Lack of number agreement in both declaratives and interrogatives is instead possible in the Ancona variety of Italian. Focused postverbal subjects (cf. 28a) and marginalized subjects (cf. 28b–c) behave alike:

28 a Questo disegno l’ha fatto quei bambini li
this drawing it= has done those children there
‘Those children did this drawing’

b L’ha FATTO, i bambini, il disegno
it= has done, the children, the drawing
‘The children did the drawing’

c Cosa ha FATTO, i bambini?
what has done, the children?
‘What have the children done?’

Although a full description and account of subject inversion in NIDs is still missing, these few examples show that the whole range of possibilities attested in Italian are not found in non-consistent NSLs.

8. Conclusions

In this chapter we have suggested that NIDs are non-consistent pro-drop languages. As we have seen in detail for Donceto, declaratives display pro only in some persons of the paradigm and clitic pronouns in the other persons. In interrogatives, the subject is a clitic pronoun throughout. We have accounted for this distribution in terms of the interaction between clitic- and verb-movement. This implies that a ‘two-paradigm’ hypothesis is not necessary to account for the different distribution of subject clitics in declaratives and interrogatives.

Our proposal has a number of consequences with respect to the properties related to the availability of pro. Firstly, since verb inflection may vary from one NID to the other while the distribution of pro and subject clitics in the paradigm remains constant, NIDs confirm the hypothesis that what allows verb-movement is a rather abstract property that does not necessarily have a morphological reflex in verbal inflection. Secondly, since NIDs are non-consistent pro-drop languages, we expect to find overt expletives, an expectation that is borne out. Finally, the full range of subject-inversion phenomena can be seen as a property that holds for full pro-drop languages like Italian, but not for non-consistent NSLs like NIDs.

6 Domains of clitic placement in finite and non-finite clauses: evidence from a Piedmontese dialect

Christina Tortora

1. Introduction

It has commonly been argued since Kayne (1991) that enclisis of object clitics to finite and non-finite verbs involves movement of the verb to the left of the clitic, itself taken to occupy a fixed functional head relatively high in the clause (somewhere in the Inflectional or Complementizer field). Under this view, enclitic structures involve verb-movement higher than that found in proclitic structures. In this chapter, I argue that not all cases of enclisis entail this. While still adopting the idea that enclisis involves verb-movement to the left of the clitic, I argue on the basis of data from Borgomanerese (NO), a Piedmontese dialect, that in some cases the clitic appears to the right of the verb because the clitic itself occupies a much lower functional head. The idea is that the finite clause contains more than one domain for clitic placement, and some languages select the low domain, while others select the high one; furthermore, within a single language, the clitic may access one or the other domain, depending on the structure type.

Analysis of the Borgomanerese data also leads to two further but related conclusions. The first is that non-finite verbs project their own clauses, providing their own clitic placement domains. Thus, the word ‘domain’ has two senses in this chapter: one refers to the domain within the clause (such that the clause itself may have a low or a high placement domain), while the other refers to the particular clause in which the clitic finds itself (in the case of bi-clausal structures). The second conclusion is that non-finite clauses do not contain any adverbs, so that the position of the adverb with respect to the non-finite verb cannot be used to determine the distance of non-finite V-movement. This means that certain verbs (such as past participles in absolutive clauses), which have traditionally been argued (based on adverb placement facts) to exhibit relatively high movement, do not in fact move high.
2. Complement clitics in Romance: the I-domain and the V-domain

2.1. The I-domain

Various authors have argued that complement clitics in Romance occupy a functional head somewhere in the Inflectional or Complementizer Field (e.g. Kayne 1989b; 1991; 1994; Martins 1994; Uriagereka 1995; Raposo 2000; Rizzi 2000a; Shlonsky 2004). Kayne (1991), for example, argues that in Italian the clitic adjoins to an \( \text{Ip} \)-type head, so that in sentences such as (1), the object clitic \( \text{lo} \) is not taken to be syntactically adjoined to the verb:

