L'Italia dialettale

Direzione Scientifica

Franco FANCIULLO, Università di Pisa

Comitato Scientifico

Michele LOPORCARO, Università di Zurigo
Martin MAIDEN, Università di Oxford
Giovanna MAROTTA, Università di Pisa
Max PFISTER, Università di Saarbrücken
Alfredo STUSSI, Università di Pisa

L'Italia dialettale può essere acquistata al prezzo di € 65.00 (estero € 80.00) presso le Edizioni ETS, Pisa, Piazza Carrara 16-19, 56126 Pisa.
È possibile abbonarsi alla rivista *Italia dialettale* tramite versamento della cifra sopra indicata sul conto corrente postale 14721567, intestato a: Edizioni ETS Pisa, Piazza Carrara 16-19, 56126 Pisa

– tel. 050 29544; 503868
– fax 050 20158
– info@edizioniets.com
– www.edizioniets.com

L'ITALIA DIALETTALE

RIVISTA DI DIALETTOLOGIA ITALIANA

FONDATA DA CLEMENTE MERLO

DIRETTA DA FRANCO FANCIULLO

VOLUME LXXV

(*Serie Terza, XI*)

2014

EDIZIONI ETS
PISA

RISERVATO OGNI DIRITTO DI PROPRIETÀ
E DI TRADUZIONE

Registrazione Tribunale di Pisa 1/1961 in data 31 Gennaio 1961
Direttore responsabile: Alessandra Borghini

L'ITALIA DIALETTALE

SOMMARIO DEL VOLUME LXXV
(*Serie Terza, XI*)

Roberta D'Alessandro, Claudio Di Felice, Irene Franco e Adam Ledgeway, *Approcci diversi alla dialettologia italiana contemporanea* Pag. 7

Birgit Alber, *Obstruent Systems of Northern Italy* » 13

Mariachiara Berizzi, *La preposizione* ma *nei dialetti dell'Italia centrale* » 37

Silvio Cruschina, *Existential and Locative Constructions in Italo-Romance* » 55

Franco Fanciullo, *I vocalismi (tonici) romanzi: siamo davvero così sicuri di quello che è successo? Un caso "transizionale"* » 81

Chiara Fedriani - Emanuele Miola, *Percorsi di soggettificazione di MANU AD MANU(M) in alcuni dialetti del nord Italia* » 103

Cristina Guardiano - Melita Stavrou, *Greek and Romance in Southern Italy. History and contact in nominal structures* » 121

Rosangela Lai, *Positional Factors in the Evolution of Sardinian* Muta cum Liquida*: A Case Study* » 149

Carla Marcato, *Toponomastica e storia del dialetto* » 161

Francisco Ordóñez - Lori Repetti, *On the morphological restrictions of hosting clitics in Italian and Sardinian dialects* » 173

Mair Parry, *Language tutorial: The dialect of Cairo Montenotte* » 201

Diego Pescarini, *La distribuzione dei clitici soggetto espletivi: tipologia e prospettive parametriche* » 229

Giuseppe Torcolacci, *Il Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico e la codifica di tratti morfosintattici. Il caso dei dialetti italiani meridionali* » 247

Dieter Vermandere - Claire Meul, *La variazione morfologica nei dialetti dell'Italia settentrionale: una causalità multifattoriale* » 273

Silvio Cruschina

Existential and Locative Constructions in Italo-Romance

1. *Introduction*

The aim of the present paper is to outline a classification of existential constructions in Italo-Romance, and to provide an accurate description of certain types of sentence frequently (but erroneously) interpreted as existential. In particular, it is claimed that certain sentence types that appear to be existential should actually be analysed as locative structures, despite their morphosyntactic similarity with true existentials. The theoretical basis of this work is within the framework of Chomskyan Generative Grammar, and relies on two major tenets. Firstly, superficially identical sentences may well have a different underlying structure, which only becomes evident following careful contrastive analysis. Secondly, the information structure of an utterance may trigger overt syntactic operations that determine the order of constituents in the sentence (cf. Cinque & Rizzi 2010).

The data discussed are from Italo-Romance dialects and Sardinian. As is well known, there is a very high degree of microvariation among Italian dialects, and existential sentences are no exception (cf. Bentley et al. 2012, and Bentley, Ciconte & Cruschina 2013; cf. also Manzini & Savoia 2005). Current generative work on comparative syntax has highlighted the importance and the advantages of research on dialectal microvariation. The study of the differences among relatively similar varieties, together with the attempt to establish which pairs or sets of differences are significantly related, turns out to be an essential requirement for the identification of common properties and for the development of unifying analyses capable of accounting for the variation encountered. Existentials exhibit resemblances or partial overlapping with other constructions (e.g. locatives), and the range of

* This paper draws from a large set of data collected in the field as part of the project '*Existential constructions: An investigation into the Italo-Romance dialects*', University of Manchester, funded by the Arts & Humanities Research Council (grant AH/H032509/1). I wish to thank the other project members, Delia Bentley and Francesco Maria Ciconte, for helpful comments and fruitful discussion. I also thank Lucia Molinu for the Sardinian data from Buddusò offered to our project, Andrea Padovan for assistance with the Paduan data, and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments and suggestions.

morphosyntactic variation present in Italo-Romance dialects and Sardinian, which involves all the primary components of the existential sentences (i.e. copula, proform and agreement), forms an ideal empirical basis for reliable descriptive generalizations and correlations. Careful investigations into this variation will thus help us to understand the fundamental properties of genuine existentials, to identify the boundaries between existentials and other structures, and to draw sound conclusions for linguistic theory. More specifically, in this paper I draw on these data with the aim of expanding on some ideas presented in Cruschina (2012a) for Italian, and in an attempt to shed new light on the nature of existential sentences and their relation with locative constructions.

