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ABSTRACT

There are two different hypotheses in the literature concerning the locative subject which occurs with certain unaccusatives in some languages (e.g., English: There have arrived four women). One takes the locative to be a semantically null expletive, inserted into subject position to satisfy the Extended Projection Principle. The other, which enjoys less popularity in the literature, takes the locative to have semantic content. Each hypothesis is motivated by different considerations. The former appeals to the expletive-like properties of this morpheme, which differentiate it from 'deictic' locatives (e.g., English: Four women have arrived there). The latter appeals to the fact that this morpheme can only occur with what seems to be a semantically coherent sub-class of unaccusatives. Drawing primarily on evidence from a Northern Italian dialect, this thesis proposes an analysis of the locative which incorporates both sets of considerations, but which primarily supports the claim that the locative has semantic content.

Chapter 2 discusses the lexical semantics of unaccusative verbs of inherently directed motion (VIDMs), and shows that a semantic distinction can be made within this class of verbs. In particular, some VIDMs entail the existence of a reached location-goal (GOAL-entailing; e.g., arrive), while some do not (SOURCE-entailing, or more generally, non-GOAL-entailing; e.g., leave). This distinction bears directly on the analysis in the subsequent chapters.

Chapter 3 shows that in Borgomanerese (a Northern Italian dialect), only GOAL-entailing VIDMs can occur with a discontinuous sequence of two locative elides (ngli...ghi) when the subject of these verbs is post-verbal. While these locatives exhibit expletive-like behavior, the evidence shows that they have semantic content. I argue that these locatives are the overt reflex of a phonologically null locative morpheme (pro-loc) which is optionally selected by GOAL-entailing VIDMs as a second internal argument, the weak locative goal argument (WLGA). The analysis of pro-loc as a 'weak' morpheme (in the sense of Cardinaletti & Starke (to appear)) places the behavior of pro-loc in the greater context of the behavior of weak pronouns generally. Various characteristics of the 'ghi-construction' are shown to follow from this hypothesis.

Chapter 4 shows that while Standard Italian has no overt evidence for a WLGA (in contrast with Borgomanerese), positing the existence of an optionally projected (phonologically null) WLGA allows us to explain certain facts regarding unaccusatives in Italian, such as the distribution of subjects, telicity, and the interpretations of goals vs. sources. The WLGA analysis suggests a modification of Moro's (1993; 1997) influential analysis of Italian unaccusatives.

Chapter 5 turns to an analysis of the 'locative expletive' there in English. I show that an expletive analysis of this morpheme is undesirable, and while Moro's (1993; 1997) predicate analysis eliminates some of the problems raised by the expletive analysis, an analysis which unifies English with Borgomanerese and Italian is to be
preferred. An analysis of *there* as a WLIQA allows us to capture neatly many of the characteristic properties of *there*-sentences, such as *there*’s need for Case, the presence of an i-subject, the ban on first and second person i-subjects, and the speaker-oriented interpretation of *there*-sentences. I also provide an analysis of the feature composition of weak *there* (and *pro*-*loc*) which explains the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal, as well as the intuition that weak *there* is expletive-like.

Chapter 6 concludes with some speculations on the nature of expletives in other languages, and on how the proposal put forth in this dissertation bears on a discourse theoretic analysis of *there*-sentences.

Current linguistic theory does not easily accommodate the notion of an expletive-like NP which has clearly definable semantic content. This is reflected, for example, in the fact that we do not have a ready technical term for such a theoretical entity. The very term ‘expletive’ implies a category that is devoid of any semantic content, and ‘argument NP’ is only used for a category that we know intuitively to have referential properties. While the term ‘quasi-argument’ has been used to describe such a potential intermediate entity (e.g., *it* in *it’s raining*), the notion is by no means as firmly entrenched in our theory as the notions of ‘expletive’ and ‘argument’. A survey of introductory syntax courses, for example, would probably reveal that in most cases *it* is introduced to the first year student as an ‘expletive’, and not as a ‘quasi-argument’; with good reason, since native intuition can be appealed to, and since the former notion is much easier to define than the latter.

Perhaps this gap in our inventory of theoretical categories simply reflects a true gap in language. After all, if as native speakers we have the intuition that a particular morpheme is an expletive, why question such a clear state of affairs? On the
other hand, it may be that the theory does not easily accommodate such an intermediate category because its properties are elusive, and confounded by independent factors. Certainly, we cannot allow native speaker intuition to be the sole determinant of such an issue; ask a native speaker what the suffix -s in cats is, and the answer will likely not reveal the true grammatical status of this morpheme. This lack of intuition does not preclude, however, the possibility that -s is a marker of, say, number. The correct analysis of this category ultimately can only be established through scientific inquiry.

In this dissertation, I take a close look at the properties of inversion constructions with locative morphemes which have expletive-like properties in three different languages: Borgomanerese (a Northern Italian dialect; see below), Italian, and English. I show that certain properties of this construction can only be understood if the locative morpheme is analyzed as an argument of the unaccusative verb it occurs with.

To illustrate with a familiar example, it is well known that in English the 'locative expletive' there can only occur with certain unaccusative verbs. The view that there is an 'expletive', however, does not explain this lexical restriction, which is also exhibited in Borgomanerese and Italian. To account for the restriction of this morpheme to a subclass of verbs in these three languages, I propose that it is not an expletive at all, but rather a locative selected as a second internal argument only by GOAL-entailing unaccusatives. In other words, the locative expletive is really the morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category GOAL. The hypothesis that the locative is a GOAL argument is further supported by the fact that its syntactic presence affects the semantic interpretation of the eventuality. Specifically, the presence of this locative goal argument forces a 'speaker-oriented' interpretation of the location-goal entailed by the verb. This fact may be difficult to determine for English, since the presence of the locative correlates with an inverted subject, it might be concluded that it is the position of the subject that forces this speaker-oriented interpretation, rather than the presence of the locative. However, the case of Borgomanerese provides an interesting and fruitful testing ground for the claim that it is the presence of the locative which affects the interpretation in this way. Borgomanerese combines properties of both Italian and English. Like English, it has an overt expletive-like locative which occurs only with GOAL-entailing verbs. Like Italian, however, Borgomanerese is a 'free-inversion' language; it allows post-verbal subjects both in the presence and in the absence of the locative. These two properties make it easier to test the semantic effects of the locative, since unlike English, the inversion of the subject is not dependent on the presence of the locative, and unlike Italian, the locative is phonologically overt.

In order to account for the 'expletive-like' nature of this morpheme in these three languages, I show that it is best analyzed as lexically weak. I adopt this notion from Cardinaletti & Starke (to appear), who show that a range of independent facts concerning pronominal behavior across languages are explained by hypothesizing a class of pronouns which are 'weaker' (in terms of semantic and syntactic behavior) than stressable ('strong') pronouns. The particular semantic and syntactic behavior of the weak locative is thus shown to follow from more general properties exhibited by weak XPs cross-linguistically. The hypothesis that this argument (which I call the weak locative goal argument) is 'weak' also allows us to explain one of the characteristic
properties of the construction in which it appears, namely, the presence of an 'i-subject' (in the sense of Bizzaro (1986)).

This dissertation is organized as follows. In Chapter 2 I discuss the lexical semantics of unaccusative verbs of inherently directed motion, and show that a semantic distinction can be made within this class of verbs. In particular, there are those verbs of inherently directed motion which entail the existence of a reached location-goal (GOAL-entailing) and those which do not (SOURCE-entailing, or more generally, non-GOAL-entailing). In the remainder of the dissertation, I discuss the syntactic manifestation of this semantic distinction exhibited in Borgomanerese, Italian, and English.

In Chapter 3 I show that in Borgomanerese, only GOAL-entailing verbs of inherently directed motion can occur with a discontinuous sequence of two locative clitics, ngh and ghi, when the subject of these verbs is post-verbal. I refer to this particular construction as the ghi-construction. While it can be shown that these locatives are 'expletive-like', I claim that the restriction on the occurrence of the locatives with GOAL-entailing verbs indicates that they have semantic content. As we shall see, this claim is supported by the fact that the presence of these locatives affects the semantic interpretation of the GOAL. I conclude that these locatives are the overt reflex of a phonologically null locative morpheme (pro-loc) which is optionally selected by GOAL-entailing verbs as a second internal argument, the weak locative goal argument (WLGA). I also show that 'subject inversion' nature of the ghi-construction receives an explanation under the hypothesis (which is motivated by cross-linguistic data) that pro-loc is 'weak'.

In Chapter 4 I show that while Italian has no overt evidence for a WLGA (in contrast with Borgomanerese), positing the existence of an optionally projected phonologically null WLGA allows us to explain some poorly understood facts about unaccusatives in Italian: the distribution of subjects, tense, and the interpretations of goals vs. sources. I further argue that the analysis of Italian unaccusatives provided here is to be preferred over the influential analysis of unaccusatives proposed by Moro (1993; 1997).

In Chapter 5 I turn to locative expletive *there* in English. I show that an expletive analysis of this morpheme is undesirable, and while Moro's (1993; 1997) predicate analysis eliminates some of the problems raised by the expletive analysis, an analysis which unifies English with Borgomanerese and Italian is to be preferred. An analysis of *there* as a WLGA allows us to capture nearly many of the characteristic properties of *there*-sentences, such as the presence of an i-subject and the ban on first and second person i-subjects. I also provide an analysis of the feature composition of weak *there* (and pro-loc) which explains the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal, as well as the intuition that weak *there* is expletive-like.

In Chapter 6 I conclude with some speculations on the nature of expletives in other languages, and on how the proposal put forth in this dissertation bears on a discourse theoretic analysis of *there*-sentences.
BORGOMANERESE

Here I briefly discuss the dialect described in the third chapter of this dissertation. Borgomanerese is a Northern Italian dialect of the Gallo-Italic family, related to the Piedmontese dialect (spoken in Torino) described in Burzio (1986). It is spoken in the town of Borgomanero (part of the Province of Novara), which is situated in the northeastern part of the Piedmont region in Italy. There are very few published works which describe this dialect in any detail, Pagani’s (1918) 40 page article representing the only basic description in existence (Biondelli 1853) also includes a Borgomanerese translation of the “The Parable of the Prodigal Son.” The data I cover in this dissertation are the product of several field trips I have made to Borgomanero from 1994 to 1997. The initial investigation was inspired by some data found in the Atlante Sintattico Italia Settentrionale (ASIS; see references) housed at the University of Padova. The dialect I describe in this work is actually a variety spoken in the southern half of the town, known by speakers as the dad zûtì (‘below’) dialect, as opposed to the variety spoken in the northern half of the town, known as the dad ab (‘above’) dialect.

The orthography I use for Borgomanerese is one which I have adopted from the Borgomanerese writers and poets of today, including Giuseppe Bacchetta (Bacotta), Pier Mario Pettinaroli (Calistu), Mario Pietmontesi, and Piero Velati, who in turn adopted (and adapted) the orthography used by Giana Colombo, a writer of the 1950s-1960s who left behind a brief unpublished description of some aspects of the phonology and syntax of Borgomanerese. Here I clarify some aspects of the orthography, which incorporates elements of the orthography of Standard Italian.

Accent marks: A grave accent mark is used to indicate word stress under the following two circumstances (although, see below under Vowels): (i) when the word stress falls on an unpredictable syllable whose nucleus is /a/, /i/, or /u/, assuming as predictable the accent on the penultimate syllable (e.g., rivva /rivva/ ‘(to) arrive’ vs. rivva /rivva/ ‘(past participle)’; parti /parti/ ‘place’ vs. partì (parte) ‘leave’); (ii) to orthographically disambiguate two monosyllabic homophones (e.g., la ‘the (fem. sing)’ vs. lò ‘there’). There are some idiosyncratic uses of the accent mark, where its elimination would result in no ambiguity (e.g., giù /giù/ ‘come’; fit /fit/ ‘do/make’).

Perhaps the intuition here is that all regular infinitival forms bear their word stress on the final syllable (e.g., mangì ‘eat’, durì ‘sleep’), monosyllabic forms included. As such, I have adopted these uses as well.

Consonants: Most of the consonantal orthography is also taken from Italian. For example, the phoneme /c/ is written as c before the front vowels /i/, /e/, and /e/ (e.g., unci /unçè/ ‘gome’), and as ci before the back vowels /u/, /o/, /o/, and /a/ (e.g., ciúmè /čuːmè/ ‘ask’). The phonemes /k/ and /g/ are written as ch and gh before the front vowels, (e.g., chì /ʃi/ ‘beac’; daghì /dagi/ ‘I give’), and as c and g before the back vowels (e.g., ca /ka/ ‘home’). The grapheme gn is also adopted from Italian, to indicate the voiced palatal nasal (e.g., gnì /ʃi/ ‘come’). Unlike Italian, Borgomanerese has a
voiced alveo-palatal fricative /β/. On analogy with the Italian grapheme ə, which is used to indicate the voiceless alveo-palatal fricative /β/ before back vowels (e.g., Italian scopero /ˈskoper/ 'strike'), Borgomanerese writers tend to use the grapheme ə for /β/ (e.g., ega/i k“b”/ 'down'; laeia/ˈlɛeia/ 'she reads'). However, sometimes it is also written as gi (e.g., Giacomo /ˈɡjatsmo/ 'Gianni'; giosia /ˈɡjosisia/ 'Thursday'), or even as gi, which is used in Italian for the voiced alveo-palatal affricate (e.g., mònti /ˈmοnti/ 'she eats'). For the purposes of this dissertation, I have decided to adopt this varied usage; an attempt to systematize this aspect of Borgomanerese orthography is a matter for future work (Tortora in preparation).

Vowels: Borgomanerese has two front mid rounded vowels, lax /ə/ and tense /i/; which are written as ə and i, respectively (e.g., odn /ɔˈdɔn/ 'dog'; ət /ɒt/ 'above'); these two vowels always carry the main word stress. In addition, it has a high front rounded vowel, written as ü, which may or may not bear the word stress (e.g., cażna /ˈkatzna/ 'kitchen' vs. tlic /ˈtlik/ 'everyone'). Like Standard Italian, Borgomanerese also has the two mid front vowels, tense /e/ and lax /ɛ/, as well as the two mid back vowels tense /o/ and lax /ɛ/. These are distinguished orthographically with an acute accent on the tense vowel and a grave accent on the lax vowel (i.e., as ə and e, and as i and o, respectively), under the following two circumstances: (i) when the main word stress falls on an unpredictable syllable whose nucleus is one of these vowels (e.g., məŋgə /ˈm̥aŋɡə/ 'eat' vs. Burebon /ˈbuɾbɔn/ 'Borgomaner'); (ii) when orthographic disambiguation is helpful (e.g., ət /ɨt/ 'is' vs. e /et/ 'and'; telefəne /telefəne/ 'to telephone'). In either case, then, the accent mark indicates both word stress and the tense/lax distinction. Again, the above writers have also developed what seem to me to be idiosyncratic uses of the accent marks, where their elimination would result in no ambiguity (e.g., nə /nə/ 'as such'). I have nevertheless adopted these uses as well, out of respect for their written tradition. Otherwise, the graphemes ə and o are used, without an accent mark.
2.1 Introduction

As demonstrated by Perlmutter (1978), and then by Burzio (1986) (within the Principles & Parameters (P&P) framework), Standard Italian provides evidence for a structural distinction between two separate classes of intransitive verbs (a hypothesis termed the Unaccusative Hypothesis in Perlmutter (1978)). These two classes are generally referred to in the literature as unergatives and unaccusatives (or intranatives and ergatives, according to Burzio's (1986) terminology). According to the Unaccusative Hypothesis as interpreted in the P&P framework, while both unergatives and unaccusatives are monadic verbs, unergatives differ from unaccusatives in that they project a d-structure subject (in Spec, VP) and no object (1), while unaccusatives project a d-structure object (in sister-to-V position), and no subject (2):

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad \text{\textit{VP}} \\
& \quad \text{\textit{DP_{adj}}} \quad \text{\textit{V}} \\
& \quad \quad \text{\textit{V}} \\
(2) & \quad \text{\textit{VP}} \\
& \quad \quad \text{\textit{V}} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{\textit{V}} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{\textit{DP_{adj}}} 
\end{align*}
\]

If a verb does not project an external argument, that verb is by definition an unaccusative. Thus, all passive verbs are unaccusatives, as are the intransitive verbs that participate in what Burzio (1986) calls the AVB/BV alternation (in Levin & Rappaport-Hovav's (1993) terms, these are the verbs that participate in the "causative alternation").

---

1 Hale & Keyser (1993) provide evidence for a different analysis of unergatives, in which these verbs are analyzed as taking a null direct object argument, acting as covert transitives. Nevertheless, the crucial difference between unergatives and unaccusatives remains in their analysis as well: only the former project a d-structure subject.

2 Here and throughout this work I assume without argument the VP-internal subject hypothesis (Pulik (1986), Pulik & Speas (1986), Kitagawa (1986), Koopman & Sportiche (1991), and Sportiche (1988)).

3 Simplifying somewhat (see Levin & Rappaport-Hovav for a detailed discussion), these are verbs that have both a transitive and an intransitive use, the object of the transitive appearing as the subject of the intransitive:

(i) John broke the window.
(ii) The window broke.

---

1 Hall (1965) also provides an analysis of intransitive verbs which distinguishes a subclass of these verbs as taking underlying objects.
There is also a large class of unaccusative verbs which have no transitive counterparts (unlike passives and AVB/BV verbs). The verb *arrive* is often used in the literature on unaccusativity as the prototypical example of this type of unaccusative verb. We will see in this dissertation, however, that *arrive* (as well as other semantically similar verbs with which it forms a distinct class) behaves differently from other unaccusatives which also have no transitive counterparts. In this chapter I will discuss the lexical semantic property of *arrive* (and verbs like it) which distinguishes this verb from other unaccusatives. It will become apparent in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 why isolating the particular ‘conceptual category’ (in the sense of Jackendoff (1990)) entailed by these verbs is useful.

2.2 Unaccusative verb classes

Levin (1993) and Levin & Rappaport-Hovav (1995) (henceforth L&RH) argue for the view that certain aspects of verb meaning can be a factor in determining syntactic structure. With respect to the Unaccusative Hypothesis, for example, they argue that unaccusativity is both semantically determined and syntactically instantiated. This does not mean, however, that all unaccusatives necessarily form a semantically coherent class. As L&RH (p. 5) state, “There is no more reason to assume that the unaccusative class is semantically homogeneous than there is to assume the same about the class of transitive verbs.” So, for example, although passives are unaccusatives (as noted above), one could not argue that they form a semantically homogeneous class anymore than one could argue that all transitives form a semantically homogeneous class. Similarly, the unaccusatives which have no transitive counterparts should not be expected to form a semantically homogeneous class, although they are assumed to ultimately have the same syntactic properties (i.e., they project the structure in (2)). For example, among these unaccusatives we find “verbs of inherently directed motion” (terminology from Levin (1993) and L&RH). This class includes the verbs in (3):

(3)  
arrive, ascend, come, depart/leave, descend, drop, enter, escape, exit, 
fall, flee, go, pass, return, rise

There are also unaccusative verbs of existence (VOEs), appearance (VOAs), and disappearance (VODs):

(4)  
a. exist, persist, prevail, remain, stay, survive
b. appear, arise, develop, emanate, emerge
c. disappear, expire, lapse, vanish (Levin (1993); L&RH)

Then there are unaccusatives which do not fall into either class, such as those in (5):

(5)  
die, Italian bastare ‘be enough’, nascere ‘be born’, piacere ‘please’, sombrare ‘seem’

If we take unaccusativity to be semantically determined, we must assume that there is some level at which passives and unaccusatives are semantically homogeneous. Without going into detail, I will just note here that L&RH derive unaccusativity by proposing a linking rule which states that the argument which undergoes a directed change must be projected as the direct object (ensuring that subjects of passives and unaccusatives are 0-structure objects). Aside from this level of semantic similarity, however, we can assume that unaccusatives are as semantically heterogeneous as transitives.
The verbs in (3) are grouped into a single class because they all entail "a specification of the direction of motion, even in the absence of an overt directional complement" (Levin (1993:264)). They are also characterized in L&RH (p. 58) as "achievement verbs; they specify an achieved endpoint—an attained location."*  

2.2.1 GOAL-entailing vs. SOURCE-entailing verbs of inherently directed motion

There is at least one notable respect in which the class of verbs of inherently directed motion (henceforth VIDMs) is not entirely semantically homogeneous. The term "achieved endpoint" cannot be used to mean that all the verbs in (3) entail a necessarily reached location-goal. Some VIDMs entail a location-goal that is necessarily reached, while others do not:

(6)  
   a. Mary arrived at the station. *but she never got there.
   b. Mary left the station. but she never got there.

From the sentence in (6a) we can conclude that arrive entails a reached location-goal, confirmed by failed cancellation by the adjunct but she never got there. However, as can be seen in (6b), although leave can appear with a PP denoting a location to be reached, the reaching of this location can be canceled, suggesting that leave does not entail a goal.

*These verbs also share the same syntactic behavior: (i) they do not participate in the causative alternation (as noted above), and (ii) as L&RH claim, they cannot occur with resultative XPs (however, see Tortora (to appear) for arguments against this conclusion). Note that VOAs, as well as VODs, also exhibit these properties; see Chapter 5, §5.4.1.1 for an analysis of VOAs and VODs as VIDMs.

This is not to say that leave does not entail a location of some sort (cf. Levin's 1993 and L&RH's intuition that verbs like leave specify direction of motion, which entails the existence of a location). However, the type of location entailed by the meaning of leave should be characterized as a source, rather than a goal (Jackendoff 1990:259) also views leave as entailing a Source. Given this lexical semantic difference between arrive and leave, then, let us say that the lexical semantic representation of arrive includes GOAL (or, 'location-goal'), and the lexical semantic representation of leave includes SOURCE (or, 'location-source'). I will refer to the VIDMs which lexically entail GOAL as 'GOAL-entailing', and to those which lexically entail SOURCE as 'SOURCE-entailing', or 'non-GOAL-entailing verbs'. For the purposes of exposition, I will at times also refer to the former as 'arrive-type verbs', and to the latter as 'leave-type verbs'. I take GOAL and SOURCE to be 'conceptual categories', in the sense of Jackendoff (1990). Specifically, they are convenient terms for the conceptual category which Jackendoff (1990:43) calls PLACE, and which I will also refer to as LOCATION.

1In Tortora (1996) I use the term 'non-locative unaccusative' for verbs like leave. This label is misleading, however, given that these verbs do entail the existence of a location.

Jackendoff (1990:46-47) (following Gruber (1965)) defines Source as "the object from which motion proceeds," and Goal as "the object to which motion proceeds." As he points out, the Source is the argument of the Path-function FROM, while the Goal is the argument of the Path-function TO. Thus, it is not the PP that is the Source or Goal, but the DP complement of the P. In the text, I may use the terms SOURCE and GOAL to refer to the entire PP (as in Jackendoff (1972), (1976)). However, nothing important will hinge on this.

6Thinking of the distinction in terms of GOAL-entailing vs. non-GOAL-entailing (as opposed to GOAL vs. SOURCE) will become useful in the discussion of Italian in Chapter 4.
Let us consider Pustejovsky's (1991) analysis of event structure, which can provide a framework in which a location-goal can be structurally distinguished from a location-source. Simplifying a great deal, Pustejovsky follows Vendler (1957) in categorizing eventualities into various types. Pustejovsky claims that an 'event' e (which includes that which Vendler terms 'accomplishments' and 'achievements') consists of two sub-events, represented as \( e_1 \) and \( e_2 \) in (7) (T indicates 'transition'):

\[
\text{(7) } \quad T \quad e_1 \quad e_2
\]

The sub-event \( e_1 \) represents a process or a state which temporally precedes the sub-event \( e_2 \). The sub-event \( e_2 \) represents the state resulting from the process which occurred in \( e_1 \), or a state which is in opposition to the state which held in \( e_1 \). A GOAL-entailing event such as that described by the verb arrive, for example, can be represented in the following way:

\[
\text{(8) } \quad T \quad e_1 \quad e_2
\]

\( e_1 \) GO state at a LOCATION Y

The structure in (8) is thus a formal way of stating that the event described by arrive involves motion (the left branch of the structure), with the result that the referent of the NP which undergoes the motion is in a state at a location (the right branch of the structure). Like arrive, the verb leave describes an event that involves two sub-events.

In contrast with arrive, however, the resulting state described by leave is the negation of a state at a location. This is illustrated in (9), which describes a state at a location on the left branch, and the negation of that state on the right branch:

\[
\text{(9) } \quad T \quad e_1 \quad e_2
\]

\( e_1 \) state at a LOCATION Y \quad \text{not at } Y

Let us say, then, that a GOAL-entailing VIDM is one which has the PLACE category (state at a LOCATION) on the right branch of the structure, while a SOURCE-entailing VIDM is one which has the PLACE category on the left branch of the structure.\(^5\)

2.2.2 a-telic verbs of inherently directed motion

There is a third type of VIDM, which is ambiguous between GOAL-entailing and non-GOAL-entailing. These VIDMs (which L&R refer to as "ataelic verbs of inherently directed motion") include verbs like descend, rise, and fall. Such verbs do not necessarily entail a reached goal, as can be seen by their compatibility with a durative phrase:

\[
\text{(10) } \quad a. \quad \text{The airplane descended for 5 minutes.}
\]

\(^5\) Regarding the structure in (9), note that it can be inferred from 'not at Y' that the referent of the NP is at some other location, Z. Thus, strictly speaking, the right branch of the structure for the SOURCE-entailing VIDM also represents a state at a location. To make the distinction between GOAL and SOURCE clear, then, let us define GOAL as the right branch location which does not include a negation.
b. The gas rose for 10 minutes.

c. The meteorite fell for 15 minutes.

Thus, in contrast with arrive and leave, descend in its atelic sense does not have a dual event structure; it is a 'process' (or an 'activity'). In Pastejovský's terms, it has a noncomplex event structure, which can be represented in his system in the following way (P indicates 'process'):

\[
\text{(11) } \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{\hfill} \\
P \\
\hfill \end{array} \\
\text{downward motion}
\]

A verb like descend, however, can also be interpreted as GOAL-entailing (and thus, atelic), as the following sentence shows:

\[
\text{(12) } \quad \text{The airplane descended onto the runway in 5 minutes \*for 5 minutes.}
\]

In its telic sense, then, descend is like arrive in that it has a dual event structure, with a state at a LOCATION on the right branch of the structure:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\hfill} \\
T \\
\hfill \end{array} \\
\text{downward motion} \\
\text{state at a LOCATION Y}
\]

Let us assume, then, that what underlies the ambiguity of descend is the existence of two different lexical items. Furthermore, let us assume that one is derived from the other via a lexical rule.\(^{11}\) I will refer to the instance of descend which is non-GOAL-entailing (that represented in (11)) as 'atelic descend', and to the instance of descend which is GOAL-entailing (that represented in (13)) as 'telic descend.' I will use the general term 'atelic VIDMs' to refer to this subclass of ambiguous VIDMs.

Note that SOURCE-entailing VIDMs (e.g., leave) and telic VIDMs (e.g., atelic descend) share the property of being non-GOAL-entailing; neither the representation in (9) nor that in (11) involves a state at a location on the right branch of the structure.\(^{12}\) This is in opposition to arrive-type verbs (e.g., arrive) and telic VIDMs (e.g., telic descend), which share the property of being GOAL-entailing VIDMs.

2.3 Conclusions

Unaccusatives do not form a semantically homogeneous class of verbs, but rather can be divided into various semantically homogeneous sub-classes. Unaccusative verbs of inherently directed motion form a semantically coherent verb class in that they briefly note here (see Chapter 5, §5.4.11 for a more detailed discussion). The idea is that unergative run is the basic instance of the verb, while the unaccusative instance of this verb is derived via a lexical rule (one which maps the constraint of an atelic verb of motion onto the lexical semantic template that unaccusative verbs of directed motion appear in). The point here is that such a lexical rule could conceivably apply to atelic VIDMs as well. In this case, the basic form of an atelic VIDM such as descend would be the atelic form, but like the case of unergative run, the constant of this verb could be mapped onto the lexical semantic template that arrive-type verbs appear in, lexically deriving a GOAL-entailing VIDM (i.e., the telic form).

\(^{11}\)The idea here is that atelic VIDMs are "variable behavior verbs" (in the sense of L&R). L&R note (as does Perlisatter (1978), among many others) that across languages, atelic unergative verbs of manner of motion (e.g., run, swim, jump) also behave like telic unaccusative verbs of directed motion (hence the term "variable behavior"). L&R suggest an analysis of this case of regular polysemy which I will

\(^{12}\)This is true for descend by default, since it does not have a right branch. Note that although leave is also non-GOAL-entailing, it is telic (unlike atelic VIDMs). It passes all tests for telicity; for example, it is incompatible with durative phrases: *John left for 15 minutes (this cannot mean "it took John 15 minutes to leave"); likewise, John is leaving does not entail that John has left.
all specify a direction of motion. Nevertheless, within this class of verbs three types of VIDM can be distinguished:

(A) Arrive-type (entailing a GOAL; e.g. arrive, come, enter, return)
(B) Leave-type (entailing a SOURCE; e.g. leave, escape, exit)
(C) α-telic VIDMs (ambiguous between entailing / not entailing a GOAL;
   e.g. descend, rise, fail)

SOURCE-entailing VIDMs and αtelic VIDMs are non-GOAL-entailing, in opposition
to arrive-type verbs and telic VIDMs, which are GOAL-entailing VIDMs.

We might ask at this point whether this semantic difference (GOAL-
entailing vs. non-GOAL-entailing) between VIDMs like arrive and leave is interesting,
from a grammatical standpoint. In the chapters which follow, I will show that this
semantic distinction correlates with an important syntactic difference between these two
types of verbs in Borgomanerese, Italian, and English.

Chapter 3

THE WEAK LOCATIVE GOAL ARGUMENT IN BORGOMANERESE

3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter we saw that VIDMs come in two types: GOAL-
entailing and non-GOAL-entailing. In this chapter I will show that this lexical semantic
difference has a syntactic manifestation in Borgomanerese. In particular we will see
that only GOAL-entailing VIDMs in this language can occur with a discontinuous
sequence of two locative morphemes (ngh...ghi). At first glance, these locatives seem to
have 'expletive-like' properties; they are the same locatives used in the existential
construction, for example. However, the fact that they may occur only with GOAL-
entailing VIDMs suggests that they have semantic content. In order to account for their
presence, I hypothesize that they reflect the presence of a phonologically null locative
argument, pro-loc. Pro-loc will be taken to be a 'weak locative', selected by GOAL-
entailing VIDMs as an optional second internal goal argument. This argument is thus
turned the weak locative goal argument (WLGA). In contrast, SOURCE-entailing
verbs cannot select pro-loc as an optional second internal argument. The hypothesis
offered in this chapter will allow us to account for two central properties of sentences that contain the WLGA: (i) the fact that the WLGA can only occur with a post-verbal subject (or subject, in the sense of Burzio (1986)), and (ii) the fact that the entailed location-goal necessarily has a speaker-oriented interpretation in the presence of the WLGA. In the Appendix at the end of the chapter, I provide an analysis of the morphological structure of the locative subject clitic.

3.1 The syntactic manifestation of the GOAL/ non-GOAL distinction in Borgomanerese

3.2.1 The data

In Borgomanerese, the semantic distinction between GOAL-entailing and non-GOAL-entailing verbs correlates with a syntactic difference between these two types of verbs (Tortora (1996)). As can be seen by the data in (14a-e), when the subject of the GOAL-entailing verbs is “arrive”, “come”, “take” and “return”, and “enter” is post-verbal, a locative clitic, ghi, appears. This clitic is doubled by the locative subject clitic ngh in preverbal position (see §3.2.4). For the purposes of exposition, let us refer to the construction in (14) as the ‘ghi-construction’.

(14) a. ngh è rivè gg’si na flòla.
   SLOC is arrived-LOC a girl
   “A girl (has) arrived.”

   b. ngh è gnò-gghi la Maria.
   SLOC is come-LOC the Maria
   “Maria came / has come”

Present perfect. While a detailed explanation of this restriction is a matter for further research, here I will offer a few comments on this restriction. As Polletto (1993, in preparation) and Roberts (1991) note, many Northern Italian dialects possess a series of subject clitics which appear only with auxiliary verbs (eclittici soggetto di auxiliare, ‘auxiliary subject clitics’ in Polletto’s terminology). I assume that the subject clitic ngh in Borgomanerese is a clitic of this type, since it does not appear in the simple tenses. I also assume that the absence of ghi in the absence of ngh reflects a dependency between the two clitics (again, the nature of this dependency is a matter for future research, although see §3.2.4.2.1).

11Note that the passive subject ghi in the examples (e.g. rivè gghi in (14a)) is the result of a phonological rule in Borgomanerese which doubles the initial consonant of a clitic when it follows a stressed vowel (a rule similar to ‘raddoppiamento fonosintattico’ in Standard Italian).

Another detail worth clarifying is the “low” enclitic position of ghi. This is just part of the more general fact about Borgomanerese that all object clitics climb to a position no higher than after the verb:

(1) i o mangia-lu.
   SCL have.1sg eat-it
   “I have eaten it.”

(2) i mòngia-lu.
   SCL eat.1sg-it
   “I eat it.”

As can be seen in (14a-e), ghi also enclitics to certain prepositions. Again, this is just a general fact about object cliticization in Borgomanerese:

(3) i porti di libbru.
   SCL carry.1sg the book
   “I carry the book.”

(4) i poartu-lu.
   SCL carry.1sg-it
   “I carry it.”

(5) i porti densa-lu.
   SCL carry.1sg inside-it
   “I carry it inside.”

