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1. Introduction.

Pronominal clitics of the sort found in Romance languages are in many ways obviously part of the syntax of those languages. Yet certain aspects of their behavior can lead to proposals more morphological than syntactic in character, as seen in Perlmutter’s (1971) templatic approach to the question of clitic ordering and clitic combinations. In this paper, I examine a somewhat different aspect of Romance clitics, one for which a more morphological, less syntactic approach might again come to mind. I will argue, however, in favor of an analysis that, using familiar syntactic notions, ties the phenomenon in question more tightly and more fruitfully, I think, to other aspects of Romance (and universal) syntax.¹

In the course of so doing, I will be led to reanalyze the status of expletives such as English there and its Romance counterparts, proposing in effect that they are not true expletives. Rather,
they originate within their so-called ‘associate’, in way that has something in common with Moro (1997) and, more so, with Sabel (2000), though the proposal I will make ties expletive there more closely to various other instances of there than do these earlier works.

2. North Italian ghe

A clitic that will have an important role in what follows is the ghe found in many North Italian dialects, in particular in the Veneto area (Padua, Venice, etc.). The behavior of this ghe is different in certain respects from that of comparable clitics in French and Italian.

French has a locative clitic y seen in:

(1) Jean y a mis le livre. (‘J there has put the book’)
This y is a clitic in the familiar sense. It can’t be coordinated, or modified, or contrastively stressed. It occurs to the left of the finite verb or auxiliary, in contrast to non-clitic locatives, which follow the verb. In French, this y is distinct from the third-person dative clitic, which is lui in the singular and leur in the plural, e.g.:

(2) Jean lui a donné le livre. (‘J him/her(dat.) has given the book’)
A parallel contrast between locative clitic and third person dative clitic holds for Italian:

(3) Gianni ci ha messo il libro. (‘G there has put the book’)
(4) Gianni gli ha dato il libro. (‘G him/them(dat.) has given the book’)
with ci the locative clitic and gli the dative (le for feminine gender, in the singular).

Many Veneto dialects, on the other hand, have a clitic ghe that seems to cover both locative and third person dative, e.g. in Paduan:

(5) Ghe meto el libro. (‘there I-put the book’)
(6) Ghe dago el libro. (‘there I-give the book’ = ‘I’m giving him/her/them the book’)
The use of ghe in (6) is systematic for Paduan - there is no distinct dative clitic form for third person, singular or plural.²

The question is how to think of this kind of syncretism. A highly morphological approach might be tempted to say that it’s merely a case of two pronominal clitics that happen to be spelled out in the same way. Yet Paduan third person pronouns typically have, like those of French and Italian, an -l- (sometimes pronounced as a y-glide, sometimes not pronounced), and never otherwise have a g(h)- (the h in ghe is just orthographic).

The more syntactic approach that I will now develop will try, instead, to find a principled reason for the appearance of an apparently locative clitic in dative sentences like (6).

3. There and ghe as deictics.

As a first step, it is necessary, I think, to move away from the terminology ‘locative clitic’, which is misleading in an important respect. This is true for all three languages mentioned so far. Both French and Italian, which clearly distinguish their locative clitic from their dative clitics, have their locative clitic appearing, as is well-known, in sentences that are not locative at all:

(7) Jean y pense. (‘J of-it thinks’)
(8) Gianni ci pensa. (Italian - same)

² This is so, whether or not the sentence contains an accusative clitic - differently from the Spanish so-called ‘spurious se’ that Perlmutter (1971) discusses.
In these sentences with the verb ‘think’, in the sense of ‘think of/about something’, both French and Italian readily have, when the complement is an unstressed pronominal (especially inanimate), what looks like the locative clitic.

In earlier work - Kayne (2004a) - I argued that sentences like (7) and (8) correspond closely to archaic English sentences of the following sort:

(9) We spoke thereof.

which also contain what seems to be a locative *there* in sentences that do not involve location. Such archaic English sentences (whose counterparts are very much alive in Dutch and German) differ from (7) and (8) in having an overt preposition (in this example, *of*) in addition to *there*. My proposal was to take French and Italian sentences like (7) and (8) to contain a silent counterpart of that preposition, whichever one is appropriate for the verb in question. (Thus (7) will have a silent *à* and (8) a silent *a* - essentially the same one in the two languages.)

From this perspective, there is a unified phenomenon in (7)-(9) whereby an element that looks like a locative (*y* or *ci* or *there*) appears in a non-locative sentence. The account I proposed goes essentially as follows (using mostly English examples, but the analysis is the same for French and Italian, apart from the orthogonal non-clitic vs. clitic difference).

*There* is not, strictly speaking, locative in any of its uses. Both in (9) and in banal locative sentences like:

(10) We went there yesterday.

we have an element *there* that is the same element as the one found in non-standard English in:

(11) That there car ain’t no good.

In addition, the proposal is that in both (10) and (11) *there* modifies a noun, except that in (10) the noun is silent (to be indicated by capital letters), i.e. (10) is to be thought of as:

(12) ...there PLACE...

The same holds of (9), except that the silent noun in (9) is not PLACE, but THING:

(13) ...there THING of...

Exactly parallel, except for the silent preposition (indicated as P) are (7) and (8):

(14) ...y/ci THING P...

The question now is how to understand the elements *y*, *ci* and *there* that occur in this range of environments (see also note 3). In (7)-(9), they are not locative in any simple sense. The link

---

3 And similarly for *here* in:

(i) This here car ain’t no good.

Although non-standard in English, comparable combinations of *there/here* with a demonstrative are standard in French:

(ii) cette voiture-là (‘dem. car there’)

(iii) cette voiture-ci (‘dem. car here’)

(In French, the demonstrative itself does not vary in form, in contrast to English *this* vs. *that*.) On the fact that -là and -ci follow the noun in French, see Bernstein (1997). Sentences like (11) and (i) but with a definite article in place of the demonstrative are also standard in various Scandinavian languages - cf. Leu (to appear).

In French, there is also a form *ici* (‘here’) in ordinary locative sentences like:

(iv) Jean est ici. (‘J is here’)

with an extra *i* whose morphemic status remains to be fully understood.

with (11) suggests a link with what we call demonstratives, which in some cases do seem related to location, as in pointing contexts:

(15) Bring us that book, please.

Yet, as is well-known, demonstratives are not limited to contexts involving location:

(16) That book you mentioned yesterday is of little interest.

A familiar idea concerning demonstratives is that they involve deixis, or reference to or orientation with respect to the speaker. The difference between *this* and *that* in English could, for example, be put as ‘in the sphere of the source of the sentence’ vs. ‘not in the sphere of the source of the sentence’.

Taking the term ‘deixis’ over to *there* (and *here*), I will henceforth speak of deictic *there* (and deictic *here*), for all the cases mentioned. In each of (9), (10) and (11) we have an instance of exactly the same deictic *there*; the three differ with respect to what deictic *there* modifies (THING in (9), PLACE in (10), and *car* in (11)\(^5\)). For the case of deictic *there* modifying PLACE, a noun expressing location, I will use the term ‘locative *there*’, to be understood solely as an abbreviation for ‘deictic *there* modifying PLACE’.

From this perspective, all of (9)-(11) contain deictic *there*. But of the three sentences, only (10) is a locative sentence (in the sense that it contains locative *there*, by virtue of containing ‘*there* PLACE’). (7) and (8) are like (9) - they contain deictic *y* and *ci*, the French and Italian counterparts of deictic *there*, but are not locative sentences, since they have no PLACE.

*Y* and *ci* in (7) and (8) are deictic clitics that are not part of a locative phrase. In:

(17) Jean *y* va. (‘J there goes’)

(18) Gianni *ci* va. (Italian - same)

*y* and *ci* are deictic clitics that are part of a locative phrase, since (17) and (18) contain PLACE.

Returning to Paduan, we see that (5) contains a deictic clitic *ghe* that is part of a locative phrase, given that the verb ‘put’ calls for PLACE (or some overt counterpart). The specificity of Paduan (6), repeated here:

(19) *Ghe* dago el libro. (‘there I-give the book’ = ‘I’m giving him/her/them the book’) is now seen to be that Paduan, unlike standard French and Italian, has a deictic clitic in its third-person dative sentences where one might have expected a dative clitic. The question is why.

A second question is whether (19) contains PLACE, i.e. whether *ghe* there is locative. I will argue that it is not. *Ghe* in (19) will be seen to be deictic, but not locative, just as the clitics *y* and *ci* in (7) and (8) are deictic but not locative.

4. Silent DATCL.

As part of the analysis of Paduan sentences like (19), let me propose that (19) actually does contain a third person dative clitic, of the sort seen overtly in French and Italian in (2) and (4).

