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1. The problem of small clauses

Recent contributions to the debate on the structural architecture of small clauses (SCs) have provided new insights into (what will be called here) Williams’s (1983) puzzle – a dilemma arising when SCs are compared to embedded infinitives. As noticed in the examples in (1), a lowered (narrow scope) interpretation (via reconstruction below the intensional embedding predicate, see May 1985, etc.) is absent for the indefinite (called here shared argument) in a small clause, but not in an infinitive:

(1)  a. A student seems sick.   b. A student seems to be sick. (ENGLISH)
   a student > seems; *seems > a student student > seems; seems > a student

Williams (1983) attributed the lack of narrow scope readings with SCs to the inexistence of a subject position inside the small clause. More recently, Sportiche (2005), as well as Moulton (2013) have challenged this conclusion. Under the assumption that the quantificational force of noun phrases is dependent on heads situated in the extended projection of the clause (Beghelli and Stowell 1997, etc.), the two accounts solve the puzzle by assuming that adjectival (Adj) SCs are too small to contain the heads relevant for nominal quantification licensing, while still housing a subject position (clausal analysis - CA). This paper addresses further data which appear to require refinements of the quantification picture. The preliminary conclusion is that once the CA is enriched with a restructuring account (developing on Stowell 1991) as well as domain-based locality conditions (similar to Bobaljik and Wurmbrand’s 2005 Domain Impenetrability Condition) yet more aspects related to the nature of embedded adjective configurations become less puzzling.

2. Small clauses as clausal

Formal investigations at the syntax-semantics interface have brought to the fore an interesting observation about adjectives under intensional predicates. When not found in an infinitival context, such embedded adjectives trigger scopal opacity (Williams 1983, Jacobson 1992, etc.). To the examples in (1), taken from Williams (1983) the sentences in (2) can be added from Stowell (1991) where a similar contrast is observed - the quantifier phrase (QP) in (2b) can accept a narrow scope construal while in (2a) only the broad scope is possible.

(2)  a. John proved two assumptions false.   b. John proved two assumptions to be false. (Stowell 1991, ex. 36 a, b)

* Monica Alexandrina Irimia, University of York, alexandrina-monica.irimia@york.ac.uk. I would like to thank Pino Longobardi, Keir Moulton, Virginia Hill, Peter Sells, Nina Radkevich, Dimitris Michelioudakis, Tim Stowell, Diane Massam, Becky Woods, as well as the audiences at WCCFL 33, GLOW 38, and DOM in Romance 2015 for their very useful comments, discussion and feedback at various stages of this work. Parts of this work have been funded by the ERC Advanced Grant # 295733, as well as the Department of Languages and Linguistics at the University of York. All errors are mine.

The puzzling robustness of these distinctions in many languages requires an explanation. In a thorough investigation of such contexts Williams (1983) argued that these examples only pose a problem if embedded adjectives are assumed to project a small clause (as reconstruction would need to use the subject position below the matrix predicate); there is another structural configuration for these constructions, namely a complex predicate one (as in Chomsky 1955/1975), in which the AP merges directly with the matrix predicate, the adjectival predicate subject (‘shared argument’) being introduced above the complex. If a complex predicate (CplxP) construal is assumed, the scope facts come out naturally. As there is no subject position below the intensional predicate reconstruction effects are not possible.

This account does explain these facts (as well as other properties of these constructions, as seen below) in a straightforward manner; but there are some trade-offs, among which locality thematic considerations, as well as compositional issues. Thus these embedded contexts have still remained a puzzle. However, more recent advances in the understanding of the nature of quantification have facilitated a new look at the data. On the one hand it has been noticed that there are instances in which narrow scope readings are possible in SCs (Moulton 2013); on the other hand, according to a line of reasoning what explains the facts is not the absence of a subject position inside the small clause, but the absence of layers of quantification (Moulton 2013, Sportiche 2005, etc.).

Moulton’s (2013) crucial insight is that lowered, narrow scope readings are possible in SCs when the predicate is a modal adjective (MA), like necessary, obligatory, etc. This is illustrated in (3):

(3) a. A new solution seems necessary. But none presently exists. \(\text{(Moulton 2013 2 a, b)}\)
   b. A new solution seems available. \# But none presently exists.