1 Lo vedo
   cl= I-see
   'I see it'

A superficial comparison of the Italian example in (1) with the Galician example in (2) might lead one to imagine, without further investigation, that the complement clitic in Galician must occupy a structural position lower than that occupied by the Italian complement clitic:

2 Ouvimo-lo
   we-hear=cl
   'We hear it'

However, as noted by Uriagereka (1995) (from which this and the following example have been taken; see also Benincà 2006), there is reason to believe that the Galician clitic, too, occupies a relatively high functional head, perhaps even higher than that targeted by the Italian clitic. Rizzi (2000a) argues that the apparent enclisis we see in (2) is actually the result of the verb's movement to the left of the clitic (so that the Galician finite verb in (2) moves higher than the Italian finite verb in (1)). The datum in (3) supports this analysis:

3 Quero que o oiades
   I-want that cl= you-hear
   'I want you to hear it'

When the finite clause is embedded in Galician, the clitic appears to the left of the verb. This can be taken as evidence for verb-movement past the clitic in examples like (2): the complementizer que in (3) blocks movement of the verb to the left of the clitic, yielding the appearance of enclisis. Let us call this hypothesis for enclisis the I-domain/C-domain hypothesis:

4 I-domain/C-domain hypothesis

In all these languages, the complement clitic is in some functional head in the I- or C-domain; 'enclisis' obtains as a result of V-movement to a position higher than that occupied by the clitic (see also Martins 1994).

2.2. The V-domain

A question that arises is whether the I-domain hypothesis should account for all cases of enclisis with finite verbs in Romance. In this section, I argue that it cannot. Let us consider Borgomanerese, which, like Galician, exhibits enclisis with finite verbs:

5 La mõngia-la
   scf= she-eats=cl
   'She's eating it'

We might assume that the clitic resides in the I-domain in Borgomanerese, with enclisis obtaining in the way that was argued for Galician. Here I show that the Borgomanerese facts cannot receive the same explanation. Firstly, in contrast with languages like Galician, there are no conditions under which the complement clitics can appear to the left of the verb; compare, for example, the sentence in (6), which contains an embedded finite verb, with the Galician example in (3):

6 Í õ diciu c la mõngia-la
   scf= I-have said that scf= eats=cl
   'I said that she's eating it'

In embedded contexts in Borgomanerese, the finite verb remains to the left of the clitic, in contrast with Galician. This suggests that appearance of the finite verb to the left of the clitic does not entail verb-movement past a clitic residing in the I-domain. Rather, it suggests that this generalized enclisis in Borgomanerese may involve a relatively low position of the complement clitic. In what follows, I briefly review further arguments from Tortora (2000; 2002) which lead us to conclude that a domain lower than the Inflectional Field is available for complement clitic-placement in some Romance languages. This hypothesis is summarized in (7):

7 V-domain hypothesis

In some Romance languages, 'enclisis' is not due to high V-movement past the clitic residing in the I-domain. Rather, the complement clitic resides in a lower domain (in the functional field outside the VP).

2.2.1. Evidence for the V-domain (Tortora 2000; 2002) The following data show that when certain 'lower' (pre-VP) adverbs (in the sense of Cinque 1999) are present, the clitic must appear to their right. The example in (8a) shows that the complement clitic must appear to the right of the postverbal negative marker \( \text{mi}ta \), while (8b) shows that it must appear to the right of the adverb \( \text{già} \) 'already'. The example in (8c) shows furthermore that when the adverb \( \text{più} \) 'any more' is present, the clitic must appear to its right as well:

8a Ï õ diciu c la mõngia-la
   scf= I-have said that scf= eats=cl
   'I said that she's eating it'

8b Ï õ diciu c la mõngia-la
   scf= I-have said that scf= eats=cl
   'I said that she's eating it'

8c Ï õ diciu c la mõngia-la
   scf= I-have said that scf= eats=cl
   'I said that she's eating it'
As can be seen, the complement clitic’s position is in a lower field, or ‘domain’, in the Borgomanerese clause, compared with the position of the complement clitic in such languages as Italian, Galician and Portuguese.

