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Lexical Inventory of Italian particles, according to Iacobini & Masini (2006):
Lexical Inventory of Italian particles, according to Iacobini & Masini (2006):

Lexical Inventory of Italian particles, according to Iacobini & Masini (2006):

(1)  


...but are they really all particles?
Svenonius’ generalizations (2003:434) help trying to single out true particles (particularly, (c)):
Svenonius’ generalizations (2003:434) help trying to single out true particles (particularly, (c)):

(2) a. The complement to P is a Ground.
b. The specifier of P is a Figure.
c. P with a Figure only (and no Ground) is a particle.
d. P with a Ground is a preposition.
e. A particle may undergo Particle Shift, a preposition may not.
the following are able to introduce a Figure only:

the following are able introduce a Figure only:


the following cannot:

(4) **addosso** ‘on’, **insieme** ‘together (with)’, **incontro** ‘towards’, **appresso** ‘by’, **contro** ‘against’
Notably, almost all of the elements in (3) can introduce a Ground in an non-adjacent position (i.e., as a clitic on $V^0$ or $I^0$):
Notably, almost all of the elements in (3) can introduce a Ground in an non-adjacent position (i.e., as a clitic on $V^0$ or $I^0$):

(5)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \textit{il cane corre dietro alla gallina} \\
& \text{the dog runs behind DAT-the hen} \\
& \text{‘the dog runs after the hen’}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \textit{il cane le corre dietro} \\
& \text{the dog her.CL.DAT runs behind} \\
& \text{‘the dog runs after it’}
\end{align*}
Notably, almost all of the elements in (3) can introduce a Ground in an non-adjacent position (i.e., as a clitic on \( V^0 \) or \( I^0 \)):

(5) a.  \( il \text{ cane corre dietro alla gallina} \)
the dog runs behind DAT-the hen
‘the dog runs after the hen’
b.  \( il \text{ cane le corre dietro} \)
the dog her.CL.DAT runs behind
‘the dog runs after it’

(6) a.  \( il \text{ commissario mette il dossier davanti all’ agente} \)
the commissioner puts the report in_front DAT-the agent
‘the commissioner puts the report in front of the agent’
b.  \( il \text{ commissario gli mette il dossier davanti} \)
the commissioner him.CL.DAT puts the report in_front
‘the commissioner puts the report in front of him’
the structure(s) at stake:

(7) a. $[ \text{DP}_{figure} \ldots \text{CL}_{ground} V \text{ P} \ldots ]$
    b. $[ \ldots \text{CL}_{ground} V \{ \text{P} \} \text{ DP}_{figure} \{ \text{P} \} \ldots ]$
the structure(s) at stake:

(7) a. \[ \text{DP}_{\text{figure}} \ldots \text{CL}_{\text{ground}} V P \ldots \]
    b. \[ \ldots \text{CL}_{\text{ground}} V \{P\} \text{DP}_{\text{figure}} \{P\} \ldots \]

- this gives rise to the typical particle-like linear order
- nonetheless, a Ground is there (realized as a clitic pronoun)
- the Ps at hand are not particles, but prepositions
the structure(s) at stake:

(7)  
   a. \[ \text{DP}_{\text{figure}} \ldots \text{CL}_{\text{ground}} V \ P \ldots \]
   b. \[ \ldots \text{CL}_{\text{ground}} V \{P\} \text{DP}_{\text{figure}} \{P\} \ldots \]

▷ this gives rise to the typical particle-like linear order
▷ nonetheless, a Ground is there (realized as a clitic pronoun)
▷ the Ps at hand are not particles, but prepositions

In this talk: focus on particles (for Ps realizing Ground as clitic, see Quaglia (forthcoming))
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Standard Italian has been shown to feature Particle Verb Constructions (PVCs) (Schwarze 1985; Simone 1996; Iacobini & Masini 2006): an uncommon encoding of spatial meanings within Romance
Standard Italian has been shown to feature Particle Verb Constructions (PVCs) (Schwarze 1985; Simone 1996; Iacobini & Masini 2006): an uncommon encoding of spatial meanings within Romance

According to Talmy’s (1985, 1991) typology of motion events:

- Romance: “verb-framed” languages
- Germanic, Slavic: “satellite-framed”
Some scholars (e.g. Iacobini & Masini 2006) argue that Italian qualifies as a mixed type between verb-framed Romance and satellite-framed Germanic.

