

# The Morphology of *Ci* and its “Distal” Relative, *Vi*

Lisa Reisig Ferrazzano  
CUNY Graduate Center  
April, 2003

## 1. Introduction

The topic of the “expletive” has garnered much attention in the generative literature in the past decade, and Italian locative/expletive *ci* is no exception.<sup>1</sup> An area that has remained virtually unexplored, however, is the connection between locative/expletive *ci* and its pronominal counterparts. Equally neglected has been the fact that Italian features a second, if somewhat less common, locative/expletive clitic, *vi*, which also doubles as a pronoun. The starting point of this paper will be an investigation into the relationship between the adverbial forms of *ci* and *vi* and their pronominal incarnations. While pronominal and adverbial *ci/vi* are derived from Latin adverbs, *hic* (here) and *ibi* (there) respectively, I argue that they are both nominals underlyingly. In order to understand the bifurcation of *ci/vi* into pronominal and adverbial forms, we must recognize that fact that pronominal *ci/vi* are distinguished in a way that adverbial *ci/vi* are not. Pronominal *ci* and *vi* have maintained the specifications for proximal (close to speaker) and distal (distant from speaker) inherited from their Latin roots. This proximal/distal distinction translates to *person* in the pronominal domain, where first person corresponds to [+proximal] and second person, to [+distal]. The Italian adverbial clitics, however, have lost these features: adverbial *ci* and *vi* are ambiguous between *here* and *there* in modern Italian. I will argue that adverbial *ci/vi* saw the disappearance of a Deixis head that encodes the features [proximal/distal] for adverbs, or [speaker/hearer] for pronouns. The fact that adverbial *ci* and *vi* are no longer distinguished with regards to proximity or distality can be attributed to the nullness of the P head that selects these clitics; more specifically, to the fact that null P must be licensed. I will argue that locative P $\emptyset$  is dominated by functional structure, which prohibits P from raising to a higher head in order to be licensed. As a consequence, the complement of null locative P must

---

<sup>1</sup> I put inverted commas around the term “expletive” to signify that I do not assume that such elements are actually place-holders for the subject. In line with Moro (1997), I consider *there/ ci* small clause predicates. I will continue to refer to these elements as expletives for simplicity’s sake.

incorporate into it P in order to license it. I will put forth a hypothesis for this diachronic change which isolates the functional structure of locative P as the crucial variable.

## 2. The Origin of *ci* and *vi*

To begin with, let us look at the paradigm for accusative and dative clitics in Italian and their non-clitic counterparts:

(1)

	ACC	DAT	non-clitic		ACC	DAT	non-clitic
Singular				Plural			
1 <sup>st</sup> :	mi	mi	me		ci	ci	noi
2 <sup>nd</sup>	ti	ti	te		vi	vi	voi
3 <sup>rd</sup>	lo/la	gli/le	lui/lei		li/le	gli	loro

One immediately notes that the clitics are all morphologically similar to their non-clitic counterparts, with the exception of the first person plural, *ci*. Unlike its non-clitic counterpart *noi*, *ci* is clearly not derived from Latin *nos*. Italian etymological dictionaries (Cortellazzo & Zolli, 1999) reveal that pronominal *ci* and adverbial *ci* share a common origin: Latin *hic*, meaning *here*. If pronominal and adverbial *ci* are derived from the same Latin root, one might wonder whether pronominal and adverbial *vi* are equally related, and if so, what their common origin might be. The matter is less transparent for *vi* than it is for *ci* however, since the pronominal clitic *vi* is morphologically similar to its non-clitic counterpart *voi* (itself from Latin *vos*). A number of possibilities arise: (i) pronominal and adverbial *vi* are derived from different roots: pronominal *vi* from Latin *vos* and adverbial *vi* from an adverbial root (ii) both pronominal and adverbial *vi* stem from the Latin pronoun *vos*, or (iii) both pronominal and adverbial *vi* are derived from an adverb. Cortellazzo and Zolli (1999) affirm the third possibility, claiming that both pronominal and adverbial *vi* can be traced back to Latin *ibi / ivi* (*there*). They write: “*Vi scrivo* significava dunque originariamente ‘io scrivo costì’” (*vi I write* originally meant *I write there*), and over time came to mean *I write to you-PL*. (1999: 1812). It appears, therefore, that all instantiations of *ci* and *vi* are derived from adverbs.