In the literature, various cases of enclisis with finite verbs have been analysed as involving high verb-movement past the complement clitic, which itself is taken to reside in the I-domain. However, the Borgomanerese facts suggest that not all cases of Romance enclisis can be treated in this way. Specifically, appearance of the clitic to the right of certain lower adverbs suggests that enclisis here is the result of the clitic’s relatively low placement in the structure. Thus, we have established that the grammar provides (at least) two possible domains for placement of complement clitics in finite clauses (for a third (C-)domain, see Benincà 2006).

A number of questions now arise, one of which is which determines whether a language will employ the I-domain (e.g. Italian) or the V-domain (e.g. Borgomanerese) for placement of complement clitics in finite clauses? Although this question is important, I do not address it here (although one might pursue the idea, suggested by Rizzi 2000a, that adjunction of a clitic to a particular head depends on whether that head is available at all in the language in question). Rather, I address another, namely, what about non-finite clauses? Do they contain their own clitic-placement domains? In what follows, I consider structures that contain more than one verb in Borgomanerese (specifically, active auxiliary + P-to-P constructions) and argue that the clitic-placement data can only be understood once we recognize that the non-finite past participle verb projects its own clause, thus providing its own domain. This conclusion will, in turn, lead to a reassessment (in §5) of constructions with non-finite verbs in the I-domain languages. In particular, I shall explore the possibility that languages which
employ the I-domain in finite clauses may employ the V-domain in non-finite clauses.

3. Domains in ‘bi-clausal’ structures

3.1. Enclitics and past participles in Borgomanerese

In (9) we saw that when the adverb sempri ‘always’ is present, the clitic must appear to its left. The fact that the clitic must always appear to the left of sempri in finite clauses contrasts with the fact that the clitic can appear to the right of sempri when a past participle is present, as in (11):

11 L Piero l' a sempri mangià-lla
   the Piero sct= has always eaten=cl
   ‘Piero has always eaten it’

Thus an apparent contradiction seems to arise: the clitic cannot occur to the right of sempri, but the clitic can occur to the right of sempri (when the clitic is hosted by a past participle).

3.2. Aux + P iP as bi-clausal structures

In order to account for the apparent contradiction discussed immediately above, let us adopt the idea that Aux + P iP structures are bi-clausal, something that has already been proposed by a number of researchers, including Belletti (1990), Kayne (1991; 1993) and Rizzi (2000a). The idea, illustrated in (12), is that the past participle projects its own clausal structure:

12 [cp1 ... auxk ... [vp tk [cp2 ... [vp piP ]]]]

The structure in (12) recalls Kayne’s (1993) proposal, whereby the auxiliary verb takes a DP (clausal) complement. Note that the sketch in (12) also depicts movement of the auxiliary out of its position within VP to its surface position within the Inflectional Field. Given the view that the P iP projects its own clause, we can elaborate on the structure in (12) by proposing that this participial clause contains a series of pre-VP functional projections similar to those projected in a finite clause; this idea is depicted in (13), where I have also included a D-structure complement clitic:

13 [cp1 ... auxs ... x y z w u [vp tk [cp2 ... x y z w u [vp piP cl ]]]]

On this view, in Aux + P iP constructions the clitic, which is an argument of the embedded participial verb, moves to the closest available appropriate functional head, which would in this case be the lower Z

head in (13).4 This, together with movement of the P iP itself out of the VP, is illustrated in (14):5

14 [cp1 ... auxk ... x y z w u [vp tk [cp2 ... piP clx+ ... [vp tk tj ]]]]

