Evidence for a NULL LOCATIVE in Italian*
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As is pointed out by Antinucci & Cinque (1977), not all monadic verbs behave identically with respect to unmarked word order. So, for example, the unmarked word order for the verbs *fumare* 'smoke' and *dormire* 'sleep' is S(subject)-V(verb), while the verbs *arrivare* 'arrive' and *venire* 'come' use V(verb)-S(subject) as the unmarked word order:

(1) Arriva Maria.
arrives Maria
'Mary is arriving.'

(2) Dorme Maria.
sleeps Maria
'Mary is sleeping.'

(3) Maria dorme.
'Maria sleeps.'

So, given a context that does not induce narrow focus on the argument DP (such as *Che succede?* 'What's the matter?'), the sentence in (1) with *arrivare* is grammatical, whereas the sentence in (2) with *dormire* is not.

Many researchers since Antinucci & Cinque (1977) (e.g., Calabrese 1992, Dell'Ittino & D'Ust 1994, Dell'itto & Pinto 1992, Pinto 1994, among others) have claimed that this difference in behaviour with respect to unmarked word order correlates with the unergative-unaccusative distinction. The idea is that unaccusatives allow unmarked postverbal subjects; this is in contrast with unergatives, which take S-V as the unmarked word order. However, it turns out that the word order facts and the unergative-unaccusative distinction do not line up so neatly. As was first noted explicitly by Benincà (1988) in Renzi's *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione* (vol. 1), the word order V-S is not the unmarked word order for all unaccusatives in Italian.

Thanks to those who helped me develop the ideas in this paper (although clearly none of them should be held responsible for any problems), including Paola Benincà, Luigi Burzio, Andrea Calabrese, Gaetano Cinque, Miriel Eng, Cecilia Poleto, and the audiences at LSRL25 and LSRL26. Thanks also to Giuseppe Bacchetta, Mila Bacchetta, and all of their colleagues for help with the Bolognaese data. A special thanks must be given to Lorenzo Bosu, for having conceived of the endlessly essential *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*, the grammar from which the ideas presented in this paper sprang.
particular, she showed that given an unmarked context, the sentence in (4) with *partire ‘leave’ is inappropriate.  

(4) *Parte Maria.
   leaves Maria

The order V–S yields a marked interpretation for the single argument of *partire. Specifically, the postverbal subject in (4) can only be interpreted as contrastively focused, similarly to what we saw above for the unergative verb *dormire. Thus, (4) can be used felicitously only in a context which allows for a contrastive focus interpretation of the postverbal subject, such as that in (5a):  

(5) a. Chi parte?
   who leaves
   *Who is leaving?*

   b. Parte Maria.
   leaves Maria
   ‘It is Maria that is leaving.’

Benincà (1988) proposes that the interpretive difference between (1) (unmarked) and (5b) (marked) is related to the presence of an “implicit locative” selected by *arrivare*; by hypothesis, *partire* does not select this locative. Specifically, she points out (op.cit.: 124) that “[p]artire differs from *arrivare* in that it does not have a subcategorized locative argument (the goal), which, if implicit, can be understood as deictic.” For the purposes of exposition, let us refer to Benincà’s hypothesis as the “GOAL-hypothesis.”

In this paper I will provide indirect evidence from both Italian and Borgomanserese (a Northern Italian dialect spoken in the Piedmont region) that the GOAL-hypothesis is correct. The paper is organized as follows: in §1 I show that the distribution of subjects with “-telic” unaccusatives (Tortora 1997) in Italian is best understood in terms of the GOAL-hypothesis. In §2 I provide evidence from Borgomanserese for the claim that the implicit goal is syntactically projected. In §3 I discuss the semantic interpretation of the implicit goal (§3.1), the incomparability of the implicit goal with pro-drop (§3.2), and the behaviour of *partire* when it occurs with a second internal argument (§3.3), and show how all of the above provide further evidence in favour of the GOAL-Hypothesis. In §4 I provide a conclusion.

