence of constructions that are possible, instead, with bivalent resultatives (either achievements or accomplishments) with an inanimate P and a thematically underspecified A, such as *rompere* 'break', *spezzare* 'crack' etc. Neither of the tests is applicable instead to bivalent stative verbs such as *costare* 'cost', *avere* 'have'.

---

5 The term refers to a pattern denoting a situation in which A is non-agentive, animate and coreferential with P. This is signalled by the reflexive morpheme, that is not an argument of the verb but a marker of the degree of involvement of the non-agentive subject, lacking control over the verbal process.

Although the animacy of P does not have a reflex in its coding, with some bivalent activity verbs, however, there seems to be a kind of D(ifferential) O(bject) M(arking), a phenomenon that is quite robust instead in several central and southern dialects and in the informal speech of the related varieties of Italian (Fiorentino 2003b, 2010 and references therein). For instance, with the verb *pensare* 'think', and *guardare* 'look', under the meaning 'think, regard', the animate object, P, is marked as an adpositional phrase headed by the preposition *a* 'to', as shown in (28a). If P is inanimate, instead, it occurs in the canonical, unmarked form, as in (28b):

(28) a. *Ho   pensato   ad Anna (*Anna).*
       have.PRS.1SG think.PP.M.SG to Anna
       'I have thought of Anna.'

   b. *Ho   pensato   una possibile   soluzione.*
       have.PRS.1SG think.PP.M.SG a.F possible.F.SG solution.F.SG
       'I have thought of a possible solution.'

With this verb, however, the inanimate P argument may also have an adpositional encoding, although with a difference in meaning, signalling a low(er) degree of completion of the verbal event/affectedness of P, as illustrated in (28c–d):

(28) c. complete elaboration
       Ho   pensato   un piano   di attacco.
       have.PRS.1SG think.PP.M.SG a.M plan.M.SG of attack.M.SG
       'I have thought out a plan of attack.'

   d. not fully developed
       Ho   pensato   ad un piano   di attacco.
       have.PRS.1SG think.PP.M.SG to a.M plan.M.SG of attack.M.SG
       'I have thought of a plan of attack.'

With mass nouns, abstract and countable plural nouns also indefinite Ps (as well as indefinite As and Ss) may be marked adpositionally, with all subtypes of bivalent verbs, headed by the preposition *di*, in partitive function, sometimes followed by an article (so-called partitive article), as in (29) (Salvi & Vanelli 2004: 144):

(29) *Ho   visto   dei   ragazzi.*
     have.PRS.1SG see.PP.M.SG of-the.M.PL boy.M.PL
     'I have seen some boys.'

Bivalent verbs also comprise three subtypes of experiencer verbs, so-called *psych-verbs* (Belletti & Rizzi 1988; Arad 1998; Bentley 2006: 93–120), denoting perception,

feelings, emotions, cognitive processes, differentiated on the basis of the coding of the A and P arguments, as summarized in Table 3:

Tab. 3: Syntax and semantics of Experiencer verbs in Italian (adapted from Bentley 2006: 95).

class (i) – 'fear' verbs *temere* 'fear' *amare* 'love' *odiare* 'hate' *avere* + noun *sentire* + noun …	EXP subject (A)	THEMÉ object (P)	*Marco* (A) Mark 'Mark fears Maria/this'	*teme* fear.PRS.3SG	*Maria/questo* (P) Mary/this.M.SG	
class (ii) – 'frighten' verbs *spaventare* 'frighten' *sorprendere* 'surprise' *preoccupare* 'worry' …	THEME/ CAUSE subject (A)	EXP object (P)	*Marco/questo* (A) Mark/this.M.SG 'Mark/this frightens everybody'	*spaventa* frighten.PRS.3SG	*tutti* (P) all.M.PL	
class (iii) – 'like' verbs *piacere* 'like' *dispiacere* 'regret' *interessare* 'interest' *seccare* 'bother' …	EXP object (A)	THEME subject (P)	*A Marco/gli* (A) Mark/he.DAT 'Mark likes Maths' (lit. to Mark/him likes Maths)	*piace* like.PRS.3SG	*la* the.F.SG	*matematica* (P) Maths.F.SG
			La the.F.SG *matematicmatica* Maths.F.SG 'Mark likes Maths' (lit. Maths pleases to Mark)	*piace* like.PRS.3SG	*a* to	*Marco* Mark

Class (i) 'fear'-verbs, with an EXP subject, comprises verbs with an animate subject and a THEME object ([±animate]) (*amare* 'love', *ammirare* 'admire', *disprezzare* 'despise', *ricordare* 'remember', *conoscere* 'know', etc). Class (ii) 'frighten'-verbs consists of bivalent verbs with a thematically underspecified [±animate] THEME/CAUSE subject and an EXP animate object, with canonical coding (and the ACC clitic if pronominalised (*li* in (30b)). Class (iii) 'like'-verbs (so-called inversion verbs (Bossong 1998)), includes verbs with a [±animate] subject and an EXP object with non-canonical encoding, expressed as an adpositional phrase headed by the preposition *a* 'to' if realised by a Nominal, and as a DAT clitic if pronominalised (*gli* 'him') in (30c). In compound tenses class (i) and class (ii) verbs select the auxiliary HAVE, whilst class (iii) verbs select the auxiliary BE, in line with their syntactic intransitivity. The non-correspondence between the semantic role of the A and P arguments of these predicates and the syntactic configurations in which they occur, can be neatly accounted for by considering the semantic parameters which determine the coding of their arguments, in particular the interplay of the aspectual nature of the verb (e.g., the presence/absence of a change component), the degree of agentivity/control of the subject, the thematic role of the object. Class (i)

consists of bivalent states, as shown by the non occurrence of adverbials denoting the completion of the eventuality (i.e, the *in X time* adverbial); it also includes complex predicates consisting of 'have' + noun (*aver caldo* 'feel hot' (lit. have heat), *aver paura (di)* 'be afraid' (lit. have fear) (Bentley 2006: 97):

(30) *Marco* (A) *teme*   *Maria/questo* (P).
    Mark   fear.PRS.3SG Mary/this.M.SG
    'Mark fears Mary/this.'

Class (ii) verbs comprise (causative) changes of state (31) (Bentley 2006: 102). They can have three different interpretations: agentive, eventive (i.e. telic) and stative, depending on the meaning components lexicalized by the verb and the nature of the stimulus (i.e. its animacy) (Arad 1998; Bentley 2006: 101). Some verbs only allow a stative interpretation (*riguardare* 'concern', *preoccupare* 'worry', *disgustare* 'disgust'), whilst other verbs only allow an eventive interpretation (e.g., *sorprendere* 'surprise'). Verbs such as *spaventare* 'frighten' instead may have an agentive, eventive or stative interpretation, according to the agentivity and animacy of the subject, as well as the lack of the change component in the lexical meaning of the verb (Arad 1998):

(31) *Marco/questo* (A) *spaventa*   *tutti* (P).
    Mark/this.M.SG   frighten.PRS.3SG all.M.PL
    'Mark/this frightens everybody.'

The variable aspectual interpretation is brought out by a number of syntactic tests, eliciting the presence/absence of the causative component (i.e. agentivity) and of the change of state component (i.e. telicity), such as reflexivization, and causativization, discussed in §5.1 and §5.2.6, respectively.

    Class (iii) verbs comprise stative verbs and encode the experiencer adpositionally (i.e. as an indirect object), headed by the preposition *a* 'to' if it is a Nominal, a dative clitic if pronominalised, as shown in (32):

(32) *A Marco/gli* (A)   *piace*   *la*   *Matematica* (P).
    to Mark/he.DAT.CL like.PRS.3SG the.F.SG Maths.F.SG
    'Mark likes Maths (lit. to Mark/him likes …).'

The pre-postverbal position of the A and P arguments reflects the distribution of given-new information, with the P argument (the theme) pre-verbal if thematic, post-verbal if rhematic. In compound tenses the auxiliary BE is selected, as with unaccusatives (see §3.3). This class also comprises few bivalent verbs (with a corresponding reflexive variant) which allow a non-canonical, adpositional encoding of P, marked by the preposition *a* 'to' (e.g., *interessar(si)* 'interest', *dispiacer(si)*

'(cause) regret', *seccar(si)* 'annoy, bother'), as shown in (33). The difference between the different encoding of the object reflects the causative/eventive (33a) vs. non-causative/stative (33b) interpretation of the pattern (Bentley 2006: 112–113). In compound tenses the causative/eventive variant takes the auxiliary HAVE, as in (33c), whilst the auxiliary BE is selected in the stative pattern, as in (33d). (For the reflexive variant of these verbs when the subject is animate, see discussion in §5.2.6):

(33) a. *Questo   interessa   molto i   ragazzi.*
       this.M.SG interest.PRS.3SG a_lot the.M.PL boy.M.PL
       'This interests the boys a lot.'

   b. *Questo   interessa   molto ai   ragazzi.*
       this.M.SG interest.PRS.3SG a_lot the.M.PL boy.M.PL
       'This interests the boys a lot.' (lit. interests to the boys)

   c. *Questo   ha   interessato   molto i   ragazzi.*
       this.M.SG have.PRS.3SG interest.PP.M.SG a_lot the.M.PL boy.M.PL
       'This interested the boys a lot.'

   d. *Questo   è   interessato   molto ai   ragazzi.*
       this.M.SG be.PRS.3SG interest.PP.M.SG a_lot to.the.M.PL boy.M.PL
       'This interested the boys a lot.'

3.4.1 Bivalent intransitives

With some bivalent verbs (e.g., *provvedere (a)* 'provide', *resistere (a)* 'resist', *obbedire a* 'obey', *approfittare di* 'take advantage of', etc. the coding of P is not determined by its inherent (e.g., animacy) and relational (e.g., affectedness) properties, as discussed in §3.4, but may reflect the syntactic valency of the verb, with P being marked adpositionally, most typically headed by the prepositions *a* 'to' and *di* 'of', as exemplified in (34):

(34) a. *Marco provvederà   al   pranzo   /provvede*
       Mark   provide.FUT.3SG to.the.M.SG lunch.M.SG /provide.PRS.3SG
       alla   sua   famiglia.
       to.the.F.SG his.F.SG family.F.SG
       'Mark will provide lunch/provides for his family.'

   b. *Marco ha   approfittato   dell'   occasione.*
       Mark   have.PRS.3SG take_advantage.PP.M.SG of.the.SG opportunity.F.SG
       'Mark took advantage of the opportunity.'

Few bivalent activity verbs select an obligatory adpositional locative argument (e.g., *abitare* 'inhabit, live', *vivere* 'live') (35a), optionally occurring with a cognate-

like canonical P, as in (35b). In this use the adpositional locative phrase behaves like an adjunct: it is optional and can be preposed (35b):

(35) a. *Marco abita   a Roma /in campagna.*
          Mark live.PRS.3SG at Rome /in countryside.F.SG
          'Mark lives in Rome/in the countryside.'

  b. (*A Roma*) *Marco abita   una casa   soleggiata.*
          in Rome Mark live.PRS.3SG a.F house.F.SG sunny.F.SG
          '(In Rome) Mark lives in a sunny house.' (lit. 'lives a sunny house')

3.5 Trivalent verbs (coding frame: A > V.subj[A] > T (a+R) (L) (I) (*di*+X))

Trivalent verbs have three nuclear arguments, A, the agent, surfacing as subject, P, the theme object, and the goal/beneficiary of the eventuality described by the verb, realized either by animate/animate-like NPs (e.g., collective nouns denoting people, institutions) – encoded adpositionally (headed by the preposition *a* 'to', *di* 'of')/as a dative clitic pronoun – or as a locative phrase, according to the verb. Various subtypes of trivalent verbs (and related coding frames) can be identified, among which *ditransitives*, involving verbs of *physical transfer*, denoting situations in which an agent 'transfers' the possession of an object to a goal/beneficiary (e.g., *dare* 'give', *inviare* 'send', *vendere* 'sell', *prestare* 'lend', *comprare* 'buy', *restituire* 'return'), as in (36a), including also *verbs of mental transfer* (e.g., *mostrare* 'show', *dire* 'tell', *spiegare* 'explain', *offrire* 'offer', *promettere* 'promise'), exemplified in (36b) (Salvi 1988; Cennamo 2011c):

(36) a. *Marco diede   il   libro   a Giovanni.*
          Mark give.PST.3SG the.M.SG book.M.SG to John
          'Mark gave the book to John.'

  a′. *Marco gli   diede   il   libro.*
          Mark he.DAT.CL give.PST.3SG the.M.SG book.M.SG
          'Mark gave him the book.'

  b. *Marco promise   un regalo   ai   ragazzi*
          Mark promise.PST.3SG a.M present.M.SG to.the.M.PL boy.M.PL
          'Mark promised a present to the boys.'

  b′. *Marco offrì   la   sua   collezione   alla*
          Mark offer.PRS.3SG the.F.SG his.F.SG collection.F.SG to.the.F.SG
          Biblioteca.
          library.F.SG
          'Mark offers his collection of books to the library.'