### 3. *Ci/vi* as underlyingly nominals

In light of the fact that *ci* and *vi* are derived from Latin adverbs, it might seem counterintuitive to claim that these clitics are underlyingly nominals. As opposed to adverbial *ci/vi*, the NP status of pronominal *ci* and *vi* is rather uncontroversial. We only need to justify the presence of the null P that selects the clitic, which is possible if we adopt Kayne's (1984) view of indirect objects: an indirect object is always part of a PP, even in double object constructions where no overt P is present.<sup>2</sup> I will extend this claim to include indirect object *clitics* as well, whose P head will always be null. It is less obvious, however, that adverbial *ci* and *vi* are underlyingly NPs, yet this argument has already been made on several occasions for English *there*. Larson (1985) claims that *here* and *there* are bare-NP adverbs, Van Riemsdijk (1978) argues that *there* is generated in the complement of a preposition and subsequently raises to [spec, PP] in R-words like *therein*, and Den Dikken (2002) submits that, "while always part of a PP, is not itself prepositional: instead, *there* is the complement of a null preposition whenever it occurs on its own" (75). As evidence for this claim he cites the fact that *there* is able to appear in the complement of lexical prepositions where other PPs cannot: So, for example, we can have (2a) (Den Dikken's (97a)), but not (2b):

- (2)        a. *there's* nothing in *there*  
             b. *there's* nothing in (\**inside*, \**within*, \**in*, . . . ) *that* box

I will follow Van Riemsdijk and Den Dikken (among others) in assuming that adverbial *ci* and *vi*, like English *there*, are in fact nominals.

### 4. *Ci* and *vi* are no longer distinguished in the adverbial domain

The above discussion suggests that adverbial and pronominal *ci/vi* share the same categorial status in the base. While this is essentially true, an important semantic distinction between pronominal and adverbial *ci/vi* indicates that there may be more to the story. We have claimed that both adverbial and pronominal *ci* derive from Latin *hic* (*there*) and adverbial and pronominal *vi* from *ibi* (*there*). The semantic distinction

---

<sup>2</sup> I will discuss accusative *ci* and *vi* further on.

between proximal *hic* and distal *ibi* was initially present in the Italian adverbial clitics *ci* and *vi*, but this distinction disappeared in the 1600's (Cortelazzi & Zolli, 1999). Modern Italian shows no vestiges of this proximal/distal dichotomy in adverbial *ci* and *vi*; in fact, there appears to be no semantic or syntactic difference between these adverbial clitics. As illustrated in (3), both *ci* and *vi* can function as expletives<sup>3</sup> and both can be reduced before a copula. The examples in (4) shows that both *ci* and *vi* can be used as true locatives, meaning either *here*, as in (4a) or *there*, as in (4b).

- (3) a. C'è modo e modo di farlo.  
 there-BE-3SG way and way of doing-it.  
 'There are better ways of doing it.'
- b. V'è modo e modo di farlo.  
 there-BE-3SG way and way of doing-it  
 'There are better ways of doing it.'
- (4) a. Rimani qua? Sì, ci/vi rimango.  
 remain-2SG here yes, here remain-1SG
- b. Rimani lì? Sì, ci/vi rimango.  
 remain-2SG there yes, there remain-1SG

In short, adverbial *ci* and *vi* are undifferentiated in present-day Italian. One might expect, therefore, that *ci* and *vi* would be interchangeable in the pronominal domain as well. Interestingly enough, however, pronominal *ci* and *vi* appear to have retained the semantic distinction intrinsic to their adverbial roots, proximity and distality. Pronominal *ci* and *vi* cannot be used interchangeably: *ci* is invariably first person and *vi*, second person. I submit that the proximity of *hic* is grammatically encoded as first person in pronominal *ci* and the distality of *ibi* is encoded as second person in pronominal *vi*. If semantic features are encoded on functional heads, we may conclude that Latin *hic/ibi*, as well as pronominal *ci* and *vi* are dominated by a functional projection on which some sort of proximal or a distal feature is checked.

---

<sup>3</sup> Although (3b) is perfectly grammatical, most speakers feel that it has a slightly archaic flavor.

