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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 clitics (*ngh...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 WLGA allows us to capture neatly many of the
classical 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 Burzio (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, telicity, 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. Borgomanese 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 Borgomanese 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 zatt ("below") dialect, as opposed to the variety spoken in the northern half of the town, known as the dad zó ("above") dialect.

The orthography I use for Borgomanese is one which I have adopted from the Borgomanese writers and poets of today, including Giuseppe Bacchetta (Bacotta), Pier Mario Pettinaroli (Calistu), Mario Piemontesi, and Piero Velati, who in turn adopted (and adapted) the orthography used by Gianun Colombo, a writer of the 1950s-1960s who left behind a brief unpublished description of some aspects of the phonology and syntax of Borgomanese. 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 /i/, /I/, or /u/, assuming as predictable the accent on the penultimate syllable (e.g., riva /ri've/ 'he arrives' vs. rivá /ri've/ 'arrived (past participle)'; partì /par'ti/ 'place' vs. parti /par'ti/ 'leave'); (ii) to orthographically disambiguate two monosyllabic homophones (e.g., la 'the (fem. sing)' vs. là 'there'). There are some idiosyncratic uses of the accent mark, where its elimination would result in no ambiguity (e.g., gnì /n'I/ 'come'; ìl /'I/ 'do/make'). Perhaps the intuition here is that all regular infinitival forms bear their word stress on the final syllable (e.g., mangè 'cat', durmi '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 /b/ is written as c before the front vowels /i/, /I/, and /u/ (e.g., naci /nati/ 'gone'), and as ci before the back vowels /aI/, /aI/, and /a/ (e.g., ciamè /ca'mè/ 'ask'). The phonemes /k/ and /g/ are written as ch and gh before the front vowels, (e.g., chi /ki/ 'here'; daghi /dagI/ 'I give'), and as c and g before the back vowels (e.g., că /ka/ 'home'). The grapheme ge is also adopted from Italian, to indicate the voiced palatal nasal (e.g., gnì /n'I/ 'come'). Unlike Italian, Borgomanese has a
voiced alveo-palatal fricative /\/. On analogy with the Italian grapheme sc, which is used to indicate the voiceless alveo-palatal fricative /\/ before back vowels (e.g., Italian scio 'strike'), Borgomanerese writers tend to use the grapheme sg for /\/ (e.g. sgi /\//d/ 'down'; lenga /\//t\a/ 'she reads'). However, sometimes it is also written as gi (e.g., Gjuanin /\//o\i/ 'Gianni'; gjobia /\//o\i/ 'Thursday'), or even as g, which is used in Italian for the voiceless alveo-palatal affricate (e.g., mongia /\//\n\a/ '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 /\o/ and tense /\i/, which are written as ů and o, respectively (e.g., eon /\o\n/ 'dog'; zo /\o/ 'above'); these two vowels always carry the main word stress. In addition, it has a high front rounded vowel, written as ñ, which may or may not bear the word stress (e.g., citzina /\i\n\z/ 'kitchen' vs. tuczi /\i\t\k\i/ 'everyone'). Like Standard Italian, Borgomanerese also has the two mid front vowels, tense /\i/ and lax /\i/, as well as the two mid back vowels tense /\o/ and lax /\a/. These are distinguished orthographically with an acute accent on the tense vowel and a grave accent on the lax vowel (i.e., as é and è, and as ó and ò, 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., mangé /\m\n\À\l\e/ 'cat' vs. Bubuà /\b\bu\À\n\À/ 'Borgomanero'); (ii) when orthographic disambiguation is helpful (e.g., è /\e/ 'is' vs. e /\e/ 'and', telefunè /\tele\fu\À/ '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., nse /\n\se/ 'such'). I have nevertheless adopted these uses as well, out of respect for their written tradition.

Otherwise, the graphemes e and ò are used, without an accent mark.
Chapter 2

UNACCUSATIVE VERB CLASSES

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 intransitives 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):

(1) \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{adj}} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{V} \\
\end{array} \]

(2) \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{obj}} \\
\end{array} \]

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 (1995) terms, these are the verbs that participate in the 'causative alternation').

---

1Hale & 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.

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

3Simplifying 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.