---

\(^5\) In colloquial Norwegian, a prenominal (counterpart of) *there* can in some cases itself modify PLACE, with ‘*there* PLACE’ then modifying the lexical noun - see Leu (to appear) - whether this is an option in non-standard English is not clear. English certainly allows this post-nominally, as in:

i) That car (over) there looks dangerous.
The difference is that, in Paduan and various other dialects, that clitic is silent. In other words, (19) should be thought of as:

(20) DATCL ghe dago el libro.

where DATCL represents the silent dative clitic.

The fact that ghe appears to ‘replace’ only third person dative clitics must now be interpreted more precisely as meaning that the silent DATCL that ghe cooccurs with in sentences like (19)/(20) is limited to third person and cannot be first or second person (or reflexive).

This person restriction can be understood in part as follows. The person property of silent DATCL\(^7\) links up here to the fact that various languages (e.g. Somali - cf. Saeed (1993, 174)) have zero forms for (object) third person pronouns in general (even in the absence of any apparent licenser), but not for first or second person. Closer to Paduan, French silent subject clitics, as in:

(21) Lui a téléphoné (‘him has called’)

with a silent third person subject clitic (in addition to non-clitic lui), are also limited to third person (non-reflexive):

(22) *Moi ai téléphoné (‘Me has called’)

as discussed in Kayne & Pollock (2001, sect. 5). Additional instances of a restriction to third person, in the case of silent pronomininals, are discussed in Kayne (2001). (Whether, despite appearances, this restriction can be attributed directly to UG, in which case nothing special would need to be said about Paduan in this regard, remains to be seen.)

By attributing the person restriction holding of Paduan dative sentences with ghe to the presence of DATCL, i.e. by calling DATCL (rather than ghe) the true locus of the person restriction, we account straightforwardly for the fact that the Paduan counterpart of (7) and (8), namely:

(23) Giorgio ghe pensa. (‘G there thinks’)

does not show the same person restriction. Paduan (23), like French (7) and Italian (8), allows reference to a first or second person (or reflexive) object (of the silent preposition) to some extent, especially with CLLD (clitic left dislocation) and with coordination. An example with CLLD in Italian (from Cinque (1990, 59)) with a reflexive is:

(24) A se stessa, Maria non ci pensa. (‘to refl. same, M neg. there thinks’)

(A French example with coordination is given in Kayne (1975, sect. 2.7).\(^8\)

Although sentences like (23) cannot refer to first or second person or reflexive with complete freedom, the restriction appears to be different in kind from the absolute one holding of (19). The reason is that only in (19) is reference mediated by DATCL (rather than by ghe, which is

---

6 Whether DATCL precedes ghe (as I’ve chosen to indicate it here) or follows it is a potentially important question that will, however, not be relevant to what follows in this paper.

The silent clitic postulated here should be compared to those discussed by Benincà (1989) for Friulian, by Roberts (1993) for Valdostano, and by Longa et al. (1998) for various Iberian languages/dialects.

7 The presence of DATCL appears to be licensed by deictic ghe, though how exactly remains to be worked out - perhaps the presence of ghe makes available a phasal spec position into which the dative clitic can ‘disappear’, a la Kayne (2006).

8 Cf. also van Riemsdijk (1978, 125) on colloquial Dutch R-pronouns being able to refer to humans, perhaps parallel to y/en, ci/ne; cf. also Bennis (1986, 191).
expletive-like in (19), as we shall see later), and silent DATCL is absolutely limited to third person.

In (23), on the other hand, DATCL is not present. Instead, we have, as in (14), with \( P = \) preposition:

(25) \( \ldots \text{ghe THING } P \ldots \)

or, more exactly, in those (limited) cases involving reference to a person (as in (24)):

(26) \( \ldots \text{ghe PERSON } P \ldots \)

Conversely, a phrase of the type ‘ghe PERSON’ is not present in (19). (This is related to the just-mentioned expletive-like character of the ghe of (19).)

The presence of DATCL in (19) also plays a role in clitic doubling of the sort seen in:

(27) Ghe dago el libro a Giorgio. (‘there I-give the book to G’)

By having DATCL in such sentences, we can (correctly, I think) assimilate this clitic doubling to the parallel well-known phenomenon found with datives in Spanish (although the dative clitic in Spanish is pronounced more than in Paduan). Of particular interest here is the point made by Cordin (1991) for Trentino (which is similar to Paduan in the relevant respects), namely that despite the appearance of the deictic clitic in both dative and locative sentences, there is a difference between them when it comes to clitic doubling. Clitic doubling is compatible (and generally obligatory when there’s a non-clitic dative) with the presence of ghe in dative sentences, yet impossible with ghe in locative sentences. (Clitic doubling must be kept distinct from right-dislocation, which is possible with both datives and locatives.) The reason, from the present perspective, is that clitic doubling is dependent on DATCL, and that ghe by itself is not compatible with clitic doubling (for reasons to be elucidated).\(^9\)

The proposal that there is a silent dative clitic in (27) leads to the expectation that there could be Romance languages in which that dative clitic would be overt at the same time as (the counterpart of) ghe, even in sentences with no locative (i.e. with no PLACE). This expectation is met by some Sardinian, to judge by an example given by Jones (1993, 220):

(28) Narrabilis! (‘tell \( b\) to-them’)

where \( b\) is the Sardinian deictic clitic parallel to ghe, and \( l\) is the overt (plural) dative clitic (with the accusative unpronounced, as in some French).\(^10\)

5. Expletive there and expletive ghe as deictics.

From the perspective of the proposal in (20), ghe there is definitely not a dative clitic. It should rather be taken to be exactly the same kind of deictic element as all the other instances of ghe (and there and \( y \) and \( c\)i) under discussion. At the same time, it does not seem to be identical to any of them.

The reason, I think, is that the ghe in Paduan dative sentences that cooccurs with DATCL is an expletive, in the same sense as the ghe of the Paduan sentence:

(29) Ghe ze un libro... (‘ghe is a book...’)

which is strongly similar to the Italian:

\[^9\] The ghe of (23) seems by and large to be incompatible with (non-dislocated) clitic doubling, too, as expected (since there’s no DATCL there), though there is the kind of exception mentioned in Kayne (1975, chap. 2, note 51).

\[^10\] If the order of clitics in (28) were to turn out to be limited to imperatives, one would think of Terzi (1999).
Burzio (1986, 148) has already argued that in this kind of Italian existential sentence ci/c’ is significantly similar to English expletive there in:

(31) There’s a book on the table.

By extension, the ghe of (29) is essentially the same as English expletive there.

An important difference, of course, is that English there is subject-like as far as its final position is concerned, while Italian ci shares properties of object clitics and not of subjects (e.g. ci follows negation and certain other object clitics). In this regard, Paduan ghe is very much like ci. But if, in the spirit of Burzio (1986), we set aside the subject position vs. object clitic position difference, we arrive at the conclusion that all of these (ghe, ci, there) in (29)-(31) are expletives in the same sense.

Recall that the first part of the answer to the question why Paduan would have deictic ghe in its third person dative sentences was that ghe in such sentences is actually present alongside silent DATCL. The second part, now, is that the ghe of Paduan datives is an expletive ghe of the sort found in (29). This will mean, in a way to be explored shortly, that Paduan dative sentences have exactly the right number of arguments for the number of theta roles.

There are still two further questions. First, what exactly do we mean by ‘expletive’? Second, why is Paduan allowed to have an expletive in dative sentences in the first place? Let me begin with the first question.

One of the guiding principles of the discussion so far has been that the various uses of there and of ghe and of ci and y are all reflections of exactly the same deictic element occurring in somewhat different environments. In all the cases discussed, the deictic modified a noun (or NP). That noun is overt in that there car and in the corresponding French cette voiture-là (‘that car there’) - see note 3. In the other cases mentioned, the noun modified by the deictic is silent, either PLACE or THING or PERSON. Pursuing this guiding principle further, we unavoidably (and desirably, I will argue) arrive at the conclusion that all the expletive uses of there and ghe and ci and y (and of Sardinian bi and Catalan hi) are likewise instances of this same deictic element.

If English expletive there is the same deictic element as all the other instances of there, then we would expect it, too, (in (31), for example) to modify a noun (or NP). The next question, then, is, what noun? Taking into account examples like:

(32) There’s a car in this garage.

and the fact that there is incompatible with this:

(33) There’s a car in this here/*there garage.

there is little plausibility to taking there in these examples to modify garage. Much more natural, I think, is the proposal that expletive there is modifying the other noun, the one informally called the ‘associate’. Put another way, in (32) and (33) expletive there is a deictic modifier of car.