2. *The relationship between the existential and the locative construction*

A close connection between existentials and locatives has often been noted in the literature. Some scholars have interpreted this connection in terms of derivation from the same underlying structure (cf., e.g., Freeze 1992). Others have acknowledged a degree of similarity, but have still maintained a distinction between the two constructions. The sentence pair in (1) exemplifies the two constructions in English:

1) a. The book was on the table. *locative*

b. There was a book on the table. *existential*

Different accounts of the patterns of variation are found in the literature, but two main approaches dominate: the *locative* approach and the *predicate-DP* approach. According to the locative approach, existential sentences and locative predications are generated from a common initial structure, which is in fact a copular locative structure (cf. Freeze 1992, Moro 1997; see also Partee & Borschev 2007):

2) BE [SC SUBJECT PREDICATE] *locatives*

the book on the table

This structure is represented with a 'small clause', namely, a reduced sentence expressing a subject-predicate relation (cf. Stowell 1978).[1] From this common structure, the specific construction arises as the result of moving one of the two constituents within the small clause into the sentence-initial subject position (i.e. Spec-IP). In locative sentences it is the $DP_{SUBJECT}$ (or DP_{THEME}) that has been moved, determining a 'normal order' (cf. 3a). In existential sentences it is instead the predicate, i.e. the locative PP, that has undergone movement to the subject position, yielding the 'inverted order' typical of existential sentences (cf. 3b).

3)	a.	SUBJECT	BE	[$_{SC}$ t_{SUB}	PREDICATE]	→ 'normal order' (*locative*)
		the book	was		on the table	*English*
		kniga	byla		na stole	*Russian*
	b.	PREDICATE	BE	[$_{SC}$ SUBJECT	t_{PRED}]	→ 'inverted order' (*existential*)
		na stole	byla	kniga		*Russian*

This alternation is immediately evident only in languages that allow a locative phrase in subject position (e.g. Russian), and is less transparent in languages such as English, where existential sentences are characterized by the presence of a pronominal form, generally referred to as 'proform', which acts as an expletive subject (i.e. *there*). To account for this different pattern, Freeze (1992) proposes that the proform spells out a locative feature in Infl, and is thus a locative subject itself. Along the same lines, but on the basis of a radically different analysis, Moro (1997) claims that in the existential construction with a proform, the proform itself functions as a predicate

[1] In line with previous studies, and also for the sake of simplicity, I will assume a small-clause analysis for both locative copular predications and existential sentences. The special properties of small clauses have raised a number of controversial issues in the literature, which should be addressed in order to unambiguously establish the syntactic status of small clauses. However, I believe that these issues do not directly affect the analysis proposed in this paper. I adopt a small clause structure mainly for illustrative purposes and because of the straightforward comparison that it allows me to draw between the two constructions under investigation. The same concepts and ideas could equally be described by means of a Predicative Phrase structure (cf. Freeze 1992, Bowers 1993, Hazout 2004, and Remberger 2009).

which moves out of the small clause to yield the characteristic inverted order (cf. 4). On this account, the parallelism with the 'inverted order' existentials is therefore re-established: the structure in (4) is essentially the same as that in (3b)[2]

4) PRF BE [$_{SC}$ DP$_{SUBJ}$ t_{PRF}] → 'inverted order' (*existential*)

there was a book (on the table)

Following the traditional view that existentials are a subtype of impersonal construction with an expletive subject and at least one DP argument (cf. Milsark 1974, Williams 1984, McNally 1992), the key claim of the DP approach to existentials is that the predicate of the existential construction is neither the proform nor the (optional) locative phrase, but the nominal DP itself, often referred to as the pivot (cf. Williams 1994, Hazout 2004, Francez 2007). The proform thus plays the role of an expletive subject of the predication[3].

5) PRF$_{SUBJ}$ BE [$_{SC}$ t_{SUBJ} DP$_{PRED}$] (*existential*)

there was a book (on the table)

Extending these analyses to Italian and Italo-Romance, I claim that the two structures postulated by the locative and the predicate-DP approach to the syntax of existentials are both necessary to understand the true nature of existential sentences in Italo-Romance. However, while the structure postulated by the predicate-DP approach corresponds to the underlying structure of genuine existential sentences, only pseudo-existential sentences, and more precisely 'inverse locatives', have a locative structure of the kind illustrated in (3b) and (4).

[2] I follow Moro (1997) in assuming that in existential sentences the locative PP is an adjunct. This is the reason why it is not represented in the structures in (4) and in (5).

[3] On the notion of predicate, especially in relation with an expletive, non-referential subject, and for a purely structural definition of subjects in a subject-predicate configuration, see Hazout (2004).

3. *A classification of existential sentences*

In Cruschina (2012a), I suggest that in Italian true existential sentences must be distinguished from pseudo-existential sentences, which are in turn of two types: disguised locative structures and presentational sentences. The following table illustrates the fourfold typology outlined for Italian *ci*-sentences:

Table 1: *Italian* ci-*sentence types* (Cruschina 2012a)

TYPE	STRUCTURE	FOCUS	*ci*	DP
I	existential	sentence/predicate	pro-argument	predicate (indefinite)
II	inverse locative	argument	pro-predicate	argument (definite)
III	deictic locative	argument	pro-predicate	argument (definite)
IV	presentational	sentence	lexicalized	argument (specific)

In line with the predicate-DP approach, existentials proper (type I) are analysed as being characterized by an indefinite DP that serves the role of predicate. The requirement that true existentials feature an indefinite DP is crosslinguistically very common[4]. In type II, however, the DP is generally definite. I thus claim that this sentence type instantiates the 'inverted order' of the locative construction, hence the name 'inverse locatives'. As in locative sentences, the definite DP of type II *ci*-sentences represents the subject of the predication. Deictic locatives (type III) are in fact a subtype of inverse locatives that is characterized by a strong deictic value. Finally, presentational sentences (type IV) are typical of colloquial language and, although they share some morphosyntactic properties with the existential construction, they can be semantically reduced to basic predications characterized by a sentence-focus information structure. This latter type of pseudo-existential will not be discussed in the current paper[5], which instead concentrates on

[4] This constraint is known as *definiteness effect* in the literature on existentials (cf. Milsark 1974, McNally 1992, 2011). An account of the definiteness effect falls out of the scope of this paper, but it must be noted that in the same way as a definite DP cannot appear in existential sentences, an indefinite DP is generally a 'bad subject' in locative predications (cf. Beaver et al. 2005, Bentley 2010, 2013). This asymmetry seems to confirm that type II *ci*-sentences are locative structures.

[5] See Berruto (1986), Berretta (1995), De Cesare (2007), Bentley et al. (2012), Cruschina (2012a) and Casalicchio (2013) for further details on pseudo-existential presentational sentences.

the distinction between existentials (type I) and locative pseudo-existentials (type II and III).