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', 
*sembrare* 'seem'
```

---

1If 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 d-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 for 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.

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 (Jackendoft (1990:259) also views leave as entailing a Source). 7 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’. 8 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 Jackendoft (1990). Specifically, they are convenient terms for the conceptual category which Jackendoft (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.

Jackendoft (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 Jackendoft (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'):

$\begin{align*}
(7) \quad & T \\
& e_1 \quad e_2
\end{align*}$

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:

$\begin{align*}
(8) \quad & T \\
& e_1 \quad e_2 \\
& GO \quad state \ at \ a \ LOCATION \ Y
\end{align*}$

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:

$\begin{align*}
(9) \quad & T \\
& e_1 \quad e_2 \\
& state \ at \ a \ LOCATION \ Y \quad not \ at \ Y
\end{align*}$

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.\(^{10}\)

2.2.2 *α*-telle 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&RH refer to as "stelic 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:

$\begin{align*}
(10) \quad & a. \ The \ airplane \ descended \ for \ 5 \ minutes.
\end{align*}$

\(^{10}\) 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 Pustejovsky's terms, it has a non-complex event structure, which can be represented in his system in the following way (P indicates 'process'):

(11) \[ P \]
    \[ e \]

\[ \text{downward motion} \]

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

(12) 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:

(13) \[ T \]
    \[ e \]
    \[ \text{downward motion} \]
    \[ e \]
    \[ \text{state at a LOCATION Y} \]

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 atelic 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

---

\(^{11}\) The idea here is that atelic VIDMs are "variable behavior verbs" (in the sense of L&RH). L&RH note (as does Perlmutter (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&RH 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) a-telic VIDMs (ambiguous between entailing / not entailing a GOAL; e.g. descend, rise, fall)

SOURCE-entailing VIDMs and atelic 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 (ghi...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 termed 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 i-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.

3.2 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 VIDs iva 'arrive', gni 'come', gni ndre / turni ndre 'return', and gni dendi '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 rivà-gghi na fjola.
   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"14

present perfect. While a detailed explanation of this restriction is a matter for future research, here I will offer a few comments on this restriction. As Poletto (1993; in preparation) and Roberts (1991) note, many Northern Italian dialects possess a series of subject clitics which appear only with auxiliary verbs (clitici soggetto di auxiliare "auxiliary subject clitics" in Poletto'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).

14Note that the geminate gg in the examples (e.g. rivà-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:

(i) 1 o mangià-lu.  
    SCL have.1sg eaten-it  
    "I have eaten it."

(ii) 1 mangia-lu.
    SCL eat.1sg-it  
    "I eat it."

As can be seen in (14-5), ghi also encliticizes to certain prepositions. Again, this is just a general fact about object cliticization in Borgomanerese:

(iii) I porti al libbru.
    SCL carry.1sg the book
    "I carry the book."

(iv) I porti-lu.
    SCL carry.1sg-it
    "I carry it."

(v) I porti dendi-lu.
    SCL carry.1sg inside-it
    "I carry it inside."

That an object clitic (such as lu in (iv)) 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 torta 'the cake' must follow the adverb sempre 'always', while the clitic lu appears in a higher position:

(vi) I mangi sempre la torta.
    SCL eat.1sg always the cake
    "I always eat the cake."
c. Ngh è gnò ndre-gghi l me omu.
SLOC is come back-LOC the my man
“My husband returned.”

d. Ngh è turnà ndre-gghi l me omu.
SLOC is returned back-LOC the my man
“My husband returned.”

e. Ngh è gnò denta-gghi na segretaría.
SLOC is come inside-LOC a secretary
“A secretary entered.”

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

(15) a. L è naci l Mario. nsòmma lój.
SLOC is gone the Mario, with them
“Mario went with them.”

b. L è naci la me amisa.
SLOC is gone the my friend
“My friend left.”

c. L è partè-gghi na fiola.
SLOC is left-LOC a girl
“A girl left.”

d. L è scapà un cón.
SLOC is escaped a dog
“A dog escaped.”

e. L è naci fora na parzuna.