That an object clitic (such as fì in (vi)) has not remained in its base position, but rather undergone clitic movement, can be seen by the following sentences, in which the DP object la toria “the cake” must follow the adverb sempri ‘always’, while the clitic fì appears in a higher position:

(6) i mòngjì sempri la toria.
   SCL eat.1sg always the cake
   “I always eat the cake.”
c. Nghi è gnò naas-gghì na amon. SLOC is come buck-LOC the my man "My husband returned."

d. Nghi è turnì naas-gghì na amon. SLOC is returned back-LOC the my man "My husband returned."

c. Nghi è gnò denta-gghì na secretaria. SLOC is come inside-LOC a secretary "A secretary entered."

In contrast with the above, when the subject of the non-GOAL-entailing VIDMs nè, 'go; leave', pari 'leave', né fora 'exit', and scopè 'escape' is in post-verbal position, these clitics do not appear, as can be seen in (15). (15) shows that the appearance of these clitics with these verbs results in ungrammaticality.

(15) a. L è naci I Mario, naas'mma lof. SLOC is gone the Mario, with them "Mario went with them."

b. L è naci I ma amita. SLOC is gone the my friend "My friend left."

c. *L è pari-I na fiola. SLOC is left-LOC a girl "A girl left."

d. *L è scopè-I un cònn. SLOC is escaped-LOC a dog "A dog escaped."

e. *L è naci fora-I na parasuma. SLOC is gone out-LOC a person "A person exited."


The VIDM nè 'go' in Borgomanerese differs from English go (and Italian andare 'go'); see footnote 57). Whereas in English go behaves like a GOAL-entailing verb (Jackendoff (1990)), in Borgomanerese it clearly patterns with leave (and is in fact also used to mean 'leave', as can be seen in (15b)). It should not come as a surprise that the use of go varies across languages, since it does seem to be the most semantically empty of all VIDMs (hence, Jackendoff's use of GO as a primitive).

It should also be noted that the post-verbal subjects with the SOURCE-entailing verbs in (15) get a contrastive focus interpretation. Thus, a more accurate translation of (15e), for example, would be "It was a girl that left." For the purposes of the present discussion, I put aside this fact, returning to a more detailed discussion of this fact in Italian in Chapter 4.

15The unaccusative status of these verbs is attested by the fact that they take the auxiliary vesst 'be', and not avej 'have' (Borgomanerese is like Italian with respect to auxiliary selection).
(16) a. L' è fundà na nave.
   SCL is sunk a ship
   "A ship sank."

b. L' è crusà i prezziu di pummi.
   SCL is grown the price of apples
   "The price of apples has grown."

c. L' è brusà na piànta.
   SCL is burned a plant
   "A tree has burned."

   SLOC is sunk-LOC a ship
   "A ship sank."

b. *Ngh' è crusà-gghi i prezziu di pummi.
   SLOC is grown-LOC the price of apples
   "The price of apples grew."

These clitics are also banned from appearing with unergatives, such as telefunà 'telephone' and parlà 'speak':

(18) a. (i) L. à telefunà i Piero.
   SCL has telephoned the Piero
   "Piero has telephoned."

   (ii) *Ngh à telefunà-gghi i Piero.

b. (i) L. à parlà la Maria.
   SCL has spoken the Maria.
   "Maria has spoken."

   (ii) *Ngh à parlà-gghi la Maria.

To summarize the facts, the VIDMs arrive, come, return, and enter can appear in the ghi-construction. The VIDMs leave, go, escape and exit, and other unaccusatives, as well as unergatives, do not appear in the ghi-construction.  

It should be noted that this occurrence of ghi with certain unaccusatives in Borgomaneroese differs from the phenomenon exhibited in Piedmontese, noted by Burzio (1986:119-126). Burzio reports that in Piedmontese (specifically, the dialect spoken in the city of Turin in Piedmont), when the subject of an unaccusative is in post-verbal position, the clitic ye appears:  

(19) A y rivu i client. 
   (Burzio's (82b), p. 122) 
   SCL there arrives the clients

Burzio points out that ye has what he terms a "pleonastic" use in (19). This contrasts with what he terms its "locative" use, seen in (20):

(20) I client a y rivu.
    the clients SCL there arrive
    "The clients arrive there."

This clitic is thus ambiguous between a "locative morpheme" and a "pleonastic morpheme" which does not have any locative semantic content. These two different ye exhibit different syntactic behavior: Unlike the "locative" ye in (20), "pleonastic" ye can co-occur with a locative PP. This contrast is seen in (21a) and (21b) (corresponding to Burzio's (83a) and (83b), respectively):

(21) a. *A y puruva seampre i cat al Valentin.
    SCL there took always the kids to the Valentin

17 Although see below in §3.2.2.3 and §3.3 concerning the existential construction.

18 The clitic ye appears as y when pre-verbal.
b. A y rivo i client nel negazi.
SCL there arrives the clients in the store

This use of a morpheme that is homophonous with a locative clitic in Piedmontese may appear to be similar to the use of ghi seen in (14) in Borgomanerese. However, the two phenomena are fundamentally different. The "pleonastic" ye of Piedmontese occurs with all unaccusatives (Burzio (1986:123)). L. Burzio reports (personal communication), for example, that all of the unaccusatives seen in (15) and (16) occur with ye when the subject is post-verbal. The occurrence of Borgomanerese ghi, on the other hand, is limited to a subclass of unaccusatives. The semantic status of Borgomanerese ghi will be discussed immediately below.

3.2.2 What is the ghi-construction?

3.2.2.1 Hypothesis: ghi is the morpho-syntactic instantiation of GOAL

As we have seen above, ghi only occurs with VIDMs which entail GOAL. Furthermore, as we will see immediately below, ghi is homophonous with the locative clitic morpheme in Borgomanerese. Let us assume that the fact that a morpheme which is homophonous with a locative co-occurs with GOAL-entailing VIDMs cannot be purely accidental. In order to explain this correlation, I propose that ghi is the overt, morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category GOAL. In what follows, I will show that although the ghi in the ghi-construction is homophonous with a locative, it has different syntactic and semantic properties. In §3.2.2.4 I will discuss a point of semantic interpretation concerning the ghi-construction which further supports our hypothesis. In particular, I will show that the presence of ghi in the ghi-construction has an effect on the semantic interpretation of the GOAL.

3.2.2.2 Ghi is a locative

Borgomanerese has several deictic locatives. The deictic locatives which mean 'here' are chi, scià, chiisà, child, and chillonà (22a). Ghi can also be used to

This line of reasoning has been adopted by several researchers in the past, the most recent of which is Freeze (1952), who notes that the co-occurrence of locative morphemes and what he calls 'locative unaccusatives' in many languages indicates that the locative morphemes must have semantic content.
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mean 'here', as can be seen by (22b):

(22) a. La Maria lè gno / selà / chiński / chilô / chilôô.
the Maria SCL is come here.
"Maria came here."

b. La Maria lè gno-gghi.
the Maria SCL is come-here
"Maria came here."

One difference between the deictic locatives in (22a) and ghi in (22b) is that the former are not clitics while the latter is. Another difference is that unlike the non-clitic deictic locatives, ghi can also mean 'there' (23b), like the non-clitic morphemes inô and là
(23a).22

(23) a. La Maria lè nacì inô / là.
the Maria SCL is gone there.
"Maria went there."

b. La Maria lè nacì-gghi.
the Maria SCL is gone-there.
"Maria went there."

ghi thus has essentially the same use as the locative clitic ci in Italian, which also can be used to denote either 'here' or 'there,' as can be seen in (24b) and (25b):

(24) a. Mangì là spesso?
eat.2sg there often
"Do you eat there often?"

b. Si, ci mangio spesso.
yes, there eat.1sg often
"Yes, I eat there often."

(25) a. Mangì qua spesso?
eat.2sg here often
"Do you eat here often?"

b. Si, ci mangio spesso.
yes, here eat.1sg often
"Yes, I eat here often."

Borgomanerese ghi and Italian ci are what I will call 'non-deictic locatives' (henceforth NDL). I use the term 'non-deictic' to distinguish locatives like Borgomanerese ghi and Italian ci from the deictic locatives, such as those seen in (22a) and (23a). The latter, like here and there in English, lexically specify a value for the feature [speaker] (see footnote 20). Unlike here and there, locatives like Borgomanerese ghi and Italian ci do not lexically encode whether the location they pick out is near the speaker [+speaker] or removed from the speaker [-speaker], but rather have a value for this feature fixed by

22While further study is required, an initial investigation indicates that the locatives inô and là differ in terms of remoteness (see, e.g., Frawley (1992)). The former encodes a location which is away from the speaker by a lesser degree of remoteness than the location encoded by the latter (whether inô is [+hesee] or see footnote 21) is a matter for further research. For example, Varda inô 'Look there!' can be used to indicate a book that can be seen on a table at the far end of the room, but not to indicate a mountain that can be seen in the distance. For the latter eventuality, Varda là is appropriate.
the context. Nevertheless, ghi and ci refer to any location that is in the context (either linguistic or spatial).

3.2.2.3 The 'expletive' status of the ghi in the ghi-construction

We have just seen that ghi can be used as an NDL. Here I will address the question of the use of the ghi in the ghi-construction. This morpheme has a substantially different syntactic and semantic behavior from the NDL ghi. First, whereas the former occurs with the locative subject clitic ngh (discussed in detail in §3.2.4), the latter does not. Second, as we shall see immediately below, the former can co-occur with a PP or a deictic locative, while the latter cannot. Third, as we shall see in detail in §3.2.2.4, the former, in contrast with the latter, forces a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. Much of our discussion of Borgomanerese ghi will involve discussion of Italian ci, since the latter has a more familiar status than the former, and as such will facilitate our understanding of ghi.

It is well known that the locative morpheme ci in Italian is also used in existentials:

(26) Italian
ci sono tre ragazzi nella stanza.
LOC are three boys in the room.
"There are three boys in the room."

As can be seen in (27), the locative morpheme ghi in Borgomanerese is like Italian ci in that it, too, is used in existentials:

(27) Borgomanerese
ghi d-ghi tre ngafrat la sòma.
SLOC is LOC three boys in the room.
"There are three boys in the room."

Both in accounts in the literature, as well as in reports by native speakers, the use of the locative morpheme ci in the Italian existential is understood to be fundamentally different from the "referential" use of this morpheme (seen in examples (24b) and (25b) above). The locative ci as used in the existential has been described as "non-referential," or "expletive," supporting the intuition among linguists and native speakers alike that this morpheme does not "refer" to or pick out any contextually relevant location, in contrast with the NDL in (24b) and (25b).\footnote{The two different cias (i.e., the NDL and the "expletive") also exhibit different contraction possibilities. Many speakers prefer contraction of the NDL ci and the auxiliary essere 'he':

(i) C' è andata eter.
there is (she)gone yesterday
"She went yesterday."

Nevertheless, non-contraction between the NDL ci and the auxiliary is also permitted:

(ii) Ci è andata eter.
there is (she)gone yesterday

In contrast, contraction is obligatory with 'expletive' ci:

(iii) C' è stata una ragazza qua.
LOC is been a girl here
"There was a girl here."

(iv) "C' è stata una ragazza qua.
LOC is been a girl here

This difference between NDL ci and 'expletive' ci suggests the possibility that they occupy different syntactic positions, 'expletive' ci occupying a position closer to the auxiliary verb.}
Borgomanerese ghì (and Italian ci) as used in the existential as the ‘locative expletive’, to distinguish it from the NDL ghì (and ci). I use this term with the caveat that I am not committing myself to the view that this morpheme has no semantic content in the existential (see §3.3 below).

Note that the ghì in the ghì-construction in (14) has the same status of the ghì in the existential construction in (27). That is, there is an intuition that, unlike the NDL, the ghì in the ghì-construction does not refer to or pick out any contextually relevant location. Note that speakers give the sentences in (14) as translations to the corresponding Italian sentences in which there is no overt “referential” (i.e., deictic or NDL) locative. For example, (14a) is given by speakers as a translation of the following:

(28) E’ arrivata una ragazza.

is arrived a girl.

“A girl arrived.”

For expository purposes, then, I will temporarily refer to the ghì in the ghì-construction as the ‘locative expletive’ as well.

Apart from native speakers’ intuitions, however, it can be shown that the ghì in the ghì-construction, like the ghì in the existential in (27), behaves differently from the NDL ghì. First, returning to the existential, note that locative expletive ghì (like Italian locative expletive ci in (26)), can occur with an overt locative PP. In contrast, NDL ghì, like Italian NDL ci, cannot occur with a PP. This can be seen in (29) (Borgomanerese) and (30) (Italian):

(29) Borgomanerese:
   a. La Maria è naci-ghi.
      the Maria SCL is gone-there
      “Maria went there.”
   b. *La Maria è naci-ghi a la stazione.
      the Maria SCL is gone-there to the station
      “Maria went to the station.”
   c. Na segreteria l’è riv-ghì.
      a secretary SCL is arrived-there/here
      “A secretary arrived there/here.”
   d. *Na segreteria l’è riv-ghì a la stazione.
      a secretary SCL is arrived-there/here at the station
      “A secretary arrived there/here at the station.”

(30) Italian:
   a. Maria ci è andata.
      Maria there is gone
      “Maria went there.”
   b. *Maria ci è andata alla stazione.
      Maria there is gone to the station
      “Maria went there to the station.”
   c. Maria ci è arrivata.
      Maria there/here is arrived
      “Maria arrived there/here.”
   d. *Maria ci è arrivata alla stazione.
      Maria there/here is arrived at the station
      “Maria arrived there/here at the station.”

Thus, locative expletive ghì differs from NDL ghì in that the former, but not the latter, can occur with an overt locative PP.
As can be seen by the following sentences, the ghi in the ghi-construction in (14) can occur with a PP, just like the locative expletive ghi in the existential in (27).\textsuperscript{34}

(31)  
a. \textit{Nghè \textit{è} riva\textsuperscript{ghi} na segretaria a la stazione.}  
SLOC is arrived-LOC a secretary at the station  
"A secretary arrived at the station."

b. \textit{Nghè \textit{è} ghi densi-ghi na segretaria int la stôna.}  
SLOC is come inside-LOC a secretary in the room  
"A secretary entered in the room."

Given (31), it seems that we can directly conclude that the ghi in the ghi-construction is like the ghi in the existential. However, we must be careful about what is meant by “can occur with a PP,” because there are two structurally distinct types of PP-doubling in languages like Italian and Borgomanerese. In order to distinguish the two types of PP-doubling, we need to briefly discuss the phenomenon of right-dislocation.

It is well known that in Italian, an XP can be right-dislocated (Antinucci & Cirque (1977), Benincà (1988b), Calabrese (1982)). This is exhibited in (32b), where the direct object DP \textit{la torta} "a cake" (which is in its base position in (32a)) appears on the right edge of the sentence, following a strong intonational break (indicated by the double-comma):

(32)  
a. \textit{Maria ha dato la torta a Giorgio.}  
Maria has given the cake to Giorgio

b. \textit{Maria ha dato a Giorgio, \textit{la torta}.}  
Maria has given to Giorgio, \textit{the cake}

As can be seen in (33), a clitic “double” can optionally appear with a right-dislocated XP: \textsuperscript{35}

(33) \textit{Maria l'ha data a Giorgio, \textit{la torta}.}  
Maria it-has given to Giorgio, \textit{the cake.}

Note that just like the direct object argument in (32b) and (33), a locative PP can also be right-dislocated, appearing without or with a clitic:

(34)  
a. \textit{Maria è andata, alla stazione.}  
Maria is gone, to the station.

b. \textit{Maria ci è andata, alla stazione}  
Maria there is gone,, to the station.

As can be seen in (34b), then, in Italian the NDL clitic can occur with a PP, so long as the PP is right-dislocated. This contrasts with (30b,d), where the NDL clitic cannot occur with a non-right-dislocated PP. We must thus distinguish between a right-dislocated PP, such as that found in (34b), from what I will call here a "doubled PP", such as that found in the existentials (26) and (27) (where no intonational break precedes the PP).

Note that Borgomanerese is just like Italian in that it also allows right-dislocated PPs to occur with NDL ghi:

(35) \textit{La Maria l'è naci-ghi, a la stazion.}  
the Maria SCL is gone-there,, to the station  
"Maria went there, to the station."

Thus, whereas NDL ghi can occur with a right-dislocated PP (35), only locative expletive ghi can occur with a doubled PP (27). In order to establish that the ghi in (31)

\textsuperscript{34}Thus, Borgomanerese ghi has the same syntactic behavior as the "pleonastic" ye of Piedmontese (discussed in \S 3.2.1 above), which can also co-occur with a locative PP.

\textsuperscript{35}Buzio reports (personal communication) that the intonational break in (32b) is not as strong as that in (33).
is a locative expletive (and not a NDL), we must ensure that the co-occurring PPs are indeed doubled, not right-dislocated. If the latter is the case, then the presence of these PPs does not tell us anything about the status (NDL or locative expletive) of this ghi.

The most straightforward way to answer the question of whether the PPs in (31) are doubled or right-dislocated is to see if these PPs occur with no intonational break preceding them. To ensure that those PPs are not right-dislocated, we can also appeal to quantified XPs (Samek-Lodovici (1994)). Let us first look at Italian, where it is well known that quantified XPs cannot be right-dislocated ((36b) and (37b)), unlike non-quantified XPs (cf. (32b), (33), (34)):

\[\begin{align*}
(36) & \quad a. \text{Non ho presentato nessuno a Carlo.} \\
& \quad \text{neg have.1sg presented nobody to Carlo} \\
& \quad \text{"I have not introduced anybody to Carlo."} \\
& \quad b. \text{*Non ho presentato a Carlo, nessuno.} \\
& \quad \text{neg have.1sg presented to Carlo, nobody} \\
(37) & \quad a. \text{Maria non è andata da nessuna parte.} \\
& \quad \text{Maria neg is gone to no place.} \\
& \quad \text{"Maria did not go anywhere."} \\
& \quad b. \text{*Maria non è andata, da nessuna parte.} \\
& \quad \text{Maria neg is gone, to no place}
\end{align*}\]

Borgomanerese also disallows quantified XPs from being right-dislocated, as can be seen by the following sentences:

\[\begin{align*}
(38) & \quad a. \text{I o presentò-gghi nûn a l Carlo.} \\
& \quad \text{SCL have.1sg presented to him nobody to the Carlo} \\
& \quad \text{"I have not introduced anybody to Carlo"} \\
& \quad b. \text{*I o presentò-gghi zu l Carlo, nûn.} \\
& \quad \text{SCL have.1sg presented to him nobody to the Carlo, nobody}
\end{align*}\]

Given that a quantified XP in Borgomanerese cannot be right-dislocated, it follows that if a quantified PP is permitted in a sentence, it must not be right-dislocated. It also follows that if a quantified PP can appear with ghi, then the use of ghi in such a case must be as a locative expletive, since only locative expletive ghi allows a doubled (non-right-dislocated) PP to occur with it. As can be seen by the following sentence, the ghi in the ghi-construction can occur with a quantified PP:

\[\begin{align*}
(40) & \quad a. \text{Ngh è rõi-gghi nûn in nzûnna part.} \\
& \quad \text{SLOC is arrived-LOC no one to no place} \\
& \quad \text{"No one arrived anywhere."}
\end{align*}\]

I conclude from (40), then, that the ghi in the ghi-construction is a locative expletive, just like the ghi in the existential in (27).

A final piece of evidence lies in the behavior of deictic locatives, like chi ‘here’. Consider (41a), where chi occurs in a position to the left of the post-verbal subject, ensuring that it is not right-dislocated. We can see that only locative expletive ghi can co-occur with this deictic locative (cf. Italian in (42)):

\[\begin{align*}
(41) & \quad \text{Borgomanerese:} \\
& \quad a. \text{Ngh è chi-gghi di màri.} \\
& \quad \text{SLOC is here-LOC two masc boys} \\
& \quad \text{"There are two boys here."}
\end{align*}\]

---

\textsuperscript{28}As can be seen in (51) below, ghi is also the 3rd person singular and plural dative clitic (translating as "to him/her/them"). See §3.2.4.2.1 for a discussion of dative clitic doubling in Borgomanerese.
3.2.2.4 The semantic interpretation of `expletive' ghi

The ghi-construction is associated with a particular semantic interpretation not indicated in the translations thus far provided. 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, (14a) with the verb *rivà ‘arrive’ (repeated here as (44)):

(44) Ngh é rivà-gghi na sfola.
SLOC is arrived-LOC a girl
"A girl (has) arrived."

(44) can only describe an eventuality where the DP *a sfola ‘a girl’ has arrived in a location shared with the speaker. Thus, (44) cannot be used to describe an eventuality in which a girl arrived in China, if the person who utters (44) 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 (as in (46) and (47), to which we will turn immediately below).

The import of noting this restriction on the interpretation of the location-goal becomes clear when we consider sentences which do not contain locative expletive ghi. Consider for example the case of the verb *nà ‘leave’, where there is no ghi when the subject is post-verbal:

(45) L. é nà sfola.
SCL is gone a girl
"A girl left."

Borgomaneresce ghi thus has two different uses, like ci in Standard Italian: it can be used as a NDL, meaning either ‘here’ or ‘there,’ and it can also be used as a locative expletive. By comparing the existential constructions with sentences that contain NDL ghi, we have seen that only locative expletive ghi can be doubled by a PP or another deictic locative like chi. Since the ghi in the ghi-construction in (14) can be doubled by a PP or a deictic locative like chi, I conclude that its use in this construction is as a locative expletive, too.

Although I have been using the term ‘locative expletive’ to differentiate the ghi of the ghi-construction from NDL ghi, in what follows, I will present evidence which shows that the former has semantic content. As we shall see, the presence of locative expletive ghi affects the semantic interpretation of the eventuality.
As we discussed, leave does entail the existence of a location-source. However, unlike the location-goal in (44), the location-source in (45) does not have to include the speaker. As such, (45) 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.

Consider also the case of the GOAL-entailing verb rivè when it does not occur in the ghi-construction (i.e., when the subject is pre-verbal, and there is no locative expletive ghi):

(46) Na fìola l è rivè.
    a girl SCL is arrived.
    "A girl arrived."

In (46) (just as in (45) with the location-source), there is no restriction on interpretation of the location-goal at which the referent of the DP arrives. Consequently, (46) 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 locative expletive 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 locative expletive ghi forces the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location, but before we continue, I want to consider a possible objection. A close comparison of (44) and (46) reveals that in the former, the subject is post-verbal, while in the latter the subject is pre-verbal. Could it be that it is the post-verbal position of the subject which forces the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal? Note, however, that in (45) the subject is post-verbal, too, and there is no speaker-oriented restriction on the interpretation of the location-source. Still we might appeal to the fact that (45) 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 (46), in which locative expletive ghi is not present, we must conclude that the occurrence of this clitic with GOAL-entailing verbs is not obligatory. As can be seen by the following sentence, its presence is also optional when the subject is in post-verbal position (cf. (44)).

(47) L è rivè na fìola.
    SCL is arrived a girl
    "A girl arrived."

The important difference to note here between (44) and (47) is that (47) patterns with (46) with respect to the interpretation of the location-goal (and with (45) with respect to the location-source). Thus, the sentence in (47) 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 pre-verbal position

\[^{27}\text{If this were the explanation, it would not be clear why only GOAL, and not SOURCE, could be subject to such a speaker-oriented interpretation.}\]

\[^{28}\text{It should be noted that (47) is a marked sentence (as opposed to (44), which is unmarked). In particular, the sentence in (44) can be used out-of-the-blue, for example, as an answer to the question "What happened?!" In sentence (47), on the other hand, narrow focus is placed on the post-verbal subject na fìola. Thus, (47) can be used only in answer to the question "Who arrived?" We will discuss this contrast in much greater detail in the discussion of Italian in Chapter 4.}\]
of the subject, which correlates with the lack of a speaker-oriented restriction on the interpretation on the location entailed by the verb. It should be underscored that it is the locative expletive gbi which forces the speaker-oriented interpretation, and not NDL ghi. The following sentence with the NDL can be used to refer to any eventuality in which a girl has arrived, regardless of the location of the speaker:

(46) Na fiola l è rikh-gghi.
a girl SCL is arrived-here/there.
"A girl arrived here/there."

3.2.2.5 Summary: the ‘locative expletive’ is a weak locative goal argument

Let us review the two facts which support the hypothesis that locative expletive ghi is the morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category GOAL. First, it is homophonous with NDL ghi, and a hypothesis which connects the locative semantics of ghi with the GOAL-entailing semantics of its selecting verbs is preferred over one which does not connect these two facts. Second, and perhaps more significantly, the presence of locative expletive ghi has an effect on the interpretation of the GOAL entailed by arrive-type verbs. When locative expletive ghi is present, the GOAL must be interpreted as a speaker-oriented location. When locative expletive ghi is absent, there is no such restriction on the interpretation of the GOAL.

Some comments are now in order concerning an apparent paradox which arises given the above conclusion. That is, the ghi in the ghi-construction possesses two seemingly contradictory characteristics. On the one hand, it is ‘expletive-like’. Its characterization as an expletive-like element is based on (i) the intuitions of natives speakers that this morpheme, like the locative expletive in existentials, is semantically different from NDL ghi (and other deictic locatives), and (ii) the fact that its syntactic behavior differs from that of the NDL. Specifically, its ability to co-occur with a locative PP is reminiscent of the behavior of the Piedmontese “pleonastic” ye. On the other hand, however, we have evidence that this morpheme has semantic content. As noted, (i) it is selected only by GOAL-entailing VLMs, and (ii) its presence has an effect on semantic interpretation of the eventuality. Thus, we have identified locative expletive ghi as an expletive element that has semantic content.

To distinguish the ghi in the ghi-construction from pure expletives devoid of any semantic content, I will use the term weak locative goal argument (WLGA) for this morpheme. I adopt the term ‘weak’ from Cardinali & Starke (to appear), for reasons that will become clear below and in Chapter 5. For the moment, however, let us allow the term ‘weak’ to characterize the “intermediate” status of this element (expletive-like, yet has semantic content). I use the term ‘locative goal’ to capture the

29 The reader may be wondering at this point why the presence of locative expletive ghi should force this speaker-oriented interpretation of the GOAL. I will postpone an explanation of this fact until Chapter 5 (§5.4.2.1.1.1).
fact that this morpheme, when used with GOAL-entailing VIDMs, syntactically instantiates the lexical semantic category GOAL. Thus, I intend the term WLGA to identify this morpheme as it is used in the ghi-construction, it does not refer to the morpheme as it is used in the existential, since the existential does not entail a GOAL.  

3.2.3 The structure projected by GOAL-entailing VIDMs

The presence of ghi in the ghi-construction is an indication of a syntactic structure which is distinct from that projected by non-GOAL-entailing verbs, most straightforwardly because it must be the case that this clitic occupies some position in the syntax. The next question that arises, then, is what the structure projected by a GOAL-entailing verb in the ghi-construction is.

Let us consider the semantics of GOAL-entailing VIDMs. These verbs entail motion along a path, and as noted repeatedly above, the existence of a necessarily

comes to the correct identification of linguistic entities. For example, native speakers normally do not have any intuitions about a particular morpheme that the linguist may identify as agreement, or a subject clitic, or a complementizer. Nevertheless, linguists are able to identify the linguistic status of such elements. Thus, the fact that native speakers have an intuition that the WLGA does not "refer" to any location cannot in itself decide the issue.

3As Freeze (1992) (and others cited therein) have noted, it can be argued that existentials entail a location, and that the locative expletive that occurs in existentials in many languages identifies the entailed location. The hypothesis put forth in this dissertation concerning the WLGA and the lexical semantic category GOAL does not preclude an analysis of the locative expletive as used in existentials as a location-denoting argument. In the context of the above discussion, the locative expletive in existentials could be termed the weak locative argument (see §3.3 below for a brief discussion of the existential). In this work, however, I am mainly concerned with the locative expletive as it occurs with GOAL-entailing VIDMs.

reached location-goal which concludes the motion along the path. Thus, these verbs are accomplishments (in the sense of Vendler (1957)), or telic, or delimited eventualities (see, for example, Tenny (1987; 1994)), since there is a terminus to the event. It is well known that the telicity of an eventuality can be determined by an argument of the verb, which can define the goal or conclusion of the eventuality (cf. Jackendoff (1990:30), who discusses the various factors which can affect the aspect of an eventuality; see also Verkuyl (1989)).

Consider now the case of GOAL-entailing verbs, which denote telic eventualities. The single direct object argument projected by a GOAL-entailing VIDM is not the argument which provides the telic interpretation; rather, it is the GOAL which does so. It follows that if ghi in Borgomanese is the overt instantiation of GOAL, then ghi is the element which provides the telic interpretation of the eventuality. Since internal arguments determine the aspect of an eventuality, let us conclude that ghi must be an argument of the verb. Further evidence that the GOAL XP which optionally occurs with arrive-type verbs is an argument comes from the 'do-so' test in English. It is well known that in English, do so obligatorily replaces argument XPs along with the verb (compare (49a) with (49c)):

(49)  
  a. John put the book on the table, and Mary did so on the floor.
  b. John put the book on the table, and Mary did so, too.
  c. John read the book in N.Y. and Mary did so in Delaware.

As can be seen in the following example, the GOAL XP at the station has the same status as the argument PP selected by put:

46  47
(50) a. *John arrived at the airport, and Mary did so at the station.
   b. John arrived at the airport, and Mary did so, too.

Of course, since the GOAL entailed by arrive-type verbs is implicit, the absence of an overt argument expressing this location-goal is permitted, and as such we find sentences like (46) and (47), which do not project ghi. Nevertheless, the existence of the ghi-construction in Borgomanerese shows that if a weak locative morpheme is available in the language, the lexical semantic category GOAL entailed by arrive-type verbs can be syntactically expressed using the weak locative morpheme.\(^{21}\)

If ghi is an argument of arrive-type verbs, then we can no longer assume that when it is projected, arrive-type verbs are monadic, projecting the structure in (2) (repeated here):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{do}}
\end{array}
\]

Rather, they are optionally dyadic, unlike other unaccusatives. One argument is that which is normally taken to be the ‘subject’ of the sentence (i.e., the d-structure object), and the other is the location-GOAL, which is ghi in the ghi-construction in

Borgomanerese. These verbs are nevertheless unaccusative, if we take the defining property of unaccusativity to be the phenomenon of not projecting an external argument (i.e., verbs which do not assign a subject 0-role, according to Burzio’s Generalization). Thus, the two arguments projected by a GOAL-entailing verb are both internal. Since ghi is a GOAL, let us take it to be the indirect object argument. This proposal is supported by the fact that ghi is specified for dative Case. As can be seen by the following paradigm, it is homophonic only with the third person dative clitic pronoun:\(^{31}\)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Accusative clitics:} & \text{Dative clitics:} \\
\text{sing.} & \text{pl.} & \text{sing.} & \text{pl.} \\
1 & \text{mi} & \text{ni} & \text{mi} & \text{ni} \\
2 & \text{ti} & \text{vi} & \text{ti} & \text{vi} \\
3 & \text{lo} (m) / \text{la} (f) & \text{i} (m/f) & \text{ghi} (m/f) & \text{ghi} (m/f)
\end{array}
\]

In this sense, GOAL-entailing verbs are like give, only give also projects an external argument. Although there is much controversy concerning the structure projected by a verb such as give, for the present purposes I adopt a Larsonian shell

\[\text{\textsuperscript{21}}\text{The fact that a GOAL-entailing VIDM can occur with an overt PP (Mary arrived at the station) reveals that the lexical semantic category GOAL can always be syntactically instantiated by a referential argument. Similarly, a non-GOAL-entailing VIDM can occur with an overt referential XP specifying the SOURCE (John left the room), so in this sense the lexical semantic category SOURCE can be syntactically instantiated as well (see §3.3 for further discussion). The phenomenon described here, however, must be distinguished: only GOAL-entailing VIDMs may select the weak locative morphemes as the WLGA.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{31}}\text{This contrasts with Italian ci, which is homophonic with the first person plural clitic pronoun, which is both accusative and dative:} \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Accusative clitics:} & \text{Dative clitics:} \\
\text{sing.} & \text{pl.} & \text{sing.} & \text{pl.} \\
1 & \text{mi} & \text{el} & \text{mi} & \text{el} \\
2 & \text{ti} & \text{vi} & \text{ti} & \text{vi} \\
3 & \text{lo(m)/la(f)} & \text{i(m)/i(f)} & \text{ghi(m)/i(f)} & \text{ghi(m/f)}
\end{array}
\]
(Lason (1988a)) to demonstrate the structure projected by rivi in Borgomanerese (at the moment nothing crucial hinges on adopting this particular structure): 34

(52)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rivi, Spec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na fiola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This contrasts with the structure projected by né ‘leave’, which only has a single direct object argument: 35

(53)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nè DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na fiola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated in footnote 14, the surface position of ghi seen in (44) results from its object clitic status. Note also that ghi in (52) is dominated by an XP node. For the moment I leave the category of this morpheme unspecified. However, I assume

34 An alternative analysis that may come to mind would involve a small clause as the complement of the verb (cf. Kayne’s (1995-69) analysis of give). Moro (1993; 1997), for example, proposes such a structure for Italian existential and unaccusatives, with locative clitic in the former and pro in the latter functioning as the predicate of the small clause. Moro’s analysis will be discussed in much greater detail in Chapter 4.

35 Of course, when a verb like leave projects a referential PP (see footnote 32), then it too must be taken to project the structure in (52) (with the PP occupying the position occupied by the XP ghi).

(following Uriagereka (1995), among others) that clitics head an XP projection. In what follows, we will look more closely at the internal structure of this clitic. In order to do so, however, it will be necessary to first discuss the nature of the pre-verbal clitic ngh.

3.2.4 Pre-verbal ngh

In this section we will discuss the nature of the preverbal clitic ngh occurring in the ghi-construction. The only possible analysis of this clitic is as a subject clitic, indicating that there is a phonologically null locative occupying subject position. This conclusion in turn leads to a discussion of the internal structure of the XP dominating the clitic ghi in (52) above.

