

The puzzling robustness of these distinctions in many languages requires an explanation. In a thorough investigation of such contexts Williams (1983) argued that 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. (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. (Williams 1983, ex.24)
 (John seems [*something*_i [*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

licensor⁶ 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 (morphological) 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 DOM a student intelligent.
 ‘The professor considered a student intelligent.’ (López 2013, ex. 56)
- (10) a. Admi kitab-ko/*Ø acēhi mani hē. HINDI-URDU
 man.M.SG book-DOM good.F.SG believe.IMPF.F.SG be.PRES.3.SG
 ‘The man considers the/a book good.’ (a book > consider; *consider > a book)
 b. Aadmi kitab-ko zəruri mani hē.
 man.M.SG book-DOM necessary believe.IMPF.F.SG be.PRES.3.SG
 ‘The man considers a book necessary. (a book > consider; consider > a book)’
- (11) Ali bir öğrenc-i-yi/*Ø zeki bulu-yor. TURKISH
 Ali a student-EP.V.-DOM intelligent find-PRES.PROGR.3.SG.
 ‘Ali finds/considers a (specific) student intelligent.’ (a student > find; *find > a student)

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 language 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: a) non-differentially marked objects (whose position is nevertheless diagnosable as high in the domain of the embedding predicate, through diagnostics in Lasnik and Saito 1991, and Postal 1974, etc.) allow scopal lowering; b) DOM blocks scope narrowing with all adjectives in SCs (13), while marginally permitting it with infinitives⁷:

- (12) a. Consideră un student inteligent. b. Consideră un student necesar.
 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), Sitaridou (2002), etc.

⁷ The infinitive is highly formal under predicates like ‘*consider*’.

- (15) Maria nu îl consideră onest
 Maria not CLT.3.M.SG considers honest.M.SG
pe un om care *să facă* așa ceva.
 DOM a man who SUBJ do.SUBJ.3.SG like something.
 ‘Maria does not consider honest a person who would do something like this.’ (ROMANIAN)

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* [_{αP} DO α [_{VP} V DO]]]
 ↑
 DOM

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 Modification⁸). 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, α] 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 level⁹. 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 $\langle e, t \rangle$ to type $\langle e \rangle$. 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):

$$(17) \quad \text{KP}_{\langle e \rangle} = \mathbf{f}_{\text{speaker/subject}} (\text{DP})$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \mathbf{K}_{\langle e, t \rangle \langle e \rangle} \quad \text{DP}_{\langle e, t \rangle} \\ | \\ \mathbf{f}_{\text{speaker/subject}} \end{array}$$

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

$$(19) \quad \exists \mathbf{f} \exists e [\text{Init}'(\text{John}')(\mathbf{f})(e) \wedge \text{saw}'(e) (\mathbf{f}(\text{woman}'))]$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \exists \mathbf{f} \quad \exists e [\text{Init}'(\text{John}')(\mathbf{f})(e) \wedge \text{saw}'(e) (\mathbf{f}(\text{woman}'))] \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \exists e \quad \dots\dots\dots \\ \alpha P = \lambda e. [\text{saw}'(\mathbf{f}(\text{woman}'))](e) \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \mathbf{f}(\text{man}')_i \quad \alpha' = \lambda x_i \lambda e [\text{saw}'(e)]([\text{t}_i]^x) \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \lambda_i \quad \alpha' \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \alpha \quad \text{VP} = \lambda e [\text{saw}'(e)](\text{t}_i) \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \lambda x [\lambda e [\text{saw}'(e)](x)] \quad (\text{t}_i) \end{array}$$

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) $\exists e [{}_{\text{VP}} \text{EA } v [\dots \text{IO} \dots \exists x [\text{DO}(x)]]]$

For Chung and Ladusaw, existential closure is at vP:

(ii) $\exists e \exists x [{}_{\text{VP}} \text{EA } v [\dots \text{IO} \dots [\text{DO}(x)]]]$

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.

$$(20) \quad [{}_{\nu P} EA \nu [{}_{\alpha P} \text{NomP} \alpha [{}_{\nu P} V [{}_{sc} [t(\text{NomP}) AP]]]]$$



No incorporation

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 νP level – the domain of quantification is the whole νP (as a result of the Baker's *Transparency Corollary*), through further raising.

$$(21) \quad \textit{Function composition} \qquad \qquad \qquad (\text{Jacobson 1992, Moulton 2013})$$

$$A \circ B = \lambda g. A(B(g))$$

where A is a function taking g and A a function taking B (g)

The high object will still get DOM due to its position. However, it is also known that differential objects can scramble further, outside the νP . 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 López (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 νP 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_i would [[for John to visit t_i] bother you]? (Stowell 1991)
 b. Who_i would it bother you [for John to visit t_i]?
 c. ?*Who_i do you consider [[the oldest sister of t_i] 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 _i -l
CLT.DAT.1.SG-CLT.ACC.3.SG.M
'H/she considers him loyal to me.' | consideră
considers | loial.
loyal. | ROMANIAN |
|--|------------------------|------------------|----------|

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 [_{AP} 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*).

