Chapter 4

THE WEAK LOCATIVE GOAL ARGUMENT IN ITALIAN

4.1 Introduction

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

4.2 The weak locative goal argument in Italian

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

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

(96) Ngh े-ग्हि तः मताय इ ला स्तोना.
SLOC is-LOC three masc boys in the room
"There are three boys in the room."

As we saw, Italian also uses its locative clitic, ci, as a locative expletive in the existential construction:
While Borgomanerese uses its locative expletive *ghi with arrive-type verbs (as the clitic double of the WLGA pro-loc) in addition to existentials, it is well known that Italian does not use the locative expletive *ci with arrive-type verbs with post-verbal subjects, as the following example shows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2.1 Indirect evidence for the WLGA

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

(101) Che succede?
     "What's happening?"

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

(103) *Dorme Maria.
     sleeps Maria

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

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

As Samek-Lovrici (1994) points out, the order V-S in (103) forces a contrastive focus interpretation on the post-verbal subject. This phenomenon will be discussed in more detail immediately below.
Many researchers since Antinucci & Cinque (1977) (e.g., Calabrese (1992), Delfitto & D'Hulst (1994), Delfitto & Pinto (1992), Pinto (1994), among others) have claimed that this difference in behavior with respect to unmarked word order correlates with the unergative-unaccusative distinction. However, it turns out that the word order facts and the unergative-unaccusative distinction do not line up so neatly. As was first noted explicitly by Benincà (1988a), the word order V-S is not the unmarked word order for all unaccusatives in Italian. In particular, she showed that given an unmarked context such as that in (101), the sentence in (105) with partire ‘leave’ is inappropriate.  

\[(105) \text{ *Parte Maria,}
\]

\[
\text{leaves Maria}
\]

The order V-S yields a marked interpretation for the single argument of partire. Specifically, the post-verbal subject in (105) can only be interpreted as contrastively focused, similarly to what we saw above (footnote 51) for the unergative verb dormire.  

Thus, (105) can be used felicitously only in a context which allows for a contrastive focus interpretation of the post-verbal subject, such as that in (106a):

---

51This is also noted for the verb andarsene ‘leave’ (andare ‘go’ +SI-NE) in Antinucci & Cinque (1977:126-127, footnote 2; see footnote 57 below). Note that the "*" in (105) is intended to indicate the ungrammaticality of this string in an unmarked context, not absolute ungrammaticality.

52Here the term ‘contrastive focus’ is used to indicate an interpretation of the DP as an individual which necessarily belongs to a set of known individuals. In sentence (106b), Maria is interpreted as belonging to a set of individuals (e.g., a set which includes Maria, Gianni, Lucia, & Giorgio) which constitutes the context in which the DP Maria can receive an interpretation in post-verbal position. The term ‘contrastive focus’ as used here thus does not entail a negation or a contradiction of a previously mentioned entity, but rather refers to the contrast between the referent of the DP and the other members of the set to which it belongs.
(106) a. Chi parte?
    who leaves
    "Who is leaving?"

b. Parte Maria.
    leaves Maria
    "It is Maria that is leaving."

4.2.1 GOAL and the unmarked i-subject

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

--

34 Several researchers following Benincà, including Delfitto & D'Hulst (1994), Delfitto & Pinto (1992), Pinto (1994), and Saccon (1992), have adopted the "implicit locative" analysis of *arrivare* in order to explain the difference in behavior between unergatives and unaccusatives with respect to unmarked word order. The above researchers (with the exception of Saccon), however, differ from Benincà in that they extend the implicit locative analysis to all unaccusatives. This extension incorrectly predicts that all unaccusatives should allow V-S as the unmarked word order. The analyses of these authors will be discussed in more detail in the Appendix below.

Benincà also notes that some unergatives, such as *telefonare* 'telephone' and *suonare* 'ring (e.g., a doorbell)' allow V-S as the unmarked word order:

(i) Ha telefonato Masiero.
    has telephoned Masiero

(ii) Ha suonato il postino.
    has rung the postman

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

35 Benincà suggests (p. 125) that the possibility of an unmarked post-verbal subject depends on the presence of a locative argument, which can serve as the theme

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

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

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

(107) *arrivare, come, return, enter*

(108) *leave, escape, exit*

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

(or "given" -- as opposed to theme) of the sentence. See the Appendix at the end of this chapter for a review of various explanations in the literature for the interpretive difference between (102) and (106b). Benincà also notes that the implicit locative has a "deictic" interpretation; I will discuss this fact in detail in §4.2.1.2 below.

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

(i) *E’ arrivata Maria.*
    is arrived Maria
(109) a. Viene Maria.
    comes Maria 

    b. Torna Maria.
    returns Maria 

    c. Entra Maria.
    enters Maria 

(110) a. *Scappa Maria.
    escapes Maria 

    b. *Esce Maria.
    exits Maria 

Note that in Italian the verb andarsene 'leave' also disallows V-S as the unmarked word order (noted by Antinucci & Cinque (1977); see footnote 52 above), thus patterning like a SOURCE-entailing verb (cf. the verb né 'go' in Borgomanerese (15a,b), which is also used to mean leave).37

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

37The verb andarsene 'leave' is morphologically composed of the verb andare 'go' plus the two clitics se (reflexive si; the allomorph se is used when si clusters with another clitic) and ne (the partitive clitic). The verb andare 'go' (without the clitics se-ne) allows a post-verbal subject in an unmarked context only if the eventuality is interpreted as GOAL-entailing. Thus, there is a contrast in the interpretations of (i) and (ii):

(i) E' andata Maria.
    is gone Maria 

(ii) Maria e gia andata.
    Maria is already gone
The sentence in (i), if used in an unmarked context, can only mean that Maria went someplace (GOAL), while the sentence in (ii) can either mean that Maria went someplace (GOAL), or that Maria left (SOURCE). These facts suggest that the verb andare 'go' is ambiguous between GOAL-entailing and non-GOAL-entailing; andarsene 'leave', however, is unambiguously SOURCE-entailing. For further discussion of VIDs which are ambiguous between GOAL-entailing and non-GOAL-

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

4.2.1.1.2 α-telic VIDs

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

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

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

The GOAL-hypothesis makes a specific prediction with respect to α-telic VIDs like scendere. In particular, it is predicted that in an unmarked context, the word order V-S for this verb can be interpreted as grammatical only if it is interpreted as telic scendere (i.e., only if it is interpreted as an arrive-type verb, entailing a GOAL). To put it
differently, the interpretation of this verb as non-GOAL-entailing (as atelic *scendere*) in an unmarked context should be impossible with the word order V-S, if it is indeed the case that non-GOAL-entailing verbs do not allow this word order in an unmarked context. Now let us see whether this prediction is borne out.

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

(113) *E' sceso* _Lo Spitfire_ (*per 5 minuti_).

is descended the Spitfire (*for 5 minutes)

"The Spitfire descended (*for 5 minutes)."

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

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

(114) What descended for 5 minutes?

(set: a dirigible, a helicopter, the Spitfire)

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

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

In other words, do arrive-type verbs in Italian project a phonologically null GOAL argument? Nothing in the discussion thus far has required us to claim that arrive-type verbs in Italian syntactically project a WLGA.

---

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

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

(116) Pro-loc Hypothesis:

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

Note that the Pro-loc Hypothesis makes two specific predictions. The first prediction is that since the unmarked interpretation of the V-S word order is enabled by the syntactic presence of the pro-loc, it should correlate with a restriction on the interpretation of the location-goal such that the location-goal must include the speaker. This prediction emerges because as we saw for Borgomanerese ((44), repeated here as (117)), the presence of the pro-loc forces this speaker-oriented (SO) interpretation of the location-goal:

(117) Ngh è rivà-gghi na fiola.
SLOC is arrived-LOC a girl
"A girl (has) arrived."
(GOAL is necessarily SO)

If it is the presence of the pro-loc that both forces this speaker-oriented interpretation of the GOAL as well as allows for the unmarked interpretation of the V-S word order, then the unmarked interpretation of the V-S word order in Italian should necessarily involve a speaker-oriented interpretation of the GOAL. Note that this prediction is borne out.

The sentence in (102), repeated here as (118), can only describe an eventuality where the DP Maria has arrived in a location shared with the speaker (cf. (117)):³⁹

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

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

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

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

Thus, (119) can be used to describe any eventuality, even if the speaker is not at the location-(source) at the time of Maria's departure. This follows from the fact that partire does not syntactically project a pro-loc (as per the Pro-loc Hypothesis in (116)).

Recall that Borgomanerese exhibits the same phenomenon ((45), repeated here as (120)). The non-GOAL-entailing verb né 'leave' does not project a pro-loc (evidenced by the lack of the locative clitics). This correlates with the lack of a restriction on the

³⁹This is what Benincà (1988a) refers to as the 'deictic' interpretation of the implicit locative (see footnote 55 above).
interpretation of the location(-source). As mentioned in footnote 15, the post-verbal subject, like that in Italian, gets a contrastive focus interpretation:

(120)  \( L \) è nacina fiola.
      SCL is gone a girl
      "It was a girl that left."
      (i-subject gets contrastive focus; SOURCE not necessarily SO)

As can be seen, then, the first prediction the Pro-loc Hypothesis makes is borne out.

Now let us turn to the second prediction made by the Pro-loc Hypothesis:

the syntactic absence of a pro-loc with arrive-type verbs (recall that arrive-type verbs project pro-loc optionally) should yield a contrastive focus interpretation for the post-verbal subject of arrivare, exactly like with partire in (119). Furthermore, the contrastive focus interpretation should correlate with the lack of a restriction on the interpretation of the GOAL, since it is the presence of the pro-loc which forces the speaker-oriented interpretation. This prediction is borne out. That is, in addition to the unmarked interpretation that obtains with the V-S word order with arrive-type verbs, it turns out that the V-S word order with these verbs can also yield a contrastive focus interpretation of the post-verbal subject. Thus, the sentence in (102) can also be used in the following context:

(121)  \( \text{Chi arriva?} \)
      who arrives
      "Who is arriving?"

Furthermore, when the order V-S is used with a contrastive focus interpretation on the post-verbal subject, the GOAL is no longer necessarily interpreted as speaker-oriented.

The following example sketches out these facts:60

(122)  Arriva Maria.
      arrives Maria
      "It is Maria that is arriving."
      (i-subject gets contrastive focus; GOAL not necessarily SO)

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

(123)  \( L \) è rivè na fiola.
      SCL is arrived a girl
      "It was a girl that arrived."
      (i-subject gets contrastive focus; GOAL not necessarily SO)

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

Recall, too, that in Borgomanerese, the pre-verbal position of the subject of rivè, which entails the lack of a pro-loc (for reasons cited in §3.2.4.2.2), also yields an unrestricted interpretation of the GOAL ((46), repeated here as (124)):

(124)  Na fiola \( l \) è rivè.
      a girl SCL is arrived.
      "A girl arrived."
      (GOAL not necessarily SO)

---

60Note that both interpretations of this sentence (i.e., unmarked (as in (118)) or contrastively focused post-verbal subject (as in (122)) yield the same intonation.
Note that Italian exhibits the same phenomenon; when the subject is pre-verbal, the location-goal does not have to include the speaker.\footnote{It should be noted that both in Borgomanerese and Italian, Spec, IP disfavors indefinite DPs like una ragazza / na fiola 'a girl', most probably having to do with structural locations outside of VP being associated with presupposed (in the sense of Diesing (1992)) or specific (in the sense of Eng (1991)) material. The sentence in (125) would thus be more felicitous with a definite DP (idem for the Borgomanerese example).}

\begin{equation}
\text{(125) \textit{Una ragazza è arrivata.}}
\end{equation}

\text{a girl is arrived.}

"A girl arrived."

\text{(GOAL not necessarily SO)}

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

To summarize, there are several positive consequences to the Pro-loc Hypothesis: First, it allows us to explain why the unmarked interpretation obtained by the V-S word order yields a speaker-oriented interpretation of the GOAL. Second, it explains why the V-S word order can also yield a contrastive focus interpretation on the post-verbal subject, as is the case with \textit{partire}. Third, it explains why this latter interpretation of the post-verbal subject correlates with the unrestricted interpretation of the GOAL. Fourth, it explains why it is only the ‘subject inversion’ construction that potentially yields the speaker-oriented interpretation of the GOAL: the presence of a pre-verbal subject necessarily correlates with an unrestricted interpretation of the GOAL because Spec, IP is not available for \textit{pro-loc}.

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

\textbf{Pro-loc Hypothesis.} Italian thus gets the same analysis as Borgomanerese (in (52)): GOAL-entailing verbs optionally project a \textit{pro-loc} as the indirect object argument:

\begin{equation}
\text{(126) \quad VP}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{\quad \quad V'}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{\quad \quad V}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{\quad \quad \quad Xp}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad V'}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad Spec}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad una ragazza}
\end{equation}

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, the difference between Borgomanerese and Italian is that Italian does not involve dative clitic doubling of the \textit{pro-loc}, nor does it have a locative subject clitic.

In Italian, then, when \textit{pro-loc} is projected, it obligatorily moves to Spec, IP (cf. the discussion in §3.2.4.2.2).\footnote{Again, TP and AgroP are not represented since they are not crucial for the purpose of the illustration.}
Note that this analysis makes the same prediction for Italian as it did for Borgomanerese with respect to the impossibility of *pro-loc* in the context of pro-drop. That is, both *pro* and *pro-loc* cannot be projected in one and the same structure, because they would have to compete for the same syntactic position, since as weak pronouns, both need to move overtly to subject position (see (78b) above). In Italian, we can indirectly detect the absence or presence of *pro-loc* by the interpretation of the location-goal. If the location-goal is not obligatorily speaker-oriented, this means *pro-loc* is not present in the structure. Note that the above prediction is borne out: in a pro-drop construction, the GOAL is freely interpreted, indicating the lack of *pro-loc* in the presence of *pro*:

(129) *E' arrivata.*

is arrived fem.sg.

"She (has) arrived."

(GOAL not necessarily SO)

That is, (129) can be used in a context in which the (feminine) subject *pro* arrives in China, even if the speaker was not in China at the time of arrival.

4.2.1.3 Further evidence for the WLGA

As I have argued, although there is no direct evidence for the syntactic projection of a phonologically null WLGA argument in Italian, indirect evidence deriving from the interaction of the interpretation of the GOAL (i.e., whether or not it is necessarily speaker-oriented) and the interpretation yielded by the word order V-S (i.e., whether it is unmarked, or marked – with a contrastive focus interpretation of the post-

---

61I assume (following Burzio (1986) and researchers following him) that in the cases where there is no *pro-loc*, a true expletive *pro* occupies Spec, IP.