1. *-TE LIC UNACCUSATIVES IN ITALIAN

Note that the GOAL-hypothesis makes a prediction: all unaccusatives which entail a goal should pattern with *arrivare* in (1), while unaccusatives which do not entail a goal should pattern with *partire* in (5b) (with respect to the interpretation of the postverbal subject). If this prediction is borne out, then we are led to believe that the GOAL-hypothesis is correct.

Tortora (1997) breaks down the class of “verbs of inherently directed motion” (terminology from Levin & Rappaport-Hovav 1994) into three types: GOAL-entailing (which includes *arrivare, entrare ‘enter,’ tornare ‘return,’ and venire ‘come’), SOURCE-entailing (which includes *partire, scappare ‘escape,’ and scendere ‘exit’), and *-telic.* The *-telic* verbs of inherently directed motion (henceforth VIDs) are ambiguous between non-GOAL-entailing (telic) and GOAL-entailing (telic); *scendere ‘descend,’* for example, is an *-telic* verb, as can be seen by (6a, b):  

(6) a. L’aereo è sceso per 5 minuti.
   the airplane is descended for 5 minutes
   ‘The airplane descended for 5 minutes.’

Since the presence of perfective aspect confounds this effect, I will only consider the simple tenses.

Several researchers following Benincà, including Delfino & D’Hulst (1994), Delfino & Piano (1992, 1994), and Saccon (1992, 1993), have adopted the “implicit locative” analysis of *arrivare* in order to explain the difference in behaviour between unergatives and unaccusatives with respect to unmarked word order. The above researchers (with the exception of Saccon), however, differ from Benincà in that they extend the implicit locative analysis to all unaccusatives. This extension incorrectly predicts that all unaccusatives should allow V–S as the unmarked word order. Benincà also notes that some unergatives, such as *telefonare ‘telephone’ and suonare ‘ring’ (e.g., a doorbell) allow V–S in the unmarked word order:

(i) Ha telefonato Masiro.
   has telephoned Masiro
(ii) Ha suonato il postino.
   has rung the postman

She claims that such unergatives, like *arrivare,* have an implicit locative (with a deictic interpretation; see below). We will not consider these unergative cases here, although it is possible that they can be subsumed under the analysis provided for *arrive*-type verbs.

3 “Partire rappresenta un caso diverso da *arrivare perché, a differenza di *arrivare, non ha un argomento locativo sommcategorizzante (in nota), che, se incorretto, passa evidentemente come deictico.” Benincà suggests (op.cit.: 125) that the possibility of an unmarked postverbal subject depends on the presence of a locative argument, which can serve as the theme (or “given”) as opposed to theme) of the sentence.

5 The latter are the verbs which Levin & Rappaport-Hovav (1994) refer to as “alien verbs of inherently directed motion.” Note that the verb *andare ‘go’ allows a postverbal subject in an unmarked context only if the eventuality is interpreted as GOAL-entailing. Thus, there is a contrast in the interpretations of (i) and (ii):  

(i) È andata Maria.
   is gone Maria
(ii) Maria è andata.
   Maria is already gone

The sentence in (i), if used in an unmarked context, can only mean that Maria went somewhere (goal), while the sentence in (ii) can either mean that Maria went somewhere (goal), or that Maria left (source). These facts suggest that *andare* is ambiguous between GOAL-entailing and non-GOAL-entailing (cf. *andare ‘leave’* (note 1 above), which is unambiguously SOURCE-entailing.)
Evidence for a null locative in Italian

That is, do arrive-type verbs in Italian project a phonologically null goal argument? Nothing in the discussion thus far has required us to claim that arrive-type verbs in Italian syntactically project a null goal. In what follows, I will discuss data from Borgomanerese which suggests the hypothesis that Italian arrive-type verbs do syntactically project a null goal argument.