For Moulton (2013) MAs are like intensional intransitive verbs that embed covert clausal material; the covert clause contains some of the functional structure that licenses quantification. This allows the subject to be interpreted narrowly with respect to the embedded predicate, and hence take narrow scope under the matrix predicate (while non-MAs do not contain the relevant clausal structure and hence cannot license quantification). The preservation of the clausal implementation is a welcome result; but the full rejection of the CplxP analysis must demonstrate that the possibility of narrow scope facts can only be accommodated under a (non-quantificational) small clause construal. And, of course, the resurrected SC analysis should account for other aspects which are best manipulated by the CmplxP configuration. Section 3 presents further data which at first look are surprising if i) SCs are not domains of quantification and ii) narrow scope readings are obtained via a type of semantic incorporation. These observations bring us back to the classical tension in this domain – how can a SC be reconciled with properties which rather suggest the absence of a subject position?

3. What is inside a small clause?

If SCs are not domains of quantification, one expectation is that narrow scope readings should not be possible (unless the adjective itself has its own source of quantification). However, as Williams (1983) has already observed it is not the case that narrow scope readings are completely absent in these contexts. An example is given in (4):

(4) John seems mad about something. \(\text{(Williams 1983, ex.24)}\)
   (John seems \[something; [mad about x_i]\])

One of the possible interpretation of the QP something requires its reconstruction below the matrix predicate. In Moulton (2013) this is explained by assuming that prepositions introduce their own domain of quantification. What needs further attention are similar interpretive options in morphologically richer languages where arguments of embedded Adjs bear (inherent) case. One example comes from Russian (5), but German, Finnish, Romance (etc.) illustrate the same facts. Inherent Case could potentially represent the spell-out of prepositional structure; however one concern is that in many of these languages Case licensing on adjectival complements has been demonstrated to result from a mix of structural and
inherent (but not purely lexical) strategies. These might involve functional projections; however no (other) independent indication of their forming domains of quantification seems to be available.

(5) Ivan kažetsja čem-to nedovol’en. RUSSIAN
Ivan seems something-INSTR unsatisfied.ADJ.SHRT.M.SG
‘Ivan seems unsatisfied about something.’
(Ivan seems [something, [mad about x]])

Of course the SC account cannot be weakened just on the basis of these examples. There seem however to be other instances in which the non-quantificational picture is more problematic. This can be tested when both the shared argument and the PP complement contain scopal material. If SCs are not domains of quantification, then intermediate readings (above the MAs but below the intensional matrix predicate) should not be possible. An intermediate scope of theQP inside PP, for example, should not be easily accessible - as even though PPs might introduce domains of quantification, a relevant position is necessary above the MA but below the intensional predicate. But such readings seem to be available, at least in English:

(6) The senators consider two days of long debate desirable for a bill. (because they need some pretext to delay the legislation package, and realized that discussing a new bill could serve the purpose)

One of the possible interpretations in (6) is that the senators consider that for the same bill it is desirable to have two days of long debate. The native speakers consulted also agree that the bill does not (necessarily) have to be interpreted generically or presuppositionally; hence a configuration is available in which the indefinite must be interpreted below consider but above the shared argument two days (which crucially is also below consider). The facts could be explained by assuming that the QR attaches at the edge of the AP or SC (May 1985); although no dedicated quantificational layer is necessary, the example in (6) shows that the quantificational picture is more complex and that we are dealing with domains of quantification, even though of a restricted type.

Other types of evidence can also be grasped from a comparison across classes of small clauses. It is well known that SCs are seen in other configurations such as absolute constructions or subject small clauses, as seen in (7) from Safir (1983). The latter are relevant for our discussion. Such contexts are restricted – SCs with overt subjects normally occur as sentential subjects if the matrix predicate is be.3 These instances are different in significant respects from ‘consider + AP’ contexts where the shared argument + Adj sequence does not pass constituency tests (cannot be preposed, etc.).

(7) [Workers angry about their pay] is the situation that the ad campaign was supposed to avoid.

(8) *[Students intelligent] is precisely what we need to consider.