In languages like Italian, featuring a clitic proform, the underlying structures of existentials (type I) and inverse locatives (type II) can be redefined as in (6a) and (6b), respectively:

6) a. BE $[_{SC}\ PRF_{(SUBJ)}\ \ DP_{PRED}]$ *existential* (type I)

b. BE $[_{SC}\ DP_{SUBJ}\ \ PRF_{(PRED)}]$ *inverse locative* (type II)

Following Moro (1995, 1997), I assume that the order of the elements within the small clause is not irrelevant, and that only the combination in which the subject precedes the predicate is legitimate (see also Hazout 2004). The main difference between the structures in (6) is thus reflected by the different order within the small clause. The proform is related to the subject in (6a) but is generated in the predicate position in (6b), presumably together with a predicate locative phrase that is subsequently dislocated[6]. The DP functions as a predicate in (6a), while it serves as the subject of the locative construction in (6b). In both structures the clitic proform has to move out of the small clause and attaches to the copula. Examples are provided in (7):

7) a. Nni sta frutta ci su(nnu) ossa assà. TYPE I *Sicilian, Mussomeli (CL)*

in this fruit prf are seeds much

'In this fruit there are many seeds.'

b. C'è ta sùəru, nta cucina. TYPE II *Sicilian, Mussomeli (CL)*

prf-is your sister in-the kitchen

'Your sister is in the kitchen.' (*'There's your sister in the kitchen')

[6] The English expletive *there* has been analysed as the (structural) subject of the sentence, but the same analysis does not hold for the Italo-Romance existential proform due to its morphological properties: namely, because of its clitic status it must be attached to the verb. Nevertheless, I claim that the Italo-Romance existential proform is related to an abstract subject or topic of the predication. Note that despite the morphological and syntactic differences (cf. Burzio 1986), the term 'proform' will be used to refer to both English *there* and Italian *ci*, as well as to the Italo-Romance equivalent pronominal forms.

The existential sentence in (7a) corresponds to a sentence-focus structure, and could thus be uttered in an out-of-the-blue context[7]. By contrast, the inverse locative in (7b) qualifies as an argument-focus structure with a focal DP and a dislocated locative phrase. This sentence would be a felicitous answer to the question *Who's in the kitchen?*. Starting off with the structure in (6b), the surface linear order of (7b) is derived by the movement of the focus constituent to the focus post-copular position, and by the dislocation of the topical locative phrase (cf. Belletti 2004)[8]. Being co-referential with the dislocated locative PP, the clitic proform *ci* has a locative value itself, but it must raise to Infl for morphological reasons. According to this analysis, type II simply involves a *focalization strategy* to obtain an argument-focus structure from a canonical locative predication, i.e. *Ta sùəru jè nta cucina* 'Your sister is in the kitchen'. The argument structure is the same – the constituent *ta sùəru* is the subject of predication in both cases – but the information structure, and consequently the linear order, are different. These discourse-related syntactic operations are independently absent in languages such as English, where intonation is exploited to mark information structure. This is why the 'inverted order' of inverted locatives is not available in English, and canonical locatives are used instead (cf. the English translation in (7b)).

A locative value also characterizes the proform in type III, but in this case an explicit locative reference is missing from the sentence and from the discourse, and the locative pronoun takes on a default deictic interpretation of 'here and now':

[7] Note that the position of the locative PP is independent from raising considerations, but is uniquely determined by information structure and discourse conditions. Sentence (7a) features a locative aboutness topic, which may, but need not convey old information: this sentence can thus be interpreted as a predicate-focus structure (cf. Cruschina 2012a, 2012b). The same locative PP would appear at the end of the sentence in a sentence-focus structure (i.e. *Ci su(nnu) ossa assà nni sta frutta*), or can be right-dislocated when it instantiates a topic conveying information already established in the discourse (i.e. *Ci su(nnu) ossa assà, nni sta frutta*). The latter case is pragmatically less frequent, but it may obtain, for example, if the DP has a focal contrastive interpretation (i.e. in an argument-focus structure). Given that this corresponds to the information structure typical of inverse locatives, it would be legitimate to analyse this case as an instance of the type II construction, despite the fact that the DP is indefinite. Similarly, cases of definite DP occurring in true existentials are well known in the literature (cf. Abbott 1992, 1993, McNally 1992).

[8] The relation between resumptive clitic and the DP associate can be captured more accurately with reference to the big DP hypothesis (cf. Cecchetto 2000, among others). According to this hypothesis, the clitic pronoun and the full DP are generated together and form part of the same 'big' DP, which is subsequently split in order to meet the relevant morphological and discourse-related requirements: the clitic element attaches to the Inflectional head, while the DP associate moves to a dedicated topic projection.

8) Talè: c'è Maria! TYPE III *Sicilian, Mussomeli (CL)*

look prf-is Mary

'Look: Mary is here!'

Similarly to what was observed for type II, the focus is also on the argument DP in this type of locative pseudo-existentials. Evidence from the argument-focus structure of inverse and deictic locatives comes from Sicilian, where argument-focus constituents are commonly fronted to a sentence initial position (cf. Cruschina 2012b). Indeed, the versions of the type II and type III sentences featuring the fronting of the argument DP were accepted by all our Sicilian informants, and were in most cases preferred over the equivalent sentences with no fronting (cf., e.g., ***To suoru*** *c'è ndâ cucina* (Leonforte, EN); *Talìa:* ***Maria*** *c'è!* (Modica, RG)). In the next sections, several pieces of evidence in support of the proposed analysis will be examined, starting with a discussion of the function of the proform in existential sentences and inverse locatives.

4. *The* proform*: pro-argument vs. pro-predicate*

In this section I will explore some morphological and syntactic arguments in favour of drawing a functional distinction between the proform in type I and that in type II. This distinction is the result of a process of grammaticalization, whereby the locative clitic has been deprived of its locative referential meaning in existential sentences, but not inverse locatives. On the basis of a survey of 115 Italo-Romance dialects, the following empirical generalizations can be drawn regarding the relation between the proform and the locative clitic when it appears in unambiguously locative contexts:

9) i. If a locative clitic is present, the proform is always morphologically identical to it.

ii. All dialects without a proform also lack a locative (resumptive) clitic.

iii. Dialects are attested with no locative clitic but with a proform.