#### 4.1 Latin *hic* and *ibi* feature an overt locative preposition

The fact that *hic* and *ibi* pattern with the pronominal *ci* and *vi* with regards to distality/proximality might lead us to expect these Latin adverbs to have pronominal counterparts, contrary to fact. A possible explanation for this state of affairs is that in Latin, the null preposition selecting *hic* and *ibi* is always locative, whereas in Italian null P can either be locative or dative. This means that *hic* and *ibi* will never surface as pronominals. The phonology of the Latin adverbs lends credibility to this claim: since *hic* and *ibi* are phonologically richer than Italian *ci* and *vi*, it is perhaps not unreasonable to assume that they are morphologically richer as well.<sup>4</sup> If we consider morphemes as heads of separate syntactic projections (Cardinaletti and Starke, 1999), it follows that Latin *hic* and *ibi* must be more syntactically complex than *ci* and *vi*. I would like to suggest that *hic* and *ibi* are conglomerates of a pronoun plus an overt (locative) preposition.<sup>5</sup> It may in fact be significant that the *i* preceding *bi* in *ibi* looks like a reduced variant of *in*, a quintessentially locative preposition. If the prepositional component of *ibi* and *hic* is indeed systematically locative, it follows that *ibi* and *hic* will never be able to function as pronouns. This suggestion will of course need to be re-examined in the context of more rigorous research into the diachrony of Italian morphosyntax.

#### 4.2 [Speaker/hearer] checked off on Deixis head

Above we have proposed that the first/second person distinction, as well as the proximal/distal distinction, is encoded on a feature and checked off on a designated functional head. What type of feature might correspond to *person* as well as *proximality/distality*? A monovalent [person] feature will not do the trick, as it merely draws a distinction between those pronouns specified for person (*mi*, *ti*, *ci*, *vi*) and the ones that, according to Benveniste (1966) and Kayne (2000) are not (the so-called ‘determiner’ pronouns). A generic [person] feature is too broad, but perhaps we can isolate some aspect of this feature that captures the distinction between first and second

---

<sup>4</sup> This possibility was suggested to me by Marcel den Dikken (personal communication).

<sup>5</sup> By “conglomerate” I do not intend to suggest that the NP has incorporated into the preposition. In fact, incorporation of P’s complement would be impossible, since the NP is dominated by a functional head, DeixisP. I will assume that orthography is not a reliable indicator of syntactic incorporation.

person. In her study on subject clitics in Northern Italian dialects, Poletto (2000) divides [person] into three sub-features, each of which is checked on separate functional heads: [number], [hearer], [speaker], in descending order. Capitalizing on this sub-division, I would like to argue that the features checked by pronominal *ci* and *vi* are [speaker] and [hearer], which are encoded on a functional head that I will label DeixisP. Accordingly, proximity is encoded as a [+speaker] feature, which is realized in the pronominal system as first person, while distance is encoded as [+hearer], realized as second person. Adverbial clitics are not dominated by a Deixis head, and hence are no longer differentiated in terms of "close to speaker" and "close to hearer": they are ambiguous between proximal *here* and distal *there*.

### 5. Pronominal *ci/vi* are intermediate between NP and DP

While Kayne (2000) gives us reason to believe that first and second pronouns, unlike determiner (third person) pronouns, are not DP's in Romance, we still must ask ourselves if there is empirical evidence for positing a structure intermediate between NP and DP, namely DeixisP. Cinque's (1994) hypothesis of partial N-Raising in Romance leads us to believe that such an intermediate structure does exist. Cinque argues that the base position of APs is the same in Romance and Germanic, namely, to the left of N. In Romance, but not in Germanic, the N moves to a functional head in-between N and D. The fact that thematic APs appear in-between N and its complement in Italian (and Romance in general), suggests that N moves to a functional head above ThematicP.

- (5)
- a. \*l'italiana invasione dell'Albania  
the-Italian invasion of Albania
  - b. l'invasione italiana dell'Albania  
the-invasion Italian of Albania
  - c. \*l'invasione dell'Albania italiana  
the-Italian of Albania Italian

Cinque argues that (5b) cannot reflect the base order of the elements within DP, as the thematic AP would "break up" the constituent formed by the head and its complement. Barring right adjunction, this order can only be derived via leftward movement of N to a

higher functional head. Furthermore, this head cannot be D, since the N that raises over its thematic AP can be separated from D by other material:

- (6) a. la sola grande invasione italiana dell'albania  
       the single big invasion Italian of Albania
- b. \*l'invasione sola grande italiana dell'Albania  
       the-invasion single big Italian of Albania

Cinque posits a series of functional projections within DP, including a *speaker-oriented phrase*, the specifier of which houses adverbs like *probabile* (probable) and *sicuro* (sure). This provides support for our claim that the features of [speaker] and [hearer] are indeed checked off on a functional head.<sup>6</sup>