SLOC is gone out a person
“A person exited.”

(vii) f mòngia-la sempri.
SCL eat.1sg.i: always
*I mòngi sempra-lá.

The VIDM né ‘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 (15c), 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 vesti ‘be’, and not avej ‘have’ (Borgomanerese is like Italian with respect to auxiliary selection).
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.\footnote{Although see below in §3.2.2.3 and §3.3 concerning the existential construction.}

It should be noted that this occurrence of ghi with certain unaccusatives in Borgomanerese 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 Torino in Piedmont), when the subject of an unaccusative is in post-verbal position, the clitic ye appears:¹⁸

\[(19) \quad A \ y \ riva \ i \ clien. \quad (Burzio's \ (82b), \ p. \ 122)\]
\nSCL 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):

\[(20) \quad I \ clien \ a \ y \ riva.\]
\nthe 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 yes 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):

\[(21) \quad a. \ *A \ y \ purtava \ sempre \ i \ cit \ a\ Valentin.\]
\nSCL there took always the kids to the Valentin

\[\text{The clitic ye appears as } y \text{ when pre-verbal.}\]
b. A y riva i client ntel negosi.
   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.19 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.20 The deictic locatives which mean 'here' are chi, scià, chinsé, chilò, and chilonsé (22a).21 Ghi can also be used to

---

19This line of reasoning has been adopted by several researchers in the past, the most recent of which is Freeze (1992), 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.

20I use the term 'deictic' to refer to a morpheme which employs the speaker as its reference point (Frawley (1992)). Thus, here and there are deictic locatives in English, the former encoding a location that is near the speaker (call it [+speaker]), and the latter encoding a location that is removed from the speaker (call it [-speaker]). Use of the feature [speaker] (originally used by Fillmore (1971), and then by Cinque (1972) and Vanelli (1995), among others) will become crucial in the analysis of the 'weak locative morpheme' in Chapter 5.

21The morphemes chilò, chinsé, and chilonsé are composed of the morpheme chi plus the bound form lo (deriving from Latin ILLOC), and/or nse 'as such' (equivalent to Italian così). The difference in meaning among these elements is subtle and requires further study. However, a preliminary investigation reveals that chilò and chilonsé indicate a location that has a higher degree of proximity to the speaker than the location indicated by chi and chinsé (see, e.g., Frawley (1992)). P. Benincà suggests (personal communication) that the demonstrative system in Borgomanerese (like that of Spanish, Tuscan varieties, and literary Italian) may employ the feature [hearer], such that chilò and chilonsé are [+hearer]. While further investigation is also required for scià, I note here some interesting distributional facts. Scià is relatively restricted; in contrast with the other locatives, it is essentially only licit with verbs of motion and with the existential:

(i) *Ven chi / scià!
come here
mean 'here', as can be seen by (22b):

(22)  a. La Maria lē gnō chi / scià / chinsē / chilō / chilōnē.
    the Maria SCL is come here.
    "Maria came here."

  b. La Maria lē gnō-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 inō and là (23a).22

(23)  a. La Maria lē naci inō / là.
    the Maria SCL is gone there.
    "Maria went there."

  b. La Maria lē naci-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. Mangi 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. Mangi 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

---

22 While further study is required, an initial investigation indicates that the locatives inō and là differ in terms of remoteness (see, e.g., Frawley (1992)). The former encodes a location which is away from the speaker to a lesser degree of remoteness than the location encoded by the latter (whether inō is [+hearer] (see footnote 21) is a matter for further research). For example, Varda inō! '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 eventualty, 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 *neg* (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 ragazzia nella stanza.*
LOC are three masc 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

*Ngh è gghi tre mataj int la stőza.*
SLOC is-LOC three masc 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).²³ The locative in the Borgomanerese existential (seen in (27), which is a direct translation of the Italian (26)), has the same status as Italian existential *ci*, according to native speakers of Borgomanerese. For the purposes of exposition, let us temporarily refer to

²³The two different *cis* (i.e., the NDL and the "expletive") also exhibit different contraction possibilities. Many speakers prefer contraction of the NDL *ci* and the auxiliary essere 'be':

(i) *C’ è andata ieri.*
there is (she)gone yesterday
"She went there yesterday."