In these analyses, a crucial piece of evidence is that Italian PVCs display systematic similarities to Germanic PVCs.
Some scholars (e.g. Iacobini & Masini 2006) argue that Italian qualifies as a mixed type between verb-framed Romance and satellite-framed Germanic.

In these analyses, a crucial piece of evidence is that Italian PVCs display systematic similarities to Germanic PVCs.

Nonetheless, there are at least two sharp differences between the systems:
Some scholars (e.g. Iacobini & Masini 2006) argue that Italian qualifies as a mixed type between verb-framed Romance and satellite-framed Germanic.

In these analyses, a crucial piece of evidence is that Italian PVCs display systematic similarities to Germanic PVCs.

Nonetheless, there are at least two sharp differences between the systems:

- the licensing of directed-motion constructions
Some scholars (e.g. Iacobini & Masini 2006) argue that Italian qualifies as a mixed type between verb-framed Romance and satellite-framed Germanic.

In these analyses, a crucial piece of evidence is that Italian PVCs display systematic similarities to Germanic PVCs.

Nonetheless, there are at least two sharp differences between the systems:

- the licensing of directed-motion constructions
- the licensing of Ground Promotion
Some scholars (e.g. Iacobini & Masini 2006) argue that Italian qualifies as a mixed type between verb-framed Romance and satellite-framed Germanic. In these analyses, a crucial piece of evidence is that Italian PVCs display systematic similarities to Germanic PVCs.

Nonetheless, there are at least two sharp differences between the systems:

▸ the licensing of directed-motion constructions
▸ the licensing of Ground Promotion

...we are going to examine these in turn
Evidence for the “mixed-type” nature of Italian comes first and foremost from data like the following:
Evidence for the “mixed-type” nature of Italian comes first and foremost from data like the following:

(8)  
\[
\text{il ladro saltò dentro}
\]
\[
\text{the thief jumped inside}
\]
\[
\text{‘the thief jumped in’}
\]

(9)  
\[
\text{Mary jumped in}
\]

(10)  
\[
\text{Maria sprang hinein}
\]
\[
\text{M. jumped h-in}
\]
\[
\text{‘Mary jumped in’}
\]

(11)  
\[
\text{Han hoppade in}
\]
\[
\text{he jumped in.DIR}
\]
\[
\text{‘He jumped in’}
\]
directed motion constructions with satellites

As Mateu & Rigau (2010) demonstrate, however, Italian and Germanic languages deeply differ in the licensing of directed motion constructions with particle-like satellites:

\[\text{the labels "put-verbs" and "swim-verbs" are due to Gehrke (2008)}\]
As Mateu & Rigau (2010) demonstrate, however, Italian and Germanic languages deeply differ in the licensing of directed motion constructions with particle-like satellites:

allowed in both Germanic and Italian with so-called “put-verbs”\(^1\):

\[(12)\quad \text{for Italian: saltare ‘to jump’, correre ‘to run’, volare ‘to fly’}\]

\(^1\)the labels “put-verbs” and “swim-verbs” are due to Gehrke (2008)
As Mateu & Rigau (2010) demonstrate, however, Italian and Germanic languages deeply differ in the licensing of directed motion constructions with particle-like satellites:

allowed in both Germanic and Italian with so-called “*put*-verbs”¹:

(12) for Italian: *saltare* ‘to jump’, *correre* ‘to run’, *volare* ‘to fly’

allowed only in Germanic with “*swim*-verbs”¹, not in Italian:

(13) for Italian: *ballare* ‘to dance’, *camminare* ‘to walk’,

*galoppare* ‘to gallop’,

¹the labels “*put*-verbs” and “*swim*-verbs” are due to Gehrke (2008)
Unlike Germanic swim-verbs, Italian ones cannot yield directed motion constructions when combined with P-satellites:

(14) \textit{Lucia balla dentro} \quad (\text{Italian})
L. dances inside
‘Lucia dances (while being) inside/*Lucia dances in’

(15) Lucy dances in \quad (\text{English})

(16) \textit{Luzia tanzt hinein} \quad (\text{German})
L. dances h-in
‘Luzia dances in/*Luzia dances (while being) inside’

(17) \textit{Lucia dansar in} \quad (\text{Swedish})
L. dansar in.DIR
‘Lucia dances in/*Lucia dances (while being) inside’
directed motion constructions with satellites

This restriction can be easily explained appealing to the purely locative nature of Italian (and Romance) satellites.

