Clitic Climbing and the Dual Status of *Sembrare*

Liliane Haegeman

For some speakers of Italian (reported in Cinque 2004), Italian *sembrare* 'seem' has dual status. On the one hand, it is a lexical verb, with an experiencer argument; on the other hand, it behaves like a ''restructuring verb.'' In the latter case, *sembrare* is incompatible with an experiencer argument and it allows clitic climbing. This article identifies several contexts in which clitic climbing is not possible with *sembrare* and offers an account in terms of Cinque's proposals about the functional hierarchy of the clause. The article also examines *sembler*, the French cognate of *sembrare*, and argues, contra Cinque 2002, that it behaves like a lexical verb. Finally, it shows that the two instantiations of Italian *sembrare* correspond to two verbs in Dutch: *schijnen* and *lijken*.

Keywords: restructuring, clitic climbing, functional projections, evidentiality, *sembrare*, *sembler*, *schijnen*, *lijken*

1 Introduction

1.1 Sembrare *and Clitic Climbing*

It has been reported that for some speakers of Italian, the verb *sembrare* 'seem' is compatible with clitic climbing, as illustrated by the following examples:[1]

(1) a. Gianni non *lo* sembra   apprezzare abbastanza.
      Gianni not it seem-3SG appreciate enough
      'Gianni does not seem to appreciate it enough.'

   b. *Lo* sembra   fare volentieri.
      it seem-3SG do   willingly
      'He seems to do it willingly.'

   c. *Ci*   sembrano andare.
      there seem-3PL go
      'They seem to be going there.'

   d. *Gli*   sembravate   parlare amichevolmente.
      him-DAT seem-PAST-2PL talk   amicably
      'You seemed to be talking to him in a friendly way.'

The clitic-climbing phenomenon suggests that for these speakers, *sembrare* is a restructuring

verb. Cinque (2004:143) signals that for the relevant speakers, clitic climbing is blocked in the presence of an experiencer argument associated with *sembrare* (1e). In this context, only the nonclimbing alternative is possible (1f).

(1) e. *Gianni non *ce* *lo* sembra   apprezzare abbastanza.
        Gianni not to-us it seem-3SG appreciate enough
        'It seems to us that Gianni does not appreciate it enough.'
    f. Gianni non *ci*   sembra   apprezzar*lo*.
        Gianni not to-us seem-3SG appreciate-it
        'It seems to us that Gianni does not appreciate it.'

Cinque proposes that for the relevant speakers, *sembrare* displays a lexical split (Roberts and Roussou 2003:42): either *sembrare* is a restructuring verb, in which case it lacks argument structure, or it is a lexical (raising) verb, with an experiencer argument. I will refer to restructuring *sembrare* as F-*sembrare* and to lexical *sembrare* as L-*sembrare*.[2] Speakers who do not allow clitic climbing have only L-*sembrare*. I will not be concerned with their grammar here.

Cinque's analysis of *sembrare* contains a number of specific hypotheses. The first is that F-*sembrare* is a functional verb. Specifically, on the basis of his articulated IP structure (Cinque 1999; see below), he proposes that F-*sembrare* is inserted as a Mood$_{evidential}$ head in a monoclausal structure. F-*sembrare* may give rise to clitic climbing. In contrast, L-*sembrare* is inserted as a lexical verb; it has argument structure and does not lead to restructuring. L-*sembrare* is incompatible with clitic climbing. F-*sembrare* and L-*sembrare* give rise to subtly different interpretations. As a more general point, Cinque also claims that restructuring verbs are always functional (2004: 153). To put this differently: restructuring effects should never be triggered by lexical verbs.

1.2 Scope and Organization

In this remark, I examine some predictions that Cinque's (2002, 2004) analysis makes regarding the distribution of clitic climbing with *sembrare*. In particular, given that only F-*sembrare*, inserted in the Mood$_{evidential}$ head, licenses clitic climbing, the analysis predicts that whenever the Mood$_{evidential}$ head is disallowed, F-*sembrare* will no longer be available. In such circumstances, only L-*sembrare*, which is incompatible with clitic climbing, will be available. It follows that when Mood$_{evidential}$ is not available, *sembrare* will not give rise to clitic climbing.

I will broaden the analysis to comparative data. I will first show that contrary to Cinque's own suggestion (2002:634), French *sembler* is more like L-*sembrare* than like F-*sembrare*. I will also show that the two uses of Italian *sembrare* postulated by Cinque correspond to two different lexical items in Standard Dutch. The Dutch data will, however, cast doubt on Cinque's hypothesis that restructuring verbs are always functional.

The article is organized as follows. Section 2 gives background for the discussion. It provides a brief survey of Cinque's (2002, 2004) monoclausal analysis of restructuring, which will be adopted in the following discussion. Section 3 examines some of the predictions that follow from

---

[2] This notation is inspired by a reviewer's suggestion.

Cinque's hypothesis that F-*sembrare* is a functional head inserted as a marker of evidential mood. Section 4 turns to French *sembler* and section 5 briefly discusses the distribution of the Standard Dutch analogues of *sembrare*: *schijnen* and *lijken*. Section 6 is a brief conclusion.

2 A Functional Analysis of Restructuring

Building on his work on adjuncts (1999), Cinque (2004:153) proposes that restructuring verbs always be analyzed as functional verbs. That is to say, restructuring verbs are merged as functional heads in Cinque's articulated clause structure, reproduced here in (2). This analysis entails that there is no syntactic process of clause merger or clause union (as there was in Rizzi 1978); so-called restructuring verbs are merged in a monoclausal structure.