2 THE SYNTAX OF INVERSION IN BORGOMANERES

In Borgomanerese, the semantic distinction between GOAL-entailing and SOURCE-entailing verbs correlates with a syntactic difference between these two types of verbs (Tortora 1997). As can be seen in (10), when the subject of a GOAL-entailing VIDM like rivé ‘arrive’ is postverbal, a locative clitic, ghi, appears. This clitic is doubled by the locative subject clitic ngh in preverbal position. For the purposes of exposition, let us refer to the construction in (10) as the ‘ghi-construction.’

(10) Ngh è rivi-gghi na fjoła, LOC is arrived-LOC a girl
     ‘A girl (has) arrived.’

In contrast with the above, when the subject of the SOURCE-entailing VIDM né ‘leave’ is postverbal these clitics do not appear, as can be seen in (11), (12) shows that the appearance of these clitics with these verbs results in ungrammaticality (SCL = subject clitic).

(11) L è naci la me amisa.
     SCL is gone the my friend
     ‘It is my friend that left.’ (see (19) below)

(12) *Ngh è naci-gghi la me amisa.
     LOC is gone-LOC the my friend

In order to explain this correlation, let us claim that ghi is the overt, morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category GOAL.

Note that the ghi-construction is associated with a particular semantic interpretation not indicated in the translations provided above. The location-goal that the referent of the DP finds him/herself in as a result of the action denoted by the verb must be interpreted as a location which includes the speaker. Let us consider, for example, (10) with the verb rivé ‘arrive’. (10) can only describe an eventuality where the DP na fjoła ‘a girl’ has arrived in a location shared with the speaker. Thus, it cannot be used to describe an eventuality in which a girl arrived in China, if the person who utters (10) was not in China at the time of the girl’s arrival. In order to express such an eventuality in which there is no restriction on the interpretation of the location-goal, the absence of ghi is required (we will return to this fact below).

The import of noting this restriction on the interpretation of the location-goal becomes clear when we consider a sentence which does not contain the locative ghi. Consider for example the case of the verb né ‘leave’ in (11), where there is no ghi when the subject is postverbal. As
discussed in Tortora (1997), ne does entail the existence of a location(-source). However, unlike the location(-goal) in (10), the location(-source) in (11) does not have to include the speaker. As such, (11) can be used to describe any eventuality involving a girl’s departure, even if the speaker is not there at the time of departure. Thus, in the absence of ghi, there is no particular requirement on the interpretation of the location entailed by the VIDM.

Now, consider the case of the goal-entailing verb rivé when it does not occur in the ghi- construction (i.e., when the subject is preverbal, and there is no ghi):

(13) Na fijola è rivé.
    a girl SCL is arrived.
    ‘A girl arrived.’

In (13) (just as in (11) with the location(-source)), there is no restriction on interpretation of the location(-goal) at which the referent of the DP arrives. Consequently, (13) can be used to describe any eventuality, irrespective of the unity of the location of arrival and location of the speaker. Again, the presence of ghi correlates with a speaker-oriented restriction on the interpretation of the location entailed by the VIDM, while its absence correlates with the lack of such a restriction.

Given these facts, it seems logical to conclude that ghi forces the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location, but before we continue, I want to consider a possible objection. A close comparison of (11) and (13) reveals that in the former, the subject is postverbal, while in the latter the subject is preverbal. A possible objection: could it be that it is the postverbal position of the subject which forces the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location(-goal)? Although (11) is V-S and still yields no speaker-oriented interpretation of the location(-source), one might appeal to the fact that (11) involves a source and not a goal to explain the difference. Is it only a goal that can be subject to such a restriction on interpretation?