- (25) *Restructuring predicate in German* (remnant extraposition in German indicates restructuring)
- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|----|------|---------|-----------|-----|----------------------|------------|
| weil | er | alle | Fenster | vergessen | hat | [_{TOBJ} zu | schließen] |
| since | he | all | windows | forgotten | has | _{TOBJ} to | close. |
- ‘Since he forgot to close all the windows.’ (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005, ex. 2a)
- i. $\forall > \text{forget}$
 - ii. $*\text{forget} > \forall$

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 passive¹² 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.
 because a book to look for forgotten was.
 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).

References

- Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. Economy. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21:435–448.
- Bailyn, John Frederik. 2001. The syntax of Slavic predicate Case. *ZAS Working Papers in Linguistics*. 22: 1-23.
- Beghelli, Filippo and Tim Stowell. 1997. Distributivity and negation: the syntax of *each* and *every*. In Szabolczi, Anna (ed.), *Ways of taking scope*, pp. 71-107. Kluwer Publications, Dordrecht.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David and Susi Wurmbrand. 2005. The domain of agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23: 809-865.
- Bossong, Georg. 1991. Differential object marking in Romance and beyond. In D. Wanner and D. Kibbee (eds.), *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics, Selected Papers from the XVIII LSRL* (1988), pp. 143–170. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

¹² Another diagnostic for restructuring in German, selected here as most native speakers consulted judged remnant extraposition ungrammatical.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1955/1975. *The logical structure of linguistic theory*. New York: Plenum.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In Freidin, Robert et al. (eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in honor of Jean Roger Vergnaud*, pp. 133-166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chung, Sandra and Jim McCloskey. 1987. Government, barriers and small clauses in Modern English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 173-237.
- Chung, Sandra and William Ladusaw. 2003. *Restriction and saturation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2001. "Restructuring" and functional structure. In Brugè, L. (ed), *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 11, pp. 45-127.
- Cresti, Diana. 1995. *Indefinite topics*. PhD thesis. MIT.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Fox, Danny. 1999. Reconstruction, binding theory and the interpretation of chains. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 157-196.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1985. The *get*-passive and Burzio's generalization. *Lingua* 66: 53-77.
- von Heusinger, Klaus. 2002. Specificity and definiteness in sentence and discourse structure. *Journal of semantics* 19: 245-274.
- Irimia, Monica Alexandrina. 2011. *Secondary predicates*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Toronto.
- Jacobson, Pauline. 1992. Raising without movement. In Larson, Richard K. et al. (eds), *Control and grammar*, pp. 149-195. Springer.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1998. Partitive Case and aspect. In Butt, Miriam and Wilhelm Geuder (eds.), *The projection of arguments*, pp. 265-307. CSLI.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. In Dobrin, L. et al. (eds.), *Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp. 324-343.
- López, Luis. 2012. *Indefinite objects. Scrambling, choice functions, and differential marking*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Maling, Joan and Richard Sprouse. 1995. Structural Case, Specifier-Head relations, and the Case of predicate NPs. In Haider, Hubert et al. (eds.), *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*, pp. 167-186. Kluwer.
- May, Robert. 1985. *Logical form: its structure and derivation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Moro, Andrea. 2000. *Dynamic antisymmetry*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Moulton, Keir. 2013. Raising from the dead. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44.1: 157-167.
- Postal, Paul. 1974. *On raising: an inquiry into one rule of English and its theoretical implications*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1997. Quantifier scope. How the labor is divided between QR and choice functions. *Linguistics and philosophy* 20: 335-397.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. On chain formation. In Borer, Hagit (ed.), *The syntax of pronominal clitics (Syntax and semantics 19)*. Academic Press: New York.
- Rothstein, Susan. 1983. *The syntactic forms of predication*. PhD thesis. MIT.
- Raposo, Eduardo. 1987. Case theory and Infl-to-Comp: the inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18.1: 85-109.
- Safir, Kenneth. 1983. On small clauses as constituents. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 730-735.
- Sitaridou, Ioana. 2002. *The synchrony and diachrony of Romance infinitives with nominative subjects*. PhD thesis. University of Manchester.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 2005. Division of labor between Merge and Move: strict locality of selection and apparent reconstruction paradoxes. Paper available at: <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/000163>.
- Starke, Michel. 1995. On the format for small clauses. In Cardinaletti, Anna and Maria Teresa Guasti (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 28: Small clauses*, pp. 237-269. Academic Press. New York.
- Stowell, Tim. 1991. Small clause restructuring. In Freidin, Robert (ed.), *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, pp. 182-219. MIT Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts/London, England.
- Stump, Gregory T. 1985. *The semantic variability of absolute constructions*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Williams, Edwin. 1983. Against small clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14.2: 287-293.
- Wurmbrand, Suzi. 2004. Two types of restructuring: lexical vs. functional. *Lingua* 114: 991-1014.

Proceedings of the 33rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by

Kyeong-min Kim, Pocholo Umbal,
Trevor Block, Queenie Chan,
Tanie Cheng, Kelli Finney, Mara Katz,
Sophie Nickel-Thompson, and Lisa Shorten

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2016

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 33rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2016 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-469-0 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Irimia, Monica Alexandrina. 2016. How Small Are Small Clauses? Embedded Adjectives and Restructuring.
In *Proceedings of the 33rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Kyeong-min Kim et al., 207-216.
Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #3240.