As stated in generalization (i), in the majority of the dialects examined the locative clitic is homophonous with the proform appearing in the existential construction. A small number of dialects, corresponding to the 7.8% of the total, do not exhibit a proform in existential sentences. Crucially,

these dialects systematically also lack a locative clitic pronominal form. These findings are summarized in Table 2, and are exemplified in (10)-(11), where the a- and b-sentences correspond to existential sentences with no proform, while the c- and d-sentences show the lack of a locative clitic in contexts where a locative resumptive clitic is expected[9]:

Table 2: *Dialects with no proform* (7.8%)

DIALECT	**REGION**	**COPULA**
Massafra (TA)	Puglia	STARE
Polignano a Mare (BA)	Puglia	STARE
Bisceglie (BT)	Puglia	STARE
Trani (BT)	Puglia	STARE
Genzano di Lucania (PZ)	Basilicata	STARE
Belluno (BL)	Veneto	ESSE
Palmanova (UD)	Friuli	ESSE
Soleto (LE)	Puglia (Salento)	HABERE
Martano (LE)	Puglia (Salento)	HABERE

10) a. Stè sorətə jind'a chəcéjnə. *Polignano a Mare (BA)*

stays sister-your in-the kitchen

'Your sister is in the kitchen.'

b. jind'a 'sta fruttə stè a səmendə assè.

in-to this fruit stays the seed much

'In this fruit there are many seeds.'

[9] The a-sentences are actually inverse locatives according to the analysis defended here (see fn. 11 below). The English idiomatic translations provided in (10) also apply to the equivalent sentences in (11)-(13).

c. Jind'u tərаtéurə, agghiə pustə i manneghərə pəghéjtə.
in-the drawer have.1SG put.PP the towels clean
'In the drawer, I have put the clean towels.'

d. A la scòughə, vòuchə tuttə i dù.
to the school go.1SG all the days
'To school, I go every day.'

11) a. L'é to sorela in cuzina. *Belluno (BL)*
SCL.M.3SG-is your sister in kitchen

b. te sti frutti qua l'é tanti semi.
in these fruits here SCL.M.3SG-is many seeds

c. Te la casèla, o mess i sugaman neti.
in the drawer have.1SG put.PP the towels clean

d. A scóla vae tuti i dì.
to school go.1SG all the days

Generalizations (i) and (ii) therefore support the idea that the proform and the locative clitic are closely related. Recent studies have indeed provided significant data that can be interpreted as suggesting that diachronically the existential proform derived from the locative clitic (cf. Ciconte 2009, 2010, Parry 2010). The morphological identity between proform and locative clitic is one of the main arguments in favour of the claim that the existential proform is endowed with a locative feature (cf. Freeze 1992). If on the one hand a strong connection between the proform and the locative clitic is undeniable, on the other it is also true that, at least synchronically, the two elements should not be viewed as one and the same. In fact, the third generalization, which asserts the existence of dialects (9.5%) with an existential proform but with no locative clitic, suggests that they must be kept distinct. The dialects in question are listed in Table 3, and the relevant data are illustrated by the examples below:

Table 3: *Dialects with a proform but no locative clitic* (9.5%)

DIALECT	REGION	COPULA	PRF
Taviano (LE)	Puglia (Salento)	ESSE	*nci*
Lecce (LE)	Puglia (Salento)	ESSE, STARE	*(n)ci*
Squinzano (LE)	Puglia (Salento)	ESSE, STARE	*(n)ci*
Grassano (MT)	Basilicata	ESSE	*ngə*
Ferrandina (MT)	Basilicata	ESSE	*ngə*
Grumento Nova (PZ)	Basilicata	ESSE	*ngə*
Castelluccio Inferiore (PZ)	Basilicata	ESSE	*ci*
Picerno (PZ)	Basilicata	ESSE (HABERE)	*nə*
Squillace (CZ)	Calabria[10]	HABERE	*(nd-)*
		ESSE	*(n)ce*
Acquaro (VV)	Calabria	HABERE	*(nd-)*
		ESSE	*(n)ci*
Reggio Calabria (RC)	Calabria	HABERE	*(nd-)*
		ESSE	*(n)ci*

12) a. **Nc**'ete sorda intra a cucina. *Taviano (LE)*

prf-is sister-your in the kitchen

b. Intra sta frutta **nci** suntu tanti nozzuli.

in this fruit prf are many seeds

c. Intra u cassettu aggiu postu i sciucamani puliti.

in the drawer have.1SG put.PP the towels clean

d. A la scola vàu tutti li giurni.

to the school go.1SG all the days

[10] In Calabria an alternation between copula *have* and copula BE has been found (cf. 13), presumably due to sociolinguistic factors. It seems that under the influence of standard Italian the variant *prf+be* is gaining ground over the use of copula *have*, which is supposed to be dialectally more genuine. When *have* is used the element *nd* from Latin INDE should be analysed as a lexicalized element, rather than a proform proper, as indicated by the fact that *nd* is also found with lexical *have* (e.g. *iddi ndannu na macchina russa* 'they have a red car'). Although *nd* does not count as proform when it occurs in combination with *have*, the clitic NCE (or *(n)ci* depending on the specific dialect) is undoubtedly a proform when it is used with *be*. This explains why I have included the Calabrian varieties in Table 3.

13) a. **C**'è to soru / **Nd**avi a to soru nta cucina. *Reggio Calabria (RC)*

prf-is your sister has to your sister in-the kitchen

b. Nta frutta **ci** su / **nd**avi tanti semi.

in-the fruit prf are has many seeds

c. A skola vaju ogni jornu.

to school *go.1SG every day*

On a theoretical level, several scholars have hypothesized that in the existential construction the topic or subject of the predication is a location, which can be either explicit or implicit (cf. Partee & Borschev 2007, Francez 2007, Leonetti 2008, Parry 2010). Following these studies, I claim that the existential proform must be interpreted as a pro-argument (cf. Table 1), namely, a pronominal form that is linked to or stands for an abstract locative subject of predication (i.e. a *pro-loc*) (cf. also Benincà 1988, Calabrese 1992, Pinto 1997, and Tortora 1997 for the idea of a null locative argument/topic with some unaccusative and unergative verbs). In fact, a subject function has often been attributed to the proform (cf. Williams 1994, Hazout 2004, Francez 2007, Burzio 1986, Tortora 1997). Let us consider, for instance, the following example from the dialect of Borgomanero, in Piedmont:

14) **Ngh** è-gghi tre mataj int la stônza.