We can now say that this is what is responsible for the appearance of the complement clitic to the right of sempri in the presence of a past participle: the participial clause provides a (second) Z head to the right of sempri. However, we must also assume that the adverbs we see in Aux + P iP structures reside in the functional structure projected by the ‘matrix’ verb (this is because if we allowed the pre-VP adverb series to appear in CP2, then we would lose the ability to explain why the clitic occurs to the right of sempri, for the simple reason that the Z head is to the left of this adverb); this proposal is illustrated in (15), where the non-finite CP contains no adverbs:

15 [cp1 ... auxk ... mia x gia x piò z sempri w [vp tk [cp2 ... piP clx+z ... [vp tk tj ]]]]

In sum, we can take the facts illustrated in (9) and (11) as supporting evidence for: (i) the claim that Aux + P iP structures involve two clauses; and (ii) the claim that any adverbs we find in such bi-clausal structures must reside in the ‘matrix’ clause.

4 Those familiar with the behaviour of Italian might wonder at this point why the complement clitic in this language does not adjoin to a functional head within the participial CP (cf. i.e.), as in Borgomanerese, but must instead appear in the matrix clause (cf. i.e.):

   a) *Abbiamo visto-llo
       we-have seen-cl
       ‘We have seen it’

   b) Lo abbiamo visto
cle= we-have seen
   ‘We have seen it’

Within the present approach, we have to think of (i.b) as a case of obligatory ‘clitic-climbing’ in Italian and similar languages, but this, of course, then raises the question of what makes clitic-climbing obligatory in this environment in some Romance languages but impossible in others (such as Piedmontese). I leave this question open here, but see §5.2, which includes some discussion of Rizzi (2000a), who proposes that the participial clause embedded under an auxiliary verb in Italian lacks the appropriate clitic landing site.

5 The structure in (14) says nothing about whether the P iP (head-)adjoins to the clitic, or whether it adjoins to an independent (higher) functional head (say, the lower participial Y in (13)). Unfortunately, I do not have the space to provide arguments to show that the P iP and clitic do not in fact constitute a head cluster; I reserve these arguments for future work.
(namely, the functional field projected by the auxiliary verb), with the participial functional field unable to host adverbs (for reasons left open).

Hitherto I have assumed, without argument, that clitic placement obtains in the V-domain in Borgomanerese participial clauses. This should not imply, however, that the domain parameter setting for finite clauses determines the domain parameter setting for non-finite clauses. In fact, in what follows I shall argue that if a language utilizes the I-domain for clitic-placement in finite clauses, it does not necessarily follow that it utilizes this same domain in non-finite clauses. Specifically, I would like to suggest that languages like Italian (which are I-domain for finite clauses) utilize the V-domain for clitic-placement in non-finite clauses, and that the Italian non-finite verb moves low. The argument will, in part, appeal to an idea argued for in this section based on the Borgomanerese data, namely, that non-finite clauses do not contain their own adverbs.

5. Non-finite verbs in I-domain languages

5.1. A non-finite I-domain?

While Italian exhibits proclisis in the presence of finite verbs (cf. 1), there are certain configurations where the complement clitic is obligatorily enclitic on the verb. In (16a–b), we see that participial/gerundial clauses (or 'absolute small clauses'; Belletti 1981; 1990) involve enclisis to the participial or gerundial form of the verb:

16 a Mangiatata ieri,...
   eaten=cl yesterday
   'Having eaten it yesterday...'

b Leggendo in fretta,...
   reading=cl in hurry
   'Reading it in a hurry...'

Two other configurations where we find obligatory enclisis in Italian are imperatives (17a) and subject infinitivals (17b):\(^6\)

\(^6\) There are other configurations where enclisis is optional, namely, infinitives following modal and aspectual verbs (cf. (1)a) and negative imperatives (cf. (1)b):

1 a Voglio vedere / Lo voglio vedere
   I-want see.inf.=cl cl= I-want see.inf.
   'I want to see him'

b Non mangiare / Non lo mangiare
   not eat.inf.=cl / not cl= eat.inf.
   'Don't eat it'

The example in (1a) represents the well-known configuration for 'clitic-climbing', while that in (1b) is discussed by Kayne (1992) and Rizzi (2000a). For the purposes of the immediate discussion, I put these cases aside, though I will discuss Kayne's (1992) account of (1b) in §5.2 below.