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

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

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

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

(iv) *Ci è stata una ragazzia 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 *ghi* (and Italian *ci*) as used in the existential as the 'locative expletive', to distinguish it from the NDL *ghi* (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 *ghi* in the *ghi*-construction in (14) has the same status of the *ghi* in the existential construction in (27). That is, there is an intuition that, unlike the NDL, the *ghi* in the *ghi*-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 *ghi* in the *ghi*-construction as the 'locative expletive' as well.

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

(29) Borgomanerese:
    a. La Maria 1 è naci-ghi.
       the Maria SCL is gone-there
       "Maria went there."
    b. *La Maria 1 è naci-ghi a la stazioni.
       the Maria SCL is gone-there to the station
       "Maria went to the station."
    c. Na segretaria 1 è rivà-gghi.
       a secretary SCL is arrived-there/here
       "A secretary arrived there/here."
    d. *Na segretaria 1 è rivà-gghi a la stazioni.
       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 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 *ghi* differs from NDL *ghi* 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):  

(31) a. Ngh è rivá-gghi na segretaria a la stázion.  
SLOC is arrived-LOC a secretary at the station  
"A secretary arrived at the station."

b. Ngh è gnó densi-ghi na segretaria int la stíóna.  
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 & Cinque (1977), Benincà (1988b), Calabrese (1982)). This is exhibited in (32b), where the direct object DP 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. Maria ha dato la torta a Giorgio.  
Maria has given the cake to Giorgio

b. Maria ha dato a Giorgio, la torta.  
Maria has given to Giorgio, the cake

As can be seen in (33), a clitic "double" can optionally appear with a right-dislocated XP:

(33) Maria l' ha data a Giorgio, la torta.  
Maria it has given to Giorgio, 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. Maria è andata, alla stazione.  
Maria is gone, to the station.

b. 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) La Maria l è naci-ghi, a la stázion,  
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)

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

21 Burzio 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 these 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)):

(36) a. Non ho presentato nessuno a Carlo.
   neg have.1sg presented nobody to Carlo
   “I have not introduced anybody to Carlo.”

   b. *Non ho presentato a Carlo, nessuno.
      neg have.1sg presented to Carlo, nobody

(37) a. Maria non è andata da nessuna parte.
   Maria neg is gone to no place.
   “Maria did not go anywhere.”

   b. *Maria non è andata, da nessuna parte.
      Maria neg is gone, to no place

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

(38) a. *I o presentò ghi nüz in Carlo.
    SCL have.1sg presented to him nobody to the Carlo
    “I have not introduced anybody to Carlo”

Given that a quantified XP in Borgomanserese 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:

(40) a. Ngh è rivà-gghi nüz in nüzna parti.
    SLOC is arrived-LOC no one to no place
    “No one arrived anywhere.”

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)):  

(41) Borgomanserese:
       SLOC is here-LOC two. masculine boys
       “There are two boys here.”

26As 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 Borgomanserese.
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 himself/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 *rivë* 'arrive' (repeated here as (44)):

(44) *Ngih è rivë-ghi* na *fiola.
SLOC is arrived-LOC a *girl
"A girl has arrived."

(44) can only describe an eventuality where the DP *na fjola* '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 *nè* 'leave', where there is no *ghi* when the subject is post-verbal:

(45) *L è naci na fjola.*
SCL is gone a *girl
"A girl left."
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 fiola l è rivà.  
   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?27

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)):28

(47) *L è rivà na fiola.  
   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

---

27If this were the explanation, it would not be clear why only GOAL, and not SOURCE, could be subject to such a speaker-oriented interpretation.

28It 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 fiola*. 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.\textsuperscript{29} It should be underscored that it is the locative expletive ghi 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:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Na sòla l \ è rivò-ghi.}
\textit{A girl SCL is arrived-here/there.}
\textit{"A girl arrived here/there."}
\end{quote}

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 VIDs, 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 Cardinaletti & Starke (to appear), for reasons that will become clearer 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).\textsuperscript{30} I use the term ‘locative goal’ to capture the

\textsuperscript{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 (§§:4.2.1.1.1).