---

97
verbal subject) suggests that arrive-type verbs optionally project a pro-loc. Thus, 
arrivare projects two arguments in (118), while partire only projects one argument in
(119). More generally, then, we can claim that it is the presence of an extra argument
that yields the unmarked interpretation of the post-verbal subject in (118). Note that
this claim makes a prediction: projecting an additional argument with partire, such as a
PP, should yield an unmarked interpretation with the post-verbal subject. Note that this
prediction is borne out:

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

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

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

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

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

(131)  

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

4.3.1 Motivation for the small clause analysis

In order to understand the motivation for Moro’s (1997) analysis of unaccusatives, it is necessary to briefly review his analysis of copular sentences. 44

4.3.1.1 The small clause analysis of copular sentences

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

(132) [cop A picture of the wall] was [cop the cause of the riot].

(133) [cop A picture of the wall] revealed [cop the cause of the riot].

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

(134) [cop The cause of the riot] was [cop a picture of the wall]. (cf. (132))

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

(135) a. *[Which wall], did [cop a picture of t1] reveal [cop the cause of the riot]?

b. [Which riot], did [cop a picture of the wall] reveal [cop the cause of t1]?

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

(136) [Which wall], did [cop the cause of the riot] reveal [cop a picture of t1]?

The impossibility of extraction from subject position (as in (135a)) is expected, as it is a straightforward subjacency violation. 45

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

(137) a. *[Which wall], was [cop a picture of t1], [cop the cause of the riot]?

b. [Which riot], was [cop a picture of the wall], [cop the cause of t1]?

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

(138) a. *[Which riot], was [cop the cause of t1], [cop a picture of the wall]?

44In the discussion which follows, all examples are taken from Moro (1997).

45No theta-role assigning head governs the DP a picture of the wall, which as a result fails to be "L-marked" (Chomsky 1986b), thus counting as a barrier.
b. "[Which wall] was [the cause of the riot] a picture of [t]?

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

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

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

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

The ungrammaticality of (137a) is straightforwardly explained, since the DP a picture of the wall occurs in a left branch position. The possibility of extraction in (137b) is also explained, since the predicate DP the cause of the riot is selected by the verb, rendering it a non-barrier. The sentence in (132) is what he terms the 'canonical copular sentence.' Now let us look at the derivation of (134):

(141)  
\[ \text{IP} \]
\[ \text{DP}\]
\[ [\text{the cause of the riot}] \]
\[ \text{I} \]
\[ \text{VP} \]
\[ V' \]
\[ \text{be} \]
\[ \text{SC} \]
\[ \text{DP} \]
\[ t_1 \]
\[ [\text{a picture of the wall}] \]

As can be seen by the structure in (141) (which Moro terms the 'inverse copular sentence'), the DP predicate the cause of the riot raises to Spec, IP, while the DP subject a picture of the wall remains in situ. Given this structural configuration, the extraction facts seen in (138a,b) are explained. Extraction from the DP the cause of the riot induces a subjacency violation (138a), because it occurs in a left branch position (Spec, IP). Similarly, extraction from the apparent "object" DP a picture of the wall in (138b) cannot obtain, since this DP also occurs in a left branch position, given the SC.

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

(i)  
\[ \text{DP}_{\text{pred}} (=\text{SC}) \]
\[ \text{DP}_{\text{sub}} \]

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

4.3.1.1.1 The small clause analysis of *ci*-sentences

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

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

---

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

(i) [La causa della rivolta, *pro*] = [La causa della rivolta, una foto del muro *pro*]

the cause of the riot = a picture of the wall

---

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

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

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

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

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

b. *Gianni lo è.
Gianni lo is

"Gianni is such."

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

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

b. *c’ è lo è.
there lo is.

"There is such."

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

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

(145) a. [Molte copie del libro], erano [sc ți [nello studio]].

many copies of the book were in the studio

b. *[Molte copie del libro], erano [sc ți [e]].

many copies of the book were

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

(146) cì erano [sc [molte copie del libro] [e]].

there were many copies of the book

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

(147) *cì erano [sc [molte copie del libro] [la cause della rivolta]].

there were many copies of the book the cause of the riot

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

Why should the presence of an expletive have the effects seen above?

Moro proposes to explain these facts by analyzing cì as the predicate of the SC complement of the copular verb essere, in contrast with what is traditionally assumed:

(148)

\[ VP \\
  \mid \]

\[ V \\
  \mid \]

\[ \text{sono} \]

\[ \text{SC} \]

\[ \text{DP} \]

\[ \text{XP} \]

\[ \text{cì} \]

\[ \text{[molte copie del libro]} \]

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

(149)

\[ \text{IP} \]

\[ \text{DP} \]

\[ \text{proj} \]

\[ \text{P} \]

\[ \mid \]

\[ \mid \]

\[ \text{VP} \]

\[ \mid \]

\[ \text{cìj} \]

\[ \text{f} \]

\[ \text{V} \]

\[ \mid \]

\[ \text{sono} \]

\[ \text{SC} \]

\[ \text{DP} \]

\[ \text{ti} \]

\[ \text{[molte copie del libro]} \]

Ci-sentences are thus taken to be 'inverse copular sentences', under Moro's analysis.

Once cì is taken to be the predicate of the SC projected by the copular verb, the apparently anomalous facts discussed above are explained. First, the fact that lo-cliticization is impossible in the presence of cì in (144b) follows from the fact that only the predicate of the SC can lo-cliticize. If cì is the predicate of the SC, lo and cì are

---

69This is confirmed by the following contrast, noted by Moro (1997:29)

(i) [Le foto del muro], loj furono [sc ti] j

the pictures of the wall lo were

"The pictures of the wall were such."
predicted to be in complementary distribution. Second, the fact (seen in (146)) that the absence of the apparent predicate correlates with the obligatory presence of cè follows from the observation that a predicate cannot be omitted, together with the hypothesis that cè is the predicate. Third, the hypothesis that cè is a predicate also explains cè's complementarity with the predicate DP in (147), since a SC cannot have two predicates.

4.3.1.1.2 Moro's unification of cè-sentences and unaccusatives

Now that we have reviewed the motivation for Moro's analysis of essere 'be' as a copular verb which takes a SC complement, we are in a position to discuss the motivation for his analysis of unaccusatives as verbs which also take a SC complement. Moro notes that existential sentences with cè pass all tests for unaccusativity in Italian. First, as can be seen in (150), existential sentences, like unaccusatives (151), take the auxiliary essere 'be' in the compound tenses, and the past participle agrees in number and gender with the subject:

(150) a. cè sono state tre fotografie.
   there are been 3plF three photographs (3plF)
   "There were three photographs."

b. *cè hanno state tre fotografie.
   there have been 3plF three photographs

(c.f.: Le foto del muro furono la causa della rivolta (canonical copular))
(ii) *[La causa della rivolta, 1o, furono [ac t 1 ]
   the cause of the riot 1o were
   (c.f.: La causa della rivolta furono le foto del muro (inverse copular))

(151) a. Sono arrivato tre ragazze.
   are arrived three girls
b. *Hanno arrivato tre ragazze.
   have arrived three girls

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

(152) ce ne sono state [ac tre t 1 ]
   there NE are been three
   "There were three of them."

(153) ne sono arrivato [ac tre t 1 ]
   NE are arrived three
   "Three of them arrived."

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

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

(154) a. *Arrivano molte ragazze.*

In (154b), the predicative *pro* moves to Spec, IP, while the "subject" *molte ragazze* 'many girls' remains in situ, yielding (154a). Presumably, in the case where the subject DP *molte ragazze* moves to Spec, IP, yielding *Molte ragazze arrivano*, the predicative *pro* remains in situ. Moro (1997:232) later suggests that the predicate of the unaccusative SC is actually a locative (which incorporates into the verb, for theoretical reasons which will not be discussed here): 79

4.3.2 Understanding the small clause analysis of unaccusatives

As noted earlier, there are obvious similarities between our proposal concerning Italian arrive-type verbs and Moro's proposal concerning unaccusatives in general. Both our analysis and Moro's motivate the existence of a phonologically null locative XP selected by the unaccusative verb, in contrast with previous analyses of Italian unaccusatives (e.g., Burzio (1986)), which claimed that such verbs take a single DP object. Nevertheless, given that each proposal is motivated by entirely different considerations, Moro's proposal involves enough significant differences from the one presented here to warrant a close comparison of the two. Let us summarize the three major distinguishing characteristics of the present analysis compared with Moro's: (i) under our proposal, only GOAL-entailing unaccusatives are claimed to project a phonologically null *pro-loc*; (ii) under our proposal, the phonologically null locative is claimed to be projected as an indirect object argument of the verb, rather than the predicate of a SC selected by the verb; and (iii) under our proposal the null locative is claimed to be projected optionally. In what follows I show that Moro's three

79 For change of state unaccusatives, he suggests that the predicate is not a locative, but rather the "expression of a quality."
conclusions (that the locative is projected by all unaccusatives, that the locative is a predicate, and that the locative is obligatory) are not necessary. Establishing this allows us to maintain the present proposal, which explains the cluster of facts illustrated in §4.2.1 above. Nevertheless, our proposal supports the important insight of Moro’s theory, which holds that the locative which occurs with unaccusatives is not an expi edive.\textsuperscript{71}

4.3.2.1 A locative predicate for all unaccusatives?

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

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

\footnote{Note that while I argue against Moro’s analysis of unaccusatives in general, I see no reason not to adopt his SC analysis of \textit{be}.}

which states that a verb which fails to assign an external theta-role also fails to assign accusative Case. Given this essential insight, it seems clear that the defining property of unaccusativity is not “the projection of a single d-structure object,” but rather, the lack of projection of an external argument. Given that unaccusatives are as semantically heterogeneous as transitives (see Chapter 2 and L&RH), there is no reason to assume that unaccusative types are not as varied as transitive types. For example, we find transitives which project a single DP object (e.g., \textit{cut}), or two internal arguments (e.g., \textit{give}, \textit{put}), or a single SC argument (e.g., \textit{consider}), or a propositional argument (e.g., \textit{say}). Similarly, we find unaccusatives which project a single DP object (e.g., \textit{break}), or two internal arguments (e.g., \textit{lie: Manhattan lies *(at the foot of the Hudson); see L&RH, p. 287, footnote 3}), or a single SC argument (e.g., \textit{be}), or a propositional argument (e.g., \textit{seem}). Under the proposal presented here, VIDsMs (both GOAL-entailing and non-GOAL-entailing) are taken to be unaccusatives which optionally project a second internal argument, much like the transitive verbs \textit{bring} (e.g., \textit{I brought a book (to the library)}), \textit{take, buy} (e.g., \textit{I bought a book (for John) / (John) a book}), or \textit{tell} (e.g., \textit{I told a story (to the girls) / (the girls) a story}).\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{71}It might be suggested that the optional status of these XPs serves as evidence that they are adjuncts, and not arguments. However, the ‘do so’ test suggests that these XPs are part of the core eventuality of the verb, much like the PP subcategorized by \textit{put} (cf. discussion in §3.2.3):

(i) \textit{Sue put the book on the table, and *Tracy did so on the floor.}
(ii) \textit{Sue brought the book to the picnic, while *Tracy did so to the party.}
See Larson (1988b) for a discussion of the argument status of such optional XPs with verbs of motion.

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

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

(and similarly, *leave, exci, and enter*) is an example of a double object unaccusative, the indirect object of which can undergo dative shift (Dowry (1991:footnote15) also suggests (but does not adopt) such an analysis):

- (iii) *Sue escaped from the police.*
- (iv) *Sue escaped the police.*

The idea here is that the sentence in (iii) involves the projection of a d-structure object (*Sue*) and an indirect object PP (*from the police*). The sentence in (iv) (without the proposition) is the dative shift variant, with the indirect object NP *the police* corresponding to the indirect object NP *Mary in I gave Mary a book* (see also Belletti & Rizzi (1988) and Larson (1998a) for the analysis of psych-verbs as double-object unaccusatives (note that psych-verbs differ from verbs like *escape* in that the former involve movement of the indirect object to Spec, IP, while with the latter involve movement of the direct object to Spec, IP). L. Burzio suggests (personal communication) that *befall* may be another unaccusative of this type. Note that the analysis of these verbs offered here goes against Baker (1993).

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

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

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

---

As Kayne (1984) suggests, a verb like *give* could conceivably involve a causal verb which takes a SC complement:

(i) John caused [sg. Mary to have a book]

Under such an analysis, the argument *Mary* does not get a theta-role from the causal verb; rather, the verb assigns a theta-role to the whole SC, while *Mary* gets a theta-role from the predicate of the SC. Note, however, that a problem arises once we attempt to assimilate simple transitive like *mangiare* into this paradigm. While semantic arguments can be made in favor of a SC analysis of *dare*, it is not obvious how one could claim that a verb like *mangiare*, which as a 'activity' verb does not have a complex event structure, takes a SC complement.

Furthermore, note that under the view that all XP's must have heads, a SC analysis differs minimally from a Larsonian-type analysis. The difference between the two amounts to a semantic one: unlike the SC analysis, a Larsonian analysis takes *Mary* and *a book* to be two arguments, rather than as occurring in a subject-predicate relation. As such, both analyses get theta-roles from the verb, in contrast with the SC analysis. The ramifications of this difference between the two analyses will be discussed in §4.3.2.2 below.
(157) Ne, ho mangiato [due t.] NE (I)have eaten two
"I have eaten two of them."

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

(158) Ne, ho considerato [sc [solo uno t.] veramente adatto]. NE (I)have considered only one truly appropriate

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

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

To conclude, Moro's proposal that all unaccusatives take a SC complement is driven by a single unfounded assumption: all unaccusatives take the same type of complement. However, as we have seen, the defining property of unaccusativity does not have to do with what type of complement the verb takes, but rather with the lack of an external theta-role. In this perspective, the analysis of essere as taking a SC complement cannot serve as an argument in favor of a SC analysis for all unaccusatives. The potential problem concerning ne-cliticization remains a problem only if we assume that it can obtain from a specific structural position. However, as we have seen, this does not seem to be true. Since we are not forced to conclude that all unaccusatives take a SC predicate, we do not need to conclude that all unaccusatives take a locative. We can thus maintain that only GOAL-entailing VIDs take a locative.