With a number of verbs (e.g., *mettere* 'put', *accusare* 'accuse', *chiamare* 'call') the non-core nuclear argument can be realised as a locative phrase, as in (37a), a different adpositional argument, as in (37b), or as a canonical object (i.e. a direct object), as in (37c):

(37) a. *Marco mise   il   libro   sul   tavolo.*
        Marco put.PRS.3sg the.M.SG book.M.SG on.the.M.SG table.M.SG
        'Mark put the book on the table.'

   b. *Marco accusò   Luca di plagio.*
        Mark accuse.PST.3SG Luke of plagiarism.M.SG
        'Mark accused Luke of plagiarism.'

   c. *Marco ha   chiamato   sua   figlia   Sara.*
        Mark have.PRS.3SG call.PP.M.SG his.F.SG daughter.F.SG Sarah
        'Mark called his daughter Sarah.'

Also in the *benefactive* construction, exemplified by verbs like *portare* 'carry', *disegnare* 'draw', the beneficiary is coded like the recipient/goal argument of ditransitives, realized either adpositionally, headed by *a* 'to'/*per* 'for', if a full noun, or by the dative if a pronominal clitic, as shown in (38) (Salvi 1988; Malchukov et al. 2010; Zuñiga & Kittilä 2010 for a crosslinguistic perspective):

(38) a. *Marco portò   la   spesa   a Giovanna /per*
        Mark carry.PST.3SG the.F.SG shopping.F.SG to Jane   /for
        Giovanna.
        Jane
        'Mark carried the shopping to Jane.'

   b. *Marco disegnò   un cuore   a Giovanna /per Giovanna.*
        Mark draw.PST.3SG a.M heart.M.SG to Jane   /for Jane
        'Mark drew a heart to Jane.'

   c. *Marco le   portò   la   spesa   /le*
        Mark she.DAT.CL carry.PST.3SG the.F.SG shopping.F.SG /she.DAT.CL
        disegnò   un cuore   (le=to her).
        draw.PST.3SG a.M heart.M.SG
        'Mark carried her the shopping.'

If the beneficiary is not an argument of the verb it can only be encoded as a *per* 'for'-phrase, as in (38d). Both the beneficiary argument and adjunct, however, can be indexed by a dative pronominal clitic, as in (38c, e):

(38) d. *Marco ha   studiato   /analizzato   i*
Mark   have.PRS.3SG study.PP.M.SG /analyse.PP.M.SG the.M.PL
documenti   per Lucio (*a Lucio).
document.M.PL for Lucio (*to Lucio)
'Mark studied/analysed the documents for Lucio.'

e. *Marco gli   ha   studiato   /analizzato   i*
Mark   he.DAT.CL have.PRS.3SG study.PP.M.SG /analyse.PP.M.SG the
documenti.   (gli = per Lucio)
document.PL
'Mark studied/analysed the documents for him.'

4 Uncoded argument alternations

Italian has a very pervasive pattern of P deletion, a valency decreasing alternation, and a number of argument rearranging strategies, with varying degrees of productivity, reflecting the aspectual characteristics of verbs and the inherent and relational properties of core and non-core arguments. The most productive uncoded alternations are object omission (§ 4.1), the oblique subject alternation (§ 4.2) and the body-part possessor ascension alternation (§ 4.3). Other, less productive alternations are discussed in § 6.

4.1 Object Omission

Several verbs in Italian allow an intransitive use, with optionality of the P argument (*insegnare* 'teach', *sentire* 'hear', *fare* 'do, make', *cuocere* 'cook', *pulire* 'clean', *macinare* 'grind', *rubare* 'steal', *guardare* 'look at', *vedere* 'see', odorare 'smell', *temere* 'fear', pensare 'think', *cercare* 'look for', *lavare* 'wash', *chiedere* 'ask', *chiamare* 'call', *costruire* 'build', *uccidere* 'kill', *toccare* 'touch', tagliare 'cut', sbucciare 'peel', dare 'give', *versare* 'pour', *riempire* 'fill', *caricare* 'load' in the Appendix). This category comprises three main subtypes, identifiable through the interplay of the inherent and structural aspects of verb meaning with the degree of thematic specification of the subject (i.e. agentivity/control), the inherent characteristics of P (e.g., animacy), the degree of semantic implication (i.e. 'lexical solidarity') between the verb and the P argument (Coseriu 1971; Jezek 2003: 101 for Italian), as well as the linguistic and extra-linguistic context.

As a general rule the object is optional with verbs denoting states and dynamic situations lacking an inherent final/terminal point, as with activity verbs and active accomplishments (activity verbs allowing an accomplishment use (Van Valin 2005: 32–33)), or accomplishments with animate objects, in iterative uses, whereby

the focus is on the event itself rather than on its impingement on the P argument (Levin 1993: 33; Lo Duca 2000; Cennamo 2003, 2011c, 2012b; Jezek 2003: 94–104; Siller-Runggaldier 2003; among others).

In type (i) the omitted P argument can be [±animate], [±referential], indefinite or reconstructable from the context (so-called *unspecified/indefinite object/strong optionality* (Allerton 1980: 68–69; Levin 1993: 33)). This group includes states (e.g., *vedere* 'see, *amare* 'love')*,* activity verbs (e.g., *cucire* 'sew', *leggere* 'read', *studiare* 'study', *cucinare* 'cook'), as well as active accomplishments like *leggere* 'read', *scrivere,* write', *mangiare* 'eat', *dipingere* 'paint', *cucinare* 'cook', etc, i.e. verbs of consumption and creation, and allow the omission of the object both in imperfective and perfective contexts, as illustrated in (39):

(39) a. *Marco mangiò   e   poi uscì.*
     Mark   eat.PST.3SG and then go.PST.3SG
     'Mark ate and then went out.'

   b. *Marco spazzò   e   lavò   a fondo   prima di*
     Mark   sweep.PST.3SG and wash.PST.3SG thoroughly before to
     partire.
     leave.INF
     'Mark swept and washed the house thoroughly before leaving.'

Type (ii), "generalized null objects" (Lo Duca 2000: 228–232), comprises other activity verbs, such as *visitare* 'visit' and different types of accomplishments (e.g., psych verbs such as *affascinare* 'enchant', active accomplishments like *ritrarre* 'draw/paint and indefinite change/gradual completion verbs/degree achievements like *corrodere* 'corrode'). The unexpressed P is [±human][±generic] (most typically) [+plural] and is either an Experiencer, as with psych-verbs (e.g., *abbrutire* 'abase', *angosciare* 'grieve', *annoiare* 'bore') or a Patient (e.g., *corrodere* 'corrode', *stancare* 'wear out', *graffiare* 'scratch', *mordere* 'bite'). This group only allows the intransitive variant in atelic and imperfective contexts, most typically habitual/attitudinal (Bertinetto & Lenci 2012: 860), as shown in (40) (Lo Duca 2000: 229; Jezek 2003; Cennamo 2011c):

(40) a. *Giovanna affascina   (*ha   affascinato).*
     Jane   enchant.PRS.3SG have.PRS.3SG enchant.PP.M.SG
     'Jane is charming (lit. enchants).'

   b. *l'eccessivo   lavoro   abbrutisce   /logora*
     the.excessive.M.SG work.M.SG abase.PRS.3SG /wear_out.PRS.3SG
     *(*ha   abbrutito/ha logorato).*
     (*have.PRS.3SG abase/wear_out.PP.M.SG)
     'Excessive work abades/wears people out.'

c. *l'acido /l'invidia corrode (*ha corroso)*
the.acid /the.envy corrode.PRS.3SG (*have.PRS.3SG corrode.PP.M.SG)
'acid/envy corrodes'

With some activity, hurt verbs taking an animate P (e.g., *mordere* 'bite', *graffiare* 'scratch', *pizzicare* 'sting'), however, the intransitive use is also possible in perfective contexts, to refer to a generic animate P, as in (40d) (Cennamo 2011c):

(40) d. *Quel   cane   ha   morso,   per   questo*
that.M.SG dog.M.SG have.PRS.3SG bite.PP.M.SG owing.to this
ha   la   museruola.
have.PRS.3SG the muzzle.F.SG
'That dog has beaten people, this is why it wears a muzzle.'

The A or P nature of the unexpressed argument/optional argument with some verbs is signalled by past participle agreement in predicative structures, as shown in (41). If the predicative element, the past participle, refers to the A argument, it must agree with it, as in (41a), where the masculine singular ending *-o* in *vestito* 'dressed', refers to A, the subject, *il pittore* 'the painter'. If the past participle is in the masculine plural ending, it refers to the unexpressed P argument, as in (41b) (Rizzi 1986; Lo Duca 2000: 229–230):

(41) a. *Il   pittore   ritrae   /ritrasse   vestito   di*
the.M.SG painter.M.SG draw.PRS.3SG /draw.PST.3SG dress.PP.M.SG of
bianco.
white
'The painter drew (the painting wearing) a white dress.'
(lit. the painter draws/drew dressed.SG of white)

b. *Il   pittore   ritrae   /ritrasse   vestiti   di*
the.M.SG painter.M.SG draw.PRS.3SG /draw.PST.3SG dress.PP.M.PL of
bianco.
white
'The painter draws/drew people wearing a white dress.'
(lit. the painter draws/drew dressed.PL of white)

c. *I   pittori   dipingono/ dipinsero   vestiti   di*
the.MPL painter.M.PL draw.PRS.3PL draw.PST.3PL dess.PP.M:PL of
bianco.
white
'The painters draw/drew people wearing a white dress.'
(lit. the painters draw/drew dressed.PL of white)
(Lo Duca 2000: 229)

Thus, with a masculine plural subject, as in (41c), the pattern is ambiguous, since the past participle may refer to either the A argument (*pittori* 'painters') or to the unexpressed generic P (Bernard Comrie, p.c.). Type (iii), "definite null objects" (Lo Duca 2000: 232) includes verbs that only allow the intransitive variant if P is recoverable from the linguistic context (anaphoric null object), as in (42a) or from discourse (deictic null object), as in (42b), where the unexpressed P may refer to the Speech Act Participants (speaker and/or hearer) (Lo Duca 2000: 233–234; Jezek 2003: 100):

(42) a. *Ho   ascoltato   la   proposta   e   ho*
      have.PRS.1SG listen.PP.M.SG the.F.SG proposal.F.SG and have.PRS.1SG
      rifiutato.
      refuse.PP.M.SG
      'I listened to the proposal and I turned it down.'

     b. *Marco stanca   /ha   stancato.*
      Mark   tire.PRS.3SG /have.PRS.3SG tire.PP.M.SG
      'Mark wears me/us out/has worn me/us out.'

Although with activity verbs the intransitive variant with an unexpressed inanimate P usually denotes "general attitudes, abilities, dispositions" (Lo Duca 2000: 227; Jezek 2003: 97), as in (41), the intransitive pattern with some activity verbs does not refer to a generic activity, but to an event, whose semantic feature(s) is/are encoded and made explicit by the object (lexical solidarity (Coseriu 1971; Jezek 2003: 99–100)/(low degree of) Individuation of O (Olsen and Resnik 1997)). It may concern single elements, e.g., *tavola* 'table' in *sparecchiare/apparecchiare* 'clear the table/lay the table' (43a), *personale* 'staff' in (43b) or a (narrow) range of objects, such as vehicles (e.g., *macchina* 'car', *moto* 'motor-cycle') for *parcheggiare* 'park' (43c) (Jezek 2003: 99):

(43) a. *Ho   dimenticato   di sparecchiare /apparecchiare.*
      have.PRS.1SG forget.PP.M.SG to clear.INF   /lay_the_table.INF
      'I forgot to clear/lay the table.'

     b. *Non assumono   più   in quella   azienda.*
      not employ.PRS.3PL no_longer in that.F.SG firm.F.SG
      'They no longer employ people in that firm.'

     c. *Marco ha   parcheggiato lontano.*
      Mark   have.PRS.3SG park.PP.M.SG far_away
      'Mark parked far away.'

Also the linguistic and situational context as well as the nature of A (the subject) (e.g., animacy) play an important role in determining the interpretation of the un-

expressed O. With activity verbs allowing a resultative use such as *bere* 'drink' the [±animate] nature of the subject and the discourse context allow one to understand whether the pattern refers to a habitual activity, the drinking of alcohol (44a), or whether it refers to a specific type of liquid (44b–c):

(44) a. *Secondo   me hai   bevuto (sc. alcohol).*
      according.to me have.PRS.2SG PP.M.SG
      'I think you are drunk (lit. you have drunk).'

 b. *Hai   bevuto?   (sc. acqua, coke ...).'*
    have.PRS.2SG drink.PP.M.SG (sc. water, coke ...)
    'Have you drunk? (sc. water, coke ...).'