(2) $\text{MoodP}_{\text{speech act}} > \text{MoodP}_{\text{evaluative}} > \text{MoodP}_{\text{evidential}} > \text{ModP}_{\text{epistemic}} > \text{TP (Past)} > \text{TP (Future)} > \text{MoodP}_{\text{irrealis}} > \text{ModP}_{\text{alethic}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{habitual}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{repetitive}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{frequentative}} > \text{ModP}_{\text{volitional}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{celerative}} > \text{TP (Anterior)} > \text{AspP}_{\text{terminative}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{continuative}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{retrospective}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{proximative}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{durative}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{generic/progressive}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{prospective}} > \text{ModP}_{\text{obligation}} > \text{ModP}_{\text{permission/ability}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{completive}} > \text{VoiceP} > \text{AspP}_{\text{celerative}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{repetitive}} > \text{AspP}_{\text{frequentative}}$
(Cinque 2004:133, (3))

Consider the example of the Italian restructuring verb *volere* 'want' in (3).

(3) *Lo* volevo   vedere subito.
    it want-PAST-1SG see   immediately
    'I wanted to see it immediately.'
    (Cinque 2004:132, (1a))

According to Cinque's approach, (3) has a monoclausal structure. *Vedere* 'see' is the lexical head of the clause. The restructuring verb *volere* 'want' is merged in the extended projection (in the sense of Grimshaw 1991) of *vedere*; specifically, *volere* is merged in Mod$_{\text{volitional}}$, the functional head that encodes volitional modality. One of Cinque's arguments in favor of his monoclausal approach to restructuring is that when restructuring verbs cooccur, they are subject to the ordering and cooccurrence restrictions that are independently found to apply to the distribution of adjuncts in a monoclausal structure and that are reflected in the hierarchy in (2). Thus, for instance, when they cooccur, the Italian restructuring verbs *volere* 'want' and *smettere* 'stop' can only appear in the order *volere – smettere* (4a). The alternative order, in which *volere* would be part of the complement of *smettere*, is ungrammatical (4b). Observe that (4b) is not semantically incoherent: its intended meaning would be that of English (4c).

(4) a. Non *vi* vuole   smettere di importunare.
        not you want-3SG stop   *di* bother
        'He doesn't want to stop bothering you.'
        (Cinque 2004:139, (29a))

b. *Non *vi* smette di voler importunare.
   not you stop-3SG *di* want to-bother
   (Cinque 2004:139, (29b))

c. He never stops wanting to bother you.

If it is assumed that *volere* and *smettere* are merged as functional heads that encode volitional modality and terminative aspect, respectively, the ordering restriction in (4) follows from the hierarchy in (2): ModP$_{volitional}$ dominates AspP$_{terminative}$.

Although the absence of clitic climbing is compatible with the presence of a biclausal structure (as in (1f), for instance), Cinque points out that with restructuring verbs, the absence of clitic climbing is in fact not to be taken as evidence for a biclausal structure. Consider the examples in (5). In (5a), the modal *dovere* 'must' triggers clitic climbing: the clitic *ci* 'here' associated with the lexical verb *venire* 'come' ends up on *dovrebbe*. In (5b), the clitic does not climb.

(5) a. Maria *ci* dovrebbe venire molte volte.
       Maria here must-COND-3SG come many times
       'Maria should come here often.'

    b. Maria dovrebbe venir*ci* molte volte.
       Maria must-COND-3SG come-here many times
       'Maria should come here often.'

Cinque argues that in spite of the absence of clitic climbing in (5b), it is monoclausal, just like (5a). In other words, in both examples in (5) *dovere* is functional. The different positions of the clitic *ci* are not to be taken as evidence for presence or absence of a monoclausal structure; instead, they relate to the syntax of clitics (for recent discussion, see Cardinaletti and Shlonsky 2004).

An argument in favor of generalizing the functional analysis of *dovere* in (5a), with clitic climbing, to *dovere* in (5b), without clitic climbing, is that in the absence of clitic climbing, there remains evidence for a monoclausal structure. For instance, in (6) the clitic *ci* does not climb, but auxiliary switch still takes place: the perfective auxiliary *essere* 'be' is selected because of the nature of the lower lexical verb (*venir*). Auxiliary switch is taken as a reliable diagnostic for a monoclausal structure (see Cardinaletti and Shlonsky 2004:540–541 for a similar argument).

(6) Maria *è* dovuta venirci molte volte.
    Maria is must-PART-FEM-SG come-here many times
    'Maria has had to come here often.'
    (Cinque 2004:150, (66a))

In addition, the absence of clitic climbing in what are potentially restructuring contexts does not suspend the rigid ordering constraints on the restructuring verbs. This is illustrated in (7).

(7) a. Soleva smettere di veder*la* ogni sei mesi.
       use-PAST-3SG stop of see-her every six months
       'He used to stop seeing her every six months.'

b. *Smetteva   di soler veder*la* ogni sei mesi.
   stop-PAST-3SG of use   see-her every six months
   'He stopped using to see her every six months.'
   (Cinque 2004:154, (84))

The ordering restrictions observed in (7) reflect the hierarchical organization of the functional heads in (2): *solere* is merged in the head of Asp$_{habitual}$ and *smettere* in the lower head of Asp$_{terminative}$. These data again show that even though the clitic *la* 'her' has not climbed in (7), *solere* and *smettere* are merged as functional heads in a monoclausal structure.

    Observe in passing that, as Cinque himself points out (2004:154), ''the reason for the ill-formedness of [7b] can hardly be semantic. It would make perfect sense to 'stop having the habit of doing something'. Yet the sentence is ungrammatical.''

    Cinque assumes that restructuring verbs are always merged as functional heads (2004:153). Some of the verbs that occur as functional heads in restructuring patterns may, however, also exist as lexical verbs in their own right. In their lexical use, these verbs do not display restructuring; hence, they do not allow clitic climbing. *Sembrare* is one example of a verb displaying such a lexical split. When *sembrare* triggers clitic climbing, it is definitely an instance of F-*sembrare*, inserted as a functional head. Without clitic climbing, the verb may be either functional (see the discussion of (5b) and (6)) or lexical. In (1e) and (1f), the presence of the experiencer argument *ci* leads to the conclusion that L-*sembrare* has been selected—hence the ungrammaticality of clitic climbing in (1e).