4.3.2.2 Two internal arguments or a small clause?

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

Notice that the one significant difference between a SC analysis of arrive-type verbs ((154b), repeated here as (159)) and our analysis ((127), repeated here as (160)), is that under the former the null locative is analyzed as a predicate while under the latter it is analyzed as a second internal argument.
(159) \[ S \rightarrow pro_i \rightarrow VP \rightarrow V \rightarrow arrivano \rightarrow SC \rightarrow DP \rightarrow t_i \rightarrow molle ragazze \]

(160) \[ AgrsP \rightarrow Spec \rightarrow pro-loc \rightarrow Agrs' \rightarrow Agrs \rightarrow VP \rightarrow V \rightarrow arrivare_i \rightarrow VP \rightarrow V' \rightarrow Spec \rightarrow Maria \rightarrow V \rightarrow t_i \]

Kayne (1984; 1995) has proposed that verbs which are normally analyzed as taking two internal arguments should be re-analyzed as taking a SC complement, with the two XPs which are traditionally understood to be arguments re-analyzed as occurring in a subject-predicate relationship (see footnote 73 above). The primary consideration motivating this proposal in Kayne (1984) is the need for binary branching. Note, however, that Larson's (1988a) analysis of verbs which take two internal arguments maintains binary branching without resorting to a SC analysis.

Furthermore, given Kayne's (1995) arguments for the claim that every XP must have a head, Kayne's (1984) SC proposal is re-elaborated in Kayne (1995), such that the SC is analyzed as containing a head. The syntactic difference between a Larsonian-type analysis and a SC analysis is thus no longer obvious (see Kayne (1995:Chapter 7, footnote 1)).

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

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

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

(161)
```
        VP
       /   \
  Spec  V'
    John
       /   \   \\
tell  XP (= SC, under Kayne)
       /   \   \\
X'    DP
     /   \     \      \\
a story to DP      Sue
```

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

(162) John told a story.

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

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

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

The semantic problem here is twofold. First, the DP a story gets its Theme theta-role from different predicates in (161) and (162), and second, the verb tell assigns different types of theta-roles in each case. This state of affairs is conceptually problematic, since (161) and (162) do not differ semantically. It also fails to explain why the DP a story should get a Theme theta-role in both cases. If there are different theta-assigners in each case, then we should expect to find examples in which the theta-role of this argument differs from one example to the other. To put it differently, the idea that the object DP gets its theta-role from different theta-assigners in (161) and (162), as well as the idea that the verb assigns different theta-roles in each case, fails to explain why both examples have the same semantics.\footnote{Of course, the two examples obviously differ semantically in that the former contains an explicit Goal argument, while the latter does not. However, even in the latter case the Goal argument is implicitly expressed, so that the basic semantic relations...}
The conclusion we can draw from the above discussion, then, is that a SC analysis of double object verbs which take the second internal argument optionally runs into conceptual problems. A Larsonian-type analysis, however, has no problem in dealing with (161) and (162). Whether or not the second argument is projected does not affect the theta relation between the verb and the direct object. In both cases, the verb assigns its Theme theta-role. The difference between the two cases is simply whether or not there is a second internal argument syntactically present.\textsuperscript{76} \par

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

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{76}Needless to say, the concept of an optional argument presents problems for the Theta Criterion, which states that every theta-role must be assigned (in addition to stating that every argument must get a theta-role). The notion of optional argument, in fact, seems to strictly rely on the idea that a theta-role (in this case Goal), does not necessarily have to be assigned. Thus, verbs like tell must be distinguished from verbs like give, such that the former lexically specifies that the Goal theta-role can be assigned optionally.

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

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

The NP the data in (ii) is optional, yet nevertheless is a complement of the head N analysis. When it is not present, we must assume that the relevant theta-role is not assigned by analysis. The question of what allows the optional assignment of a theta-role will not be pursued here (see Grimshaw (1990)).

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

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

4.3.2.3 Optional or obligatory locative?

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

\textsuperscript{77}A further semantic argument against a SC analysis of arrivare can be made. Unlike the copular verb essere, arrivare has semantic content, raising the question as to whether it is reasonable to view verbs with semantic content as copular verbs. That is, if arrivare assigns a theta-role to the SC, the configuration essentially yields a semantic interpretation in which a proposition arrives.
verbs in which the null locative is projected optionally, Moro claims that it is always present. Empirical arguments were made in §4.2.1.2 for the claim that the pro-loc is projected optionally. Moro's argument in favor of the non-optionality of the null locative is essentially a theoretical one, centering on the need to assimilate all unaccusatives with essere. However, as I argued in §4.3.2.1, there is no need to claim that all unaccusatives take a SC complement. Consequently, the argument for the view that the locative is always projected also disappears.\footnote{An alternate argument against the claim that the null locative is always projected comes from English. Moro analyzes 'explicative' there as the English equivalent of Italian existential ci (and his null locative predicate selected by other unaccusatives). The fact remains, however, that there is optional with unaccusatives:

(i) \textit{There arrived four women.}

(ii) \textit{Four women arrived.}

If there is the equivalent of the null locative in Italian, then the simplest conclusion is that the null locative in Italian is optionally projected as well. As we shall see in Chapter 5, the optionality of there follows if we take it to be the WLGAs selected by arrive-type verbs in English (note that the optionality of there poses a problem for an analysis of this morpheme as the predicate of a SC).}

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

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

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

\begin{verbatim}
(163) pro-loc ngh è gghi tre matal.
pro-loc SLOC is-LOC three masc boys
\end{verbatim}

I assumed that, just as with the GOAL-entailing constructions in (14), ghi in the existential is the clitic double of pro-loc, while ngh is the locative subject clitic which occupies the Agr head and agrees in features with pro-loc, which occupies Spec, IP at s-structure. I would like to suggest here that the existential in Italian should get the same analysis. That is, in Italian, pro-loc is also projected as the LOCATION argument. This can be seen in (164):
(164) pro-loc ci sono tre ragazzi.
   pro-loc LOC are three boys
   "There are three boys."

Recall our discussion in §3.2.2.3 concerning the intuition that Italian
existential (or 'expletive') ci is semantically different from the 'referential' NDL ci.
Compare (164) with (165):

(165) Ci sono andati tre ragazzi.
   there are gone.3pl three boys
   "Three boys went there yesterday."

Our proposal that the existential involves a pro-loc can explain this difference in
semantic interpretation: the 'expletive-like' interpretation of the locative in the
existential in (164) actually derives from the presence of pro-loc. The fact that ci in
(165) yields a non-expletive-like interpretation derives from the fact that there is no
pro-loc in this case.

Evidence in favor of this analysis of (164) and (165) comes from
Borgomanerese. Consider the fact, noted in Moro (1997), that the existential
interpretation of a sentence such as that in (164) contrasts with the following, which has
a "true locative" interpretation:

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

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

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

(167) a. L è-gghi Mario.
   SCL is there/here Mario
   b. *Ngh è-gghi Mario.

"Under this analysis, we must take ci to be the clitic-double of pro-loc. Of
course, this raises the question as to why ci doubles pro-loc when it is a LOCATION
argument, but not when it is a GOAL argument. While I cannot offer a principled
answer to this question, let us suppose (given Moro’s arguments) that the pro-loc in the
existential is a predicate of a SC complement of the verb essere 'be' (in contrast with
pro-loc as the WLGA). It is possible that the doubling of pro-loc with ci can obtain
with a predicate in Italian, but not with an indirect object argument. Perhaps pro-loc as
a predicate (in contrast with pro-loc as a dative argument) can be doubled by ci because
as a predicate, it is not marked for dative Case; there would thus be no Case clash
between the predicate and the non-dative ci. When pro-loc is projected as the WLGA,
however, it is marked for dative Case; under this view, the doubling of pro-loc (the
WLGA) with ci would thus result in a Case clash (see footnote 33 above, which
illustrates that ci, unlike ghi, is not specified for dative Case)."
Thus, in terms of the semantic interpretation of the locative, (167a) corresponds to (166), and (163) corresponds to (164). Given this parallelism, I will assume that the Italian existential involves a pro-loc while the NDL does not occur with a pro-loc.\footnote{As Moro (1997:138) notes, it would be undesirable to posit the existence of two different cis in order to explain the semantic difference between (164) and (166). Under the hypothesis offered here, recourse to such a solution is not necessary: the semantic difference between the two derives from the fact that the former involves a pro-loc while the latter does not (supported by the Borgomanerese facts in (163) and (167)).}

On this note, I would like to make one final comment concerning Moro’s analysis of the Italian existential. As we saw, he analyzes the existential as an ‘inverse copular sentence’, with ci as a raised predicate. Under the analysis of the existential suggested here, however, it is pro-loc which is the raised constituent, while ci is a clitic double (like Borgomanerese ghi).\footnote{Whether pro-loc in the existential is an indirect object argument or the predicate of a SC selected by essere be remains an open question under this analysis. I simply note here that Moro provides several convincing arguments for analyzing essere as taking a SC, and I see no reason not to adopt this aspect of his analysis.} Thus, under our analysis the clitic ci moves to preverbal position not because it is a raised predicate, but rather because it procliticizes to finite verbs, like all object clitics in Italian. As can be seen in the following example, ci encliticizes to the infinitival form of the verb essere:

(168) Sembrano esser-ci due ragazzi.
    seem be-LOC two boys
    “There seem to be two boys.”

The enclisis of ci in (168) cannot be characterized as an instance of ‘NP raising’ (if by ‘raising’ we mean movement to subject position). Similarly, then, the movement of ci in (164) cannot be characterized as raising either; its position is simply the result of clitic movement. That (164) involves a pro-loc which has undergone NP-raising to the matrix Spec, IP is again suggested by the facts in Borgomanerese. As can be seen in (169), in a sentence with the raising verb smijé ‘seem’, the locative SCL ngh occupies the matrix Agr, which is indicative of a pro-loc in subject position:

(169) pro-loc ngh è smijé vessa-ghi do mati int la cisina.
    pro-loc SLOC is seemed be-LOC two.fem girls in the kitchen
    “There seemed to be two girls in the kitchen.”

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

(170) a. A I era sta-ye tanta gent. (L. Burzio, p.c.)
    SCL SCL was been-LOC many people

b. *A y era sta-ti tanta gent.

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

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

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

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

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

(171) a. El e rivà la Maria.
SCL is arrived the Maria

b. *El e ndat la Maria.
SCL is gone the Maria

She explains this difference by claiming that rivar has an implicit locative which can
act as the SOP, while ‘go’ does not.† Thus, Saccon’s explanation essentially concurs

†Saccon (1993:141) notes that the notion of an SOP is not unlike the notion of
‘theme’ or ‘topic’.

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

(130)  

a. *Parte un razzo per la luna.*
   leaves a rocket for the moon
   “A rocket is leaving for the moon.”

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

(172)  

a. $X_{\text{max}}$  
   SOP(,...theme)  
   VP

b. $X_{\text{max}}$  
   VP  
   SOP(,...theme)

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

(173)  

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

In (173), the SOP (the PP) is right-adjointed to the VP. Is it possible that the PP in (130a) is in the correct position to act as a theme, or as an SOP? While it does occur to the right of the i-subject (like the PP in (173)), there is no intonational break after the direct object, in contrast with (173). According to Saccon, the intonational break in (173) is indicative of right-adjunction. The lack of an intonational break in (130a), then, suggests that the PP is not in the appropriate structural position to be an SOP. If anything, it has probably remained in its base-generated position within the VP.86

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

(130)  

b. *Mi parte il treno.*
   to-me leaves the train
   “The train is leaving on me.”

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

---

86While I cannot offer any insights concerning the data in Coneglianese, note that the Italian counterparts to the sentences in (171a) and (173) are not informationally equivalent. The Italian counterpart to (171a) can be interpreted as unmarked (i.e., used in answer to the question “What happened?”). The Italian counterpart to (173), however, is not unmarked. Rather the i-subject is presented as new information. This seems to be the case whenever an i-subject is followed by a right-dislocated XP, as in (i):

(i)  

Ha telefonato Maria, alle due.
has telephoned Maria, at two o’clock

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

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

Delfitto & Pinto (1992), Delfitto & D'Hulst (1994), and Pinto (1994) provide an explanation for the grammaticality of the word order V-S with *arrivare which relies on a comparison of unaccusatives with unergatives and transitives.\(^6\)

Delfitto & Pinto (1992) (D&P), for example, note (following Benincà (1988a)) that while *arrivare allows a definite post-verbal subject (see (118) above), transitives and unergatives do not:

\[(174)\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a.} & \text{*Ha recensito il libro Gianni.} & \text{(transitive)} \\
& \text{has reviewed the book Gianni} \\
\text{b.} & \text{Ha urlato Gianni.} & \text{(unergative)} \\
& \text{has yelled Gianni}
\end{array}
\]

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

\[(175)\]
\[
\text{pro, è arrivata [SC, Maria, t\text{,}]}\]

\[^6\]These authors extend their explanation for *arrivare to all unaccusatives, including *partire.

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

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

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

b. Ha urlato qualcuno.
    has yelled Gianni

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

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

I do not offer an explanation for these facts here.

A final comment concerns the claim that arrivare takes a SC complement.

As we saw in §4.3.2 above, arrivare must be analyzed as optionally taking a second internal argument, not as taking a SC complement. Note that once we eliminate the possibility of a SC analysis, Case transmission as proposed by D&P is no longer possible, since no subject-predicate relation obtains between the "subject" and the (trace of the) second internal argument.17

Chapter 5

THERE: THE WEAK LOCATIVE GOAL ARGUMENT IN ENGLISH

5.1 Introduction

A central assumption made by Chomsky (1981; 1986a; 1995), den Dikken (1995), Groar (1995), Lasnik (1992; 1995), and Safir (1982; 1985), among many others, is that the morpheme there in there-sentences such as that in (178) is an expletive:18

(178) There arrived four women.

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

17See §5.4.2.3.1 for an alternative analysis of Case assignment of the WLGA.

18For the purposes of this chapter I will consider 'there-sentences' to be those constructions which involve there and a verb other than be. To avoid confusion I will refer to there-sentences with be as the 'existential'. See below in §5.4.1 for a discussion of the verbs which may occur with there. Note also that from here on, 'there' refers to so-called 'expletive there' (unless otherwise specified), and not stressable ('deictic') there.
locative semantics view; among others, Fillmore (1968), Kimball (1973), Kuno (1971), Lyons (1967), and more recently, within the Principles & Parameters framework, Freeze (1992) and Hoekstra & Mulder (1990)). While the fact that there is limited to a semantically coherent class of verbs presents a problem for the expletive analysis, this problem is rarely addressed. Another problem raised by the expletive analysis has to do with the question of why there needs Case. As I will show in this chapter, this fact has continually raised problems for linguistic theory. Moro’s (1993; 1997) analysis of there as a raised predicate eliminates some of the problems of the expletive analysis.

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

(179) Four women arrived there.

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

5.2 Expletive there and Case

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

(180) a. I tried [there to arrive four women]
   (cf. I tried four women to arrive.)
   b. It seems [there to have arrived four women]
   (cf. It seems four women to have arrived.)
   c. It is unnecessary [for there to have arrived four women]
   (cf. It is unnecessary [for] four women to have arrived.)