17 a Mangia
   eat=cl
   'Eat it!'

b [Vederti] sarebbe un errore
   see.inf.=cl would-be a mistake
   'To see you would be a mistake'

A question that arises is how to account for these cases of obligatory enclisis in (16a–b), when Italian otherwise exhibits proclisis. In the literature there appears to be a consensus on how to handle this question. In particular, it is assumed that the clitic resides in the same functional head as it does in finite clauses (namely, Inf\(^0\), or AgrS\(^0\), or T\(^0\), depending on the analysis).\(^7\) Enclisis obtains just as we saw in §2: the verb in these constructions has reason to move to the left of Inf\(^0\).

In the case of the participial/gerundial clauses in (16a–b), Rizzi (2000a) proposes that the participial verb moves to the left of the clitic landing site within the participial clause; in the case of the imperative in (17a), Rivero (1994b) proposes that the imperativational verb moves to C\(^0\), so that the clitic residing in Inf\(^0\) now appears to the verb's right. In the case of subject infinitivals (cf. (1b), Kayne (1991) assumes that the non-finite verb moves to the left of the clitic, which is in the T\(^0\) head. The specific claim, then, is that Italian utilizes the I-domain for clitic-placement in non-finite clauses as well.\(^8\)

However, there may be reason to object to the idea that Italian utilizes the I-domain for clitic-placement in such non-finite clauses. The problem has to do with the claim that the non-finite verb moves to the left of Inf\(^0\). Why would the verb, which is non-finite, move to a zone of the clause that is associated with features of finiteness, such as tense (or subject agreement)?\(^9\) On the other hand, we need to account for the clitic's appearance to the right of the verb in non-finite clauses, and if all we have is an I-domain for clitic-placement, we are led to this conundrum.

5.2. An alternative view: activation of the V-domain in non-finite clauses

In the remainder of this chapter, I would like to capitalize on the idea that we in fact are not stuck with just the I-domain at our disposal. Given the arguments for

\(^7\) This is expressed explicitly in Shlonsky (2004: 332): 'It needs to ... be assumed ... that the cliticization site or sites are the same in finite and non-finite clauses.' However, see Rizzi (2000a) for suggestions (along the lines I pursue here) that different clause-types may have different clitic landing sites.

\(^8\) For the imperative purposes, I will put aside the question of the imperative (though see §5.2 below).

\(^9\) Since temporal interpretations can be derived from infinitivals, it is too naive to suggest that non-finite clauses have no T head. Nevertheless, cross-linguistically we find that finite verbs have more robust evidence of tense and agreement than do non-finite verbs. As such, the idea that non-finite verbs move higher than finite verbs is suspicious.
a V-domain in Romance, we can provide an alternative view of enclisis with non-finite verbs in languages like Italian. The idea is simple: while Italian utilizes the I-domain for clitic-placement in finite clauses, the V-domain is accessed in non-finite clauses. So, even if the non-finite verb moves to a very low position within its own clause, the clitic, which resides in the low Z head, appears to its right; under this view, it is possible to take the non-finite verb to move only as high as the Y head within its own clause. Reconsider, in this regard, CP2 in (15), modified for our purposes here:

18  \( \text{[CP2 X V\text{-}finite]_{y} \rightarrow CP2 \rightarrow \{v_{p}, \text{Y}\} \}} \]

Under this hypothesis, the non-finite verb does not move to an Inflectional Field within its own clause; perhaps the non-finite clause does not even have an Inflectional Field at all (recall that the X, Y, Z, W and U heads are intended to represent the low (pre-VP) functional field; cf. 10; note too that we are using the label ‘CP’ for convenience to convey the idea that the non-finite verb projects its own clause, without necessarily projecting all the way up to CP).