3 F-*Sembrare* as a Functional Head

3.1 Sembrare *and the Functional Hierarchy*

Cinque (2004) proposes that when associated with restructuring effects, F-*sembrare* is a functional head. In particular, in the functional hierarchy in (2) F-*sembrare* is merged as the head MoodP$_{evidential}$. As a functional head, F-*sembrare* is subject to the ordering constraints associated with the hierarchy in (2). We predict that F-*sembrare* will not be able to occur in the complement of modals that correspond to functional heads lower than MoodP$_{evidential}$ in the hierarchy. One such modal is *potere* 'may', which, following Cinque, I take to express alethic modality.[3] The prediction is borne out: (8) is ungrammatical. Clitic climbing in (8) shows that *sembrare* is functional.

(8) *?*Lo* potrebbe   sembrare capire   (ma io sono sicura che non
     it may-COND-3SG seem   understand (but I am   sure that not
     abbia   capito   niente).
     have-SUBJ-3SG understood nothing)
     'He might seem to understand it (but I am sure he hasn't understood a thing).'

The Italian analogue for English (9a) is (9b), in which *sembrare* does not trigger clitic climbing.

---

[3] For the distinction between epistemic modality and alethic possibility, see Cinque 1999:79–81, 89, 197n1, 198n3. Thanks to Guglielmo Cinque for bringing this point to my attention.

(9) a. He might seem to understand it (but I think he has not understood a thing).

b. Potrebbe   sembrare capir*lo*   (ma io sono sicura che non abbia

may-COND-3SG seem   understand-it (but I am   sure   that not have-SUBJ-3SG

capito   niente).[4]

understood nothing)

The absence of clitic climbing in (9b) means that this example can be taken to instantiate L-*sembrare*, which, being a lexical verb, is inserted as V and will be dominated by ModP$_{alethic}$.

Furthermore, given the functional hierarchy in (2) we also expect that F-*sembrare* will not be compatible with the perfect aspect. MoodP$_{evidential}$ dominates TP (Anterior), the projection associated with perfectivity (for discussion of the expression of perfectivity, see also Cinque 1999: 94). For the relevant speakers, *sembrare* is incompatible with the perfect when the clitic climbs.

(10) *Non *lo* sono sembrati capire.[5]

not it are   seemed   understand

'They didn't seem to understand it.'

However, a complication at this point, and one for which I have no explanation, is that for the speakers who reject (10), the perfect is also degraded when the clitic fails to climb, as the judgment in (11) illustrates.[6] This is unexpected since absence of clitic climbing should be compatible with the use of L-*sembrare*.

---

[4] Thanks to Susi Wurmbrand for pointing out the relevance of these data.

Of course, the absence of clitic climbing in (9b) as such does not rule out that *sembrare* is functional. It is the fact that it is embedded under Mod$_{alethic}$ that is conclusive.

Burzio's (111b) (1986:263), repeated here as (i), should be taken to illustrate lexical *sembrare* in a biclausal structure.

(i) Potrebbe   sembrargli   che Giovanni sia qui.

may-COND-3SG seem-to-him that Giovanni be here

'It might seem to him that Giovanni has already arrived.'

On the one hand, *sembrare* is embedded under the alethic modal *potere*; on the other hand, it has an experiencer argument (*gli*).

[5] Thanks to Carlo Cecchetto, Guglielmo Cinque, Nicola Munaro, and Raffaella Zanuttini for judgments. For one informant, without clitic climbing the perfect was not so degraded.

Note that small clause *sembrare* is compatible with the perfect. I thank Nicola Munaro for the example.

(i) Mi   sono sembrati stanchi.

to-me are   seemed   tired

'They seemed tired to me.'

Further research is needed here.

[6] *Essere/Avere*, the auxiliaries of the perfect, are merged in T (Anterior) (see Cinque 1999 for discussion). Thus, following the hierarchy in (2), sequences like those in (i) can be taken to instantiate the order ModP$_{alethic}$ (*potrebbe*) > TP (Anterior) (*essere*) > ModP$_{obligation}$ (*dovuta*). *Andare* 'go' is inserted as the lexical verb.

(i) Maria ci potrebbe   essere dovuta   andare.

Maria there may-COND-3SG be   must-PART-FEM-SG go

'Maria might have had to go there.'

Depending on the interpretation (future in the past, reportive evidential, irrealis, etc.), the conditional mood on *potrebbe* will correspond to one of the functional heads above Mod$_{alethic}$.

Thanks to Guglielmo Cinque for clarifying some issues here.

(11) *??Non sono sembrati capir*lo*.
      not are   seemed understand-it
      'They didn't seem to understand it.'

Observe that, in general, L-*sembrare* is compatible with the perfect aspect, as shown by (12). The optional availability of *a loro* 'to them', the experiencer argument of *sembrare*, shows that (12) contains L-*sembrare*.[7]

(12) (Anche *a loro*), il governo   è sembrato affidare la gestione   ai   cittadini.
      (also   to them) the government is seemed   confide the management to-the citizens
      'They also had the impression that the government was confiding the management to the citizens.'

With respect to the compatibility of perfect aspect with L-*sembrare*, the presence of a clitic on the lower lexical verb seems to be conditional on the presence of the experiencer argument of *sembrare*. For many speakers, inserting the experiencer argument of *sembrare* in (11), as in (3a), improves the sentence.[8] Similarly, (13b), with a clitic *ci* on the lower verb and an experiencer argument, is judged acceptable. Recall that because of the presence of the experiencer argument, these examples unequivocally illustrate L-*sembrare*.