Cinque's data lead him to conclude, however, that N raises obligatorily only to a the position of *subject-oriented* adverbs, which are lower in the tree than speaker-oriented adverbs. This means that N will not raise all the way up to DeixisP, contra our analysis. The fact that Cinque's discussion deals with full referential DPs while our analysis is concerned with pronominal clitics, however, provides the key to understanding this discrepancy. We can reasonably assume that referential DPs are not normally adorned with a [speaker] or [hearer] feature. There is no sense in which the noun *invasione* for example, is somehow underlyingly speaker or hearer-oriented, although it may come to have that meaning by entering into an agreement relation (overt or covert) with an adjective like *probabile*. Consequently, full referential noun phrases will not generally raise to DeixisP, as they lack matching features.

Exceptions might include cases in which full referential DPs are used as "proxies" for a first or second person pronoun, as in *vostro servo umilissimo* (your humble servant) and *Vostra Maestà* (your Majesty), standing in for first and second person pronouns, respectively. While in English, movement of the noun *servant* to DeixisP would occur at LF (the word order attests that movement does not occur overtly), we would predict that

---

<sup>6</sup> Cinque does not introduce a *Hearer-oriented* phrase in his structure. While it is difficult to come up with adjectives that are hearer-oriented, I nonetheless assume that DeixisP checks off both speaker and hearer features.

this movement is overt in Italian DP “proxies,” in line with pronouns. This appears to be the case for the noun in *vostro servo umilissimo* qua DP proxy. As shown in (7) and (9), the only order acceptable for a first person interpretation of the DP is one in which the noun precedes the (non-possessive) adjective. Interestingly enough, the judgments are reversed for the normal (third person) reading of the DP, as illustrated by (8) and (10).

- (7) a. *Vostro servo umilissimo è d’opinione che si deve bere solo ai pasti.*  
 b. ??*Vostro umilissimo servo è d’opinione che si deve bere solo ai pasti.*  
 ‘Your very humble servant is of the opinion that one should drink only at meals.’
- (8) a. ??*Ho salutato il vostro servo umilissimo nel corridoio.*  
 b. *Ho salutato il vostro umilissimo servo nel corridoio.*  
 ‘I greeted your very humble servant in the hallway.’
- (9) a. *Vostra maestà illustrissima vorrebbe parlare?*  
 b. ??*Vostra illustrissima maestà vorrebbe parlare?*  
 ‘Would your illustrious majesty care to speak?’
- (10) a. ??*Ho visto la vostra maestà illustrissima al palazzo reale.*  
 b. *Ho visto la vostra illustrissima maestà al palazzo reale.*  
 ‘I saw your illustrious majesty at the royal palace.’

The facts seem to indicate that the noun raises further up when the DP stands in for a first/second pronoun than when it has its normal third person reading. Assuming that the adjectives *umilissimo* and *illustrissima* are subject-oriented, it follows that N in DP proxy cases raises to the Deixis head, the equivalent of Cinque’s Speaker-oriented head.<sup>7</sup>

While it is the exception for a DP to possess a [speaker] or [hearer] feature, it is a matter of course for pronouns. Pronouns are by nature specified for such features, which translate into *person*. It follows that pronouns must always raise to the Deixis head to check their features.

---

<sup>7</sup> One may argue that the word order differences illustrated above are a product of the adjectives sitting in two different positions: in the DP qua proxy reading, *umilissimo* and *illustrissima* might be attributive adjectives, which are lower in the tree than subject-oriented adverbs. Only in the third person reading, then, would *umilissimo* and *illustrissima* be subject-oriented adverbs. As Cinque notes, it is often difficult to differentiate between the two readings. Note, however, that if the above scenario were correct, we would expect *umilissimo* and *illustrissima* to be felicitous post-nominally in the DP as third person reading as well, allowing an alternative (attributive) interpretation. This is not the case. For the time being, I will assume that *umilissimo* and *illustrissima* are subject-oriented adverbs in all of the examples above.