SCL.LOC is-LOC.CL three boys in the room

'There are three boys in the room.' (Tortora 1997: 33)

In Borgomanerese all object and oblique clitics are enclitic, so the doubling enclitic *gghi*, attached to the copula, is co-referential with the locative phrase *int la stônza.* This leads Tortora (1997) to interpret the first locative clitic *ngh* as a locative subject clitic that signals the presence of a *pro-loc* in Spec-IP. Note that the structure in (14) is only possible with an indefinite DP. As soon as a definite DP appears, the locative subject clitic *ngh* is no longer acceptable, and "this sentence gets a 'true locative' (i.e. 'referential') interpretation" (Tortora 1997: 128):

15) a. L' è-gghi Mario

SCL is-LOC.CL Mario

'Mario is here/there.'

b. ***Ngh** è-gghi Mario.

In Italo-Romance, the proform seems to have originated from locative structures with a locative resumptive clitic, and has then undergone grammaticalization and reanalysis, having lost its anaphoric and referential connotation (Ciconte 2009, 2010, Parry 2010). If the claim that the existential proform is related to an abstract locative argument is on the right track, the proform of existential sentences then has not been completely stripped of its spatial reference, in that it expresses a contextual location or, perhaps more appropriately, it is bound to an abstract or null locative topic which provides the spatial parameters for the predication (Cruschina 2012a). A tentative explanation of the pattern described in our third generalization could then be that in those dialects the locative clitic has disappeared only after the grammaticalization process that gave rise to the existential proform, which now stands as a fully autonomous element[11].

That the proform in inverse locatives (type II) behaves as a referential locative clitic, rather than an existential proform, is strongly suggested by several pieces of evidence. However, some preliminary considerations are necessary before this hypothesis is examined in more detail. The idea that some kinds of sentence superficially identical to existentials actually have a locative nature is not new. In particular, it has been independently pointed out that Italian existential sentences with a definite DP have a strong locative flavour (cf. Moro 1997, Zamparelli 2000). As a result of the locative character of this sentence type, definite descriptions of entities that can-

[11] As observed by an anonymous reviewer, the fact that inverse locatives with a definite DP (i.e. the a-sentences in the examples (12-13)) behave like true existentials, rather than like locative sentences (i.e. the c- and d-sentences), with respect to the presence/absence of the clitic is unexpected under the present analysis. Admittedly, I do not have a sound solution to this problem, and I can only tentatively suggest that in those dialects where the locative clitic is now lost, it has survived not only in existential sentences as a grammaticalized element, but also in conjunction with copula ESSE in inverse locatives, preserving a (more) referential locative meaning. The special status of *ci*+copula as a locative predicate may also be responsible for the obligatoriness of the clitic in inverse locatives, which contrasts with its optionality when it is used as a resumptive clitic in dislocation structures. Note however this contrast mainly concerns standard Italian, as in many dialects the locative clitic is always obligatory even in dislocation structures.

not easily be understood to have a physical realization are judged to be marginal:

16) a. ?? Ci sono le due soluzioni di questa equazione.
prf are the two solutions of this equation

b. ?? Ci sono i problemi complessi che conosci nella mia teoria.
prf are the problems complex that know.2SG in-the my theory

(Zamparelli 2000: 69)

According to Cruschina (2012a), Italian *ci*-sentences with a definite DP are inverse locatives (type II) (cf. Table 1), and their locative nature is the direct result of the locative pro-predicate role of the proform. Strong evidence for the locative role of the proform comes from the fact that it can replace a locative predicate PP. The Italian proform *ci* can substitute the locative PP of a previous locative predication sentence, thus acting as a pro-predicate. In the examples in (17), the locative expression introduced in the question (17a) can be replaced by a locative adverb or repeated in the answer (17b). Alternatively, it can be 'resumed' by the locative clitic, but, crucially, the clitic cannot co-occur in the same clause with the full PP or with the locative adverb (17c)[12]:

17) a. Gli asciugamani sono nel cassetto? *Italian*
the towels are in-the drawer
'Are the towels in the drawer?'

b. Sì, sono là / nel cassetto.
yes are there / in-the drawer
'Yes, they are there / in the drawer.'

c. Sì, ci sono (*là / *nel cassetto).
yes prf are there / in-the drawer

That the proform cannot occur together with another locative element in the same sentence strongly suggests that it functions as a locative resump-

[12] This incompatibility is due a general ban on clitic doubling, to which I will return in more detail in the next section.

tive clitic. A similar pattern is observed in many Italo-Romance varieties. The following equivalent data are from Paduan:

18) a. I sugamani zé-i nt'el casseto? *Paduan*

the towels are-SCL.M.PL in-the drawer

b. Sì, i zé là / nt'el casseto

yes SCL.M.PL are there / in-the drawer

c. Sì, i ghe zé (*là / *nt'el casseto.

yes SCL.M.PL prf are there / in-the drawer

Sentences with a definite DP, therefore, are not real existential constructions, but rather (inverse) locative sentences featuring a resumptive locative clitic. When a locative *coda* is present within the same sentence, it must be analysed as a dislocated constituent. The next section provides further evidence supporting this specific configuration and the nature of the elements in the sentence.

5. *Clitic doubling effects and Sardinian copula alternation*

This section presents further syntactic arguments in favour of a locative analysis of pseudo-existential sentences with a definite DP. With regard to this type of sentence, Leonetti (2008) points out that for the definite DP to be allowed, the locative coda must be dislocated or removed. This observation is expressed by his Coda Constraint:

19) *Coda Constraint* (Leonetti 2008: 142)

The presence of the locative coda inside the VP blocks the insertion of definite DPs: these are excluded unless the locative coda is itself (right- /left-) dislocated (or removed).

Leonetti (2008: 140) points out that sentences like (20a) cannot be uttered as a single intonational unit: if the locative PP appears in a postverbal position, a pause is necessary – as indicated by the comma – proving the right-dislocated status of the locative phrase (20b)[13]:

[13] This restriction was first observed by Rigau (1997) for Catalan.