3.2.4.1 Ngh is a subject clitic

As can be seen in (44) and (47) (repeated here as (54) and (55)), ngh is in complementary distribution with the subject clitic l:

(54) Ngh é rivi-ghi na fiola.
    SLOC is arrived-LOC a girl
    “A girl (has) arrived.”

(55) L é rivi na fiola.
    SCL is arrived a girl
    “A girl arrived.”

Since ngh occupies the position of a subject clitic, we can conclude that it, too, must be a subject clitic.
A possible objection to this conclusion might be suggested by a fact noted by Roberts (1991; 1993), who discusses four varieties of Valdostain which exhibit subject clitics in the compound tenses (see footnote 13 above). He notes that although these subject clitics are obligatory in the absence of any other clitics in the sentence, they disappear in the presence of an object clitic which raises to pre-auxiliary position (a phenomenon he terms "OCL for SCL"). This is exhibited, for example, in the variety of Ayas, which allows object clitics to encliticize to the past participle (56a) or move to pre-auxiliary position (56b):

(56) a. \textit{Gmune l a v\textit{i}-me,}
    nobody SCL has seen\textit{-me}
    "Nobody has seen me."

b. \textit{Gmune m a v\textit{i}-m,}
    nobody me has seen\textit{me}
    "Nobody has seen me."

c. \textit{*Gmune l m a v\textit{i}-m,}
    nobody SCL me has seen\textit{me}

d. \textit{*Gmune m l a v\textit{i}-m,}
    nobody me SCL has seen\textit{me}

As can be seen in (56b), when the object clitic \textit{me} moves to pre-auxiliary position, it displaces the subject clitic \textit{l}. Roberts explains this complementary distribution by claiming that clitics cannot adjoin to other clitics. When an object clitic moves to a head which is normally occupied by the subject clitic, the latter can no longer occupy that position, and thus disappears.

Given the facts of Valdostain, it cannot be the case that whenever a subject clitic is in complementary distribution with another clitic, the clitic that replaces it must also be a subject clitic. The clitic \textit{ngh} in Borgomanerese might therefore be an object clitic which has moved up to occupy the position normally occupied by the subject clitic, as in Valdostain. There is a reason, however, why this analysis is not tenable. As already noted in footnote 14 above, in Borgomanerese we find no instance of an object clitic (direct, indirect, or oblique) climbing to a position any higher than to the right of the verb. Thus, any clitic we find in pre-verbal position in Borgomanerese (e.g., \textit{ngh}) cannot be an object clitic.

3.2.4.2 Ngh: evidence for a null locative in Spec, IP

Now that we have determined that \textit{ngh} is a subject clitic, the next question to ask is what licenses its presence. To answer this question, we must briefly review the phenomenon of subject clitics.

There is no way to adequately summarize in the present work the vast amount of complex facts surrounding the phenomenon of subject clitics in the Northern Italian dialects. For this I refer the reader to Polletto (1993), (in press), and (in preparation), who surveys over 100 dialects and concludes that there are at least four distinct types of subject clitics to be found in these languages. Nevertheless, for the present purposes, we can characterize the type of subject clitic found in Borgomanerese.
As can be seen in (57a-c), Borgomanese has the type of subject clitic that varies according to the subject which occupies Spec, IP.:

(57) a. La Maria la leggia il libro.
the Maria SCL reads the book.
"Maria is reading the book."

b. L Piero al leggia il libro.
the Piero SCL reads the book.
"Piero is reading the book."

c. Te tal leggia il libro.
you SCL read the book.
"You are reading the book."

Thus, la occurs with a third person singular feminine subject, al occurs with a third person singular masculine subject, and tal occurs with the second person singular subject. Following Brandi & Cordin (1986), Rizzi (1986), and Poletto (1993), I assume that these clitics function as a form of agreement with the overt subject in Spec, IP.

Note that these clitics obligatorily appear in the absence of an overt subject, as well:

(58) a. La leggia il libro.
SCL reads the book.
"She is reading the book."

b. Al leggia il libro.
SCL reads the book.
"He is reading the book."

c. Tal leggia il libro.
SCL read the book
"You are reading the book."

I conclude on the basis of the data in (58) (again, following the above authors) that Borgomanese is a pro-drop language (like Italian). When there is no overt subject, the subject clitics agree with a pro in subject position:

(59) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
\text{pro} \\
\text{Agr} \\
\text{AgrP} \\
\end{array}
\]

Now that we have determined that subject clitics in Borgomanese are of the type that identify a pro in subject position, let us return to the question of the nature of the subject clitic nga. Given its near identity to the locative clitic ghi, and the fact that it co-occurs with it, let us assume that it is a locative clitic, too.\[2\] Now, so we have

\[2\] Note that the lack of complete identity with the object locative clitic ghi should not deter us from assuming that nga is a locative. Subject clitics are commonly distinct from their object clitic counterparts in the Northern Italian dialects. For example, while the third person singular masculine subject clitic is al, its object clitic counterpart is in. Similarly, the second person singular subject clitic is tal (or t), while its object clitic
just seen, subject clitics in Borgomanerese agree with an phonologically null subject in Spec, IP. The inescapable conclusion, then, is that the presence of the locative subject clitic ngh signals the presence of a co-indexed phonologically null locative in Spec, IP.

Let us call this XP pro-loc:

(60)

Further evidence that there is a phonologically null element occupying subject position in the ghi-construction comes from agreement facts. As can be seen in (61), the ghi-construction involves obligatory 3rd person singular marking on the verb, even in the presence of a plural subject:28

(61) a. ngh è rivà gghi do mati.
SLOC is arrived-LOC two.fem girls

counterpart is n. There is no reason to assume, then, that the subject clitic version of the locative should be identical to the object clitic version of the locative. The nature of the ngh in the subject clitic locative will be discussed in the Appendix at the end of the chapter.

28See Cardinaletti (1997) and Chomsky (1995:Chapter 4) for a discussion of agreement patterns with post-verbal subjects across languages; in §5.4.2.2.1 below I discuss how this agreement pattern relates to Case assignment.

Note that in Chapter 4 I propose that Italian arrive-type verbs (like in Borgomanerese) optionally project a pro-loc. However, Italian (like English; see Chapter 5), in contrast with Borgomanerese, generally exhibits agreement with the post-verbal subject (Sono arrivato due ragazze ‘Are arrived two girls’ / *E’ arrivato due ragazze ‘is arrived two girls’), in spite of the presence of pro-loc. I will simply assume that pro-loc in Italian, like there in English (see references cited above), does not have the features necessary to trigger agreement.

b. *Ngh 0j n rivaj gghi do mati.
SLOC (SCL) are arrived.pl-LOC two.fem girls

This supports the hypothesis that a phonologically null XP (i.e., pro-loc) occupies Spec, IP in the ghi-construction. In (61a), it is pro-loc which triggers agreement with the verb. In contrast, when ngh...ghi is absent, agreement with the post-verbal subject is obligatory (62) (cf. (47)):

SCL(3sg) is arrived two.fem girls

b. J n rivaj do mati.
SCL(3pl) are arrived.pl two.fem girls

Under our analysis, the lack of 3rd person singular marking on the verb in (62b) indicates the lack of a pro-loc.

The conclusion that a pro-loc occupies Spec, IP in the ghi-construction now raises the following questions. What is this phonologically null locative? Where does it come from?

3.2.4.2.1 Pro-loc: the null locative

We have thus far seen that there are three locatives in the ghi-construction:

the subject clitic ngh, the phonologically null locative (pro-loc), and ghi itself. Why is there such a proliferation of locatives? The existence of a locative subject clitic in addition to the empty locative in subject position simply follows from the fact that

Borgomanerese is a subject clitic language (i.e., it has overt subject clitics which agree
with the subject in Spec, IP). But why is there a ghi in addition to the empty locative in subject position?

To account for this, consider the fact that Borgomanerese is a dative clitic-doubling language. As seen in (63), Borgomanerese dative arguments are doubled by a dative clitic:

(63)  a. la Maria la paria-ghi a l Piero.
      the Maria SCL speaks-to him to the Piero
      "Maria speaks to Piero."

   b. Te tal de-ghi a l Maria.
      you SCL give-to him to the Maria
      "You give it to Maria."

Recall from §3.2.3 our claim that the WLGA ghi is the indirect (dative) object argument of the verb it occurs with. I would like to propose here a slight modification of that conclusion. Let us say that both the phonologically null locative (pro-loc) and ghi are indirect object arguments of arrive-type verbs. This conclusion takes advantage of the fact that Borgomanerese is a dative clitic-doubling language, accommodating both pro-loc and ghi by placing pro-loc to be the dative double of the locative clitic ghi, much as l Piero is the dative double of the dative clitic ghi in (63a). At this point, then, we must slightly adjust our previous assumptions: we will now take the pro-loc to be the WLGA. The clitic ghi occurs with pro-loc in a clitic-doubling relationship. I assume that pro-loc is simply part of the morphological inventory of Borgomanerese.

Adopting Uriagereka's (1995) analysis of clitic-doubling, we can account for the co-occurrence of both the pro-loc and ghi by positing that at d-structure pro-loc (the dative double) is in the Spec of the XP headed by ghi. Let us refer to this XP as 'LocP'. Thus, the internal structure of the indirect object XP (=LocP) seen in (52) (repeated here for convenience as (64)) is actually as in (65).40

(64)  VP
      |  V
      |  V_p
      Spec
      na Pala
      V
      V

(65)  WLGA clitic-doubling

LocP
   Spec
   pro-loc
      Loc
      ghi

The revised VP structure is thus the following:

---

39Note that ghi is simply the morphological realization of the clitics ghi and l ("to-him" and "it") when they occur together.

40There is nothing crucial which hinges on the use of Uriagereka's Spec-Head analysis of clitic-doubling, which I use as a tool to illustrate how pro-loc and ghi are both base-generated as indirect object arguments.
The subject clitic *ghè is in the AgroP head, as per our discussion of (60) above. Ghè, like all objectitics, enclitics to the verb (not depicted in (67)).

3.2.4.2  Pro-loc and the i-subject

Note that if we can motivate the claim that movement of pro-loc to subject position is obligatory, we can explain the characteristic feature of the *ghi construction, namely, that the "subject" (e.g., na fòla in (44)) must be post-verbal (descriptively known as 'subject inversion').

Pro-loc is a phonologically null XP. It has been independently argued by Burzio (1986:129-130) (as well as Cardinaletti (1995) and Cardinaletti & Starke (to appear)) that pro, the more familiar phonologically null argument in Romance, must be pre-verbal (i.e., must be in Spec, IP). Burzio uses the following paradigm to show that pro can only occur pre-verbally ((68-69) correspond to Burzio's (105-105):

\[(68)\]  
\[\text{a. Io sono alla festa.} \]  
I am at the party

\[\text{b. Sono alla festa.} \]  
I am at the party

\[(69)\]  
\[\text{a. Ci sono alla festa.} \]  
LOC am I at the party

\[\text{b. *Ci sono alla festa.} \]  
LOC am I at the party

(68a) and (68b) are examples of a pre-verbal overt pronoun and pro-drop, respectively. As can be seen in (69), the subject pronoun io 'I' occurs post-verbally when the locative

---

To save space I have eliminated any functional projections (e.g., TP, AgroP) that may intervene between AgroP and VP.\[\]
explicative or occurs in subject position. (69b) shows that the presence of ci in subject position excludes pro-drop, suggesting that pro-drop cannot occur post-verbally, and hence that pro cannot be post-verbal.

Given the VP-internal subject hypothesis, I will assume that subject pro is base generated within VP, and its occupation of Spec, IP is a result of obligatory movement to that position. Cardinali & Stasse (to appear) and Cardinali & Starke (1996) independently argue that pro is a ‘weak’ pronoun. Weak pronouns, they show, cannot remain in their base positions, but rather must move overtly to Spec, IP. Consider, for example, the case of the pronoun egli ‘he’ vs. the pronoun lui ‘he’ in Italian. As can be seen in (70a,b), the pronoun lui can occur post-verbally as well as pre-verbally:

(70) a. Ha aderito lui.
has adhered he

b. Lui ha aderito.
he has adhered

Thus, lui behaves like any other noun:

(71) a. Ha aderito Gianni.
has adhered Gianni

b. Gianni ha aderito.
Gianni has adhered

Thus far we have examined two properties of weak pronouns: (i) they can refer to non-human entities, and (ii) they must move overtly to a Case-related position.

b. Egli ha aderito.
He has adhered

If the exclusively leftward nature of movement is assumed (Kayne 1995), we must conclude that the post-verbal subjects lui and Gianni are in their base-generated positions (Spec, VP) in (70a) and (71a). Since egli cannot occur post-verbally, we must further assume that it cannot remain in its base-generated position, but rather must move in the syntax to a Case-related position (Spec, IP).

Pronouns like egli are thus XPs which exhibit clitic-like behavior. Such weak pronouns also differ from ‘strong’ pronouns such as lui in that the former but not the latter may refer to non-human entities. This difference can be seen in (73a,b), where esse ‘they-fem’ may refer to either girls or roses, while loro ‘they-fem’ can refer only to girls. The weak nature of esse and the strong nature of loro is confirmed by the fact that loro can occur in its base position (74b), whereas esse cannot (74a).

(73) a. Esse sono troppo alte.
they-fem are very tall (=the girls; the roses)

b. Loro sono troppo alte.
they-fem are very tall

(74) a. *Hanno mangiato esse.
have eaten they-fem
(cf.: Essa hanno mangiato.)

b. Hanno mangiato loro.
have eaten they-fem

A more detailed discussion of Cardinali & Stasse’s theory of weak pronouns is deferred until Chapter 5.
As Cardinali & Starke (to appear) and Cardinali (1996) point out, pro qualifies as a weak pronoun. In addition to being used as a quasi-argument (75) and an impersonal (76), pro can have both human and non-human referents, as can be seen in (77):

(75) pro piave.
(76) pro mi hanno venduto un libro rovinato, in quel negozio.
(77) pro sono molto belle.

(= the girls; the roses)

(they) are very beautiful

If pro is a weak pronoun, like sogli and esse, then its obligatory presence in pro-verbal position, independently argued for by Burzio (1986), is explained.

Let us now return to the original question we set out to address in this subsection: if we can motivate the claim that movement of the pro-loc argument to subject position is obligatory, then we can explain the characteristic feature of the ghil construction (namely, that the “subject” must be post-verbal). It seems reasonable to assume that pro-loc, like pro, is weak. Like pro, then (and weak pronouns in general), pro-loc cannot remain in its base position and must move overtly to subject position, yielding (44), repeated here for convenience:

(44) Ngòkmì riv-k-ggùk na fiola.
SLOC is arrived-LOC a girl
“A girl (has) arrived.”

Given that pro-loc must occupy the subject position, the d-structure object cannot move to that position, and thus remains in situ (i.e., post-verbal). To put it differently, if the d-structure object were to move to Spec, IP instead of the pro-loc, this would result in ungrammaticality, since the pro-loc could not move to that position, as required. Thus, whenever pro-loc is projected, Spec, IP has to be left open for occupation of the pro-loc. The d-structure object thus remains in situ, yielding the “subject inversion” characteristic of the ghil-construction.

Recall that arrive-type verbs project the WLGA (i.e., pro-loc) optionally (cf. the discussion in §3.2.3). If the WLGA is not projected, then, the d-structure object can either remain in situ or move to subject position, yielding the sentences in (47) and (46), respectively (repeated here for convenience):

(47) L è rivà na fiola.
SCL is arrived a girl
“A girl arrived.”

(46) Na fiola l è rivà.
a girl SCL is arrived.
“A girl arrived.”

The option for the d-structure object to remain in situ follows from a more general property of Borgonuortese, which (like Italian) allows “free inversion”.

There are two final pieces of evidence that support the explanation provided here for obligatory subject inversion in the presence of pro-loc. First, as discussed above, pro-drop can only be pre-verbal. This follows from the fact that pro (as a weak
pronoun) must move in the syntax from its base-generated position. Thus, in the case of
a pro-drop construction like that in (78a), pro must move to Spec, IP, as in (78b). \(^44\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(78) a. } & \text{L } \text{è rivé.} \\
& \text{SCL is arrived.} \\
& \text{"He (has) arrived."}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (Spec) {Spec};
  \node (Agrs) [below left of=Spec] {Agrs'};
  \node (VP) [below right of=Spec] {VP};
  \node (Agrs') [below left of=VP] {Agrs'};
  \node (V) [below right of=VP] {V};
  \node (山西) [below right of=V] {rivé};
  \node (pro) [left of=Spec] {pro};
  \draw (Spec) -- (Agrs); \draw (Agrs) -- (VP);
  \draw (VP) -- (Agrs'); \draw (Agrs') -- (V);
  \draw (V) -- (山西);
\end{tikzpicture}
\]

Given this analysis, we predict pro-drop to be impossible in the presence of the WLGA.
That is, 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,
both need to move overtly to subject position (compare (78b) with (67)). Note that this
prediction is borne out:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(79) } & \text{Ngh \ è rivé-gghi.} \\
& \text{SLOC is arrived-LOC}
\end{align*}
\]

Second, Poletto (in preparation Chapter 6) argues that in Italian (as well as
in many Northern Italian dialects), when the negative quantifier nessuno 'nobody' is
used as a pre-verbal subject, as in (80a), it does not occupy Spec, IP, the canonical
subject position normally occupied by non-quantified DP subjects, but rather occupies a
higher Spec position. \(^45\) Note that the hypothesis that the subject nessuno 'nobody' in
Borgomanerese occupies a position other than Spec, IP (as Poletto argues for the
negative quantifier in Italian and other Italian dialects) allows us to make a prediction
with Spec, IP left open in the presence of the pre-verbal subject nessuno, the ghi-
construction should be possible, as pro-loc is free to move to that position. As can be
seen in (80b), this prediction is borne out; note that (80b) contrasts with (80c), in which
a non-quantified subject DP (La Maria) cannot occur pre-verbally in the presence of
pro-loc:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(80) a. } & \text{Nessuno è arrivato.} \\
& \text{nobody is arrived}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Nessuno ngh è rivé-gghi.} \\
& \text{nobody SLOC is arrived-LOC}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \text{La Maria ngh è rivé-gghi.} \\
& \text{the Maria SLOC is arrived-LOC}
\end{align*}
\]

To summarize, the above facts confirm that pro-loc is only licit when Spec,
IP is left open as a position into which it can move. Pro-loc and pro are incompatible
because each has the requirement that it must occupy Spec, IP; thus, if pro is present,
pro-loc is excluded (and likewise, if pro-loc is present, pro is excluded). In addition,
the hypothesis that nessuno occupies a position higher than Spec, IP (in contrast with other
subject DPs) explains why it is the only DP subject allowed to occur pre-verbally in the
ghi-construction; by leaving Spec, IP open, pro-loc is free to move to that position.

\(^44\) The structure in (78b), which does not involve a Lensonian shell, is essentially
the one seen in (53) projected by ne 'leave'; this is due to the fact that the second
internal argument is not projected in this case.

\(^45\) Poletto (in press) and (in preparation) argues extensively for a more articulated
functional structure, involving two AgrsP projections.
Thus, once we recognize that pro-loc must occupy Spec, IP, the ‘subject inversion’ nature of the ghi-construction is explained.

3.3 SOURCE-entailing verbs and the existential

The claim that pro-loc is the WLGA in Borgomanerese raises the question of the use of the ghi-construction for the existential (seen in (27)), given that the existential does not entail a GOAL. To address this question, I will take this opportunity to clarify our analysis of pro-loc.

The idea being presented here is that pro-loc is simply part of the morphological inventory of Borgomanerese, in the same way that NDL ghi and the deictic locatives chi ‘here’ and là ‘there’ are morphemes listed in the lexicon of the language. The difference between pro-loc, and, say, chi or là, is that pro-loc is a ‘weak locative’, while chi and là are ‘strong locatives’ (again, terminology adopted from C&S).46

Now, let us consider the fact that GOAL-entailing verbs and SOURCE-entailing verbs project their GOAL and SOURCE arguments optionally. As we have seen, the optionally projected argument of a SOURCE-entailing verb can be either a PP (81b), the NDL ghi (81c), or a deictic (strong) locative (81d):

(81) a. La Maria l’ è naci.
   the Maria SCL is gone

b. La Maria l’ è naci a la stazion.
   the Maria SCL is gone to the station

c. La Maria l’ è naci-gghi.
   the Maria SCL is gone-there

d. La Maria l’ è naci là.
   the Maria SCL is gone there

The optionally projected argument of a GOAL-entailing verb, like that of a SOURCE-entailing verb, can also be either a PP (82b), the NDL ghi (82c), or a deictic locative (82d):

(82) a. La Maria l’ è rivi.
   the Maria SCL is arrived

b. La Maria l’ è rivi a la stazion.
   the Maria SCL is arrived at the station

c. La Maria l’ è rivi-gghi.
   the Maria SCL is arrived there

d. La Maria l’ è rivi là.
   the Maria SCL is arrived here

The difference between SOURCE-entailing and GOAL-entailing verbs, however, lies in the ability of GOAL-entailing verbs to select pro-loc as the optionally projected argument:

(83) pro-loc nghi è rivi-gghi na féela.
    pro-loc SLOC is arrived-LOC a girl

The term weak locative goal argument allows us to differentiate this morpheme, as used with GOAL-entailing verbs, from the other locatives.

---

46One difference between a weak morpheme and a strong morpheme (noted in the preceding sub-section) is that while both are XPs, weak morphemes exhibit clitic-like behavior.
Let us now return to the question of the existential in Borgomaneroese. As noted, the existential appears to employ pro-loc as well, in spite of the fact that this construction does not entail a GOAL:

\[(84)\] pro-loc ngha g-gghi ire masaf.
pro-loc SLOC is-LOC three masaf boys

To account for the existential, I would like to suggest that pro-loc can also be used as the morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category LOCATION. Given this analysis, let us take pro-loc to be a weak locative morpheme which can be used either as the optionally projected GOAL argument (in which case it is the weak locative goal argument), or as the optionally projected LOCATION argument (in which case it is a weak locative argument (WLA)). Thus, the lexical semantic categories GOAL and LOCATION pattern together, while the odd man out is SOURCE.

3.3.1 Speculations on the relevant lexical semantic distinction between SOURCE vs. GOAL and LOCATION

The above observation raises the question as to why the weak locative (i.e., pro-loc in Borgomaneroese) cannot be used as the morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category SOURCE (in opposition to PPs, NDLOC, and deictic locatives). While I do not have an answer to this question, it seems that the conceptual categories GOAL and LOCATION must be formally distinguished from SOURCE, since the grammar is sensitive to this distinction. Here I provide a tentative analysis which formally distinguishes the former two lexical conceptual categories from the latter, which is based on Jackendoff’s (1990) observations concerning Goal and Location, and Pustejovsky’s (1991) theory of event structure. A more detailed analysis of the lexical conceptual distinction between GOAL/LOCATION and SOURCE is a matter for future research.

As Jackendoff (1990:27) notes, a “...be-sentence expresses the end-state of ...
[a... go-sentence.” He captures this relation via an inference rule, which essentially states that at the end of an event in which X goes to Y, it is the case that X is at Y. Note that this conceptual relation between GOAL and LOCATION does not hold for SOURCE and LOCATION. That is, at the end of an event in which X goes from Y, it is not the case that X is at Y (rather, X is not at Y). Given Jackendoff’s observation, it could in fact be argued that GOAL and LOCATION are one and the same lexical semantic category. The only difference between GOAL and LOCATION is that the former is embedded in a conceptual structure under the ‘Event’ GO, whereas the latter is embedded in a conceptual structure under the ‘State’ BE. This difference is sketched out in (85a,b) (adapted from Jackendoff (1990:27)), where X is the theme and Y is the location (let us take (85a) to roughly represent an event described by arrive):

\[(85)\] a. \([xX, G\o (X)], \text{TO} \ [\{Y\}])\]
b. \([xX, B\e (X)], \text{AT} \ [\{Y\}])\]

Thus, Y is both (85a,b) can be referred to as LOCATION.47

47Nevertheless, in the remainder of this work I will refer to the former as GOAL, for the sake of clarity.
However, note that according to Jackendoff, a SOURCE-entailing event (as opposed to a GOAL-entailing event or a state at a LOCATION) is differentiated only by the presence of the Path-function FROM (instead of TO or AT; assume (86) represents an event described by leave):

(86) ![Diagram](image)

Thus, while Jackendoff’s inference rule excludes an equation of a location-source with a state at a location, the above structures do not express any formal distinction between a location-source, a location-goal, and a state at a location; all three are expressed as the conceptual category \( Y \) (\( \sim \) LOCATION). Nevertheless, as we have seen, the weak locative in Boromaranerse (pro-loco) can only be used to instantiate the lexical semantic category LOCATION in (85a,b), and not that in (86). It seems, then, that the former and the latter must somehow be distinguished.

Once again, Pustejovsky’s (1991) analysis of event structure, which was discussed in §2.2.1, can provide a framework in which a location-source can be structurally distinguished from a location-goal and a state at a location. As we saw in §2.2.1, a GOAL-entailing event such as that described by the verb arrive can be represented as in (8), repeated here as (87):

(87) ![Diagram](image)

Note that in contrast, an existential does not involve such a dual event structure.

Rather, it is a ‘state’ with a non-complex event structure (in the same sense that a "process" has a non-complex event structure), which is represented in Pustejovsky’s system in the following way (\( S \) indicates "state"):

(88) ![Diagram](image)

As we saw, like arrive, the verb leave describes an event that involves two sub-events. In contrast with arrive, however, the resulting state described by leave is the negation of a state at a location. This was illustrated in (9) (repeated here as (89)), which describes a state at a location on the left branch, and the negation of that state on the right branch:

(89) ![Diagram](image)

Note that the above structures formally capture Jackendoff’s observation (expressed by his inference rule) which equates GOAL with LOCATION. If we compare (87) with (89), we note a structural difference. In (87) (the GOAL-entailing event), ‘state at a LOCATION \( Y \)’ is on the right branch of the event structure, while in (89) (the SOURCE-entailing event) ‘state at a LOCATION \( Y \)’ is on the left branch of the event structure. Now consider (88); by virtue of the fact that there is no left branch, the LOCATION is not on a left branch in the event structure. Viewed in this way, we can distinguish SOURCE from GOAL and LOCATION by stating that the former is the conceptual category LOCATION which occurs on the left branch of the event structure, while the latter two are instances of the conceptual category LOCATION which do not occur on the left branch of the event structure.
Let us now return to the fact that pro-loc, the weak locative morpheme in Boromo-Merese, cannot be selected by SOURCE-entailing verbs (in opposition to PPs, NDL ghi, and deictic locatives). Given the above analysis of the distinction between SOURCE on the one hand and GOAL/LOCATION on the other, we can state pro-loc’s restriction in the following way:

(90) Pro-loc cannot be used as the morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category LOCATION when LOCATION occurs on the left branch of the event structure.

Again, I cannot offer an explanation for the descriptive generalization in (90). Nevertheless, the above analysis allows us to capture the intuition that at some level, SOURCE-entailing and GOAL-entailing eventualities and the existential all entail the same conceptual category, namely, LOCATION. At the same time, it allows us to capture the fact that at another level, a location-source is grammatically distinguished from a location-goal and a state at a location.

3.4 Conclusions

The presence of the locative clitics ngh and ghi in the ghi-construction indicate the syntactic presence of a phonologically null locative morpheme, pro-loc. Although the locatives in the ghi-construction exhibit expletive-like properties, we have seen that the analysis of pro-loc as a WPGA has allowed us to explain two facts. One is the ‘subject-inversion’ nature of the ghi-construction. As a weak morpheme, pro-loc must move overtly from its base position to Spec, IP, leaving the subject stranded in post-verbal position. The fact that maa ‘nobody’ (which does not occupy Spec, IP) can occur as a pre-verbal subject in the ghi-construction is consistent with this analysis. The other fact this hypothesis allows us to explain is that the presence of pro-loc correlates with a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. This fact would not have an explanation if pro-loc were analyzed as a pure expletive, with no semant content. I also proposed that only unaccusatives which contain the lexical semantic category GOAL or LOCATION can optionally select pro-loc as a second internal argument. To explain why pro-loc cannot be associated with SOURCE, I appealed an analysis of event structure which would allow us to formally distinguish the former from the latter.
APPENDIX: What is the n?

One final aspect of the subject clitic ngh needs clarification. Ngh is a locative subject clitic, and its lack of morphological identity to ghi should not come as a surprise. However, it seems rather obvious that the gh in ngh is morphologically related to ghi. Less immediately obvious, however, is the nature of the n which precedes gh.

Many Italian dialects have a locative clitic (deriving from Latin HINC), that resembles Borgomanerese ngh: for example, Barese ngh, Neapolitan nè (Calabrese (1996)), and Sardinian nke (Jones (1993)). While at first sight it might seem more straightforward to analyze ngh as a single morpheme deriving from Latin HINC, there are three facts that lead me to assume that n and gh are two different clitics, the former most likely related to partitive ne in Borgomanerese.

First, although there are several Central and Southern Italian dialects that have a locative clitic deriving from Latin HINC (such as Neapolitan nè), to my knowledge there are no Northern Italian Dialects which have such a locative clitic. Second, in Biondelli (1853), there is an instance of the existential construction in Borgomanerese in which there is no n preceding the preverbal gh:

(91) Ali gh éra na bosta su chiu...
SCL LOC was a time a man...
"Once upon a time there was a man..."

The absence of n in an earlier stage of Borgomanerese suggests that it is a separate clitic.

Third, there are many Northern Italian dialects which exhibit a co-occurrence requirement between the locative expletive clitic and the partitive clitic. Many dialects related to Borgomanerese require the partitive clitic in the presence of the locative expletive clitic, and/or (vice-versa) the locative expletive clitic in the presence of the partitive clitic. For example, in varieties spoken in the Province of Belluno, the existential (which uses the locative expletive ghè) requires the presence of partitive ne (Nicola Munaro, personal communication), as can be seen in the following sentence:

(92) a. Che n è-lo Mario? (Italian: C'è Mario?)
LOC NE is-SCL Mario
"Is there Mario?"

b. Che n è-a na macchina? (Italian: C'è una macchina?)
LOC NE is-SCL a car
"Is there a car?"

It is important to note that partitive ne, when obligatorily used with the locative expletive in the existential, does not make any partitive semantic contribution to the sentence. This is attested by the fact that partitive ne is used with full DPs, both definite and indefinite, as well as with proper names (92a).

Padovano is an example of a language in which partitive ne requires the presence of the locative expletive clitic ghè (Paola Benincà, personal communication):

---

When an overt referential indirect object clitic is present, however, the locative expletive clitic does not appear:

(i) I me ne da do.
SCL to-me NE gives two "He gives two of them to me."
This demonstrates that the locative clitic ghè in (92) does not make a semantic contribution to the sentence.
Other dialects exhibit both co-occurrence requirements (i.e., the locative expletive requires the partitive clitic, and the partitive clitic requires the locative expletive). This is found, for example, in the dialect of Motta di Livenza, spoken in the Province of Treviso (data from the ASIS):

(94) Locative requires partitive:

Ghe n è un putel.
LOC NE is a boy
"There is a boy."

(95) Partitive requires locative:

I ghe ne parla tuti.
SCL LOC NE speak everyone
"Everyone speaks about it."

I do not offer an explanation for this co-occurrence requirement between the locative expletive clitic and the partitive. The point here is simply that, given that this co-occurrence requirement exists in many languages related to Borgomanerese, it seems plausible to assume that the n in the subject clitic ngh is the partitive clitic. 49 Again, it

49 A question which this analysis raises is why the partitive clitic precedes the locative in Borgomanerese, whereas in the other dialects cited it follows the locative. This fact may not be entirely unexpected once we note a morphological difference between the Borgomanerese partitive clitic and that found in the other dialects. In contrast with Borgomanerese, whose partitive clitic is nu (io vuesto-nu tre ‘I have seen three of them’), the partitive clitic in the other dialects is ne (like in Italian). It is possible that, unlike the partitive clitic in the other dialects, nu is actually composed of the partitive morpheme ne plus the epenthetic vowel u (P. Benincà, personal communication). The complex ngh (as opposed to ghi-n), then, may result from incorporation of the morphologically deficient n into gh within the clitic cluster.

We must also note that the order partitive-locative is only found in the subject

must be noted that, as in the cases discussed above, the partitive clitic in this case does not have any partitive semantic import (compare, for example, the meaning of (93), which is a true partitive, and the meaning of (14b)).

---

49 ngh, where the alleged partitive clitic n has no partitive semantic value. The order locative-partitive is found when the partitive is used with its true partitive semantics:

(i) Ngh d-gghu tre
SLOC is-GHI.NU three

The clitic gh is the morphological realization of the two clitics ghi (locative) and nu (partitive).
4.1 Introduction

Unlike Borgomanerese, Italian has no direct evidence for a WLGA. However, in this chapter we will see that Italian also makes a distinction between GOAL-entailing and SOURCE-entailing VIDsMs. The facts of Italian parallel those of Borgomanerese; the i-subject of GOAL-entailing VIDsMs can get an unmarked interpretation, while the i-subject of SOURCE-entailing VIDsMs only gets a focused interpretation. Furthermore, only in the former case does the location-goal get a speaker-oriented interpretation. I show that this set of facts is best explained by positing the existence of an optionally projected phonologically null WLGA (pro-loc). Just as in Borgomanerese, I will show that SOURCE-entailing verbs cannot optionally select pro-loc as a second internal argument. This proposal contrasts with the influential analysis provided by Moro (1993;1997), who claims that all unaccusatives select a SC complement with a null locative predicate. I provide a close comparison of the two proposals, and argue that the present one is to be preferred. In the Appendix, I provide a brief discussion of accounts in the literature (Sacco (1992) and DelRìto & Plato (1992)) for the correlation between the projection of a null locative and the unmarked status of the V S word order.