\textsuperscript{30} The “intermediate” status of this morpheme can create terminological problems. In particular, native speakers report that the WLGA is not “referential” (in contrast with the NDL and the deictic locatives); yet at the same time, when it is present, the GOAL is interpreted as speaker-oriented, indicating that this element is indeed referential (referring to the location the speaker is in at the time of the event). I assume that this problem has to do with the inadequacy of the term “referential.” It should also be noted that native speakers’ intuitions are not always reliable when it
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. 31

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
t 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.

31As Freese (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 Borgomanerese 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:
(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.32

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):

\[ (2) \]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
  \text{VP} \\
  \text{V'} \\
  \text{V} \\
  \text{DP_{so}}
\end{array}
\]

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 θ-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 homophonous only with the third person dative clitic
pronoun:33

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

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

---

32 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 a 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 morpheme as the WLOG.

---

33 This contrasts with Italian ci, which is homophonous with the first person
plural clitic pronoun, which is both accusative and dative:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{Accusative clitics:} & \text{Dative clitics:} \\
\hline
\text{sing.} & \text{pl.} & \text{sing.} & \text{pl.} \\
1 \ mi & ci & mi & ci \\
2 \ ti & vi & ti & vi \\
3 \ lu(m)/la(f) & li(m)/le(f) & ghi(m)/le(f) & ghi(m/f) \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]
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 ci 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.

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 t:

\[
(54) \text{Ngh } \overset{\text{t}}{\text{é rivá-gghi na fíola.}} \\
\text{SLOC is arrived-LOC a girl} \\
\text{"A girl (has) arrived."}
\]

\[
(55) \text{L } \overset{\text{t}}{\text{é rivá na fíola.}} \\
\text{SCL is arrived a girl} \\
\text{"A girl arrived."}
\]

Since ngh occupies the position of a subject clitic, we can conclude that it, too, must be a subject clitic.

Larson (1988a) to demonstrate the structure projected by rive in Borgomanerese (at the moment nothing crucial hinges on adopting this particular structure):
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. Gnunc l a viu-me.
    nobody SCL has seen-me
    "Nobody has seen me."

b. Gnunc m a viu.
    nobody me has seen
    "Nobody has seen me."

c. *Gnunc l m a viu.
    nobody SCL me has seen

d. *Gnunc m l a viu,
    nobody me SCL has seen

As can be seen in (56b), when the object clitic me moves to pre-auxiliary position, it displaces the subject clitic 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 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., ngh) cannot be an object clitic.

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

Now that we have determined that 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), Borgomanerese has the type of subject clitic that varies according to the subject which occupies Spec, IP:36

(57) a. La María la lesgía l libbru.
    the María SCL reads the book.
    “Maria is reading the book.”

b. Al Piero al lesgía l libbru.
    the Piero SCL reads the book.
    “Piero is reading the book.”

c. Të tal lesgía l libbru.
    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 lesgía l libbru.
    SCL reads the book.
    “She is reading the book.”

b. Al lesgía l libbru.
    SCL reads the book.
    “He is reading the book.”

c. Tal lesgía l libbru.
    SCL reads the book.
    “You are reading the book.”

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

(59) \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
\text{pro,} \\
\text{Agrs} \\
\text{la,} \\
\text{Agrs} \\
\end{array} \]

Now that we have determined that subject clitics in Borgomanerese are of the type that identify a pro in subject position, let us return to the question of the nature of the subject clitic ngk. 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.37 Now, as we have

36In Borgomanerese, the first person singular and all the persons of the plural use the same subject clitic, i:

(i) Mé i lesgía l libbru.
    I SCL read the book.

(ii) Njau i lesgjumma l libbru.
    we SCL read the book.

(iii) Vjau i lesgi l libbru.
    you.pl SCL read the book.

(vi) Lay i lesgju l libbru.
    they(masc./fem.) SCL read the book.

This subject clitic seems to be of a different type from those in (57), and will not be dealt with here. It is possible that i is what Poletto (in press) terms an 'invariable' subject clitic, although more tests are needed to determine this.