Though, this cannot be interpreted as a complete deficiency of the system. Just bounded directional Ps are absent, unbounded ones can be found:

(18)  *Marco nuota incontro ad Andrea*  \hspace{1cm} (Italian) 
M. swims towards DAT Andrea  
‘Marco swims towards Andrea’

(19)  *Aldo cammina verso il bosco*  \hspace{1cm} (Italian) 
A. walks towards the wood  
‘Aldo walks towards the wood’

\[2\] these P-items qualify as prepositions, and not as particles
Ground Promotion

Germanic particles (and Ps in general) are well-known for licensing “Ground Promotion” (cf. McIntyre 2007; Stiebels 1996; Svenonius 2003):
Germanic particles (and Ps in general) are well-known for licensing “Ground Promotion” (cf. McIntyre 2007; Stiebels 1996; Svenonius 2003):

(20) a. *Ingrid smeert henna in haar haar*
   I. smears henna in her hair
   ‘Ingrid smears henna in her hair’

   b. *Ingrid smeert haar haar in (met henna)*
   I. smears her hair in with henna
   ‘Ingrid greases her hair (with henna)’

   (Dutch; Svenonius (2003:437))

(21) a. *sie malt grüne Farbe an den Schrank*
   she paints green colour on the.ACC closet
   ‘she spreads green colour onto the closet’

   b. *sie malt den Schrank (mit grüner Farbe) an*
   she paints the.ACC closet with green colour on
   ‘she paints the closet with green colour’

   (German; Stiebels (1996:105), revised)
similar structures are totally excluded in Italian: the Object-DP is always interpreted as the Figure

(22)  a.  *ha buttato il sacco giù dalla finestra*  
      has thrown the bag down from-the window  
      ‘(he/she) threw the bag down the window’

      b.  *ha buttato giù la finestra*  
      has thrown down the window  
      ‘(he/she) threw down the window’

(23)  a.  *ho messo la chiave dentro al cassetto*  
      have-1SG put the key inside DAT-the drawer  
      ‘I put the key in the drawer’

      b.  *ho messo dentro il cassetto*  
      have-1SG put inside drawer  
      ‘I put in the drawer’
the German particle *an* displays a type of Ground Promotion that has not received much attention in the literature (Stiebels 1996:162-5)
the German particle *an* displays a type of Ground Promotion that has not received much attention in the literature (Stiebels 1996:162-5)

(24) a. *sie schwimmt an die Wendeboje*  
    she swims on the turning.buoy  
    ‘she swims to the turning buoy’

    b. *sie schwimmt die Wendeboje an*  
    she swims the turning.buoy on  
    ‘she swims towards the turning buoy’
some interesting aspects of this alternation:

- switch from preposition to particle syntax (as usual in Ground Promotion)
- directional, bounded reading (24-a) vs. directional, unbounded reading (24-b)
- (perhaps the only) very productive Ground Promotion in Contemporary German\(^3\)

---

\(^3\) according to Stiebels (1996:162-3), five verb classes may show up in the structure in (24-b): Vs of saying, seeing, expressing emotions, transmission of visual/acoustic signals, and agentive motion verbs. Here, we just consider the last class
Interestingly, Italian behaves exactly in the opposite way to German, with respect to this:
Interestingly, Italian behaves exactly in the opposite way to German, with respect to this:

- German *an* cannot surface as preposition (with governed Object-DP) when denoting an unbounded Path
- the only Italian directional prepositions (*incontro* and *verso* ‘towards’) denote exactly the same sort of unbounded Path (recall (18), (19))
Interestingly, Italian behaves exactly in the opposite way to German, with respect to this:

- German *an* cannot surface as preposition (with governed Object-DP) when denoting an unbounded Path
- the only Italian directional prepositions (*incontro* and *verso* ‘towards’) denote exactly the same sort of unbounded Path (recall (18), (19))

...is this perhaps a window on the diversity between Italian and Germanic?
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The analysis of the phenomena at stake will be given in the framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG) (Bresnan 1982; 2001).
The analysis of the phenomena at stake will be given in the framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG) (Bresnan 1982; 2001).