20) a. ?? C'è la statua di Michelangelo in Piazza della Signoria. *Italian*

b. C'è la statua di Michelangelo, in Piazza della Signoria.

prf-is the statue by Michelangelo in Piazza della Signoria

'Michelangelo's statue is in Piazza della Signoria.'

Under the proposed analysis, this constraint is not as surprising as it might look at first sight. I consider the Coda Constraint that characterizes *ci*-sentences with a definite DP to be a corollary of the more general ban on clitic doubling. It is well known that in Italian resumptive clitics resume topics, but are incompatible with foci (cf. Rizzi 1997). The resumptive locative clitic *ci* is therefore incompatible with a locative phrase when the latter is focal, but not when it is dislocated or removed due to its topical nature. A locative phrase, for instance, is focal when it corresponds to a wh-phrase (21a) or to the focus of the sentence in an answer to a wh-question (21b):

21) a. Dove (*ci) vai?

where LOC.CL go.2SG

'Where are you going?'

b. (*Ci) vado a Roma.

LOC.CL go.1SG to Rome

'I am going to Rome.'

By contrast, the locative PP is a right-dislocated topic in (22), and the sentence is therefore grammatical. Here, the proform *ci* clearly functions as a resumptive clitic:

22) C'è Gianni, in giardino *inverse locative* (TYPE II)

prf-is John in garden

'John is in the garden.'

When the definite DP is in a pre-copular position, the proform and the locative PP are compatible only if the locative phrase is, once again, right-dislocated (23a). If both elements are part of the focus, as in (23b), the sentence is ungrammatical, on the grounds that it would lead to a case of clitic doubling, which is not allowed in Italian, as shown in (21) above:

23) a. [Gianni]$_{TOP}$ [c'è,]$_{FOC}$ [in giardino]$_{TOP}$

b. *[Gianni]$_{TOP}$ [c'è in giardino]$_{FOC}$

It is important to emphasize that the proform is incompatible with a focal locative phrase only in inverse locatives with a definite DP (type II), but not in an existential sentence (type I). This contrast is expected under the analysis that in type II sentences *ci* is a resumptive clitic, which cannot thus co-occur with a focal locative phrase. By contrast, if we have an indefinite DP, and hence a proper existential construction of type I, such clitic doubling effects should not arise, and in fact they do not. In (24) the proform and the locative PP both belong to the focus of the clause, as shown in (25). Nevertheless, no ungrammaticality is detected[14]:

24) Pane, ce n'è sul tavolo. *existential sentence* (TYPE I)

bread prf of-it.CL-is on-the table

'There's bread on the table.'

25) [Pane]$_{TOP}$ [ce n'è sul tavolo]$_{FOC}$

Recall that in existential sentences the proform is not a locative clitic, but a pro-argument. This pattern is therefore unsurprising. Further data from other Italo-Romance varieties confirm this fundamental difference. The clitic doubling restrictions accounting for the paradigm in (18) above, do not apply to true existential sentences with an indefinite DP in Paduan. An example is provided in (26)[15]:

[14] An anonymous reviewer observes that the information structure in (24)/(25) is fine only when the sentence contains a mass noun and a partitive clitic. Conversely, the same information structure is not allowed with an indefinite countable noun (e.g. *[*una mela*]$_{TOP}$ [*c'è sul tavolo*]$_{FOC}$ 'there is an apple on the table' (lit. an apple there is on the table). The relevant notion here seems to be partitivity, rather than the mass/countable distinction, as shown by the fact that a plural countable noun can appear in a sentence with the information structure in question (e.g. [*mele*]$_{TOP}$ [*ce ne sono sul tavolo*]$_{FOC}$ 'there are apples on the table' (lit. apples there are on the table). This however does not provide a satisfactory answer to the question of why it is not possible with singular non-partitive nouns. This restriction might independently result from the fact that this type of nouns are generally not good topics and cannot readily be dislocated.

[15] It must be clarified that in Paduan the clitic *ne* always requires the presence of *ghe* (cf. Penello 2003). However, this peculiarity does not affect the validity of the relevant example.

26) Camise, ghe ne zé nt'el casseto. *Paduan*

shirts prf of-them.CL are in-the drawer

'There are shirts in the drawer.'

The clitic doubling effects strongly suggest that the underlying structure of this sentence type is indeed locative, and the clear-cut contrast with respect to existential sentences of type 1 can be summarized by the following constraint on the information structure of inverse locatives:

27) *Information-structure constraint on inverse locatives*

The presence of a **focal** locative coda within the clause blocks the insertion of the locative proform.

As previously mentioned, this constraint also applies to cases in which the locative phrase is a wh-element, which is the focus of a wh-question, thereby providing an explanation for the incompatibility between *ci* and the interrogative locative phrases that obtains exclusively in the presence of a definite DP (28), but not in genuine existential sentences (29):

28) a. Dove (*ci) sei tu?

where prf are you

'Where are you?'

b. Dove hai detto che (*c') è Gianni?

where have.2SG said that prf is John

'Where did you say John is?'

29) a. Dove pensi che ci siano più problemi?

where think.2SG that prf be.SUBJ.3PL more problems

'Where do you think there are more problems?

c. In quale giardino ci sono alberi di limone?

in which garden prf are trees of lemon

'In which garden are there lemon trees?'

A similar contrast can be observed in Sardinian. In some Sardinian dialects the distinction between type I and type II is marked morphosyntactically by copula alternation, in that the two structures are distinguished by the use of different copulas: a distinction that goes hand in hand with the specificity of the DP (cf. Jones 1993, La Fauci & Loporcaro 1997, Bentley 2004, 2011, Remberger 2009):

30) B'**at** metas frores in sa tanca.
prf-has many flowers in the meadow
'There are many flowers in the meadow.' (Jones 1993: 113)

31) B'**est** sorre tua in coghina.
prf-is sister your in kitchen
'Your sister is in the kitchen.' (Bentley 2011)

Copula *have* is found with indefinite DPs (30), while *be* appears with definite DPs (31). It was first observed by Jones (1993) that, in combination with auxiliary *be*, the clitic *bi* has a tangible referential locative value. Remberger (2009) develops this idea further and claims that sentences with the copula *be* are actually locative structures. The ungrammaticality of (32b) can therefore be explained by making reference to our information-structure constraint on inverse locatives in (27):

32) a. In ube b'at metas frores?
where prf-has many flowers
'Where are there many flowers?'

b. *In ube bi sun sos prattos?
where prf are the plates
'Where are the plates?' (Jones 1993: 114)

We have collected further data from the Sardinian variety spoken in Buddusò, in the province of Olbia-Tempio (OT), confirming this opposition.