4.3 The weak locative goal argument in Italian

In the previous chapter we saw that the ghì-construction in Borgomanerese involves a phonologically null locative (pro-loc), which is the weak locative goal argument (WLGA), optionally projected by arrive-type verbs. I argued that the ghì in the ghì-construction is the dative clitic double of pro-loc, which is base generated as an indirect object argument, and that the ghì is a subject clitic which agrees in features with the pro-loc (which occupies Spec, IP at t-structure). The appearance of the clitic ghì follows from the fact that Borgomanerese is a subject clitic language, and the appearance of the clitic ghì follows from the fact that Borgomanerese is a dative clitic doubling language.

We saw that the ghì of the ghì-construction, which was also descriptively dubbed ‘locative expletive ghì’ (in order to differentiate it from the NDL ghì ‘here’ / ‘there’), is used in the existential construction in Borgomanerese as well:

(96) Nghi è ghì che mangia la stecca.
SLOC is-LOC three * nice boys in the room
"There are three boys in the room."

As we saw, Italian also uses its locative clitic, ci, as a locative expletive in the existential construction:
(97) Ci sono tre ragazzi nella stanza.
   LOC are three boys in the room.
   "There are three boys in the room."

While Bergomansere uses its locative expletive *gli* with arrive-type verbs (as the clitic double of the WLGA pro-loc) in addition to existentials, it is well known that Italian does not use the locative expletive *ci* with arrive-type verbs with post-verbal subjects, as the following example shows:

(98) *Ci *è arrivata una ragazza. (intended interpretation)
   LOC is arrived a girl
   "A girl arrived."

In fact, unlike Bergomansere, Italian exhibits no overt syntactic difference between GOAL-entailing and non-GOAL-entailing VTDs with post-verbal subjects:

(99) E' arrivata una ragazza.
    is arrived a girl.
    "A girl arrived."

(100) E' partita una ragazza.
      is left a girl.
      "A girl left."

Comparing (97) with (98) and (99), then, we might conclude that arrive-type verbs in Italian do not project a WLGA. However, recall our explanation for the occurrence of *gli* in the *gli*-construction in Bergomansere: *gli* is the dative clitic double of pro-loc.

If we consider the fact that Italian is not a dative clitic doubling language, then pro-loc in Italian would not be doubled by *ci*. In other words, the lack of dative clitic doubling means that the presence of pro-loc in Italian would not be signaled by an overt morpheme in (99). We thus have no direct evidence either for or against the hypothesis that arrive-type verbs in Italian project a phonologically null WLGA.

### 4.2.1 Indirect evidence for the WLGA

It was first pointed out by Antinucci & Cinque (1977) that monadic verbs split into two groups with respect to unmarked word order. The unmarked word order for verbs like *fumare* ‘smoke’ and *dormire* ‘sleep’ is S-V, while verbs like *arrivare* ‘arrive’ and *venire* ‘come’ allow V-S as the unmarked word order. That is, given an unmarked context (such as that in (101)), the sentence in (102) with *arrivare* is grammatical, whereas the sentence in (103) with *dormire* is not (compare (103) with (104)):

(101) C'è succeduto?
      "What's happening?"

(102) *Arriva* Maria.
      arrives Maria
      "Mary is arriving."

(103) *Dorme* Maria.
      sleeps Maria

(104) Maria dorme.
      Maria sleeps
      "Mary is sleeping."

---

{The question as to what licenses 'locative expletive' *ci* in existentials in Italian will be addressed in §4.3.3 below.

As Samek-Lodovici (1994) points out, the order V-S in (103) forces a contrastive focus interpretation on the post-verbal subject. This phenomenon will be discussed in more detail immediately below.}
Many researchers since Antinucci & Cinque (1977) (e.g., Calabrese (1992), Delfitto & D'Hulst (1994), Delfitto & Pinto (1992), Pinto (1994), among others) have claimed that this difference in behavior with respect to unmarked word order correlates with the unergative-unaccusative distinction. 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 Benuač (1988a), the word order V-S is not the unmarked word order for all unaccusatives in Italian. In particular, she showed that given an unmarked context such as that in (101), the sentence in (105) with partire ‘leave’ is inappropriate.\footnote{\textsuperscript{52}}

\begin{center}
(105) \text{"Parte Maria, leaves Maria"}
\end{center}

The order V-S yields a marked interpretation for the single argument of partire.

Specifically, the post-verbal subject in (105) can only be interpreted as contrastively focused, similarly to what we saw above (footnote 51) for the unergative verb dovere.\footnote{\textsuperscript{51}} Thus, (105) can be used felicitously only in a context which allows for a contrastive focus interpretation of the post-verbal subject, such as that in (106a):

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{52}This is also noted for the verb andarsene ‘leave’ (andare ‘go’+SI-NE) in Antinucci & Cinque (1977:126-127, footnote 2; see footnote 57 below). Note that the ‘*’ in (105) is intended to indicate the ungrammaticality of this string in an unmarked context, not absolute ungrammaticality.
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{51}Here the term ‘contrastive focus’ is used to indicate an interpretation of the DP as an individual which necessarily belongs to a set of known individuals. In sentence (106b), Maria is interpreted as belonging to a set of individuals (e.g., a set which includes Maria, Gimena, Lucia, & Clorinda) which constitutes the context in which the DP Maria can receive an interpretation in post-verbal position. The term ‘contrastive focus’ as used here thus does not entail a negation or a contradiction of a previously mentioned entity, but rather refers to the contrast between the referent of the DP and the other members of the set to which it belongs.
\end{center}
4.2.1.1 GOAL and the unmarked I-subject

Benincà (1988a) proposed that the interpretive difference between (102) (unmarked) and (106b) (marked) is related to the fact that arrivare has an “implicit locative”, whereas partire does not. Specifically, she points out (p. 124) that partire differs from arrivare in that it does not have a subcategorized locative argument (the goal)... For the purposes of exposition, let us refer to Benincà’s hypothesis as the

GOAL-hypothesis. Note that the GOAL-hypothesis makes a prediction: all VIDMs which entail a GOAL should pattern with arrivare in (102), while VIDMs which do not entail a GOAL should pattern with partire in (106b) (with respect to the interpretation of the post-verbal subject). If this prediction is borne out, then we are led to believe that the GOAL-hypothesis is correct.

4.2.1.1.1 Come, return, and enter vs. escape and exit

Recall from the discussion in Chapter 2 that the verbs in (107) were classified as GOAL-entailing verbs, while the verbs in (108) were classified as non-GOAL-entailing (SOURCE) verbs:

(107) arrive, come, return, enter
(108) leave, escape, exit

The GOAL-hypothesis predicts that the verbs in (107) should allow V-S as the unmarked word order, while the verbs in (108) should not. Note that this prediction is borne out. The sentences in (109) are grammatical in an unmarked context, while the sentences in (110) are not.

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 likely that they can be subsumed under the analysis provided for arrive-type verbs.

Benincà suggests (p. 125) that the possibility of an unmarked post-verbal subject depends on the presence of a locative argument, which can serve as the theme (or “given” – as opposed to theme) of the sentence. See the Appendix at the end of this chapter for a review of various explanations in the literature for the interpretive difference between (102) and (106b). Benincà also notes that the implicit locative has a “deictic” interpretation; I will discuss this fact in detail in §4.2.1.2 below.

For many speakers, the difference between (102) and (106b) is much sharper in the non-compound tenses. The difference becomes less clear, for example, in the present perfect:

(i) E' arrivata Maria.
     is arrived Maria
(109) a. Viene Maria.
    comes Maria
b. Torna Maria.
    returns Maria
c. Entra Maria.
    enters Maria

(109) a. *Scappa Maria.
    escapes Maria
b. *Esce Maria.
    exits Maria

Note that in Italian the verb andarsene 'leave' also disallows V-S as the unmarked word order (noted by Atrinucci & Cinque (1977); see footnote 52 above), thus patterning like a SOURCE-entailing verb (cf. the verb né 'go' in Borgomanerese (15a,b), which is also used to mean leave).²⁷

(ii) ??? Es parte Maria.
    is left Maria
Since the presence of perfective aspect confounds this effect, I will only consider the simple tenses.

²⁷The verb andarsene 'leave' is morphologically composed of the verb andare 'go' plus the two clitics si (reflexive si; the allomorph se is used when si clusters with another clitic) and ne (the participial clitic). The verb andare 'go' (without the clitics se-ne) allows a post-verbal 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) E' andato Maria.
    is gone Maria
(ii) Maria è già andata.
    Maria is already gone
The sentence in (i), if used in an unmarked context, can only mean that Maria went someplace (GOAL), while the sentence in (ii) can either mean that Maria went someplace (GOAL), or that Maria left (SOURCE). These facts suggest that the verb andare 'go' is ambiguous between GOAL-entailing and non-GOAL-entailing; andarsene 'leave', however, is unambiguously SOURCE-entailing. For further discussion of VIDs which are ambiguous between GOAL-entailing and non-GOAL-

(111) *Se ne va Maria.
    SE NE go Maria
To summarize, the VIDS which I claimed to be GOAL-entailing (and which occur in the ghi-construction in Borgomanerese) allow V-S as the unmarked word order, while the VIDS which I claimed to be non-GOAL-entailing do not.

4.2.1.1.2 a-telic VIDS

Now let us turn to the behavior of a-telic VIDS. Recall (Chapter 2) that a-telic VIDS such as descend are ambiguous between non-GOAL-entailing (atelic) and GOAL-entailing (telic) in English. The Italian verb scendere 'descend' is also ambiguous between non-GOAL-entailing and GOAL-entailing, as can be seen by

(112) a. L'aereo è sceso per 5 minuti.
the airplane is descended for 5 minutes
"The airplane descended for 5 minutes."

b. L'aereo è sceso (sulla pista) in 5 minuti.
the airplane is descended (on the runway) in 5 minutes
"The airplane descended (onto the runway) in 5 minutes."

The GOAL-hypothesis makes a specific prediction with respect to a-telic VIDS like scendere. In particular, it is predicted that in an unmarked context, the word order V-S for this verb can be interpreted as grammatical only if it is interpreted as telic scendere (i.e., only if it is interpreted as an arrive-type verb, entailing a GOAL). To put it

entailing, see §4.2.1.1.2 below.
differently, the interpretation of this verb as non-GOAL-entailing (as atelic *scendere*) in an unmarked context should be impossible with the word order V-S, if it is indeed the case that non-GOAL-entailing verbs do not allow this word order in an unmarked context. Now let us see whether this prediction is borne out.

Consider example (113), in which the subject of *scendere* is in post-verbal position. In an unmarked context (such as that in (101) "What's happening?"), the verb in (113) can only be interpreted as entailing a GOAL (i.e., the Spitfire has to have landed). This is confirmed by the fact that the order V-S with *scendere* is incompatlible with a durative phrase in an unmarked context:

(113) *E’ sceso* *Lo Spitfire* (*per 5 minuti*).
     is descended the Spitfire (*for 5 minutes*)
     "The Spitfire descended (*for 5 minutes")."

Thus, our prediction is borne out: when the subject of *scendere* is post-verbal, the sentence can only be interpreted as grammatical in an unmarked context if the verb is interpreted as entailing a GOAL (i.e., it patterns with *arrivare*).

Note that there is another part to the prediction made by the GOAL-hypothesis. In particular, this hypothesis predicts that given a context in which the post-verbal subject of *scendere* is interpreted as contrastively focused, this verb should be interpretable as non-GOAL-entailing (i.e., as atelic *scendere*). In other words, it should behave like *partire*. The sentence in (114) provides the context in which the post-verbal subject in (115) can be interpreted as contrastively focused. The grammaticality of (115) establishes that the prediction is borne out:

(114) *What descended for 5 minutes?*
     (set: a dirigible, a helicopter, the Spitfire)

(115) *E’ sceso* *Lo Spitfire* (*per 5 minuti*).
     is descended the Spitfire (*for 5 minutes*)
     "The Spitfire descended (*for 5 minutes")."

Thus, if the post-verbal subject of *scendere* is contrastively focused, the verb is interpretable as non-GOAL-entailing (i.e., it behaves like *partire*), as is attested by its compatibility with a durative phrase.

The GOAL-hypothesis thus makes correct predictions. Note, however, that the following question arises at this point: is it simply the lexical semantic category GOAL entailed by arrive-type verbs which allows V-S as the unmarked word order, or is it the syntactic instantiation of this lexical semantic category, i.e., the presence of a phonologically null WLGA (a *pro-loc*) which allows V-S as the unmarked word order? In other words, 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 WLGA.

---

5Given the facts concerning Italian *scendere*, the question arises as to what the facts are concerning the same verb in Borgomanerese; if it is the syntactic presence of a *pro-loc* which is responsible for the telic interpretation of the eventuality (as well as the unmarked interpretation of the V-S word order), we would expect the same verb in Borgomanerese to occur with *ngh...(ghi* under this interpretation (and without these clitics under the marked interpretation). Unfortunately, I have not been able to find an appropriate equivalent of the atelic verb *scendere* in Borgomanerese. Borgomanerese uses the verbs *ghi* *aggi* "come down" and *nd* *aggi* "go down" to express the notion of "descent"; both these verbs, however, are inherently telic (their choice depends on the point of view of the speaker). There is also the verb *stretto* (*stroet* +SI) "descend", which like *scendere* can be used atelicit. However, the presence of the clitic *si* excludes the clitic *ghi*, making it impossible to test the above prediction with this verb (Piedmontese exhibits the same complementary distribution between *ye* and *se* (Burzio (1986:124)).
4.2.1.2 The syntactic presence of pro-loc in Italian

Let us take the Borgomanerese data as evidence for the following hypothesis:

(116) Pro-loc Hypothesis:
Italian arrive-type verbs optionally select pro-loc; it is the syntactic presence of this pro-loc that yields the unmarked interpretation for the V-S word order.

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 Borgomanerese ((44), repeated here as (117)), the presence of the pro-loc forces this speaker-oriented (SO) interpretation of the location-goal:

(117) Ngh è riva�� ci a fiafia.
SLOC 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 (102), repeated here as (118), can only describe an eventuality where the DP Maria has arrived in a location shared with the speaker (cf. (117)):

(118) Arriva Maria.
arrives Maria
"Mary is arriving."
(GOAL is necessarily SO)

The sentence in (118) cannot be used to describe an eventuality in which, for example, Maria arrived in China, if the person who utters (118) was not in China at the time of Maria’s arrival. Thus, (118) corresponds to the Borgomanerese sentence in (117), which exhibits overt evidence for the presence of a pro-loc.

Note that the V-S word order with partire ((106b), repeated here as (119)), which forces a contrastive focus interpretation of the post-verbal subject, does not yield such a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-source:

(119) Parte Maria.
leaves Maria
"It is Maria that is leaving."
(i-subject gets contrastive focus; SOURCE not necessarily SO)

Thus, (119) 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 fact that partire does not syntactically project a pro-loc (as per the Pro-loc Hypothesis in (116)).

Recall that Borgomanerese exhibits the same phenomenon ((45), repeated here as (120)). 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

---

“This is what Breninch (1988a) refers to as the ‘deictic’ interpretation of the implicit locative (see footnote 55 above).
interpretation of the location(-source). As mentioned in footnote 15, the post-verbal
subject, like that in Italian, gets a contrastive focus interpretation:

(120) L. è nacque la figlia.
SCL is born a girl
“It was a girl that left.”
(I-subject gets contrastive focus; SOURCE not necessarily SO)

As can be seen, then, the first prediction the Pro-loc Hypothesis makes 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 post-
verbal subject of **arrivare**, exactly like with **partire** in (119). 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 post-verbal subject. Thus, the sentence in (102) can also be used in
the following context:

(121) Chi arriva?
who arrives
“Who is arriving?”

Furthermore, when the order V-S is used with a contrastive focus interpretation on the
post-verbal subject, the GOAL is no longer necessarily interpreted as speaker-oriented.
The following example sketches out these facts:60

(122) Arriva Maria.
arrives Maria
“It is Maria that is arriving.”
(I-subject gets contrastive focus, GOAL not necessarily SO)

The above example is comparable to the Borgomanerese example ((47), repeated here
as (123)) in which the lack of a **ghi** yields the lack of a restriction on the interpretation
of the GOAL:

(123) L. è arrivato nella figlia.
SCL is arrived a girl
“It was a girl that arrived.”
(I-subject gets contrastive focus; GOAL not necessarily SO)

We noted in footnote 28 that (123) also yields a contrastive focus interpretation of the
post-verbal subject, rendering (122) and (123) completely parallel.

Recall, too, that in Borgomanerese, the pre-verbal position of the subject of
**rivestirsi**, which entails the lack of a pro-loc (for reasons cited in §3.3.4.2.1), also yields an
unrestricted interpretation of the GOAL ((46), repeated here as (124)):

(124) Na figlia l. è rivestitasi.
a girl SCL is arrived.
“A girl arrived.”
(GOAL not necessarily SO)

60Note that both interpretations of this sentence (i.e., unmarked (as in (118)) or
contrastively focused post-verbal subject (as in (122)) yield the same intonation.
Note that Italian exhibits the same phenomenon: when the subject is pre-verbal, the location-goal does not have to include the speaker.\(^{31}\)

(125) *Una ragazza è arrivata.*

*A girl arrived.*

(GOAL not necessarily SO)

The pre-verbal subject precludes the existence of pro-loc. As predicted by the Pro-loc Hypothesis, the location-goal is thus not necessarily interpreted as speaker-oriented.

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 on the post-verbal subject, as in the case with *partitive.* Third, it explains why this latter interpretation of the post-verbal subject correlates with the unrestricted interpretation of the GOAL. Fourth, it explains why it is only the "subject inversion" construction that potentially yields the speaker-oriented interpretation of the GOAL: the presence of a pre-verbal subject necessarily correlates with an unrestricted interpretation of the GOAL because Spec. IP is not available for pro-loc.

These facts all line up with those exhibited by Borgomanerese, where there is overt phonological evidence for a pro-loc. Given these consequences, let us adopt the

---

\(^{31}\)It should be noted that both in Borgomanerese and Italian, Spec. IP disfavors indefinite DPs like *una ragazza* / *una signora* "a girl," most probably having to do with structural locations outside of VP being associated with preasupposed (in the sense of Diesing (1992)) or specific (in the sense of Enc (1991)) material. The sentence in (125) would thus be more felicitous with a definite DP (idem for the Borgomanerese example).

---

\(^{32}\)Again, TP and AgroP are not represented since they are not crucial for the purpose of the illustration.
(127) Arriva Maria. (unmarked interpretation; speaker-oriented GOAL)

Thus, the structure in (127) corresponds to the sentence in (118), in which the post-verbal subject is unmarked and the GOAL is necessarily interpreted as speaker-oriented.

The structure which corresponds to the sentence in (122), in which the post-verbal 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):

(128) Arriva Maria. (marked interpretation; GOAL not necessarily speaker-oriented)

This is the same structure as that projected by partire.48

48I assume (following Burzio (1986) and researchers following him) that in the cases where there is no pro-loc, a true expletive pro occupies Spec, IP.

Note that this analysis makes the same prediction for Italian as it did for Borgomanerese with respect to the impossibility of pro-loc in the context of pro-drop.

That is, 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, both need to move overtly to subject position (see (78b) above). In Italian, we can indirectly detect the absence or presence 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:

(129) E' arrivata.
    is arrived.fem.sg.
    'She (has) arrived.'
    (GOAL not necessarily SO)

That is, (129) 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.

4.2.1.3 Further evidence for the WLGA

As I have argued, although there is no direct evidence for the syntactic projection of a phonologically null WLGA argument in Italian, indirect evidence deriving from the interaction of the interpretation of the GOAL (i.e., whether or not it is necessarily speaker-oriented) and the interpretation yielded by the word order V-S (i.e., whether it is unmarked, or marked — with a contrastive focus interpretation of the post-
verbal subject) suggests that arrive-type verbs optionally project a pro-loc. Thus, 
arrivare projects two arguments in (118), while partire only projects one argument in 
(119). More generally, then, we can claim that it is the presence of an extra argument 
that yields the unmarked interpretation of the post-verbal subject in (118). Note that 
this claim makes a prediction: projecting an additional argument with partire, such as a 
PP, should yield an unmarked interpretation with the post-verbal subject. Note that this 
prediction is borne out:

(130) a. *Parto un razzo per la luna.
leaves a rocket for the moon
"A rocket is leaving for the moon."

b. Mi *parto il treno.
leaves the train
"The train is leaving on me."

Consider (130a). With a PP syntactically present, the post-verbal subject of partire no 
longer gets a contrastive focus interpretation. The sentence in (130a) can be used in an 
unmarked context, just like the sentence in (118) with arrivare. While I will not 
attempt to explain why the syntactic presence of an extra argument renders the post-
verbal subject unmarked, see the Appendix below for a discussion of some accounts 
provided in the literature.

4.3 The pro-loc hypothesis and Moro’s analysis of unaccusatives

The hypothesis offered here bears important similarities with the influential 
analysis of unaccusatives proposed by Moro (1997) (originally proposed in Moro 
1989, 1990, 1991 and 1993), which has been adopted by Delfito & D’Hulst 
among others. Although Moro’s proposal is similar in some respects to that offered 
here, it is motivated by entirely different considerations. On the basis of the behavior 
exhibited by copular constructions and existentials in English and Italian, Moro argues 
that all unaccusatives in Italian take a small clause (SC) complement. According to 
Moro, the argument that is normally taken to be the d-structure object of the verb is the 
subject of a SC, in which a phonologically null locative serves the predicate.

(131)  

Because the motivations for Moro’s proposal are entirely different than those for the 
proposal presented here (represented in (127)), some substantial differences between the 
former and the latter arise. First, while I argue that only GOAL-entailing verbs project 
a phonologically null locative (the WLGA), Moro argues that all unaccusatives select a 
null locative (which is not connected to the lexical semantic category GOAL). Second, 
in contrast to our analysis of Italian, in which the pro-loc is optionally projected, 
Moro’s analysis involves the obligatory presence of the null locative. Third, Moro 
claims that the null locative functions as the predicate within the SC complement, while 
the analysis here takes it to be an argument of the verb. Thus, the two analyses are at 
substantial variance with one another. In what follows, I will review the motivations
for Moro's analysis, and argue that his conclusions concerning the structure projected by unaccusatives are not necessary. I further conclude that only the present proposal can explain both the facts discussed by Moro and the collection of facts discussed in §4.2.1.2 above.

4.3.1 Motivation for the small clause analysis

In order to understand the motivation for Moro's (1997) analysis of unaccusatives, it is necessary to briefly review his analysis of copular sentences.

4.3.1.1 The small clause analysis of copular sentences

Moro notes that, on the surface, copular sentences (132) and non-copular sentences (133) appear to have the same structure:

(132) [\textit{a picture of the wall} \textit{was} \textit{the cause of the riot}].

(133) [\textit{A picture of the wall} \textit{revealed} \textit{the cause of the riot}].

However, there are two major differences to note between copular and non-copular sentences. First, in contrast with non-copular sentences, it is possible to reverse the two DPs in copular sentences and obtain the same semantic interpretation:

(134) [\textit{The cause of the riot} \textit{was} \textit{a picture of the wall}]. (cf. (132))

Second, the extraction possibilities in non-copular sentences are different than those in copular sentences. In particular, in non-copular sentences, while extraction from subject position is not possible (as can be seen in (135a)), extraction from object position is (135b):

(135) a. [\textit{Which wall}, \textit{did} \textit{a picture of the riot} \textit{reveal} \textit{the cause of the riot}].

b. [\textit{Which riot}, \textit{did} \textit{a picture of the wall} \textit{reveal} \textit{the cause of the riot}].

The ungrammaticality of (135a) must be due to the position of the DP from which extraction originates, because once the DP \textit{a picture of the wall} is placed in object position, extraction becomes possible:

(136) [\textit{Which wall} \textit{did} \textit{the cause of the riot} \textit{reveal} \textit{a picture of the riot}].

The impossibility of extraction from subject position (as in (135a)) is expected, as it is a straightforward subcacency violation.

At a first glance, copular sentences appear to demonstrate this same subject-object asymmetry as non-copular sentences:

(137) a. [\textit{Which wall}, \textit{was} \textit{a picture of the riot} \textit{the cause of the riot}].

b. [\textit{Which riot}, \textit{was} \textit{a picture of the wall} \textit{the cause of the riot}].

However, the asymmetry seen in (137) suddenly disappears when the order of the DPs is reversed. That is, extraction in (134) is possible neither from subject position (138a), nor from what is the apparent object position (138b) (cf. (137b)):

(138) a. [\textit{Which riot}, \textit{was} \textit{the cause of the riot} \textit{a picture of the wall}].

b. [\textit{Which riot}, \textit{was} \textit{the cause of the riot} \textit{a picture of the wall}].

\footnote{No theta-role assigning head governs the DP \textit{a picture of the wall}, which as a result fails to be "L-marked" (Chomsky 1986b), thus counting as a barrier.}
b. *(Which wall) was the cause of the riot?* *a picture of* t, ?

In order to account for this apparently anomalous set of facts, Moro 
(adapting Stowell's (1978) analysis of be as a raising verb), proposes that the copular 
verb selects a small clause (SC). Thus, the analysis of (132), for example, involves the 
DP a picture of the wall as the subject of the SC, and the DP the cause of the riot as the 
predicate of the SC:

(139) \[ \begin{array}{c}
V' \\
V \\
be \\
SC \\
DP \\
DP(pred) \\
[a picture of the wall] \\
[the cause of the riot] \\
\end{array} \]

(132) is derived by raising the subject of the SC to Spec, IP:

(140) \[ \begin{array}{c}
IP \\
DP_1 \\
[a picture of the wall] \\
I \\
VP \\
V' \\
V \\
be \\
SC \\
DP(pred) \\
[the cause of the riot] \\
\end{array} \]

The ungrammaticality of (137a) is straightforwardly explained, since the DP a picture 
of the wall occurs in a left branch position. The possibility of extraction in (137b) is 
also explained, since the predicate DP the cause of the riot is selected by the verb.

66Moro assumes that SCs are not projected by a head, but rather involve 
adjunction of the subject DP to the predicate DP ((i) is adapted from Moro's (1997) 
example (85), p. 56):

(i) \[ \begin{array}{c}
DP_{\text{pred}} (\text{SC}) \\
DP_{\text{subj}} \\
\end{array} \]

Given this configuration, since the SC (=DP_{\text{pred}}) is selected by the copular verb, the 
actual predicate of the SC (which is a segment of the same category as the SC) is 
selected by the copular verb as well.
hypothesis. This analysis clearly has an advantage over one in which the DP a picture of the wall in (134) is taken to be an object, since the latter could not explain the prohibition on extraction from this DP in (138b). The SC analysis also explains why the "reversal" of arguments in (132) and (134) yields the same semantic interpretation: both sentences involve the same d-structure.

4.3.1.1.1 The small clause analysis of ci-sentences

Given that the same extraction facts obtain in Italian, Moro provides essentially the same analysis for Italian copular sentences. Here I will briefly review three additional facts Moro notes concerning Italian copular sentences and sentences with ci (i.e., existentials), which lead him analyze ci as the predicate of a SC. Our review of his analysis of sentences with ci will lead to an understanding of his claim that all unaccusatives take a SC complement (§4.3.1.1.2 below).

Moro points out that it is widely accepted that the locative ci which occurs in Italian existentials is an 'expletive' (analogous to English existential there) whose function it is to occupy subject position when the "real" subject remains in situ (e.g.,

More accurately, the analysis Moro provides for Italian differs from his analysis of English in one respect which is not crucial to the present discussion. Very briefly, he motivates an analysis of Italian in which the predicate of the SC is a pro (rather than a lexical DP) co-indexed with the subject of the SC. The inverse copular sentence thus involves movement of the pro predicate to Spec, IP, with the co-indexed lexical DP adjoined to IP.

(i) La causa della rivolta [La pro, fu una foto del muro] the cause of the riot pro was a picture of the wall

Buzio (1986). Compare the copular construction in (142a) with the existential in (142b):

(142) a. Molti copie del libro sono nello studio. Many copies of the book are in the studio

b. Ci sono molte copie del libro nello studio. There are many copies of the book in the studio

As Moro notes, however, several important facts remain unexplained under the view that ci is an expletive. First, he points out that in copular sentences in Italian, such as that in (143a), the predicate of the SC can be cliticized, as in (143b):

(143) a. Gianni è uno scienziato. Gianni is a scientist

b. Gianni lo è. Gianni lo is
"Gianni is such."

The view that ci is simply an expletive inserted in subject position leads us to expect that the presence of ci, as in (144a), would have no effect on the ability of the post-copular DP to cliticize. However, contrary to what is expected, the presence of ci blocks cliticization of the post-copular DP, as can be seen in (144b) (cf. (143b)):

(144) a. c’è uno scienziato. there is a scientist

b. *c’ è lo. there lo is.
"There is such."

I will return to Moro’s explanation for this fact below.

The nature of English there will be discussed in Chapter 5.
Second, as Moro explains, the following contrast receives an explanation under the SC analysis; (145b) is ungrammatical because predicates cannot be omitted:

(145) a. [Molte copie del libro], erano [sc tₙ [nello studio]].
many copies of the book were in the studio

b. *[Molte copie del libro], erano [sc tₙ [e]].
many copies of the book were

Under the view that ci is an expletive, we would expect the presence of ci to have no effect on the restriction on omission of predicates. Contrary to this expectation, however, when ci is present, the predicate is no longer obligatorily present:

(146) erano [sc [molte copie del libro] [e]].
there were many copies of the book

Third, as the following sentences show, the presence of ci precludes the existence of a DP predicate:

(147) *erano [sc [pro molte copie del libro] [pro la cause della rivolta]].
there were many copies of the book the cause of the riot

As with the facts concerning io-cliticization and predicate deletion seen above, the view that ci is an expletive renders this fact obscure.

Why should the presence of an expletive have the effects seen above?
Moro proposes to explain these facts by analyzing ci as the predicate of the SC complement of the copular verb essere, in contrast with what is traditionally assumed:

\[
\begin{align*}
(148) & \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad \text{V} \\
& \quad \text{V} \\
& \quad \text{SC} \\
& \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \text{XP} \\
& \quad [\text{molte copie del libro}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

Sentences such as that in (146), then, are derived via raising of the predicate ci, which adjoins to IP, and is co-indexed with pro, which occupies Spec, IP:

\[
\begin{align*}
(149) & \quad \text{IP} \\
& \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \text{IP} \\
& \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad \text{ci} \\
& \quad \text{I} \\
& \quad \text{V} \\
& \quad \text{V} \\
& \quad \text{SC} \\
& \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \text{tₙ} \\
& \quad [\text{molte copie del libro}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

CI-sentences are thus taken to be "inverse copular sentences", under Moro's analysis. Once ci is taken to be the predicate of the SC projected by the copular verb, the apparently anomalous facts discussed above are explained. First, the fact that io-cliticization is impossible in the presence of ci in (144b) follows from the fact that only the predicate of the SC can io-cliticize. If ci is the predicate of the SC, io and ci are

---

6See this is confirmed by the following contrast, noted by Moro (1997:29)
(i) [Le foto del muro], lo furono [sc tₙ, tₙ]
the pictures of the wall lo were
"The pictures of the wall were such."
predicted to be in complementary distribution. Second, the fact (seen in (146)) that the absence of the apparent predicate correlates with the obligatory presence of ci follows from the observation that a predicate cannot be omitted, together with the hypothesis that ci is the predicate. Third, the hypothesis that ci is a predicate also explains ci's complementarity with the predicate DP in (147), since a SC cannot have two predicates.

4.3.1.1.2 Moro's unification of ci-sentences and unaccusatives

Now that we have reviewed the motivation for Moro's analysis of essere 'be' as a copular verb which takes a SC complement, we are in a position to discuss the motivation for his analysis of unaccusatives as verbs which also take a SC complement.

Moro notes that existential sentences with ci pass all tests for unaccusativity in Italian. First, as can be seen in (150), existentials, like unaccusatives (151), take the auxiliary essere 'be' in the compound tenses, and the past participle agrees in number and gender with the subject:

(150) a. ci sono state tre fotografie.
    there are been three photographs
    "There were three photographs."

b. *ci hanno stato tre fotografie.
    there have been three photographs

(c.f.: Le foto dal muro furono la causa della rivolta (canonical copular))

(ii) *[La causa della rivolta] lo furono [ci t_t]
    the cause of the riot he were
    (c.f.: La causa della rivolta furono le foto dal muro (inverse copular))

(151) a. Sono arrivate tre ragazze.
    are arrived three girls

b. *Hanno arrivate tre ragazze.
    have arrived three girls

Second, existentials allow ne-cliticization (152), which is only possible with unaccusative subjects (and not unergative subjects) (153) (Burzio (1986)):

(152) ce ne sono state [ci t_t]
    there NE are been three
    "There were three of them."

(153) ne sono arrivate [ci t_t]
    NE are arrived three
    "Three of them arrived."

Thus, there is no apparent empirical difference between essere and other unaccusatives, such as arrivare, which are claimed to project a single DP argument. Eserceti must thus be considered to be an unaccusative verb.

According to Moro, this fact presents a significant theoretical problem, which can be summarized in the following way. To assimilate essere into the class of unaccusatives "undermines the Unaccusative Hypothesis itself" (p. 220), since, he states, the defining property of unaccusativity is the projection of the verb's single argument as a DP object (rather than a DP subject). However, as he demonstrates, essere, while demonstrably unaccusative, does not take a single DP object, but rather a SC complement which contains a subject and a predicate (ci). How can arrivare, whose "subject" is really a d-structure object, and essere, whose "subject" is really the subject of a SC complement, both be unaccusatives? In order to solve this apparent dilemma,
Moro proposes to unify unaccusatives with *esserci* by redefining unaccusativity such that all unaccusatives are assimilated under the SC analysis.