LFG is a constraint-based, generative (but non-derivational) theory of grammar where different pieces of grammatical information pertain to different levels of a complex architecture:

- C(onstituent)-structure is a representation of phrase-structural relations
- A rgument)-structure contains syntactically relevant lexical information about the predicate’s arguments
- F(unctional)-structure is a representation of grammatical features and deep syntactic dependencies (e.g. Grammatical Functions)
- S(emantic)-structure prepares syntactic information for a model-theoretic semantic computation
the different levels of representation are connected to each other via mathematical functions called “projections”:
the different levels of representation are connected to each other via mathematical functions called “projections”:  

- $\phi$ maps c-structure to f-structure  
- $\lambda$ maps a-structure to f-structure  
- $\sigma$ maps f-structure to s-structure
the different levels of representation are connected to each other via mathematical functions called “projections”:

- $\phi$ maps c-structure to f-structure
- $\lambda$ maps a-structure to f-structure
- $\sigma$ maps f-structure to s-structure

...in what follows, an example of the mapping from c- to f-structure ($\phi$ projection) is given
Figure: c- to f-structure mapping for *gli è corsa dietro* ‘she ran after him’
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Part (I):
bounded directional satellites with both *put*-verbs (Italian, Germanic) and *swim*-verbs (only Germanic) are optional arguments:

- they are added to the initial verb a-structure via a lexical rule that targets motion verbs (cf. Needham & Toivonen (2011))
- at a-structure, they are “Directions”, whereas at f-structure, they are OBLs
...why the Direction-augmenting lexical rule applies to Germanic swim-verbs, but not to Italian ones?

- Germanic owns both directional and locative Ps: with the former, the rule successfully applies even if there is no BECOME-operator available in the verb lexical semantics (i.e., swim-verbs)

- Italian Ps are only locative (except for incontro and verso): accordingly, the rule successfully applies just if a BECOME-operator is available in the verb lexical semantics (i.e., put-verbs, but not swim-verbs)
the mapping from a-structure to f-structure is obtained through the principles of Lexical Mapping Theory (LMT) (cf. Bresnan (2001:307-311)):

- both $\theta$-roles and GFs are decomposed by means of binary features: $[\pm r(\text{stricted})]$ and $[\pm o(\text{bjective})]$.
- every $\theta$-role at a-structure is lexically underspecified, making it possible to have a linking space (i.e., $\theta$-roles can be possibly linked to more than one GF).
- $\theta$-roles are ordered from link to right according to which are higher w.r.t. a Thematic Hierarchy.
- standard Mapping Principles (e.g. sensitive to what the highest $\theta$-role is) determine full specification of features (constraining the choice space to one GF).
Bounded directional satellites with *put*-verbs:

(25) *il ladro saltò dentro* ‘the thief jumped in’

\[
\text{saltare} \langle \quad \text{th} \quad \rangle \quad \text{Direction-augmentation Rule}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{th} & \quad \text{dir} \\
[\text{−r}] & \quad [\text{−o}] \\
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{OBL}_{\text{θ}}
\end{align*}
\]

(26) *Maria sprang hinein/Maria jumped in/Han hoppade in*

\[
\text{springen/spring/hoppa} \langle \quad \text{th} \quad \rangle \quad \text{Direction-augmentation Rule}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{th} & \quad \text{dir} \\
[\text{−r}] & \quad [\text{−o}] \\
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{OBL}_{\text{θ}}
\end{align*}
\]
In both (25) and (26), the final verb’s a-structure displays a Theme and a Direction:
In both (25) and (26), the final verb’s a-structure displays a *Theme* and a *Direction*:

- in the initial a-structure, there is just a *Theme*, which gets \([-r(estricted)]\) (the syntactic underspecification of patientlike \(\theta\)-roles)
- the lexical rule introduces a *Direction*, which gets \([-o(bjective)]\) (the syntactic underspecification of \(\theta\)-roles that are neither Agents nor patientlike)
- according to standard Mapping Principles of LMT, if the highest \(\theta\)-role is not \([-o]\), then the \(\theta\)-role marked as \([-r]\) is linked to SUBJ, the other to the lowest possible GF, in this case, OBL\(_\theta\)
In both (25) and (26), the final verb’s a-structure displays a Theme and a Direction:

- in the initial a-structure, there is just a Theme, which gets \([-r(\text{restricted})]\) (the syntactic underspecification of patientlike $\theta$-roles)

- the lexical rule introduces a Direction, which gets \([-o(\text{objective})]\) (the syntactic underspecification of $\theta$-roles that are neither Agents nor patientlike)

- according to standard Mapping Principles of LMT, if the highest $\theta$-role is not \([-o]\), then the $\theta$-role marked as \([-r]\) is linked to SUBJ, the other to the lowest possible GF, in this case, OBL$_\theta$

$\rightarrow$ the similarity between Italian and Germanic within this type of construction is correctly captured
Bounded directional satellites with *swim*-verbs (just Germanic):

(27)  *Luzia tanzt hinein/Lucy dances in/Lucia dansade in*

tanzen/dance/dansa  \(\langle\)  \(ag\)  \(\rangle\)  (initial)

\(ag\)  \(dir\)  \([-o]\)  \([-o]\)  Direction-augmentation Rule

SUBJ  OBL_θ  Intrinsic Classification

Mapping Principles
In (27), the final verb’s a-structure displays an *Agent* and a *Direction*:
In (27), the final verb’s a-structure displays an *Agent* and a *Direction*:

- in the initial a-structure, there is just an *Agent*, which gets \([-\text{o}(bjective)]\) (the syntactic underspecification for Agents)
- the lexical rule introduces a *Direction*, which gets \([-\text{o}(bjective)]\), too (as before)
- according to standard Mapping Principles of LMT, the highest \(\theta\)-role marked as \([-\text{o}]\) is linked to  *SUBJ*, the other to the lowest possible *GF*, in this case, *OBL*
Unbounded directional satellites with swim-verbs (Italian, too):

(28)  \textit{Marco nuota incontro ad Andrea} ‘Marco swims towards Andrea’

\begin{align*}
\text{nuotare} & \left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\text{ag} \\
\text{ag} \\
\text{[−o]} \\
\text{SUBJ}
\end{array} \right\rangle \quad \text{(initial)} \\
\text{\text{marine}} & \begin{array}{l}
\text{\text{dir}} \\
\text{[−o]} \\
\text{OBL}_\theta
\end{array} \\
\text{\text{Direction-augmentation Rule}} & \text{\text{Intrinsic Classification}} \\
\text{\text{Mapping Principles}}
\end{align*}
The linking goes as for Germanic swim-verbs with bounded directional satellites. Though, there is a difference in boundedness: Italian satellites that are directional are unbounded, Germanic can be both bounded and unbounded (with the exception of German, cf. later)
Part (II):

- Ground Promotion phenomena are syntactic Applicatives
- Grounds are *Location* $\theta$-roles at a-structure, but OBJs at f-structure
- for the particle acts here as an applicative morpheme, the internal argument of a predicate hierarchically subordinate to the matrix predicate (P) is realized as a direct argument of the matrix predicate (V)
(29) *sie malt grüne Farbe an den Schrank* (default, no applicative)

\[
\text{malen} \quad \langle \quad \text{ag} \quad \text{th} \quad \text{loc} \quad \rangle \\
\quad \text{[−o]} \quad \text{[−r]} \quad \text{[−o]} \quad \text{Intrinsic Classification} \\
\text{SUBJ} \quad \text{OBJ} \quad \text{OBL}_\theta \quad \text{Mapping Principles}
\]
what happens when the particle acts as an applicative marker? It forces a Location (i.e. the Ground-argument of P) to be encoded as a patientlike $\theta$-role, i.e. to get $[-r]$:

$$an-malen \quad \langle \text{ag th loc}_{app} \rangle \quad \begin{array}{c} [-o] \quad [-r] \quad [-r] \end{array}^* \rightarrow \text{violation of AOP}$$

Though, there is a violation of the Asymmetrical Object Principle (AOP), which states that there may be no more than one $\theta$-role marked as $[-(r)]$ per a-structure$^4$.