More generally:

(34) a. In English existential sentences, expletive there is invariably a deictic modifier of the associate.

b. The same holds in existentials for Paduan ghe, for Italian ci, for French y, etc.

(Note that given the discussion above, this definitely does not mean that expletive there is locative; expletive there (and its counterparts in other languages) is a deictic element that is non-locative, i.e. that does not modify PLACE.)
Adopting (34) means adopting derivations in which expletive *there* originates within the associate and splits off from it, ending up in subject position (and similarly for the other languages, apart from the object clitic vs. subject position difference). There are two ways to think of this splitting off. One would be to have *there* raise directly out of the associate containing it. A second would be to have the rest of the associate raise, stranding *there* and then to have ‘*there* + trace of associate’ raise further in the manner of remnant movement.

There may well be some questions with respect to which the choice between these two approaches to ‘splitting’ is neutral. For others, though, the choice is likely to be meaningful (e.g., for agreement, as discussed below). Thinking more specifically of the kind of remnant movement derivations discussed in Kayne (2002) and works cited there, and of the possible impossibility of extraction of modifiers from within a containing DP, let me adopt the second, remnant movement, approach, which yields (for sentences like (31)) (partial, sketchily illustrated) derivations such as the following:

(35)  ...[there a book]...  -->  raising of ‘a book’

...a booki ... [there t_i]...  -->  merger of V

...is a booki ... [there t_i]...  -->  remnant movement

...[there t_i] is a booki ... t_i,

and similarly for Paduan, etc. modulo the difference in final landing site (i.e. *ghe* will end up in an object clitic position, rather than in a subject position).11

The proposal reflected in (35) has expletive *there* originating as an instance of deictic (non-locative) *there* contained within an indefinite DP (using the term DP loosely). In (non-standard) English, however, *there* appears with an overt noun only in the presence of a demonstrative:

(36)  that there book; this here book

as opposed to:

(37)  *the there book; *the here book

(38)  *a there book; *some here book, etc.

(39)  *there a book; *here some book, etc.

How plausible is it, then, in particular in light of (38) and (39), to allow the derivation in (35)?

One consideration can be put as follows. Given (36), would we have expected (38) or (39) to be acceptable, or not?12 That depends, I think, on how exactly we see the derivation of (36) itself. In particular, if (36) has *there* or *here* originating within a relative clause structure, then the impossibility of (38)/(39) is actually a bit surprising, given that relative clauses are in general compatible with both definite and indefinite ‘heads’.13

---

11 For the Romance languages under discussion, the most direct transposition from (35) would suggest that the expletive clitic (e.g. *ghe*) is a remnant, rather than a pure head. The possibility that pronominal clitics are always phrasal needs to be examined carefully in any event.

A remnant movement approach to pronominal clitics may be suggested, too, by cases of past participle agreement in Italian with *ne*, which itself shows no phi-features:

i) Ne ho visti tre. (‘of-them I-have seen plural three’)

and (example suggested by Guglielmo Cinque, p.c.):

ii) Ne ho letta la metà, di quel libro. (‘of-it I-have readfem. the halffem., of that bookmasc.’)

12 On (37), see Leu (to appear).

13 Indefinite-’headed’ relatives are also compatible with ‘person’-possessives that have something in common with deictics:

i) We need a place of our own.
Kayne (2004a) argued against a relative clause analysis of (36) on what I now think were inconclusive grounds. The relevant data are in part:

(40) *that over there book, *this right here book

which contrast with:

(41) the book that’s over there; the book that’s right here

Relatives can contain over there or right here, but those combinations are not possible prenominally. Somewhat similarly, there in a relative can be stressed (indicated here by extra spacing and italics) in a way that it cannot be prenominally:

(42) the book that’s there
(43) *that there book

(vs. that green book) - suggesting, apparently, that prenominal deictic there and here must have a source other than within a (reduced) relative. However, there’s a narrower conclusion that can be drawn - one that allows these facts to be interpreted as neutral with respect to the relative clause question.

This narrower conclusion is that over and right in (40) and stress in (43) are excluded because they all depend on the presence of PLACE, i.e. on the presence of a locative phrase. Deictic there and here are by themselves not compatible with over or right or with contrastive stress falling on them. If this is correct, then prenominal deictic there (or here) could well have a relative clause source, as long as the relative lacked PLACE.

If prenominal there and here do have a relative clause source, then it is (38)/(39) that is surprising, and not the presence of ‘[there a book]’ in the derivation proposed in (35).

The question remains, then, as to why neither (38) nor (39) is possible. Let me suggest a link to Szabolcsi’s (1983; 1994) analysis of Hungarian possessive sentences. Szabolcsi argues that

---

14 For a compatible approach to right, see Johnson (1991).

Supporting the importance of PLACE are the following, similar to (40):

i) We spoke (*over) thereof.
ii) We spoke (*right) thereof.

The contrasts seem clear, even relative to archaic English. More part of (a certain) spoken English is:

iii) I hereby give you permission.

Again:

iv) *I over/right hereby give you permission.

15 Like simple adjectives, deictics, even if derived from relative clauses, cannot, I think, remain postnominal (contrary to certain reduced relatives like any linguist interested in physics), i.e. (i) and, very clearly, (ii) in English feel as if they only contain a locative:

i) that book there
ii) the book that’s there

In French, on the other hand, (iii) almost certainly can be a non-locative deictic:

iii) ce livre-là

On the order difference between English and French and its relation to the position of adjectives, see Bernstein (1997).

possessors (in the Hungarian counterparts of simple possessive sentences like *John has a sister*) originate within a DP (containing *a sister*) that is the argument of an existential verb (that looks like *be*). The possessor then moves out of that DP, doing so obligatorily because the DP is indefinite.

Putting it slightly differently, a Hungarian DP containing a (relatively non-embedded) possessor must necessarily ‘split’ if that DP is indefinite (and may do so if it is definite). Let me now suggest the same for deictic *there*, namely that when deictic *there* is contained in an indefinite DP (and not embedded too far down in it), that indefinite DP must split obligatorily, in the way shown in (35).16  (Why exactly such (non-specific) indefinites must split in these two kinds of cases, and perhaps others, or perhaps all cases, remains to be elucidated.17)  (38) and (39) are impossible as intact DPs because they have not split, despite being indefinite. Yet such indefinite DPs containing deictic *there* (or *here*) can be legitimate if they do split, and therefore can appear in the initial stage of a derivation such as (35).

In summary, then, what we call expletive *there* is characterized by (34) and, along with its counterparts in various Romance languages, has a derivation of the sort loosely sketched in (35).

6. Deictics, demonstratives and indefinites.

As illustrated in (36)-(39), English deictics have a privileged relation to demonstratives, which are the only determiners that in (non-standard) English can overtly cooccur with a prenominal deictic. On the other hand, not every instance of a demonstrative is compatible with a deictic, even (to my not entirely native ear) in non-standard English. The following seem appreciably less possible than (36):

(44) *Your child has never been that there irritable before.
(45) *A thesis shouldn’t really be this here short.
(Both of these would be possible without *there or here.*) The generalization may be that deictics must modify a noun (or projection thereof).18

To the (partial) extent that deictics do have a privileged relation with demonstratives, we are led to ask, given the proposal that deictics can in fact combine with indefinites, whether demonstratives might not be able to combine with indefinites, too, in a way that would support separating both deictics and demonstratives from any intrinsic link to definiteness.

Of interest here is Hebrew, as discussed by Sichel (2001), which has the convenient property that its demonstratives cooccur, when in a definite DP, with an overt definite article:

---

16 Maximal parallelism with Hungarian would lead to thinking that Hungarian indefinites containing a possessor split in remnant movement fashion, too.
17 One should also consider this from the perspective of Sportiche (2002) on *D*.
18 At least in English. Delsing (1993, 136) notes as acceptable the Swedish counterpart of *a so here big car.*
Yet Hebrew also allows (Sichel, chap. 1, note 6):

(47) yalda zot

with no definite article, yet with the same demonstrative element. In addition, while (46) as a direct object would be preceded by the morpheme et that normally precedes definite direct objects, (47) would not be. Sichel concludes that (47) is an instance of a demonstrative that is not definite.19

It seems, then, that demonstratives are no more universally wedded to definites than are, given my proposal that expletive there is a deictic originating within an indefinite, deictics. The plausibility of (35) is thereby enhanced.