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

---

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

In addition to the question of the need for expletives to get Case, the visibility requirement also raises the question of why non-NP arguments (i.e., CPs, IPs, and PP) do not need Case in order to be assigned a theta-role. For example, the CP complement of say or the IP complement of seem do not get Case, yet are assigned a theta-role.
lack of scopal ambiguity seen in (181a) (cf. (181b); Williams (1984)), and the lack of binding seen in (182a) (cf. (182b); den Dikken (1995)).

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

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

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

---

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

5.2.1.1 Chomsky (1995)

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

(183) There, arrived [four women],

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

(184) *There1, seem [P, there2, to have arrived [four women]],

That is, there is no reason why (there1, there2, four women) could not form a chain, much as (four women, t', t) or (there, t, four women) in (185a,b):

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

b. There, seem [P, t, to have arrived [four women]],

Lasnik suggests that the ungrammaticality of (184) seems to reside in the fact that the expletive NP (specifically, *there2) does not get Case. Thus, the need for an expletive to get Case cannot be reduced to the need for the associate to get Case (via a chain); if it did, (184) should be grammatical.91

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

91Note that (184) is an adaptation of Lasnik’s (1992) example (61) (*There is likely there to be a man here). The change to the verb arrive is simply to render the example directly relevant to the central discussion in this thesis.

92Lasnik’s explanation for there’s need to get Case will be discussed immediately below (§5.2.1.2).
phi-features for the associate's features to be checked against, the features continue to move up to be checked off in the matrix Infl. Notice that the Case and phi-features must also move through an intermediate functional projection which does not contain the appropriate features in (186), too, confirming that (184) cannot be ruled out by claiming that the features of the associate cannot move through more than one head in search of the appropriate features:

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

Under the CH4 analysis, in (186) the Case and phi-features of the associate would first have to move to the embedded Infl. Since this head does not contain the appropriate features, they would have to move up again to the Agro head dominating the embedded IP, which presumably contains the appropriate features to check off those of the associate. 93

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

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

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

(188) _ seem [IP _ to have arrived [four women]]

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

(189) _ seem [IP [four women], to have arrived _]

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

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

93The derivation should be similar to that for the DP them in (i), where presumably the Case and phi-features of this DP move to Agro.

(i) I believe [IP them to have arrived]

This raises the question of how the Case and phi-features of the DP them are checked in (ii) under the CH4 analysis:

(ii) It is unnecessary [IP for [IP them to have arrived]]

Since only features move at LF, it is conceivable that these features can be checked off by adjoining directly to the complementizer for, which is traditionally taken to be the Case-assigner in such constructions.
5.2.1.2 Lasnik (1992; 1995)

5.2.1.2.1 Lasnik (1992): Case marking the expletive

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

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

In order to explain the ungrammaticality of (187), he also proposes that Case marking be an s-structure requirement, in addition to an LF requirement.

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

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

(190) John, seems [sp, t' to be believed [sp, t' to have been arrested t]]

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

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

5.2.1.2.2 Lasnik (1995): alternative proposals

The analysis of (187) provided in Lasnik (1995) follows the analysis given in Chomsky (1995). In particular, Lasnik claims that a sentence such as that in (187) is blocked by the principle 'Procrastinate' in the following way.4 At the stage in the derivation seen in (188), either the operation 'Merge' may apply to there in the embedded Spec, IP, or the associate can 'Move' to the embedded Spec, IP (as noted above). According to Lasnik, the latter operation involves a violation of Procrastinate, since under the former operation (i.e., merging of there), the movement of the associate would be unnecessary. In other words, insertion of there is less costly than movement of the associate, since the operation Merge does not violate any principles, while the movement operation violates Procrastinate. Thus, application of Merge to there blocks the movement of the associate at that point in the derivation, successfully ruling out the derivation that produces (187).

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

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


b. *There someone laughed.

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

---

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

There are two objections to this analysis that I will consider. The first is a theory internal one: recall our discussion above concerning the problem with 'expletive replacement' analyses of there, which is eliminated once Chomsky's (1995) theory of LF feature movement (used in the CH4 analysis of there) is adopted. In particular, we saw that the claim that the entire associate moves to the position of the expletive leads to problems concerning scope and binding, exhibited in the examples in (181) and (182). Note that the LF-affix analysis adopted by Lasnik inherits this problem from previous expletive replacement analyses. Although under Lasnik the associate adjoins to the expletive (rather than fully replacing it), it is still in a position from which it can c-command everything dominated by IP. This analysis thus makes incorrect predictions concerning the sentences in (181) and (182), in contrast with Chomsky's (1995) analysis, which assumes that only the features of the associate move at LF.

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

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

\[ (i) \]

\[
\text{IP} \quad \text{there} \quad \text{IP} \\
\text{[four women]} \quad \text{there} \quad \text{I} \quad \ldots
\]

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

I would like to suggest here that this revised claim could be easily paraphrased in the following way: "*there* is selected by a subclass of unaccusatives."

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

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

As we saw in §4.3.1.1.1, Moro (1997) provides several arguments in favor of analyzing Italian 'expletive' *ci* as a SC predicate. He shows that some of the arguments used for this analysis of *ci* apply directly to expletive *there* in English.

---

*Hoekstra & Mulder (1990), following Moro (1989), also analyze English *there* as a raised predicate.

---

example, as we saw in the Italian sentences in (145) (repeated here as (192)), the PP in a copular construction is obligatorily present:

(192) a. [Molte copie del libro] erano [SC * there] in the studio

b. *[Molte copie del libro] erano [SC * there] in the studio

many copies of the book were

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

(193) a. [Many copies of the book] were [SC * there] in the studio

b. *[Many copies of the book] were [SC * there] in the studio

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

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

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

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

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

Similarly, Moro shows, the phenomenon seen in Italian in (147) (repeated here as (166a)) also holds in English (166b):

(196) a. *c' erano [S there, molte copie del libro] [vp la cause della rivolta].
there were many copies of the book the cause of the riot

b. *There were [S many copies of the book] [vp the cause of the riot]

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

Analogously to Italian (discussed in §4.3.1.1.2 above), Moro extends this analysis of there as a raised predicate to all unaccusatives. Thus, English there is analyzed as the phonologically overt counterpart to Italian's null locative predicate.

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

(197) a.

b.  

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

5.3.1 The elimination of problems caused by an expletive analysis

As Moro shows, many problems created by analyses of there as an expletive are eliminated under his raised predicate analysis. Two of these were

---

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

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

(ii) *To whom does it seem that there are many people indebted?
(c.f.: It seems that there are many people indebted to John)

The idea is that (i) is explained if the AP indebted to whom is taken to be a predicate in (i) but an adjunct in (ii), under the assumption that extraction from an adjunct leads to ungrammaticality (it is not clear to me, however, that (ii) merits a full *). It cannot be similarly shown that a PF co-occurring with there (as in (194)) is an adjunct, since (as is well known) extraction from a PF adjunct does not lead to ungrammaticality (e.g., Which kitchen did he eat in?). Moro notes that NPs can never be adjuncts.
discussed immediately above; here I show that the problems which remain under CH4 (§5.2.1 above) are also readily explained under Moro’s theory.

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

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

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

Note that the ungrammaticality of these sentences receives a ready explanation under Moro’s analysis of there as a raised predicate.72 The sentence in (198) is straightforwardly ruled out because the unaccusative verb selects a SC in which only one predicate is admissible. Adding a second there to the sentence would simply involve adding an extra predicate. The sentence in (199), as Moro points out, is ruled out as a violation of locality conditions on movement. That is, the associate occupies the intermediate specifier position as a result of movement (seen in (189), re-elaborated here as (200)):

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

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

(201) *There, seem [four women, to have arrived [SC t _]]

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

(202) *Mary, seems [it to be believed [that [there to be intelligent]]]

Neither can the sentence in (199) be successfully derived by first raising there, because the trace of there would block movement of the NP into that position (also noted by Zwart (1992:footnote 5)):

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

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

---

72Moro also notes that his analysis explains the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (i) (which Lasnik (1992) points out has never received an adequate explanation), which contrasts with the sentence in (ii):

(i) I believe there *(to be) a picture of the wall in the room.

(ii) I believe John *(to be) the cause of the riot.

According to Moro, the fact that the copula is required in (i) follows from the more general fact that in inverse copular sentences, the predicate (in this case, there) can raise only if there is a landing site available. The copula must thus be present in order to provide the landing site. This would also explain (iii) (an inverse copular sentence):

(iii) I believe the cause of the riot *(to be) John. (cf. (i) and (ii))

Note, however, that this explanation incorrectly predicts (iv) (a canonical copular sentence) to be possible without the copula:

(iv) I believe a picture of the wall *(to be) in the room.

That is, (iv) should pattern with (ii). I cannot offer an explanation for the ungrammaticality of this sentence without the copula. However, if we take there to be a predicate, the descriptive generalization seems to be that the copula cannot be omitted when the predicate is a locative.

73Most of Moro’s discussion of there as a raised predicate revolves around examples involving the copular verb be. In this section I have modified his examples by changing the verb to arrive (to make the examples directly relevant to the central discussion in this thesis). Since Moro (1997:Chapter 5) proposes that unaccusatives, like be, take a SC complement, nothing crucial will hinge on this change.
5.3.2 Questions raised by the predicate analysis

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Another problem with the analysis of *there* as a predicate has to do with the question of Case assignment. Returning to the question of visibility (raised, for example, in Lasnik (1992); §5.2.1.2.1 above), it is not clear why a predicate (as a non-argument) would require Case. According to Moro (1997), the fact that *there* needs Case follows from his analysis. He states (p. 120), "...Case is assigned to *there* as to all raised DPs in copular sentences, irrespective of whether they are argumental or not. Assuming the analysis of *there* as a raised predicate, Case assignment to it is no longer surprising [..as it was under expletive analyses,] but rather exactly what we would now expect." This only follows, however, if Case assignment to a raised NP predicate (as in (141)) is likewise unsurprising. If the Visibility Condition holds (see footnote 89 above), then it should indeed be surprising that a predicate NP (a non-argument)
requires Case. Under visibility, then, it would follow that even a predicate analysis of there could not offer a ready explanation of Case assignment.\footnote{If, on the other hand, we assume (along with Moro) that visibility is not a factor in Case assignment (i.e., to explain why an NP predicate, as a non-argument, needs Case), then a predicate analysis of there would have no advantage over an expletive analysis with respect to the issue of Case assignment; under both analyses, one could claim that there gets Case simply because it is an NP. The analysis I offer below would have the same lack of advantage; see §5.4.2.2.}

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

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

5.4 There is a weak locative goal argument

It has long been noted (e.g., Burzio (1986), Freeze (1992), Kimball (1973), Kuno (1971), Levin (1993), L&RH, and Milisark (1974), among many others) that expletive there can only occur with a subset of unaccusatives in English.\footnote{In line with the expletive view, however, Moro (1997:145) states that “...there does not add any ‘lexical’ content of its own [as such] we might call it a ‘propredicate’. This offers us the possibility of remaining within the traditional terminology and considering there as an expletive, provided that the proper syntactic source of there is indicated. Specifically, there can be considered the expletive of the predicate of the small clause, rather than the expletive of the subject of predication.”} If it turns

\footnote{English contrasts with other Germanic languages (e.g., Dutch) which use a locative expletive analogous to English there with all classes of verbs (transitives, intransitives, and all unaccusatives; see, for example, Vikner (1995) and Zwart (1992)). The analysis provided here for English there thus cannot be directly extended to locative expletives in other languages. However, it should be noted that our analysis does not preclude the possibility of the use of a weak locative as a true expletive (i.e., a semantically null NP inserted into subject position to satisfy the EPP) in other languages. For our purposes, we can assume that Dutch or “there”, for example, differs from English there in that the former has entirely lost its semantic content, while the...}
out that the class of verbs that allows *there* is semantically homogeneous, then this fact should call into question the claim that *there* is a semantically empty NP, inserted in subject position simply to satisfy the EPP. However, it may not be immediately obvious what the verbs which occur in *there*-sentences have in common semantically (noted, for example, by Milsark (1974); see Appendix below for discussion of a discourse theoretic analysis). Freeze (1992) characterizes the class of verbs which occur with *there* as 'locative unaccusatives' (also used in Tortora (1996)). The term 'locative unaccusative', however, does not precisely characterize the group of verbs that occur with *there*. As we saw in Chapter 2, unaccusatives such as *leave, exit, and escape* entail the existence of a location (specifically, SOURCE). Nevertheless, these verbs do not occur in *there*-sentences. On the other hand, there is something to Freeze's intuition (also expressed in Hockstra & Mulder (1990)) that the group of unaccusatives that occur with *there* entail a location of some sort. The question, then, is how to characterize the group of verbs which occur with *there* such that it includes some location denoting unaccusatives while excluding others.

Given the discussion of Borgomanerese and Italian in the previous chapters, I would like to suggest that *there*, just like pro-loc, is a weak locative goal argument. In the following we will see that this hypothesis is supported by the fact that *there* is restricted to occurring with GOAL-entailing VIDMs.

### 5.4.1 The lexical restriction of *there*

Levin (1993) gives a list of the unaccusative verbs which occur in *there*-sentences. These verbs include some Verbs of Inherently Directed Motion (VIDMs) (206), Verbs of Appearance (VOAs) (207), Verbs of Manner of Motion (MOMs) (208), and Verbs of Existence (VOEs), Verbs of Spatial Configuration, and Meander Verbs (209a-c):

(206) arrive, ascend, come, descend, drop, enter, fall, go, pass, rise

(207) appear, arise, begin, develop, emerge, occur, etc.

(208) fly, jump, march, run, roll, walk, etc.

(209) a. exist, grow, remain, survive, etc. (VOEs)

   b. hang, lie, sit, stand, etc. (Verbs of Spatial Configuration)

   c. climb, meander, turn, wander, etc. (Meander Verbs)

---

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


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


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


5.4.1.1 *There is selected by GOAL-entailing VIDs

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

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

b. *There walked a man with a dog.

The analysis I would like to provide takes the α-telic VIDs in (206) and the MOMs in (208) to be lexically GOAL-entailing VIDs.134 Once we can show that these verbs are lexically GOAL-entailing, we can claim that only GOAL-entailing VIDs can occur in there-sentences. To show that these verbs are lexically GOAL-entailing, I will adopt the essentials of L&RH’s analysis of MOMs.

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

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

b. They jumped clear of the vehicle.