Consider, in this regard, the following. Given sentences like (13), in which ghi is not present, we must conclude that the occurrence of this clitic with GOAL-entailing verbs is not obligatory. In fact, as can be seen in (14), its presence is also optional when the subject is postverbal.8

(14) L è rivé na fijola.
    SCL is arrived a girl
    ‘It is a girl that arrived.’ (see (22) below)

The important difference to note between (10) and (14) is that (14) patterns with (13) with respect to the interpretation of the location(-goal) (and with (11) with respect to the location(-source)). Thus, the sentence in (14) can be used to describe an eventuality in which a girl arrives at some location that does not necessarily include the speaker. Here we see, then, that it is the absence of ghi, and not the preverbal position of the subject, which correlates with the lack of a speaker-oriented restriction on the interpretation of the location entailed by the verb.9

3 THE SYNTACTIC PRESENCE OF A PRO-LOC IN ITALIAN

Let us take the Borgomaneroese data to suggest the hypothesis that the locative argument discussed by Benincà (1988) is syntactically projected:

(15) Pro-loc Hypothesis

Italian arrive-type verbs optionally select pro-loc (a phonologically null locative argument); it is the syntactic presence of this pro-loc that yields the unmarked interpretation for the V-S word order.

3.1 The interpretation of the locative

Note that the Pro-loc Hypothesis makes two specific predictions. The first prediction is that since the unmarked interpretation of the V-S word order is enabled by the syntactic presence of the pro-loc, it should correlate with a restriction on the interpretation of the location-goal such that the location-goal must include the speaker. This prediction emerges because as we saw for Borgomanese (10), repeated here as (16), the presence of the pro-loc forces this speaker-oriented (SO) interpretation of the location-goal:

(16) Ngh é rivé-gghi na fijola.
    LOC is arrived-LOC a girl
    ‘A girl (has) arrived.’
    (GOAL is necessarily SO)

If it is the presence of the pro-loc that both forces this speaker-oriented interpretation of the goal as well as allows for the unmarked interpretation of the V-S word order, then the unmarked interpretation of the V-S word order in Italian should necessarily involve a speaker-oriented interpretation of the goal. Note that this prediction is borne out. The sentence in (1), repeated here as (17), can only describe an eventuality where the referent of the DP Maria arrives in a location shared with the speaker.10

7 Note that if the were the explanation, it would not be clear why only goal, and not source, could be subject to such a speaker-oriented interpretation.
8 It should be noted that (14) is a marked sentence (as opposed to (10), which is unmarked). In particular, the sentence in (10) can be used out-of-the-hibe (e.g., as an answer to the question “What happened?”). In sentence (14), on the other hand, narrow focus is placed on the postverbal subject na fijola “a girl”. Thus, (14) can be used only in answer to the question “Who arrived?” We will discuss this contrast in greater detail in the discussion of Italian in §3.

9 The reader may be wondering at this point why the presence of ghi should force this speaker-oriented interpretation of the goal. A discussion of this is given in Tortora 1997.

10 This is what Benincà (1988) refers to as the “deontic” interpretation of the implicit locative (see note 6 above).
(17) Arriva Maria.
arrives Maria
'Mary is arriving.'

(20) Chi arriva?
who arrives
'Who is arriving?'

The sentence in (17) cannot be used to describe an eventuality in which, for example, Maria arrives in China, if the person who utters (17) is not in China at the time of Maria's arrival. Thus, (17) corresponds to the Borgomanerese sentence in (16), which exhibits overt evidence for the presence of a pro-loc.

Note that the V-S word order with partire ((5b), repeated here as (18)), which forces a contrastive focus interpretation of the postverbal subject, does not yield such a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-source):

(18) Parte Maria.
leaves Maria
'It is Maria that is leaving.'

(subject gets contrastive focus; SOURCE not necessarily SO)

Thus, (18) can be used to describe any eventuality, even if the speaker is not at the location-source at the time of Maria's departure. This follows from the idea that partire does not syntactically project a pro-loc (as per the Pro-loc Hypothesis in (15)). Recall that Borgomanerese exhibits the same phenomenon (11), repeated here as (19)). The non-GOAL-entailing verb nè 'leave' does not project a pro-loc (evidenced by the lack of the locative clitics). This correlates with the lack of a restriction on the interpretation of the location-source. Note that the postverbal subject, like that in Italian, gets a contrastive focus interpretation:

(19) L è naci na fjola.
SCL is gone a girl
'It was a girl that left.'