In addition to providing support for the existence of a functional head on which the features [speaker] and [hearer] are checked, Cinque's argument for "partial" N movement lends support, albeit indirectly, to the claim that nominals can be bigger than an NP yet smaller than a DP. If we assume that "empty" functional structure is simply absent altogether<sup>8</sup>, pronominal *ci* and *vi* are no more than DeixisPs, crucially lacking a determiner position. Moreover, if we draw a parallel between the internal structural organization of the noun phrase and that of clauses, following Szabolcsi (1983), we may discover additional evidence that pronominal *ci* and *vi* can be as small as DeixisPs. On such an analogy, the root clausal node C will correspond to D. We might assimilate AspP, which is perhaps present only with accomplishments, to NumP, which is reserved for count nouns serving to delimit the event denoted by the verb. Capitalizing on the connection between the temporal and spatial adverbs, between *here* and *now*, and *there* and *then*, we might assimilate the Deixis head on nominals to Tense in the clausal domain. If this parallel can be maintained, we derive that DeixisP is independently licensed: we know that T can exist independently of C in root clauses, hence by analogy, DeixisP can be licensed without the presence of a D node.

## 6. The Disappearance of the Deixis head in adverbial *ci* and *vi* is due to null P

Once we have established that the semantics of proximity/distality is brought in by a functional head, we can attribute the loss of the proximal/distal distinction between adverbial *ci* and *vi* to the disappearance of the Deixis head on these clitics. The interesting question then becomes what causes the disappearance of the Deixis head in the adverbial clitics. I would like to suggest that the disappearance of the Deixis head in adverbial *ci/vi* is structurally forced by the syntactic environment in which these clitics find themselves. More specifically, it is the presence of a null P in need of licensing which forces the disappearance of functional structure on adverbial *ci/vi*.

As argued above, adverbial *ci* and *vi* are not PPs, but rather nominal complements to a null locative preposition. This null preposition must be licensed. The way in which null

---

<sup>8</sup> Cinque does not make this assumption.

P can be licensed depends on what kind of element P is, namely, whether it is an affix or simply a null head. If we consider P to be affixal, then it can be licensed in one of two ways: either by adjoining to a higher head, or by having something adjoin to it. If P is not affixal, then it will presumably be subject to the same restrictions as other base-generated empty categories, of which *pro* is the paradigmatic case: it must be both formally licensed and identified, in the sense of Rizzi (1986). On analogy to *pro*, a null head is formally licensed if it is governed by Infl or V, and it is identified by checking off matching features in a local relation with these heads. Below, I will go through the details of licensing null P under each approach. While both accounts can be implemented in the present framework, I determine the ‘P as affix’ approach to be more theoretically advantageous: not only is it free of the antiquated theoretical concept of government, it provides a key to understanding one of the major explananda of this paper: the lack of a proximal/distal distinction in adverbial *ci* and *vi*.

## 7. Licensing Null P (I): On analogy to *pro*

### 7.1 Pronominal *Ci/vi*

As suggested by Den Dikken (2002), and Haider (1994), we may extend Rizzi’s (1986) theory of *pro*-licensing to apply to all base-generated empty categories: an empty category must be both formally licensed and identified.<sup>9</sup> This means that a null head is formally licensed if it is governed by Infl or V, and it is identified by entering into a local agreement relation with these heads. Let us first consider the case of null P which selects pronominal *ci* and *vi* under this approach. I will be mainly concerned with dative clitic pronouns here, since there is no reason to believe that accusative *ci* are *vi* selected by a null preposition. I will simply assume that accusative *ci/vi* are base-generated as DeixisPs in the complement of a verb, hence the issue of null P licensing will not arise.

---

<sup>9</sup> Emonds’ (1985) ICP represents yet another theory for licensing null heads. Unfortunately, Emonds’ ICP (Invisible Category Principle) will not get null P licensed in this context, since null P is crucially not associated with “overt, productive morphology” in its complement. In order to incorporate the ICP, we would have to posit a disjunctive account of null-head licensing: a null head is licensed iff (i) it can be formally licensed and identified in the sense of Rizzi (1986), OR (ii) if it satisfies the ICP.

Dative *ci* and *vi*, on the other hand, are introduced by a null P, as argued above. To see how the null P introducing dative *ci* and *vi* in triadic verb constructions is licensed, let us consider the phenomenon of dative shift as proposed by Den Dikken (1995a and subsequent works). The basic intuition behind this approach is that “triadic” verbs like *give* take a small clause complement, with the THEME NP appearing as the clause subject and the GOAL PP as the small clause predicate. When the dative prepositional head is empty in the predicate, the GOAL undergoes dative shift, which Den Dikken argues involves two steps: (i) raising of the null P to the functional head of the small clause and (ii) subsequent raising of the beheaded PP to the specifier position of a functional projection dominating the SC.<sup>10</sup> Note that the P $\emptyset$  involved in dative constructions is not formally licensed in its base position: in (11), P $\emptyset$  is not governed by V or T. I would like to suggest that null P moves into a position from where it can be formally licensed. As a result of movement to the small clause head (the first step in dative shift), P $\emptyset$  finds itself as part of the complex head [X+P] whose maximal projection is governed by the verb (or the [*v*+ V] complex), as illustrated by (12).