134See footnote 15 in Chapter 2 for comments concerning go. It is clear that English go, which is GOAL-entailing in there-sentences, has a different use than Borgomanerese ne ‘go’, which is basically a SOURCE-entailing verb. As we saw in footnote 57, Italian andare ‘go’ is ambiguous between a GOAL-entailing and a non-GOAL-entailing VIDs.
They also note that when these verbs are used as unaccusatives, they are interpreted as verbs of directed motion. This difference in meaning can be detected in the examples in (214). Specifically, the referent of the NP that does the jumping in (214b) has reached a location-goal. Furthermore, this sentence describes an event which involves a single jump, and not several successive jumps. This is not true of (214a), which contains the unergative instance of the verb; this sentence can describe an event which involves several successive jumps.

To account for this systematic meaning shift, they propose a lexical rule which takes the 'constant' of the verb which appears in the unergative lexical semantic template (i.e., the basic form of the verb) and maps it onto the lexical semantic template that unaccusative verbs of directed motion appear in. The net effect of this mapping rule is that the lexicon contains both an unergative and an unaccusative instance of the verb. Note, however, that this is not equivalent to saying that the lexicon lists two different instances of this verb. Rather, the unaccusative instance of this verb is systematically derived from the unergative instance of the verb via the lexical mapping rule, eliminating redundancy and capturing the systematicity of the polysemy. The appeal of a lexical rule is that it captures the fact that the meaning of the unaccusative instance of a verb such as _jump_ entails a directed change, involving a single jump which ends in a reached goal; it does not entail a process involving successive jumps. As L&RH note, all verbs which entail that their single argument undergoes a directed change project this argument internally (a fact which they capture in their 'Directed Change Linking Rule'). Thus, the lexical mapping rule they propose captures the fact that when the verb describes a directed change, the verb is unaccusative. To put it differently, it captures the fact that when the verb is unaccusative, it describes a directed change. 105

Note that L&RH's mapping rule states that MOMs are mapped onto the lexical semantic template of 'verbs of directed motion'. Let us make this mapping rule more specific, and claim that the verbs in question are mapped onto the lexical semantic template of 'verbs of directed motion'.

L&RH's proposal contrasts with other accounts in the literature which take the meaning shift discussed above to be derived compositionally by the syntactic presence of the resultative XP or a goal PP (see L&RH for references, which includes Dowty (1991) and Hockett & Maldonado (1990), among others; see also Kizu (to appear)). I briefly note here two objections to this latter type of account. First, if the goal-entailed (or telic) meaning of the unaccusative instance of _jump_ were derived compositionally through the syntactic presence of a PP, then we would predict (214b) to be interpretable as an event which involves reaching a goal through successive jumps (contrary to fact). The lexical account, on the other hand, neatly captures the fact that the unaccusative verb describes a directed change, rather than an event that involves a process of repeated events.

Second, it is widely held in the literature that in Italian, it is the presence of the PP which allows the unaccusative use of a verb of motion such as _correre_ 'run'. This claim is sketched out in (i) and (ii):

(i) _Ho corso._
(i) have run.
(ii) _Sono corsa_ *(a casa)._  
(ii) am run fem *to home.*

The above data would be consistent with the claim that it is the syntactic presence of a PP which yields the goal-entailed meaning of the unaccusative instance of the verb. However, contrary to what is widely held in the literature, it turns out that the presence of the PP in (ii) is not obligatory; _sono corsa_ is grammatical as long as the location-goal is interpretable from context. This is illustrated in the following sentence (which is given in English for ease of exposition): "I was sitting in the living room minding my own business, when suddenly I heard a huge crash in the kitchen; _sono corsa_, and what do I see but the whole pile of dishes on the floor." The eventuality _sono corsa_ is obligatorily interpreted as entailing goal (in this case, 'the kitchen'). The point here is that the syntactic account of the meaning shift predicts _sono corsa_ (without the syntactic presence of the PP) to be impossible, contrary to fact. Note that a lexical analysis such as L&RH's does not have a problem explaining this fact.
template of 'GOAL-entailing verbs of inherently directed motion'. I adapt this aspect of their mapping rule simply because the verbs in question specifically take on a GOAL-entailing meaning when used as unaccusatives. If we understand the mapping rule to work in this way, we can claim that the unaccusative instances of the MOMs and the GOAL-entailing instances of the α-elic VIDMs are lexically GOAL-entailing, making them lexically identical to GOAL-entailing VIDMs like *arrive.136

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

\[(215)\]
\[\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \text{*The programmer appeared a picture (on the screen).} \\
&\text{b. } \text{*The thief disappeared the bicycle (from the garage).}
\end{align*}\]

As noted in Chapter 2, however, neither do VIDMs.137

136As stated in footnote 11, let us assume that the lexical mapping rule applies to the aelic instance of α-elic VIDMs such as *descend. Under this view, the mapping
rule in question would target aelic verbs of motion in general, regardless of their basic unergative (e.g., jump) or basic unaccusative (e.g., descend) status.

137Some Italian dialects may use some VIDMs transitively (noted, for example, in Moro (1997:234), see also references cited therein). The two most common such uses are with *scendere 'descend' and *salire 'ascend' (examples from P. Benincá,

\[(216)\]
\[\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \text{*Mary arrived Sue (at the station).} \\
&\text{b. } \text{*Mary left Sue.} \quad (\text{"Mary caused Sue to leave")}
\end{align*}\]

Furthermore, as L&RH claim, VIDMs cannot occur with resultative XP's (also noted by, among others, Simpson (1983)).138 This is illustrated in the following examples ((217a) is taken from L&RH):

\[(217)\]
\[\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \text{*Willa arrived breathless.} \\
&\text{b. } \text{*Sue left sad.}
\end{align*}\]

Note that VOAs and VODs are also restricted in the same way (the examples in (218) are ungrammatical under the intended interpretation):

\[(218)\]
\[\begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \text{*Willa appeared worried.} \\
&\text{b. } \text{*Sue disappeared worried.}
\end{align*}\]

Thus, VIDMs (both GOAL- and SOURCE-entailing) exhibit the same properties as VOAs and VODs. Further evidence which supports a unification of these verb classes comes from many Northern Italian dialects, such as Borgomanerese. Borgomanerese

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{personal communication; see also Benincá (1984)):}
\item \begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ho sceso il gatto / la spazzatura.} \quad (causative)
\item (i) have descended the cat / the garbage
\item \begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Ho sceso il gatto / la spazzatura.} \quad (causative)
\item (i) have descended the cat / the garbage
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
\item \begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ho sceso le scale.} \quad (non-causative)
\item (i) have descended the stairs
\item \begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Ho sceso le scale.} \quad (non-causative)
\item (i) have descended the stairs
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

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

\begin{itemize}
\item \begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ho sceso Mario.} \quad (causative, cf. (i))
\item (i) have descended Mario
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

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

138However, see Tortora (to appear) for arguments against the claim that VIDMs cannot occur with resultative XP's.
does not have translation equivalents of verbs such as ‘disappear’ and ‘appear’. In order to express the notion of appearance, the GOAL-entailing VIDs *rive* ‘arrive’, *gai* ‘come’, and *gai fora* ‘come out’ must be used. Similarly, in order to express the notion of disappearance, the SOURCE-entailing VID *mē* ‘go; leave’ must be used. From these observations I conclude that there is no principled reason not to consider VOAs to be GOAL-entailing VIDs, and VODs to be SOURCE-entailing VIDs. This is consistent with the conclusion arrived at by L&RH (p. 241), who note, “...[o]ne could ask whether [the verb *come*] and possibly some of the other verbs of inherently directed motion are better viewed as verbs of appearance in all their uses.” The hypothesis made here, however, changes the focus of the conclusion by reducing VOAs to GOAL-entailing VIDs, rather than the other way around.

5.4.1.1 There is a WLGA

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

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

(219) 

a. *Four women left.*

b. *Four women left from the station.*

c. *Four women left there.*

(220)

a. *Four women arrived.*

b. *Four women arrived at the station.*

c. *Four women arrived *here.*

d. *There arrived four women.*

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

(221)

```
       VP  
      /   
     V'   
    /    
   V    VP
  /      
 arrive Spec
     /
 four women V 
    /
      XP
     /
     there
```

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

(222)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
\text{there}_j
\end{array}
\!
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{arrive}_j
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{V'}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
\text{four women}_j
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{t}_j
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Agrs'}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Agrs}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AgrP}
\end{array}
\]

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

Unfortunately, however, as can be seen by (220d), the post-verbal position of the subject directly correlates with the presence of the WLGA there in English (although see footnote 110 below for a brief discussion of locative inversion). As such, it is not immediately obvious whether it is the post-verbal position of the subject or the presence of the there which forces the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. In order to maintain that it is the presence/absence of there which counts, let us recall the facts of Borgomanerese (Chapter 3, §3.2.2.4), which can enlighten this discussion. Borgomanerese differs from English in that it allows 'free inversion' (like Italian), regardless of whether or not a locative occupies Spec, IP. As we saw, the absence of the weak locative in Borgomanerese correlates with the absence of a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal; this is the case even when the subject is post-verbal (i.e., even in a normal 'free inversion' construction, as in (47)).

Thus, the speaker-oriented interpretation obtains not due to the post-verbal position of the subject, but rather to the presence of the weak locative. I take these facts as indirect evidence that the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal in English there-sentences derives from the presence of there, and not from the syntactic position of the subject.\footnote{105}{One could ask whether locative inversion constructions serve as evidence against the hypothesis in the text, since (like there-sentences) they involve a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal, in spite of the fact that there is no there:}
analysis of there: this morpheme cannot be semantically empty if its presence affects the semantic interpretation of the sentence.

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

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

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

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

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

5.4.2 There is weak

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

C&S provide extensive cross-linguistic evidence which shows that pronouns divide into three distinct grammatical classes: ‘strong pronouns’, ‘weak pronouns’, and clitics. The first two types of pronouns, strong and weak, exhibit syntactic and semantic differences. In §3.2.4.2.2 we discussed two properties of weak pronouns which differentiate them from strong pronouns: (i) weak pronouns can refer to non-human entities, and (ii) weak pronouns must move overtly to a Case-related position. This was illustrated with the two morphologically distinct third person plural feminine nominative pronouns, loro and esse, in (73) and (74) (repeated here as (223) and (224) for convenience):

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

b. Loro sono troppo alte.
    they-fem are very tall
    (= the girls, *the roses)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

c. *Arriveranno presto, esse.
will arrive.3pl soon they-fem

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

To summarize, loro and esse exhibit a semantic difference: loro can only refer to [+human] entities, while esse can refer to both human and non-human entities. This semantic difference correlates with a difference in syntactic behavior: loro has a free syntactic distribution, while esse can only occur in Spec, IP. This correlation suggests the following hypothesis: if a pronoun X can refer to both human and non-human entities, X must be weak; as such, we predict it to exhibit the syntactic behavior exhibited by the weak pronoun esse.
C&S note that in contrast to Italian, which has two morphologically distinct third person plural feminine nominative pronouns, French has the single morphological form elles 'they (fem.)'. Like Italian esse, French elles can refer to both human and non-human entities. This fact suggests that elles is a weak pronoun, like esse. Yet unexpectedly, unlike esse, elles can be coordinated, thus exhibiting the syntactic behavior exhibited by the strong pronoun loro. However, C&S note the revealing fact that when elles is coordinated with another NP, it can only refer to a [+human] entity. This can be seen in (229):

(229)  a. Elles sont trop grands. (= the girls; the roses) they-fem are too big
      "They are too big."

b. Elles et celles d'a côté sont trop grands. (= the girls; *the roses) they-fem and those besides are too big.
      "They and those besides are too big."

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

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

(230)  a. *Here and there arrived four women.
      b. *Right there arrived four women.
      c. *It is there that arrived four women (at the station).
      d. Where did four women arrive? *There.

(231)  a. Four women arrived here and there.
      b. Four women arrived right there.
c. It is there at the station that four women arrived.

d. Where did four women arrive? There.

Note, too, that as with Italian esse, these syntactic restrictions exhibited by weak there correlate with a semantic distinction: weak there does not have the same ability to refer to a contextual location as strong (deictic) there.\footnote{How this semantic restriction relates to the ability of a weak pronoun such as esse to refer to a [-human] entity will be discussed below in §5.4.2.1} Furthermore, like the weak pronoun esse, there cannot remain in its base position:

\footnote{Moro (1997:279, footnote 22) states that “...there...has the characteristics both of maximal projections and of heads, in that it occupies a spec-position but cannot contain either specifiers or complements.” This observation is consistent with the analysis of there in (230b) as a weak XP. However, the fact that there can be modified by right in (231b) is evidence that there are two distinct morphemes in the English lexicon. This conclusion contrasts with that of Moro (1997:138-145), who claims that the ‘expletive-like’ behavior of there is derived syntactically, suggesting that the English lexicon contains only one there. It is not clear, however, how the syntactic process Moro proposes can account for the fact that there in (230b) cannot be modified while there in (231b) can. Furthermore, his proposal does not allow for a unification of these morphological facts and those exhibited by weak esse and strong loro in Italian, or weak elles and strong elles in French. Under the hypothesis that there are two different theres, however, the modification phenomena follow directly from a more general universal fact about weak and strong pronouns. Note that the hypothesis offered here is reminiscent of Sampson’s (1972) conclusion that the English lexicon contains two theres: for him, one is underlyingly at it (our weak there) and the other is underlyingly at that (our strong there). This is consistent with C&S’s observation that it is a weak pronoun (and that that is a strong pronoun).}

(232) *Four women arrived there.

To put it differently, the syntactic behavior exhibited by a weak pronoun such as esse allows us to understand there’s obligatory occupation of Spec, IP within the greater context of a general cross-linguistic phenomenon. The obligatory overt movement of weak there to subject position is not an isolated fact about there, but rather a general cross-linguistic fact about weak pronouns that they cannot remain in their base positions.\footnote{C&S (p. 33) actually claim that the weak pronoun’s lack of [+human] specification is due to a missing functional head in its structure. This contrasts with the structure projected by a strong pronoun, which projects the functional head in which the feature resides. This is illustrated in (i) and (ii) (I use a DP for the purposes of exposition, although C&S use a CP; FP refers to a generic ‘functional projection’):}

5.4.2.1 The feature deficiency of weak XPs

As we saw above, the differences in syntactic behavior exhibited by strong pronouns vs. weak pronouns correlate with a semantic difference. This was illustrated with Italian’s two morphologically distinct third person plural feminine nominative pronouns, strong loro and weak esse, as well as with elles\_weak and elles\_strong in French. We saw that loro is restricted to [+human] referents, while weak esse can refer to both [+human] and [-human] referents. In order to account for this pattern, C&S propose that the strong and weak pronouns differ in their feature composition. Strong pronouns, they argue, have a feature specification which is lacking in weak pronouns. Specifically, a strong pronoun such as loro is specified for the feature [+human], while a weak pronoun such as esse is not specified for a value of this feature.\footnote{C&S (p. 33) actually claim that the weak pronoun’s lack of [+human] specification is due to a missing functional head in its structure. This contrasts with the structure projected by a strong pronoun, which projects the functional head in which the feature resides. This is illustrated in (i) and (ii) (I use a DP for the purposes of exposition, although C&S use a CP; FP refers to a generic ‘functional projection’):}
'impoverishment' in the specification of the feature [+human] is what enables the weak pronoun to refer to [+ or - human] referents: with no value for the feature specified, the pronoun is "free to corefer with any...antecedent" (C&S:33). The strong pronoun, on the other hand, is constrained by its feature specification to corefer with an antecedent that is [+human].