An examination of clauses similar to (7) indicates that their subjects can get a variety of interpretations which do not signal the lack of quantification layers inside the small clauses itself (although matters are complex). Moreover, examples like (7) also point to the presence of a DP Case

---

1 See Maling and Sprouse (1995), Bailyn (2001), Kiparsky (1998), etc.
2 Abbreviations: ACC = accusative, ADJ = adjective, CLT = clitic, DAT = dative, DOM = differential object marking, EP. V = epenthetic vowel, F = feminine, IMPF. = imperfective, INSTR = instrumental, SHRT = short form, M = masculine, PRES = present, PROGR = progressive, SG = singular, SUBJ = subjunctive, 1 = first person, 3 = third person.
3 Intermediate readings of the shared argument do not seem to be impossible either, but more investigation is needed.
4 As (genuine) absolute constructions can get a variety of circumstantial readings which could be due to the presence of rich functional material interacting with and possibly introducing quantification they will obviously not be addressed here.
5 These contexts must be distinguished from DPs containing internal appositive material or reduced relative clauses. Due to space restrictions the structural distinctions cannot be addressed in detail here.
licensor internally, while ‘consider intelligent’ do not. It will be argued below that this distinction has significant consequences on scope opacity. Section 4 addresses further complications with the shared arguments.

4. The status of shared arguments

It is well established by now that the shared argument in these configurations is licensed in the domain of the matrix predicate (see Postal 1974, Lasnik and Saito 1991, etc.). A brief look at their realization also indicates that these arguments are of a special type, distinct from other high objects. Dedicated marking, usually a morpheme connected to notions of specificity (Irimia 2011, López 2012, etc.) is often obligatory. Numerous languages where differential object marking (DOM) is active must use the strategy here (on object shared arguments), as seen in Spanish, Hindi-Urdu or Turkish. This requires principled explanation.

(9) El profesor consideró a/*Ø un estudiante inteligente. SPANISH
    ‘The professor considered a student intelligent.’

(10) a. Admi kitab-ko/*Ø accbi mani hr. HINDI-URDU
    ‘The man considers the/a book good.’ (a book > consider; *consider > a book)

b. Aadmi kitab-kọrui mani hr. HINDI-URDU
    ‘The man considers a book necessary. (a book > consider; consider > a book)’

Native speakers strongly prefer specificity readings in (9), (10a) and (11). But as expected, if a MA is made available instead, weak readings become possible (10b). In addition to this, there are languages in which both object realization strategies are possible (i.e., DOM and non-DOM), but where the challenge is even more complex. Let’s briefly look at a paradigm from Romanian, a language in which bare (non-DOM) indefinites can be strong quantifiers:

    Consider a student intelligent. Consider a student necessary.
    ‘H/she considers a student intelligent.’ ‘H/she considers a student necessary.’
    a student > consider; *consider > a student a student > consider; consider > a student

(13) (Îl) consideră pe un student necesar.
    CLT.3.SG.M.ACC considers DOM a student necessary.
    ‘H/she considers a specific student necessary.’ (a student > consider; *consider > a student )

(14) ??(Îl) consideră pe un student a fi necesar.
    CLT.3.SG.F.ACC considers DOM a student to be necessary.
    a student > consider; consider > a student

---

6 See more about domain internal Case licensing in non-finite configurations in Chung and McCloskey (1987), Raposo (1987), Sitariidou (2002), etc.
7 The infinitive is highly formal under predicates like ‘consider’.
The data in (13) are particularly challenging. As lowered interpretations are connected to movement under theories of scope reconstruction (either syntactic – Fox 1999, or semantic – Cresti 1995), the absence of the lowered readings in (13) cannot easily be explained under the CA and taking MAs as containing covert clausal material (unless the DOM and non-DOM arguments do not have the same status below the matrix predicate). This coupled with the observation that DOM objects in Romanian do allow non-specific interpretations (see one example in 15) requires further investigation. In the next subsection one recent comprehensive analysis of DOM is examined. One important conclusion emerges – the narrow scope readings (with MAs) can (and in some contexts, must) be assumed to arise from scope embedding above the matrix predicate, after a restructuring process has taken place.

4.1. A theory of differential object marking and its predictions

What is particularly interesting about such marked objects is their intricate connection with specificity, as well as interactions with features like [+animate], [+ human], etc., (see Bossong 1991, Aissen 2001, López 2012, a.o.). As opposed to scrambled objects in languages like Icelandic which are obligatorily specific, it has repeatedly been noticed that the morphologically marked arguments in Romance or Hindi do permit non-specific readings – see the Romanian example in (15). The generalization is rather that marked objects can be specific, while the non-marked ones cannot be specific. This demonstrates that a structural account similar to Diesing (1992) is not sufficient for them, as narrow scope readings will be left unexplained. Moreover, various c-command tests also indicate that (in some languages at least) differentially marked objects are not necessarily found above the external argument. López (2012) provides a theory which is able to derive these properties. Two of his assumptions are particularly important for our discussion here. First of all, differentially marked objects are found above VP but below v, in a Spec position of a functional projection collapsing aspectual and indirect object features.