    Posso   mettere la   bottiglia in   frigorifero?
    Can.PRS.1SG put.INF the.F.SG bottle.F.SG into fridge.M.SG
    'Can I put the bottle back into the fridge?'

 c. *La   mia   macchina beve   (sc. benzina).*
    the.F.SG my.F.SG car.F.SG   drink.PRS. 3SG (sc. petrol.F.SG)
    'My car consumes a lot (lit. drinks).'
    (Jezek 2003: 100)

Interestingly, the omission of the object is only possible in literal uses, as in (45a) (Lo Duca 2000: 233; Jezek 2003: 100). In figurative uses O must be expressed (45b) vs. (45c):

(45) a. *Marco frenò   /ha   frenato   improvvisamente*
      Mark   brake.PST.3SG /have.PRS.3SG brake.PP.M.SG suddenly
      (sc. la macchina).
      (sc. the.F.SG car.F.SG)
      'Mark suddenly braked.'

 b. *Marco ha   frenato   il   loro entusiamo.*
    Mark   have.PRS. 3SG restrain.PP.M.SG the.M.SG their enthusiasm.M.SG
    'Mark restrained their enthusiasm.'

 c. **Marco ha   frenato.*
    Marco   have.PRS.3SG restrain.PP.M.SG
    'Mark has restrained.'

Not only activity verbs, but also accomplishments taking an animate P, such as *uccidere*, *ammazzare* 'kill' allow its omission in order to express the event itself, as in (46a):

(46) a. *Ha   ucciso   (più volte),   ecco   perché*   = (25a)
       have.PRS.3SG kill.PP.M.SG (more times) that.is why
       è   in carcere.
       be.PRS.IND.3SG in jail.M.SG
       'He has killed (several times), that is why he is in jail.'

The possibility of omitting the P argument with these verbs reflects the degree of
thematic specification of the A argument, that is low for *uccidere* 'kill', but high
for *assassinare* 'murder', whose subject is highly agentive. This accounts for the
non omissibility of P with this verb, as shown in (46b) (see also discussion in §3.3):

(46) b. **Marco ha   assassinato   ripetutamente, ecco   perché*
       Mark   have.PRS.3SG murder.PP.M.SG repeatedly   that._is why
       è   in carcere.
       be.PRS.3SG in jail
       '*Mark murdered several times, that is why he is in jail.'

To sum up, the optionality of the object in Italian involves states, activity verbs
and different types of accomplishments, with focus on the event itself rather than
on its impingement on the P argument (Levin 1993: 33; Lo Duca 2000; Cennamo
2003, 2011c, 2012b; Jezek 2003: 94–104; among others). It is banned, instead, with
achievements. The aspectual characteristics of verbs interact, in turn, with other
features such as the elements of meaning lexicalized in the verb (e.g., the type of
result encoded), animacy, definiteness, referentiality as well as with the linguistic
and extra-linguistic context, confirming a general tendency also observable cross-
linguistically (Lazard 1984; Bossong 1991, 1998; Aissen 2003; Cennamo 2003 and
further references therein).

4.2 The oblique subject alternation

This alternation involves the upgrading of the oblique (i.e. adpositional) argument
of a bivalent verb to subject function, with the original A argument unexpressed, as
illustrated in (47). It occurs with verbs of different aspectual classes (achievements,
accomplishments, activities) and comprises four main subtypes: (i) the **Time sub-
ject alternation**, occurring with verbs such as *vedere* 'see', *trovare* 'find', *segnare*
'mark', *causare* 'cause' (47a) as in English (Levin 1993: 79), (ii) the **Instrument
subject alternation**, including natural forces (47b), instantiated by verbs like *sec-
care, asciugare* 'dry', *riscaldare* 'heat', *variare* 'vary', *riprodurre* 'reproduce', and
intermediary instruments, as in (47c), occurring with verbs like *rompere* 'break',
caricare 'load', *scavare* 'dig', *sotterrare* 'bury', (iii) the **Instrument subject alter-
nation with object omission**, a pattern confined to modal or negative polarity
contexts, where the predicate refers to the activity itself as carried out by an Instru-

ment, as in (47c), (iv) the **Locatum subject alternation**, where the subject is realized by an originally oblique argument, the entity whose location is described by the verb (*acqua* 'water' in (47d) (e.g., *riempire* 'fill', *legare*, 'tie' *coprire* 'cover', *inondare* 'flood', *circondare* 'surround', *infettare* 'infect', *ornare* 'decorate') (Levin 1993: 79–82 for English; Lo Duca 2000 for Italian):

(47) a. *Il   2010 ha   segnato   un nuovo   corso*
       the.M.SG 2010 have.PRS.3G mark.PP.M.SG a.M new.M.SG course.M.SG
       nell'azienda.'
       in_the_firm.F.SG
       '2010 marked a new era in the firm.'

   a′. *Nel   2010 il nuovo   direttore   ha*
       in.the.M.SG 2010 the new.M.SG director.M.SG have.PRS.3G
       segnato   un nuovo   corso   nell'azienda.
       mark.PP.M.SG a.M new.M.SG course.M.SG in_the_firm.F.SG
       'In 2010 the new director marked a new era in the firm.'

   b. *Il   sasso   ruppe   il   vetro.*
       the.M.SG pebble.M.SG break.PST.3SG the.M.SG window_pane.M.SG
       'The pebble broke the windowpane.'

   b′. *Marco ruppe   il   vetro   con il   sasso.*
       Mark break.PST.3SG the.M.SG glass.M.SG with the.M.SG pebble.M.SG
       'Mark broke the glass with the pebble.'

   c. *Questa penna   scrive   bene.*
       this.F.SG pen.F.SG write.PRS.3SG well
       'This pen writes well.'

   c′. *Generalmente scrivo   con questa   penna.*
       generally   write.PRS.IND.1SG with this.F.SG pen.F.SG
       'Usually I write with this pen.'

   d. *L'acqua   riempì   il   secchio.*
       the_water.F.SG fill.PST.3SG the.M.SG pail.M.SG
       'Water filled the pail.'

   d′. *Marco riempì   il   secchio di acqua   /con*
       Mark fill.PST.3SG the.M.SG pail.M.SG of water.F.SG /with
       l'acqua.
       the_water.F.SG
       'Mark filled the pail with water.'

4.3 The body-part possessor ascension alternation

This alternation involves a possessor object and a possessed body part (Levin 1993: 71–72), which may be encoded either as an object noun phrase (e.g., *la spalla* 'the shoulder' in (48a), *Marco* in (47b)), or may be expressed as a prepositional phrase (e.g., *sulla spalla* 'on his shoulder' in (48b), *di Marco* 'Mark's shoulder', in (48a), with the possessor expressed as a genitive within the NP). This pattern is fairly common, occurring mainly with accomplishments lacking an inherent endpoint (e.g., *legare* 'tie'), and activities (e.g., *toccare* 'touch', *colpire* 'hit') as shown in (48):

(48) a. *L'uomo   colpì   la   spalla*   (possessed body part)
   the.man.M.SG hit.PST.3SG the.F.SG shoulder.F.SG
   di Marco.
   of Mark
   'The man beat Mark's shoulder.'

  b. *L'uomo   colpì   Marco sulla   /alla   spalla.*
   the.man.M.SG hit.PST.3SG Mark   on.the.F.SG /at.the.F.SG shoulder.F.SG
   'The man beat Mark on his shoulder.'

The choice of the preposition varies according to the body part involved, as in (48b) vs. (48d):

(48) c. *L'uomo   colpì   l'occhio   di Marco.*
   the.man.M.SG hit.PST.3SG the.eye.M.SG of Mark
   'The man poked Mark's eye.'

  d. *L'uomo   colpì   Marco nell'occhio.*
   the.man.M.SG hit.PST.3SG Mark   in.the.eye.M.SG
   'The man poked Mark in the eye.'

Interestingly, in the corresponding patterns with a pronominalized possessor, there occur the dative and accusative forms respectively, as shown in (48e–f):

(48) e. *L'uomo   gli   (sc. Marco) colpì   l'occhio.*   (< (48c))
   the.man.M.SG he.DAT.CL (sc. Mark) hit.PST.3SG the-eye.M.SG
   'The man poked his eye.'

  f. *L'uomo   lo   (sc. Marco) colpì*   (< (48d))
   the.man.M.SG he.ACC.CL (sc. Mark) hit.PST.3SG
   nell'occhio.
   in.the.eye.M.SG
   'The man poked him in the eye.'

4.4 Possessor-attribute alternation

Also the (in)transitive variant of a pattern involving a possessor object and a possessed attribute is extensively used. The attribute may be encoded either as an object noun phrase, as in (49a), or may be expressed adpositionally, headed by the preposition *per* 'for', as in (49b). This pattern occurs with type (i) experiencer verbs, i.e. with bivalent states with an experiencer subject (A) and a theme object (P): *temere* 'fear', *conoscere* 'know', *ammirare* 'admire', *apprezzare* 'appreciate', *stimare* 'esteem', *disprezzare* 'despise', *amare* 'love', *ricordare* 'remember, *invidiare* 'envy', *detestare* 'detest', … (see Levin 1993: 72–74 for analogous verbs in English):

(49) a. *Temo   l'arroganza   di Giovanni.*
fear.PRS.1SG the.arrogance.F.SG of John
'I fear John's arrogance.'

   b. *Temo   Giovanni per la   sua   arroganza.*
fear.PRS. 1SG John   for the.F.SG his.F.SG arrogance.F.SG
'I fear John because of his arrogance.'

5 Coded alternations: voice and valency changes

As pointed out in §2.4, the system of voice alternations and valency changing strategies involves the following patterns and related markers: (i) the **factitive** construction (§5.1), (ii) the **reflexive/reciprocal/middle** construction (§5.2), (iii) **anticausatives** (§5.3), (iv) the **reflexive passive** (§5.4), (v) **impersonal of (lexicalized) reflexives** (§5.5), (vi) **impersonal reflexives** (§5.6), (vii) the **analytic passive** (§5.7). The discussion proceeds from valency increasing mechanisms and alternations to valency decreasing ones.

5.1 The factitive construction

This valency increasing alternation is realized in Italian through the adjoining of two predicates, a factitive verb such as (the causative) *fare* 'make', and (the permissive) *lasciare* 'let', the governing or matrix verb, and a dependent infinitive. The two verbs form a complex predicate, functioning as one unit, with ensuing restructuring of their original argument structure. If the adjoined infinitive is monovalent, its original subject (*cucchiaio* 'spoon' in (50a)) becomes the object of the complex predicate *far(e)/lasciar(e) cadere* (postverbal if nominal, as in (50a), preverbal if pronominal, as in (50b)). If the adjoined infinitive is bivalent or trivalent, its origi-

nal object and indirect objects (*pacco* 'parcel' in (50b), *a Luca* in (50c)) function, respectively, as the direct object and indirect object of the complex predicate *far(e)/ lasciar(e) scartare* 'make/let unwrap' in (50b), *far(e)/lasciar(e) inviare* 'make/let send' in (50c). The original subject (i.e. the causee) is expressed, instead, as either an indirect object (headed by the preposition *a* 'to') or as an agentive phrase (headed by *da* 'by'), if a full nominal, as in (50b). The different encoding of the causee reflects a difference in control, low in the former form (i.e. the *a*-phrase), high in the latter (i.e. the *da*-phrase). If the causee is realized by a clitic pronoun, it goes in the dative and occurs before the complex predicate *fare/lasciare* + V, as in (50d):

(50) a. *Marco fece   /lasciò   cadere il   cucchiaio.*
      Mark   make.PST.3SG /let.PST.3SG fall.INF the.M.SG spoon.M.SG
      'Mark made/let the spoon fall.'

    a′. *Marco lo   fece   /lasciò   cadere.*
       Mark   it.ACC.CL make.PST.3SG /let.PST.3SG fall.INF
       'Mark made/let it fall.'

    b. *Marco fece   /lasciò   scartare   il   pacco   a*
      Mark   make.PST.3SG /let.PST.3SG unwrap.INF the.M.SG parcel.M.SG to
      Luca /da Luca.
      Luke /by Luke
      'Mark made/let Luke unwrap the parcel.'

    c. *Marco fece   /lasciò   inviare   il   libro   a Luca*
      Mark   make.PST.3SG /let.PST.3SG send.INF the.M.SG book.M.SG to Luke
      da Anna.
      by Anna
      'Mark made/let the book to be sent to Luke by Anna.'

    d. *Marco gli   fece   /lasciò   inviare   il*
      Mark   he.DAT.CL make.PST.3SG /let.PST.3SG send.INF the.M.SG
      libro   da Anna.
      book.M.SG by Anna
      'Mark made/let Anna send him the book.'