(11) *v* [<sub>VP</sub> ‘give’ (. . .) [<sub>XP</sub> Theme X [<sub>PP</sub> P $\emptyset$  GOAL]]]

(12) *v* [<sub>VP</sub> ‘give’ (. . .) [<sub>XP</sub> Theme P $\emptyset$ +X [<sub>PP</sub> t<sub>P $\emptyset$</sub>  GOAL]]]

In other words, in (12), the verb selects the projection of the small clause head, which includes P after movement of P $\rightarrow$ X. Hence, we have a scenario in which the licensing of null P is essentially parasitic on the licensing of null head of the small clause, X.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> In Romance, this derivation would involve an extra step when the possessum is a dative pronominal clitic: cliticization of the GOAL argument to Tense. Alternatively, the clitic might move as a head from the very beginning, without first undergoing phrasal movement. I will not make a decision between these two options in this paper.

<sup>11</sup> Den Dikken (1995) argues that null P is ultimately licensed by incorporating [P+X] into V. While incorporation into V is not a necessary step on the present analysis, it is not incompatible with it. P would raise to X in the overt syntax, followed by incorporation of [P+X] into V at LF, since Italian lacks overt incorporation. Den Dikken (2000) considers the small clause head a *relator*, which relates a subject to its predicate. In this sense X is similar to *little v*, a semi-lexical head (Chomsky, 1995). X would also count as a lexical head in Li’s (1990) system (see also section 8.1, below): while not a theta-role assigner or recipient, the relator head plays a crucial role in the establishment of a predicational relationship between its complement and its specifier. Since X is clearly theta-related, incorporation of P into V through X should be perfectly licit.

## 7.2 Adverbial *ci/vi*

We now must consider how the null P that selects adverbial *ci/vi* is licensed in a Rizgian framework. Den Dikken (2002) argues that the null P preceding *there* is licensed in the same way that *pro* is licensed, by raising to T. According to Den Dikken, it is this licensing requirement on null P that serves as the trigger for predicate inversion: “it is exactly the nullness of the predicate that is responsible for its raising: an overt, fully intact locative PP will not raise to SpecTP” (2000: 75). Like the null P selecting *there*, the null P selecting *ci/vi* is also licensed by raising to T.

## 8. Licensing Null P (II): P as an affix

While the government-based account of null-head licensing is attractive in that it capitalizes on the existing theory for *pro*-licensing, it is sub-optimal in that it relies on the notion of government, an anachronism in the otherwise strictly minimalist framework adopted in this paper. An alternative to the above account of null head licensing is one in which null P is considered an affix. In this case, the affixality of P could be satisfied in one of two ways: either incorporating some element, or by incorporating into a higher head. While it is difficult to decide between the two approaches based on empirical data, the ‘affixal P’ approach is theoretically advantageous in that it sheds light on the division between pronominal and adverbial *ci/vi* with regards to the proximal/distal distinction.

### 8.1 Pronominal *ci/vi*

On the ‘affixal P’ approach, the null P selecting pronominal (dative) *c/vi* can again be licensed by raising to the small clause head (X), the first step in dative shift. While in a Rizgian approach to null head licensing dative shift licenses null P because  $P \rightarrow X$  renders P governable by the verb, on the affixal approach,  $P \rightarrow X$  simply satisfies the affixality of null P. Recall that affixal P can in principle also be licensed by having something incorporate into it. This option is barred for pronominal *ci* and *vi*, however, because these clitics are dominated by functional structure (there will minimally be a DeixisP present, which brings in the proximal/distal distinction). As argued by Li (1990),

incorporation from a lexical head to a lexical head via intermediate functional heads results in improper movement, hence only bare NPs can incorporate.

Li's proposal is based on the Binding Theory and crucially relies on a revised definition of "theta-position": theta-positions (T-positions) are not only those positions to which a theta role can be assigned, but also those positions *from which* a theta-role can be assigned. In his framework, then, verbal, prepositional, and nominal heads are considered T-positions, while functional heads are T-bar positions. If incorporation proceeds from a T-position (the noun) to a T-position (the verb) via the intermediate T-bar positions of functional heads (determiner or Case assigning heads), the result will be improper movement. Since incorporation cannot proceed through functional heads, and by the HMC, cannot skip these heads, it follows that only bare NPs can undergo incorporation. Li's proposal accounts for the fact that determiners and case-markers are systematically absent in verb-noun incorporation: they are functional heads. Following Li, I suggest that the inability of pronominal *ci* and *vi* to incorporate into P is due to the fact that these nominals are dominated by functional structure: DeixisP.