7. The definiteness effect.

The order of elements in the constituent ‘[there a book]’ postulated in (35), in which there precedes a, is indirectly supported by (non-standard):

(48) these here four books

to the extent that the indefinite article a is akin to numerals, as argued by Perlmutter (1970). In other words, ‘...there a...’ in (35) parallels ‘...here four...’ in (48).

Assume now that the definite article would, in contrast, precede the deictic, as the demonstrative does in the example just given.20 This means that replacing the indefinite article in (35) by a definite article would yield:

(49) ...[the there book]...

(50) ...[the there three books]...

This contrast in relative position between definite and indefinite article will have an interesting effect. Whereas in (35) ‘a book’ could raise out from within ‘there a book’, that same raising will be precluded in (49) or (50). Such raising of ‘the book’ or of ‘the three books’ out of their containing DP is precluded by the fact that in (49) and (50) ‘the book’ and ‘the three books’ are not constituents. Therefore there is no way to have, parallel to (35), a derivation that would yield, with expletive there:

(51) *There’s the book on the table.

Thus we have, granted that the must precede there or here, the beginning of an account of the core definiteness effect found in (English) existentials.21

19 Cf. perhaps English:
   i) There’s this guy on the phone for you.
20 Contrary to Afrikaans, for which something further needs to be said. On relatives preceding D, cf. Whitman (1981) and Kayne (1994, sect. 8.3).
21 (51) is possible in a ‘list’ context, e.g.:
   i) What should we read? Well, there’s the book on the table.
   ii) Who can we invite? Well, there’s John.

Perhaps the definites here are embedded within hidden indefinites.

On differing sensitivity to definiteness in two dialects of Catalan, see Rigau (2005, 792); similarly, for two varieties of Spanish, Longa et al. (1998, 13).

As a reviewer emphasizes, the account suggested for (51) should generalize to (cf. Milsark (1974)):

iii) *There’s every book on the/a shelf.

on the assumption that this every must precede there as the does in (49), and similarly for other
In essence, any determiner that must in general precede deictic *there* will be incompatible with the kind of derivation shown in (35) that underlies existentials that contain expletive *there* (a particular subcase of deictic *there*).

Starting from (49) or (50) there is another imaginable derivation that needs to be considered, in which ‘(a) book’ or ‘three books’ would be raised out of the containing DP leaving behind ‘the there’. Such a derivation would yield:

(52) *The there is (a) book on the table.
(53) *The there are three books on the table.

These can be excluded if the presence of *the* blocks the raising operation.\footnote{\text{22}} That *the* might have such a blocking effect is a long-standing idea - cf. Fiengo and Higginbotham (1981). Although there are exceptions and although the reason for the blocking effect needs to be made more precise, there is one very sharp case in Romance that seems to fit well with (52)/(53):

(54) Jean en a (*les) trois. (‘J of-them has (the) three’)
(55) Jean en a un/*l’ autre. (‘J of-them has an/the other’)

In these French examples, the extraction of quantitative *en* (cf. Pollock (1998)) is blocked by the presence of a definite article.\footnote{\text{23}}

Thinking of (48) and the corresponding non-standard:

(56) them there four books
(with *them* rather than *those*), one also needs to exclude a derivation that would yield:

(57) *Them there were four books on the table an hour ago.

Again, it is plausible that the presence of *them* blocks the extraction of *four books* that would have been necessary to derive (57) in a way parallel to the licit derivation indicated in (35).

Arguably like the definiteness effect of (51) is (cf. Heim (1987)) the absence of a wide scope reading for *three books* in *There must be three books on the table*. From the present perspective, a wide scope (‘specific’) reading of *three books* must in general require the presence of a ‘specific’ D (a more general D than the one restricted to definites), covert in English but arguably overt in Gungbe - Aboh (2004, chap. 3). That D will have the same effect on extraction of *there* as the definite D.\footnote{\text{24}} (Not surprisingly, then, Cresti (2003) argues that there is a parallel... 'strong determiners' in Milsark’s sense. The contrast with:

iv) There’s every reason to believe we’re right.

implies, then, that the *every* of (iv) is lower than that of (iii), as argued on independent grounds by Postma and Rooryck (1996).

\footnote{\text{25}} For a partly similar idea, see den Dikken (1997).

\footnote{\text{23}} Cf. Kayne (1975, chap. 2, note 55). Note that right-dislocation with *de* (cf. Vinet (1977)), but without *en*, is possible:

i) Jean m’a montré les tiens, de livres. (‘J me has shown the yours, of books’)

though not with *des*:

ii) *Jean m’a montré les tiens, des livres. (‘...of-the books’)

The text discussion assumes that there is no ‘escape-hatch’ available in these cases, either, in particular Spec,DP (unlike in the case of (Hungarian) possessors).

\footnote{\text{24}} The ill-formedness of (i) can similarly be taken to reflect the presence of a covert definite or specific D (required by the presence of *all*):

(i) *There will all be three books on the table.

The ill-formedness of (ii) (v. Chomsky (1995, 275)) might be related to this:

(ii) *There seem to each other to be five people here.
scope restriction with Italian *ne* (related to the French *en* of (54) and (55)).

8. Agreement.

In the remnant movement derivation given in (35), what ends up in subject position is ‘[there \(t_i\)]’, where \(t_i\) is the trace/copy of ‘a book’. In the corresponding derivation of:

(58) *There are three books on the table.*

what ends up in subject position is again ‘[there \(t_i\)]’, where \(t_i\) is now the trace/copy of ‘three books’. This may make it possible to take the plural *are* in (58) to be determined by the plurality of the phrase in subject position, which is not simply expletive (deictic) *there*, but a bigger phrase containing (the trace/copy of) plural number - cf. also Koopman (2003; 2005). If this is correct, then there may be no need here for downward agreement of the sort proposed by Chomsky (2001).\(^{25}\)

In a similar vein, in the Italian counterpart of (58):

(59) *Ci sono tre libri sul tavolo.* (‘there are three books on-the table’)

the plural form *sono* might be determined through direct agreement with the preceding ‘[ci \(t_i\)]’, i.e. with the phrase containing the expletive clitic. Alternatively, there may be a spec position between *ci* and *sono* through which ‘[ci \(t_i\)]’ has passed.\(^{26}\)

9. Why is *there* the expletive?

English expletive *there* has no counterpart in *then*:

(60) There are problems with your proposal.

(61) *Then are problems with your proposal.

If expletives were uninterpretable elements merged directly into a (relatively) high subject position, it would not be immediately clear why English or some nearby (or distant) language could not have *then* as its expletive. From the present perspective, which takes expletive *there* to be a deictic element merged within an indefinite DP, we can do somewhat better. First, we can note that the contrast between (60) and (61) is not limited to existential contexts; it is also found in the archaic English construction mentioned earlier, e.g.:

(62) We spoke thereof/*thenof.

and similarly for *thereby*, which can still be heard:

(63) We thereby/*thenby demonstrated...

More pointedly, perhaps, deictic *there* preceding an overt noun has no *then* counterpart:\(^{27}\)

(64) That there/*then car ain’t no good.

\(^{25}\) The lack of agreement possible in colloquial English in some cases has a counterpart in Italian - cf. Burzio (1986, 77). On interesting variation concerning agreement within Catalan, see Rigau (2005).

\(^{26}\) Cf. also Belletti (2005, 18).

\(^{27}\) Conversely the non-colloquial (i) has no counterpart with *there*:

i) *his then wife; the then president

ii) *his there wife; the there president

(i) seems more like:

iii) the president then

i.e. more like the temporal counterpart of a locative, rather than like the temporal counterpart of a deictic.
A statement touching on all the facts of this section is:

(65) Locatives are closer to deictics than are temporals. More specifically, locatives can be formed by combining a deictic with silent PLACE, yielding what I have been calling locative *there* (or *here*). This in effect gives locatives the possibility of being phonetically indistinguishable from the non-locative deictic *there* seen in (60), (62), (63) and probably in one (perhaps the only - see note 5) reading of (64).

The idea behind (65) is that the proper analysis of *then* in sentences like:

(66) They were happy (back) then.

cannot be as simple as the proper analysis of locative *there*. Put another way, although locative *there* is deictic *there* combined with PLACE, temporal *then* cannot simply correspond to a deictic element combined with TIME. This property of temporals is probably not to be understood in terms of silent TIME being systematically unavailable, given the double possibility indicated in:

(67) We’ll be at your place in two hours.

(68) We’ll be at your place in two hours’ time.

which makes TIME seems appropriate for (67) - see Kayne (to appear - a).