(13) a. Non *mi*   sono sembrati capir*lo*.
         not to-me are   seemed understand-it
         'They didn't seem to me to understand it.'
     b. Maria *mi*   è sembrata non capir*ci*   niente.[9]
         Maria to-me is seemed   not understand-of-it nothing
         'Maria seemed to me not to understand a thing.'

Regardless of this complicating factor, the prediction that F-*sembrare* resists perfect aspect is confirmed. L-*sembrare* is compatible with the perfect, though there remain some as yet puzzling restrictions when its complement contains a clitic.[10]

3.2 F-Sembrare *as a Marker of Evidential Mood*

Cinque (2004) proposes that the lexical split between F-*sembrare* and L-*sembrare* correlates with a subtle semantic difference. According to Cinque, L-*sembrare* ''literally means that a certain

---

[7] Thanks to a *Linguistic Inquiry* reviewer for providing this piece of information.
[8] Thanks to Anna Cardinaletti for pointing this out to me.
[9] This example was accepted by most informants. One informant said, ''Maybe it's not great, but it's sort of acceptable.''
[10] Similar effects have been noted by Ausín and Depiante (2000) for Spanish *parecer* 'seem/appear': perfect aspect is compatible with *parecer* if there is also an experiencer clitic. However, in Spanish the constraint seems to be operative regardless of whether *parecer* takes a nonfinite complement or not; it also seems not to correlate with the presence of a clitic in the complement of *parecer*. Ausín and Depiante propose that *parecer* is a modal even when it takes a finite complement. Further research would be useful to clarify to what extent their account can be made compatible with Cinque's analysis. See also Torrego 1996 regarding *parecer*.

state of affairs seems to be true (to someone).'' F-*sembrare* is an evidential functional verb that ''(mildly) commits the speaker to a certain state of affairs'' (p. 157). One crucial difference seems to be that F-*sembrare* implies anchoring to the speaker. Cinque illustrates the two readings in (14): (14a) contains L-*sembrare*, inserted as a lexical verb, and (14b) contains F-*sembrare*, inserted as the head encoding speaker-related evidential mood (see Cinque 2004:157).[11]

(14) a. Gianni sembra a tutti   apprezzar*lo* molto, ma io non credo che
Gianni seem-3SG to everybody appreciate-it much but I not believe that
lo apprezzi.
it appreciate-3SG
'To everyone it seemed that Gianni appreciates it a lot, but I don't believe that he does appreciate it.'

b. #Gianni *lo* sembra   apprezzare molto, ma io non credo che lo apprezzi.
Gianni it seem-3SG appreciate much but I not believe that it appreciate-3SG
'Gianni seems to appreciate it a lot, but I don't believe that he does appreciate it.'

If F-*sembrare* is a marker of speaker-related evidential mood, the present analysis predicts that it will not be available in contexts that are semantically incompatible with evidential mood. On the other hand, L-*sembrare* may well continue to be available in such contexts. This prediction is borne out. I will examine two contexts that are semantically incompatible with speaker-related evidential mood: conditional clauses and the complements of factive predicates.

3.2.1 Conditional Clauses   Informally speaking, a conditional clause modifies the state of affairs denoted by the main clause. Conditional clauses cannot contain markers of speaker anchoring such as illocutionary force markers, tags, and speaker-related epistemic adverbials (see Hooper and Thompson 1973, Haegeman 2003). They are indirectly anchored to the speaker via the main clause. For instance, in (15) the adverb of epistemic modality is incompatible with the conditional (see also von Fintel and Iatridou 2002, 2003; and see Haegeman 2003 for a syntactic account).

(15) *The plants won't grow if it *probably* doesn't rain.

Epistemic modality is speaker-related: it expresses the speaker's stance concerning the likelihood of the state of affairs/event. As Tenny (2000:319) notes, ''[E]pistemic modality, which addresses a state of knowledge of something, must involve a sentient mind that is in the state of knowing; at the sentential level it is the speaker who is represented as holding that knowledge.'' I assume that the functional projection encoding epistemic modality is excluded from conditionals because such clauses are not anchored to the speaker.

Similarly, evidential mood is anchored to the speaker, as Tenny (2000:319) also points out: ''Evidentiality involves the speaker as a sentient perceiver; a proposition that is apparently true or false must be so to someone.'' It follows that MoodP$_{evidential}$ will also be excluded from conditional clauses.

---

[11] For an overview of the concept of evidentiality, see Rooryck 2001.

Recall that F-*sembrare* involves restructuring contexts and triggers clitic climbing, while L-*sembrare* does not give rise to restructuring or to clitic climbing. In Italian, conditional clauses are in general compatible with clitic climbing (16a), but not if the verb is *sembrare* (16b). If F-*sembrare* is merged as Mood$_{evidential}$, the ungrammaticality of (16b) is expected because conditional clauses are incompatible with evidential mood. On the other hand, in the absence of clitic climbing, the conditional clause in (16c) is grammatical. This is because in this case we can assume that L-*sembrare*, which is not a marker of speaker-related evidential mood, is used.

(16) a. Se non *lo* vogliono cambiare, dovrò   parlare al   direttore.
          if not it want-3PL change   have-FUT-1SG speak   to-the director
          'If they refuse to change it, I will have to talk to the director.'

      b. *Se *lo* sembrano trovare troppo difficile, faremo   il   secondo capitolo.
          if it seem-3PL find   too   difficult do-FUT-1PL the second   chapter
          'If they seem to find it too difficult, we'll do the second chapter.'

      c. Se sembrano trovar*lo* troppo difficile, faremo   il   secondo capitolo.
          if seem-3PL find-it too   difficult do-FUT-1PL the second   chapter
          'If they seem to find it too difficult, we'll do the second chapter.'