I should also point out that the form tal (the second person singular subject clitic seen in (57c/58c)) is not used with vesti 'be' and avej 'have', which require the form i:

(vii) Të i è l libbru.
    you SCL have the book.

37Note that the lack of complete identity with the object locative clitic ghi should not deter us from assuming that ngk 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 la. Similarly, the second person singular subject clitic is tal (or t), while its object clitic
just seen, subject clitics in Borgomanerese agree with a 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)  \[ \text{AgrsP} \]
\[ \text{Spec} \quad \text{Agrs} \quad \text{agrs} \quad \text{gh} \]

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:31

(61)  
\[ \text{a. Ngh \ è rivà-gghi \ do \ maiti.} \]
\[ \text{SLOC is arrived-LOC two fem girls} \]

31See Cardinaletti (1997) and Chomsky (1995:Chapter 4) for a discussion of agreement patterns with post-verbal subjects across languages; in §5.4.2.3.1 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 arrivate 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 (i) \ n rivaj-gghi \ do \ maiti. \nSLOC (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)):

(62)  
\[ \text{a. *L \ è rivà \ do \ maiti.} \]
\[ \text{SCL(3sg) is arrived two fem girls} \]

\[ \text{b. ngh \ n rivaj \ do \ maiti.} \]
\[ \text{SCL(3pl) are arrived pl two fem girls} \]

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 parla-ghi a l’ Piero, the Maria SCL speaks-to him to the Piero "Maria speaks to Piero."

b. Te tal da-ggu a l’ Mario.39 you SCL give-to him it to the Mario "You give it to Mario."

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 taking 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.

39Note that gu is simply the morphological realization of the clitics ghi and lu (‘to-him’ and ‘it’) when they occur together.

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) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{V'} \end{array}
\]

(65) WLGA clitic-doubling

Spec

LocP

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{LocP} \\
\text{Loc} \\
\text{ghi} \end{array}\]

The revised VP structure is thus the following:

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 ngh is in the Agrs head, as per our discussion of (60) above. Ghī, like all object clitics, encliticizes to the verb (not depicted in (67)).

3.2.4.2.2 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 ghī-construction, namely, that the "subject" (e.g., na fīola 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 (1996) 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 (105-106):

(68) a. Io sono alla festa.
I am at the party

b. Sono alla festa.
(I)am at the party

(69) a. Ci sono io alla festa.
LOC am I at the party

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 AgrsP and VP.**
explicative ci 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-interval 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. Cardinaletti & Starke (to appear) and Cardinaletti (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

In contrast, the pronoun egli cannot occur post-verbally:

(72) a. *Ha aderito egli.
    has adhered he

b. Egli ha aderito.
    He has adhered

If the exclusively leftward nature of movement is assumed (Kayne (1995)), we must conclude that the post-verb al 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.: Esse hanno mangiato.)

b. Hanno mangiato loro.
    have eaten they-fem

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.

42 A more detailed discussion of Cardinaletti & Starke's theory of weak pronouns is deferred until Chapter 5.
As Cardinaletti & Starke (to appear) and Cardinaletti (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 piöve.
(76) pro mi hanno venduto un libro rovinato, in quel negozio.
(77) pro sono molto belle.

(pro piöve.
(pro mi hanno venduto un libro rovinato, in quel negozio.
(pro sono molto belle.

(75) (it) rains
(76) they to-me have sold a book damaged, in that shop
(77) (= the girls; the roses)
(they) are very beautiful

If pro is a weak pronoun, like egli and esse, then its obligatory presence in pre-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 ghi-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:45

(44) Ngh è rivő-ghi na fjoła.
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 ghi-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) I. è rivő na fjoła.
SCL is arrived a girl
“A girl arrived.”

(46) Na fjoła I è rivő 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 Borgomanerese, 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

45Recall that the presence of the subject clitic ngh signals the presence of the pro-loc in Spec, IP.
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).\(^{44}\)

(78) a. \(L'\ e\ \text{riv\`e}.\)
   SCL is arrived.
   "He (has) arrived."