Subsequently, two options are available:

- Option (I): the Theme gets suppressed
- Option (II): the Location gets suppressed

---

$^4$The AOP applies to German (and most other European languages), but it does not apply e.g. to Kichaga, a Bantu language (cf. Bresnan (2001:307-311))
Option (I):

(30) *sie malt den Schrank (mit grüner Farbe) an*

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{an-malen} & \langle & \text{ag} & \text{th} & \text{loc}_{\text{appl}} & \rangle \\
[\text{−o}] & \Ø & [\text{−r}] & \text{SUBJ} & (\text{ADJ}) & \text{OBJ} \\
\end{array}
\]

*option (I) : suppression of Theme

Mapping Principles*
Option (II):

(31)  \textit{sie malt grüne Farbe an} (Stieber{\textcopyright}s:(1996:106))

\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{an-malen}  \\
\text{ag}  &  \text{th}  &  \text{loc}\text{\textsubscript{appl}}  \\
\text{[\textit{\textit{\text{-o}}}]}  &  \text{[\textit{\textit{\text{-r}}}]}  &  \emptyset  \\
\text{SUBJ}  &  \text{OBJ}  &  \text{(ADJ)}
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{option (II) : suppression of Location}  \\
\text{Mapping Principles}
\end{tabular}
The alternation in (24-a)-(24-b), repeated here as (32-a)-(32-b):

\[(32) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \textit{sie schwimmt an die Wendeboje} \\
& \quad \text{she swims on the turning.buoy} \\
& \quad \text{‘she swims to the turning buoy’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \textit{sie schwimmt die Wendeboje an} \\
& \quad \text{she swims the turning.buoy on} \\
& \quad \text{‘she swims towards the turning buoy’}
\end{align*}\]  

\text{(German)}

can be thus analyzed as an alternation between an a-structure targeted by the \textit{Direction}-augmentation lexical rule ((32-a)) and an a-structure targeted by Applicativization ((32-b))
(33)  *sie schwimmt an die Wendeboje*

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{schwimmen} \quad \langle ag \quad \rangle \\
\quad \langle ag \quad \text{dir} \quad \rangle \\
\quad \langle [-o] \quad [-o] \rangle \\
\quad \text{SUBJ} \quad \text{OBL}_\theta
\end{array}
\]

- Direction-augmentation Rule
- Intrinsic Classification
- Mapping Principles
(34) sie schwimmt die Wendeboje an

an-schwimmen \( \langle \text{ag} \quad \text{loc}_{\text{appl}} \rangle \)

\([-o] \quad [-r]\)     Applicativization

SUBJ  OBJ  Mapping Principles
(34) *sie schwimmt die Wendeboje an*

\[
\text{an-schwimmen} \left\langle \begin{array}{ll}
\text{ag} & \text{loc}_{\text{appl}} \\
\text{[−o]} & \text{[−r]}
\end{array} \right\rangle
\]

**Applicativization**

**Mapping Principles**

→ notably, here no \( \theta \)-role needs to be suppressed: Agent is linked to SUBJ, applied Location to OBJ
In some sense, the (already pointed out in the literature) diversity between Germanic and Romance, i.e. the \{possibility vs. impossibility\} to realize resultative (or bounded) predications in the syntax has its peak in the comparison between German and Italian:
In some sense, the (already pointed out in the literature) diversity between Germanic and Romance, i.e. the \{possibility vs. impossibility\} to realize resultative (or bounded) predcations in the syntax has its peak in the comparison between German and Italian:

- German only allows augmented Direction-OBLs that are bounded (perhaps Ps endowed with a \textit{CHANGE}-operator (Wunderlich 1991), or the dowtian \textit{BECOME})
- unbounded ones must be licensed in other ways, i.e. through (syntactic) Applicatives

- Italian only allows augmented Direction-OBLs that are unbounded
- bounded ones are not possible: the system has to resort to other strategies (\textit{Lucia è entrata ballando}, ‘Lucia entered (while) dancing’)

42 / 54
As a matter of fact, it is possible to find other alternations similar to (32-a)-(32-b) in German, where the switch from prepositional to particle syntax triggers a switch from bounded to unbounded interpretation of the Direction added:

(35) a. *sie tanzte gegen die Wand*  
    she danced against the.ACC wall  
    ‘she danced against the wall’ (bounded)  

b. *sie tanzte der Wand entgegen*  
    she danced the.DAT wall against  
    ‘she danced against the wall’ (unbounded)

(36) a. *sie galoppiert hinter das Auto*  
    she galloped behind the.ACC car  
    ‘she galloped (ending up) behind the car’ (bounded)  

b. *sie galoppiert dem Auto hinterher*  
    she galloped the.DAT car behind  
    ‘she galloped behind the car’ (unbounded)
In the previous examples, the applied Location is linked to OBJ$_\theta$, and not to OBJ. This probably follows from the case requirements of *entgegen* and *hinterher*. These lexical items impose Dative case on their Grounds, which forces this to be marked as [+r(estricted)] instead of [−r(estricted)] (cf. Butt (1999) for the role of Case in constraining linking options)
At this point, there remains a question: how comes that particle-syntax forces an unbounded reading?
At this point, there remains a question: how comes that particle-syntax forces an unbounded reading? → One possibility would be to assume that in both the applicative an, and entgegen and hinterher, a CHANGE (or BECOME) operator is not present, or not active — as opposed to prepositional an, gegen and hinter
At this point, there remains a question: how comes that particle-syntax forces an unbounded reading?

One possibility would be to assume that in both the applicative *an*, and *entgegen* and *hinterher*, a CHANGE (or BECOME) operator is not present, or not active — as opposed to prepositional *an*, *gegen* and *hinter*

Accordingly:

- the former and the latter correspond to different lexical entries (whereby *an*₁ (“prepositional” P) is homophonous to *an*₂ (“particle” P))
- the former must have a more complex lexical semantics, where something “blocks” the change-of-state operator, yielding an unbounded reading
- the former are P elements that are not able to govern their Grounds directly (i.e. with prepositional syntax), and must hence add them to the verb a-structure for them to be governed by an higher predicate
As regards applicative *an*, we find a piece of evidence for this. There exists a purely aspectual variant of *an* — displaying particle syntax — that combines with telic predicates, yielding the reading that the process has been carried out just in part, not until the end (Stiebels dubs this “Partialmarkierung” (1996:78-82)):

(37) a. *er brät das Schnitzel an*  
   he roasts the.ACC schnitzel on  
   ‘he roasts the schnitzel partially’

b. *er liest den Aufsatz an*  
   he reads the.ACC essay on  
   ‘he reads the essay partially’

c. *sie spielt die Mondscheinsonate an*  
   she plays the.ACC moonshine_sonata on  
   ‘she plays the Moonshine sonata partially’
the idea is that the applicative *an* combines two semantic “building blocks” in its lexical entry⁵:

- the two-place spatial relation of prepositional *an* — endowed with CHANGE (or BECOME) —
- the aspectual information of the “Partialmarkierung”-*an*

→ the interaction of these yields an unbounded directional semantics: the change-of-state operator is rendered “inactive” by the aspectual information of partiality

---

⁵I would like to thank Maribel Romero for this suggestion.
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Conclusions and Outlook
Within this brief inquiry, we could single out some differences between Italian and Germanic spatial particles and P-satellites:

- licensing of directed motion constructions
- licensing of Ground promotion

Furthermore, not every Italian P dubbed “particle” in the literature, is really a particle
The two major differences reduce in some sense to the greater autonomy of Germanic P-satellites to affect the verb’s argument structure:

- they are able to license *Direction*-augmentation without relying on the verb’s lexical semantics
- they are able to apply their Ground-argument, adding it to the verb’s argument structure
one final remark...what about Ground Promotion?

→ it serves to holistically “underline” an argument that usually is not “underlined” (its best known “function”, or effect) or perhaps also:

→ it is used as a kind of “rescue”-strategy? This seems to be the case for German applicative *an*, *entgegen* and *hinterher*. These lexical items cannot govern their Grounds directly: subsequently, the only strategy to realize them is to “promote” them to verb’s arguments

6Interestingly, this would draw an interesting cross-theoretical parallelism between LFG and derivational accounts: e.g. Svenonius (2003:436-8) claims that, in Ground promotion phenomena, the Ground-DP is reliant on v for Case, for p is missing, or defective
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