(16) López (2013) – [\(vP\) EA \(v\) [\(\alpha P\) DO \(\alpha\) [\(VP\) V DO]]]

A second relevant aspect is related to their semantic composition. In López’s (2012) mechanics, differential objects are syntactically and semantically distinct from (indefinite) objects that stay in-situ; the latter are of type \(<e,t>\) and have a specific mode of composition (i.e., they do not compose via Functional Application, but rather through Predicate Modification\(^8\)). The possibility of wide-scope readings irrespective of island constraints indicates on the other hand that differential objects have a mode of composition which is not the mechanism seen with canonical Quantifier Raising (QR) which is island and locality constrained. López (2012), following Reinhart (1997) starts from the assumption that wide scope can be obtained either by means of QR or choice functions. The difference between them is related to how they manipulate structure. QR is defined as a syntactic operation as a result of which a quantifier is moved to a position from which it c-commands other scopal elements. A choice function, on the other hand, opens the possibility for a nominal to take wide-scope regardless of its syntactic position. Crucially, in the case of differential objects scrambling must take place in order to make possible the application of a choice function. Such objects must raise above VP, but their scrambling can be very short – [Spec, \(\alpha\)] between VP and v. This short scrambling is motivated by the need to escape existential closure which

\(^8\) Following Chung and Ladusaw (2003), they are subject to Restrict, which translates into an operation of predicate modification whose result is that the DP does not saturate the predicate, but is rather conjoined with it.
applies at the VP level. Hence wide scope is not only obtained above vP. Differential objects, in spite of the possibility of obtaining what looks like a wide-scope reading, are not found in a syntactic position which overtly c-commands other operators. In other words, short scrambling is a pre-condition for the application of a choice function, which in turn will allow the objects to take wide-scope. Another important piece is that the overt marking of the object is an instruction regarding the semantic mode of composition by which the element must be interpreted. Differential objects are not composed via Restrict, but via regular Functional Application. They are not bare NP/DP but KPs. KPs must raise in order to retrieve a Case assigner. K can be associated to a semantic function, and translates in the semantics as a choice function variable, triggering type-shifting of the indefinite DP from type \(<e,t>\) to type \(<e>\). This permits the construction of specificity, understood as the anchoring the indefinite to the speaker or the subject of the clause (von Heusinger 2002, et seq.), as illustrated in (17) and (18). A more detailed derivation is given in (19):

(17) \[ \text{KP}_{<e>} = f_{\text{speaker/subject}} (\text{DP}) \]
\[ \text{K}_{<e,t,e>} \quad \text{DP}_{<e>} \]
\[ f_{\text{speaker/subject}} \]

(18) a. Juan vio a una cierta mujer.
   ‘Juan saw a certain woman.’
b. \( \exists f \text{CH}(f) \land \text{Juan saw } f_{\text{speaker}}(\text{woman}) \)
   ‘There is a choice function \( f \), which picks out a woman, known to the speaker, and Juan saw the individual picked out by \( f \).’

(19) \[ \exists f \exists e [\text{Init}(\text{John})(e) \land \text{saw}(e) (f(\text{woman}))] \]
\[ \exists f \exists e [\text{Init}(\text{John})(e) \land \text{saw}(e) (f(\text{woman}))] \]
\[ \exists e \quad \ldots \quad \alpha P = \lambda e. [\text{saw}(f(\text{woman}))(e)] \]
\[ f(\text{man}), \quad \alpha' = \lambda x, \lambda e [\text{saw}^*(e)][(t_i)]^x \]
\[ \lambda_i \quad \alpha' \]
\[ \alpha \quad \text{VP} = \lambda e [\text{saw}(e)](t_i) \]
\[ \lambda x [\lambda e [\text{saw}(e)](x)] (t_i) \]

López (2012) does address the obligatoriness of DOM with SCs. In his analysis, such objects are always marked because they cannot be interpreted below the matrix predicate. In that position they could only be subject to the operation Restrict, which translates into a syntactic process of incorporation. However, given that the adjective is also a complement of V, and incorporation can only take place from complement to head, non-marked syntactic objects cannot be licensed in that configuration (20).

---

9 The predicate must be saturated before the event argument is existentially closed, and an existential quantifier is added to bind the indefinite DP. In López (2012) existential closure takes place before any other arguments are merged.