3.2.2 Factive Predicates   As Rooryck (2001:161) points out, clauses associated with factive predicates are also incompatible with evidential mood: ''[W]ith verbs of saying and believing, the degree of reliability co-varies with the reliability of the matrix subject, but with factive verbs, the degree of reliability of the sentential complement is entirely independent of the reliability of the matrix subject, and is presented as a fact.''[12] If evidential mood is excluded from such contexts, we predict that F-*sembrare* will not be allowed and that with factive predicates *sembrare* will be incompatible with clitic climbing. On the other hand, L-*sembrare*, without clitic climbing, should be allowed in clauses associated with factive predicates. This prediction is correct: Italian *sembrare* does not allow clitic climbing in clauses associated with factive predicates.[13]

(17) a. ??Che *lo* sembrino   trovare troppo difficile, non mi sorprende.
          that it seem-SUBJ-3PL find   too   difficult not me surprise-3SG
          'It doesn't surprise me that they seem to be finding it too hard.'

      b. ??È strano che *lo* sembrino   trovare troppo difficile.
          is strange that it seem-SUBJ-3PL find   too   difficult
          'It is strange that they seem to be finding it too hard.'

The reason the examples are not felt to be completely excluded is that factive predicates can often be given an enriched reading (see, e.g., Urmson 1963, Hooper and Thompson 1973:479ff., Maki, Kaiser, and Ochi 1999:8–9n8, Gärtner 2001:127–128, Shaer and Frey 2004:486). The

---

[12] Demonte and Fernándes-Soriano (2005:1072) provide evidence from the Spanish *dequísmo* phenomenon (i.e., the alternation between *que* 'that' and *de que* 'of that' to introduce embedded clauses) for the incompatibility of evidential mood in clauses associated with factive predicates.

[13] Thanks to Guglielmo Cinque for judgments.

English verb *regret*, for instance, is often cited as a prototypical factive predicate. However, in addition to being used to denote a subject's emotional response to a ''fact,'' this verb can have a slightly different use in which it can be used to convey 'regret to say' or 'express one's regrets that'.

(18) We regret that due to a funding shortage there will no longer be any drinks available at the bar for nonmembers.

Informally speaking, the complement of *regret* can be enriched so that speaker anchoring is encoded. Given such enrichment, markers of speaker-related evidential mood become licit.

L-*sembrare* is not a marker of evidential mood and is allowed in clauses associated with factive predicates.

(19) a. Che sembrino   trovar*lo* troppo difficile, non mi sorprende.
       that seem-SUBJ-3PL find-it   too   difficult not me surprise-3SG
       'It doesn't surprise me that they seem to be finding it too hard.'
    b. È strano che sembrino   trovar*lo* troppo difficile.
       is strange that seem-SUBJ-3PL find-it   too   difficult
       'It is strange that they seem to be finding it too hard.'

To conclude: the semantic opposition postulated by Cinque (2004) to distinguish F-*sembrare* and L-*sembrare* is reflected in the restrictions on clitic climbing: clitic climbing is unavailable in conditional clauses and in clauses associated with factive predicates. This is because in those contexts F-*sembrare* is not licit: F-*sembrare* is a marker of (speaker-related) evidential mood. L-*sembrare* on the other hand is compatible with these contexts. Because L-*sembrare* is not a restructuring verb, clitic climbing will not be available.

4 French *Sembler*

In this section, I examine French *sembler* 'seem', which I compare with Italian *sembrare*. The question arises whether in terms of Cinque's analysis, *sembler* is more like F-*sembrare*, a functional verb with restructuring, or more like L-*sembrare*, a lexical verb without restructuring. Recall that according to Cinque's (2004) approach, only these two options are available. That is to say, Cinque formulates the strong hypothesis that restructuring verbs are always functional (2004:153) (see Wurmbrand 2004 for a different claim). Cinque (2002:634) suggests that French *sembler* is similar to Italian F-*sembrare*: ''[S]embler 'seem' is a 'restructuring' verb (as *sembrare* is for many Italian speakers—see Cinque [2004]:fn.27)—but, crucially, only when the verb has no internal arguments (as the evidence presented in Cinque [2004]:sec. 4.1 for Italian suggests).'' Cinque bases his hypothesis on the ''*tous* à gauche'' (*tous* to the left) pattern, illustrated in (20).[14] The quantifier *tous* 'all' quantifies over the pronoun *les* 'them', the direct object of the lexical verb *lus* 'read'. The quantifier has ''climbed'' to the domain of the higher verb *semblé* 'seemed'.

---

[14] The contrast was first pointed out in Pollock 1978:97–98.

Quantifier climbing is ungrammatical when *sembler* is itself associated with an experiencer argument (20b).

(20) a. ?Elle a   *tous* semblé les   avoir lus.
          she has all   seemed them have read
          'She seemed to have read them all.'
     b. *Elle *m*'a   *tous* semblé les   avoir lus.
          she to-me has all   seemed them have read
          'She seemed to me to have read them all.'
          (Cinque 2002:633)

It seems to me that this evidence is somewhat problematic. First of all, Cinque himself repeatedly signals that French quantifier climbing does not depend on restructuring (2002:632, 633). This means that (20a) is not unequivocal evidence that *sembler* induces restructuring, which casts some doubt on the functional status of *sembler*. Other empirical evidence suggests that French *sembler* differs from Italian F-*sembrare* and that it is closer to Italian L-*sembrare*.

As French modals do not allow generalized clitic climbing (21a), this phenomenon cannot be used as a diagnostic for transparency. However, noncolloquial, literary variants of French do allow *en* and *y* climbing with the class of verbs that typically give rise to restructuring in Italian. This is illustrated in (21b) and (21c).