5.4.2.2 The feature deficiency of weak there

In what follows, I will show that this feature 'impoverishment' exhibited by weak pronouns has a correlate in the weak locative. The discussion will center around weak there, but the conclusions will be assumed for pro-loc, the weak locative in Borgomanerese and Italian. As we shall see in §5.4.2.1.1, the speaker-oriented interpretation which is forced by the syntactic presence of the weak locative can be reduced to the more general phenomenon of feature impoverishment exhibited by weak XPs.

As we saw above, the semantic difference exhibited by strong vs. weak pronouns is captured by positing the existence of an impoverished feature specification for weak pronouns. Let us consider how this analysis of weak pronouns can bear on the analysis of the weak locative. It is well known that weak there and strong there differ semantically. The former has been characterized as 'non-referential' or 'non-deictic', and the latter has been characterized as 'deictic'. For example, while Freeze (1992) takes weak there to be lexically locative, he states that it is 'pleonastic', and "...must be distinguished from the deictic there, which is referential and for which here may be substituted" (footnote 15). He also states that "...establishing that the proform there is locative does NOT make it deictic: it has a [+LOC] feature, but it does not refer to a place within some utterance context" (footnote 11). Thus, weak there is semantically deficient with respect to strong there, much like Italian weak esse is semantically deficient with respect to strong loro.

Let us capture this distinction between weak there and strong there in the same way the distinction between esse and loro is captured. In order to do so, we must consider which features are needed to minimally distinguish strong there from here and from the demonstrative that. First, let us suppose that there has the feature [locative], which is what differentiates it from that (cf. Freeze's (1992:footnote 11) suggestion, noted in the preceding paragraph). Furthermore, as was noted in footnote 20 above, 'deictics' such as here and there employ the speaker as their reference point (Frawley

(i) strong pronoun:  
(ii) weak pronoun:

C&S's analysis thus suggests that the entire [human] feature is missing in the weak pronoun. This contrasts with the analysis I provide in the text, which holds that the weak pronoun possesses the [human] feature, which however is not specified for a value. It will become clear below why I modify C&S's proposal in this way.
(1992)). To differentiate between the two, then, let us adopt this essential insight and assume the existence of a feature [speaker] (following Fillmore (1971), Cinque (1972), and Vanelli (1995), among others). Thus, the deictic locative here encodes a location near the speaker by means of a positive value for the feature (i.e., [+speaker]), while the deictic locative there encodes a location removed from the speaker by means of a negative value for the feature (i.e., [−speaker]). This gives us the following characterization of the two deictic locatives:

(233) a. strong there: [+locative], [−speaker]
    b. strong here: [+locative], [+speaker]

We saw above that the semantics of weak esse in Italian can be accounted for by positing the loss of the value for the feature [human]. Let us take this analysis of weak esse as a key to the appropriate analysis of weak there. That is, in order to account for the semantics of weak there, let us posit the loss of the value for the feature [speaker]. This gives us the following lexical characterization of weak there:

(234) weak there: [+locative], [speaker]

Given this analysis, the difference between weak there and strong there parallels the difference between weak esse and strong loro in Italian, or weak elles and strong elles in French (see §5.4.2): the weak instance of the pair is missing a value for the relevant feature, while the strong instance of the pair has a value specified for the relevant feature:

(235) a. weak there: [speaker] strong there: [−speaker]
    b. weak esse: [human] strong loro: [+human]
    c. weak elles: [human] strong elles: [+human]

Note that this analysis of weak there captures the widely held intuition that this morpheme is semantically locative, yet at the same time is semantically impoverished with respect to deictic there.

5.4.2.2.1 The speaker-oriented interpretation

As was demonstrated in the previous chapters (§3.2.2.4, §4.2.1.2) and above (§5.4.1.1.1), it is the syntactic presence of the weak locative which yields the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. Now that I have provided an analysis of the weak locative in terms of features, I will offer an explanation for this phenomenon. I would like to suggest that the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal obtains as a result of the fact that the feature [speaker] is not specified for a value (see (234) above).

Let us suppose that, although the feature [speaker] is lexically unspecified for a value, there is a grammatical constraint such that it must ultimately be specified. There are two possible ways in which this feature can be assigned a value: (i) by referring to a location in the linguistic or spatial context, or (ii) through 'default' assignment. Let us first discuss the former possibility. Until now, we have addressed the interpretation of the WLGA in the absence of any linguistic context. Note,
however, that if the syntactic context provides a location, the WLGA refers to it.

Concerning English, Kimball (1973:265) notes that "[the] restriction on speaker placement [in there-sentences] can be relaxed to the extent that the speaker can be replaced by some point of reference, with respect to which the moving object is coming into being. Thus, we might have, 'Sherry was sitting in the house when there entered a white dove,' so with respect to Sherry the dove is coming into being.' Thus, the matrix sentence Sherry was sitting in the house provides a location that weak there can refer to.

In Italian, we can see that the syntactic context need not contain an explicit PP (such as in the house in Kimball's English example) in order to serve as a deictic anchor for the WLGA. Recall (Chapter 4) that the location-goal in (118) (repeated here as (236)) must get a speaker-oriented interpretation:

(236) pro-loc arriva Maria.
pro-loc arrives Maria
"Mary is arriving." (i-subject unmarked; GOAL is speaker-oriented)

However, once such a sentence is embedded under another sentence, as in (237), the location-goal is no longer speaker-oriented:

(237) Erano tutti contenti perché arrivava Maria.
(they) were all happy because arrived Maria.
"They were all happy because Maria was arriving."

Although the location-goal is not speaker-oriented in (237), note that its interpretation is still restricted. In particular, the location of Maria's arrival can only be that of the happy people (thanks to P. Benincà for pointing this out to me). This is the case in spite of the fact that there is no PP in the matrix sentence denoting a location. It is important to note that this restricted interpretation is not a logical necessity; an imaginable (although non-existent) interpretation of (237) is that the people (who were not in China) were happy because Maria arrived in China. This fact illustrates that the WLGA refers to the deictic coordinates of the sentence, and not just any location that may have been previously mentioned in the discourse. Thus, even if the discourse which precedes the sentence in (237) includes a discussion of China, China cannot serve as the location that the WLGA gets its reference from (if the happy people were not in China). The WLGA thus behaves like an anaphor, in that it is an NP which does not have any inherent reference of its own, and so must get its reference from something in a syntactic domain.

In the absence of any syntactic context from which the WLGA can derive its reference, the feature [speaker] is assigned the default value ‘+’ (possibility (ii) above). The question arises as to why the default value is not ‘-’ instead. While I do not offer a principled answer to this question, let us note that from a conceptual standpoint, it is simpler if the default value is ‘+’, rather than ‘-’. If the latter were the default value, the number of locations that there could refer to would be unrestricted, since there are an indefinite number of locations which are removed from the speaker (pointed out to me by both A. Cardinaletti and M. Enc). The former value, on the other

---

113 This, in fact, is a possible interpretation if Maria is contrastively focused (which is expected, given our discussion in Chapter 4). It is important to keep in mind, however, that we are concerned with the interpretation of the location-goal under the unmarked interpretation of the embedded sentence (i.e., the case in which pro-loc is present).

116 Thus, the feature [speaker] differs from the feature [human] in that the latter can take its value from a referent in the context (cf. the referential possibilities exhibited by esse).
hand, restricts the number of locations to one. It is important to note that the interpretation of the location-goal is obligatorily speaker-oriented in the absence of syntactic context, even if a location is provided in the discourse. Thus, if the person who utters (236) is not in China at the time of Maria’s arrival, the location-goal cannot be China, even if it has been previously mentioned in the discourse.

One final comment must be made concerning the assignment of the default value ‘+.’ If nothing else is said, this process ultimately renders weak there indistinguishable from here (seen in (233b) above). This is problematic, since sentences which contain the weak locative do not require that the location-goal be interpreted as ‘here’. What is required to remedy this problem is a modification of our analysis of here in (233b). To do this, let us note that there is another difference between here and strong there that has not yet been mentioned, and which is not encoded in (233). In particular, here (in contrast with strong there) uses the moment of speech as a reference point; in other words, here can only refer to the location the speaker is in at the moment of speech. Thus, here is anchored to the speech act in a way that there is not. Given this distinction, let us change our analysis of here in (233b) to that in (238b):

\[
\text{(238)} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. strong there:} & \quad [+\text{locative}], [-\text{speaker}] \\
\text{b. strong here:} & \quad [+\text{locative}], [+\text{speaker}], [+\text{speech act}]
\end{align*}
\]

Thus, weak there (after it has been assigned a positive value for the feature [speaker]) and strong here differ in that only the latter contains the feature [+speech act]:

\[
\text{(239)} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. weak there:} & \quad [+\text{locative}], [+\text{speaker}] \\
\text{b. strong here:} & \quad [+\text{locative}], [+\text{speaker}], [+\text{speech act}]
\end{align*}
\]

The lack of the feature [+speech act] for weak there captures the fact that when weak there is used, the speaker does not have to be in the location goal at the moment of speech in order for the sentence to be true, in contrast with here.

\[117\] A question which comes to mind is the following: if the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal is derived through the presence of the weak locative, then why doesn’t the existential (which also uses weak there) get a speaker-oriented interpretation? I cannot offer a principled answer to this question here. However, note that a location-goal differs conceptually from a state at a location. The former is taken to be a single spatial point at the end of a path; this is conceptualized, for example, by an arrow →, the point of which indicates a single spatial point as the goal). A state at a location, on the other hand, can conceptually involve extended space. How these distinct conceptualizations are to be encoded in the grammar is beyond the scope of the present discussion. However, for the present purposes I will assume that they relate to the above question. The speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal might be derived compositionally through both the syntactic presence of the weak locative plus this spatial conceptualization of a location-goal (thanks to Y. Li for helpful discussion here; he is not, however, responsible for the inconclusiveness of this point).

\[118\] As Cinque (1972:581) points out, "...there exists no word that specifies the place of the Speaker in a time different from the present, an equivalent of "here" in the past tense, so to speak." He notes that in contrast, the deictic element entailed by the verb come, for example, is not anchored to the time of utterance. Under our analysis, weak there and pro-loc (as WLGAs) are words which specify the place of the speaker at a time different from the present (i.e., a "here" with no anchor to the time of utterance). Even given our analysis, however, Cinque’s statement that there exists no such word still seems correct, since the WLGA is not lexically specified for [+speaker]. Also note that under our analysis, weak there must be taken to be ‘deictic’ (since ultimately it specifies [+speaker]), contrary to its characterization in the literature. Again, however, the traditional intuition that this morpheme is not deictic is captured by our claim that it is not lexically specified for a value for the feature [speaker].
5.4.2.3 Other Advantages of the WLGA Analysis

Here I would like to show that there are several other advantages to the analysis of *there* as a WLGA, in addition to those noted above. To consider these advantages, let us return to the questions raised by both the expletive and predicate analyses of *there*, discussed in §5.2.1 and §5.3.2 above.

As we saw in §5.2.1, there are two sentences discussed in Lamik (1992; 1995) that do not receive an explanation under an expletive analysis of *there*. These are repeated here for convenience:

(240) *There 1, seem [np there2, to have arrived [four women]].

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

In §5.3.1 we saw that the ungrammaticality of these sentences receives a ready explanation under Moro’s analysis of *there* as a raised predicate. The sentence in (240) is straightforwardly ruled out because the unaccusative verb selects a SC in which only one predicate is admissible; the second *there* would simply have no source. The sentence in (241) is straightforwardly ruled out as a violation of locality conditions on movement. That is, in order to derive this sentence, the SC predicate *there* must move to the matrix Spec, IP, skipping the intermediate Spec position which is occupied by *four women*; this is illustrated again here:

(242) *There, seem [np [four women]], to have arrived [sc t 11]

Thus, (241) is analogous to the standard cases of super-raising.

These advantages of Moro’s analysis can be extended to the analysis of *there* as a WLGA. Under the WLGA analysis, the sentence in (240) is ruled out because adding a second *there* would amount to having two indirect object arguments, violating the theta-criterion. The sentence in (241) is ruled out as an instance of super-raising under our analysis as well, since the WLGA *there* undergoes NP raising from its d-structure position as an indirect object to its s-structure position in Spec, IP. With respect to these questions, then, our analysis is in spirit more like Moro’s analysis, and adopts his important insight which allows for a straightforward explanation of the data: *there* is base generated VP-externally, not inserted in Spec, IP to satisfy the EPP.

In addition to providing a straightforward account for the sentences in (240) and (241) (which have always been problematic under expletive analyses), the hypothesis that *there* is a WLGA allows us to eliminate the problems raised under the predicate analysis. First, recall from §5.3.2 that the analysis of *there* as the predicate of a SC complement of unaccusative verbs such as *arrive* predicts that the presence of *there* is obligatory in the absence of a PP. As we saw, this is an incorrect prediction; the example is repeated here for convenience:

(243) a. *There arrived four women.

b. *Four women arrived.

That is, (243b) necessarily involves a missing predicate under Moro’s analysis (see §4.3.2.3 and §5.3.2 for a discussion of why this state of affairs is problematic). Under the hypothesis that *there* is a WLGA, however, (243b) is expected; as we have seen, VIDMs project their second internal argument optionally. Second, note that the
question which was left unanswered at the end of §5.2.1.2.2 (in the discussion of Lasnik’s expletive analysis of *there*) is also left unanswered by Moro’s analysis: why is *there* only permitted with a small subclass of unaccusative? The analysis of *there* as a WLGA not only provides an answer to this question, but also allows for a unification of the English facts with those exhibited by Italian (Chapter 4) and Borgomanerese (Chapter 3). Third, the analysis of *there* as the predicate of a SC raises a question concerning Case assignment. If the concept of ‘visibility’ is maintained as an explanation for Case assignment, it is not clear why a predicate (as a non-argument) would require Case (see §5.2 and §5.3.2 for a discussion). However, under the analysis offered here, the need for *there* to get Case is straightforward: *there* is an argument, and as such needs Case in order to be visible for theta-marking. In what follows, I will discuss the issue of Case assignment in more detail.