It may rather be that silent TIME requires a modifier that is itself specified for ‘time’ (as is (two) *hours* in (67)), whereas PLACE is not so demanding. Alternatively put, both TIME and PLACE require a modifier at least partially specified for, respectively, ‘time’ or ‘place’.28 The difference, then, would be that there is some partial overlap between ‘location’ and ‘deixis’ itself, but no comparable partial overlap between ‘time’ and ‘deixis’.29 In effect, location would then be seen as a more concrete, narrowed down (via PLACE) counterpart of deixis, whereas time would not be.

From this perspective, (66) can be thought of as:

(69) ...then TIME.

where temporal *then* is itself specified for time (and requires TIME) - in a way that distinguishes it sharply from deictic *there*, which is not specified for location (and does not need to cooccur with PLACE, though it can). There is consequently no derivation available for (61) that could track the derivation of (60) (that was in effect sketched in (35), which is repeated here):

(70) ...[there a book]... --> raising of ‘a book’
...a book<sub>i</sub> ... [there t<sub>i</sub>]... --> merger of V
...is a book<sub>i</sub> ... [there t<sub>i</sub>]... --> remnant movement
...[there t<sub>i</sub>]<sub>k</sub> is a book<sub>k</sub> ... t<sub>k</sub>...

In addition to there being no expletive *then* parallel to expletive *there*, we can also note that there is no modified expletive *there*:

(71) Are there problems with your proposal?

(72) *Are over/right there problems with your proposal?

28 The PLACE found in:

i) Let’s go over to John’s tonight.

is a silent counterpart of the *place* found in:

ii) Let’s go over to John’s place tonight.

which conveys more than just location - it seems close to ‘home’, in a way that recalls Longobardi (1996).

29 On probably related differences between locatives and temporals, see Starke (2001).
Since expletive *there is a subcase of deictic *there and since deictic *there in general disallows modification (cf. also (40)):30

(73) *That over/right there car ain’t no good.
the unacceptability of (72) is expected.

There is no expletive *here parallel to expletive *there, either:31

(74) *Are here problems with your proposal?
which means that *here cannot successfully appear in a derivation like (70). We can express this restriction as:

(75) *Here can only appear within a definite DP.
In effect, *there is more ‘neutral’ than *here,32 with this difference in turn probably to be related to what I think are similar differences between *that and *this, e.g.:

(76) He’s not all that/*all this smart.
(77) The behavior of their son is somewhat different from that/*this of their daughter.
and even with what we call complementizer *that:

(78) They think that/*this everything is fine.

One (plausible) implication of (75) is that *here must be contained within a definite DP in both of the following, despite there being no overt definite article:

(79) They live here.
(80) We hereby declare...
(In addition to some silent indicator of definiteness, (79) contains PLACE and (80) THING.)

Both locative *there and the *there of archaic thereof (and non-archaic thereby) have counterparts with *where:

(81) Where do they live?
(82) Whereof have they spoken? (archaic)
(83) the plan whereby we...

Expletive *there does not:33

(84) Where is there/*where a problem?
In this respect the deictic *there that we call expletive behaves as the deictic *there preceding overt nouns (in non-standard English):

(85) that there car
(86) *that where car; *this where car; *a where car; *some where car

30 Possible is:
i) that car over there
but here we have locative *there, i.e. deictic *there combined with PLACE, with over keyed to PLACE.
31 Possible is:
i) Here are several problems for you.
but this is probably an instance of a preposed locative *here, i.e. with PLACE.

*Here, this and these may contain a first-person feature or morpheme that does not have or at least can fail to have a counterpart with *there, *that and *those
If where is not a deictic element at all, then (84) is not surprising.\textsuperscript{34}

In summary to these last sections, what we call expletive there is an instance of deictic there initially occurring within an indefinite DP, and then being split away from it, as indicated in (70).

10. Expletive ghe and ci in possessive sentences.

As earlier (cf. the discussion of (30)), I follow Burzio (1986) in taking Italian ci in existential sentences to be strongly similar to English there, apart from the fact that ci ends up in object clitic position, whereas there ends up in subject position. An example of Italian existential ci is:

(87) C’è un libro sul tavolo. (‘there is a book on-the table’)

The derivation of (87) will resemble that of (70), modulo the final landing site, and similarly for Paduan ghe in:

(88) Ghe ze un libro... (‘there is a book...’)

For a certain subset of Italian speakers, the expletive ci of (87) can also appear in simple possessive sentences such as:\textsuperscript{35}

(89) Gianni c’ha una sorella. (‘G ci has a sister’)

For the speakers in question (89) is possible without any locative interpretation being associated with it, i.e. it can correspond perfectly to English:

(90) John has a sister.

In the Italian of the relevant speakers, the presence of ci in (89) is generally not obligatory. In many dialects of Italy such a clitic (i.e. the corresponding deictic clitic, e.g. ghe in Paduan) often is obligatory in the equivalent of (89)/(90) - cf. Moro (1997, 237).\textsuperscript{36} It seems virtually certain, as Moro suggests, that this ci or ghe in possessive sentences is an expletive clitic and is in fact the same expletive clitic as the one found in existential sentences like (87) and (88).

The question is why (some) Italian and many dialects of Italy should allow an expletive at all in possessive sentences like (89). I think the answer is to be found in Szabolcsi’s (1983; 1994) analysis of simple possessive sentences in Hungarian. Her proposal, mentioned earlier, is

---

\textsuperscript{34} If there, here and where do form a natural class of deictics - see Kayne (to appear - b) - then more needs to be said.

\textsuperscript{35} (89) becomes (much) more widely accepted if expletive ci cooccurs with an accusative or quantitative clitic:

i) Una sorella, ce l’ha anche Gianni. (‘a sister there it has also G’)

ii) Gianni ce n’ha due. (‘G there of-them has two’)

in a way that recalls the improvement in Italian non-dislocated clitic doubling attributable to a second clitic - Cinque (1990, 178).

In possessive sentences, this ci cannot undergo clitic climbing:

iii) *Ci vorrei avere una sorella. (‘there I-would-like to-have a sister’)

unless accompanied (perhaps pied-piped) by another clitic, as in:

iv) Una bella casa, ce la vorrei avere anch’io. (‘a beautiful house, there it I-would-like to-have also I’)

In addition, there are restrictions preventing ci from appearing (postverbally) in non-finite contexts, in many cases. All of this needs further study.

\textsuperscript{36} In many dialects, there is a ghe with auxiliary ‘have’, too. The source for those instances of ghe may lie with the nominalization-like character of past participles.
essentially that possessive sentences are based on existentials. The derivation of simple possessive sentences tracks that of existential sentences (which are taken to have a single verb that takes a single argument (apart from a possible additional locative)), with an important twist.

In possessive sentences like (90) in Hungarian, the possessor originates within that single argument of the existential and raises out of it, picking up dative Case on the way. Transposition of Szabolcsi’s analysis to English - Kayne (1993) - has the possessor in English raising out of the same single argument of the existential.

There are, however, two (linked) differences between Hungarian and English; the possessor in English ends up with nominative Case (apart from ECM contexts) and the verb in English must be have rather than be, as seen in (90). (In the Hungarian counterpart of (90), John would bear dative Case and the verb would be existential be).

Szabolcsi’s idea that possessive sentences like (90) embed an existential structure within them clearly makes the appearance of expletive ci in (89) less surprising (and similarly for the relevant dialects). In effect, (89) has ‘inherited’ its expletive ci from the existential embedded within it.

To see what the derivations might look like, let’s begin with one (modeled on (70)) for:

(91) There is a sister of John’s in our class.

Setting aside the locative in our class, the derivation proceeds as follows:

(92) ...[there a sister of John’s]_indef.DP... --> raising of ‘a sister of John’s’
...[a sister of John’s][...[there t]... --> merger of V
...is [a sister of John’s][...[there t]... --> remnant movement
...[there t]_k is [a sister of John’s]_i...t_k...

Transposing to Italian (89) gives:

(93) ...[ci una sorella di Gianni]_indef.DP... --> raising of ‘una sorella di Gianni’
...[una sorella di Gianni][...[ci t]... --> merger of V
...è [una sorella di Gianni][...[ci t]... --> remnant movement
...[ci t]_k è [una sorella di Gianni]_i...t_k...

If the derivation stopped here, it would correspond to the existential sentence:

(94) C’è una sorella di Gianni... (‘there is a sister of G...’)

Extending the derivation in (93) along Szabolcsi’s lines amounts to saying that in Italian the possessor Gianni can subsequently raise out of the phrase ‘una sorella di Gianni’, ending up in subject position. With the necessary appearance of ‘have’ instead of ‘be’, this yields (89). The last step (abstracting away from the question whether ‘have’ is in the numeration or not and also from the question of the preposition di) is then:

(95) ...[ci t]_k ha [una sorella Gianni]_i...t_k... --> raising of the possessor
...Giannim [ci t]_k ha [una sorella t_m]...t_k...