(21) a. *Jean *le* voudrait   manger.
          Jean it want-COND-3SG eat
          'Jean would like to eat it.'
          (Cinque 2002:617, (1a))
     b. J'*en*   voudrais   voir beaucoup.
          I of-them want-COND-1SG see   many
          'I would like to see many of them.'
          (Cinque 2002:620, (4a))
     c. J'*y*   voudrais   aller.
          I there want-COND-1SG go
          'I would like to go there.'
          (Cinque 2002:620, (4b))

If *en/y* climbing constitutes evidence for restructuring in French, then for the French speakers I consulted *sembler* cannot be analyzed as a restructuring verb: my informants do not accept *en* and *y* climbing with *sembler*.

(22) a. *Il *en*   a   semblé avoir parlé.
          he of-them has seemed have talked
          'He seems to have talked about them.'
     b. *Il *y*   a   semblé aller.
          he there has seemed go
          'He seems to have gone there.'

Further evidence that *sembler* should not be amalgamated with F-*sembrare* is that it does not display the same cooccurrence restrictions in relation to the functional heads in the hierarchy (2) (see section 3.1). For instance, while Italian F-*sembrare* is incompatible with alethic *potere* 'may' (see (8)), French *sembler* is compatible with alethic *pouvoir* 'may', as shown by the examples in (23).[15] Observe that these examples illustrate quantifier climbing: the quantifier *tout* 'all' originates as the complement of the lower lexical verb and ends up to the left of *sembler*. However, compatibility with a marker of alethic modality suggests that *sembler* in (23) is lexical and thus is closer to L-*sembrare*.

(23) a. Ils   peuvent *tout* sembler comprendre (mais est-ce que cela va   durer)?
          they may   all seem   understand but is-it   that this will last
          'They may give the impression that they understand everything, but will this last?'

    b. Il peut très bien *tout* sembler comprendre, sans   que ça   prouve rien.
          he may very well all   seem   understand   without that that proves anything
          'He may well give the impression that he understands everything, but that does not prove a thing.'

    c. Ils   pourraient *tout* sembler vouloir abandonner, mais vous ne connaissez pas
          they might   all   seem   want   abandon   but you *ne* know   not
          leur courage.
          their courage
          'They may well give the impression of wanting to abandon everything, but you underestimate their courage.'

    d. Elle pourrait par exemple *tout* sembler accepter, et   refuser à la dernière
          she might   for instance all   seem   accept   and refuse at the last
          minute.
          minute
          'She might, for instance, give the impression of accepting everything, and then refuse at the last minute.'

Furthermore, as shown by Cinque's own example reproduced in (20a), in a context of quantifier climbing, French *sembler* remains compatible with perfect aspect. We have found that Italian F-*sembrare* is not compatible with perfect aspect (see (10a)). Italian L-*sembrare* is compatible with the perfect, again leading to the conclusion that French *sembler* is closer to Italian L-*sembrare* than to its functional counterpart.

If French *sembler* is to be assimilated to Italian F-*sembrare*, then we would assume that, like F-*sembrare*, it encodes speaker-related evidential mood; moreover, we predict that it will be excluded in contexts that resist speaker-related evidential mood (see section 3.2). Two relevant contexts are conditional clauses and the complements associated with factive predicates. As shown by (24) and (25), even in the context of quantifier climbing, French *sembler* may appear in a conditional clause and in the complement of a factive predicate.

---

[15] Thanks to Jonathan Carre and Danièle van de Velde for judgments.

(24) S'ils   avaient *tout* semblé comprendre, je n'aurais   pas dû   reprendre
     if they had   all   seemed understand   I *ne* have-COND-1SG not must retake
     mon cours.
     my   course
     'If they had given the impression of understanding everything, I would not have had
     to repeat the course.'

(25) Je suis contente qu'ils   ont *tout* semblé comprendre.
     I am pleased that they have all   seemed understand
     'I am pleased that they seem to have understood everything.'

The evidence casts doubt on Cinque's hypothesis that French *sembler* is like Italian F-*sembrare*.
Observe that this in fact accords with Cinque's overall conclusion that quantifier climbing is not
bona fide evidence for restructuring. Given this conclusion, though, the contrast in (20) awaits
another explanation.

The hypothesis that quantifier climbing with French *sembler* as in (20a) constitutes evidence
for restructuring would challenge Cinque's claim that restructuring verbs are always functional.
French *sembler* would have to be a verb that, although lexical, still triggers restructuring. Such
a conclusion is compatible with that reached by Wurmbrand (2004), mainly on the basis of German
data. She assumes that restructuring effects are not necessarily evidence that the triggering verb
is functional; in her account, restructuring is associated both with verbs that are inserted as
functional heads (i.e., like F-*sembrare*) and with certain lexical verbs. See also Haegeman 2005
for an interpretation in terms of semilexical categories in the sense of Corver and Van Riemsdijk
(2001).

5 A Note on Dutch *Lijken* and *Schijnen*

Cinque (2004) argues for a lexical split between two verbs *sembrare* in Italian, which I have
identified as F-*sembrare* and L-*sembrare*. Various distributional facts distinguish these two verbs.
Italian *sembrare* corresponds to two different lexical items in Standard Dutch: *schijnen* and *lijken*.
(26) illustrates the use of these verbs, which can both be translated by *seem* (see Wurmbrand
2004:1002).[16]

(26) a. Hij *schijnt* die   zaken niet te begrijpen.
        he seems those things not to understand
        'He does not seem to understand those things.'

---

[16] This discussion is based on judgments from Hans Broekhuis, Roland Noske, and Albert Oosterhof. However,
there is considerable variation among speakers of Dutch. On the basis of (i), it appears that Arnold Evers, for instance,
accepts *schijnen* with the perfect and in conditional clauses (Evers 2004:104, (26a)).

(i) als   hij de vogels weg had schijnen te jagen . . .
    when he the birds away had seem   to chase
    'when he had appeared to chase away the birds'

I intend to explore speaker variation in collaboration with Hans Broekhuis.

b. Hij *lijkt* die zaken niet te begrijpen.
   he seems those things not to understand
   'He looks as if he does not understand those things.'