(i) \[ \exists e [\phi \text{EA v [...IO...} \exists x \text{[DO(x)]]}] \]
For Chung and Ladusaw, existential closure is at vP:

(ii) \[ \exists e \exists x [\phi \text{EA v [...IO... [DO(x)]]}] \]
If there is no functional structure inside the SCs, a relevant question is why the argument does not incorporate into the adjective, to get licensed that way. As further shown in section 5, if the shared argument merges with the adjectival predicate it does not do so as a complement of A, but after further material has been added to A. In phrasal terms, the DP merges with what would correspond to an AP, not to the head A. Hence incorporation is blocked. But then we have another question – assuming that the KP and the AP merge before V is introduced, and given that DOM is not subject to canonical rules of quantification, how are the facts with MAs explained? Crucially, it cannot be the case that narrow scope is a result of noun incorporation under the matrix predicate as that would block the differential marking; a differentially-marked object is interpreted as a non-incorporating one, while the mechanism for narrow scope in absence of a domain of quantification would require (a type of) incorporation of some sort. And, how would we derive the difference between Romanian and Hindi-Urdu/Spanish? Recall that in Romanian DOM does not allow non-specific readings with modal adjectives, while in the other two languages this is possible.

The answer proposed here is that the non-specific reading can be obtained after the adjective has undergone complex predicate formation with the matrix predicate. This is the result of a process of restructuring, triggered by the absence of licensing functional projections above the AP. As these predicates need to be licensed, they will have to incorporate into the matrix. However, as opposed to canonical classes of predicate incorporation obtained by head-to-head movement, we seem to be dealing here with non-minimal/non-maximal structures incorporating into heads. As underlined in Chomsky (1995) this type of incorporation is possible at a level where linearization constraints are not active. Consider could be allowed to compose with an unsaturated predicate, forming a complex predicate (Chomsky 1955/1975), as in (21). As the AP composes with the matrix predicate it will not be able to incorporate the DP, but its quantificational force will be active at the vP level – the domain of quantification is the whole vP (as a result of the Baker’s Transparency Corollary), through further raising.

\[ (20) \ [vP \ EA \ v [\alpha P \ NomP \ \alpha [vP \ V \ [t(NomP) \ AP]]] \]
\[ \ \\
\[ \backslash \ldots \backslash \alpha \ldots \alpha \ \\
\] No incorporation

The high object will still get DOM due to its position. However, it is also known that differential objects can scramble further, outside the vP. When that happens, no narrow scope readings will be possible under necessary (due to phasal boundaries). The assumption is that the Romanian data can receive a straightforward explanation once DOM positions are better diagnosed. One of the motivations Lopez (2012) brought forward for postulating the intermediate position are c-command tests with non-quantificational indefinites (binding). These indicate that the differentially marked object is lower than the external argument. However, these configurations do not hold in Romanian, where binding of an anaphor inside the agent is possible from the differential object. Hence, the Romanian differential objects are outside vP at the relevant level of interpretation, and this explains their insensitivity to the quantificational component in the MA. Also note that the Romanian differentially-marked objects have a more complex (morphological) structure than their Spanish and Hindi counterparts – in Romanian the marker pe, clitic doubling, as well as morphologically special forms of indefinites are obligatory in many contexts.

Before closing this section, it must be signaled in passing that the DOM account above also provides clarification for some facts which have been adduced to support the true structural subject status of the shared argument. For example, non-extractability, as in (22) (Stowell 1991). What needs to be noted is that DOM blocks extraction even when it applies to true objects. This is due to the extra layer of functional material in their composition, and hence does not signal subjecthood.
(22) a. *Who would [[for John to visit ti] bother you]?  (Stowell 1991)
b.  Who, would it bother you [for John to visit ti]?
c.  ?*Who, do you consider [[the oldest sister of ti] foolish]?

So the puzzle is still with us – we are dealing with some objects which according to some diagnostics
are i) definitely above V and ii) invisible for certain operations applying below V. However, other
(theory-internal) considerations require them to appear below V, at least at some stage in the derivation.
A complex predicate account derives their high position, but a SC configuration captures basic aspects
of predication and locality in a simple way. The crucial question is: how can we reconcile all these
aspects by preserving a SC? What makes these subjects invisible? The answer doesn’t seem to be the
total absence of a quantificational domain. As we saw from section 2, such an assumption requires further
qualification. Section (5) sketches the general lines of an answer to this puzzle.