Again, this allows us to make sense of the presence of expletive ci in such possessive sentences - ci (and similarly for ghe in the relevant dialects) has been carried over into such possessive sentences from the existential substructure embedded in them.

In contrast, of course, expletive there cannot appear in the corresponding English simple possessive sentences:

(96) *John has there a sister.

(96) is not acceptable and (97) is not a simple possessive sentence, i.e. its there must be interpreted as a locative, parallel to (98):

(97) John has a sister there.

(98) John has a sister in Chicago.
This restriction on English, as compared with some Italian and many Italian dialects, is plausibly to be related to the fact that expletive there, unlike expletive ci or ghe, occupies a subject position.\footnote{If the contrast in:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item [i)] John has a sister.
  \item [ii)] *John has the sister.
\end{itemize}

is due to the same (definiteness) effect found with existentials illustrated in (51), we might be led to postulate a silent there in (i) parallel to the overt ci of (89). This silent there would not interfere with the raising of the possessor (for reasons to be made precise - cf. Kayne (2006)), but it would call for the kind of splitting seen in (70) that leads to the definiteness effect. For relevant discussion, see Szabolcsi (1986).
Il pleut. (‘it rains’)
with which it shares the property of being zero (rather than the usual accusative le/l’) in accusative contexts:

?Un malentendu (*l’)a fait y avoir trop d’enfants à la soirée. (‘a misunderstanding has made there have too-many of children at the party’)

Although embedding an existential like There were too many children at the party under a causative in French is somewhat marginal (perhaps as in English), the result is clearly, as seen in (104), appreciably more acceptable without le/l’ than with it. This is the same property that one finds with weather verbs:

Les savants sont maintenant capables de (*le) faire pleuvoir. (‘the scientists are now capable of making to-rain’)

The subject il of French existentials also shares with the il of French weather sentences the ability to control PRO (much as in Chomsky’s discussion of English; cf. also Kayne (1979, 713)):

Il pourrait y avoir du pain sans y avoir de l’eau. (‘it could there to-have of-the bread without there to-have of the water’ = ‘there could be bread without there being water’)

Il peut neiger sans pleuvoir. (‘it can to-snow without to-rain’)

Note that in the French existential control example (106) il does not appear in the infinitival part (it is replaced by PRO), while y does. This is indirectly related to the fact that English there cannot be a controller:

There can’t possibly be a solution without *(there) being a problem.

*There was a problem before being a solution.

The reason that English prohibits control with expletive there, in contrast to (106), is that expletive there (like y) is not a quasi-argument (but rather a deictic element that is not an argument at all), contrary to il. (106) can thus have PRO as the subject of the infinitival phrase beginning with sans, whereas in (108) and (109) the subject of the gerund cannot be PRO; put another way, in both languages the existential argument within the controlled infinitive or gerund needs to be merged with a deictic - in French that deictic y can cooccur with PRO since they occupy different types of positions, contrary to what holds in English.

In summary, neither of the two elements that might have appeared to be expletives in French (100) is actually an expletive. The il is a quasi-argument, and the y is a deictic modifier that originates within the associate.

As for the derivation of a French existential sentence such as (100), the best way to see it is to begin by going back to (93)-(95), consolidated here as the derivation of:

Gianni c’ha una sorella. (‘G there has a sister’) = (89)

which is the Italian possessive sentence containing expletive ci. The derivation goes as follows:

---

Why exactly le is impossible here remains to be understood. Note the contrast with English:

i) Scientists are now capable of making *(it) be very cold.

---

Here I’m taking ha = ‘have’ to be in the numeration, and abstracting away from the question of preposition incorporation - on which, see Kayne (1993), Rigau (2005) and references cited in those works.

The last step of the derivation in (111) involves the extraction of the possessor from within a previously moved constituent. In this respect it recalls (vs. Wexler and Culicover (1980, 278)):

i) That’s the problem that we explained to John only part of. (cf. Kayne (1994, 74))
(111) ...[ci una sorella Gianni]_{indef.DP}... --> raising of ‘una sorella Gianni’
...[una sorella Gianni]...[ci t_i]... --> merger of V
...ha [una sorella Gianni]...[ci t_i]... --> remnant movement
...[ci t_i]k ha [una sorella Gianni]...t_k,... --> raising of the possessor
...Giannim [ci t_i]k ha [una sorella t_m]...t_k...

The proposal now is that (100) has a similar derivation, except that quasi-argument possessor il replaces the full possessor argument Gianni; un livre replaces una sorella; and y replaces ci:
(112) ...[y un livre il]_{indef.DP}... --> raising of ‘un livre il’
...[ un livre il ]...[ y t_i ]... --> merger of V
...a [ un livre il ]...[ y t_i ]... --> remnant movement
...[ y t_i ]k a [ un livre il ]...t_k,... --> raising of the possessor
...il_m [ y t_i ]k a [ un livre t_m ]...t_k...

Consider in turn the result of replacing un livre in (100) by une soeur de Jean (‘a sister of J’):
(113) Il y a une soeur de Jean dans la cour. (‘it there has a sister of J in the courtyard’)

This is a sentence whose derivation (abstracting away from the preposition de) must begin with ‘[y [une soeur Jean] il]_{indef.DP}’ in place of ‘[y [un livre il] il]_{indef.DP}’. That is, the derivation of (113) must contain an indefinite DP with two possessors, argument Jean and quasi-argument il. This is not implausible (as an instance of recursion), in particular given the existence in English of the quite acceptable (to me):
(114) (??)This painting of yours of mine is now quite valuable.

in the sense of ‘this painting that you did that I own’.40

Returning to French (99), repeated here:
(115) Jean (*y) a une soeur. (‘J (there) has a sister’)

I think the answer to why it is impossible with expletive y, as opposed to Italian (110) being possible with expletive ci, lies in the following (unidirectional) comparative syntax correlation:
(116) If a Romance language allows a clitic counterpart of expletive there in its possessive sentences, then its existential sentences have the verb be (and not have).

Particularly striking here is Catalan, whose deictic clitic hi is in other ways very much like Italian ci. Yet Catalan seems to be like French, rather than like Italian, with respect to (115). (116) claims that Catalan lacks expletive hi in its possessive sentences because Catalan has ‘have’ in its existentials, like French.

The next question is why (116) should hold. What I would like to propose as an answer to that question depends on a strong ‘uniformity’ assumption about existential sentences (and hence about possessive sentences, given my adoption and extension of Szabolcsi’s analysis), namely that all (Romance) languages have a quasi-argument possessor in their existentials (and hence in their possessive sentences), of the sort seen overtly in French il. (This implies that an existential sentence in which the associate contains a full argument possessor actually has two possessors.)

Returning to (116) and to the unacceptability of (115) with expletive y, we can now understand (116) as follows. A language that allows an expletive deictic clitic in its possessive

40 The fact that (114) is so much better than:
i) *My your painting is valuable.
which presumably has something to do with of, needs to be elucidated.
sentences, as do Italian and Paduan, must of necessity be a language in which the presence of
that expletive clitic does not force subject position to be filled by the quasi-argument possessor
that by hypothesis is found in all simple possessive sentences.\textsuperscript{42} But in existentials, French and
Catalan do have the quasi-argument possessor raising to subject position. (In French, the quasi-
argument possessor must generally be pronounced, as opposed to Catalan.) Consequently, we
can exclude French (115) with expletive $y$ by taking the raising of the quasi-argument possessor
in French to be more general:

(117) In French (and similarly for Catalan), the quasi-argument possessor must, if expletive $y$
is present, raise to subject position.
This will exclude (115), as desired.

A more general formulation of (117) would be:

(118) If a language has quasi-argument possessor raising in the presence of an overt deictic
expletive clitic in some cases (in particular in existentials), then it has it in all cases (thereby
blocking full argument possessor raising in the presence of the overt expletive).
Again, (115) is correctly excluded.

If $y$ is not pronounced, then the French (and Catalan) quasi-possessor does not (and cannot,
for reasons to be determined) raise to subject position, in which case nothing blocks the raising
of the full argument possessor \textit{Jean}, yielding the acceptable variant of (115).

Note that in the derivation (112) what is raised into subject position cannot, even in the
absence of overt \textit{il}, be the associate itself:

(119) *Un livre \textit{y} a sur la table.
This might be due to the fact that in that derivation \textit{un livre} is not a full DP argument, having
been raised out in the first step from within the argument phrase containing $y$;\textsuperscript{43} alternatively,
there might be an intervention/relativized minimality effect, with $y$ constituting a block.