It turns out that Dutch *lijken* is more like Italian L-*sembrare* or French *sembler* and that *schijnen* is more like Italian F-*sembrare*.

First of all, *lijken* is compatible with an experiencer argument, while *schijnen* is not.

(27) a. *Hij schijnt *me* een beetje onhandig te zijn in de omgang.
     he seems to-me a bit clumsy to be in the interaction
     'To me he seems to be rather clumsy in social interaction.'
   b. Hij lijkt *me* een beetje onhandig te zijn in de omgang.
     he seems to-me a bit clumsy to be in the interaction
     'To me he looks rather clumsy in social interaction.'

Second, *schijnen* cannot embed under the alethic modal *kunnen* 'may', while *lijken* can.

(28) a. *Hij *kan* soms erg aardig schijnen, maar dan opeens wordt hij
     he can sometimes very nice seem but then suddenly becomes he
     afstandelijk.
     distant
     'At times he may seem very nice, but then all of a sudden he becomes distant.'
   b. Hij *kan* soms erg aardig lijken, maar dan opeens wordt hij
     he can sometimes very nice seem but then suddenly becomes he
     afstandelijk.
     distant
     'At times he may seem very nice, but then all of a sudden he becomes distant.'

Third, *schijnen* is not compatible with perfect aspect, while *lijken* is.

(29) a. *Het postmodernisme *heeft* de grond onder de wetenschappelijke traditie
     the postmodernism has the ground under the scientific tradition
     schijnen te willen wegvagen.
     seem to want away-sweep
     'It seems as if postmodernism has tried to demolish the foundations of the scientific tradition.'
   b. Het postmodernisme *heeft* de grond onder de wetenschappelijke traditie
     the postmodernism has the ground under the scientific tradition
     lijken te willen wegvagen.
     seem to want away-sweep
     'It appears as if postmodernism has tried to demolish the foundations of the scientific tradition.'

The restrictions on the distribution of *schijnen* are like those on Italian F-*sembrare* (see section 3.1). We could propose that, like F-*sembrare*, *schijnen* is inserted as a functional head to encode

speaker-related evidential mood. The prediction will be that *schijnen* cannot occur in contexts that are incompatible with evidential mood such as conditional clauses and the complements of factive predicates (see section 3.2). The prediction is correct.

(30) a. ??Je   moet de dokter roepen *als* zijn toestand   schijnt te verslechteren.
          you must the doctor call   if   his condition seems to get-worse
          'Call the doctor if you have the impression that his health is deteriorating.'
     b. ??Ik vind het *jammer* dat hij dat niet schijnt te begrijpen.
          I   find it   sad   that he that not seems to understand
          'It's a pity that he does not appear to understand that.'

If *lijken* is similar to *sembler* and to L-*sembrare*, then we expect that it will be available in these contexts. This prediction is also correct.

(31) a. Je   moet de dokter roepen *als* zijn toestand   lijkt   te verslechteren.
          you must the doctor call   if   his condition seems to get-worse
          'Call the doctor if you have the impression that his health is deteriorating.'
     b. Ik vind het *jammer* dat hij dat niet lijkt   te begrijpen.
          I find it   sad   that he that not seems to understand
          'It's a pity that he does not appear to understand that.'

The evidence above suggests that Dutch *schijnen* is similar to F-*sembrare* and that Dutch *lijken* is similar to L-*sembrare*. In terms of Cinque's analysis, *schijnen* will be inserted as a functional head in a monoclausal structure, and *lijken* will be inserted as a lexical head in a biclausal structure.

Given Cinque's hypothesis that all restructuring verbs are functional, *schijnen* should give rise to restructuring, while *lijken* should not. However, the latter prediction is not borne out. There are indications that both *schijnen* and *lijken* trigger restructuring. I discuss some of them here. First of all, observe that in (32) both with *schijnen* and with *lijken* the complement *dat* 'that' of the embedded nonfinite verb *begrijpen* 'understand' precedes the finite verb *schijnt*, *lijkt* 'seems'. Similarly, the degree adjunct *niet al te best* 'not too well', which modifies the lower verb *begrijpen*, precedes the finite verb *schijnt/lijkt*.

(32) a. Ze zegt dat hij *dat niet al te   best* schijnt te begrijpen.
          she says that he that not all too well seems to understand
          'She says that he doesn't seem to understand that too well.'
     b. Ze zegt dat hij *dat niet al te   best* lijkt   te begrijpen.
          she says that he that not all too well seems to understand
          'She says that he doesn't seem to understand that too well.'

This word order is characteristic of the verb-raising pattern, which typically illustrates restructuring (Evers 1975, Haegeman and Van Riemsdijk 1986, Wurmbrand 2001).

Further evidence comes from the earlier example (29b), which served to illustrate that Dutch *lijken* is compatible with perfect aspect. This example was intended to show that *lijken* is not inserted as a functional head in Mood_{evidential}. However, observe that, although it is the head of

the complement of an aspectual auxiliary (*heeft* 'has'), the verb *lijken* occurs in its infinitival form. This is an instance of the so-called infinitivus pro participio (IPP) effect, in which an infinitive replaces the expected past participle. A participial form of *lijken* is ungrammatical (33). The IPP effect is typically associated with clause merger patterns due to verb raising (Rutten 1991, Haegeman 1998).

(33) *Het postmodernisme heeft de grond   onder de wetenschappelijke traditie *geleken*
the postmodernism has   the ground under the scientific   tradition seemed
te willen wegvagen.
to want   away-sweep
'Postmodernism seemed to want to destroy the foundation of the scientific tradition.'