5. Structural deficiency and its consequences

The basic ingredients of the preliminary account are the following: i) small clauses of the consider + Adj type are defective domains in that they lack relevant licensing projections (nominal and event licensing) 10, 11; ii) merge operation between AP and DP cannot be labeled (Moro 2000); the assumption
is that this results in the obviation of the subject position (which for operations from outside the domain
is treated as non-existent), as well as in the failure of constituency tests; iv) lack of labelling triggers
obligatory argument raising (Moro 2000, Chomsky 2008, et subseq.); v) functional deficiency (a basic
relation of predication is established but cannot be licensed) feeds the process of restructuring by which
the adjectival projection is integrated into the domain of the matrix predicate; vi) APs are agreement
domains (as overtly seen cross-linguistically through patterns of predicative agreement), but again even
Agree is deficient here (no person agreement). These contexts are similar to the restructuring
configurations discussed in Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2005). Hence we have here a conspiracy of factors
leading to the absence of narrow scope readings with non-MAs. These contexts only allow quantification
at the edge of the maximal projection (May 1985) delimiting the theta/predication domain. But they do
not contain a C layer (against Starke 1995), the source of sentential quantification

As expected under a restructuring account, embedded adjective contexts pass tests signaling clause
union. Rizzi (1978) as well as Stowell (1991) have discussed clitic climbing effects in Italian; an example
from Romanian is also given below:

(23) Mi-l consideră loial i.   RO MANIAN
CLT.DAT.1.SG-CLT.ACC.3.SG.M considers loyal.
‘H/she considers him loyal to me.’

In spite of restructuring, adverbials merged within the adjectival domain cannot take matrix predicate
scope, also indicating the preservation of domain opacity:

(24) John considers Bill sincerely foolish.  (Stowell 1991, ex 18 b)
(Bill foolishness is sincere)

What needs further attention is their similarity to in Bobaljik and Wurmbrand’s (2005) restructuring
infinitivals which have also been claimed to trigger anti-reconstruction, as seen in example (25):

10 Similarly to GB accounts of ‘bare’ small clauses, whose maximal projection is AP. See Stowell (1983, 1991)
where a bare small clause structure is argued for: …. [v’ V [x’ NP AP]]. Domains of predication are defined in
accordance with local theta domains (every predicate must be predicated of a subject): ‘A domain of predication is
an XP, such that the X’ category directly dominated by XP is predicated of the SPEC of XP.’ (Stowell 1991, 7)
11 Diagnosed through absence of adverbials of independent time reference, predicative Case non-alternation, lack of
subject orientation (*John considers smart for John considers himself to be smart).
The analysis proposed in Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2005) makes use of domain opacity constraint, implemented as the Agreement Scope Corollary in (26):

(26) Agreement scope corollary
A DP may not be interpreted (for scope and binding) in a position lower than in the domain in which it undergoes Case/agreement checking.

The embedded predicate lacks relevant licensing functional projections (especially Accusative Case licensing). When the new predicate is merged a new thematic domain starts and the lower domain is closed off, blocking reconstruction. This is similar to what we see with SCs.

Although the two authors do not discuss contexts with intensional embedded predicates, a quick examination indicates that narrow scope readings are possible. In (27) an example with a long passive is illustrated, and the most prominent reading offered by native speakers is the narrow scope one. This shows that a source of quantification is still available domain-internally (just like with SCs). And although more investigation is needed, intermediate scope readings seem to also be accepted more easily than in SC contexts. This is a crucial point of variation which needs further research.

(27) weil ein Buch zu suchen tOBJ vergessen wurde.
look for a book

6. Conclusion

Various sources of structural deficiency feed restructuring and have non-trivial consequences upon the type of quantification permitted in a configuration. Before closing off, a few remarks are necessary about restructuring. In some prominent accounts (Cinque 2001), restructuring heads are seen as functional projections merging with lexical categories. This predicts that such heads cannot have any arguments of their own or thematic roles to assign (the thematic roles are assigned by the embedded lexical category – the adjective). In the realm of SCs, this assumption might make the right prediction for seem, but is clearly not sufficient for the consider-types (‘declare’, ‘announce’, etc.). Even if declare does not introduce a thematic object (DP internal argument), as expected under restructuring, its subject appears to behave like a true external argument cross-linguistically. These facts suggests that embedded adjectives do employ a second source of restructuring, which is lexical (Wurmbrand 2004).
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