In Italian and in the dialects of Italy, the verb in existentials is \textit{be} rather than \textit{have}. I interpret
this to mean that in those languages the quasi-argument possessor has not raised to nominative
subject position. The fact that it does not have to, even in the presence of expletive \textit{ci} or \textit{ghe},
will make it possible for the full argument possessor to do so even in their presence, yielding
sentences like (110), in a way compatible with (116). (On the fact that English acts differently,
despite having \textit{be} in existentials, see the discussion of (96).)

12. Other languages and no languages.

Some Scandinavian languages are like English in having existentials with \textit{be} and with a
counterpart (\textit{der}) of subject \textit{there}.\textsuperscript{44} This \textit{der} can be taken to originate as a deictic modifier of
the associate, as discussed for English. Other Scandinavian languages can have \textit{be} with a subject
(\textit{det}) that seems more like English \textit{it} or \textit{that}.\textsuperscript{45} This \textit{det} might be akin to French \textit{il}, i.e. it might
be a quasi-argument possessor, though that would leave open (for the time being) why the verb

\textsuperscript{42} At least in possessive sentences of the type under discussion, with an indefinite possessee.
Probably the text approach should be extended to cases like:

\begin{itemize}
  \item i) John has it/your pencil in his pocket.
\end{itemize}
though with additional structure - cf. in part note 21.

\textsuperscript{43} Cf. Rigau (2005, note 22).

\textsuperscript{44} Cf. Allan et al. (1995, sect. 407).

\textsuperscript{45} Cf. Holmes and Hinchliffe (1994, 140).
is *be*; alternatively, this *det* might have some other status (perhaps related to the *it* of clefts) that remains to be elucidated.

In Swiss German and other southern varieties of German, existentials can have the verb *have*, with a subject *es* that corresponds in other ways to English *it* (examples from Thomas Leu):

(120) Es het es buaech uf em tisch. (‘it has a book on the table’)

This subject *es* looks very much like a quasi-argument counterpart of French *il*. Although in (120) there is no overt element corresponding to French *y*, Swiss German also allows:

(121) Da het s es buaech uf em tisch. (‘there has it a book on the table’)

with an additional *da* that may correspond to *y*. Where a Swiss German existential has *es* het... a standard German existential would have *es gibt...*, with (probably) the same *es*, but with the verb ‘give’. This use of ‘give’ in existentials has a (non-productive) counterpart in English:

(122) What gives?

In Spanish and Portuguese, the verb in existentials is a form of *have*, without there being any visible counterpart of French *y* (except perhaps in the present tense in Spanish). Since Spanish and Portuguese have no visible *y* elsewhere, either, they plausibly have a silent one in existentials. In addition, they are like Catalan in having no overt counterpart of French *il*.

As we can see, there is substantial variation in the form of existentials across Romance and Germanic. This should not prevent us, however, from ‘seeing’ what is not present. One gap of interest can be illustrated with an (unacceptable) English example:

(123) *There has a book on the table.

Subject deictic expletive *there* is not compatible with *have* in English. But as far as I know, no Romance or Germanic language has an exact counterpart of (123), with verb ‘have’ and a deictic element (rather than a quasi-argument) in subject position. This follows directly from the assumption made earlier that *have* requires a possessor subject, whether quasi-argument (French *il*, (Swiss) German *es*) or full argument. Combined with the radically different status of *there*, which (like French *y*, Italian *ci*, Paduan *ghe*, Catalan *hi*) is a deictic modifier and not an argument or quasi-argument, this accounts for the general absence of (123).

I have been assuming that the French type of existential seen in (100), with verb ‘have’ and with deictic *y* in object clitic position and quasi-argument possessor *il* in subject (clitic) position, is closely matched by Catalan (example from Rigau (2005, 777)):

(124) Hi ha una biblioteca nova. (‘there has a library new’)

with the single difference that Catalan, in a way related to its being a null subject language, has a silent counterpart of *il*. Less immediate is the answer to the question where the quasi-argument possessor is in Italian existentials:

(125) C’è un libro sul tavolo. (‘there is a book on-the table’)

Since Italian *ci* is not in subject position, Italian could perhaps (though not if (118) is correct) be like Catalan in having a silent *il* there. Alternatively, the quasi-argument possessor in Italian is

46 (123) contrasts with:

i) There has to be a book somewhere.

ii) There have been lots of problems.

indicating that auxiliary-like *have* (and similarly in other languages) does not require a possessor subject in the same way, despite other similarities with main verb *have* that led Kayne (1993) to assimilate the two to a significant degree.
silent and oblique (thinking of the fact that argument possessors are oblique in many languages47).

13. Existentials and causers

As alluded to just above (122), German has one existential with the verb give:

(126) Es gibt keine Lösung. (‘it gives no solution’)

Since give is normally causative, it seems odd at first glance that (126) could have an existential interpretation. The various languages that use have in their existentials (French, Catalan, Spanish, Portuguese, Swiss German and others) appear not to pose a problem of this sort, insofar as have is normally not thought of as causative. Yet English have can be causative, in sentences with an agentive subject:

(127) We’ll have them call you.

Somewhat similarly, although English get seems straightforwardly like an inchoative of have in:

(128) They got a large inheritance.

and like an inchoative of be in:

(129) They got sick.

get can also be causative:

(130) They got him arrested.
(131) They got us talking to each other.
(132) They got us to lend them money.

A possible interpretation of these facts is that (126) actually does have causative content, and so do existentials with have in the various languages mentioned (and arguably, then, existentials with be in languages like English and Italian). This causative content could be understood by thinking of a sentence like There’s no solution as similar to:

(133) Something has caused there to be no solution.

in which case the es of (126) could be taken to be a quasi-argument causer. That in turn would lead to the possibility that French il in existential il y a... is also a quasi-argument causer48 rather than a quasi-argument possessor, and similarly for the other quasi-argument possessors postulated earlier.

Postulating the presence of a non-agentive causer where none is visible is also a tempting option in the case of what are sometimes called ‘anti-causative’ verbs such as sink, which enter into pairs like:

(134) The boat sank.

47 For interesting discussion, see Hoekstra (1994).

Even if oblique, the quasi-argument in Italian must be able to be a controller, given (from Burzio (1986, 174)):

i) Potrebbe esserci del pane senza esserci dell’acqua. (‘could to-be there of-the bread without to-be there of-the water’ = ‘there could be bread without there being water’)

48 Leading to the possibility that other instances of French il are, too, for example, those of:

(i) Il faut que vous partiez. (‘it needs that you leave’)
(ii) Il me semble que vous avez raison. (‘it me seems that you...’)
(iii) Il est important que... (‘it is important that...’)
(iv) Il est arrivé quelqu’un. (‘it is arrived someone’)

On (ii), see Rooryck (1997).
The navy/the storm sank the boat. In (135) the causer can be agentive (the navy) or non-agentive (the storm). At the same time, there is a well-known argument concerning a possible implicit argument in (134), based on the contrast:  

(136) The boat was sunk in order to collect the insurance.
(137) *The boat sank in order to collect the insurance.

The deviance of (137) does seem to indicate that (134)/(137) contains no implicit agent, contrary to (136). But it does not exclude the possibility that (134) contains an unpronounced non-agentive causer.

Saying that both (126) and (134) contain a non-obvious causer argument is of some interest, if we return to the question of the variation within Romance concerning have and be in existentials, specifically to the difference between French, which has have, and Italian, which has be. The reason for thinking this is of interest lies in the fact that French and Italian also differ with respect to verbs like sink, and do so in a way quite parallel to the verb difference in existentials, insofar as French, with anti-causatives like sink, uses auxiliary have with past participles, while Italian uses auxiliary be:

(138) Le bâteau a coulé hier. (French ‘the boat has sunk yesterday’)
(139) La nave è affondata ieri. (Italian ‘the boat is sunk yesterday’)

In other words, there may be a generalization that spans existentials and (past-participial) anti-causatives (a more natural class from the perspective of this section than usually assumed), to the effect that French uses have where Italian uses be.

14. Limitations on deictic there as expletive.

In (my) colloquial English, expletive there occurs only with be. Although the following are possible in some register(s) of English, they are for me impossible in colloquial English:

(140) There exist solutions to all these problems.
(141) There have arrived several letters for you.

In this respect, colloquial English is like both Italian and French, whose deictic expletive ci and y are limited to existentials with be (in Italian) and have (in French) and which do not occur in the counterparts of (140) and (141). In contrast, as discussed by Burzio (1986, chap. 2), Piedmontese expletive clitic ye is found more widely, occurring as it does with all unaccusatives.