With ditransitives, although the causee is generally encoded as a *da*-phrase if it is a nominal, as in (50c–d), marginally it can also be realized as an *a*-phrase, although with a different ordering of the causee and the recipient (50e), which cannot be adjacent, since they are both marked by the preposition *a* 'to', as shown in (50f):

(50) e. *Marco fece   /lasciò   inviare   a(d) Anna (causee)*
Mark   make.PST.3SG /let.PST.3SG send.INF to   Anna
il   libro   a Luca (recipient).
the.M.SG book.M.SG to Luke
'Mark made/let Anna send the book to Luke.'

  f. *Marco fece   /lasciò   inviare   il   libro   *a(d)*
Mark   make.PST.3SG /let.PST.3SG send.INF the.M.SG book.M.SG to
Anna (causee) a Luca (recipient).
Anna   to Luke

If the dependent infinitive is a stative verb, in the pattern with the permissive verb *lasciare* 'let', the causee can only be realised as an *a*-phrase, never as a *da*-phrase (50g):

(50) g. *Marco lasciò   vedere il   quadro   a Luca /*da Luca.*
Mark   let.PST.3SG see.INF the.M.SG painting.M.SG to Luke /*by Luke
'Mark let Luke see the painting.'

When the dependent infinitive is a reflexive verb, in the factitive construction the verb occurs without the reflexive morpheme *si*, as in (51):

(51) *Marco fece/lasciò   ribellare (*ribellare)   Giovanni.*
Mark   make.PST.3SG/let.PST.3SG rebel.INF (*rebel himself) John
'Mark made/let John rebel.'

With bivalent (object) experiencer verbs (type ii), in the causative construction the causee can be overtly expressed, realised as a *da*-phrase, only if the verb denotes a change of state and the subject is thematically specified, i.e. agentive, as with *spaventare* in (52a), that can be contrasted with the ungrammaticality of (52b), with the stative verbs *preoccupare* 'worry' (type ii) and *temere* (type i), if the object is inanimate (52g) (see also § 3.4) (Bentley 2006: 103–105; Cennamo 2011a):

(52) a. Marco fece   spaventare i   ragazzi   da Luca /*a Luca.
Mark   make.PST.3SG frighten.INF the.M.PL boy.M.PL by Luke /*to Luke
'Mark made Luke frighten the boys.'
(lit. 'made frighten the boys by Luke/*to Luke.')

  b. *Marco fece   preoccupare i   ragazzi   *da /a Luca.*
Mark   make.PST.3SG worry.INF   the.M.PL boy.M.PL by /to Luke
'*Mark made Luke worry the boys.'

Interestingly, with class (ii) experiencer verbs the causee can only be introduced by the preposition *da* 'by', never by the preposition *a* 'to', as shown in (51a), in line with the aspectual and thematic constraints on causativization with these verbs. Conversely, with experiencer stative verbs of class (iii), inversion predicates such as *piacere*, where A, the experiencer, is in the dative, the causee can only be headed by the preposition *a* 'to', never by *da* 'by', as in (52c):

(52) c. *Marco fa   piacere la   matematica a tutti*
Mark   make.PRS. 3SG like.INF the.F.SG maths.F.SG to all.M.PL
/*da tutti.
/*by all.M.PL
'Mark makes everybody like maths.'

With class (i) experiencer verbs (e.g., *amare* 'love', *ammirare* 'admire', *odiare* 'hate', etc.) the animacy of P appears to determine the coding of the causee, realised as a *da*-phrase if animate (52d, f) and as an *a*-phrase if inanimate, as in (52e, g):

(52) d. *Marco fa   amare i   suoi   studenti   da*
Mark   make.PRS.3SG love.INF the.M.PL his.M.PL student.M.PL by
tutti   /a tutti.
all.M.PL /to all.M.PL
'Mark makes everybody be fond of/love his students.'

   e. *Marco fa   amare la   matematica a tutti*
Mark   make.PRS.3SG love.INF the.F.SG maths.F.SG to all.M.PL
/*da tutti.
/*by all.M.PL
'Mark makes everybody like maths.'

   f. *Marco fa   temere il   suo   cane da tutti*
Mark   make.PRS.3SG fear.INF the his.M.PL dog by all.M.PL
/*a tutti.
/*to all.M.PL
'Mark makes everybody fear his dog.'
(lit. 'makes fear the his dog by/to all.')

   g. *Marco fa   temere il   suo   comportamento a*
Mark   make.PRS.IND.3SG fear.INF the.M.SG his.M.SG behaviour.M.SG to
tutti   /*da tutti.
all.M.PL /*by all.M.PL
'Mark makes everybody fear his behaviour.'
(lit. 'makes fear the his behaviour to everybody/by everybody.')

5.2 The reflexive voice

A major and very pervasive valency decreasing marker is the reflexive morpheme *si*, the unstressed third person singular/plural reflexive pronoun, occurring with a variety of functions, signalling coreference between the A and P arguments of bivalent verbs, and between A and R with trivalent ones, as in its reflexive-middle uses (§ 5.2.1 and 5.2.5), a suppressed A, as in its anticausative (§ 5.3) and passive functions (§ 5.4), as well as a logically implied but unexpressed (A/S or P) argument with variable referential status or even lack of an argument, as in its impersonal uses (§ 5.5 and § 5.6). With all *si*-patterns the auxiliary selected is BE.

5.2.1 The reflexive-middle continuum

Depending on the syntactic valency of the verb, the argumental/non-argumental status of *si*, the animacy and degree of control/affectedness of the A subject, different subclasses of reflexives can be identified: direct, indirect, reciprocal reflexive, middle, inherent, anticausative, passive. The distinction among different types of reflexive patterns, however, is to be seen as a gradient, with overlapping of categories at their periphery, in their non-canonical realizations. It is not always easy, in fact, to detect the function of the reflexive morpheme *si*, owing to the complex interplay between syntactic and semantic features, resulting also from different diachronic paths (Cennamo 1993, 1995, 1999, 2011c, 2014).

5.2.2 Direct and Indirect/Dative Reflexive

In a *direct reflexive* pattern the verb is bivalent, A is animate, high in Potency and coreferent with P, which is signalled by the reflexive morpheme *si*, that is an argument of the verb, as shown by the applicability of the substitution test, whereby *si* can be replaced either by the tonic form *se stesso* 'oneself' or by a clitic complement pronoun, as in (53a):

(53) a. *Marco si protegge con la menzogna.*
     Mark   REFL protect.PRS.3SG with the.F.SG lie.F.SG
     'Mark protects himself by lying.'

   a′. *Marco protegge se stesso /lo protegge con*
      Mark   protect.PRS.3SG REFL himself /it.ACC protect.PRS.IND.3SG with
      la menzogna.
      the.FSG lie.FSG
      'Mark protects himself by lying.'

In compound tenses the pattern with the tonic form *se stesso* and its variants (feminine singular *se stessa*, masculine plural *se stessi*, feminime plural *se stesse*) take

the auxiliary HAVE, unlike the structure with *si*, that selects BE, as shown in (53b–c):

(53) b. *Marco ha   protetto   se   stesso   con la*
      Mark   have.PRS.3SG protect.PP.M.SG REFL.TF self.M.SG with the.F.SG
      menzogna.
      lie.F.SG
      'Mark protected himself by lying.'
      (lit. 'Mark has protected himself with the lie.')

    c. *Marco si è   protetto   con la   menzogna.*
      Mark   REFL be.PRS. 3SG protect.PP.M.SG with the.F.SG lie.F.SG
      'Mark protected himself by lying.'
      (lit. 'Mark has protected himself with the lie.')

In the **indirect/dative reflexive** the verb is trivalent and *si* is an argument of the verb, R, coreferent with the A subject, denoting either the goal/beneficiary of the verbal activity or Possession. In its canonical realization, *si* has the syntactic function of an indirect object, as in (54a). In its non-canonical realization, it is not an argument of the verb, but denotes the degree of involvement/participation of the subject in the verbal activity, as in (54b) (so-called Benefactive/Ethic Dative), frequently used in informal registers (Cennamo 2011b and references therein):

(54) a. *Marco si   comprò   una cravatta.*
      Mark   REFL buy.PST.3SG a.F tie.F.SG
      'Mark bought himself a tie.'

    b. *Marco si   lesse   un libro.*
      Mark   REFL read.PST.3SG a.M book.M.SG
      'Mark read a book.' (lit. 'read himself a book')

5.2.3 Reciprocal Reflexive

The reflexive also marks reciprocal situations, as with (di)transitives, with the two nuclear arguments A and P acting on each other and being both agent and patient of the verbal activity (benefactive in Indirect Reciprocal Reflexive), as shown in (55) (Cennamo 2011b and references therein):

(55) *Essi si   abbracciarono.*
   they REFL hug.PST.3PL
   'They hugged each other.'

5.2.4 Middle reflexive

In its middle function the reflexive is not an argument of the verb (as shown by the non-applicability of the substitution test), but a marker of the degree of involvement of the non-agentive subject, lacking control over the verbal process. Most typically, the notion of control usually differentiates the reflexive and middle patterns, as in (56) (Jezek 2003: 123; Cennamo 2011b; among others):

(56) a. involuntary action

    Luca si è bagnato mentre riparava (middle)
    Luke REFL be.PRS.3SG get_wet.PP.M.SG while repair.PST.3SG
    il lavandino.
    the.M.SG basin.M.SG
    'Luke got wet while repairing the basin.'

  b. voluntary action

    Luca si è bagnato per rinfrescarsi. (reflexive)
    Luke REFL be.PRS.3SG get_wet.PP.M.SG for refresh.INF.REFL
    'Luke got wet deliberately in order to get cooler.'

Interestingly, with object experiencer verbs denoting a state such as *preoccupare* 'worry' (i.e. type (ii)), the reflexive pattern can only have a middle interpretation, as in (56c), whilst telic object experiencer verbs like *spaventare* 'frighten', allow both a middle and a reflexive interpretation, depending on the agentivity of the subject (i.e. control), as shown in (56d):

(56) c. middle interpretation

    I ragazzi si preoccupano. (*di proposito).
    the boy.M.PL REFL worry.PRS.3PL (of purpose)
    'The boys get worried on purpose.' (lit. 'worry on purpose')

  d. reflexive interpretation

    Quei due si spaventano intenzionalmente ogni volta che
    this.M.PL two REFL frighten.PRS.3PL intentionally every time that
    ne hanno l'occasione.
    of.it have.PRS.IND.3PL the.opportunity.F.SG
    'They deliberately frighten each other every time they have the opportunity for it.'
    (Belletti & Rizzi 1988: 298)

5.2.5 Inherent reflexives

Some monovalent and bivalent (most typically denominal) stative (e.g., *fidarsi* 'trust', *vergognarsi* 'shame') and activity (e.g., *congratularsi* 'congratulate', *ribellarsi* 'rebel') verbs with an animate, often non-agentive subject, obligatorily take the reflexive morpheme, as in so-called inherent reflexives (Salvi & Vanelli 2004: 206), illustrated in (57) for a bivalent verb (Jezek 2003: 193 for a partial sample list):

(57) *Giovanna si è congratulata con il vincitore.*
    Jane   RFL be.PRS.3SG congratulate.PP.F.SG with the.M.SG winner.M.SG
    'Jane congratulated the winner.' (lit. 'congratulated herself with the winner')

5.2.6 Other alternations involving the reflexive

With some verbs the presence of the reflexive does not fall under any of the above categories. For instance, with stative verbs of spatial configuration such as *sedere* 'be seated', the corresponding reflexive form *sedersi* 'to sit down', denotes a change of state, thus *si* acts as a telicizer, as shown in (58b) (Salvi & Vanelli 2004: 50; Cennamo 2011c):

(58) a. *Marco sedeva sempre lì.*
      Mark sit.IMPF.3SG always there
      'Mark was always seated there.'

    b. *Marco si sedeva sempre lì.*
      Mark REFL sit.IMPF.3SG always there
      'Mark always sat down there.'