(subject gets contrastive focus; SOURCE not necessarily SO)

As can be seen, then, the first prediction made by (15) is borne out.

Now let us turn to the second prediction made by the Pro-loc Hypothesis: the syntactic absence of a pro-loc with arrive-type verbs (recall that arrive-type verbs project pro-loc optionally) should yield a contrastive focus interpretation for the postverbal subject of arrivate, exactly like with partire in (18). Furthermore, the contrastive focus interpretation should correlate with the lack of a restriction on the interpretation of the goal, since it is the presence of the pro-loc which forces the speaker-oriented interpretation. This prediction is borne out. That is, in addition to the unmarked interpretation that obtains with the V-S word order with arrive-type verbs, it turns out that the V-S word order with these verbs can also yield a contrastive focus interpretation of the postverbal subject. Thus, the sentence in (1) can also be used in the following context:

(21) Arriva Maria.
arrives Maria
'It is Maria that is arriving.'

(subject gets contrastive focus; GOAL not necessarily SO)

The above example is comparable to the Borgomanerese example (14), repeated here as (22), in which the lack of a girl yields the lack of a restriction on the interpretation of the goal:

(22) L è rivà na fjola.
SCL is arrived a girl
'It was a girl that arrived.'

(subject gets contrastive focus; GOAL not necessarily SO)

Recall from note 11 that (22) also yields a contrastive focus interpretation of the postverbal subject, rendering (21) and (22) completely parallel.

Recall, too, that in Borgomanerese, the preverbal position of the subject of rívà, which entails the lack of a pro-loc, also yields an unrestricted interpretation of the goal (13), repeated here as (23):

(23) Na fjola l è rívà.
a girl SCL is arrived.
'A girl arrived.'

(GOAL not necessarily SO)

Note that Italian exhibits the same phenomenon; when the subject is preverbal, the location-goal does not have to include the speaker:

(24) Una ragazza è arrivata.
a girl is arrived.
'A girl arrived.'

(GOAL not necessarily SO)

The preverbal subject precludes the existence of pro-loc (which much occupy SpecIP; see Tortora 1997 and §3.2 below). As predicted by the Pro-loc Hypothesis, the location-goal is thus not necessarily interpreted as speaker-oriented.

---

11 Note that both interpretations of this sentence (i.e., unmarked as in (17)) or contrastively focused postverbal subject (as in (21)) yield the same intonation.

12 It should be noted that in both Borgomanerese and Italian, SpecIP disfavors indefinite DPs like una ragazza/na fjola 'a girl', most probably having to do with structural locations outside of VP being associated with presupposed (in the sense of Delsing (1992)) or specific (in the sense of Eeg (1991)) material. The sentence in (24) would thus be more felicitous with a definite DP (iden for the Borgomanerese example).
To summarize, there are several positive consequences to the Pro-loc Hypothesis: first, it allows us to explain why the unmarked interpretation obtained by the V-S word order yields a speaker-oriented interpretation of the goal. Second, it explains why the V-S word order can also yield a contrastive focus interpretation of the postverbal subject, as is the case with purtire. Third, it explains why this latter interpretation of the postverbal subject correlates with the unrestricted interpretation of the goal. Fourth, it explains why it is the only "subject inversion" construction that potentially yields the speaker-oriented interpretation of the goal: the presence of a preverbal subject necessarily correlates with an unrestricted interpretation of the goal because SpecIP is not available for pro-loc (see §3.2 below).