5.4.2.3.1 The WLGA and Case assignment

The analysis of weak *there* as an argument allows us to explain in a straightforward way why Case is assigned to this morpheme. Here I show how, exactly, Case assignment works under this analysis. We shall see that there are good reasons for claiming that *there* and the i-subject are assigned Case by one and the same Case assigner (namely, Infl). After I provide evidence which shows that nominative is assigned to both arguments, I will suggest a modification of Chomsky’s (1995, Chapter

4) analysis of Case checking; in particular, I will propose that the nominative Case feature in Infl survives (i.e., is not deleted) if it is checked off by a weak NP.\(^{19}\)

There are at least two possible analyses of Case assignment of *there*. One analysis can take advantage of *there*’s status as a second internal argument, and simply stipulate that it is assigned inherent dative Case by the unaccusative verb that selects it. Under such an analysis, we can continue to assume that the (Case feature of the) i-subject checks nominative in Infl (at LF). Such an analysis might be desirable because it would involve no additional complications to the system. However, this analysis would cause us to miss an important cross-linguistic generalization concerning i-subjects and agreement. In order to understand the nature of this generalization, let us turn to ghi-sentences in Borgomanerese.

As we noted in §3.2.4.2, ghi-sentences involve obligatory third person singular agreement on the verb, even when the i-subject is third person plural. This was illustrated in (61a), repeated here as (244):

(244) Ngh è riwà-gghi do mài.
SLOC is arrivd-LOC two.fem girls

We concluded from this fact that pro-loc (which occupies Spec, IP) triggers (singular) agreement on the verb (i.e., pro-loc checks the phi-features in Infl).\(^{20}\) Assuming that

\(^{19}\)The development of this section has benefitted greatly from a discussion with L. Buazzo, although he is in no way responsible for any of its flaws.

\(^{20}\)In the discussion which follows, “triggering agreement on the verb” should be understood as “checking phi-features in Infl.” Similarly, “assignment of nominative Case” should be understood as “checking the nominative Case feature in Infl.”

On the basis of the behavior of expletives in several Romance and Germanic languages, Cardinaletti (1997) concludes that expletives which are unambiguously marked for nominative Case (e.g., French il) trigger agreement with the verb. If we
Case and agreement go together (an assumption traditionally made in the analysis of
there-sentences),\textsuperscript{11} the example in (244) would suggest that in addition to checking the
phi-features on Infl, pro-loc also checks the (nominative) Case feature on this head.
Keeping this conclusion in mind, let us now turn to the question of how the i-subject
gets Case.

A concern which immediately comes to mind regarding Case assignment of
the i-subject is the Case filter. The claim that pro-loc checks nominative Case in (244)
would seem to suggest that the i-subject cannot also be assigned nominative. Lasnik’s
(1992; 1995) analysis of Case assignment in there-sentences could provide a solution to
this problem. As we saw in §5.2.1.2.1, he claims (following Belletti (1988)) that
unaccusatives have the ability to (optionally) assign partitive Case to their d-structure
objects. He instantiates this idea by claiming that the i-subject checks partitive Case in
Spec, Agro at LF. In spite of the dictates of the Case filter, however, there are at least
two pieces of evidence which lead to the conclusion that the i-subject is assigned
nominative Case, rather than some other Case assigned in Agro. First, as is illustrated
in Burzio (1986; to appear), subject inversion with pronouns in Italian (which are

relax this generalization to encompass all weak morphemes which are unambiguously
marked for Case (not necessarily for nominative), the Borgomanerese example is
consistent with this generalization; as we saw in (51) in Chapter 3, ghi is
unambiguously marked for dative Case.

\textsuperscript{11} That the i-subject triggers verb-agreement in there-sentences has always been
the principle factor driving the assumption that the i-subject raises (at LF) to get
nominative Case (although see Lasnik (1992; 1995)).

\textsuperscript{12} As far as I know, it is impossible to show in Romance that a post-verbal third
person pronoun gets nominative Case, because such pronouns (i.e., the ‘strong’
pronouns; see §3.2.4.2.2) are all ambiguous between nominative and accusative (e.g.,
Italian lei ‘he/him’, lei ‘she/her’, loro ‘they/them’; also pointed out by Sacco
(1993:132)). The third person pronouns which are unambiguously nominative are all
weak (e.g., Italian egli ‘he’, essi ‘they-DEM’), and as such cannot occur post-verbally.

I note here that Benincà (1995) discusses some data on exclamatives which may
call into question the use of examples such as that in (245) as evidence for the
nominative status of i-subjects. As Benincà shows, pronouns with nominative
morphology are used in contexts in which there is no nominative Case assigning head:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Parlo, io (ad accettare)!}
  \item \textit{Sì, \_ \_ \_ \_ (to accept)}
\end{itemize}

P. Benincà suggests (personal communication) that pronouns such as \textit{io} may not
necessarily be marked for nominative. I leave this matter open.
pattern in French that (the phi-features of) such i-subjects do not move at LF to check the phi-features in Infl. Note that this claim predicts the following: any i-subject should be possible with a verb that exhibits 3SG morphology. This is an incorrect prediction; it is well known that only third person (singular and) plural i-subjects are permitted with third person singular verbal morphology in 3SG-3PL languages. This can be seen, for example, in Borgomanerese, which does not allow first and second person i-subjects in the ghi-construction:

   SLOC is arrived-LOC you.sg you.pl

b. *Ngh è rivà-ghhi mé /njau. 
   SLOC is arrived-LOC 1/we

The dialect of Conegliano (Saccom 1992:1993) also exhibits apparent lack of agreement between the verb and the i-subject. This can be seen in (247) (taken from Saccom 1993:133), where a non-agreeing subject clitic (el) occurs with a third person feminine i-subject:

(247) El e ndat ela. 
   SCL(-agr) is gone she

Nevertheless, the apparently non-agreeing i-subject can only be third person, and not first or second, as can be seen in (248):

(248) *El e ndat ti. Saccom (1993:133)
   SCL(-agr) is gone you

It is important to note that the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (246) and (248) is not due to a general ban on first and second person i-subjects. Such subjects are possible, as long as they agree with the verb. This can be seen in the Italian example in (245) above, as well as in the following examples from Borgomanerese (249a,b) and Coneglianese (249c):

(249) a. l summa rivà njau.
   SCL be.1pl arrived we

b. l sön rivà mé.
   SCL be 1sg arrived I

c. Te sé ndat ti. 
   SCL(+agr) are gone you

Coneglianese (Saccom 1993:133)

Again, as far as I know, the agreement pattern seen in (249a-c) is found in all 3SG-3PL languages. The ungrammaticality of (246) thus casts doubt on the claim that the phi-features of the i-subject in 3SG-3PL languages do not raise to check off the phi-features in Infl; if they did, we would expect (246) to be grammatical, contrary to fact.

The above set of facts thus suggest that the third person plural i-subject in 3SG-3PL languages does in fact agree with the verb, contrary to appearances. In support of this conclusion, let us turn to Burzio (1991; to appear), who argues for the notion of 'pseudo-agreement' in order to account for an apparently independent set of facts concerning impersonal/reflexive si in Romance. As can be seen in (250), impersonal si can occur with a third person singular i-subject:

(250) Si inviterà anche lui.
   SI will-invite.3sg also he
   "He will be invited as well."

Burzio shows that si can also occur with a third person plural i-subject (251a); however, it cannot occur with a first or second person i-subject (251b):

(251) a. Si inviteranno anche loro.
   SI will-invite.3pl also they
   "They will be invited as well."

b. *Si inviterà anche loro.
   SI will-invite.1pl also they
   "He will be invited as well."
b. *Si inviteremo anche noi.
Si will-invite.1pl also we

He argues that the ungrammaticality of (251b) can be explained (i) if we take both the i-
subject and the impersonal subject si to be connected to Infl, and (ii) if agreement is
defined as follows:

(252) a agrees with β if: (Burzio (1991))

(a) (Strict Agreement) α and β have identical φ-features, or
(b) (Pseudo-Agreement):
   (i) β has no gender, no number, no person
   (ii) α is third person

The featureless element si (pseudo-)agrees with the third person verb in (250) and
(251a); it cannot, however, (pseudo-)agree with the non-third person verb in (251b).

The above cases are thus unified with the case of reflexive si, which occurs with both
singular and plural third person antecedents (253a,b), but not first or second person
antecedents, as in (253c):

(253) a. Lui si inviterà.
he SI will-invite.3sg
"He will invite himself."

b. Loro si inviteranno.
they SI will-invite.3pl
"They will invite themselves."

c. *Noi si inviteremo.
we SI will-invite.1pl

As Burzio (to appear) points out, the phenomenon of pseudo-agreement is again found
in ‘quirky subject’ (QS) constructions in Icelandic. He notes that QSs in Icelandic
apparently do not trigger verb agreement:

(254) Strákum var bjargad.
the boys.dat was.3sg rescued
"The boys were rescued."

To account for this, he proposes that the QS has both a ‘quirky Case’ and a nominative
Case assigned to it, such that nominative is ‘stacked’ onto the QS:

(255) [[[NP ] Q-Case ] Nom ] (Burzio (to appear))

According to Burzio, the agreement features in Infl are blocked by the Q-Case shell,
and as such cannot see into the inner NP; the plural feature of the NP thus does not
reach Infl. He further proposes that the outer shell has no agreement features, resulting
in default (i.e., 3SG) agreement between the QS and the verb. To support this analysis,
he notes (citing Sigurdsson (1991)) yet another property of QS sentences in Icelandic,
namely that they cannot occur with first and second person nominative objects; rather,
they are limited to third person nominative objects, as in (256):

(256) Henni voru sýndir bilarnir.
her.dat were shown the-cars.nom

Under the assumption that the QS is connected to Infl (in spite of the apparent lack of
agreement between QS and verb in sentences such as that in (254)), this fact is
accounted for under the (independently needed) notion of pseudo-agreement. In
particular, note that the nominative object triggers agreement on the verb. If the
nominative object were first or second person, then the QS henni ‘her.dat’ (the outer
shell of which is featureless) could not pseudo-agree with the first or second person
features in Infl, and as such, would not be licit. In other words, the hypothesis that the (featureless outer shell of the) QS pseudo-agrees with the verb, and the fact that the nominative object also checks agreement in Infl accounts for the obligatoriness of a third person nominative object.

To sum up, then, the fact that (apparently non-agreeing) i-subjects in Romance can only be third person is part of a more general cross-linguistic phenomenon. This restriction of objects to third person (regardless of number) in the presence of third person verbal morphology is captured under Burzio’s formulation of the notion of pseudo-agreement, which covers the apparently independent phenomena concerning impersonal/reflexive si and quirky subjects in Icelandic. I conclude, then, that the third person plural i-subject in 3sg-3pl languages does in fact (pseudo-)agree with the verb (as in, e.g., (244) above). Furthermore, under the assumption that Case and agreement go together, I conclude that the verb assigns nominative Case to the i-subject. Our earlier conclusion that the verb also assigns nominative to pro-loc in (244) results in the claim that the verb assigns nominative to two different arguments. As we discussed earlier, concern over the Case filter might lead us to prefer an alternative solution to Case assignment of the WLGA and the i-subject. However, any solution which involves Case assignment of these two arguments by distinct Case assigning heads would not allow us to explain the obligatoriness of third person i-subjects in the WLGA-construction, and it would not allow us to unify this fact with the similar facts revolving around impersonal/reflexive si and Qs in Icelandic.

Let us see how the above discussion bears on the analysis of the WLGA in English. In apparent contrast with languages like Borgomanerese (see (244)), in English it is the (plural) i-subject in there-sentences that triggers (plural) agreement with the verb, rather than the WLGA:

(257) There have arrived four women.

(257) seems to indicate, then, that there, unlike pro-loc, does not trigger verb agreement (this is assumed by both Chomsky (1995: Chapter 4) and Cardinaletti (1997)). However, as we saw for QS sentences in Icelandic, there are good reasons to hypothesize that there does in fact (pseudo-)agree with the verb. Under such a hypothesis, we predict that the i-subject can only be third person; note that this is a correct prediction:

(258) *There am I. (intended interpretation)

Like the case of Qs in Icelandic, the ungrammaticality of (258) is explained if we assume that both the WLGA and the i-subject are connected to Infl; since the (featureless) WLGA (pseudo-)agrees with the third person verb, the i-subject must also

---

The ungrammaticality of (258) cannot be due to a ban on first and second person (=definite) i-subjects in there-sentences. As Milsark (1974) and Belletti (1988) note, definite i-subjects are permitted under a list reading:

(i) Who was there at the party? Well, there was Sue, there was Bill...

First and second person i-subjects are permitted in such a context:

(ii) Who was there at the party? Well, there was you, there was me...

Note that in (ii), there is no agreement between the first/second person i-subject and the verb. This indicates that in contrast with sentences such as that in (257), there is no link between Infl and the i-subject in (ii). This is confirmed by the fact that such i-subjects cannot be nominative:

(iii) *Well, there was I/he/they...

Thus, sentences such as that in (ii) do not serve as a counter-evidence to the claim being made in the text.
be third person. The hypothesis that there is an argument base-generated in complement position which moves to subject position and (pseudo-)agrees with the verb suggests that there is in fact a quirky subject. If so, then we should not be surprised that there-sentences in English exhibit the same characteristics as QS sentences in Icelandic.

To summarize, we have shown that the obligatoriness of third person i-subjects in WLGA constructions in both Borgomanerese and English can be explained if we adopt Burzio's notion of pseudo-agreement, which is independently needed to account for the facts surrounding impersonal/reflexive si and QS sentences in Icelandic. Thus, both the WLGA (pro-loc and there) and the i-subject agree with the verb. Since nominative Case and agreement go together, I conclude that both the i-subject and the WLGA are assigned nominative by Infl.

The evidence which shows that both the WLGA and the i-subject check nominative Case in Infl suggests a modification of Chomsky's (1995:Chapter 4) analysis of nominative Case assignment which (i) accounts for the data discussed above, and (ii) eliminates an undesirable aspect of his analysis. Chomsky claims that the nominative Case feature on Infl is [-interpretable], and as such must be checked-off; once this feature is checked-off, it is deleted. Under this theory, then, Case checking in the WLGA construction would work in the following way: when the pro-loc/there argument checks off the nominative Case feature in Infl (via spec-head agreement), this feature is deleted; as such, the nominative Case feature in Infl is no longer an available target for checking of the nominative Case feature of the i-subject at LF. Chomsky (1995:274) and Cardinaletti (1997) both argue for such an analysis of Case checking in French expletive constructions such as the following (see footnote 90):

(259) Il est entré trois hommes.
   it is entered three men

Note that this analysis entails that the Case feature of the i-subject is never checked off. In other words, under this analysis the i-subject is never assigned Case (in violation of the Case filter), an undesirable consequence.