With non-canonical, oblique object experiencer verbs like *dispiacere* 'be sorry', *dolere* 'regret', *interessare* 'interest' (i.e. class iii), the alternation between the reflexive/non reflexive form functions as an applicative-like pattern (§ 6.3), with the reflexive registering on the verb the upgrading of an adpositional argument to subject function, as in (59b), with the original subject (P) encoded adpositionally (Cennamo 2011c):

(59) a. *Questo dispiace molto ai ragazzi.*
      this   displease.PRS.3SG a_lot to.the.M.PL boy.M.PL
      'This greatly displeases the boys.' (lit. 'disappoints to the boys')

    b. *I ragazzi si dispiacciono molto di ciò.*
      the boy.M.PL REFL displease.PRS.3PL a_lot of this
      'The boys are very disappointed for this.' (lit. 'displease themselves of this')

With other (class i) experiencer verbs (i.e. bivalent states) (e.g., *dimenticare* 'forget', *ricordare* 'remember') and other activity verbs (e.g., *sbagliare* 'make a mistake') the presence of the reflexive signals the lack of control of the subject over the verbal process, as shown in (59c–d):

(59) c. *Marco ha   dimenticato   le   chiavi   da* (+control)
        Mark   have.PRS.3SG forget.PP.M.SG the.F.PL key.F.PL at
        Giovanna per riveder-la.
        Jane   for see_again.INF-she.ACC
        'Mark has forgotten the keys at Jane's in order to see her again.'

     d. *Marco si è   dimenticato   le   chiavi   da* (−control)
        Mark   REFL be.PRS.3SG forget.PP.M.SG the.F.PL key.F.PL at
        Giovanna *per riveder-la.
        Jane   for see-again.INF-she.ACC
        'Mark happened to forget his keys *in order to see her again.'

5.3 Coded and uncoded anticausatives

This type of valency decreasing operation may be both coded, marked by the reflexive morpheme *si,* and uncoded, with formal identity between the intransitive and the corresponding transitive verb form. The process is presented as taking place spontaneously (Haspelmath 1987, 1993; among others), without an external causer (A), regarded as either suppressed both syntactically and semantically (Haspelmath 1987: 7) or as suppressed at argument structure (i.e. the lexical syntactic representation) but retained in the lexical semantic representation (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 20–21, 84; Koonz-Garboden 2009: 97). The pattern has different morphosyntactic realizations, characterized by the obligatory presence, absence or optionality of *si*, and by the selection of the auxiliaries BE, HAVE or HAVE/BE in compound tenses (Cennamo 1995, 2011c; Cennamo & Jezek 2011; among others). Three parameters determine the different distribution of *si* and of perfective auxiliaries: the aspectual nature of the verb/predicate, (inherent/relational) properties of the subject (animacy, control/affectedness), lexical (the meaning components encoded in the verb). According to the interplay among these factors and their morphosyntactic manifestations, three subtypes of anticausatives can be identified (Folli 2002; Jezek 2012; Manente 2008):

    Class 1: [+si], [+BE], comprises inherently telic predicates: achievements/accomplishments (e.g., *rompersi,* 'break', *spezzarsi* 'crack', *spegnersi* 'go out'), as shown in (60a), although including also degree achievements/gradual completion verbs (e.g., *svuotarsi* 'empty'), activities (e.g., *esprimersi 'express')* and states (*e.g., basarsi* 'base'):

(60) a. *La   sedia   si   è   rotta.*
       the.F.SG chair.F.SG REFL be.PRS.3SG break.PP.F.SG
       'The chair has broken.'

Class 2: [–si] [+BE], consists of predicates with different degrees of telicity, denoting a gradual change of state or the gradual approximation to a terminal point along a scale, which may or may not be attained, as with degree achievements/gradual completion verbs (e.g., *aumentare* 'increase', *migliorare* 'improve') (Centineo 1995; Sorace 2000: 864). This class comprises, however, also some inherently telic verbs such as *guarire* 'heal', *affondare* 'sink', *cambiare* 'change' and, marginally, activities (e.g., *continuare* 'continue'):

(60) b. *I   prezzi   sono   aumentati   per mesi.*
       the.M.PL price.M.PL be.PRS.3PL raise.PP.M.PL for month.M.PL
       'Prices have gone up for months.'

Class 3: [±si], involves verbs describing a complex event consisting of a change process and an optional telos. The existence of a final state is possible but not necessary (Folli 2002; Schäfer 2008). It comprises accomplishments (e.g., *fonder(si)* 'melt', *bruciar(si)* 'burn', *cuocer(si)* 'cook', *gelar(si)* 'freeze') and degree achievements/gradual completion verbs (e.g., *sbiadire* 'fade away', *ingiallire* 'discolour/ turn yellow'). With these verbs the focus is on the attainment of a final state in the pattern with *si*, as in (60c), and on the process if *si* is lacking, and ensuing telic/ atelic interpretation with related BE/HAVE selection in compound tenses, as in (60c, d) vs. (60e), respectively (Sorace 2000: 874–875):

(60) c. *Il   bosco   si   è   bruciato   (in poco tempo).*
       the.M.SG forest.M.SG REFL be.PRS.3SG burn.PP.M.SG in   short time
       'The forest burnt in a short time.'

    d. *Il   bosco   è   bruciato   in poco tempo.*
       the.M.SG forest.M.SG be.PRS.3SG burn.PP.M.SG in short time
       'The forest burnt in a short while.'

    e. *Il   bosco   ha   bruciato   per ore.*
       the.M.SG forest.M.SG have.PRS.3SG burn.PP.M.SG for hour.F.PL
       'The forest burnt for hours.'

With some verbs, however (e.g., *bruciare* 'burn') BE is also acceptable in an atelic context (60f) and marginally, in the informal speech, HAVE can occur in a telic one (60g) (Manente 2008: 200, 212; Cennamo & Jezek 2011: 817) (59f):

    f. *Il   bosco   è   bruciato   per ore.*
       the.M.SG forest.M.SG be.PRS. 3SG burn.PP.M.SG for hour.F.PL
       'The forest burnt for hours.'

g. *Il   bosco   ha   bruciato   in poche ore.*
the forest have.PRS.3SG burn.PP.M.SG in few   hour.F.PL
'The forest burnt in a few hours.'

Si therefore functions both as a detransitivizer, a marker of the suppressed causer (Cennamo 1995; Bentley 2006: 134) and as the marker of the final (Folli 2002)/result/target state (Manente 2008; Jezek 2008) in the lexical meaning of the verb.

Thus, there appear to be three general semantic constraints on anticausativization in Italian: (i) Aspectual, reflecting the inherent/compositional temporal structure of the verb/predicate, (ii) Thematic, whereby only verbs with a thematically underspecified subject (i.e. agent, instrument, natural cause) can become the subject of a corresponding anticausative form, (iii) Inherent properties of the subject: only the inanimate object of a bivalent telic/atelic verb can become the subject of a corresponding anticausative form. As for the marking of this alternation, degree achievements/gradual completion verbs generally show labile behaviour (lacking an overt morphological marking, the reflexive morpheme *si*), with exceptions/mismatches reflecting residues of early stages where anticausativization was marked through the morpheme *si* with all aspectual classes of verbs, alternating with the labile pattern (Cennamo 2012a).

5.4 Reflexive Passive

The third person singular/plural reflexive morpheme *si* also marks a P-oriented pattern, as in so-called reflexive passives, where the original P of a corresponding transitive verb occurs as subject and A is suppressed and cannot be overtly expressed. In the unmarked word order the [±animate] subject occurs in the preverbal position, it is definite, referential and conveys given information, as in (61) (Cennamo 1995: 85–86). In compound tenses the auxiliary selected is always BE *essere*, in all reflexive patterns. The pattern is possible with all bivalent and trivalent verbs (Bentley 2006; D'Alessandro 2007; Cennamo 2011b and further references therein).

(61) *I   libri_gialli si   leggono   con piacere.*
the.M.PL thriller.M.PL REFL read.PRS.3PL with pleasure
'One reads thrillers with pleasure.' (lit. 'thrillers are read with pleasure')

5.5 Impersonal of (lexicalized) reflexives

In the corresponding impersonal form of (direct/indirect/middle/inherent) reflexives, the defocused A/S argument (the subject), surfaces as *ci*, the 1 personal plural pronoun replacing impersonal *si*, whereby one finds the *ci si* V pattern instead of the sequence *si si* V, as in (62) (Cennamo 2011b, and references therein):

(62) a. *Ci   si   pente.*
    IMPS REFL repent.PRS.3SG
    'One regrets.'

    b. *Ci   si   è   pentiti-e.*
    IMPS REFL be.PRS.3SG repent.PP.M.PL-F.PL
    'One has repented. / We repented.'

    c. *Ci   si   compra   una penna.*
    IMPS REFL buy.PRS.3SG a.F pen.F.SG
    'One buys oneself a pen.'

    d. *Ci   si   è   comprati-e-a   una penna.*
    IMPS REFL be.PRS.3SG buy.PP.M.PL-F.PL-FSG a.F pen.F.SG
    'One has bought oneself a pen.'

In compound tenses there occurs split agreement: the finite verb is in the un-marked third person singular, whilst the past participle is in the plural (masculine or feminine, according to the context), as in (62b, d), following the general rule of Italian whereby in impersonal patterns the nominal predicate is in the plural (Salvi 1988; Cennamo 1993: 36), albeit optionally agreeing with the P argument (*penna* in (62d)).

5.6 Impersonal Reflexive

Si can also signal an indefinite S/A, as in (63a–b) or P (in the so-called impersonal passive pattern, where A can be overtly expressed, surfacing as an adpositional phrase headed by *da* 'by') as in (63c):

(63) a. *Si   parte   /si lavora   /si   è   bambini*
    REFL leave.PRS.3SG /REFL work.PRS.3SG /REFL be.PRS.3SG child.M.PL
    /allegri.
    /happy.M.PL
    'One/they (indef.)/we leave/work; one is a child/is happy.'

    b. *Si   vendono   libri   /si   mangia   /si   mise   un*
    REFL sell.PRS. 3PL book.M.PL /REFL eat.PRS. 3SG /REFL put.PST.3SG a.M
    libro   sul   tavolo.
    book.M.SG on.the.M.SG table.M.SG
    'One/they (indef.)/we sell books/one, they (indef.), we eat/one, they (in-def.) we put a book on the table.'

    c. *Si   è   pagati   meno dallo   Stato.*
       REFL be.PRS.3SG pay.PP.M.PL less   by.the.M.SG Government.M.SG
       'One/they (indef.)/we are paid less by the Government.'

With transitive verbs, in the unmarked word order the subject occurs in the post-verbal position, and is most typically indefinite, non-referential and conveys new information, as in (63b) (Cennamo 1995: 85–86; Bentley 2006; D'Alessandro 2007; Cennamo 2011b and references therein). In most northern dialects, Florentine and in the corresponding regional varieties, although with varying degrees of acceptability (Salvi 1988: 102), reflecting the definiteness/indefiniteness of the nominal (D'Alessandro 2007), one finds, however, the non-agreeing form (63d–e)[6] (Cennamo 1997: 153–54), that in standard Italian is only possible when *si* is cliticised onto the finite verb, in fixed phrases such as (63f):

(63) (Example (63d) is Genoese)

    d. *Se   'leze   fasil'mente i   'libri.*
       REFL read.PRS.3SG easily   the.M.PL books.M.PL
       'One reads the books easily.'

    e. *Si   vende   libri   /i   libri.*
       REFL sell.PRS.3SG book.M.PL /the.M.PL book.M.PL
       'One sells books/the books; books/the books are sold.'

    e′. *Li   si   vende.*   (*li* = the books)
       they.CLM.ACC REFL sell.PRS.3SG
       'One sells them; they are sold.'

    f. *Affittasi   stanze   (*affittansi) /vendesi*
       rent.PRS. 3SG.REFL room.F.PL (*rent.PRS.3PL /sell.PRS. 3SG.REFL
       appartamenti   (*vendensi).
       apartment.M.PL sell.PRS. 3PL
       'Rooms are for rent/apartments are on sale.'

When the nominal (object) is pronominalised, however, in standard Italian the non-agreeing pattern occurs, with the verb in the default third person singular inflection, as in (63e′). The logically implied understood participant can be generic or existential/indefinite, also optionally comprising the Speech Act Participants, as

---

6 In Florentine and other Tuscan, Umbrian and some Lazio varieties, however, (63e) has a different, first person plural interpretation, 'we sell books/the books', since *si*+3SG has replaced the 1PL ending (Cennamo 1997: 158, 2014: 82).

in the first person plural, inclusive interpretation, according to the temporal reference of the clause and the aspectual nature of the predicate. With unaccusatives, in fact, the generic interpretation is impossible with specific time reference, unlike with unergatives, as shown in (64a), that only allow an inclusive interpretation:

(64) a. *Ieri   si è   partiti   presto.*
     yesterday REFL be.PRS.3SG leave.PP.M.PL early
     'We left early.' (*One left early)

   b. *Ieri   si è   camminato   a lungo.*
     yesterday REFL be.PRS.3SG walk.PP.M.SG at length
     'Yesterday they (indef.)/we walked for a long time.'