Given that unaccusatives other than *esserci* do not have any overt morpheme like *ci* which could potentially serve as the predicate of the SC argument, Moro proposes that unaccusatives other than *esserci* take a SC argument with a phonologically null predicate. Using *arrivare* as an example, he thus proposes the following structure for all unaccusatives:

(154)  a. *Arrivano molte ragazze.*

b.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{pro}_i \\
\text{V} \\
\text{arrivano} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{molte ragazze}_i \\
\end{array}
\]

In (154b), the predicative *pro* moves to Spec, IP, while the "subject" *molte ragazze* 'many girls' remains in situ, yielding (154a). Presumably, in the case where the subject DP *molte ragazze* moves to Spec, IP, yielding *Molte ragazze arrivano*, the predicative *pro* remains in situ. Moro (1997:232) later suggests that the predicate of the unaccusative SC is actually a locative (which incorporates into the verb, for theoretical reasons which will not be discussed here):³⁹

³⁹For change of state unaccusatives, he suggests that the predicate is not a locative, but rather the "expression of a quality."

4.3.2 Understanding the small clause analysis of unaccusatives

As noted earlier, there are obvious similarities between our proposal concerning Italian arrive-type verbs and Moro's proposal concerning unaccusatives in general. Both our analysis and Moro's motivate the existence of a phonologically null locative XP selected by the unaccusative verb, in contrast with previous analyses of Italian unaccusatives (e.g., Burzio (1986)), which claimed that such verbs take a single DP object. Nevertheless, given that each proposal is motivated by entirely different considerations, Moro's proposal involves enough significant differences from the one presented here to warrant a close comparison of the two. Let us summarize the three major distinguishing characteristics of the present analysis compared with Moro's: (i) under our proposal, only GOAL-entailing unaccusatives are claimed to project a phonologically null *pro*-loc; (ii) under our proposal, the phonologically null locative is claimed to be projected as an indirect object argument of the verb, rather than the predicate of a SC selected by the verb; and (iii) under our proposal the null locative is claimed to be projected optionally. In what follows I show that Moro's three
conclusions (that the locative is projected by all unaccusatives, that the locative is a predicate, and that the locative is obligatory) are not necessary. Establishing this allows us to maintain the present proposal, which explains the cluster of facts illustrated in §4.2.1 above. Nevertheless, our proposal supports the important insight of Moro's theory, which holds that the locative which occurs with unaccusatives is not an explicative.\footnote{Note that while I argue against Moro's analysis of unaccusatives in general, I see no reason not to adopt his SC analysis of \emph{be}.}

4.3.2.1 A locative predicate for all unaccusatives?

Let us focus on the first difference between the two analyses. Concerned with the defining characteristic of unaccusativity, Moro concludes that all unaccusatives take a phonologically null locative. The particular point of concern is the claim that unaccusatives project their single DP argument as an object. Moro questions how `essence' (which takes a SC complement) and `arrive' (which is claimed to take a single DP argument) can both be unaccusatives. In order to solve this apparent paradox, Moro proposes that all unaccusatives must take the same type of complement, namely, a SC.

Note, however, that this apparent problem only arises if we take the defining property of unaccusativity to be the complement structure of unaccusatives. The problem does not arise, however, if we deny that all unaccusatives must take the same type of complement. In this regard, let us consider the Burzio's Generalization,

which states that a verb which fails to assign an external theta-role also fails to assign accusative Case. Given this essential insight, it seems clear that the defining property of unaccusativity is not "the projection of a single d-structure object," but rather, the lack of projection of an external argument. Given that unaccusatives are as semantically heterogeneous as transitives (see Chapter 2 and L&RH), there is no reason to assume that unaccusative types are not as varied as transitive types. For example, we find transitives which project a single DP object (e.g., *cut), or two internal arguments (e.g., give, put), or a single SC argument (e.g., consider), or a propositional argument (e.g., say). Similarly, we find unaccusatives which project a single DP object (e.g., break), or two internal arguments (e.g., lie: \emph{Manhattan lies at (at the foot of the Hudson); see L&RH, p. 287, footnote 3), or a single SC argument (e.g., be), or a propositional argument (e.g., seem). Under the proposal presented here, VIDs (both GOAL-entailing and non-GOAL-entailing) are taken to be unaccusatives which optionally project a second internal argument, much like the transitive verbs bring (e.g., \textit{I brought a book to the library}), take, buy (e.g., \textit{I bought a book (for John) / (John) a book}), or tell (e.g., \textit{I told a story (to the girls) / (the girls) a story).\footnote{It might be suggested that the optimal status of these XP's serves as evidence that they are adjuncts, and not arguments. However, the 'do so' test suggests that these XP's are part of the core eventuality of the verb, much like the PP subcategorized by \textit{put} (cf. discussion in §3.2.3):}

(i) \textit{She put the book on the table, and Tracy did so on the floor.}

(ii) \textit{She brought the book to the picnic, while Tracy did so to the party.}

See Larson (1988b) for a discussion of the argument status of such optional XP's with verbs of motion.

Note, too, that given the theoretical possibility of there being as many unaccusative types as there are transitive types, there arises a question as to whether there are unaccusatives which allow dative shift. I would like to suggest that
To summarize, if an unaccusative is a verb which does not assign an external theta-role, then there is nothing paradoxical about esserci and, say, partire or arrivare, both passing tests for unaccusativity, while at the same time taking different types of complements. To put it differently, the tests for unaccusativity do not entail that all unaccusatives have the same type of complement. The unaccusative behavior exhibited by both types of verbs thus does not constitute an argument in favor of claiming that all unaccusatives, like esserci, must take a SC complement.

There is, however, a specific point regarding ne-citilization which may be the main locus of concern for Maro, and which deserves more discussion. If we maintain that ne-citilization can only obtain from a particular structural position (say, from a d-structure object), then the claim that different unaccusatives take different types of complements presents a potential problem. That is, if ne-citilization is only possible from the position occupied by a direct object, then how is it possible from the subject of a SC (if, indeed, the apparent object of esserci is really the subject of a SC)?

Note, however, that this question arises independently of the claim that esserci takes a SC complement. The moment we are bound to binary branching, the question arises once we take note of the fact that ne-citilization is possible from the direct object of a double object verb, as in (156):

(156) Ne, ho dato [duc t] a Maria.
    NE (I have given two to Maria.
    "I gave two of them to Maria."

Given a Larsonian shell, the direct object in (156) is not in the same syntactic position as the direct object of a simple transitive like mangiare 'eat' (assuming that verbs like mangiare do not project a VP shell). Rather, the direct object is in the specifier of a VP complement to a V, instead of sister to V (as is the case with the object of mangiare). It is well known that ne-citilization is also possible from the direct object of a verb like mangiare:

(83) As Kayne (1984) suggests, a verb like give could conceivably involve a causal verb which takes a SC complement:
       (i) John caused [Iw. Mary to have a book]
Under such an analysis, the argument Mary does not get a theta-role from the causal verb; rather, the verb assigns a theta-role to the whole SC, while Mary gets a theta-role from the predicate of the SC. Note, however, that a problem arises once we attempt to assimilate simple transitive-like mangiare into this paradigm. While semantic arguments can be made in favor of a SC analysis of dare, it is not obvious how one could claim that a verb like mangiare, which as an 'activity' verb does not have a complex event structure, takes a SC complement.

Furthermore, note that under the view that all XP's must have heads, a SC analysis differs minimally from a Larsonian-type analysis. The difference between the two amounts to a semantic one: unlike the SC analysis, a Larsonian analysis takes Mary and a book to be two arguments, rather than as occurring in a subject-predicate relation. As such, both DPs get theta-roles from the verb, in contrast with the SC analysis. The ramifications of this difference between the two analyses will be discussed in §4.3.2.2 below.
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(157) No, ho mangiato [due t].
NE (I) have eaten two.
"I have eaten two of them."

Furthermore, ne-cliticization is also possible from the subject of the SC complement of a verb like considerare 'consider':

(158) No, ho considerato [sc solo uno t] veramente adatto.
NE (I) have considered only one truly appropriate.

Thus, the data in (156-158) present a problem for the claim that ne-cliticization is only possible from a specific structural position, independent of any questions concerning the complement type of unaccusatives. The fact that ne-cliticization is possible in both (157) and (158) in fact suggests that it is not restricted to a single structural position.

Given this observation, the claim that esserci takes a SC while other unaccusatives (like partire) do not is unproblematic. As such, the facts of ne-cliticization cannot be used as an argument in favor of a generalized SC analysis of unaccusatives.

To conclude, Moro's proposal that all unaccusatives take a SC complement is driven by a single unbounded assumption: all unaccusatives take the same type of complement. However, as we have seen, the defining property of unaccusativity does not have to do with what type of complement the verb takes, but rather with the lack of an external theta-role. In this perspective, the analysis of esserci as taking a SC complement cannot serve as an argument in favor of a SC analysis for all unaccusatives.

The potential problem concerning ne-cliticization remains a problem only if we assume that it can obtain from a specific structural position. However, as we have seen, this does not seem to be true. Since we are not forced to conclude that all unaccusatives take a SC predicate, we do not need to conclude that all unaccusatives take a locative. We can thus maintain that only GOAL-entailing VIMs take a locative.

4.3.2.2 Two internal arguments or a small clause?

Given that there are no theoretical considerations forcing us to adopt a locative-predicate analysis for all unaccusatives, let us consider the question of whether Moro's SC proposal could be extended just to GOAL-entailing verbs. As we saw in §4.3.1.1.1, Moro provides several convincing arguments in favor of analyzing esserci as a SC taking unaccusative, with ci as the locative predicate of the SC. Given our arguments for analyzing Italian GOAL-entailing unaccusatives as projecting a phonologically null locative, the question arises as to whether there are any considerations which make a SC analysis of arrivate-type verbs, parallel to a SC analysis of esserci, more desirable than the analysis presented here.

Notice that the one significant difference between a SC analysis of arrivate-type verbs ((154b), repeated here as (159)) and our analysis ((127), repeated here as (160)), is that under the former the null locative is analyzed as a predicate while under the latter it is analyzed as a second internal argument.
analyzed as containing a head. The syntactic difference between a Larsonian-type analysis and a SC analysis is thus no longer obvious (see Kayne (1995:Chapter 7, footnote 1)).

While there is no obvious syntactic difference between one claim and the other, there is a clear semantic difference between the two. As noted in footnote 73 above, a Larsonian-type analysis takes the two complement XPs in question to be arguments of the verb. As such, the verb assigns theta-roles to both (roughly, Theme to the direct object, and Goal to the indirect object). A SC analysis, however, takes the two complements to be in a subject-predicate relation. As such, the verb assigns a theta-role to the whole SC, while the predicate of the SC assigns a theta-role to the subject (i.e., the Theme argument). Since predicates do not get theta-roles, the "Goal argument" (= the predicate) does not get a theta-role under this analysis.

It is difficult to find empirical arguments in favor of one analysis over the other. However, a theoretical argument in favor of the Larsonian-type analysis and against the SC type analysis can be made. In order to make our argument, let us consider those double object verbs which take the second internal argument optionally, such as sell, buy, bring, etc. Under the view that the presence of two internal XPs indicates the presence of a SC complement, a verb such as sell would get the same

---

From here on I use 'Larsonian-type analysis' to refer to any analysis which takes the two internal XPs to be arguments of the verb, rather than as occurring in a subject-predicate relation. The question of whether the complement configuration involves a VP shell, or some other type of binary branching structure (such as (161) below) is irrelevant for the present discussion.
analysis as give. (the structure in [161] is intended to essentially reflect the SC analysis suggested in Kayne (1995), with to as the possible head of the SC):

\[ (161) \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
\text{John}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\downarrow
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} = \text{SC, under Kayne} \\
\downarrow
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{tell} \\
\downarrow
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\downarrow
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
a \text{story} \\
\text{to}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\triangle
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Sue}
\end{array}
\]

A problem arises, however, when we consider a sentence in which the purported predicate of the SC is not projected, as in [162]:

\[ (162) \]

\[ \text{John told a story.} \]

Under the SC analysis, the predicate in [162] is missing. Recall that one of Moro's central arguments in favor of analyzing \textit{ci} as a predicate (see §4.3.1.1 above) is the observation that predicates are never optional (Moro (1997:105)). Since predicates are not omission, the question arises as to how a verb like \textit{tell} could be analyzed.

One possibility which comes to mind involves claiming that the predicate in \textit{John told a story} is syntactically projected, but is phonologically null. Once we allow such a possibility, however, then one of the central arguments in favor of Moro’s analysis of \textit{ci} as a predicate disappears. That is, he claims that the sentence in [145b] is ungrammatical because it has a missing predicate, while [146] (with \textit{ci} as a predicate) does not. If we claim that a phonologically null predicate is possible in order to account for [162] with \textit{tell}, then we must ask why a null predicate is not allowed in the case of [145b]. Thus, unless we want to lose Moro's explanation for [145b], and as a consequence lose a central argument in favor of analyzing \textit{ci} as a predicate, then we cannot assert the existence of a null predicate.

To save the SC analysis, another possible explanation for [162] which comes to mind is the following: when the predicate is absent, a SC is not projected. Rather, a single internal DP argument is projected, as in the case of a simple transitive. There arises a semantic problem with this analysis, however. In particular, \textit{tell} would assign a theta-role to the SC in the case of [161], but would assign a theta-role to the direct object \textit{a story} in the case of [162]. Thus, in [161] a \textit{story} gets the Theme theta-role from the predicate, while in [162] it gets the Theme theta-role from the verb \textit{tell}.

The semantic problem here is twofold. First, the DP a \textit{story} gets its Theme theta-role from different predicates in [161] and [162]. And second, the verb \textit{tell} assigns different types of theta-roles in each case. This state of affairs is conceptually problematic, since [161] and [162] do not differ semantically. It also fails to explain why the DP a \textit{story} should get a Theme theta-role in both cases. If there are different theta-assigners in each case, then we should expect to find examples in which the theta-role of this argument differs from one example to the other. To put it differently, the idea that the object DP gets its theta-role from different theta-assigners in [161] and [162], as well as the idea that the verb assigns different theta-roles in each case, fails to explain why both examples have the same semantics.\footnote{Of course, the two examples obviously differ semantically in that the former contains an explicit Goal argument, while the latter does not. However, even in the latter case the Goal argument is implicitly expressed, so that the basic semantic relations}
The conclusion we can draw from the above discussion, then, is that a SC analysis of double object verbs which take the second internal argument optionally runs into conceptual problems. A Larsonian-type analysis, however, has no problem in dealing with (161) and (162). Whether or not the second argument is projected does not affect the theta relation between the verb and the direct object. In both cases, the verb assigns its Theme theta-role. The difference between the two cases is simply whether or not there is a second internal argument syntactically present.66 Recall that gives

(Theme and a Goal) obtain in both cases. The relation between (161) and (162) contrasts with that seen between (i) and (ii):

(i) I considered John intelligent.
(ii) I considered John.

The verb in (i) takes a SC complement, while the verb in (ii) takes an NP complement. This difference in complement types corresponds to a clear semantic difference. The former means something like "I held this proposition to be true" while the latter means something like "I thought about John." This difference in meaning also corresponds to a difference in stativity:

(iii) I consider John intelligent. (*I am considering John intelligent)
(iv) I am considering John. (*I consider John)

Thus, there is a clear semantic difference reflected by the choice of complement (SC or NP). This suggests that the two sentences I told a story to John and I told a story (which do not exhibit such a semantic difference) do not involve this difference in complement types (thanks to L. Burzio for enlightening discussion).

66Needless to say, the concept of an optional argument presents problems for the Theta Criterion, which states that every theta-role must be assigned (in addition to stating that every argument must get a theta-role). The notion of optional argument, in fact, seems to strictly rely on the idea that a theta-role (in this case Goal), does not necessarily have to be assigned. Thus, verbs like tell must be distinguished from verbs like give, such that the former lexically specifies that the Goal theta-role can be assigned optionally.

Note that the question of unassigned theta-roles also arises within the NP domain:

(i) The linguist analyzed *(the data).
(ii) The linguist's analysis *(of the data).

The NP the data in (i) is optional, yet nevertheless is a complement of the head N analysis. When it is not present, we must assume that the relevant theta-role is not assigned by analyze. The question of what allows the optional assignment of a theta-

Kaye (1995), the difference between a Larsonian-type analysis and a SC analysis amounts to whether or not we call the second XP (in this case Goal) a predicate or an argument. Given the problems with the claim that this XP is a predicate, I conclude that the Larsonian-type analysis is to be preferred.

Let us note that the above discussion concerning tell carries over directly to arrive-type verbs (and to VIDs in general, since SOURCE-entailing VIDs also optionally project a second internal argument). Arrive-type verbs in Italian optionally project a second internal argument, which can be realized as a locative PP, as a deictic locative, as NDL, or as pro-loc (as we illustrated in §3.3 for Borgomaneroese). Given that the projection of the second internal argument is optional, the same issues arise for arrive as for tell. Thus, as we concluded for verbs like tell, arrive-type verbs must get a Larsonian-type analysis, rather than a SC analysis.77 We thus maintain the claim that the locative projected by arrive-type verbs is an argument and not a predicate.

4.3.2.3 Optional or obligatory locative?

The discussion in the last section already touched upon the third and final difference between our analysis and Moro's, while I motivate an analysis of arrive-type role will not be pursued here (see Grimshaw (1990)).

77A further semantic argument against a SC analysis of arrive can be made. Unlike the copular verb essere, arrive has semantic content, raising the question as to whether it is reasonable to view verbs with semantic content as copular verbs. That is, if arrive assigns a theta-role to the SC, the configuration essentially yields a semantic interpretation in which a proposition arrives.
verbs in which the null locative is projected optionally, Moro claims that it is always present. Empirical arguments were made in §4.2.1.2 for the claim that the pro-loc is projected optionally. Moro's argument in favor of the non-optional nature of the null locative is essentially a theoretical one, centering on the need to assimilate all unaccusatives with essere. However, as I argued in §4.3.2.1, there is no need to claim that all unaccusatives take a SC complement. Consequently, the argument for the view that the locative is always projected also disappears.\footnote{Another argument against the claim that the null locative is always projected comes from English. Moro analyzes 'explicative' there as the English equivalent of Italian existential er (and his null locative predicate selected by other unaccusatives). The fact remains, however, that there is optional with unaccusatives: (i) There arrived four women. (ii) Four women arrived. If there is the equivalent of the null locative in Italian, then the simplest conclusion is that the null locative in Italian is optionally projected as well. As we shall see in Chapter 5, the optional nature of there follows if we take it to be the WGLA selected by arrive-type verbs in English (note that the optional nature of there poses a problem for an analysis of this morpheme as the predicate of a SC).}

In addition to the empirical arguments in favor of the claim that the projection of pro-loc is optional, a final theoretical argument can be made, as well. As we saw in §3.2.4.2.2, pro can only occur pre-verbally, because as a weak XP it cannot remain in its base position. Adopting the same analysis for pro-loc allowed us to explain why the construction with the projected locative always correlates with the existence of a post-verbal subject. This can be demonstrated directly in Borgomanerese, since Borgomanerese has an overt reflex of pro-loc. Since Italian has no overt reflex of pro-loc, this must be shown indirectly. It can be shown by the fact that the interpretation of the GOAL as necessarily speaker-oriented (= presence of pro-loc) is only possible with a post-verbal subject. Note, however, that under Moro's analysis, the null locative pro is always projected. The structure in (159) exemplifies movement of his locative pro to subject position, while the "real subject" remains in situ (the 'inverse copular' variant). When the "subject" moves to Spec, IP in the 'canonical copular' variant (Moie ragazzе arrivano), the locative pro remains in situ. This claim, however, is at variance with the observation that pro, as a weak XP, cannot remain in its base position.

\subsection*{4.3.3 Pro-loc and the existential in Italian}

Recall our discussion of the existential in Borgomanerese in §3.3. We noted that the use of the ghi-construction for the existential indicated that the weak locative morpheme (pro-loc) is also used as the morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category LOCATION. This was sketched out in (84) (repeated here as (163)):

\begin{quote}
163) pro-loc ngh è ghi tro monta\[\]
pro-loc SLOC is-LOC three marci boys
\end{quote}

I assumed that, just as with the GOAL-entailing constructions in (14), ghi in the existential is the clitic double of pro-loc, while ngh is the locative subject clitic which occupies the Agr head and agrees in features with pro-loc, which occupies Spec, IP at s-structure. I would like to suggest here that the existential in Italian should get the same analysis. That is, in Italian, pro-loc is also projected as the LOCATION argument. This can be seen in (164):
interpretation of a sentence such as that in (164) contrasts with the following, which has a “true locative” interpretation:

(166) $C'$ è Mario.
therefore is Mario
"Mario is there/here."

Thus, the $ci$ in (166) is really the NDL $ci$, and not the existential $ci$. While (164) and (166) are semantically distinguishable, they are morphologically indistinguishable (both involve the morpheme $ci$). Under our theory, however, the semantic difference between (164) and (166) derives from the fact that the former involves a pro-loc while the latter does not.

Note that these two sentences are morphologically disambiguated in Borgomanerese. Recall that the presence of the locative SCL ngh signals the presence of a pro-loc in Spec, IP. Given this state of affairs, we predict that while the existential contains a ngh (see (163) above), the Borgomanerese equivalent of the sentence in (166) should not (since it contains no pro-loc). This prediction is borne out; the equivalent of (166) in Borgomanerese can only be expressed without the SCL ngh, indicating that there is no pro-loc. Correspondingly, this sentence gets a “true locative” (i.e., “referential”) interpretation:

(167) a. L $c$-ghgh $Mario$.
SCL is there/here Mario

b. * Ngh $c$-ghgh $Mario$. 

---

Under this analysis, we must take $ci$ to be the clitic-double of pro-loc. Of course, this raises the question as to why $ci$ doubles pro-loc when it is a LOCATION argument, but not when it is a GOAL argument. While I cannot offer a principled answer to this question, let us suppose (given Moro’s arguments) that the pro-loc in the existential is a predicate of a SC complement of the verb essere ‘be’ (in contrast with pro-loc as the WLGA). It is possible that the doubling of pro-loc with $ci$ can obtain with a predicate in Italian, but not with an indirect object argument. Perhaps pro-loc as a predicate (in contrast with pro-loc as a dative argument) can be doubled by $ci$ because as a predicate, it is not marked for dative Case; there would thus be no Case clash between the predicate and the non-dative $ci$. When pro-loc is projected as the WLGA, however, it is marked for dative Case; under this view, the doubling of pro-loc (the WLGA) with $ci$ would thus result in a Case clash (see footnote 33 above, which illustrates that $ci$, unlike ghgh, is not specified for dative Case).
Thus, in terms of the semantic interpretation of the locative, (167a) corresponds to (166), and (163) corresponds to (164). Given this parallelism, I will assume that the Italian existential involves a pro-loc while the NDL does not occur with a pro-loc.68

On this note, I would like to make one final comment concerning Moro's analysis of the Italian existential. As we saw, he analyzes the existential as an 'inverse copular sentence', with ci as a raised predicate. Under the analysis of the existential suggested here, however, it is pro-loc which is the raised constituent, while ci is a clitic double (like Borgomanerese gihi).69 Thus, under our analysis the clitic ci moves to preverbal position not because it is a raised predicate, but rather because it procliticizes to finite verbs, like all object clitics in Italian. As can be seen in the following example, ci enclitics to the infinitival form of the verb essere:

(168) Sembrano esser-ci due ragazzi.

'seem be-LOC two boys

'There seem to be two boys.'

The enclisis of ci in (168) cannot be characterized as an instance of 'NP raising' (if by 'raising' we mean movement to subject position). Similarly, then, the movement of ci in (164) cannot be characterized as raising either; its position is simply the result of

---

68As Moro (1997:138) notes, it would be undesirable to posit the existence of two different ci's in order to explain the semantic difference between (164) and (166). Under the hypothesis offered here, recourse to such a solution is not necessary; the semantic difference between the two derives from the fact that the former involves a pro-loc while the latter does not (supported by the Borgomanerese facts in (163) and (167)).

69Whether pro-loc in the existential is an indirect object argument or the predicate of a SC selected by essere 'be' remains an open question under this analysis. I simply note here that Moro provides several convincing arguments for analyzing essere as taking a SC, and I see no reason not to adopt this aspect of his analysis.

Citic movement. That (164) involves a pro-loc which has undergone NP-raising to the matrix Spec, IP is again suggested by the facts in Borgomanerese. As can be seen in (169), in a sentence with the raising verb smiță 'seem', the locative SCL nght occupies the matrix Agr, which is indicative of a pro-loc in subject position:

(169) pro-loc nght ĕ smiță vessa-ghi do māti in la clăsnă.

pro-loc SLOC is seemed be-LOC two 'sm girls in the kitchen

'Their seemed to be two girls in the kitchen.'

Languages such as Piedmontese (Buzio (1986)), which unlike Italian (but like Borgomanerese) do not exhibit proclisis of object clitics on finite verbs in the compound tenses, also allow us to determine more readily that the movement of the locative clitic is simply obeying the laws of object clitic movement in the relevant language, rather than undergoing 'raising' to subject position:

(170) a. A l era sta-ve tanta gent. (L. Buzio, p.c.)

SCL SCL was been-LOC many people

b. *A l era stati tanta gent.

Again, these facts suggest that, unlike the NP predicates in Moro's 'inverse copular sentences', ci cannot be analyzed as a 'raised predicate'.70

---

70As can be seen in (149) (which corresponds to Moro's (1997:Chapter 2) (39b)), Moro claims that there is a pro in Spec, IP, which is co-indexed with ci, rendering his analysis superficially similar to the one given here (see (127) above). What is not clear in Moro (1997) is whether this pro is inserted as an expletive, or base generated as a predicate of the SC. In his discussion in Chapter 5 (pp. 219-220), which contains a representation, (13), which is similar to his (39b), except for the fact that there is no co-indexing between pro and ci, he explicitly states that the pro is 'expletive.' This statement (coupled with the fact of co-indexing between pro and ci in his revised representation) indicates that he considers there to be no connection between these two elements. This differs from the analysis offered here, which holds that pro-loc and ci are related via clitic doubling.
4.4 Conclusions

We have seen several arguments in favor of positing the existence of a proloc in Italian, optionally projected as a goal argument by GOAL-entailing VIDMs. The fact that SOURCE-entailing VIDMs never require a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-source can be understood in the context of the facts exhibited by GOAL-entailing VIDMs. The latter verbs only allow a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal when the V-S word order is used with an unmarked interpretation of the post-verbal subject. When the V-S word order yields a contrastive focus interpretation of the post-verbal subject, the speaker-oriented interpretation is no longer required, just as with SOURCE-entailing verbs. This phenomenon finds an explanation if we posit the existence of a WLGA in Italian. This hypothesis is further supported by the behavior of α-tele VIDMs like rendere. The hypothesis that only GOAL-entailing verbs optionally select a phonologically null weak locative as a second internal argument is thus motivated by a cluster of syntactic and semantic facts concerning telicity, the position and interpretation of subjects, and the interpretations of locations. As such, the WLGA analysis is to be preferred over the SC analysis, which does not allow for an explanation of these interrelated phenomena.

APPENDIX: Explanation for the connection between the null locative and unmarked V-S word order

While I do not offer an explanation of the relation between the unmarked status of the V-S word order with arrive-type verbs and the syntactic presence of a locative argument, here I review some accounts offered in the literature.

Bencini (1988a) has suggested that the unmarked status of the V-S word order with arrive-obtains because the implicit locative argument serves as the 'theme' (i.e., 'given', as opposed to the 'theme') of the sentence. An explanation along these lines is also suggested by Sacco (1992, 1993), who proposes that every sentence requires a 'subject of predication' (SOP). She notes (Sacco 1992:394) that in Conseglia (a Northern Italian dialect), riiv 'arrive' can occur with a post-verbal subject, while an unaccusative like 'go' cannot:

(171) a. El i riviv la Maria.
    SCL is arrived the Maria
b. *El i mada la Maria.
    SCL is gone the Maria

She explains this difference by claiming that riiv has an implicit locative which can act as the SOP, while 'go' does not. Thus, Sacco's explanation essentially concurs

Sacco (1993:141) notes that the notion of an SOP is not unlike the notion of 'theme' or 'topic'.

She states: "To arrive..." can only have one final destination... On the contrary, 'to go..." can potentially have a lot of destinations." Her intuition seems to accord with the claim made here that arrive entails a GOAL, while go does not. Contrary to Sacco, however, I claim here that go does have an implicit locative, namely, SOURCE (which nevertheless is not syntactically projected as a null
with Benincà's, which recognizes the relevance of an extra syntactic argument. A question which arises under this explanation, however, is to how to account for the unmarked status of the sentence in (130a) (repeated here), where the post-verbal subject is followed by a PP:

(130) a. Parte un razzo per la luna.
    leaves a rocket for the moon
    "A rocket is leaving for the moon."

With the locative PP following the post-verbal subject, there is no straightforward sense in which the PP serves as a theme, or as a SOP, at least not syntactically. It is too low in the structure to be associated with any type of topic position. Normally, themes or topics are analyzed as occupying a position at least as high as Spec, IP. Saccoon (1992:393) offers a different analysis of the structural position of the SOP (at least for Italian and the Italian dialects), in which it is taken to be right- or left-adjacend to the VP:

(172) a. \[ X_{\text{max}} \]
    \[ \text{SOP}(\_\text{here}) \]
    \[ \text{VP} \]

b. \[ X_{\text{max}} \]
    \[ \text{VP} \]
    \[ \text{SOP}(\_\text{there}) \]

According to Saccoon, then, the sentence in (171b) becomes grammatical once a PP, acting as the SOP, is added:

(173) El e ndat la Maria, a botega.
    SCL is gone the Maria, to store

In (173), the SOP (the PP) is right-adjacent to the VP. Is it possible that the PP in (130a) is in the correct position to act as a theme, or as an SOP? While it does occur to the right of the subject (like the PP in (173)), there is no intensional break after the direct object, in contrast with (173). According to Saccoon, the intensional break in (173) is indicative of right-adjunction. The lack of an intensional break in (130a), then, suggests that the PP is not in the appropriate structural position to be an SOP. If anything, it has probably remained in its base-generated position within the VP.³⁴

Another question which arises under the SOP-explanation is the unmarked status of the sentence in (130b) (repeated here), which has a pre-verbal Benefactive clitic:

(130) b. Mi parte il treno.
    to-me leaves the train.
    "The train is leaving on me."

The "extra argument" in (130b) (i.e., mi) is not in one of the SOP syntactic positions illustrated in (172) above. While the questions raised by the data in (130) remain open, the important observation made by both Benincà and Saccoon still stands: the unmarked status of the V-S word-order seems to rely on the presence of a second syntactic argument.

³⁴While I cannot offer any insights concerning the data in Coniglio, note that the Italian counterparts to the sentences in (171a) and (173) are not informationally equivalent. The Italian counterpart to (171a) can be interpreted as unmarked (i.e., used in answer to the question "What happened?"). The Italian counterpart to (173), however, is not unmarked. Rather the subject is presented as new information. This seems to be the case whenever an -subject is followed by a right-dislocated XP, as in (i):

(i) Ha telefonato Maria, alle due.
    has telephoned Maria, at two o'clock

Thus, adding a right-dislocated PP (as in (173)) does not render a V-S sentence with a SOURCE-entailing verb informationally equivalent to a V-S sentence with a GOAL-entailing verb.

It should also be noted that the Italian counterpart to (171b) is not ungrammatical, but rather requires a contrastive focus interpretation on the post-verbal subject (as discussed earlier in this chapter).
argument which serves some role as the theme, or subject of predication, or topic of the sentence.

Dell'ítito & Pinto (1992), Dell'ítito & D'Flulst (1994), and Pinto (1994) provide an explanation for the grammaticality of the word order V-S with *arrivare* which relies on a comparison of unaccusatives with unergatives and transitives.65 Dell'ítito & Pinto (1992) (D&P), for example, note (following Benincà (1988a)) that while *arrivare* allows a definite post-verbal subject (see (118) above), transitives and unergatives do not:

(174) a. *Ha recensito il libro Gianni.* (transitive) 
ha reviewed the book Gianni

b. *Ha urlato Gianni.* (unergative) 
has yelled Gianni

In order to explain this difference in behavior, they propose (following Moro (1989)) that unaccusatives undergo what they call a "process of reanalysis," in which the unaccusative is allowed to take a small clause (SC) complement, with a null locative as the predicate. The null locative predicate moves to Spec, IP, where it gets nominative Case. The locative predicate, by virtue of being co-indexed with its trace, is also co-indexed with the subject of the SC (under the assumption that subject-predicate relations involve co-indexing). This is illustrated in (175):

(175) pro*jet arrivate [SC Maria, t]

---

65These authors extend their explanation for *arrivare* to all unaccusatives, including *partire*.

The nominative Case assigned in Spec, IP is transmitted to the subject of the SC via (indirect) co-indexing between the null locative and the subject of the SC. According to D&P, since transitives and unergatives do not project such a SC complement, "locative proposing" cannot obtain, Case transmission fails, and the sentences in (174) are correctly ruled out.