33) a. Inue b'at duos sindigos? *Sardinian, Buddusò (OT)*
where prf-has two mayors
'Where are there two mayors?'

b. Inue (*bi) son sos duos sindigos?
where prf are the two mayors
'Where are the two mayors?'

34) a. Inue (*bi) ses tue?
where prf are you
'Where are you?'

b. In cale calasciu (*bi) son sos piattos de pratta?
in which drawer prf are the plates of silver
'In which drawer are the silver plates?'

To sum up, I have shown that pseudo-existential sentences with a definite DP (type II) must be analysed as inverse locative structures, and must be distinguished from true existential sentences (type I) which feature an indefinite DP and are subject to different syntactic restrictions. This distinction is supported by copula alternation in Sardinian, where copulas *have* and *be* correlate with type I and type II, respectively.

6. *Information structure and the scope of negation*

One further argument supporting the distinction between existential and pseudo-existential sentences, especially inverse locatives, is provided by their different behaviour with respect to negation. In type I the DP must fall within the scope of negation, while in type II the DP is excluded from the focus, and only the predicate (*prf+copula*) can be negated:

35) a. Non ci sono orsi bianchi al Polo Sud. TYPE I
not prf are bears white at-the Pole South
'There are no polar bears in the South Pole.'

b. Non c'è Gianni in giardino. TYPE II

not prf-is John in garden

'John is not in the garden.'

As a consequence, the information-structure articulation illustrated in (36b) for the existential sentence in (35a) is ungrammatical, while the articulation in (36a) is not:

36) a. [Non ci sono orsi bianchi]$_{\text{FOCUS}}$ [al Polo Sud]

b. *[Non ci sono]$_{\text{FOCUS}}$ [orsi bianchi], [al Polo Sud]

In existential sentences the DP must be part of the focus of the sentence, in an either sentence- or predicate-focus structure (cf. Table 1). Negated existentials are not an exception in this regard. This restriction can also be viewed as the direct result of the predicative structure of existentials. As discussed in the introduction with reference to the predicate-DP approach, the DP represents the predicate of the existential construction. Excluding the DP from the focus of the sentence, and hence from the scope of negation, proves ungrammatical because the proform plus the copula (e.g. *ci sono* in (35a)) does not constitute a complete predicate. The only constituent that does not fall within the scope of negation is the locative phrase, in compliance with the observation that negative existential sentences must presuppose a location (Partee & Borschev 2007), which is accordingly dislocated.

In type II, instead, the proform plus copula cluster *c'è* (cf. 35b) is a predicate. The proform here stands for a (dislocated or implicit) locative predicate and can thus be negated on its own. On the other hand, negative locative predications must presuppose the existence of the entity denoted by the DP (Partee & Borschev 2007): the definite DP therefore must be out of the scope of the negation[16].

[16] The discussion of these examples is not meant to preclude other factors affecting scope in negative existentials. It could well be that the definite DP cannot be under the scope of negation due to its definiteness, which triggers an existential presupposition that cannot be deleted under negation (I owe this remark to an anonymous reviewer). What is important here is the different behaviour of the cluster *ci*+copula with respect to negation, and that presupposed DPs are typical of locative predications, as opposed to existential sentences.

37) a. [Non c'è]$_{FOCUS}$ [Gianni], [in giardino]

b. *[Non c'è Gianni]$_{FOCUS}$ [in giardino]

c. ??/*Non c'è [Gianni]$_{FOCUS}$ [in giardino]

As shown in (37), the DP of an inverse locative must be dislocated and cannot be part of the focus. If we assume that sentences with an indefinite DP and sentences with a definite DP are equally existential, their different behaviour with respect to negation would be left unexplained. However, the same facts are satisfactorily accounted for once the distinction between existentials and pseudo-existentials is established.

7. *Conclusion*

The central argument of this paper is that Italo-Romance existential constructions do not represent a homogenous sentence class, and the principal basis for this argument is the observation that the sentence types identified show different properties at several levels. In the proposed analysis, the morphosyntactic similarities and substantial differences are captured by postulating that existential sentences and locative pseudo-existential sentences share a similar underlying structure, which can be represented with a small clause. The same elements are present in this structure, but in a crucially different – and in fact reverse – order, which in turns determines the different functions, properties, and behaviours. In type I the proform expresses a subject-related contextual location, and is bound to a null locative topic which provides the spatial parameters for the predication; the locative coda is an adjunct, which may or may not be part of the focus of the sentence. In type II the proform plays the role of a locative clitic that is co-indexed with a dislocated predicative locative PP. As in canonical locatives, the locative phrase of inverse locatives is a predicate, linked to the clause by means of a locative resumptive clitic. On a morphosyntactic level the distinction between existentials and pseudo-existentials is primarily supported by the different definiteness value of the DP according to the sentence type: the DP must be indefinite in type I, but is typically definite (or at least specific) in type II. Finally, the distinction between the two sentence types is reflected in their information structure, which corresponds to a sentence- or predicate-focus structure in type I, and to an argument-focus structure in type II, where the locative phrase must be dislocated and cannot be part of the focus.

References

Abbott, B., 1992: "Definiteness, existentials, and the 'list' interpretation". In C. Barker & D. Dowty (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT II*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University. pp. 1-16.

Abbott, B., 1993: "A pragmatic account of the definiteness effect in existential sentences". *Journal of Pragmatics* 19: 39-55.

Beaver, D., I. Francez & D. Levinson, 2005: "Bad subject: (non)-canonicality and NP distribution in existentials". In G. Effi & J. Howell (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) XV*. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications. pp. 19-43.

Belletti, A., 2004: "Aspects of the low IP area". In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Vol. 2*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 16-51.

Benincà, P., 1988: "L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate". In L. Renzi and G. Salvi (eds.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, *Vol. 1*. Bologna: Il Mulino, pp. 115-194.

Bentley, D., 2004: "Definiteness effects: evidence from Sardinian". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 102: 57-101.

Bentley, D., 2010: "Principles of subject markedness in Romance". *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 95: 152-189.