The inclusive interpretation of impersonal *si*, however, can be 'suspended' with unaccusatives if the predicate is temporally unbounded, e.g., in a hypothetical clause, as in (64c), that allows both an inclusive and a generic interpretation (Cinque 1988: 150; D'Alessandro 2007: 154 f.; Cennamo 2014: 76):

(64) c. *Ieri,   se si fosse   arrivati   tardi*
     yesterday if REFL be.PST.SUBJ.3PL arrive.PP.M.PL late
     all'appuntamento.
     at.the.appointment.M.SG
     'Yesterday, if we had arrived/they (indef.) had arrived late at the appointment.'

Unaccusatives and unergatives also trigger a different agreement pattern in compound tenses with impersonal *si*, with which the auxiliary BE is selected, with all verb classes. The past participle, in fact, is in the umarked masculine singular form with unergatives (and transitives), as in (65a–b), whereas it is in the plural (masculine/feminine) with unaccusative verbs/predicates, as in (65c–d) (thus also with equative structures and passives):

(65) a. unergative
     Si è   giocato.
     REFL be.PRS.3SG play.PP.M.SG
     'One/they (indef.)/we have played.'

   b. transitive
     Si è   letto   /pagato.
     REFL be.PRS.3SG read.PP.M.SG pay.PP.M.SG
     'One/they (indef.)/we have read/paid.'

c. unaccusative

Si è partiti presto.
REFL be.PRS.3SG leave.PP.M.PL early
'We left early.'

d. passive/equative

Si è letti /pagati /felici.
REFL be.PRS.3SG read.PP.M.PL /pay.PP.M.PL /happy.M.PL
'One/they (indef.)/we are read/paid/happy.'

Interestingly, whereas impersonal *si* is possible with all verb classes in finite tenses, in non-finite forms of the verbs its occurrence is lexically constrained. For instance, in the gerund it is impossible with unaccusatives (66a) (Salvi & Vanelli 2004: 76), whilst being only marginally acceptable with unergatives (66b):

(66) a. **Essendosi partiti all'alba.*
be.GER.REFL leave.PP.M.PL at.the.dawn
'Having we left at dawn.'

b. *??Essendosi lavorato /dormito fino a tardi.*
be.GER.REFL work.PP.M.SG /sleep.PP.M.SG till at late
'Having one/they (indef.)/we worked/slept till late.'

5.7 (Analytic) passives

Passives, i.e. patterns with a P subject and suppression of A, optionally surfacing as an adpositional phrase headed by *da* 'by'/*da parte di* 'on behalf of' in Italian, are expressed by means of a *marked verb morphology* involving the auxiliaries *essere* BE, *venire* COME, *andare* GO + the past participle of the lexical verb, agreeing in gender and number with the subject, with different aspectual constraints. BE (*essere*) occurs in simple and compound tenses (i.e. in dynamic-eventive and resultative functions), with all verbs, as in (67a). COME (*venire*) occurs only in simple tenses, i.e. only with a dynamic-eventive function (67b); GO (*andare*) occurs mainly with deontic value (dynamic-eventive passive), as in (66b), and only marginally in non-deontic function, in a resultative construction, with a restricted number of telic verbs and inanimate subjects (e.g., *distruggere* 'destroy', *perdere* 'lose'), as in (67d) (Bentley 2006: 346–349 and references therein):

(67) a. *Il tetto fu distrutto da un fulmine.*
the.M.SG roof.M.SG be.PST.3SG destroy.PP.M.SG by a.M lightening.M.SG
'The roof was destroyed by a lightening.'

b. *Il   tetto   verrà   riparato   domani.*
   the.M.SG roof.M.SG come.FUT.3SG repair.PP.M.SG tomorrow
   'The roof will be repaired tomorrow.'

c. *Il   tetto   va   sostituito   /riparato.*
   the.M.SG roof.M.SG go.PRS.3SG replace.PP.M.SG /repair.PP.M.SG
   'The roof ought to be replaced/repaired.' (lit. 'goes repaired')

d. *Il   tetto   è   andato   distrutto*
   the.M.SG roof.M.SG be.PRS.3SG go.PP.M.SG destroy.PP.M.SG
   */*rotto.*
   /*break.PP.M.SG
   'The roof has been destroyed.' (lit. 'has gone destroyed/*broken')

Passivization is possibile with achievements (e.g., *strappare* 'tear'), accomplishments (e.g., *bruciare* 'burn', *affondare* 'sink', *costruire* 'build', *uccidere* 'kill'), activities (e.g., *dire* 'tell', *abbracciare* 'hug'), and states (e.g., *vedere* 'see', *amare* 'love'), most typically with postverbal subjects if they are indefinite/generic, although preverbal subjects are equally possible with achievements and accomplishments (68a):

(68) a. *Ogni anno vengono   /sono   distrutti   querceti*
        every year come.PRS.3PL /be.PRS.3PL destroy.PP.M.PL oak-grove.M.PL
        e   aranceti   /querceti   e   aranceti
        and orange-grove.M.PL oak-grove.M.PL and orange-grove.M.PL
        vengono   /sono   distrutti ...
        come.PRS.3PL /be.PRS.3PL destroy.PP.M.PL
        'Every year oak-groves and orange-groves are destroyed.'

In contrast, passivization of activity verbs with an indefinite/generic P is impossible, regardless of the pre-postverbal position of the subject (68b–c) vs. (68d) (Van Valin & La Polla 1997: 149, 657, note 4; Cennamo 2003: 53 for an analogous constraint in English). A different strategy is used, the reflexive passive, as shown in (68e), the corresponding patterns of the ungrammatical (68c):

(68) b. **Carne   fu   mangiata /mele   furono   mangiate*
        meat.F.SG be.PST.3SG eat.PP.F.SG apple.F.PL be.PST.3PL eat.PP.F.PL
        (da Anna).
        by Anna
        'Meat was eaten/apples were eaten (by Anna).'

c. **?fu mangiata carne/furono mangiate mele (da Anna)*

d. *La   carne   fu   mangiata   /le   mele*
   the.F.SG meat.F.SG be.PST.3SG eat.PP.F.SG the.F.PL apple.F.PL

> *furono   mangiate   da Anna.*
> be.PST.3PL eat.PP.F.PL by Anna
> 'The meat was eaten/the apples were eaten by Anna.'

e. *Si   mangiò   carne   /si   mangiarono mele.*
   REFL eat.PST.3SG meat.F.SG /REFL eat.PST.3PL apple.F.PL
   'Meat was eaten/apples were eaten.'
   (Other possible interpretation: 'One, they (indef.) ate meat/apples.')

6 Other argument rearranging alternations

There also occur a number of valency rearranging operations involving core (namely P) and non-core arguments, that are very frequent in other languages (e.g., English) but that appear to be confined to a limited number of activity verbs in Italian: the **conative** (§ 6.1), the **locative** (§ 6.2) and the **applicative(-like)** (§ 6.3) constructions.

6.1 The conative alternation

The intransitive variant of a transitive pattern, with the prepositional encoding of the P argument reflecting the lack of attainment of the verbal process, and related low degree of affectedness of P, the so-called **conative** alternation (Guerssel et al. 1985; Levin 1993: 41–42; Cennamo 2003: 56, 2011c; among others), exemplified in (68a), is only marginally attested in Italian (see also discussion in § 3.4). Unlike in English and other languages, where this alternation occurs with verbs of impact/ concussion/contact/motion (Levin 1993: 42, Cennamo 2003 and further references therein), in Italian this pattern is attested mainly with verbs of saying (e.g., *discutere* 'discuss', *raccontare* 'tell', *accennare* 'hint, mention') and of mental process (e.g., *pensare* 'think'). Also other activity verbs allow this alternation when P is inanimate (e.g., *applaudire* 'applaud', *ammiccare* 'wink', *supplire* 'replace'), at times in figurative uses and only with abstract P arguments. In the last use marginally also accomplishments may be found, as in (69) (the issue, however, needs further investigation) (see also discussion in Lenci 2012: 8, 13):

(69) a. conative coding
    Marco raccontò   della   propria   esperienza.
    Mark   narrate.PST.3SG of.the.F.SG own.F.SG experience
    'Mark talked about his experience.' (lit. 'told of his experience')

b. canonical coding
Marco raccontò   la   propria   esperienza.
Mark   narrate.PST.3SG the.F.SG own.F.SG experience
'Mark narrated his experience.'

c. canonical coding
Marco riparerà   i   danni   causati
Mark   remedy. PRS.FUT.3SG the.M.PL damage.M.PL cause.PP.M.PL
dal   suo predecessore.
by.the.M.SG his predecessor
'Mark will remedy the damages caused by his predecessor.'

d. conative coding
Marco riparerà   ai   danni   causati
Mark   remedy. PRS. FUT.3SG to.the.M.PL damage.M.PL cause.PP.M.PL
dal   suo predecessore.
by.the.M.SG his predecessor.M.SG
'Mark will remedy the damages caused by his predecessor.'

6.2 The locative alternation

Also the locative alternation has a low degree of productivity in Italian. In this type of alternation the canonical/non-canonical (i.e. adpositional) encoding of the P argument of a bivalent verb, headed by the preposition *di* 'of', reflects the holistic/partitive interpretation of the location argument (Levin 1993: 50). When the location argument is expressed as a canonical object, as in (70b), it is associated with a holistic/affected interpretation; when the location argument is realized as an adpositional phrase, as in (70b), it is associated with a partitive interpretation (Levin 1993: 50–51; Iwata 2008 and references therein).

(70) a. *Caricai   la   macchina di libri.*
load.PST.1sg the.F.SG car.F.SG   of book.M.PL
'I loaded the car with books.'

b. *Caricai   i   libri   in macchina.*
load.PST.1SG the.M.PL book.M.PL in car.F.SG
'I loaded the books onto the car.'

6.3 The applicative(-like) pattern

Italian also seems to allow, although, marginally, an applicative-like alternation, a transitive pattern (71a) derived from an intransitive construction (71b) with an origi-

nal adjunct 'promoted' to object status. Unlike in canonical applicative constructions, however, there occurs no change in the verb morphology. This pattern appears with some activity verbs with an emotional overtone (e.g., *urlare*, *gridare* 'scream', *piangere* 'cry', *strillare* 'yell', *soffrire* 'suffer':

(71) a. *Marco urlò   il   proprio   dolore.*
     Mark scream.PST.3SG the.M.SG own.M.SG sorrow/pain.M.SG
     'Mark screamed with pain.' (lit. 'Mark screamed his pain/sorrow.')

   b. *Marco urlò   per   il   dolore.*
     Mark scream.PST.3SG owing.to the.M.SG pain/sorrow.M.SG
     'Mark screamed with pain/under sorrow.'

7 Conclusion

The analysis of the coding and behavioural properties of different valency classes of verbs in Italian reveals the existence of a number of regularities, reflecting the interplay of the structural aspect of a verb meaning (i.e. its event structure template) with the elements of meaning lexicalized in its root (e.g., state, target/result state, manner, location etc.) and the inherent/relational properties of their arguments (e.g., animacy and control/affectedness).

As regards the **coding properties** of verbs, there appear to emerge the following general characteristics: **Flagging** (instantiated by adpositional marking, with a minimal case distinction for non-subject clitic and 1/2/3 SG tonic pronouns), although mainly used to mark non-core arguments and adjuncts, may be used to mark an atypical P, as shown by the adpositional marking of P with some activity/stat*e* verbs, reflecting its animacy and low degree of affectedness, as with the verb *pensare* 'think'. **Indexing** (realized by verb agreement and auxiliary selection) is the main coding strategy for core arguments, S, A and P: the verb agrees with A/S in simple tenses in the active voice, whilst agreeing with the P subject in the passive. In perfective contexts (i.e. in compound tenses) indexing is sensitive to aspectual and thematic notions, namely telicity and control/affectedness of S, as well as to animacy, thereby differentiating two subtypes of S. Consistent BE selection+past participle agreement occurs with achievements and accomplishments, i.e. verbs of telic change and a patient S (S_P), whilst consistent selection of HAVE+ lack of agreement occur with activity verbs, i.e. dynamic atelic verbs with an agent S (S_A). Variable auxiliary selection is displayed instead by stative verbs, whose flexible behaviour reflects the range of possible interpretations, resulting from their (compositional) aspectual reclassification (e.g., as achievements and accomplishments). The presence/lack of agreement also signals the S_P/P status of the underlying unexpressed argument with impersonal *si* constructions, and the P status of the omitted

argument of some divalent activity verbs allowing object omission in a predicative construction, such as *visitare* 'visit', *ritrarre* 'paint'.