   b. \[ 
   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{Spec} \quad \text{Agrs'} \quad \text{VP} \\
   \text{pro} \\
   \text{Agrs} \\
   \text{V'} \\
   \text{V} \\
   \text{i}
   \end{array}
   \]

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:

(79) \(\*\text{N'gh\  e\ riv\`a-gghi.}\)
    SLOC is arrived-LOC

    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
Borgomanese 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:

(80) a. Nessuno \(\ e\ \text{arrivato}.
    \) nobody is arrived

   b. N\(z\)\(\`\)un ngh \(\ e\ \text{riv\`a-gghi.}\)
     nobody SLOC is arrived-LOC

   c. \("\text{La Maria ngh} \ e\ \text{riv\`a-gghi.}\)
      the Maria SLOC is arrived-LOC

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 Larsonian 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 Borgomarinese raises the question of the use of the ghi-construction for the existential (see 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 Borgomarinese, 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 ot là, is that pro-loc is a 'weak locative', while chi and là are 'strong locatives' (again, terminology adopted from C&S). 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-ghi.
    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 rivà.
    the Maria SCL is arrived

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

c. La Maria l’è rivà-ghi.
    the Maria SCL is arrived-there

d. La Maria l’è rivà 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 nga hì rivà-ghi na fòla.
    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 Borgomanerese. 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 ngh uggghi ire mutaf.
pro-loc SLOC is-LOC three masc 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 Borgomanerese) cannot be used as the morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category SOURCE (in opposition to PPs, NDL ghi, 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)\)

\[\text{a. } \text{[arriv GO } \{X], \text{[TO } \{\{Y\}\}]\]

\[\text{b. } \text{[arriv BE } \{IX], \text{[AT } \{\{Y\}\}]\]

Thus, Y in both (85a,b) can be referred to as LOCATION.7

7Nevertheless, 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):

\[ (86) \quad \{\text{leave} \quad \text{GO} \quad \{X\}, \{\text{FROM} \quad \{(Y)\}\} \} \]

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 \(Y\) (= LOCATION). Nevertheless, as we have seen, the weak locative in Borgomanerese (pro-loc) 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):

\[ (87) \quad \begin{array}{c}
T \\
\downarrow \\
c_1 \\
\downarrow \\
\text{GO} \\
\downarrow \\
c_2 \\
\text{state at a LOCATION Y}
\end{array} \]

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 (5 indicates 'state'):

\[ (88) \quad \begin{array}{c}
S \\
\downarrow \\
\text{state at a LOCATION Y}
\end{array} \]

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:

\[ (89) \quad \begin{array}{c}
T \\
\downarrow \\
\text{state at a LOCATION Y} \\
\downarrow \\
c_1 \\
\text{not at Y}
\end{array} \]

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 Borgomanerese, cannot be selected by SOURCE-entailing verbs (in opposition to PPs, NDI 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 WLGA 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 nziţ '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 semantic 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 latter from the former.
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 nce (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 nce), 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)  
\[ \text{gh e\'ra na b\'otta un \'om...} \]  
\[
\text{SCL LOC was a time a man...} \]

“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 ghe) requires the presence of partitive ne (Nicola Munaro, personal communication), as can be seen in the following sentence:

(92)  
\[ \text{a. Ghe n \'e-\'lo Mario?} \]  
\[
\text{LOC NE is-SCL Mario} \]

“Is there Mario?”

\[ \text{b. Ghe n \'e-la na machina?} \]  
\[
\text{LOC NE is-SCL a car} \]

“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 ghe (Paola Berinca, personal communication):

\[ \text{4When an overt referential indirect object clitic is present, however, the locative expletive clitic does not appear:} \]

(4)  
\[ \text{I me ne da do.} \]  
\[
\text{SCL to-me NE gives two} \]

“He gives two of them to me.”

This demonstrates that the locative clitic ghe in (92) does not make a semantic contribution to the sentence.
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)).

(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 (i o vusnu 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 n plus the epenthetic vowel u (P. Benincá, personal communication). The complex ngh (as opposed to gh-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 clitic 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 è-ghu tre. (Italian: Ce ne sono tre)
SLOC is-GHI.NU three

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