Bentley, D., 2011: "Sui costrutti esistenziali sardi. Effetti di definitezza, deissi, evidenzialita". *Zeitschrift fur Romanische Philologie* 127: 111-140.

Bentley, D., 2013: "Subject canonicality and definiteness effects in existential constructions". *Language* 89: 675-712.

Bentley, D., F. M. Ciconte, S. Cruschina & M. Ramsammy, 2012: "Micro-variation in information structure: Existential constructions in Italo-Romance". Ms., The University of Manchester.

Bentley, D., F. M. Ciconte & S. Cruschina, 2013: "Micro-variation in subject agreement: The case of existential pivots with split focus in Romance". *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 25: 15-43.

Berretta, M., 1995. "Come inseriamo elementi nuovi nel discorso/1: 'C'e il gatto che ha fame'". *Italiano e Oltre* 10: 212-217.

Berruto, G., 1986: "Un tratto sintattico dell'italiano parlato: il c'è presentativo". In K. Lichem, E. Mara & S. Knaller (eds.), *Parallela 2. Aspetti della sintassi dell'italiano contemporaneo*. Tubingen: Narr, pp. 61-73.

Bowers, J., 1993: "The Syntax of Predication". *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 591-656.

Burzio, L., 1986: *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Calabrese, A., 1992: "Some Remarks on Focus and Logical Structures in Italian". *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* 1: 91-127.

Casalicchio, J., 2013: *Pseudorelative, gerundi e infiniti nelle varietà romanze: affinità solo superficiali e corrispondenze strutturali*. PhD Dissertation, University of Padua.

Cecchetto, C., 2000: "Doubling structures and reconstruction". *Probus* 12: 93-126.

Chomsky, N., 1981: *Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Ciconte, F. M., 2009: "Pro-forms in existential constructions of early Italo-Romance vernaculars". In G. Kaiser and E. Remberger (eds.), *Null subjects, expletives and locatives in Romance*. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz, Arbeitspapiere des Fachbereichs Sprachwissenschaft (No. 123), pp. 183-198.

Ciconte, F. M., 2010: *Existential constructions of Early Italo-Romance Vernaculars*. PhD Thesis, The University of Manchester. To appear in the *Monograph Series of The Philological Society*.

Cinque, G. & L. Rizzi, 2010: "The Cartography of Syntactic Structures". In B. Heine & H. Narro (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 51-66.

Cruschina, S., 2012a: "Focus in Existential Sentences". In V. Bianchi & C. Chesi (eds.), *Enjoy Linguistics! Papers offered to Luigi Rizzi on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Siena: CISCL Press, pp. 77-107.

Cruschina, S., 2012b: *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

De Cesare, A.-M., 2007: "Sul cosiddetto 'c'**è** presentativo'. Forme e funzioni". In A.-M. De Cesare & A. Ferrari (eds.), *Lessico, grammatica e testualità, tra italiano scritto e parlato*. University of Basilea: *Acta Romanica Basiliensia 18*: 127-153.

Francez, I., 2007: *Existential Propositions*. PhD Dissertation, Stanford University.

Freeze, R., 1992: "Existentials and other locatives". *Language* 68: 553-595.

Hazout, I., 2004: "The syntax of existential constructions". *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 393-430.

Jones, M. A., 1993: *Sardinian Syntax*. London: Routledge.

La Fauci, N. & M. Loporcaro, 1997: "Outline of a theory of existentials on evidence from Romance". *Studi italiani di linguistica teorica e applicata* 26: 5-55.

Leonetti, M., 2008: "Definiteness effects and the role of the coda in existential constructions". In H. Høeg Müller & A. Klinge (eds.), *Essays on Nominal Determination*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 131-162.

Manzini, M.-R. & L. Savoia, 2005: *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*. Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.

McNally, L., 1992: *An Interpretation for the English Existential Construction*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz. Published by Garland Press, New York, 1997.

McNally, L., 2011: "Existential sentences". In C. Maienborn, K. von Heusinger & P. Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning, Vol. 2*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 1829-1848.

Milsark, G., 1974. *Existential Sentences in English*. PhD Dissertation, MIT. Published by Garland Press, New York, 1979.

Moro, A., 1995: "Topics in small clauses with predicative nominals". In A. Cardinaletti & M. T. Guasti (eds), *Small Clauses*. New York: Academic Press. pp. 109-132.

Moro, A., 1997: *The raising of Predicates: Predicative Noun Phrases and the Theory of Clause Structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parry, M., 2010: "Non-canonical subjects in the early Italian vernaculars". *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 95: 190-226.

Partee, B. & V. Borschev, 2007: "Existential sentences, BE, and the genitive of negation in Russian". In I. Comorovski & K. von Heusinger (eds.), *Existence: Semantics and Syntax*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 147-190.

Penello, N., 2003: *Capitoli di morfologia e sintassi del dialetto di Carmignano di Brenta*. PhD Thesis, University of Padua.

Pinto, M., 1997: *Licensing and Interpretation of Inverted Subjects in Italian*. PhD Thesis, Universiteit Utrecht.

Remberger, E., 2009: "Null subjects, expletives and locatives in Sardinian". In G. Kaiser & E. Remberger (eds.), *Null subjects, expletives and locatives in Romance*. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz, Arbeitspapiere des Fachbereichs Sprachwissenschaft (No. 123), pp. 231-261.

Rigau, G., 1997: "Locative sentences and related constructions in Catalan: *ésser / haver* alternation". In A. Mendikoetxea & M. Uribe-Etxebarría (eds.), *Theoretical issues at the morphology-syntax interface*. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco, pp. 395-421.

Rizzi, L., 1997: "The fine structure of the left periphery". In L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 281-337.

Stowell, T., 1978: "What was there before there was there". In D. Farkas et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 13th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society,* pp. 458-471.

Tortora, C., 1997: *The Syntax and Semantics of the Weak Locative.* PhD Dissertation, University of Delaware.

Williams, E., 1984: "*There*-insertion". *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 131-153.

Williams, E., 1994: *Thematic Structure in Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Zamparelli, R., 2000: *Layers in the Determiner Phrase*. New York: Garland.

Edizioni ETS
Piazza Carrara, 16-19, I-56126 Pisa
info@edizioniets.com - www.edizioniets.com
Finito di stampare nel mese di luglio 2014