If nothing else is stated, this analysis of unaccusatives incorrectly predicts SOURCE-entailing unaccusatives to allow V-S as the unmarked word order. However, this problem can easily be remedied by recognizing that SOURCE-entailing unaccusatives do not project a locative. As such, V-S sentences with leave-type verbs can be assimilated to the sentences in (174). As D&P note (p. 6, footnote 1), the sentences in (174) are actually grammatical if the post-verbal subjects are interpreted as contrastively focused. Since *partire* also allows a post-verbal subject, as long as it is interpreted as contrastively focused, D&P's analysis of unaccusatives can be modified such that it excludes SOURCE-entailing verbs. Verbs like *partire* could thus get the same analysis as transitives and unergatives do under D&P. A question which comes to mind, however, is how those sentences can be grammatical at all, if the post-verbal subject of *partire* (and likewise, transitives and unergatives) do not pass the Case Filter under this analysis. To answer this question, D&P suggest that contrastive focus on an NP is sufficient to satisfy the Visibility Condition. Such a suggestion tacitly assumes that NPs do not need Case if they can become visible for theta-assignment in some other way.
Another question which remains (noted by D&P) is why the sentences in (174) improve once an indefinite subject is used (noted by Benincà (1988a)):

(176)  a. Ha recensito il libro qualcuno.
        has reviewed the book Gianni

        b. Ha urlato qualcuno.
        has yelled Gianni

The indefinite post-verbal subjects in (176), unlike the definite subjects in (174) do not necessarily get a contrastive focus interpretation. This contrasts with partire, which forces a contrastive focus interpretation of its post-verbal subject even when it is indefinite:

(177) E partito uno studente.
     is left a student
     "It was a student that left"

I do not offer an explanation for these facts here.

A final comment concerns the claim that arrivare takes a SC complement. As we saw in §4.3.2 above, arrivare must be analyzed as optionally taking a second internal argument, not as taking a SC complement. Note that once we eliminate the possibility of a SC analysis, Case transmission as proposed by D&P is no longer possible, since no subject-predicate relation obtains between the "subject" and the (trace of the) second internal argument.\(^8\)

\(^8\)See §5.4.2.3.1 for an alternative analysis of Case assignment of the WLGA.

Chapter 5

THERE: THE WEAK LOCATIVE GOAL ARGUMENT IN ENGLISH

5.1 Introduction

A central assumption made by Chomsky (1981; 1986a; 1995), den Dikken (1995), Georl (1995), Lecuy (1992; 1995), and Safir (1982; 1983), among many others, is that the morpheme there in there-sentences such as that in (178) is an expletive:\(^9\)

(178) There arrived four women.

The expletive analysis assumes that there is devoid of any semantic content, inserted into subject position to satisfy the Extended Projection Principle (EPP). Several generativeists of the late 1960s and 1970s have noted, however, that the locative expletive is allowed only with unaccusatives that have locational semantics, analyzing there as a morpheme with locative semantic content, rather than as an expletive (the

\(^9\)For the purposes of this chapter I will consider "there-sentences" to be those constructions which involve there and a verb other than be. To avoid confusion I will refer to there-sentences with be as the "existential". See below in §5.4.1 for a discussion of the verbs which may occur with there. Note also that from here on, "there" refers to so-called "expletive there" (unless otherwise specified), and not stressable ("existential") there.
locative semantics view'; among others, Fillmore (1968), Kimball (1973), Kuno (1971), Lyons (1967), and more recently, within the Principles & Parameters framework, Freeze (1992) and Hoekstra & Mulder (1990). While the fact that *there is limited to a semantically coherent class of verbs presents a problem for the expletive analysis, this problem is rarely addressed. Another problem raised by the expletive analysis has to do with the question of why *there needs Case. As I will show in this chapter, this fact has continually raised problems for linguistic theory. Moro’s (1993; 1997) analysis of *there as a raised predicate eliminates some of the problems of the expletive analysis.

However, as we shall see, Moro’s analysis itself presents empirical and conceptual problems, and furthermore does not address the question of the restriction of *there to a subclass of verbs. After I review Moro’s work, I offer an analysis of *there which unifies English with Borgomanero and Italian: *there is a WLGs. Our analysis of *there is thus in spirit within the tradition of the locative semantics view. The analysis presented here, however, differs in that it also provides answers to questions raised by the locative semantics view. For example, it explains why speakers understand *there to be fundamentally different from the deictic stresses *there, seen in (179):

(179) *Four women arrived there.

It will be shown that the ‘expletive-like’ properties of *there follow from a weak locative analysis.

§2 Expletive *there and Case

It has long been noted that expletive *there needs to occupy a Case-marked position. This can be seen in (180):

(180) a. *I tried [o there to arrive four women]
   (cf. *I tried four women to arrive.)

   b. *It seems [o there to have arrived four women]
   (cf. *It seems four women to have arrived.)

   c. *It is unnecessary [o *for there to have arrived four woman]
   (cf. It is unnecessary *for four women to have arrived.)

The fact that *there needs Case immediately presents a problem for the Visibility Condition (Lambik (1992)), which states that NPs need Case in order to be visible for theta-assignment (Chomsky 1981). That is, why should an expletive, which (as a non-argument) does not need to be visible for theta-assignment, need Case? To explain this, analyses of *there as an expletive have claimed that Case is not required by *there, but rather by the post-verbal NP (the so-called ‘associate’; four women in (178)). Here I review Chomsky’s (1995:Chapter 4) (henceforth CH4) analysis of *there, which adopts this basic claim of preceding analyses (e.g., Safir (1982; 1985), Chomsky (1981; 1986a)

---

8For the purposes of the discussion in this section, I follow the cited authors in assuming the Visibility Condition. Note, however, that if the Visibility Condition were eliminated, the fact that *there needs Case would require no special explanation; *there’s status as an NP would be enough to explain why it needs Case. One of our arguments against treating *there as an expletive (see §5.4.2.2 below), however, relies on the cited authors’ appeal to the Visibility Condition.

In addition to the question of the need for expletives to get Case, the visibility requirement also raises the question of why non-NP arguments (i.e., CPs, IPs, and PP) do not need Case in order to be assigned a theta-role. For example, the CP complement of say or the IP complement of seem do not get Case, yet are assigned a theta-role.
(among others). I review CH4 in lieu of reviewing all previous analyses of there, because the most recent analysis in the literature, it subsumes the essential characteristics of previous analyses, while in addition offering solutions to residual problems hitherto unresolved.

CH4 holds that the need for there to get Case is only apparent. The real need is for the ‘associate’ to get Case. To summarize, CH4 assumes that the morpheme there is not itself endowed with Case and phi-features; it is only endowed with the D (or EPP) feature, and as such checks off this feature on Agrs. It is the Case and phi-features of the associate which raise at LF to be checked off on Infl (the target). Given this analysis, the sentences in (180) are ungrammatical because the lack of a Case feature on Infl means that the Case feature of the associate is never checked off.

One of the advantages of the CH4 analysis over its predecessors resides in the claim that it is just the features of the associate which raise, and not the entire DP itself. Previous (‘explicative replacement’) analyses, which claimed that the entire DP raises at LF (e.g., Chomsky (1986a)), had difficulty explaining phenomena such as the lack of scopal ambiguity seen in (181a) (c.f. (181b); Williams (1984)), and the lack of binding seen in (182a) (c.f. (182b); den Dikken (1995)).

(181) a. There aren’t many people in the room.
   b. Many people aren’t in the room.

(182) a. *There seem to each other to be some linguists that are eligible for the job.
   b. Some linguists seem to each other to be eligible for the job.

That is, as noted by Williams (1984), the claim that the whole DP raises at LF incorrectly predicts (181a) to be equivalent in meaning to (181b). Moreover, den Dikken (1993) noted that this claim also predicts the DP some linguists to be able to bind the anaphor each other in (182a), as is possible in (182b). These problems are eliminated under the CH4 analysis. With only the Case and phi-features of the DP raising, the actual semantic features of the DP are left in situ at LF in (181a) and (182a). As such, it is correctly predicted that the (relevant part of the) DP cannot take scope over negation in (181a) and cannot bind the anaphor in (182a). Only if the entire DP moves (as in (181b) and (182b)) is a high scopal position of the semantic features of the DP obtained.

---

Note: that an inconsistency in assumptions arises in Chomsky (1995). In particular, while Chomsky assumes the Visibility Condition (i.e., that Case marking obtains so that the NP can be visible for theta-assignment), he analyses French explicative il (e.g., Il est entre trois filles ‘It has entered four women’) and English explicative it as being lexically specified for a Case feature (in contrast with explicative there; see also Cardinaliatti (1997)). It follows from his analysis that an NP (e.g., an explicative) can require Case-checking simply because it possesses an inherent Case feature, and not because it needs to be visible for theta-assignment. Thus, while the Visibility Condition is assumed, it is also assumed that at least some instances of Case-checking are not necessarily subsumed under the visibility requirement.
5.2.1 Questions raised by the expletive analysis

5.2.1.1 Chomsky (1995)

Despite the advantages illustrated above, the CH4 analysis also presents some problems, which I discuss here. These problems were originally raised Lasnik (1992; 1995), in his arguments against 'Case-chain' analyses, such as that of Safrir (1982; 1986). The first problem is the following. Case-chain analyses claim that the associate in (178) gets Case via transmission through a chain. Specifically, *there* is assigned nominative Case in Spec, IP, and transmits this Case to the associate by virtue of being in a chain relation which it, which obtains via co-indexation of the expletive with the associate, as in (183):

(183) There, arrived [four women]

Lasnik points out that the chain analysis incorrectly predicts the following sentence to be grammatical:29

(184) *There, seemed [*there2, to have arrived [four women]*] That is, there is no reason why *(there1, there2, four women)* could not form a chain, much as *(four women, t', t)* or *(there, t, four women)* in (185a,b):

(185) a. [Four women], seemed [t, t', to have arrived t],

b. There, seemed [t, t', to have arrived [four women]],

Lasnik suggests that the ungrammaticality of (184) seems to reside in the fact that the expletive NP (specifically, *there*2) does not get Case. Thus, the need for an expletive to get Case cannot be reduced to the need for the associate to get Case (via a chain); if it did, (184) should be grammatical.30

Lasnik intended this observation to serve as an argument against chain analysis (and consequently against the claim that the associate ultimately gets nominative Case through association with Spec, IP). Note, however, that Lasnik's objection also applies straightforwardly to the CH4 analysis of *there* (which is neither a Case-chain analysis, nor an 'expletive replacement' analysis). That is, the sentence in (184) is predicted to be grammatical by CH4 as well. Under CH4, *there1* checks off the EPP feature on the matrix Inf, while *there2* checks off the EPP feature on the embedded Inf. The Case and phi-features of the matrix Inf are available to be checked off by these features of the associate at LF. The features of the associate can thus move in a successive fashion, first to the Inf of the embedded IP. Since the embedded Inf has no Case or phi-features for the associate's features to be checked against, the features continue to move up to be checked off in the matrix Inf. This derivation is the same one which holds for the grammatical derivation in (185b) above. In (185b), just as in (184), the (trace of) *there* checks off the EPP feature of both the embedded Inf and the matrix Inf. The Case and phi-features of the associate move in a successive fashion, first to the Inf of the embedded IP. Since the embedded Inf has no Case or

---

29Note that (184) is an adaptation of Lasnik's (1992) example (61) (*There is likely there to be a man here*). The change to the verb arrive is simply to render the example directly relevant to the central discussion in this thesis.

30Lasnik's explanation for *there* 's need to get Case will be discussed immediately below (§5.2.1.2).
phi-features for the associate’s features to be checked against, the features continue to move up to be checked off in the matrix Infl. Notice that the Case and phi-features must also move through an intermediate functional projection which does not contain the appropriate features in (186), too, confirming that (184) cannot be ruled out by claiming that the features of the associate cannot move through more than one head in search of the appropriate features:

(186) I believe [I to have arrived four women]

Under the CH4 analysis, in (186) the Case and phi-features of the associate would first have to move to the embedded Infl. Since this head does not contain the appropriate features, they would have to move up again to the Agro head dominating the embedded IP, which presumably contains the appropriate features to check off those of the associate.53

The second problem has to do with the following sentence, which again cannot be directly ruled out by the CH4 analysis (although see §5.2.1.2.2 for a discussion of Lasnik’s (1995)/Chomsky’s (1995) analysis of this sentence):

(187) *There seem four women to have arrived. (cf. (185b))

As with the sentence in (184), (187) is predicted to be grammatical by CH4. The derivation of (187) involves the following structure, before the merging of there:

(188) __ seem [I to have arrived [four women]]

Subsequent movement of four women to the Spec of the lower IP yields the following configuration:

(189) __ seem [I [four women] to have arrived 1,]

Subsequent application of ‘Merge’ to there in the matrix Spec, IP yields (187). If nothing else is said, the sentence in (187) is predicted to be grammatical, because the Case and phi-features of the associate can move at LF to be checked in the matrix Infl, just as in the derivation of (185b). The only difference between the derivation of (187) and that of (185b) is that in the former, movement of the associate obtains before the merging of there, whereas in the latter, the merging of there in the lower Spec, IP obtains before the movement of the associate (see §5.2.1.2.2 for a discussion of the economy difference between the two operations Merge and Move appealed to by Lasnik (1995)).

Thus, neither (184) nor (187) can be straightforwardly ruled out under the CH4 analysis. In what follows, I will review Lasnik’s (1992; 1995) accounts of (184) and (187).
5.2.1.2 Lasnik (1992, 1995)

5.2.1.2.1 Lasnik (1992): Case marking the expletive

Lasnik’s (1992) (and 1995) approach to Case checking of the associate in sentences such as (178) does not fall within the tradition of Case-chain and expletive replacement analyses, which involve some form of linking between the associate and Spec, IP. Rather, following Belfatti (1988) he claims that unaccusatives have the ability to (optionally) assign partitive Case to their d-structure objects. Thus, while he still assumes that the associate moves to the position of the expletive at LF, he claims that this movement does not obtain for Case reasons. Rather, the associate moves to the position of the expletive to “replace” it. There must be replaced because it is an illegitimate LF object, which as such must be deleted at LF. Thus, “replacement” involves obligatory movement of the associate to the position of the expletive, in order to satisfy the EPP.

In order to account for the ungrammaticality of (184), Lasnik (1992) proposes that the visibility condition be extended in scope such that it is a constraint not only on theta-marking, but on movement operations, as well. That is, he proposes that a particular position cannot be visible as the target of movement if that position is not assigned Case. Thus, because the position of there2 in (184) is not marked for Case, the associate cannot move to that position at LF, and the derivation crashes.

In order to explain the ungrammaticality of (183), he also proposes that Case marking be an s-structure requirement, in addition to an LF requirement. Furthermore, he claims that partitive Case marking of the associate by the unaccusative verb obtains under government. Thus, the sentence in (185b) would be grammatical under Lasnik (1992) because the associate finds itself in the appropriate structural configuration at s-structure to be Case marked. In the sentence in (187), however, the associate is not governed by the verb at s-structure. This sentence thus violates his requirement that NPs be in a Case marked position at s-structure.

Note that while Lasnik’s (1992) proposals do account for (184) and (187), these proposals are inconsistent with Minimalist principles. First, his “visibility condition on movement” can only be claimed to apply to LF movement. Sentences such as that in (190) demonstrate that a particular syntactic position does not have to be Case marked in order for it to be a visible target of overt movement:

(190) John seems [IP t1 to be believed [IP t2 to have been arrested]]

That is, the two intermediate Spec, IP positions (those occupied by t1 and t2) are not Case positions, yet are nevertheless available as positions to which (or through which) movement can obtain. Thus, in order to allow (190) but to exclude (184), Lasnik’s extended visibility condition must be restricted such that it can only apply at LF. This restriction of application of a principle to just one level is inconsistent with a central Minimalist assumption, which states that the application of a particular principle to make reference to levels such as d-structure or s-structure. Similarly, the requirement that an NP be Case marked at s-structure in addition to LF (to account for (187)) is also
inconsistent with this Minimalist assumption (this problem is also noted in Lasnik (1995: footnote 12)).

In what follows, I review the analyses of (184) and (187) offered in Lasnik (1995), which eliminate the problems created in Lasnik (1992). It will be shown, however, that the Lasnik (1995) analyses raise other questions which, I claim, render these more current analyses likewise undesirable.

5.2.1.2.2 Lasnik (1995): alternative proposals

The analysis of (187) provided in Lasnik (1995) follows the analysis given in Chomsky (1995). In particular, Lasnik claims that a sentence such as that in (187) is blocked by the principle 'Procrastinate' in the following way. At the stage in the derivation seen in (188), either the operation 'Merge' may apply to there in the embedded Spec, IP, or the associate can 'Move' to the embedded Spec, IP (as noted above). According to Lasnik, the latter operation involves a violation of Procrastinate, since under the former operation (i.e., merging of there), the movement of the associate would be unnecessary. In other words, insertion of there is less costly than movement of the associate, since the operation Merge does not violate any principles, while the movement operation violates Procrastinate. Thus, application of Merge to there blocks the movement of the associate at that point in the derivation, successfully ruling out the derivation that produces (187).

Whether or not this explanation can be maintained rests on the tenability of the claim that Merge must obtain before Move. It has been argued by Ura (1995), for example, that these operations do not compete with one another; according to Ura, two operations compete with one another only if they are both created by the application of 'Move'. Assuming that the question raised by Ura remains open, the question of the tenability of Lasnik's explanation for (187) likewise remains open.

If it indeed turns out that Merge and Move must be compared as operations, and that Merge is less costly than Move, we are still left with the question of Lasnik's (1995) explanation of the sentence in (184). To account for (184), Lasnik observes that there is not permitted with unergative verbs:

(191) a. *There laughed someone.
   b. *There someone laughed.

As Lasnik notes, the assumption that there is an explicative is not enough to rule out the sentences in (191), for if there is inserted into Spec, IP simply to satisfy the EPP, there is no reason why (191) should not be possible. To explain (191), then, Lasnik takes advantage of the idea that 'explicative replacement' involves LF adjunction of the associate to there, which is claimed to be an 'LF-affix'. Such an LF-affix, he proposes, has the specific requirement that an NP marked with partitive Case be affixed to it. Since unergative verbs do not assign partitive Case to their (single external) arguments (in contrast with unaccusatives), (191) is ruled out by virtue of the fact that the NP

94 Again, (187) is an adaptation of the sentence given in Lasnik (1995) (There is likely someone to be here). For the purposes of this discussion, however, the two sentences are equivalent.
adjointed to there at LF is not marked with partitive Case; the requirement of there is thus not satisfied. Lassenk further suggests (footnote 10) that this morphological requirement of there allows us to rule out (184). In particular, in (184) the associate (which gets partitive Case from the unaccusative verb arrive) adjoins to there2, an LF-affix whose needs are satisfied by this adjunction process. However, the new complex [four women - there2], is "arguably not itself a partitive NP" (Lasnik (1995:footnote 10)). Thus, when the whole complex moves to adjoin to there1, the requirements of there1 will not be satisfied.

There are two objections to this analysis that I will consider. The first is a theory internal one: recall our discussion above concerning the problem with 'explicative replacement' analyses of there, which is eliminated once Chomsky's (1995) theory of LF feature movement (used in the Ch14 analysis of there) is adopted. In particular, we saw that the claim that the entire associate moves to the position of the explicative leads to problems concerning scope and binding, exhibited in the examples in (181) and (182). Note that the LF-affix analysis adopted by Lassenk inherits this problem from previous explicative replacement analyses. Although under Lassenk the associate adjoins to the explicative (rather than fully replacing it), it is still in a position from which it can e-command everything dominated by IP.99 This analysis thus makes incorrect predictions concerning the sentences in (181) and (182), in contrast with Chomsky's (1995) analysis, which assumes that only the features of the associate move at LF.

Given that the latter makes correct predictions concerning (181) and (182) while the former does not, the latter must be favored over the former. As a consequence, Lassenk's proposal that there needs an NP with partitive Case affixed to it must also be abandoned, since under the feature movement analysis, the Case and phi-features adjoin to Inf at LF, and not to the explicative which occupies Spec, IP. Once this proposal is abandoned, Lassenk's explanation for the ungrammaticality of (184) is no longer tenable.

The second objection to Lassenk's analysis concerns the claim that there requires an NP with partitive Case affixed to it. This claim is motivated by the observation that unergatives cannot occur with there, while unaccusatives can. Note, however, that even if an LF-affix analysis could be maintained, we do not gain anything by claiming that there is licit only with an associate marked with partitive Case. Such an explanation amounts to an alternative way of describing the fact that there occurs with unaccusatives, but not with unergatives. Furthermore, this claim is in itself not empirically correct. As we shall discuss in §5.4, it is well known that there is not licit with all unaccusatives (e.g., Buzzio (1986), Milasark (1974), Levin (1993)). In order for

---

99 There are two considerations which lead to this conclusion (den Dikken (1995)). The first simply has to do with the ECP: in order for the trace of the associate to be licit, it must be e-commanded by the associate. The second has to do with the definition of e-command. Under the assumption that adjunction of the associate to there creates the configuration seen in (i), we must assume that what counts as the first node dominating the associate cannot be there, since it is only a segment, not a category (Chomsky (1986b), Kayne (1995)).

---

(i)

\[
\text{IP} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{there} \\
\text{I}
\end{array}
\]

\text{[four women] there}

The first full node dominating the associate, then, is IP. As such, under Lassenk's analysis the associate can e-command (and take scope over) any material dominated by IP, giving rise to the problems concerning (181) and (182).
Lasnik's analysis to be descriptively adequate, then, it would have to be revised such that the morphological requirement of *there* were stated in the following way: "*there* selects an NP which must be marked with partitive Case only by a subclass of unaccusatives."

I would like to suggest here that this revised claim could be easily paraphrased in the following way: "*there* is selected by a subclass of unaccusatives." Once the descriptive generalization is stated in this way, it seems less obvious that *there* is a semantically empty morpheme. For the moment, I will not address this conclusion, nor will I elaborate on the claim that the unaccusatives which select *there* form a semantically homogeneous class; I reserve a detailed discussion of these questions for §5.4.1.1. Rather, here I simply note that these are problems raised by an expletive analysis. I turn now instead to a discussion of Moro's (1997) analysis of *there*. As will be shown, Moro's proposal can directly provide a solution to the unsolved problems created by an expletive analysis.

5.3 Moro's analysis of *there* as a raised predicate

As we saw in §4.3.1.1.1, Moro (1997) provides several arguments in favor of analyzing Italian 'expletive' *ci* as a SC predicate. He shows that some of the arguments used for this analysis of *ci* apply directly to expletive *there* in English. For example, as we saw in the Italian sentences in (145) (repeated here as (192)), the PP in a copular construction is obligatorily present:

(192) a. [*Molte copie del libro*, erano \[SC \(t\), [nello studio]]; many copies of the book were in the studio
b. *[*Molte copie del libro*, erano \[SC \(t\), [ci]; many copies of the book were

It is well known that the same facts hold for English ((193a,b) correspond to Moro's (1997:119) (65a,b)):

(193) a. *[Many copies of the book], were \[SC \(t\), in the studio]
   b. *[Many copies of the book], were \[SC \(t\), [ci]]

Moro proposes that (193b) can receive the same explanation as (192b): given an analysis of the PP as the predicate of a SC, (193b) is excluded on the grounds that predicates are not deletable. As with Italian *ci*, however (seen in (146)), the presence of expletive *there* suddenly renders the presence of the PP optional ((194) corresponds to Moro's (1997:119) (65c-d)):

(194) *There were many copies of the book (in the studio).

Why should the presence of an expletive, which is purportedly inserted in Spec, IP simply to satisfy the EPP, have this effect? As Moro notes, this fact is readily explained once *there*, like Italian *ci*, is taken to be the predicate of the SC, as in (195):

(195) *were \[SC \[many copies of the book]] [there]*

As such, the sentence in (194) (without the PP) does not involve a missing predicate. Rather, the predicate is *there*, which raises to subject position, while the SC subject
many copies of the book remains in situ. (194) is thus an instance of what Moro calls an 'inverse copular' sentence.

Similarly, Moro shows, the phenomenon seen in Italian in (147) (repeated here as (16a)) also holds in English (16b):

\[
\begin{align*}
(166) & \quad a. & \text{c' erano [sc co molte copie del libro] [ca la cause della rivolta].} \\
& \quad b. & \text{There were [SC many copies of the book] [adv the cause of the riot].}
\end{align*}
\]

Again, the fact seen in (166b) receives no explanation if there is taken to be a semantically null element inserted directly in Spec, IP. However, the hypothesis that there originates as the predicate of a SC complement of be readily explains the ungrammaticality of (166b): a SC cannot contain two predicates. 77

Analogously to Italian (discussed in §4.3.1.1.2 above), Moro extends this analysis of there as a raised predicate to all unaccusatives. Thus, English there is

77This explanation requires the assumption that the only possible place for the NP the cause of the riot in (166b) is as the predicate of the SC. As Moro notes, this contrasts with a sentence such as that in (194), where the PP, which appears to act as a predicate in the absence of there, is also permissible in the presence of there. As Moro explains, this is possible under the hypothesis that in the presence of there, the PP is taken to be an adjunct, rather than a predicate. Moro offers the following data as evidence in favor of this hypothesis (corresponding to Moro's (1997:119) (66a-b)):

(i) To whom does it seem that many people are indebted?
(ii) *To whom does it seem that there are many people indebted?

(cf.: It seems that there are many people indebted to John)

The idea is that (i-ii) are explained if the AP indebted to whom is taken to be a predicate in (i) but an adjunct in (ii), under the assumption that extraction from an adjunct leads to ungrammaticality (it is not clear to me, however, that (ii) merits a full **). It cannot be similarly shown that a PP co-occurring with there (as in (194)) is an adjunct, since (as is well known) extraction from a PP adjunct does not lead to ungrammaticality (e.g., Which kitchen did he eat in?). Moro notes that NPs can never be adjucnts.

analyzed as the phonologically overt counterpart to Italian's null locative predicate.

This is seen in (197a) with the verb arrive (Moro's (1997:244) example (60); compare with the structure for Italian in (159) above, repeated here as (197b)):

\[
\begin{align*}
(197) & \quad a. & S \quad \downarrow \quad \text{there,} \\
& \quad & \quad \quad \downarrow \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad & \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \quad \text{arrive} \\
& \quad & \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \quad \text{SC} \\
& \quad & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \quad \text{many girls} \\
& \quad & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \quad \text{SC} \\
& \quad & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \quad \text{molt ragazz} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In the following section we will see the advantages Moro's analysis of there has over an expletive analysis.

5.3.1 The elimination of problems caused by an expletive analysis

As Moro shows, many problems created by analyses of there as an expletive are eliminated under his raised predicate analysis. Two of these were
discussed immediately above; here I show that the problems which remain under CH4 (§ 5.2.1 above) are also readily explained under Moro's theory.

The two sentences which have not received an explanation under CH4 (nor under previous expletive replacement analyses) were (184) and (187), repeated here as (198) and (199):

(198) *There1, seem [p, there2, to have arrived [four women]].

(199) *There seem four women to have arrived.

Note that the ungrammaticality of these sentences receives a ready explanation under Moro's analysis of there as a raised predicate. The sentence in (198) is straightforwardly ruled out because the unaccusative verb selects a SC in which only one predicate is admissible. Adding a second there to the sentence would simply involve adding an extra predicate. The sentence in (199), as Moro points out, is ruled out as a violation of locality conditions on movement. That is, the associate occupies the intermediate specifier position as a result of movement (seen in (189), re-elaborated here as (200)):

(200) _ seem [p, [four women, to have arrived [sc, t, there]]

In order to derive (199), the SC predicate there must then move to the matrix Spec, IP, skipping the intermediate Spec position which is occupied by four women ((201) corresponds to Moro's (1997:121) (75b)):

(201) *There, seem [p, [four women, to have arrived [sc, t, t]]

Note that (199) is thus analogous to the standard case of super-raising, seen in (202):

(202) *Mary, seems [p, that [p, it was believed [p, t, to be intelligent]]]

Neither can the sentence in (195) be successfully derived by first raising there, because the trace of there would block movement of the NP into that position (also noted by Zwart (1992:footnote 5)):

(203) There, seem [p, t, to have arrived [sc, [four women, t]]

To conclude this section, we have seen that Moro's analysis of there as the predicate of a SC selected by the unaccusative allows for a straightforward explanation of data that have never been satisfactorily accounted for under an expletive analysis. As we shall see immediately, however, there are several questions raised by the predicate analysis which require explanation.
5.3.2 Questions raised by the predicate analysis

As we have seen, Moro’s analysis of there as a raised predicate provides answers to the questions raised by the data seen in §5.3 above, and also allows for a straightforward explanation of the sentences in (198) and (199), a fact that explicative analyses seem to never have accomplished. However, as we shall see immediately below, the predicate analysis in turn raises several questions which need to be addressed. At the end of this section, I will conclude that the claim that there is a raised predicate of a SC selected by the unaccusative verb is not tenable. In §5.4 I will offer an alternative analysis of there which provides a solution to the problems raised by both the explicative analysis and the predicate analysis.

The first problem raised by Moro’s analysis has already been touched upon in §4.3.2.2 above. That is, in the context of his discussion of English, one of Moro’s many arguments in favor of analyzing there as a predicate instead of an explicative centers around the sentences in (193) and (194), repeated here as (204a,b):

(204) a. Many copies of the book were *in the studio.

b. There were many copies of the book in the studio.

Why should the presence of an explicative render the PP in the studio optional? The predicate analysis provides a ready explanation for this question: omitting the PP in (204a) "...would amount to omitting the predicate of the clause, and would thus be just as serious as omitting come from John has come, yielding *John has." (Moro (1997:105)). A missing PP in (204b), however, does not involve a missing predicate, because the predicate is there. While this analysis may be tenable for there as it occurs with the verb be, it runs into problems once we consider other unaccusative verbs, such as arrive. In particular, the contrast seen in (204) does not obtain with other unaccusatives:

(205) a. Four women arrived (at the station).

b. There arrived four women (at the station).

As can be seen in (205a), a missing PP with arrive still yields a grammatical sentence. Under an analysis which claims that unaccusatives such as arrive take a SC complement, this fact presents a problem, since (205a) without the PP (and without there) would necessarily involve a missing predicate. As we discussed in §4.3.2.2 above, there is no clear solution to this problem.

Another problem with the analysis of there as a predicate has to do with the question of Case assignment. Returning to the question of visibility (raised, for example, in Luićk (1992); §5.2.1.2.1 above), it is not clear why a predicate (as a non-argument) would require Case. According to Moro (1997), the fact that there needs Case follows from his analysis. He states (p. 120), "...Case is assigned to there as to all raised DPs in copular sentences, irrespective of whether they are argumental or not. Assuming the analysis of there as a raised predicate, Case assignment to it is no longer surprising [as it was under explicative analyses], but rather exactly what we would now expect.” This only follows, however, if Case assignment to a raised NP predicate (as in (141)) is likewise unsurprising. If the Visibility Condition holds (see footnote 89 above), then it should indeed be surprising that a predicate NP (a non-argument)
requires Case. Under visibility, then, it would follow that even a predicate analysis of 
there could not offer a ready explanation of Case assignment.109

A final question left unanswered by Moro’s analysis of there is the very question that was left unanswered at the end of §5.2.1.2.2 in the discussion of Lascar’s 
explicative analysis of there. That is, there is only permitted with a small subclass of 
unaccusatives. It has been suggested by some (e.g., Freeze (1992) and Kimball (1973)), 
furthermore, that the verbs which can occur with there all entail some sort of 
‘locational’ semantics. Of course, this observation is not without its problems; for instance, as we shall see below in §5.4.1, it is not true that all unaccusatives which have 
locational semantics can occur with there. On the other hand, it is clear that there is (in 
some yet to be determined way) linked to the semantics of the verb it occurs with. In 
contrast with explicative analyses, Moro also suggests (1997:278, footnote 14) that there 
has semantic content; he states that the “...content of there is to be derived from the 
discourse: by default, it denotes the whole world, ... alternatively, it can be restricted to 
a specific domain, when an adjunct PP is added...”110 However, an explanation for the 
lexical restriction of there is not given.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will motivate an alternative analysis of 
there which aims to provide an explanation for this semantic restriction. Specifically, I 
will show that there, like pro-loc in Bolognese and Italian, should be viewed as a 
weak locative, optionally selected by GOAL-entailing verbs. In other words, there is a 
weak locative goal argument. This analysis will also allow us to eliminate the problems 
rased by both the explicative analysis as well as the predicate analysis of there.

5.4 There is a weak locative goal argument

It has long been noted (e.g., Buzio (1986), Freeze (1992), Kimball (1973), 
Kuno (1971), Levin (1993), L&R, and Milbrath (1974), among many others) that 
expletive there can only occur with a subset of unaccusatives in English.111 If it turns

109If, on the other hand, we assume (along with Moro) that visibility is not a 
factor in Case assignment (i.e., to explain why an NP predicate, as a non-argument, 
needs Case), then a predicate analysis of there would have no advantage over an 
expletive analysis with respect to the issue of Case assignment; under both analyses, one 
could claim that there gets Case simply because it is an NP. The analysis I offer below 
would have the same lack of advantage; see §5.4.2.2.
out that the class of verbs that allows there is semantically homogeneous, then this fact should call into question the claim that there is a semantically empty NP, inserted in subject position simply to satisfy the EPP. However, it may not be immediately obvious what the verbs which occur in there-sentences have in common semantically (noted, for example, by Miltsark (1974); see Appendix below for discussion of a discourse theoretic analysis). Freeze (1992) characterizes the class of verbs which occur with there as 'locative unaccusatives' (also used in Tortora (1996)). The term 'locative unaccusative', however, does not precisely characterize the group of verbs that occur with there. As we saw in Chapter 2, unaccusatives such as leave, exit, and escape entail the existence of a location (specifically, SOURCE). Nevertheless, these verbs do not occur in there-sentences. On the other hand, there is something to Freeze's intuition (also expressed in Hockstra & Mulder (1990)) that the group of unaccusatives that occur with there entail a location of some sort. The question, then, is how to characterize the group of verbs which occur with there such that it includes some location denoting unaccusatives while excluding others.

Given the discussion of Bergomanserese and Italian in the previous chapters, I would like to suggest that there, just like pro-loc, is a weak locative goal argument. In

the following we will see that this hypothesis is supported by the fact that there is restricted to occurring with GOAL-entailing VIDs.