Also for the behavioural coding of verbs, the distribution of syntactic alternations across verbs reflects aspectual, thematic notions as well as the nature of arguments (e.g., animacy). In particular, the omission of P occurs with activities, active accomplishments (i.e. verbs which do not lexicalize a final point), states, as well as with accomplishments with an animate P, such as *ammazzare, uccidere* 'kill', whilst being impossible with achievements and accomplishments with an inanimate P. The oblique subject alternation reflects, instead, the type and degree of telicity lexicalized in the verb, whilst the conative, locative and applicative alternations only apply to activity verbs. The degree of aspectual specification of a verb also plays a role in allowing the overt expression of the causee in causatives with experiencer verbs, that is impossible for stative object experiencer verbs (e.g., *preoccupare* 'worry').

On the whole the Italian data confirm general trends observed cross-linguistically, such as the uniform coding and behavioural properties of achievements and accomplishments lexically encoding telicity (i.e. a result state) as opposed to the variability of verbs encoding different types and degrees of telicity, such as active accomplishments and degree achievements, with some properties confined to specific clusters of verbs, such as activities and states.

Thus, as regards one pervasive manifestation of indexing, auxiliary selection, the thematic and aspectual parameters determining it in Italian – telic dynamic change ~ patienthood and atelic, non-motional activity ~ agentivity with gradient effects, along Sorace's 2000, 2004 ASH – also mould it in several European languages (Dutch, French, German) (Sorace 2000; Keller & Sorace 2003; Diedrichsen 2013) as well as in other typologically distant languages such as Chinese (Liu 2007). As for the most widely used alternations, non-reflexive anticausatives tend to occur with degree achievements and marginally activities and states, confirming the preference for P-lability for verbs with lower semantic transitivity across languages (Letuchiy 2009). Also the semantic constraints on the omission of P are not specific to Italian but widespread cross-linguistically, although varying in their morphological realization (e.g., A-lability in Italian and English vs. the presence of the reflexive for indefinite object deletion and a habitual action in Russian and for indefinite object deletion in Dyirbal or the antipassive in Tzutujil (a Mayan language) for accomplishments under a habitual meaning) (Levin 1993: 33; Comrie 1985: 328; Malchukov, this volume; Van Valin & La Polla 1997: 302; Cennamo 2003; among others). In contrast, the lexical restrictions on the conative alternation appear to be peculiar to Italian, where this alternation involves verbs of saying and mental process rather than verbs of impact/concussion/contact/motion, as in English (Levin 1993: 41–42) and other languages (e.g., Warlpiri and Hungarian) (Simpson 1991: 327–333; Moravcsik 1978; Cennamo 2003: 86 and further references therein).

The Italian data also point to the usefulness of an approach integrating the insights from typological research on transitivity and valency with the event struc-

ture perspective on verb meaning and on the role played by the elements of meaning lexicalized in the root in determining argument realization.

Appendix

The table below summarizes the various valency patterns of Italian, with related coding frames and some uncoded and coded alternations. The verbs are listed according to their number of arguments, from zerovalent to trivalent ones.

#	Meaning label	Verb form	Coding frame schema	AUX	Object Omission	Oblique Subject	Anti-causative	Body part possessor	Impersonal of Reflexives	Impersonal Reflexive	Reflexive Passive	Reflexive
69	RAIN	*piovere*	(S) >V.subj[3SG/S]	BE/HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	'lighten, flash'[7]	*lampeggiare*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE/HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
46	BLINK	*sbattere le palpebre*	1 > V.subj[1]	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	m	–
47	COUGH	*tossire*	1 > V.subj[1]	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
49	RUN	*correre*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE/HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
52	JUMP	*saltare*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE/HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
53	SING	*cantare*	1 > V.subj[1]	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	m	indir.
58	SCREAM	*urlare*	1 > V.subj[1]	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
61	DIE	*morire*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
63	BE SAD	*essere triste*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
64	BE HUNGRY	*avere fame*	1 > V.subj[1]		–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–

7 This entry is not part of the database.

#	Meaning label	Verb form	Coding frame schema	AUX	Object Omission	Oblique Subject	Anti-causative	Body part possessor	Impersonal of Reflexives	Impersonal Reflexive	Reflexive Passive	Reflexive
64	BE HUNGRY	*essere affamato*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
68	BE DRY	*essere arido*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
81	APPEAR	*apparire*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
82	BE ILL	*essere malato*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
83	CRY	*piangere*	1 > V.subj[1]	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	m	–
84	FALL	*cadere*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
	'go down'[8]	*scendere*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
	'go up'	*salire*	1 > V.subj[1]	BE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
50	SIT	*sedere*	1 > V.subj[1] (> LOC2)	BE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
51	SIT DOWN	*sedersi*	1 > V.subj[1] (> LOC2)	BE	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–
54	GO	*andare*	1 > V.subj[1] (> LOC2)	BE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
56	LIVE	*abitare*	1 > V.subj[1] (> LOC2)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
59	FEEL PAIN	*sentire dolore*	1 > V.subj[1] (> LOC2)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
59	FEEL PAIN	*avere dolore*	1 > V.subj[1] (> LOC2)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
60	FEEL COLD	*sentire freddo*	1 > V.subj[1] (> LOC2)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–

8 This and the following entry are not part of the database.

60	FEEL COLD	*avere freddo*	1 > V.subj[1] (> LOC2)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
62	PLAY	*giocare*	1 V.subj[1] (con+2)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	m	–
57	LAUGH	*ridere*	1 V.subj[1] (di+2)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
8	LIKE	*piacere*	a+1 > V.subj[2] > 2	HAVE	–	+	–	–	+	–	–	indir.; (dir.) recipr.
1	EAT	*mangiare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	indir.
2	HUG	*abbracciare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	m; (dir.) recipr.
3	LOOK AT	*guardare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	m	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir./ indir.; (dir.) recipr.
4	SEE	*vedere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir./indir.; (dir.) recipr.
5	SMELL	*odorare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	BE/HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir.; (dir.) recipr.
6	FEAR	*temere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	m; (dir.) recipr.
7	FRIGHTEN	*spaventare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	m	+	–	–	+	+	+	mid.; (dir.) recipr.
9	KNOW	*conoscere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir.; (dir.) recipr.
11	SEARCH FOR	*cercare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	dir., indir.; (dir.) recipr.

#	Meaning label	Verb form	Coding frame schema	AUX	Object Omission	Oblique Subject	Anti-causative	Body part possessor	Impersonal of Reflexives	Impersonal Reflexive	Reflexive Passive	Reflexive
12	WASH	*lavare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	dir./ indir.; (dir.) recipr.
13	DRESS	*vestire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	m	+	dir.; (dir.) recipr.
15	HELP	*aiutare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir.; (dir.) recipr.
16	FOLLOW	*seguire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	–; (dir.) recipr.
17	MEET	*incontrare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	mid.; (dir.) recipr.
20	SHOUT AT	*sgridare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	–; (dir.) recipr.
33	PEEL	*sbucciare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	indir./mid.; (indir.) recipr.
48	CLIMB	*scalare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	+	–	–	–	–	+	+	–
55	LEAVE	*lasciare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	–; (dir.) recipr.
73	DIG	*dissotterrare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	–	+	–	–	+	+	+	indir.

#		Verb	Pattern	Aux								Notes
78	HEAR	*sentire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	indir.; (dir.) recipr.
78	HEAR	*udire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	+	–
79	COOK	*cuocere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	–	+	+ cod./ unc.	+	+	+	+	indir.; (ind.) recipr.
87	WANT	*volere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	HAVE	+	–	–	–	m	+	+	– (dir.) recipr.
126	BOIL (tr)	*bollire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	?	–	–	unc.	–	+	+	+	indir.
128	ROLL (tr)	*rotolare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2	BE/HAVE	–	–	unc.	–	+	+	+	dir./mid.
18	TALK	*parlare*	1 > V.subj[1] > (a+2) (di+3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	indir.
55	LEAVE	*partire*	1 V.subj[1] (da+2) (per+3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
38	CARRY	*trasportare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (> LOC3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	recipr.
39	THROW	*lanciare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (> LOC3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir.; dir./ indir. recipr.
41	PUT	*mettere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (> LOC3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir./indir.; (indir.) recipr.
42	POUR	*versare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (> LOC3)	HAVE	–	–	cod.	–	+	+	+	indir.; (indir.) recipr.

#	Meaning label	Verb form	Coding frame schema	AUX	Object Omission	Oblique Subject	Anti-causative	Body part possessor	Impersonal of Reflexives	Impersonal Reflexive	Reflexive Passive	Reflexive
74	PUSH	*spingere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (> LOC3)	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir./indir.; (dir.) recipr.
14	SHAVE	*radere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3)	HAVE	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	dir./indir.; (indir.) recipr.
19	ASK FOR	*chiedere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3)	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	–; (indir.) recipr.
21	TELL	*raccontare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir.; (indir.) recipr.
22	SAY	*dire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3)	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir./indir.; (indir.) recipr.
34	HIDE	*nascondere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3)	HAVE	–	+	+ cod.	–	+	+	+	dir./indir.; (dir./indir) recipr.
35	SHOW	*mostrare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3)	HAVE	–	–	+ cod.	–	+	+	+	dir./mid.; (indir.) recipr.
36	GIVE	*dare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	dir./indir.; indir
37	SEND	*inviare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	–; indir

#												
75	BRING	*portare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3)	HAVE	–	+	–	–	+	+	+	indir.; (indir.) recipr.
77	TEACH	*insegnare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3)	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	–
25	BREAK	*rompere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	HAVE	–	+	+ cod.	–	+	+	+	mid.; (dir./ indir) recipr.
26	KILL	*uccidere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	HAVE	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	dir.
27	BEAT	*colpire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	HAVE	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	dir./indir./ mid.; (dir.) recipr.
28	HIT	*urtare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	?	–	+	–	+	+	+	+	–; (dir.) recipr.
29	TOUCH	*toccare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	HAVE	m	–	–	+	+	+	+	dir./indir./ mid.; (dir.) recipr.
30	CUT	*tagliare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	HAVE	–	–	+ cod.	–	+	+	+	indir./mid.; (dir./indir.) recipr.
43	COVER	*coprire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	HAVE	–	+	+ cod.	–	+	+	+	dir./indir./; (dir.) recipr.
44	FILL	*riempire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	HAVE	m	+	+ cod.	–	+	+	+	dir./indir.; (indir.) recipr.

#	Meaning label	Verb form	Coding frame schema	AUX	Object Omission	Oblique Subject	Anti-causative	Body part possessor	Impersonal of Reflexives	Impersonal Reflexive	Reflexive Passive	Reflexive
71	GRIND	*macinare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	HAVE	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	indir.
91	ASSASSI-NATE	*assassinare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–
116	BURN (tr)	*bruciare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	HAVE	–	+	+ cod./unc.	+	+	+	+	mid.
125	SINK (tr)	*affondare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (con+3)	?	–	+	+ uncod.	–	–	+	m	–
31	TAKE	*prendere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (da+3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	indir.; (dir./indir.) recipr.
32	TEAR	*strappare*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (da+3)	HAVE	–	–	+ cod.	–	+	+	+	indir./mid.; (indir.) recipr.
72	WIPE	*pulire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (da+3)	HAVE	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	dir./indir.; (m) recipr.
86	GET	*ricevere*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (da+3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	m	+	+	–
90	CLEAN	*pulire*	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (da+3)	HAVE	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	dir./indir.; (m) recipr.

24	BUILD	costruire	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (di+3)	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	indir.
85	MAKE	fare	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (di+3)	HAVE	–	–	–	–	+	+	+	indir.; (indir.) recipr.
45	LOAD	caricare	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (su+3)	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	indir.
23	NAME	chiamare	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 > 3	HAVE	–	–	–	–	m	+	+	dir.; (dir.) recipr.
40	TIE	legare	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3) (con+4)	HAVE	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	dir./indir.; (dir.) recipr.
76	STEAL	rubare	1 > V.subj[1] > 2 (a+3) (da+4)	HAVE	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	indir.; (indir.) recipr.
70	BE A HUNTER	no verbal counterpart	N/A		–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Legend: + = occurs regularly; m = occurs marginally; – = occurs never; _ = no data; dir. = direct; indir. = indirect; mid. = middle.

Abbreviations

ACC	Accusative	mid	middle
cod	coded	PP	past participle
CL	clitic	PL	plural
DAT	dative	PRS	present (tense)
dir	direct	PST	past (tense)
EXP	experiencer	REFL	reflexive
F	feminine	SG	singular
FUT	future (tense)	SV(O)	Subject Verb (Object)
IMPF	imperfect (tense)	TF	tonic form
IMPS	impersonal	unc	uncoded
indir	indirect	1	first person
INF	infinitive	2	second person
M	Masculine	3	third person

References

Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. 21(3). 435–483.

Allerton, David J. 1980. *Valency and the English Verb*. London: Academic Press.