These facts all line up with those exhibited by Borgomanere, where there is overt phonological evidence for a pro-loc. Given these consequences, let us adopt the Pro-loc Hypothesis. Here I give a tree for Italian arrivate; I use a Larsonian (Larson 1988) structure, since I take such GOAL-entailing verbs to optionally project the pro-loc as the indirect object argument:

\[(25)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
V' \\
\text{arrivate}_0 \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{subj}} \\
V' \\
\_1 \\
\text{pro-loc}
\end{array}
\]

In Italian, when pro-loc is projected, it obligatorily moves to SpecIP.\(^{13}\)

\[(26)\] Arriva Maria. (unmarked interpretation; speaker-oriented GOAL)

Thus, the structure in (26) corresponds to the sentence in (17), in which the postverbal subject is unmarked and the goal is necessarily interpreted as speaker-oriented. The structure which corresponds to the sentence in (21), in which the postverbal subject is interpreted as contrastively focused and there is no restriction on the interpretation of the goal, is the following (where no pro-loc is projected):

\[(27)\] Arriva Maria. (marked interpretation; GOAL not necessarily speaker-oriented)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V' \\
\text{arrivate} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{DP} \\
\_1 \\
\text{Maria}
\end{array}
\]

This is the same structure as that projected by purtire.

### 3.2. Pro-loc and pro-drop

Both pro and pro-loc cannot be projected in one and the same structure, because they would have to compete for the same syntactic position, since as "weak" pronouns ("weak" in the sense of Cardinali & Starke 1999), both need to move overtly to subject position.\(^{14}\) As such, the Pro-loc Hypothesis predicts that pro-loc is impossible in the context of pro-drop. In Italian, we can indirectly detect the absence of pro-loc by the interpretation of the location-goal: if the location-goal is not obligatorily speaker-oriented, this means pro-loc is not present in the structure.

Note that the above prediction is borne out: in a pro-drop construction, the goal is freely interpreted, indicating the lack of pro-loc in the presence of pro:

\[(28)\] È arrivata.

in arrived.FEM

'She (has) arrived.'

(GOAL not necessarily SO)

That is, (28) can be used in a context in which the (feminine) subject pro arrives in China, even if the speaker was not in China at the time of arrival.

Note that the fact exhibited in (28) lines up with the Borgomanere facts. In the case of a pro-drop construction like that in (29a), pro must move to SpecIP, as in (29b).\(^{15}\)

\[^{13}\] The idea that pro-loc raises to subject position captures Bentacut's intuition (note 6) that the locative serves as the "theme" of the sentence (NB: TP and Agr, are not represented in (26) since they are not crucial for the present purposes).

\[^{14}\] Cardinali & Starke claim that pronouns divide into three distinct grammatical classes: "strong", "weak" and "null". I follow Cardinali & Starke's proposal that pro must be taken to be a weak pronoun. They further argue that one property which distinguishes strong and weak pronouns is that the latter must obligatorily move to a Case-related position (in this case, SpecIP).

\[^{15}\] The structure in (29b), which does not involve a Larsonian shell, is essentially the one seen in (27); this is due to the fact that the second internal argument is not projected in this case.
4 Conclusion

The distribution of subjects with α-elic unaccusatives in Italian is explained under Benincà's GOAL-hypothesis. The Borgomanerese data presented in §2 further suggest the hypothesis that the goal argument entailed by arrive-type verbs in Italian is syntactically projected (the Pro-loc Hypothesis). The Pro-loc Hypothesis has allowed us to explain: (a) the restricted semantic interpretation of the locative with unmarked postverbal subjects of arrive-type verbs; (b) the absence of a restricted semantic interpretation of the locative in pro-drop constructions, constructions with preverbal subjects, and constructions with contrastively focused postverbal subjects; and finally, (c) the unmarked interpretation of postverbal subjects with leave-type verbs when an overt second internal argument is present. I thus hope to have shown that adopting Benincà's GOAL-hypothesis and extending it to the syntactic level allows us to unify a number of apparently independent phenomena.
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