We conclude that while there is evidence that Dutch *schijnen* behaves like a functional verb inserted as a marker of evidential mood and that *lijken* retains the properties of a lexical verb, the latter verb also seems to give rise to restructuring effects. This means that we might have to conclude with Wurmbrand (2004) and against Cinque (2002, 2004) that restructuring verbs are not always functional. Restructuring effects arise with two types of verbs: those that are merged as functional heads (*schijnen*) and those that are lexical heads that lead to restructuring (*lijken*).

6 Conclusion

This article first examined restrictions on clitic climbing with Italian *sembrare*. It was argued that the restrictions follow from Cinque's (2002, 2004) proposal that there are two verbs *sembrare*: functional *sembrare*, which gives rise to restructuring, and lexical *sembrare*, which does not. As a restructuring verb, F-*sembrare* is merged in Mood$_{evidential}$ in a monoclausal structure. The observed restrictions on clitic climbing follow from Cinque's proposal. Clitic climbing is ungrammatical whenever F-*sembrare* is unavailable.

It was also shown that, contrary to Cinque's own discussion, the evidence suggests that French *sembler* is not merged as an evidential functional head; instead, it is a lexical verb in a biclausal structure. The same analysis seems to apply to the Dutch verb *lijken*, while the closely related Dutch verb *schijnen* seems to have functional status. The different classification of these two Dutch verbs can account for their (in)compatibility with the perfect. However, the fact that *lijken*, though not merged as a functional head, occurs in what seem to be bona fide restructuring patterns suggests that contrary to Cinque's hypothesis and in line with Wurmbrand's (2004) proposal, we must allow the possibility that lexical verbs may also give rise to restructuring.

References

Ausín, Alonso, and Marcela Depiante. 2000. On the syntax of *parecer* ('to seem') with and without an experiencer. In *Papers from the 3rd Hispanic Linguistics Symposium: Hispanic linguistics at the turn of the millennium*, ed. by Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger, Alfonso Morales-Front, and Thomas J. Walsh, 155–170. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press.

Benincà, Paola, and Cecilia Poletto. 1994. *Bisogna* and its companions: The verbs of necessity. In *Paths towards Universal Grammar*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque, Jan Koster, Jean-Yves Pollock, Luigi Rizzi, and Raffaella Zanuttini, 35–57. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Cardinaletti, Anna, and Ur Shlonsky. 2004. Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:519–558.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2002. A note on ''restructuring'' and quantifier climbing in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:617–636.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. ''Restructuring'' and functional structure. In *The cartography of syntactic structures*. Vol. 3, *Structures and beyond*, ed. by Adriana Belletti, 132–191. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corver, Norbert, and Henk van Riemsdijk, eds. 2001. *Semi-lexical categories*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Demonte, Violeta, and Olga Fernándes-Soriano. 2005. Features in Comp and syntactic variation: The case of '(de)quísmo' in Spanish. *Lingua* 115:1063–1082.

Evers, Arnold. 1975. The transformational cycle in Dutch and German. Doctoral dissertation, University of Utrecht. Distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington.

Evers, Arnold. 2004. Move head. In *Yearbook 2004*, ed. by Annemarie Kerkhoff, Joke de Lange, and Oren Sadeh Leicht, 93–107. Utrecht: Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS.

von Fintel, Kai, and Sabine Iatridou. 2002. If and when *if* clauses can restrict quantifiers. Ms., MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

von Fintel, Kai, and Sabine Iatridou. 2003. Epistemic containment. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:173–198.

Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2001. Are there V2 relative clauses in German? *Journal of Comparative German Linguistics* 3:97–141.

Grimshaw, Jane. 1991. Extended projection. Ms., Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1998. V-positions and the middle field in West Flemish. *Syntax* 1:259–299.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. Conditional clauses: External and internal syntax. *Mind and Language* 18:317–339.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2005. Functional heads, lexical heads and hybrid categories. In *Organizing grammar: Linguistic studies in honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*, ed. by Hans Broekhuis, Norbert Corver, Riny Huybregts, Ursula Kleinhenz, and Jan Koster, 152–161. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haegeman, Liliane, and Henk van Riemsdijk. 1986. Verb projection raising and the typology of rules affecting verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:417–466.

Hooper, Joan B., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4:465–497.

Maki, Hideki, Lizanne Kaiser, and Masao Ochi. 1999. Embedded topicalization in English and Japanese. *Lingua* 109:1–14.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1978. Trace theory and French syntax. In *Recent transformational studies in European languages*, ed. by Samuel Jay Keyser, 65–112. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1978. A restructuring rule in Italian syntax. In *Recent transformational studies in European languages*, ed. by Samuel Jay Keyser, 113–158. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Roberts, Ian, and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rooryck, Johan. 2001. Evidentiality. *Glot International* 5(4):125–133 and 5(5):161–168.

Rutten, Jean. 1991. Infinitival complements and auxiliaries. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Shaer, Benjamin, and Werner Frey. 2004. 'Integrated' and 'non-integrated' left peripheral elements in German and English. In *Proceedings of the Dislocated Elements Workshop, ZAS Berlin, November 2003*, ed. by Benjamin Shaer, Werner Frey, and Claudia Maienborn, 465–502. ZAS Papers in Linguistics 35(2). Berlin: ZAS (Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Typologie, und Universalienforschung).

Tenny, Carol. 2000. Core events and adverbial modification. In *Events as grammatical objects*, ed. by Carol Tenny and James Pustejovsky, 285–334. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.

Torrego, Esther. 1996. Experiencers and raising verbs. In *Current issues in comparative grammar*, ed. by Robert Freidin, 101–120. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Urmson, J. O. 1963. Parenthetical verbs. In *Philosophy and ordinary language*, ed. by C. Caton, 220–240. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2004. Two types of restructuring: Lexical vs. functional. *Lingua* 114:991–1014.

STL-Bâtiment B
Université Lille 3
BP 60149
59653 Villeneuve d'Ascq cedex
France

liliane.haegeman@univ-lille3.fr