To eliminate this consequence of Chomsky's and Cardinaletti's analysis, I propose the following: if the nominative Case feature in Infl is checked off by a weak NP (i.e., either a weak argument or an expletive), this feature is not deleted from Infl.114 As such, it is available to be checked off again by the i-subject. This analysis allows us to render Chomsky's and Cardinaletti's analysis of French-type expletive constructions unproblematic from the point of view of the Case filter, which requires that every NP be assigned Case. Furthermore, it allows us to account for the fact that both the WLGA and the i-subject check nominative Case in Infl.

Recall that Chomsky and Cardinaletti assume that there is an expletive, and claim that unlike French if, it does not check off the Case and phi-features in Infl; rather, it is the (Case and phi-) features of the i-subject which raise at LF to check off these features. Note that this hypothesis incorrectly predicts the sentence in (258) to be grammatical. Thus, the hypothesis that there is an expletive cannot explain the above set of facts concerning i-subjects in there-sentences, and cannot unify these with the

114 We might assume that one of the properties of weak NPs is that they are not 'strong' enough to delete the Case feature they check off.
similar set of facts exhibited by QS sentences in Icelandic and impersonal/reflexive *si* constructions in Italian.

5.4.3 Verbs of Existence

Now let us return to the verbs in (209). As we saw, *there* can occur with VOEs, Verbs of Spatial Configuration, and Meander Verbs, in addition to GOAL-entailing VIDMs. The fact that *there* can occur with VOEs is consistent with the facts of Borgomanerese and Italian, and the hypothesis put forth in Chapter 3 (§3.3): the weak locative can be used as the morpho-syntactic instantiation of the lexical semantic category LOCATION. If it can be shown that Verbs of Spatial Configuration and Meander Verbs as used in *there*-sentences have an ‘existence’ meaning, then we can claim that these verbs are VOEs as well. The hypothesis that weak *there* is used as a LOCATION argument can thus apply to all three classes of verbs in (209).

In fact, putting aside GOAL-entailing VIDMs, it is well known that when non-*be* verbs are used in *there*-sentences, they function as VOEs. This is noted, for example, by Milsark (1974:156), who demonstrates that the verb *grow* has two meanings: “increase in size or maturity” and “live rootedly.” Note that the latter is arguably an ‘existence’ reading, while the former is a ‘change of state’ reading. As Milsark notes, when *grow* occurs in a *there*-sentence, only its existence reading is possible:

(260) *There grew some corn in our garden last year.*

L&RH show that Verbs of Spatial Configuration (as in (209b)) have multiple meanings (much like *grow*). The verb *sit*, for example, has a ‘simple position’ reading, a ‘maintain position’ reading, and an ‘assume position’ reading, seen in (261a-c) (adapted from L&RH, p. 239):

(261) a. *The book was sitting on the table.*
    b. *Mary was sitting on the chair.*
    c. *Mary sat as quickly as she could.* (= ‘sit down’)

Like with the verb *grow*, when the verb *sit* occurs in a *there*-sentence, only one reading, the ‘simple position’ reading in this case, becomes available:

(262) *There sat four women in the back of the room.*

L&RH argue that Verbs of Spatial Configuration in their ‘simple position’ sense are VOEs. Thus, the verb in (262), which describes the location of the NP *four women*, is a VOE. We can conclude, then, that Verbs of Spatial Configuration, as used in *there*-sentences, are lexically VOEs.

Finally, the same argument can be made for Meander Verbs. Like Verbs of Spatial Configuration, Meander Verbs have multiple senses. This can be seen, for example, with the verb *wander*:

(263) a. *Four women wandered through the forest.*
    b. *A beautiful river wandered through the forest.*

In (263a), the verb *wander* describes spatial displacement of the NP *four women*; in (263b), it mainly describes the location of the NP it is predicated of. Note that when *wander* is used in a *there*-sentence, only the latter sense is possible:
(254) a. *There wandered four women through the forest.
   b. There wandered a beautiful river through the forest.

Just like the verb sit, then, wander has an existence sense when it is used in a there-sentence. In other words, Meander Verbs as they occur in there-sentences are VOEs.

We can conclude, then, that the two types of verbs that occur with there are GOAL-entailing VIDMs and VOEs (which entail the conceptual category LOCATION). Thus, as was demonstrated for the weak locative morpheme (pro-loc) in Borgomanerese and Italian (see §3.3 and §4.3.3), the weak locative there is optionally selected by both GOAL- and LOCATION-entailing unaccusatives as a second internal argument.

5.5 Conclusions

The analysis of there as a WLGA captures the intuition that this morpheme is both expletive-like and at the same time has semantic content. It explains the restriction of there to GOAL-entailing VIDMs and VOEs (capturing the traditional intuition, expressed, for example, by Kimball (1993) that there-sentences are possible with VOAs and VOEs). It also explains why the presence of there has an effect on the semantic interpretation of the sentence it appears in, and why the syntactic presence of there entails that the subject of the sentence must be post-verbal. The particular properties of this morpheme, that it is 'non-deleter', that it cannot be modified, coordinated, used in isolation, or remain in its base position, were shown to follow from the fact that it is weak. Thus, the properties exhibited by there are not unique, but rather can be understood in the general context of weak pronouns. Like other weak pronouns, there has an impoverished set of features, but is not wholly deprived of a feature composition; it still has the feature [locative] and the feature [speaker], rendering it non-semantically null. This analysis of there, which is extended to pro-loc, also allows us to better understand why the presence of this morpheme forces a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. The WLGA analysis of there also has the advantage of eliminating several problems raised by an expletive analysis. As a modification and extension of Moro's theory, it also allows us to eliminate the problems created by a predicate analysis. There gets Case because as an argument it is subject to the visibility requirement; the claim that both there and the i-subject are assigned nominative Case by Infl is supported by the fact that there-sentences are restricted to third person i-subjects.
Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS

The central hypothesis in this dissertation raises many questions which are beyond the scope of this thesis. Here I briefly conclude this work by touching upon some of these questions, with the hope that they will serve as points for future research into the nature of weak and expletive morphemes.

One question raised by the theory put forth here concerns languages which use a weak locative morpheme with all classes of verbs. Putting the facts of Borgomanerese and Italian aside, the hypothesis that weak *there* in English is not an expletive is supported by the fact that it only occurs with GOAL-entailing unaccusatives, and that its presence forces a speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. Note, however, that the claim that *there* is an argument in English does not preclude the possibility that the weak locative in other languages is a ‘pure expletive’. Our hypothesis, then, leaves open the question of the status of Dutch *er*, for example (see Zwart (1991)), which occurs with all classes of verbs. As stated in footnote 102 above, it is possible that Dutch *er* is ambiguous between an expletive and a WLGA. Zwart, who adopts Moro’s analysis of English existential *there* as a raised predicate, argues that *er* is ambiguous between a semantically empty expletive and a raised predicate. Whether Zwart’s tests (which show that existential *er* is base generated in complement position) will reveal that *er* is also base generated as a complement of GOAL-entailing VIDMs remains to be seen.

‘Pleonastic’ *ye* in Piedmontese is a case which is intermediate between English *there* / Borgomanerese *ghi*, on the one hand, and Dutch *er* on the other. Unlike the former, it occurs with all unaccusatives, but unlike the latter it cannot occur with unergatives and transitives. Given that *ye* occurs with all unaccusatives, it cannot be a GOAL argument. At the same time, however, the question arises as to why it is restricted to unaccusatives. If *ye* were a pure expletive, we would expect to find it with transitives and unergatives, contrary to fact. Piedmontese unergatives such as *telefuné* allow i-subjects just like unaccusatives do, so the restriction of *ye* to unaccusatives cannot be due to the lack of availability of the subject position. Calabrese (1992:111) claims (following DeVincenzi (1988) and Kratzer (1987)) that all unaccusatives in Italian take a (null) spatio-temporal argument. Considering this suggestion, a possibility which comes to mind concerning Piedmontese *ye* is that it is the overt morpho-syntactic instantiation of this argument. As with Dutch *er*, however, these questions concerning *ye* remain open.

A question raised by the claim that existential *there* is a LOCATION argument concerns languages which use a weak non-locative morpheme (*ii*) for the existential, such as Black English (e.g., Wolfram (1991): *It’s a picture on TV* ‘There’s a picture on TV*’), Norwegian, and Swedish (see, a.o., den Dikken (1995) and Vikner
of inversion constructions, argue that the fact that inversion constructions are restricted to certain types of verbs follows from this requirement. Specifically, since the post-verbal subject must be relatively unfamiliar, a verb is licit in such constructions only if it is ‘informationally light’, rendering it relatively more familiar than the post-verbal subject. As L&RH state, "...if a verb in the locative inversion construction did contribute information that was not predictable from context, it would detract from the newness of the information conveyed by the post-verbal NP." Their analysis makes specific reference to the locative inversion construction (see footnote 110 above). However, they take their analysis of locative inversion to be applicable to *there*-sentences; in the discussion which follows, then, I use L&RH’s examples of locative inversion to illustrate certain points, keeping in mind that the conclusions they draw from the locative inversion examples are applied to *there*-sentences.

L&RH note that locative inversion does not permit the large class of Change of State (COS) unaccusatives (see in (212) above). They claim that this is due to the fact that COS verbs are not informationally light. They note: "by predicking an externally caused, and therefore unpredictable, change of state of their argument, these verbs themselves contribute discourse-new information and hence are not eligible for the construction." As evidence in favor of this view, they discuss the verbs *break* and *open*, both of which have (at least) two different senses. One is the core change of state meaning (e.g., *the vase broke; the door opened*), and the other is the ‘appearance’ meaning (e.g., *the war broke*). They demonstrate that the locative inversion
construction only allows the latter meaning ((265) is adapted from L&RH, p. 234, example (33)):

(265) a. Then broke the war...

b. Underneath him opened a cavity...

L&RH note that such cases of multiple senses of verbs which are basically COS verbs are sporadic, and as such probably do not result from any systematic meaning shift.

However, they claim that in the attested cases, such as those above, "the shift in meaning is accompanied by a 'bleaching' of the verb's meaning so that little more than the notion of appearance is left" (p. 234). In other words, the verbs become informationally light, allowing them to occur in the locative inversion construction.

Two observations can be made concerning this explanation for the restricted distribution of there. First, the task of defining 'informational lightness' may not be so straightforward. Note that if what is required of the verb is informational lightness, then we would predict the COS verbs alter and change, which express a pure change of state (with no additional information as to how the change of state comes about), to be possible in there-sentences. As can be seen by the following sentence, however, this prediction is not borne out:

(266) *There changed / altered the sky from purple to blue.
(cf.: The sky changed / altered from purple to blue.)

It is difficult to see how change and alter are not sufficiently informationally light, with respect to the COS verbs break or melt, for example. As noted above, L&RH point out that all COS verbs predicate an externally caused (and therefore unpredictable) change of state of their argument; under their view, this is sufficient to render these verbs non-

informationally light. However, while it is true that the entailment of an externally caused (and hence unpredictable) change of state may count as contributing discourse new information, it is not clear how such information is any more 'heavy' than, say, the information entailed by verbs like walk vs. run, which are found in abundance in there-sentences and locative inversion constructions. That is, like alter and change, walk and run are not entirely deplete of discourse new information (yet the former are banned from there-sentences, while the latter not). Walking entails a different manner of motion than running, so these verbs do involve extra information which goes beyond the notion of appearance. Recall that L&RH suggest that break is possible in (265a) because the verb's meaning has been 'bleached', leaving little more than the notion of appearance. But if such bleaching (to the point of yielding a verb which has no more than a pure appearance sense) were required to make the verb sufficiently informationally light, we would expect all motion verbs in there-sentences to have little more than an appearance sense (i.e., we would expect no difference in meaning between two different appearance verbs). However, as we just saw with walk and run, this is not the case. Similarly, enter and arrive (also found in there-sentences) involve information that goes beyond the appearance sense. Entering is a very specific type of arriving; the meaning of enter entails passing through a threshold (in contrast with the meaning of arrive). Without a way to distinguish this additional information furnished by enter (specifics of crossing a threshold) from that furnished by change (existence of an externally caused change of state), it is difficult to establish that the former is informationally light, while the latter is not. Given the extra (i.e., discourse new)
information furnished by enter or run, we would expect these to be ineligible for the there-construction, contrary to fact. Thus, the verbs enter, run, walk, etc. show that there-sentences allow verbs which have some discourse new information. Given this state of affairs, it is not clear how alter and change can be excluded from there-sentences by virtue of their not being informationally light, while at the same time including the other verbs.

The second observation regarding L&RH's explanation for the restricted distribution of there is that it cannot be adopted for Borgomanerese and Italian. As we saw, pro-loc (the weak locative) is restricted to GOAL-entailing verbs, just like there. However, neither the ghi-construction in Borgomanerese nor sentences with pro-loc in Italian have the same discourse function as there-sentences in English. As we noted in Chapters 3 and 4, the pro-loc sentences in Borgomanerese and Italian do not involve narrow focus (neither presentational nor contrastive) of the i-subject. Rather, the whole sentence is interpreted as new information, such that there is no requirement that the post-verbal subject be interpreted as relatively unfamiliar with respect to the material that precedes the subject (in contrast with there-sentences in English). Given this state of affairs, the restriction of pro-loc to GOAL-entailing VIDs cannot be given the same explanation as the restriction of there to the same verbs. The WLGA hypothesis, however, allows a unified account of the English phenomenon with the Borgomanerese and Italian phenomena.

It is important to note that this proposal does not preclude a discourse analysis of there-sentences. It may be that the semantics of a there-sentence is such that the construction 'lends' itself to the specific discourse function it has (to “introduce the referent of the NP onto the scene,” with the requirement that the NP be relatively unfamiliar with respect to the material that precedes it). The semantics of the sentence compositionally obtains as a result of various independent semantic and syntactic factors. For example, the fact that there is a weak XP means that it must overtly move from its d-structure position to Spec, IP (see (222) above). The net result of this syntactic operation is that the 'subject' NP remains post-verbal. Furthermore, the syntactic presence of the weak locative forces the speaker-oriented interpretation of the location-goal. In other words, the view here is that “the compositional semantics of the construction allows the construction to have the discourse function that it does,” rather than “the discourse function of the construction is what makes the construction select the types of verbs it does.”
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