## 8.2 Adverbial *ci/vi*

The licensing situation for the null P selecting adverbial *ci/vi* is the reverse of that described above for the pronominal clitics, due to the fact that we are dealing with a different type of preposition, as well as a different type of nominal complement. I submit that, unlike null dative P, null locative P has a rich extended projection, and consequently cannot satisfy its affixality by incorporating into a higher head (improper movement).

Koopman (1997) argues for series of functional projections dominating locative prepositions in Germanic, based on the distribution of so-called r-pronouns (*er op* 'thereon', *daar op* 'thereon', *waar op* 'whereon', *nergens op* 'nowhere on') in Dutch.

- (13) omdat ik ze boven in de la gelegd heb.  
 because I them up in the drawer put have  
 'because I have put them up in the drawer.'
- (14) omdat ik ze er boven (\*er) in heb gelegd.  
 because I them there up there in have put  
 'because I have put them up in there.'

The fact that the r-pronoun *er* cannot follow *boven* in (14) leads Koopman to conclude that it must have raised to a specifier position outside the immediate projection of lexical P. Koopman assumes that r-pronouns agree with a locative head called PlaceP, and move to the specifier of this head. In addition, Koopman posits two levels of projection dominating PlaceP, which she establishes on the basis of the distribution of r-pronouns and certain bare adverbial modifiers.

- (15) a. vlak bij het huis  
close near the house
- b. (er) vlak (er) bij  
there close there near
- (16) a. pal achter het huis  
right behind the house
- b. (er) pal (er) achter  
there right there behind

The fact that r-pronouns can either precede or follow bare adverbs (as shown in the (b) examples) with no difference in meaning, indicates that there must be two specifier positions available to r-pronouns. One of these specifier positions is PlaceP, as mentioned above; Koopman identifies the other as the specifier of CP(place), a projection which, on analogy to D in the nominal domain, turns a PP into an “independently licensed constituent.” Between PlaceP and CP(place), Koopman posits a DegP(place), which houses XP modifiers like *twee meter* (two meters), and between PP and PlaceP, she posits an AgrP. The fully articulated structure for the extended projection of the locative preposition in Germanic is sketched below:

- (17) [<sub>CP(place)</sub> C [<sub>FP</sub> *er* F [<sub>DegP(place)</sub> *2 meters* Deg(place) [<sub>PlaceP</sub> *er* Place  
[<sub>AgrP</sub> *pronouns* Agr [<sub>PP</sub> P DP]]]]]]]]

I will assume that Italian locative PPs, like their Germanic counterparts, are dominated by a rich functional structure.<sup>12</sup> As a consequence, null locative P will not be able to

<sup>12</sup> I am making a crucial assumption here that Dative P's will project functional structure only when overt; when they are null, they are bare PP's. Null Dative P, therefore, will be able to incorporate into X (a semi-lexical head) in order to be licensed, as previously outlined.

incorporate into a higher head in order to be licensed: incorporation of a lexical element via a functional head results in improper movement. The only means by which affixal P can satisfy its affixality, therefore, is by incorporating something into it, namely *ci/vi*. Since null locative P must be able to incorporate *ci* and *vi* in order to satisfy its affixality, it follows that adverbial *ci* and *vi* must be bare NPs. If adverbial *ci/vi* are DeixisPs like their pronominal counterparts, the null P selecting them will fail to be licensed and the derivation will crash. Hence, the nullness of the locative P forces *ci/vi* to be bare NPs, and hence indistinguishable with respect to proximality and distality.