For this alternative view to make sense, we need to consider some further questions. Specifically, let us discuss an objection that could be levelled against the idea portrayed in (18), namely, that the non-finite verb moves to a relatively low position within its own clause. As has been discussed by a number of researchers (e.g. Belletti 1990; Cinque 1999; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005), non-finite verbs in Italian appear to the left of some relatively high adverbs, indicating that the non-finite verb moves to a relatively high position within its own clause.\(^{10}\) As can be seen in (19), for example from Cinque 1999: 149), while the past participle (in the absolute small clause construction) can appear to the right of *fortunatamente* ‘fortunately’ (one of the Cinque 1999 ‘higher adverbs’), as in (19a), it can also appear to this adverb’s left, as in (19b):

19  a  [Fortunatamente arrived in anticipo]. Gianni poté rimediare

   fortunately arrived early Gianni could remedy

   ‘Having luckily arrived early, Gianni could remedy [the situation]’

   Similarly, the following example (from Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005: 92)

   illustrates that the infinitive appears to the left of *francamente* ‘frankly’, a pragmatic adverb very high in the ‘higher adverb space’:

20  Mi dispiace [annunciare] francamente una tale notizia

   me=displeases announce.inf=cl frankly a such news

   ‘I’m sorry to announce frankly such news’

10 I thank P. Bencini for raising this question in the context of my proposal.

Given the data in (19b) and (20), it seems reasonable to conclude (as has been done by the above-cited authors) that the non-finite verb does in fact move to a high position. As already noted, this contrasts with what I claim here, which is that the non-finite verb moves to a relatively low position within its own clause (cf. 18). So the question at this point is how to reconcile the adverb placement facts, illustrated with the data in (19b) and (20), with my claim.

Here, I would like to appeal to the proposal made in §3.2 of this chapter. Specifically, recall that the Borgomanerese clitic-placement facts gave us reason to posit that the non-finite clause does not contain any adverbs. To refresh our memories, let us recall example (15), repeated here as (21):

21  \( \text{[CP1 \rightarrow Aux_{k} \rightarrow mija x gia v piò z semprì w \{v_{p}, \text{KCP2} \rightarrow \text{PP, CP2+Z} \rightarrow \{v_{p}, \text{Y}\} \}} \}\]

Let us now reconsider the Italian data in (19) and (20). In these examples, we cannot take the non-finite verb’s appearance to the left of the adverbs in question as evidence that the verb itself has (head)-moved to the left of the adverb within its own clause. This is because there are no adverbs within the non-finite clause. Rather, there are only adverbs outside the non-finite clause in the functional structure of a higher clause. Let us therefore propose that appearance of the non-finite verb to the left of the high adverbs in question is the result of movement of the entire non-finite clause (namely, CP2) to the left of the adverb, which is in the matrix clause (namely, CP1), as illustrated by the pre- and post-movement representations in (22a–b):

22  a  [CP1 fortunatamente [CP2 arrivato] ...]

   b  [CP1 [CP2 arrivato] \text{K} \text{fortunatamente t_κ} ...]

   As can be seen in (22a), on the basis of the analysis of the Borgomanerese facts, I am proposing a structure for embedded non-finite clauses in Italian such as those in (16a–b) and (17b) that is different from that previously assumed. As for the structural position of the adverb in (22), I would like to propose that the adverb resides in the functional structure projected by a null Aux, which itself takes the non-finite clause as a complement. In other words, I take the structure in (18) to be just like the structure proposed for Borgomanerese in (21), the difference being that the Aux, which selects the embedded participial clause in (19/22), is phonologically null:

23  \( \text{[CP1 ... fortunatamente ... \{v_{p}, \text{NULL-AUX}\{CP2 \rightarrow \text{arrivato} \}} \}} \]