5.4.1 The lexical restriction of there

Levin (1993) gives a list of the unaccusative verbs which occur in there-sentences. These verbs include some Verbs of Inherently Directed Motion (VIDMs) (206), Verbs of Appearance (VOAs) (207), Verbs of Manner of Motion (MOMs) (208), and Verbs of Existence (VOEs), Verbs of Spatial Configuration, and Meander Verbs (209a-c)\(^\text{106}\). (206) arrive, ascend, come, descend, drop, enter, fall, go, pass, rise (207) appear, arise, begin, develop, emerge, occur, etc. (208) fly, jump, march, run, roll, walk, etc. (209) a. exist, grow, remain, survive, etc. (VOEs) b. hang, lie, sit, stand, etc. (Verbs of Spatial Configuration) c. climb, meander, turn, wander, etc. (Meander Verbs)

\(^{106}\) I put aside the few transitive verbs and the small list of transitives used in the passive which Levin (1993:90) lists as occurring in there-sentences. It is possible, however, that the 'transitives' are actually covert unaccusatives; enter is included among these verbs, but as we have seen, in Italian and Bergomanserese this verb selects the auxiliary be, revealing its unaccusative status. As discussed in footnote 72, I thus take such verbs, even in their apparently transitive uses (e.g., Mary entered the room), to be unaccusative VIDs. Other apparently transitive verbs listed in Levin, such as take place, are idiomatic, and may just be verbs of occurrence (in which case they should pattern with GOAL-entailing VIDs; see below). The transitive verbs used in the passive mostly include verbs of creation and putting (e.g., create, write, hang, place), which have an 'appearance' sense (see discussion below on verbs of appearance).
The following verbs are not among the VIDMs listed in Levin (1993) as occurring in 
there-sentences:


VODs also do not occur in there-sentences (noted, e.g., by Burzio (1986), Kimball (1973), and Milsark (1974), as well):


Finally, Verbs of Change of State (COS) are listed as uniformly being excluded from 
there-sentences. For the purposes of exposition, I include only a handful of these verbs 
here, since the group which includes these verbs is large (see Levin (1993:240-248) for 
a complete list of COS verbs):


5.4.1.1 There is selected by GOAL-entailing VIDMs

Let us consider the verbs which can occur in there-sentences, putting aside 
for the moment the VOAs in (207) and the verbs in (209). This leaves us with a 
subclass of VIDMs in (206) and the MOMs in (208). Note that the VIDMs in (206) 
include the GOAL-entailing VIDMs arrive, come, and enter, and the α-telic VIDMs 
ascend, descend, drop, fall, pass, and rise. We can characterize all of these VIDMs as 
GOAL-entailing once we recognize that the fact that the α-telic VIDMs are only 
permitted in there-sentences in their GOAL-entailing sense. Furthermore, it is well 
known that this also holds for the MOMs in (208) (see, a.o., Burzio (1986) and 
Heekstra & Mulder (1990)). This can be seen by the following contrast (taken from 
Heekstra & Mulder (1990-34)):

(213) a. There walked a man into the room.

b. *There walked a man with a dog.

The analysis I would like to provide takes the α-telic VIDMs in (206) and 
the MOMs in (208) to be lexically GOAL-entailing VIDMs.\(^{14}\) Once we can show that 
these verbs are lexically GOAL-entailing, we can claim that only GOAL-entailing 
VIDMs can occur in there-sentences. To show that these verbs are lexically GOAL-
entailing, I will adopt the essentials of L&RH’s analysis of MOMs.

It is well known that MOMs are basically unergative, but also 
systematically exhibit unaccusative behavior (see L&RH for references). This 
'syncretic polysemy' is very productive in English, and L&RH show that these verbs' 
status as both unergatives and as unaccusatives in English is attested by the fact that 
they occur in the unergative resumptive pattern (with a fake reflexive object, for 
example, as in (214a)), as well as in the unaccusative resumptive pattern, as in (214b)
(examples adapted from L&RH):

(214) a. They jumped their way clear of the vehicle.

b. They jumped clear of the vehicle.

\(^{14}\)See footnote 15 in Chapter 2 for comments concerning go. It is clear that 
English go, which is GOAL-entailing in there-sentences, has a different use than 
Borgomanero's n‘go’ , which is basically a SOURCE-entailing verb. As we saw in 
footnote 57, Italian andare ‘go’ is ambiguous between a GOAL-entailing and a non-
GOAL-entailing VIDM.
They also note that when these verbs are used as unaccusatives, they are interpreted as verbs of directed motion. This difference in meaning can be detected in the examples in (214). Specifically, the referent of the NP that does the jumping in (214b) has reached a location-goal. Furthermore, this sentence describes an event which involves a single jump, and not several successive jumps. This is not true of (214a), which contains the unergative instance of the verb; this sentence can describe an event which involves several successive jumps.

To account for this systematic meaning shift, they propose a lexical rule which takes the 'constant' of the verb which appears in the unergative lexical semantic template (i.e., the basic form of the verb) and maps it onto the lexical semantic template that unaccusative verbs of directed motion appear in. The net effect of this mapping rule is that the lexicon contains both an unergative and an unaccusative instance of the verb. Note, however, that this is not equivalent to saying that the lexicon lists two different instances of this verb. Rather, the unaccusative instance of this verb is systematically derived from the unergative instance of the verb via the lexical mapping rule, eliminating redundancy and capturing the systematicity of the polysemy. The appeal of a lexical rule is that it captures the fact that the meaning of the unaccusative instance of a verb such as jump entails a directed change, involving a single jump which ends in a reached goal; it does not entail a process involving successive jumps. As L&RH note, all verbs which entail that their single argument undergoes a directed change project this argument internally (a fact which they capture in their 'Directed Change Linking Rule'). Thus, the lexical mapping rule they propose captures the fact that when the verb describes a directed change, the verb is unaccusative. To put it differently, it captures the fact that when the verb is unaccusative, it describes a directed change.

Note that L&RH's mapping rule states that MOMs are mapped onto the lexical semantic template of 'verbs of directed motion'. Let us make this mapping rule more specific, and claim that the verbs in question are mapped onto the lexical semantic template of 'verbs of directed motion'.
template of "GOAL-entailing verbs of inherently directed motion." I adopt this aspect of their mapping rule simply because the verbs in question specifically take on a GOAL-entailing meaning when used as unaccusatives. If we understand the mapping rule to work in this way, we can claim that the unaccusative instances of the MOMs and the GOAL-entailing instances of the atelic VIDsMs are lexically GOAL-entailing, making them lexically identical to GOAL-entailing VIDsMs like *arrive.106

Now that we have concluded that the MOMs and the atelic VIDsMs that occur in there-sentences are lexically GOAL-entailing (i.e., they are instances of arrive-type verbs as used in this construction), let us turn to VOAs. I would like to suggest that VOAs are GOAL-entailing VIDsMs. To better understand this hypothesis, let us compare both VOAs and VODs with GOAL-entailing and SOURCE-entailing VIDsMs, respectively. While VOAs and VODs are considered in the literature to be classes of verbs distinct from VIDMs, note that they exhibit no behavior that justifies this distinction. For example, as L&RH note, VOAs and VODs do not participate in the causative alternation (examples from L&RH:121):


b. *The thief disappeared the bicycle (from the garage).

As noted in Chapter 2, however, neither do VIDMs.107

106As stated in footnote 11, let us assume that the lexical mapping rule applies to the atelic instance of atelic VIDsMs such as descend. Under this view, the mapping rule in question would target atelic verbs of motion in general, regardless of their basic unergative (e.g., jump) or basic unaccusative (e.g., descend) status.

107Some Italian dialects may use some VIDMs transitively (noted, for example, in More (1997:234); see also references cited therein). The two most common such uses are with scendere 'descent' and salire 'ascent' (examples from P. Benincà, personal communication; see also Benincà (1984)). (i) Ho sceso il gatto / la spazzatura. (causative)

(i) have descended the cat / the garbage

"I brought the cat / the garbage down."

(ii) Ho sceso le scale. (non-causative)

(i) have descended the stairs

"I went down the stairs."

However, note that the phenomenon is very restricted. First, as pointed out to me by P. Benincà, the direct object in these cases can never be animate:

(iii) *Ho sceso Mario. (causative; cf. (i))

(i) have descended Mario

Furthermore, this phenomenon is never attested with arrive, come, return, leave, go, escape, etc. (i.e., with the majority of VIDMs).

108However, see Tortora (to appear) for arguments against the claim that VIDMs cannot occur with resultative XPs.
does not have translation equivalents of verbs such as 'disappear' and 'appear'. In order to express the notion of appearance, the GOAL-entailing VIDs of 'arrive', get 'come', and get fora 'come out' must be used. Similarly, in order to express the notion of disappearance, the SOURCE-entailing VIDs as 'go; leave' must be used. From these observations I conclude that there is no principled reason not to consider VAs to be GOAL-entailing VIDs, and VOs to be SOURCE-entailing VIDs. This is consistent with the conclusion arrived at by L&R (p. 241), who note, "...[w]hat could one ask whether [the verb come] and possibly some of the other verbs of inherently directed motion are better viewed as verbs of appearance in all their uses." The hypothesis made here, however, changes the focus of the conclusion by reducing VAs to GOAL-entailing VIDs, rather than the other way around.

5.4.1.1 There is a WLGA

I have now argued that all of the verbs which occur in there-sentences are lexically GOAL-entailing VIDs (continuing to momentarily put aside the verbs in (209)). Note, furthermore, that all of the verbs excluded from there-sentences are non-GOAL-entailing verbs. The verbs in (210) are all SOURCE-entailing VIDs, as are the VOs in (211) (as concluded in the discussion immediately above). The COS unaccusatives in (212) do not entail a location of any sort. Given this conclusion, let us restate this generalization in terms of the basic hypothesis put forth in this dissertation: only GOAL-entailing VIDs can select there as an optional second internal argument;

in other words, there is a WLGA, the English correlate of the WLGA pro-loc in Borgomanerese and Italian. Thus, just as was observed for pro-loc in Borgomanerese (and Italian), while SOURCE-entailing verbs may optionally project either a PP or a 'strong' locative as a second internal argument (219b,c), GOAL-entailing verbs may optionally project a PP, a strong locative (here or there), or 'weak' there (220b-d):

(219) a. Four women left.
   b. Four women left from the station.
   c. Four women left there.

(220) a. Four women arrived.
   b. Four women arrived at the station.
   c. Four women arrived there
   d. There arrived four women.

The d-structure of the sentence in (220d) is the following:

I shall illustrate immediately below in §5.4.2 why I take the morpheme there in (220d) to be a 'weak locative', like pro-loc in Borgomanerese and Italian, in contrast with 'strong' there. For the moment, however, note that as a weak XP, there in (221) cannot
stay in its base position (see §3.2.4.2.2 for a discussion). As such, it must move to subject position; (222) is thus the surface structure of the sentence in (220d):

(222)  
\[ \text{Spec} \therefore \text{Agr} \rightarrow \text{Agr}^2 \rightarrow \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{Spec} \text{four women} \rightarrow \text{V} \rightarrow t_j \]

Note that the hypothesis that \textit{there} is a WLGA raises a question concerning the semantic effect its syntactic presence may have. It has long been noted that \textit{there}-sentences involve a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal, or as Kimball (1973:265) puts it, an interpretation of 'coming into being for the speaker'.\footnote{Kimball (1973) claims that "...the existential \textit{there} can appear with a sentence if it expresses coming into being of some object, where this coming into being can include coming into the perceptual field of the speaker."} In the discussion of Borgomanerese and Italian, I demonstrated that the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal was due to the syntactic presence of the WLGA, \textit{pro-loc}. A natural hypothesis for English \textit{there}-sentences which would capture a cross-linguistic generalization, then, would be the following: it is the syntactic presence of the WLGA \textit{there} that forces this speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal, just like \textit{pro-loc} in Borgomanerese and Italian. Note that the speaker-oriented interpretation cannot be attributed simply to the semantics of the verbs which may occur in \textit{there}-sentences, because the use of these verbs in non-\textit{there}-sentences (e.g., (220a)) does not necessarily involve such an interpretation.

Unfortunately, however, as can be seen by (220d), the post-verbal position of the subject directly correlates with the presence of the WLGA \textit{there} in English (although see footnote 110 below for a brief discussion of locative inversion). As such, it is not immediately obvious whether it is the post-verbal position of the subject or the presence of the \textit{there} which forces the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. In order to maintain that it is the presence/absence of \textit{there} which counts, let us recall the facts of Borgomanerese (Chapter 3, §3.2.2.4), which can enlighten this discussion. Borgomanerese differs from English in that it allows 'free inversion' (like Italian), regardless of whether or not a locative occupies Spec, IP. As we saw, the absence of the weak locative in Borgomanerese correlates with the absence of a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal; this is the case even when the subject is post-verbal (i.e., even in a normal 'free inversion' construction, as in (47)). Thus, the speaker-oriented interpretation obtains not due to the post-verbal position of the subject, but rather to the presence of the weak locative. I take these facts as indirect evidence that the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal in English \textit{there}-sentences derives from the presence of \textit{there}, and not from the syntactic position of the subject.\footnote{One could ask whether locative inversion constructions serve as evidence against the hypothesis in the text, since (like \textit{there}-sentences) they involve a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal, in spite of the fact that there is no \textit{there}:}
analysis of there: this morpheme cannot be semantically empty if its presence affects
the semantic interpretation of the sentence.

(i) Into the room walked four women.
Locative inversion does not serve as a counter example to our claim if we hypothesize
the existence of a phonologically null locative which occupies Spec, IP in (i) (suggested
to me by P. Bennis, personal communication). This analysis entails that the PP into
the room does not occupy Spec, IP, but rather the Spec of a higher functional projection.
This goes against Hoekstra & Mulder (1990), who claim that the PP occupies Spec, IP.
However, I think certain facts point against this claim. First, note that subject-locus
inversion is not possible in locative inversion sentences, suggesting that the PP (like
sentential subjects) does not occupy Spec, IP:

(ii) *Did into the room walk four women?
Second, locative inversion constructions are not easily embedded, again suggesting that
the PP occupies a position higher than Spec, IP, i.e., one which interferes with the
‘Comp field’:

(iii) "John regretted / claimed / said that into the room walked four women.
Further evidence that it is not the post-verbal position of the subject which yields
the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal comes from English sentences
such as that in (iv) (pointed out to me by M. Eng.; see also Fabb (1987)):

(iv) JOHN arrived.
If the sentence in (iv) is used in an unmarked context, e.g., in answer to the question
"What happened?" (with a rising intonation on John), the location-goal is necessarily
interpreted as speaker-oriented. Thus, (iv) cannot be used to indicate that John arrived
in China, if the speaker was not in China at the time of arrival (unless, of course, John
is interpreted as contrastively focused). Note that this contrasts with the sentence in (v),
which has a rising-falling intonation on arrived:

(v) John ARRIVED.
In contrast with (iv), (v) in an unmarked context does not necessarily yield a speaker-
oriented interpretation (the following is an example context: A picks up a ringing
phone; B is standing next to A, waiting to hear from A what the phone call is all about;
B asks A "What happened?", and A says "John ARRIVED." In this context, John's
arrival can be in China, even though B is not in China at the time of John's arrival). As
was suggested to me by M. Eng., the intonation in (v) (which correlates with the
speaker-oriented intonation) may indicate a low syntactic position of the NP John,
leaving Spec, IP open to be occupied by a phonologically null locative (much as in the
locative inversion sentence in (i)). Under this view, it is the presence of the
phonologically null locative which forces the speaker-oriented interpretation of the
location-goal. This interpretation does not obtain in (v) because John occupies Spec, IP
(which yields the different intonation).

5.4.2 There is weak

In Chapter 3 (§3.2.4.2.2) I introduced Cardinaletti & Starke’s (to appear)
(C&S) theory of weak pronouns and adopted a weak pronoun analysis of pro-loc. Here
I show that there, like pro-loc, must be analyzed as a weak XP. In order to show this, in
what follows I will present additional particulars of C&S’s analysis which were not
discussed in Chapter 3.

C&S provide extensive cross-linguistic evidence which shows that
pronouns divide into three distinct grammatical classes: ‘strong pronouns’, ‘weak
pronouns’, and clitics. The first two types of pronouns, strong and weak, exhibit
syntactic and semantic differences. In §3.2.4.2 we discussed two properties of weak
pronouns which differentiate them from strong pronouns: (i) weak pronouns can refer
to non-human entities, and (ii) weak pronouns must move overtly to a Case-related
position. This was illustrated with the two morphologically distinct third person plural
feminine nominative pronouns, loro and esse, in (73) and (74) (repeated here as (223)
and (224) for convenience):11

(223) a. Esse sono troppo alte.
they-fem are very tall
b. Loro sono troppo alte.
 (= the girls; *the roses)
they-fem are very tall

111Loro is also used as the third person masculine pronoun, and is used as an
accusative and dative, as well as a nominative.
Another syntactic difference between these two pronouns is that *loro* can occur in peripheral positions, such as in a cleft (227a), left dislocation (227b), right dislocation (227c), and in isolation (227d), while *esse* is allowed none of these options (228a-d):

(227) a. *Sono loro* che sono belle.
    are they-fem that are beautiful
    "It is them that are beautiful."

b. *Loro, loro* sono belle.
    They-fem, they-fem are beautiful.

c. *Arriveremo presto, loro.*
    will arrive 3pl soon, they-fem

d. *Quali sono belle? Loro.*
    which are beautiful? They-fem.

(228) a. *Sono esse* che sono belle.
    are they-fem that are beautiful

b. *Essi, esse* sono belle.
    They-fem, they-fem are beautiful.

c. *Arriveremo presto, essi.*
    will arrive 3pl soon, they-fem

d. *Quali sono belle? Essi.*
    which are beautiful? They-fem.

To summarize, *loro* and *esse* exhibit a semantic difference: *loro* can only refer to [+human] entities, while *esse* can refer to both human and non-human entities. This semantic difference correlates with a difference in syntactic behavior: *loro* has a free syntactic distribution, while *esse* can only occur in Spec, IP. This correlation suggests the following hypothesis: if a pronoun X can refer to both human and non-human entities, X must be weak; as such, we predict it to exhibit the syntactic behavior exhibited by the weak pronoun *esse*. 
C&S note that in contrast to Italian, which has two morphologically distinct third person plural feminine nominative pronouns, French has the single morphological form elles ‘they (fem)’. Like Italian esse, French elles can refer to both human and nonhuman entities. This fact suggests that elles is a weak pronoun, like esse. Yet unexpectedly, unlike esse, elles can be coordinated, thus exhibiting the syntactic behavior exhibited by the strong pronoun loro. However, C&S note the revealing fact that when elles is coordinated with another NP, it can only refer to a [+human] entity.

This can be seen in (229):

(229) a. Elles sont trop grans. (= the girls; the roses)
   “They are too big.”

   b. Elles et celles d’à côté sont trop grans. (= the girls; "the roses"
   "They and those besides are too big.

Thus, when elles is coordinated with another NP, it suddenly exhibits the semantic limitation exhibited by the strong pronoun loro. Why should coordination restrict the semantic interpretation of elles in this way? C&S propose that the behavior of elles can be understood in the context of Italian esse and loro if French, just like Italian, is analyzed as having two third person plural feminine nominative pronouns, one weak and one strong. Unlike Italian, however, the two pronouns in French are homophonous: elles and elles. Note that the facts seen in (229) directly follow under this hypothesis: elles is disambiguated in a coordinate structure, since only strong pronouns can be coordinated (and as such, only the [+human] interpretation of the pronoun should be possible in such a context). In other words, the [+human] interpretation is excluded in the coordinate structure, because elles is excluded from this structure.

French thus provides an example of a pronoun which is ambiguous between strong and weak.

Now that we have seen the motivation for positing the existence of these two distinct grammatical classes, let us return to the question of there in English. It is well known that the morpheme there in there-sentences exhibits a distinct semantic and syntactic behavior from ‘deictic’ there (see, for example, Allan (1971; 1972)). In the context of the above discussion concerning elles and elles, the hypothesis that English possesses a weak there and a strong there would allow us to capture a cross-linguistic generalization. In support of this hypothesis, note that the syntactic restrictions exhibited by the weak pronoun esse in Italian are exactly the same restrictions exhibited by weak there in English. That is, weak there cannot be coordinated (230a), modified (230b), clefted (230c), or used in isolation (230d) (cf. Allan (1971), who uses some of these tests also to show that this morpheme is different from strong ‘deictic’ there). This contrasts with the behavior of strong there, seen in (231) (note that 230c,d are ungrammatical under the intended interpretation):

(230) a. *Here and there arrived four women.

   b. *Right there arrived four women.

   c. *It is there that arrived four women (at the station).

   d. Where did four women arrive? *There.

(231) a. Four women arrived here and there.

   b. Four women arrived right there.
c. It is there/at the station that four women arrived.
d. Where did four women arrive? There.

Note, too, that as with Italian esse, these syntactic restrictions exhibited by weak there correlate with a semantic distinction: weak there does not have the same ability to refer to a contextual location as strong (deictic) there. Furthermore, like the weak pronoun esse, there cannot remain in its base position:

(232) *Four women arrived there.

To put it differently, the syntactic behavior exhibited by a weak pronoun such as esse allows us to understand there's obligatory occupation of Spec, IP within the greater context of a general cross-linguistic phenomenon. The obligatory overt movement of weak there to subject position is not an isolated fact about there, but rather a general cross-linguistic fact about weak pronouns that they cannot remain in their base positions.  

112How this semantic restriction relates to the ability of a weak pronoun such as esse to refer to a [-human] entity will be discussed below in §5.4.2.1

113Moro (1997:279, footnote 22) states that "...there...has the characteristics both of maximal projections and of heads, in that it occupies a spec-position but cannot contain either specifiers or complements." This observation is consistent with the analysis of there in (230b) as a weak XP. However, the fact that there can be modified by right in (231b) is evidence that there are two distinct morphemes in the English lexicon. This conclusion contrasts with that of Moro (1997:138-145), who claims that the 'explicative like' behavior of there is derived syntactically, suggesting that the English lexicon contains only one there. It is not clear, however, how the syntactic process Moro proposes can account for the fact that there in (230b) cannot be modified while there in (231b) can. Furthermore, his proposal does not allow for a unification of these morphological facts and those exhibited by weak esse and strong loro in Italian, or weak elles and strong elles in French. Under the hypothesis that there are two different theres, however, the modification phenomena follow directly from a more general universal fact about weak and strong pronouns.

Note that the hypothesis offered here is reminiscent of Sampson's (1972) conclusion that the English lexicon contains two theres: for him, one is underlyingly at it (our weak there) and the other is underlyingly at that (our strong there). This is consistent with C&S's observation that it is a weak pronoun (and that that is a strong pronoun).

114C&S (p. 33) actually claim that the weak pronoun's lack of [-human] specification is due to a missing functional head in its structure. This contrasts with the structure projected by a strong pronoun, which projects the functional head in which the feature resides. This is illustrated in (i) and (ii) (I use a DP for the purposes of exposition, although C&S use a CP; FP refers to a generic 'functional projection'):
'impoveryment' in the specification of the feature [+human] is what enables the weak pronoun to refer to [+ or - human] referents: with no value for the feature specified, the pronoun is "free to corefer with any... antecedent" (C&S:33). The strong pronoun, on the other hand, is constrained by its feature specification to corefer with an antecedent that is [+human].

5.4.2.2 The feature deficiency of weak there

In what follows, I will show that this feature 'impoveryment' exhibited by weak pronouns has a correlate in the weak locative. The discussion will center around weak there, but the conclusions will be assumed for pro-loc, the weak locative in Borneoanerese and Italian. As we shall see in §5.4.2.1.1, the speaker-oriented interpretation which is forced by the syntactic presence of the weak locative can be

(i) strong pronoun:

```
  DP
    Spec D' D
      +human
    FP
      Spec F
      NP %here
```

(ii) weak pronoun:

```
  FP
    Spec F
      NP %there
```

C&S's analysis thus suggests that the entire [+human] feature is missing in the weak pronoun. This contrasts with the analysis I provide in the text, which holds that the weak pronoun possesses the [+human] feature, which however is not specified for a value. It will become clear below why I modify C&S's proposal in this way.

reduced to the more general phenomenon of feature impoverishment exhibited by weak XPs.

As we saw above, the semantic difference exhibited by strong vs. weak pronouns is captured by positing the existence of an impoverished feature specification for weak pronouns. Let us consider how this analysis of weak pronouns can bear on the analysis of the weak locative. It is well known that weak there and strong there differ semantically. The former has been characterized as 'non-referential' or 'non-deictic', and the latter has been characterized as 'deictic'. For example, while Freeze (1992) takes weak there to be lexically locative, he states that it is 'pleonastic', and "...must be distinguished from the deictic there, which is referential and for which here may be substituated" (footnote 15). He also states that "...establishing that the proform there is locative does NOT make it deictic: it has a [+LOC] feature, but it does not refer to a place within some utterance context" (footnote 11). Thus, weak there is semantically deficient with respect to strong there, much like Italian weak esse is semantically deficient with respect to strong lori.

Let us capture this distinction between weak there and strong there in the same way the distinction between esse and lori is captured. In order to do so, we must consider which features are needed to minimally distinguish strong there from here and from the demonstrative that. First, let us suppose that there has the feature [locative], which is what differentiates it from that (cf. Freeze's (1992:footnote 11) suggestion, noted in the preceding paragraph). Furthermore, as was noted in footnote 20 above, 'deictics' such as here and there employ the speaker as their reference point (Frawley
(1992)). To differentiate between the two, then, let us adopt this essential insight and assume the existence of a feature \([\text{speaker}]\) (following Fillmore (1971), Cinque (1972), and Vanelli (1995), among others). Thus, the deictic locative \(\text{here}\) encodes a location near the speaker by means of a positive value for the feature (i.e., \([+\text{speaker}]\)), while the deictic locative \(\text{there}\) encodes a location removed from the speaker by means of a negative value for the feature (i.e., \([-\text{speaker}]\)). This gives us the following characterization of the two deictic locatives:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. strong } \text{there}: & \quad [+\text{locative}, [-\text{speaker}]] \\
\text{b. strong } \text{here}: & \quad [+\text{locative}, [+\text{speaker}]]
\end{align*}
\]

We saw above that the semantics of weak \(\text{esse}\) in Italian can be accounted for by positing the loss of the value for the feature \([\text{human}]\). Let us take this analysis of weak \(\text{esse}\) as a key to the appropriate analysis of weak \(\text{there}\). That is, in order to account for the semantics of weak \(\text{there}\), let us posit the loss of the value for the feature \([\text{speaker}]\). This gives us the following lexical characterization of weak \(\text{there}\):

\[
\text{weak } \text{there}: \quad [+\text{locative}, [+\text{speaker}]]
\]

Given this analysis, the difference between weak \(\text{there}\) and strong \(\text{there}\) parallels the difference between weak \(\text{esse}\) and strong \(\text{loro}\) in Italian, or weak \(\text{elles}\) and strong \(\text{elles}\) in French (see §5.4.2); the weak instance of the pair is missing a value for the relevant feature, while the strong instance of the pair has a value specified for the relevant feature:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{233} & \quad \text{a. weak } \text{there}: \quad [\text{speaker}] & \text{strong } \text{there}: & \quad [-\text{speaker}] \\
\text{b. weak } \text{esse}: \quad [\text{human}] & \text{strong } \text{loro}: & \quad [+\text{human}] \\
\text{c. weak } \text{elles}: \quad [\text{human}] & \text{strong } \text{elles}: & \quad [+\text{human}]
\end{align*}
\]

Note that this analysis of weak \(\text{there}\) captures the widely held intuition that this morpheme is semantically locative, yet at the same time is semantically impoverished with respect to deictic \(\text{there}\).

\subsection{The speaker-oriented interpretation}

As was demonstrated in the previous chapters (§3.2.2.4, §4.2.1.2) and above (§5.4.1.1), it is the syntactic presence of the weak locative which yields the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. Now that I have provided an analysis of the weak locative in terms of features, I will offer an explanation for this phenomenon. I would like to suggest that the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal obtains as a result of the fact that the feature \([\text{speaker}]\) is not specified for a value (see (234) above).

Let us suppose that, although the feature \([\text{speaker}]\) is lexically unspecified for a value, there is a grammatical constraint such that it must ultimately be specified. There are two possible ways in which this feature can be assigned a value: (i) by referring to a location in the linguistic or spatial context, or (ii) through 'default' assignment. Let us first discuss the former possibility. Until now, we have addressed the interpretation of the WLGA in the absence of any linguistic context. Note,
however, that if the syntactic context provides a location, the WLGA refers to it.

Concerning English, Kimball (1973:265) notes that "[t]he restriction on speaker placement [in there-sentences] can be relaxed to the extent that the speaker can be replaced by some point of reference, with respect to which the moving object is coming into being. Thus, we might have, 'Sherry was sitting in the house when there entered a white dove,' so with respect to Sherry the dove is coming into being." Thus, the matrix sentence Sherry was sitting in the house provides a location that weak there can refer to.

In Italian, we can see that the syntactic context need not contain an explicit PP (such as in the house in Kimball's English example) in order to serve as a deictic anchor for the WLGA. Recall (Chapter 4) that the location-goal in (118) (repeated here as (236)) must get a speaker-oriented interpretation:

(236) pro-loo arriva Maria.
pro-loo arrives Maria
  "Mary is arriving." (i-subject unmarked; GOAL is speaker-oriented)

However, once such a sentence is embedded under another sentence, as in (237), the location-goal is no longer speaker-oriented:

(237) Erano tutti contenti perché arriva Maria.
  (they) were all happy because arrived Maria.
  "They were all happy because Maria was arriving."

Although the location-goal is not speaker-oriented in (237), note that its interpretation is still restricted. In particular, the location of Maria's arrival can only be that of the happy people (thanks to P. Besnier for pointing this out to me). This is the case in spite of the fact that there is no PP in the matrix sentence denoting a location. It is important to note that this restricted interpretation is not a logical necessity; an imaginable (although non-existent) interpretation of (237) is that the people (who were not in China) were happy because Maria arrived in China.115 This fact illustrates that the WLGA refers to the deictic coordinates of the sentence, and not just any location that may have been previously mentioned in the discourse. Thus, even if the discourse which precedes the sentence in (237) includes a discussion of China, China cannot serve as the location that the WLGA gets its reference from (if the happy people were not in China).116 The WLGA thus behaves like an anaphor, in that it is an NP which does not have any inherent reference of its own, and so must get its reference from something in a syntactic domain.

In the absence of any syntactic context from which the WLGA can derive its reference, the feature [speaker] is assigned the default value '+-' (possibility (ii) above). The question arises as to why the default value is not '+' instead. While I do not offer a principled answer to this question, let us note that from a conceptual standpoint, it is simpler if the default value is '+', rather than '-' If the latter were the default value, the number of locations that there could refer to would be unrestricted, since there are an indefinite number of locations which are removed from the speaker (pointed out to me by both A. Cardinali and M. Enq). The former value, on the other

115This, in fact, is a possible interpretation if Maria is contrastively focused (which is expected, given our discussion in Chapter 4). It is important to keep in mind, however, that we are concerned with the interpretation of the location-goal under the unmarked interpretation of the embedded sentence (i.e., the case in which pro-loo is present).

116Thus, the feature [speaker] differs from the feature [human] in that the latter can take its value from a referent in the context (cf. the referential possibilities exhibited by esse).
hand, restricts the number of locations to one. It is important to note that the interpretation of the location-goal is obligatorily speaker-oriented in the absence of syntactic context, even if a location is provided in the discourse. Thus, if the person who utters (236) is not in China at the time of Maria's arrival, the location-goal cannot be China, even if it has been previously mentioned in the discourse.

One final comment must be made concerning the assignment of the default value ‘+’. If nothing else is said, this process ultimately renders weak there indistinguishable from here (seen in (233b) above). This is problematic, since sentences which contain the weak locative do not require that the location-goal be interpreted as ‘here’. What is required to remedy this problem is a modification of our analysis of here in (233b). To do this, let us note that there is another difference between here and strong there that has not yet been mentioned, and which is not encoded in (233). In particular, here (in contrast with strong there) uses the moment of speech as a reference point; in other words, here can only refer to the location the speaker is in at the moment of speech. Thus, here is anchored to the speech act in a way that there is not. Given this distinction, let us change our analysis of here in (233b) to that in (233b):

(238) a. strong there: [+locative], [+speaker]
     b. strong here: [+locative], [+speaker], [+speech act]

Thus, weak there (after it has been assigned a positive value for the feature [speaker]) and strong here differ in that only the latter contains the feature [+speech act]:

(239) a. weak there: [+locative], [+speaker]
     b. strong here: [+locative], [+speaker], [+speech act]

The lack of the feature [+speech act] for weak there captures the fact that when weak there is used, the speaker does not have to be in the location goal at the moment of speech in order for the sentence to be true, in contrast with here.

---

111 A question which comes to mind is the following: if the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal is derived through the presence of the weak locative, then why doesn't the existential (which also uses weak there) get a speaker-oriented interpretation? I cannot offer a principled answer to this question here. However, note that a location-goal differs conceptually from a state at a location. The former is taken to be a single spatial point at the end of a path; this is conceptualized, for example, by an arrow →, the point of which indicates a single spatial point as the goal). A state at a location, on the other hand, can conceptually involve extended space. How these distinct conceptualizations are to be encoded in the grammar is beyond the scope of the present discussion. However, for the present purposes I will assume that they relate to the above question. The speaker-oriented interpretation of the location goal might be derived compositionally through both the syntactic presence of the weak locative plus this spatial conceptualization of a location-goal (thanks to Y. Li for helpful discussion here; he is not, however, responsible for the inconclusiveness of this point).

---

112 As Ciphone (1972:581) points out, "...there exists no word that specifies the place of the Speaker in a time different from the present, an equivalent of "here" in the past tense, so to speak." He notes that in contrast, the deictic element entailed by the verb come, for example, is not anchored to the time of utterance. Under our analysis, weak there and pro-loc (as WLGAs) are words which specify the place of the speaker at a time different from the present (i.e., a "here" with no anchor to the time of utterance). Even given our analysis, however, Ciphone's statement that there exists no such word still seems correct, since the WLGAs is not lexically specified for [+speaker].