## 9. The Diachronic Picture

If our hypothesis has been correct thus far, we might expect the disappearance of functional structure on adverbial *ci* and *vi* to reflect a change in the P that selects them, perhaps from an overt locative preposition to a null one in need of licensing. Prima facie, this hypothesis seems unsustainable: to my knowledge, at no point in the history of Italian did phrases like *\*vado a ci* (go-1SG. to there) or *\*ci vado a* (go-1SG. go to) exist. Recall, however, that we have previously suggested that Latin *hic* and *ibi* are unambiguously locative due to the fact that the locative P is manifested by an overt morpheme. It is not unreasonable to assume that once this overt morpheme drops out, the remaining empty preposition can in principle become either a locative or dative. Null dative pronouns lack an extended projection, and hence can be licensed by incorporating into the verb (via the small clause head). This means that pronominal *ci/vi* are free to retain their Deixis head. Null locative Ps, on the other hand, are dominated by several functional heads, hence can only be licensed by incorporating a bare NP complement. This difference in the extended projection of null locative and dative P, therefore, leads to the bifurcation with respect to the proximal/distal distinction that exists in modern Italian: the distinction is necessarily lost in locative *ci/vi* while it is preserved in pronominal *ci/vi*. While the diachronic picture sketched in this paper nicely depicts the transition from the Latin adverbs to their clitic counterparts in Italian, it does not address the lingering question of why adverbial *ci* and *vi* were *at one time* specified for proximality and

distality. Resolving this non-trivial matter will require a careful analysis of the diachrony of Italian syntax, and hence will be reserved for future research.

## 10. Summary and Conclusion

In this paper I have aimed to give a unified account of the clitics *ci* and *vi*. This proposal is grounded in the idea that the coexistence of pronominal and adverbial *ci/vi* is not an accident of the lexicon, but a product of diachronic change. Both adverbial and pronominal *ci* derive from Latin *hic* (here), while both forms of *vi* come from Latin *ibi* (there). Pronominal and adverbial *ci/vi* are underlyingly nominals in the complement of a null preposition, and like their Latin roots, were both originally equipped with a [speaker] or [hearer] feature that was checked off on a designated functional head. This feature was lost on the adverbial clitics, but remained intact on the pronominal clitics in the form of *person*. I suggest that the bifurcation of *ci/vi* into locative and pronominal is a product of structural change in the preposition: when the overt prepositional morpheme of Latin *ibi* and *hic* dropped out, the remaining null P was free to become either locative or dative. The fact that these null prepositions have different extended projections is directly correlated to the semantics of their complements. Since locative P has a rather large extended projection (as opposed to dative P), it only has one option for licensing its emptiness: incorporating *ci/vi*. Adverbial *ci/vi* must therefore be devoid of functional structure, hence neutral with regards to proximity/distality. Null dative P projects a bare PP and thus can incorporate into a higher head in order to be licensed: its complement is therefore free to retain its functional structure, and hence, its features [+speaker/hearer]. While the diachronic contingent of this proposal is somewhat speculative and needs to be evaluated in light of actual data, it nonetheless brings to the foreground some interesting avenues of research, namely, the synchronic and diachronic syntax of null prepositions in Italian and Romance in general.

## References

- Benveniste, E. (1966). *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *Derivation by Phase*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cinque, G. (1994). On the Evidence for Partial N-Movement in the Romance DP. In *Paths Towards Universal Grammar: Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*. Georgetown University Press: Washington D.C.
- Cortelazzo, M, & Zolli, P. eds. (1999). *Il Nuovo Etimologico*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- Cardinaletti, A. & Starke, M. (1999). ‘The Typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns,’ in *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Henk van Riemsdijk, ed. Mouton de Gruyter, New York.
- Den Dikken, M. (1995a). *Particles: On the syntax of verb-particle, triadic and causative constructions*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Den Dikken, M. (2002) Copulas (book manuscript in progress).
- Den Dikken, M. (2003). Why Particles Won’t Part (manuscript).
- Emonds, J. (1985). *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Haider, Hubert. Empty Functional Head Projections. In *Paths Towards Universal Grammar: Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*. Georgetown University Press: Washington D.C.
- Kayne, R. (1984). *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kayne, R. (2000). Person Morphemes and Reflexives in Italian, French, and Related Languages. In *Parameters and Universals*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Koopman, H. 1997. Prepositions, Postpositions, Circumpositions and Particles: The Structure of Dutch PPs. Ms. UCLA.
- Larson, R. (1985). Bare-NP Adverbs. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 16. 595-621.
- Li, Y. (1994). X<sup>0</sup>-Binding and Verb Incorporation. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 3. 399-426.
- Moro, A. (1997). *The raising of predicates: Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Poletto, C. (2000). *The Higher Functional Field: evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Riemsdijk, Henk van. (1978). *A Case Study in Syntactic Markedness*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, L. (1986a). “Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*.” *Linguistic Inquiry*, 17-501-557.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1983). “The Possessor that Ran Away from Home.” *The Linguistic Review* 3. 89-102.