Similarly, I take the bracketed structure in (17b), repeated here as (24a), to involve an empty Aux embedding the infinitival verb (the re-elaborated structure is illustrated in (24b)):
To work back through the argument, let us return to the question of whether the data in (19a–b) and (20) serve as evidence that the non-finite verb moves to a relatively high position. Given the proposal illustrated in (20)–(24b), which is driven by the Borgomanerese data and arguments discussed in §3.2, we can conclude that the data in (19)/(20) do not serve as evidence that the non-finite verb moves high (contrary to what is concluded by, for instance, Cinque 1999). Rather, the entire non-finite clause moves to the left of adverbs that reside in a higher clause, headed by a null Aux. The non-finite verb’s own clause does not contain any adverbs. This leaves us with the following state of affairs: there is no evidence that the non-finite verb itself moves high (or higher than a finite verb) within its own clause. This is a desirable result, given that it seems more natural that a non-finite verb (with impoverished – or no – tense and subject agreement information) would not move as high as a finite verb. And finally, this alternative view of non-finite verb-movement (namely, that it is low) leaves us with the need for an alternative explanation of the fact that the clitic appears to the right of the non-finite verb in the constructions in question (cf. 16a–b and 17b). The proposal here is that the V-domain is accessed for clitic-placement in such non-finite clauses.

5.2.1. Relative freedom of postverbal clitic combinations as evidence for low placement. I would like to discuss one final empirical issue (and the theoretical analysis thereof) that supports the idea that the non-finite verb does not move high within its clause (and that therefore the clitic’s position to the right of the non-finite verb indicates a low clitic-placement). Specifically, I would like to consider Săvescu’s (2007) analysis of clitic-placement facts in Romanian.

As Săvescu notes, Romanian does not exhibit the Person Case Constraint on clitic combinations that one finds in numerous other Romance languages (as discussed by, for example, Perlmutter 1971; Bonet 1991), whereby a 3rd person
dative clitic cannot occur with accusative clitics other than 3rd person. It does, however, exhibit some restrictions on how clitics combine. To summarize, Săvescu shows that in Romanian, dative clitics must always precede accusative clitics (cf. 25a), and although 1st and 2nd person clitics can occur together, the former must precede the latter when preverbal, so that it is strictly ungrammatical for a 2nd person clitic to precede a 1st person one in finite contexts (cf. 25b; Săvescu 2007):

25 a Mi-te a prezentat Ion la petrecere
       me.dat. =you.acc. = has introduced John at party
       ‘John introduced you to me at the party’

25 b *Ti-m- a prezentat Ion la petrecere
     you.dat. = me.acc. = has introduced John at party
     ‘John has introduced me to you at the party’

Simplifying somewhat, Săvescu accounts for the strict ordering by proposing that the functional structure of the clause contains a series of projections above TP that are rigidly ordered, and to which the 1st and 2nd person clitics must move (to check features):

26 Person1P >> Person2P >> ... TP >> ...V

If the 1st person clitic moves to Person1P, and the 2nd person clitic moves to Person2P, then, given the rigid ordering of the functional heads in (26), 1st person will always precede 2nd person. Now, what is of relevance to us here is the following: while this strict 1st – 2nd person ordering obtains when the clitics are preverbal (namely, when they occur with finite verbs), there are no such person restrictions when the clitics are postverbal (for Romanian, this means when the clitics occur with gerunds and imperatives).12 To illustrate, consider Săvescu’s (2007) example with a gerund:

27 Dindu ti-mă de nevastă, tata a căstigat mulți bani (cf. 25)
  giving= you.dat. =me.acc. of wife father has gained much money
  ‘Giving me to you in marriage, my father has gained a lot of money’

The 2nd person clitic can precede the 1st person clitic in this non-finite context. Săvescu accounts for this freedom with the non-finite verb as follows: given the lack of subject agreement we find with gerunds, we can assume that the Person projections (cf. 26) are not merged.13 And given the lack of Person