---

50 French and Italian differ in what seems to be the same fashion, when it comes to the auxiliary used with the past participle of seem, appear, disappear and be itself (i.e. French uses auxiliary have and Italian, auxiliary be) - cf. Burzio (1986, 138). Whether some or all of these should be integrated into the text discussion is left an open question, as is the question why die takes auxiliary be in both languages.

The contrast between (138) and (139) also seems to be mimicked by French vs. Italian periphrasic causatives (indirectly supporting the text proposal), in the sense that they can passivize in Italian but not in French - cf. Kayne (1985).

51 As opposed to:
(i) There they go.
like:
(ii) Here they come.
which do not involve expletive there, despite having some special properties.
Why Piedmontese should be freer in this regard than Italian or French is not clear (perhaps there is a link to the fact that Piedmontese object clitics generally follow past participles in a way that Italian and French object clitics do not).

Nor is it clear why be is singled out by Italian, French and colloquial English - perhaps it is that be is associated with less structure than any other verb - or even that be is not really a verb (thinking of Postma (1993); cf. also Baker (2003, sect. 2.4)). Considering the partial derivation given earlier:

(142)  ...[there a book]...  -->  raising of ‘a book’
    ...a booki ... [there ti]...  -->  merger of V
    ...is a booki ... [there ti]...  -->  remnant movement
    ...[there ti]k is a booki ... tk...

it might be that the landing site needed for the first movement step is unavailable in these languages except with be.

In Piedmontese, expletive ye does not occur with transitives, or even (Luigi Burzio, p.c.) with unaccusatives embedded under an overt causative. Again, it may be that the first step of (142) cannot proceed in the face of the extra structure associated with transitives.

Although French unaccusatives do not show expletive y, they do show a subject clitic il that might be taken to be a (different) kind of expletive:

(143)  Il est arrivé trois lettres. (‘it is arrived three letters’)

Alternatively, this il might turn out to be the quasi-argument il discussed earlier - cf. the discussion beginning at (100) and note 48. (Note that this il is not, strictly speaking, limited to unaccusatives - cf. Pollock (1998, note 11).)

15. Datives.

The last case of parametric variation having to do with expletives that I will touch on has to do with the topic that this paper opened with, namely the deictic clitic ghe that is widely found in North Italian dialects in dative sentences where one might not have expected it. Put another way, these North Italian dialects differ from standard French and from standard Italian, which have retained an overt specifically third person dative clitic.

The question how best to understand this difference in syntactic behavior rests in part on how one analyzes the ghe of, for example, Paduan sentences like:

(144)  Ghe dago un libro (a G). (‘ghe I-give a book (to G)’)

One of the proposals made earlier was that such sentences contain a silent dative clitic:

(145)  DATCL ghe dago un libro (a G)

I have also argued in favor of taking all instances of ghe, like all instances of there in English, to be the same element.

In this final section, I would like to take the more specific position that the ghe of (144) is the expletive subtype of deictic ghe, i.e. that it originates, like all the other expletive deictics so far discussed, within the associate (which in (144) is un libro). This proposal rests on two points, the first being that sentences like (144), with a verb corresponding to give, can, following a long tradition, be thought of as arising through the embedding of a have-like structure within a

---

52 (144) is also possible with definite el libro (‘the book’) in place of indefinite un libro. See notes 21 and 42, as well as the possibility, thinking of Koopman (2003; 2005), that definites are or can be built upon indefinites, in relative clause fashion.
cascative one. The second is that *have*-sentences in a certain number of Italian dialects and for a certain number of Italian speakers show an overt expletive, as discussed earlier beginning with (89).

The idea, then, is that expletive *ghe* appears in (144) via ‘inheritance’. Dative sentences embed within them possessive sub-sentences that can contain an expletive, in turn inherited from the existential subpart of the possessive structure itself. Thus the *ghe* of (144) is in essence the familiar expletive of existentials.

Needless to say, things are not quite this simple. But we can simply illustrate the first point using French periphrastic causatives of the sort that dativize the embedded subject:

(146) Ils ont fait avoir un prix à cet étudiant. (‘they have made have a prize to that student’) This sentence, which has the approximate interpretation of:

(147) Ils ont donné un prix à cet étudiant. (‘they have given...’) embeds under the causative verb *faire* a sentence containing *avoir* (‘to-have’). The subject of the embedded verb *avoir* ends up as the ‘object’ of the (dative) preposition *à*, in a way discussed in Kayne (2004b).

Assume now that a *have*-sentence embedded under a causative can itself contain an expletive (e.g. *ghe*), as we know to be visibly possible for *have*-sentences in various dialects. Then in the relevant dialects, this expletive (deictic) *ghe* will be visible in their counterparts of (146) and, assuming a parallel derivation, of (147).

In which case we have an answer to the question we started with, namely why it is that *ghe*, an apparent locative (but really a deictic element, as argued above), appears in dative sentences like (144) in the first place. Rather than reflecting syncretism, the presence of *ghe* in (144) more precisely reflects a piece of the underlying (in part existential) syntactic structure of such sentences.53

Left open is the question why we don’t see this expletive in all Romance languages (or in all languages). It does not appear to be possible to say that *ghe* can be found in dative sentences only if it is found in possessive sentences, since, as Paola Benincà points out (p.c.), Bellunese has *ghe* in datives but not in possessives.54 Nor, thinking of Italian itself, does the converse seem to hold, since there are Italian speakers who have *ci* in possessives without having it in datives. Ultimately, the answer will probably involve the question of whether or not clitics belonging to the embedded sentence of a causative structure such as (146) can successfully surface.55

The question also arises as to why *ghe* (or *ci* or *y* or *there*) appears in the first place in existentials in some languages. French existentials with *il y a...* indicate clearly that filling a

53 This will have to be extended to cover the whole range of dative sentences.

Guglielmo Cinque (p.c.) asks why expletive *ghe* can cooccur with a silent DATCL in (144)/(145), yet never seems to be able to license a silent ACC-CL. In sentences with just an accusative object, the answer should be that there is no source for expletive *ghe* (i.e. no existential substructure) in the first place. In ditransitive sentences, we had an example with a silent accusative in Sardinian in (28); the contrast with Paduan remains to be elucidated.

54 Perhaps like Bellunese is the popular French described by Postal (1990, 188, note 19) (unless the *y* there turns out to be a dative Case morpheme).

55 For some relevant data, see Kayne (1975), Rouveret and Vergnaud (1980) and Burzio (1986).

We will also need to understand why in some dialects/languages, such as the Carmignano dialect studied by Penello (2004), *ghe* can in dative sentences precede the subject clitic.
subject position cannot be a general answer, since in French the subject position is filled by quasi-argument *il*, so that the presence of deictic expletive *y* must rest on other considerations. Part of the answer may be that these deictic elements are an obligatory part of all DPs (including indefinites) in all languages,\(^56\) with various factors combining to determine whether they are pronounced, in one or another language, in one or another context.

16 Conclusion.

Expletive *there* and its closest counterparts in other languages are not expletives in Chomsky’s sense (merged directly into a sentential Spec position). They are instead instances of deictic elements originating within their associate.\(^57\) In some languages, e.g. Paduan, these expletives can be ‘imported’ into possessive sentences and (from there) into dative sentences, giving the impression in the latter case of syncretism between deictic clitic and dative clitic, but the correct, more syntactic and less morphological, analysis is that in such languages the deictic clitic is not a dative clitic, though it cooccurs with a dative clitic that is silent.
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How exactly to characterize the interpretive contribution to indefinites of *there* remains to be elucidated; cf. the discussion of (75).

\(^{57}\) This is close to Sabel (2000) (cf. also Moro (2000, 125) and Choe (2006)), with the difference that he takes the expletive to correspond to a D-feature within the associate, whereas I have suggested a reduced relative source (cf. the discussion after (43)) that is compatible with taking *there* to be bi- or perhaps tri-morphemic.

That *there* is at least bi-morphemic is clearly indicated by its parallelism to *here* (and perhaps *where* - cf. note 34), by the plausibility of an initial morpheme *th-* related to the *th-* of *the, that*, etc., and by the relation between Dutch *daar* (‘there’) and Dutch *er* (‘-ere’).

Possibly, adapting a suggestion of Pierre Pica’s, one of the morphemes (other than *th*) making up *there* is prepositional, thinking also of the fact that the closest counterpart to *there* in Egyptian Arabic is prepositional, as brought to my attention by Maha Aboul-Ela - cf. Brustad (2000, 152).
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