Also note that under our analysis, weak there must be taken to be 'deictic' (since ultimately it specifies [+speaker]), contrary to its characterization in the literature. Again, however, the traditional intuition that this morpheme is not deictic is captured by our claim that it is not lexically specified for a value for the feature [+speaker].
5.4.2.3 Other Advantages of the WLGA Analysis

Here I would like to show that there are several other advantages to the analysis of there as a WLGA, in addition to those noted above. To consider these advantages, let us return to the questions raised by both the expletive and predicate analyses of there, discussed in §5.2.1 and §5.3.2 above.

As we saw in §5.2.1, there are two sentences discussed in Lasnik (1992; 1995) that do not receive an explanation under an expletive analysis of there. These are repeated here for convenience:

(240) *There1, seem [2, there2, to have arrived [four women]].

(241) *There seem four women to have arrived.

In §5.3.1 we saw that the ungrammaticality of these sentences receives a ready explanation under Moro’s analysis of there as a raised predicate. The sentence in (240) is straightforwardly ruled out because the unaccusative verb selects a SC in which only one predicate is admissible; the second there would simply have no source. The sentence in (241) is straightforwardly ruled out as a violation of locality conditions on movement. That is, in order to derive this sentence, the SC predicate there must move to the matrix Spec, IP, skipping the intermediate Spec position which is occupied by four women; this is illustrated again here:

(242) *There, seem [four women], to have arrived [Spec 1 2 3 4]

Thus, (241) is analogous to the standard cases of super-raising.

These advantages of Moro’s analysis can be extended to the analysis of there as a WLGA. Under the WLGA analysis, the sentence in (240) is ruled out because adding a second there would amount to having two indirect object arguments, violating the theta-criterion. The sentence in (241) is ruled out as an instance of super-raising under our analysis as well, since the WLGA there undergoes NP raising from its d-structure position as an indirect object to its a-structure position in Spec, IP. With respect to these questions, then, our analysis is in spirit more like Moro’s analysis, and adopts his important insight which allows for a straightforward explanation of the data: there is base generated VP-internally, not inserted in Spec, IP to satisfy the EPP.

In addition to providing a straightforward account for the sentences in (240) and (241) (which have always been problematic under expletive analyses), the hypothesis that there is a WLGA allows us to eliminate the problems raised under the predicate analysis. First, recall from §5.3.2 that the analysis of there as the predicate of a SC complement of unaccusative verbs such as arrive predicts that the presence of there is obligatory in the absence of a PP. As we saw, this is an incorrect prediction; the example is repeated here for convenience:

(243) a. There arrived four women.

b. Four women arrived.

That is, (243b) necessarily involves a missing predicate under Moro’s analysis (see §4.3.2.3 and §5.3.2 for a discussion of why this state of affairs is problematic). Under the hypothesis that there is a WLGA, however, (243b) is expected; as we have seen, VIMs project their second internal argument optionally. Second, note that the...
question which was left unanswered at the end of §5.2.1.2.2 (in the discussion of Lamik's expletive analysis of there) is also left unanswered by Moro's analysis: why is there only permitted with a small subclass of unaccusatives? The analysis of there as a WLGA not only provides an answer to this question, but also allows for a unification of the English facts with those exhibited by Italian (Chapter 4) and Borgomannese (Chapter 3). Third, the analysis of there as the predicate of a SC raises a question concerning Case assignment. If the concept of 'visibility' is maintained as an explanation for Case assignment, it is not clear why a predicate (as a non-argument) would require Case (see §5.2 and §5.3.2 for a discussion). However, under the analysis offered here, the need for there to get Case is straightforward: there is an argument, and as such needs Case in order to be visible for theta-marking. In what follows, I will discuss the issue of Case assignment in more detail.

5.4.2.3.1 The WLGA and Case assignment

The analysis of weak there as an argument allows us to explain in a straightforward way why Case is assigned to this morpheme. Here I show how, exactly, Case assignment works under this analysis. We shall see that there are good reasons for claiming that there and the i-subject are assigned Case by one and the same Case assigner (namely, Infl). After I provide evidence which shows that nominative is assigned to both arguments, I will suggest a modification of Chomsky's (1995:Chapter

4) analysis of Case checking; in particular, I will propose that the nominative Case feature in Infl survives (i.e., is not deleted) if it is checked off by a weak NP.19

There are at least two possible analyses of Case assignment of there. One analysis can take advantage of there's status as a second internal argument, and simply stipulate that it is assigned inherent dative Case by the unaccusative verb that selects it. Under such an analysis, we can continue to assume that the (Case feature of the) i-subject checks nominative in Infl (at LF). Such an analysis might be desirable because it would involve no additional complications to the system. However, this analysis would cause us to miss an important cross-linguistic generalization concerning i-subjects and agreement. In order to understand the nature of this generalization, let us turn to ghi-sentences in Borgomannese.

As we noted in §3.2.4.2, ghi-sentences involve obligatory third person singular agreement on the verb, even when the i-subject is third person plural. This was illustrated in (61a), repeated here as (244):

(244) Ghi è rimarghi do muti.
SLOC Inf arrived-LOC two. fem girls

We concluded from this fact that pro-loc (which occupies Spec, IP) triggers (singular) agreement on the verb (i.e., pro-loc checks the phi-features in Infl).120 Assuming that

19 The development of this section has benefitted greatly from a discussion with L. Burzio, although he is in no way responsible for any of its flaws.

120 In the discussion which follows, "triggering agreement on the verb" should be understood as "checking phi-features in Infl." Similarly, "assignment of nominative Case" should be understood as "checking the nominative Case feature in Infl."

On the basis of the behavior of expletives in several Romance and Germanic languages, Cardinalini (1997) concludes that expletives which are unambiguously marked for nominative Case (e.g., French il) trigger agreement with the verb. If we
Case and agreement go together (an assumption traditionally made in the analysis of there-sentences), the example in (244) would suggest that in addition to checking the phi-features on Infl, pro-loc also checks the (nominative) Case feature on this head. Keeping this conclusion in mind, let us now turn to the question of how the i-subject gets Case.

A concern which immediately comes to mind regarding Case assignment of the i-subject is the Case filter. The claim that pro-loc checks nominative Case in (244) would seem to suggest that the i-subject cannot also be assigned nominative. Lassik's (1992; 1995) analysis of Case assignment in there-sentences could provide a solution to this problem. As we saw in §5.2.1.2.1, he claims (following Belletti (1988)) that unaccusatives have the ability to (optionally) assign partitive Case to their d-structure objects. He instantiates this idea by claiming that the i-subject checks partitive Case in Spec, Agro at LF. In spite of the dictates of the Case filter, however, there are at least two pieces of evidence which lead to the conclusion that the i-subject is assigned nominative Case, rather than some other Case assigned in Agro. First, as is illustrated in Buzzio (1986; to appear), subject inversion with pronouns in Italian (which are morphologically marked for Case) reveals that the Case of the i-subject is nominative:

(245) Arrivò io / *me.
      will-arrive I / *me

The second piece of evidence which suggests that the i-subject is assigned nominative Case is somewhat more complicated, requiring a discussion of agreement in ghi-sentences. Let us anticipate the conclusion of the discussion: contrary to appearances, the i-subject agrees with the verb in (244). This means that both the pro-loc in Spec, IP and the i-subject check off the phi-features in Infl. Under the assumption that Case and agreement go together, it will follow that the i-subject (in addition to pro-loc) is assigned nominative Case.

The apparent lack of agreement between a third person plural i-subject and the verb exhibited in (244) is common in Romance. Let us refer to languages which exhibit this type of agreement pattern as '3SG-3PL' languages. Both Cardinaletti (1997) and Chomsky (1995: Chapter 4) conclude on the basis of this type of agreement

\[\text{12}\]

As far as I know, it is impossible to show in Romance that a post-verbal third person pronoun gets nominative Case, because such pronouns (i.e., the 'strong' pronouns; see §3.2.4.2.2) are all ambiguous between nominative and accusative (e.g., Italian lui 'he/they', lei 'she/they', loro 'they/them'; also pointed out by Sacco (1993:132)). The third person pronouns which are unambiguously nominative are all weak (e.g., Italian egli 'he', esse 'they/them'), and as such cannot occur post-verbally.

I note here that Benincà (1995) discusses some data on exclamatives which may call into question the use of examples such as that in (245) as evidence for the nominative status of i-subjects. As Benincà shows, pronouns with nominative morphology are used in contexts in which there is no nominative Case assigning head:

\[(f) \quad \text{Furbo, io (ad accentare)!} \]

\[\text{sly, } 1 \text{ (to accept)}\]

P. Benincà suggests (personal communication) that pronouns such as io may not necessarily be marked for nominative. I leave this matter open.
pattern in French that (the phi-features of) such i-subjects do not move at LF to check the phi-features in Infl. Note that this claim predicts the following: any i-subject should be possible with a verb that exhibits 3SG morphology. This is an incorrect prediction; it is well known that only third person (singular and) plural i-subjects are permitted with third person singular verbal morphology in 3SG-3PL languages. This can be seen, for example, in Borgomanerese, which does not allow first and second person i-subjects in the phi-construction:

    SLOC is arrived-LOC you.sg you.pl

b. * Ngh è rivè-gghi më / vjau.
    SLOC is arrived-LOC 1 / we

The dialect of Conegliano (Saccon (1992;1993)) also exhibits apparent lack of agreement between the verb and the i-subject. This can be seen in (247) (taken from Saccon (1993:133)), where a non-agreeing subject clitic (e/ì) occurs with a third person feminine i-subject:

(247) Eî e ndat e/ì.
    SCL(-agr) is gone she

Nevertheless, the apparently non-agreeing i-subject can only be third person, and not first or second, as can be seen in (248):

(248) *Eî e ndat ii.
    SCL(-agr) is gone you

It is important to note that the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (246) and (248) is not due to a general ban on first and second person i-subjects. Such subjects are possible, as long as they agree with the verb. This can be seen in the Italian example in (245) above, as well as in the following examples from Borgomanerese (249a,b) and Coneglianese (249c):

(249) a. I summa rivè nja.
    SCL be.1pl arrived we

b. I son rivè më.
    SCL be.1sg arrived I

c. Ye se ndat li.
    SCL(+agr) are gone you

Coneglianese (Saccon (1993:133))

Again, as far as I know, the agreement pattern seen in (249a-c) is found in all 3SG-3PL languages. The ungrammaticality of (246) thus casts doubt on the claim that the phi-features of the i-subject in 3SG-3PL languages do not raise to check off the phi-features in Infl; if they did, we would expect (246) to be grammatical, contrary to fact.

The above set of facts thus suggest that the third person plural i-subject in 3SG-3PL languages does in fact agree with the verb, contrary to appearances. In support of this conclusion, let us turn to Burzio (1991; to appear), who argues for the notion of 'pseudo-agreement' in order to account for an apparently independent set of facts concerning impersonal/reflexive si in Romance. As can be seen in (250), impersonal si can occur with a third person singular i-subject:

(250) Si invitè anche lui.
    SI will-invite.3sg also he
    "He will be invited as well."

Burzio shows that si can also occur with a third person plural i-subject (251a), however, it cannot occur with a first or second person i-subject (251b):

(251) a. Si invitè anche loro.
    SI will-invite.3pl also they
    "They will be invited as well."
As Burzio (to appear) points out, the phenomenon of pseudo-agreement is again found in 'quirky subject' (QS) constructions in Icelandic. He notes that QSs in Icelandic apparently do not trigger verb agreement:

(254) Strákum var bjargast.
the boys.dat was.3sg rescued
"The boys were rescued."

To account for this, he proposes that the QS has both a 'quirky Case' and a nominative Case assigned to it, such that nominative is 'stacked' onto the QS:

(255) [[[NP ] Q-Case ] Nom ]
            (Burzio (to appear))

According to Burzio, the agreement features in Infl are blocked by the Q-Case shell, and as such cannot see into the inner NP; the plural feature of the NP thus does not reach Infl. He further proposes that the outer shell has no agreement features, resulting in default (i.e., 3SG) agreement between the QS and the verb. To support this analysis, he notes (citing Sigurðason (1991)) yet another property of QS sentences in Icelandic, namely that they cannot occur with first and second person nominative objects; rather, they are limited to third person nominative objects, as in (256):

(256) Hænni voru sjöndir bilarnir.
her.dat were shown the-cars.nom

Under the assumption that the QS is connected to Infl (in spite of the apparent lack of agreement between QS and verb in sentences such as that in (254)), this fact is accounted for under the (independently needed) notion of pseudo-agreement. In particular, note that the nominative object triggers agreement on the verb. If the nominative object were first or second person, then the QS hænni 'her.dat' (the outer shelf of which is featureless) could not pseudo-agree with the first or second person

b. *Si uinviteremo. ancie not.
Si will-invite.1pl also we

He argues that the ungrammaticality of (251b) can be explained (i) if we take both the i-subject and the impersonal subject si to be connected to Infl, and (ii) if agreement is defined as follows:

(252) a. agrees with β if: (Burzio (1991))

(a) (Strict Agreement) α and β have identical Φ-features, or

(b) (Pseudo-Agreement):

(i) β has no gender, no number, no person

(ii) α is third person

The featureless element si (pseudo-)agrees with the third person verb in (250) and (251a); it cannot, however, (pseudo-)agree with the non-third person verb in (251b). The above cases are then unified with the case of reflexive si, which occurs with both singular and plural third person antecedents (253a,b), but not first or second person antecedents, as in (253c):

(253) a. Lui si inviterok.
he SI will-invite.3sg
"He will invite himself."

b. Loro si inviteranno.
they SI will-invite.3pl
"They will invite themselves."

c. *Noi si inviteremo.
we SI will-invite.1pl
features in Inf, and as such, would not be licit. In other words, the hypothesis that the (featureless outer shell of the) Qs pseudo-agrees with the verb, and the fact that the nominative object also checks agreement in Inf accounts for the obligatoriness of a third person nominative object.

To sum up, then, the fact that (apparently non-agreeing) i-subjects in Romance can only be third person is part of a more general cross-linguistic phenomenon. This restriction of objects to third person (regardless of number) in the presence of third person verbal morphology is captured under Burzio’s formulation of the notion of pseudo-agreement, which covers the apparently independent phenomena concerning impersonal/reflexive si and quirky subjects in Icelandic. I conclude, then, that the third person plural i-subject in 3SG-3PL languages does in fact (pseudo-)agree with the verb (as in, e.g., (244) above). Furthermore, under the assumption that Case and agreement go together, I conclude that the verb assigns nominative Case to the i-subject. Our earlier conclusion that the verb also assigns nominative to pro-loc in (244) results in the claim that the verb assigns nominative to two different arguments. As we discussed earlier, concern over the Case filter might lead us to prefer an alternative solution to Case assignment of the WLGA and the i-subject. However, any solution which involves Case assignment of these two arguments by distinct Case assigning heads would not allow us to explain the obligatoriness of third person i-subjects in the WLGA-constitutions, and it would not allow us to unify this fact with the similar facts revolving around impersonal/reflexive si and QSS in Icelandic.

Let us see how the above discussion bears on the analysis of the WLGA in English. In apparent contrast with languages like Borgomansese (see (244)), in English it is the (plural) i-subject in there-sentences that triggers (plural) agreement with the verb, rather than the WLGA:

(257) There have arrived four women.

(257) seems to indicate, then, that there, unlike pro-loc, does not trigger verb agreement (this is assumed by both Chomsky (1995:Chapter 4) and Cardinaletti (1997)). However, as we saw for QSS sentences in Icelandic, there are good reasons to hypothesize that there does in fact (pseudo-)agree with the verb. Under such a hypothesis, we predict that the i-subject can only be third person; note that this is a correct prediction:

(258) *There am I. (intended interpretation)

Like the case of QSS in Icelandic, the ungrammaticality of (258) is explained if we assume that both the WLGA and the i-subject are connected to Inf; since the (featureless) WLGA (pseudo-)agrees with the third person verb, the i-subject must also

12 The ungrammaticality of (258) cannot be due to a ban on first and second person (=definite) i-subjects in there-sentences. As Milstein (1974) and Belletti (1988) note, definite i-subjects are permitted under a list reading:

(i) Who was there at the party? Well, there was Sue, there was Bill...
First and second person i-subjects are permitted in such a context:

(ii) Who was there at the party? Well, there was you, there was me...
Note that in (ii), there is no agreement between the first / second person i-subject and the verb. This indicates that in contrast with sentences such as that in (257), there is no link between Inf and the i-subject in (ii). This is confirmed by the fact that such i-subjects cannot be nominative:

(iii) *Well, there was I/he/she/... Thus, sentences such as that in (ii) do not serve as a counter-evidence to the claim being made in the text.
be third person. The hypothesis that there is an argument base-generated in
complement position which moves to subject position and (pseudo-)agrees with the
verb suggests that there is in fact a quirky subject. If so, then we should not be
surprised that there-sentences in English exhibit the same characteristics as QS
sentences in Icelandic.

To summarize, we have shown that the obligatoriness of third person i-
subjects in WLGA constructions in both Borgomaneroes and English can be explained
if we adopt Burzio’s notion of pseudo-agreement, which is independently needed to
account for the facts surrounding impersonal/reflexive si and QS sentences in Icelandic.
Thus, both the WLGA (pro-loco and there) and the i-subject agree with the verb. Since
nominative Case and agreement go together, I conclude that both the i-subject and the
WLGA are assigned nominative by Infl.

The evidence which shows that both the WLGA and the i-subject check
nominative Case in Infl suggests a modification of Chomsky’s (1993:Chapter 4)
analysis of nominative Case assignment which (i) accounts for the data discussed
above, and (ii) eliminates an undesirable aspect of his analysis. Chomsky claims that
the nominative Case feature on Infl is [-interpretable], and as such must be checked-off;
once this feature is checked-off, it is deleted. Under this theory, then, Case checking in
the WLGA construction would work in the following way: when the pro-loco there
argument checks off the nominative Case feature in Infl (via spec-head agreement), this
feature is deleted; as such, the nominative Case feature in Infl is no longer an available
target for checking of the nominative Case feature of the i-subject at LF. Chomsky
(1993:274) and Cardinaletti (1997) both argue for such an analysis of Case checking in
French expletive constructions such as the following (see footnote 90):

(259) Il est entré il vix homens.
    it is entered three men

Note that this analysis entails that the Case feature of the i-subject is never checked off.
In other words, under this analysis the i-subject is never assigned Case (in violation of
the Case filter), an undesirable consequence.

To eliminate this consequence of Chomsky’s and Cardinaletti’s analysis, I
propose the following: if the nominative Case feature in Infl is checked off by a weak
NP (i.e., either a weak argument or an expletive), this feature is not deleted from Infl.12
As such, it is available to be checked off again by the i-subject. This analysis allows us
to render Chomsky’s and Cardinaletti’s analysis of French-type expletive constructions
unproblematic from the point of view of the Case filter, which requires that every NP be
assigned Case. Furthermore, it allows us to account for the fact that both the WLGA
and the i-subject check nominative Case in Infl.

Recall that Chomsky and Cardinaletti assume that there is an expletive, and
claim that unlike French if, it does not check off the Case and phi-features in Infl;
rather, it is the (Case and phi-) features of the i-subject which raise at LF to check off
these features. Note that this hypothesis incorrectly predicts the sentence in (258) to be
grammatical. Thus, the hypothesis that there is an expletive cannot explain the above
set of facts concerning i-subjects in there-sentences, and cannot unify them with the

12We might assume that one of the properties of weak NPs is that they are not
‘strong’ enough to delete the Case feature they check off.
similar set of facts exhibited by QS sentences in Icelandic and impersonal/reflexive of constructions in Italian.

5.4.3 Verbs of Existence

Now let us return to the verbs in (209). As we saw, there can occur with VOEs, Verbs of Spatial Configuration, and Meander Verbs, in addition to GOAL-entailing VIMs. The fact that there can occur with VOEs is consistent with the facts of Bergomanserese and Italian, and the hypothesis put forth in Chapter 3 (§3.3): the weak locative can be used as the morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category LOCATION. If it can be shown that Verbs of Spatial Configuration and Meander Verbs as used in there-sentences have a ‘existence’ meaning, then we can claim that these verbs are VOEs as well. The hypothesis that weak there is used as a LOCATION argument can thus apply to all three classes of verbs in (209).

In fact, putting aside GOAL-entailing VIMs, it is well known that when non-be verbs are used in there-sentences, they function as VOEs. This is noted, for example, by Milnik (1974:156), who demonstrates that the verb grow has two meanings: “increase in size or maturity” and “live robustly.” Note that the latter is arguably an ‘existence’ reading, while the former is a ‘change of state’ reading. As Milnik notes, when grow occurs in a there-sentence, only its existence reading is possible:

(260) There grew some corn in our garden last year.

L&RH show that Verbs of Spatial Configuration (as in (209b)) have multiple meanings (much like grow). The verb sit, for example, has a ‘simple position’ reading, a ‘maintain position’ reading, and an ‘assume position’ reading, seen in (261a-c) (adapted from L&RH, p. 239):

(261) a. The book was sitting on the table.
    b. Mary was sitting on the chair.
    c. Mary sat as quickly as she could. (= ‘sit down’)

Like with the verb grow, when the verb sit occurs in a there-sentence, only one reading, the ‘simple position’ reading in this case, becomes available:

(262) There sat four women in the back of the room.

L&RH argue that Verbs of Spatial Configuration in their ‘simple position’ sense are VOEs. Thus, the verb in (262), which describes the location of the NP four women, is a VOE. We can conclude, then, that Verbs of Spatial Configuration, as used in there-sentences, are lexically VOEs.

Finally, the same argument can be made for Meander Verbs. Like Verbs of Spatial Configuration, Meander Verbs have multiple senses. This can be seen, for example, with the verb wander:

(263) a. Four women wandered through the forest.
    b. A beautiful river wandered through the forest.

In (263a), the verb wander describes spatial displacement of the NP four women; in (263b), it mainly describes the location of the NP it is predicated of. Note that when wander is used in a there-sentence, only the latter sense is possible:
(264) a. *There wandered four women through the forest.

b. There wandered a beautiful river through the forest.

Just like the verb sit, then, wander has an existence sense when it is used in a there-sentence. In other words, Meander Verbs as they occur in there-sentences are VOEa.

We can conclude, then, that the two types of verbs that occur with there are GOAL-entailing VIMDs and VOEs (which entail the conceptual category LOCATION). Thus, as was demonstrated for the weak locative morpheme \textit{(pro-loc)} in Borgomanerean and Italian (see §3.3 and §4.3.3), the weak locative there is optionally selected by both GOAL- and LOCATION-entailing unaccusatives as a second internal argument.

5.5 Conclusions

The analysis of \textit{there} as a WLGA captures the intuition that this morpheme is both expletive-like and at the same time has semantic content. It explains the restriction of \textit{there} to GOAL-entailing VIMDs and VOEs (capturing the traditional intuition, expressed, for example, by Kimball (1993) that \textit{there}-sentences are possible with VOAs and VOEs). It also explains why the presence of \textit{there} has an effect on the semantic interpretation of the sentence it appears in, and why the syntactic presence of \textit{there} entails that the subject of the sentence must be post-verbal. The particular properties of this morpheme, that it is 'non-definite', that it cannot be modified, coordinated, used in isolation, or remain in its base position, were shown to follow from the fact that it is weak. Thus, the properties exhibited by there are not unique, but rather can be understood in the general context of weak pronouns. Like other weak pronouns, \textit{there} has an impoverished set of features, but is not wholly deprived of a feature composition; it still has the feature [locative] and the feature [speaker], rendering it non-semantically null. This analysis of \textit{there}, which is extended to \textit{pro-loc}, also allows us to better understand why the presence of this morpheme forces a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. The WLGA analysis of \textit{there} also has the advantage of eliminating several problems raised by an expletive analysis. As a modification and extension of Moro's theory, it also allows us to eliminate the problems created by a predicate analysis. \textit{There} gets Case because as an argument it is subject to the visibility requirement; the claim that both \textit{there} and the i-subject are assigned nominative Case by \textit{Inf} is supported by the fact that \textit{there}-sentences are restricted to third person i-subjects.
Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS

The central hypothesis in this dissertation raises many questions which are beyond the scope of this thesis. Here I briefly conclude this work by touching upon some of these questions, with the hope that they will serve as points for future research into the nature of weak and expletive morphemes.

One question raised by the theory put forth here concerns languages which use a weak locative morpheme with all classes of verbs. Putting the facts of Borgomanerese and Italian aside, the hypothesis that weak there in English is not an expletive is supported by the fact that it only occurs with GOAL-entailing unaccusatives, and that its presence forces a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. Note, however, that the claim that there is an argument in English does not preclude the possibility that the weak locative in other languages is a 'pure expletive'. Our hypothesis, then, leaves open the question of the status of Dutch er, for example (see Zwart (1991)), which occurs with all classes of verbs. As stated in footnote 102 above, it is possible that Dutch er is ambiguous between an expletive and a WLGA. Zwart, who adopts Moro's analysis of English existential there as a raised predicate, argues that er is ambiguous between a semantically empty expletive and a raised predicate. Whether Zwart's tests (which show that existential er is base generated in complement position) will reveal that er is also base generated as a complement of GOAL-entailing VIDs remains to be seen.

'Pleonastic' ye in Piedmontese is a case which is intermediate between English there / Borgomanerese gli, on the one hand, and Dutch er on the other. Unlike the former, it occurs with all unaccusatives, but unlike the latter it cannot occur with unergatives and transitives. Given that ye occurs with all unaccusatives, it cannot be a GOAL argument. At the same time, however, the question arises as to why it is restricted to unaccusatives. If ye were a pure expletive, we would expect to find it with transitives and unergatives, contrary to fact. Piedmontese unergatives such as telefonié allow i-subjects just like unaccusatives do, so the restriction of ye to unaccusatives cannot be due to the lack of availability of the subject position. Calabrese (1992:111) claims (following DeVincenzi (1988) and Kratzer (1987)) that all unaccusatives in Italian take a (null) spatio-temporal argument. Considering this suggestion, a possibility which comes to mind concerning Piedmontese ye is that it is the overt morpho-syntactic instantiation of this argument. As with Dutch er, however, these questions concerning ye remain open.

A question raised by the claim that existential there is a LOCATION argument concerns languages which use a weak non-locative morpheme (it) for the existential, such as Black English (e.g., Wolfram (1991): 'It's a picture on TV' 'There's a picture on TV'), Norwegian, and Swedish (see, a.o., den Dikken (1995) and Vikner
(1995)). At first glance, such languages would seem to call into question the claim (suggested also by Freeze (1992)) that there is a connection between the locative morphology of weak *there* and the locational semantics of existentials. However, the claim that weak *there* in English is a LOCATION argument does not necessarily preclude the possibility of languages which select a weak non-locative as a second internal argument. Perhaps Black English does not have a weak locative in its morphological inventory. I leave this question open as a matter for further investigation.

A final question I would like to address here is how the claim that weak *there* is an argument bears on L&RH’s (Chapter 6) discourse theoretic explanation for the restriction of *there*-sentences to a subclass of unaccusatives. I would like to show that although my analysis does not preclude a discourse theoretic analysis of *there*-sentences, discourse theory is not enough to explain the lexical restriction of *there*, nor does it allow for a unification of the facts of English with those of Borgomanereanese and Italian.

It has been argued (see, for example, Rochemont (1986) and Rochemont & Culicover (1990)) that *there*-sentences allow for presentational focus of the post-verbal subject, such that the subject is interpreted as being “introduced on the scene.” Birner (1992; 1994) argues for a more fine-grained analysis of the information status of the post-verbal subject. Specifically, she claims that the post-verbal subject must be interpreted as relatively unfamiliar with respect to the material that precedes the subject. L&RH (Chapter 6), adopting the essentials of Birner’s account of the discourse function of inversion constructions, argue that the fact that inversion constructions are restricted to certain types of verbs follows from this requirement. Specifically, since the post-verbal subject must be relatively unfamiliar, a verb is licit in such constructions only if it is ‘informationally light’, rendering it relatively more familiar than the post-verbal subject. As L&RH state, “...if a verb in the locative inversion construction did contribute information that was not predictable from context, it would detract from the newness of the information conveyed by the post-verbal NP.” Their analysis makes specific reference to the locative inversion construction (see footnote 110 above). However, they take their analysis of locative inversion to be applicable to *there*-sentences; in the discussion which follows, then, I use L&RH’s examples of locative inversion to illustrate certain points, keeping in mind that the conclusions they draw from the locative inversion examples are applied to *there*-sentences.

L&RH note that locative inversion does not permit the large class of Change of State (COS) unaccusatives (see in (212) above). They claim that this is due to the fact that COS verbs are not informationally light. They note: “by predicating an externally caused, and therefore unpredictable, change of state of their argument, these verbs themselves contribute discourse-new information and hence are not eligible for the construction.” As evidence in favor of this view, they discuss the verbs *break* and *open*, both of which have (at least) two different senses. One is the core change of state meaning (e.g., *the vase broke, the door opened*), and the other is the ‘appearance’ meaning (e.g., *the war broke*). They demonstrate that the locative inversion
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construction only allows the latter meaning ((265) is adapted from L&R, p. 234, example (33)):

(265)  a. Then broke the war...

   b. Underneath him opened a cavity...

L&R note that such cases of multiple senses of verbs which are basically COS verbs are sporadic, and as such probably do not result from any systematic meaning shift. However, they claim that in the attested cases, such as those above, "the shift in meaning is accompanied by a 'bleaching' of the verb's meaning so that little more than the notion of appearance is left" (p. 234). In other words, the verbs become informationally light, allowing them to occur in the locative inversion construction.

Two observations can be made concerning this explanation for the restricted distribution of there. First, the task of defining 'informational lightness' may not be so straightforward. Note that if what is required of the verb is informational lightness, then we would predict the COS verbs alter and change, which express a pure change of state (with no additional information as to how the change of state comes about), to be possible in there-sentences. As can be seen by the following sentence, however, this prediction is not borne out:

(266) *There changed / altered the sky from purple to blue.

   (cf.: The sky changed / altered from purple to blue.)

It is difficult to see how change and alter are not sufficiently informationally light, with respect to the COS verbs break or melt, for example. As noted above, L&R point out that all COS verbs predicate an externally caused (and therefore unpredictable) change of state of their argument; under their view, this is sufficient to render these verbs non-

informationally light. However, while it is true that the entailment of an externally caused (and hence unpredictable) change of state may count as contributing discourse new information, it is not clear how such information is any more 'heavy' than, say, the information entailed by verbs like walk vs. run, which are found in abundance in there-sentences and locative inversion constructions. That is, like alter and change, walk and run are not entirely deplete of discourse new information (yet the former are banned from there-sentences, while the latter not). Walking entails a different manner of motion than running, so these verbs do involve extra information which goes beyond the notion of appearance. Recall that L&R suggest that break is possible in (265a) because the verb's meaning has been 'bleached', leaving little more than the notion of appearance. But if such bleaching (to the point of yielding a verb which has no more than a pure appearance sense) were required to make the verb sufficiently informationally light, we would expect all motion verbs in there-sentences to have little more than an appearance sense (i.e., we would expect no difference in meaning between two different appearance verbs). However, as we just saw with walk and run, this is not the case. Similarly, enter and arrive (also found in there-sentences) involve information that goes beyond the appearance sense. Entering is a very specific type of arriving; the meaning of enter entails passing through a threshold (in contrast with the meaning of arrive). Without a way to distinguish this additional information furnished by enter (specifics of crossing a threshold) from that furnished by change (existence of an externally caused change of state), it is difficult to establish that the former is informationally light, while the latter is not. Given the extra (i.e., discourse new)
information furnished by *enter* or *run*, we would expect these to be ineligible for the *there*-construction, contrary to fact. Thus, the verbs *enter*, *run*, *walk*, etc. show that *there*-sentences allow verbs which have some discourse new information. Given this state of affairs, it is not clear how *after* and *change* can be excluded from *there*-sentences by virtue of their not being informationally light, while at the same time including the other verbs.

The second observation regarding L&RH's explanation for the restricted distribution of *there* is that it cannot be adopted for Borgomanerese and Italian. As we saw, *pro-loc* (the weak locative) is restricted to GOAL-entailing verbs, just like *there*. However, neither the *ghi*-construction in Borgomanerese nor sentences with *pro-loc* in Italian have the same discourse function as *there*-sentences in English. As we noted in Chapters 3 and 4, the *pro-loc* sentences in Borgomanerese and Italian do not involve narrow focus (neither presentational nor contrastive) of the i-subject. Rather, the whole sentence is interpreted as new information, such that there is no requirement that the post-verbal subject be interpreted as relatively unfamiliar with respect to the material that precedes the subject (in contrast with *there*-sentences in English). Given this state of affairs, the restriction of *pro-loc* to GOAL-entailing VIDsMe cannot be given the same explanation as the restriction of *there* to the same verbs. The WLGA hypothesis, however, allows a unified account of the English phenomenon with the Borgomanerese and Italian phenomena.

It is important to note that this proposal does not preclude a discourse analysis of *there*-sentences. It may be that the semantics of a *there*-sentence is such that the construction 'lends' itself to the specific discourse function it has (to "introduce the referent of the NP onto the scene," with the requirement that the NP be relatively unfamiliar with respect to the material that precedes it). The semantics of the sentence compositionally obtains as a result of various independent semantic and syntactic factors. For example, the fact that *there* is a weak XP means that it must overtly move from its d-structure position to Spec, IP (see (222) above). The net result of this syntactic operation is that the 'subject' NP remains post-verbal. Furthermore, the syntactic presence of the weak locative forces the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. In other words, the view here is that "the compositional semantics of the construction allows the construction to have the discourse function that it does," rather than "the discourse function of the construction is what makes the construction select the types of verbs it does."
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