11 The idea is reminiscent of Kayne’s (1992) proposal for negative 2sg. imperatives in Italian (such as non mangiare ‘don’t eat it’), where a null modal embeds the infinitive (e.g. non [modal [mangiare t]]) ‘don’t eat it’). Of course, the structures discussed above differ in many ways from the negative imperative analysed by Kayne. For one thing, the clitic can appear to the left of the infinitive in the negative imperative; the postulation of the null modal allows for an account of this as a case of clitic-climbing (namely, non [t (modal [mangiare t])] If my proposal is on the right track, then it would need to be understood why, despite the presence of the null Aux in (24b), there is no clitic-climbing (namely, * [cp1 ... adv1 ... aux NULL-AUX [cp2 vedere t] ] sarebbe un errore). The answer would have to lie in the nature of the NULL-Aux, or the functional heads projected by the NULL-Aux, which would not serve as an appropriate clitic-placement domain.

12 See Ordóñez (2002) for a detailed cross-linguistic discussion of ordering restrictions/freedoms, depending on whether the clitics appear pre- or postverbally.

13 Note that this could also be correlated with the lack of a TP, in fact, Săvescu suggests this for the case of imperatives, where she notes ‘true imperatives lack tense, [so] it could be the case that the unavailability of Person projections with true imperatives correlates with the absence of Tense as well’ (following Zanuttini 1997). On imperatives, see note 15 below.
projections, there is no longer anything which imposes the rigid ordering of 1st and 2nd person clitics.

I would like to concur with Săvescu's analysis of the data and argue that this analysis in fact supports the view of low clitic-placement with non-finite verbs advocated here. Note that in the absence of Person projections, the clitics need to find alternative adjunction sites. Now, if the TP and all projections above are missing, we are left with the lower functional projections as potential clitic adjunction sites. It is this, I would like to suggest, that is responsible for the appearance of clitics to the non-finite verb's right in Romanian. That is, in the absence of any higher clausal structure, the clitics must utilize the lower V-domain for placement.\textsuperscript{14}

6. Conclusions

The data from Borgomanerese indicate that, in some languages, a relatively low (pre-VP) head is made available in finite clauses for complement clitic-placement. This contrasts with such languages as Italian, which arguably utilize a higher (Infl-)domain for clitic-placement in finite clauses. However, non-finite clauses may be different: in Italian-type languages complement clitics appear to the right of the verb in non-finite clauses. While previous literature has taken this fact to indicate that non-finite verbs in these languages move even higher than finite verbs, this work has used the Borgomanerese facts to suggest that the appearance of the clitic to the right of the non-finite verb in Italian indicates the clitic's lower placement in non-finite clauses.

If this view is on the right track, it opens up many new questions regarding clause structure and clitic placement. For example, why do some languages have an active finite V-domain (Borgomanerese) while others do not (Italian)? What other syntactic properties correlate with this point of variation? Why is the V-domain active in non-finite clauses in Italian-type languages? Are there structural entailments? In this regard, it is worth establishing whether there is a

\textsuperscript{14} This is consistent with Săvescu's claim that the clitics 'never reach PersonP'. It is important to clarify, though, that while I concur with Săvescu's claim (following Kayne 1991; 1994; Terzi 1999) that the non-finite verb 'moves past the encliticization site to a higher functional position, thus leaving the clitics behind', the enclisis we witness cannot be the result of the non-finite verb moving to a position that is even higher than that to which the finite verb would move.

\textsuperscript{15} This discussion raises the question of how to analyse imperatives. Although enclisis in these structures (cf. 17a) has traditionally been taken to indicate (high) movement of the verb to C\textsuperscript{1} (Rivero 1994b), past the high encliticization site in the I-domain, the analysis put forth in this chapter, together with Săvescu's (2007) discussion of imperatives in Romanian, suggests an entirely alternative view. Specifically, it could be that the impoverished clausal structure of imperatives such as that in (17a) indicates, along the lines suggested here for non-finite verbs, a low verb-movement, with a low clitic-placement site (in the V-domain). Further research needs to be done in this area, especially with respect to the different imperative forms in Romanian (which, as Săvescu has shown, yield different clitic-ordering restrictions).