Arad, Maya. 1998. Psych-notes. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 10. 203–222.

Aranovich, Raúl (ed.). 2007. *Split Auxiliary Systems*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Belletti, Adriana & Luigi Rizzi 1988. Psych verbs and theta theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6. 291–352.

Bentley, Delia. 2006. *Split Intransitivity in Italian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bentley, Delia. 2008. The interplay of focus structure and syntax: evidence from two sister languages. In Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. (ed.), *Investigations of the Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface,* 263–284. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco & Mario Squartini. 1995. An attempt at defining the class of gradual completion verbs. In Piermarco Bertinetto, Valentina Bianchi, James Higginbotham & Mario Squartini (eds.), *Temporal Reference, Aspect, and Actionality,* 11–28. Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier.

Bertinetto, Pier Marco & Alessandro Lenci. 2012. Habituality, pluractionality and imperfectivity. In Robert Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect,* 852–880. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bossong, Georg. 1991. Differential object marking in Romance and beyond. In Dieter Wanner & David Kibbee (eds.), *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics. Selected Papers from the XVIII Synposium on Romance Languages,* 143–170. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bossong, Georg. 1998. Le marquage différentiel de l'objet dans les langues d'Europe. In Jack Feuillet (ed.), *Actance et Valence dans les Langues de l'Europe,* 259–294. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cennamo, Michela. 1993. *The Reanalysis of Reflexives: a Diachronic Perspective*. Naples: Liguori.

Cennamo, Michela. 1995. Transitivity and VS order in Italian reflexives. In Yaron Matras & Hans-Jürgen Sasse (eds.), *Verb-Subject Order and Theticity in European Languages*. STUF 48(1/2). 84–105.

Cennamo, Michela. 1997. Passive and impersonal constructions. In Martin Maiden & Mair Parry (eds.), *Dialects of Italy,* 145–161. London: Routledge.

Cennamo, Michela. 1999. Late Latin pleonastic reflexives and the Unaccusative hypothesis. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 97(1). 103–150.

Cennamo, Michela. 2001. L'Inaccusatività in alcune varietà campane. In Federico Albano Leoni, Eleonora Stenta Krosbakken, Rosanna Sornicola & Carolina Stromboli (eds.), *Dati Empirici e Teorie Linguistiche*. Atti del XXXIII Congresso Internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana, 427–453. Rome: Bulzoni.

Cennamo, Michela. 2002. La selezione degli ausiliari perfettivi in napoletano antico: fenomeno sintattico o sintattico-semantico? *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 87(2). 175–222.

Cennamo, Michela. 2003. (In)transitivity and object marking: some current issues. In Giuliana Fiorentino (ed.), *Romance Objects,* 49–104. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cennamo, Michela. 2008. The rise and development of analytic perfects in Italo-Romance. In Thórhallur Eythórsson (ed.), *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory: The Rosendal Papers,* 115–142. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Cennamo, Michela. 2009. Argument structure and alignment variations and changes in Late Latin. In Jóhanna Barðdal & Shobana Chelliah (eds.), *The Role of Semantics and Pragmatics in the Development of Case*, 307–346. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Cennamo, Michela. 2010. Impersonali, verbi. In Raffaele Simone (ed.), *Enciclopedia dell'italiano*, vol I, 637–639. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana G. Treccani.

Cennamo, Michela. 2011a. Psicologici, verbi. In Raffaele Simone (ed.), *Enciclopedia dell'italiano*, vol II, 258–260. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana G. Treccani.

Cennamo, Michela. 2011b. Riflessivi, verbi. In Raffaele Simone (ed.), *Enciclopedia dell'italiano*, vol II, 320–322. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana G. Treccani.

Cennamo, Michela. 2011c. Transitivi e intransitivi, verbi. In Raffaele Simone (ed.), *Enciclopedia dell'italiano*, vol II, 535–539. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana G. Treccani.

Cennamo, Michela. 2012a. Aspectual constraints on the (anti)causative alternation in Old Italian. In Jóhanna Barðdal, Michela Cennamo & Elly van Gelderen (eds.), Thematic issue on *Argument Realization and Change. Transactions of the Philological Society* 110(3). 394–421.

Cennamo, Michela. 2012b. Unexpressed objects and the semantics of predicates in Italian. Workshop on Contrastive Studies of Verbal Valency in European Languages, 45th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, Stockholm, 31 August–1 September 2012.

Cennamo, Michela. 2014. Passive and impersonal reflexives in the Italian dialects. Synchronic and diachronic aspects. In Paola Benincà, Adam Ledgeway & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Diachrony and Dialects*, 71–95. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cennamo, Michela & Antonella Sorace. 2007. Auxiliary selection and split intransitivity in Paduan. In Raúl Aranovich (ed.), *Split Auxiliary Systems*, 65–99. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Cennamo, Michela & Elisabetta Jezek. 2011. The anticausative alternation in Italian. In Giovanna Massariello & Silvana Dal Masi (eds.), *Le Interfacce*, 809–823. Rome: Bulzoni.

Cennamo, Michela & Alessandro Lenci. 2011. Gradience in subcategorization? Locative phrases with Italian verbs of motion. Workshop on Explorations in Syntactic Government and Subcategorization, Cambridge, 31 August–3 September 2011. To appear in *Studia Linguistica*.

Centineo, Giulia. 1995. The distribution of *si* in Italian transitive/inchoative pairs. In Mandy Simmons & Theresa Galloway (ed.), *Proceedings from Semantic and Linguistic Theory V.,* 54–71. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1988. On *si* constructions and the theory of arb. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19(4). 521–581.

Comrie, Bernard. 1985. Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description III. Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon,* 309–348. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Second edition. London: Blackwell.

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1971. Solidarietà lessicali. In Eugenio Coseriu (ed.), *Teoria del Linguaggio e Linguistica Generale. Sette Studi,* 303–316. Bari: Laterza.

Diedrichsen, Elke. 2013. Auxiliary selection in German. Constructional gradience with perfect formation. In Elly van Gelderen, Michela Cennamo & Jóhanna Barðdal (eds.), *Argument Structure in Flux: the Naples-Capri Papers*, 404–434. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dixon, Robert M.W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

D'Alessandro, Roberta. 2007. *Impersonal si Constructions. Agreement and Interpretation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fiorentino, Giuliana. 2003 (ed). *Romance Objects*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fiorentino, Giuliana. 2003. Prepositional objects in Neapolitan. In Giuliana Fiorentino (ed), *Romance Objects*, 117–152. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fiorentino, Giuliana. 2010. Accusativo preposizionale. In Raffaele Simone (ed.), *Enciclopedia dell'italiano*, vol I, 17–19. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana G. Treccani.

Folli, Raffaella. 2002. *Constructing telicity in English and Italian*. PhD Thesis. University di Oxford.

Guerssel, Mohamed, Hale, Kenneth, Laughren, Mary, Levin, Beth & Eagle, Josie White. 1985. A crosslinguistic study of transitivity alternations. In William H. Eilfort, Paul D. Kroeber & Karen L. Peterson (eds.) *Papers from the Parasession on Causatives and Agentivity*, 48–63. Chicago Linguistic Society 21.2. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1987. Transitivity alternations of the anticausative type. *Arbeitspapier* n. 5. Institut für Srachwissenschaft, Köln. 1–51.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations. In Bernard Comrie & Maria Polinsky (eds.), *Causatives and Transitivity*, 87–120. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2011. On S, A, P, T, and R as comparative concepts for alignment typology. *Linguistic Typology* 15(3). 535–689.

Iacobini, Claudio. 2006. Italian as a fusional language. In K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics,* 2nd Edition, vol 6, 64–69. Oxford: Elsevier.

Iwata, Seizi. 2008. *Locative Alternation. A Lexical-Constructional Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Keller, Frank & Antonella Sorace. 2003. Gradient auxiliary selection and impersonal passivization in German: an experimental investigation. *Journal of Linguistics* 39(1). 57–108.

Koontz-Garboden, Andrew. 2009. Anticausativization. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27(1). 77–138.

Jezek, Elisabetta. 2003. *Classi di Verbi tra Semantica e Sintassi*. Pisa: ETS.

Jezek, Elisabetta, 2012. Inaccusativité, structure événementielle et verbes pronominaux en Italien. In Christine Bracquenier & Louis Begioni (eds.), *L'Aspect dans les Langues Naturelles*, 159–178. Rennes: Presses Universitaires des Rennes.

La Fauci, Nunzio 2009. *Compendio di Sintassi Italiana*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Lazard, Gilbert. 1984. Actance variations and categories of the object. In Frans Plank (ed.), *Objects. Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations,* 269–292. London: Academic Press.

Lenci, Alessandro. 2012. Argument alternations in Italian verbs: a computational study. In Valentina Bambini, Irene Ricci, Pier Marco Bertinetto & Collaborators (eds.), *Linguaggio e Cervello – Semantica/Language and the Brain – Semantics. Atti del XLII Congresso Internazionale di Studi della Società di Linguistica Italiana* (Pisa, SNS, 2008), Roma: Bulzoni. Volume 2. 1–26 (CD ROM, II.B.1).

Lepschy, Anna Laura & Giulio Lepschy. 2006. Italian. In K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd edition, vol 6, 545–549. Oxford: Elsevier.

Letuchiy, Alexander. 2009. Towards a typology of labile verbs: Lability vs. derivation. In Alexandre Arkhipov & Patience Epps (eds.), *New Challenges in Typology. Transcending the Borders and Refining the Distinctions,* 223–244. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Liu, Feng-hsi. 2007. Auxiliary selection in Chinese. In Raúl Aranovich (ed.), *Split Auxiliary Systems*, 181–205. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lo Duca, Maria Giuseppa. 2000. Proprietà valenziali e criteri di descrizione lessicografica: un caso di alternanza argomentale. In R. Simone (ed.), Thematic issue on *Classi di Parole e Conoscenza Lessicale. Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 2. 219–242.

Maiden, Martin. 1995. *A Linguistic History of Italian*. London: Longman.

Maiden, Martin & Cecilia Robustelli. 2007. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Italian,* 2nd edition. London: Hodder Arnold.

Malchukov, Andrej, Haspelmath, Martin & Bernard Comrie. 2010. Ditransitive constructions: a typological overview. In Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Studies in Ditransitive Constructions. A Comparative Handbook,* 1–64. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Manente, Mara. 2008. *L'aspect, les auxiliaires 'être' et 'avoir' et l'hypothèse inaccusative dans une perspective comparative Français/Italien*. PhD Thesis. University of Venice.

Mereu, Lunella. 2010. Argument versus Adjunct PPS. Where does the difference lie? MS. Rom: University of Roma3.

Mithun, Marianne & Wallace Chafe. 1999. What are S, A and O? *Studies in Language* 23. 569–596.

Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. On the case-marking of objects. In Joseph Greenberg et al. (eds.), *Universals of Human Language,* vol. 4, 249–289. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Olsen, Mari B. & Philippe Resnik, 1997. Implicit object constructions and the (in)transitivity continuum. In Kora Singer, Randall Eggert & Gregory Anderson (eds.), *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistics Society* 33. *Papers from the Main Session*, 327–336. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro. Linguistic Inquiry* 17(3). 501–557.

Salvi, Giampaolo. 1988. La frase semplice. In Lorenzo Renzi (ed.), *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*, vol. 1, 29–113. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Salvi, Giampaolo & Laura Vanelli. 2004. *Nuova Gammatica Italiana*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Schäfer, Florian. 2008. *The Syntax of (Anti-)Causatives. External Arguments in Change-of-State Contexts*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Serianni, Luca. 1989. *Grammatica Italiana*. Torino: UTET.

Siller-Runggaldier, Heidi. 2003. Changes of valence and their effect on objects. In Giuliana Fiorentino (ed.), *Romance Objects*, 187–216. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Simpson, Jane. 1991. *Warlpiri Morphosyntax. A Lexicalist Approach*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Sorace, Antonella. 2000. Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76. 859–890.

Sorace, Antonella. 2004. Gradience at the lexicon-syntax interface: evidence from auxiliary selection and implications for unaccusativity. In Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopolou & Martin Everaert (eds.), *The Unaccusativity Puzzle: Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface,* 243–268. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thornton, Anna 2005. *Morfologia*. Roma: Carocci.

Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. 2001. *An Introduction to Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. & Randy J. La Polla. 1997. *Syntax: Strucure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vincent, Nigel. 1988. Italian. In Martin Harris & N. Vincent (eds.), *The Romance Languages,* 279–313. London: Routledge.

Voigt, Rainer. 2008. Italian language in Ethiopia and Eritrea. In Siegbert Uhlig (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, vol. 3, 222–224. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Zúñiga, Fernando & Seppo Kittilä (eds.). 2010. *Benefactives and Malefactives. Typological perspectives and case studies*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.