In Jill Gilkerson, Misha Becker and Nina Hyams (eds.), *Language Development and Breakdown*, pp. 40-55. UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics 5. Los Angeles, CA: Department of Linguistics, UCLA, 2000.

IS ESSERE NOT TO BE? EVIDENCE FROM ACQUISITION¹

IVANO CAPONIGRO capo@humnet.ucla.edu

According to Becker (1998a,b; 1999), children acquiring English virtually never omit have, while their production rate of be is not uniform across constructions. It is high in existential/deictic and demonstrative constructions, low in locatives and varies in progressives and predicatives across the children. I studied the production of essere 'be' and avere 'have' in 4 young Italian-speaking children, and I found that they either omit neither of the two verbs or their omission rate is quite low and does not vary across constructions. I suggest that these differences can be accounted for by refining Becker's (1998a,b) hypothesis that the presence of additional functional material in Infl drives overtness even in the early stages of language production. Becker does not seem to consider subject agreement features (person and number) as functional material that can drive overtness. I suggest, instead, that at least subject person agreement features need to be overtly realized (Overt Subject Person Agreement Requirement, OSPAR). English and Italian satisfy this requirement in two different ways. English, a non-pro drop language, satisfies OSPAR by means of subjects; Italian, a pro-drop language, by means of a rich verbal morphology. Thus, children acquiring English can drop be without violating OSPAR, while children acquiring Italian cannot drop essere unless the subject is overtly realized.

1. THE HYPOTHESIS

Becker (1998a,b; 1999) studies the production of *have* and *be* constructions in three 2-year-old children acquiring English monolingually. She finds that while *have* is virtually never absent in the early stages of language production (avg. 96-98% overt *have*), the production rate of *be* is not uniform across constructions. It is high in existential/deictic constructions (avg. 80% overt *be*), low in locatives (avg. 28% overt *be*) and varies in progressives and predicatives across the children.

She accounts for the difference between the overtness of *have* and *be* in locatives on one hand and existential/deictic and demonstrative constructions on the other assuming the so called Predicative Inversion analysis (Hoekstra & Mulder (1990), Den Dikken (1995), Moro (1997)). According to this approach, possessive *have* and existential *be*

¹ I would like to thank Misha Becker, Nina Hyams, Carson Schütze and Harold Torrence for their valuable help. I alone am responsible for any omissions or mistakes.

are derivationally analogous, both involving the raising of a predicate of a small clause to subject position [(cf. (1)-(2))], in contrast to locatives, which do not involve such raising. In the case of locatives, it is the subject of the small clause that raises to the subject position of the matrix clause (cf. (3)).

(1) Existential be: There is a book in the box.



(2) Possessive have: John has a book.



(3) Locative *be A book is in the box*



If the Predicate Inversion analysis is correct, *be* in locatives is just the spell-out of the head Infl, while *be* in existential and *have* in possessive are the spell-outs of one (I+Agr) or two (I+Agr+P) heads that have been incorporated into $Infl^2$.

Becker assumes that the presence of additional functional material in Infl drives overtness even in the early stages of language production and accounts for the asymmetry in the production of locatives, existentials, and possessives.

I tried to find out if the asymmetry above is attested in the acquisition of a language other than English. In particular, I looked at the production of *essere* 'be' and *avere* 'have' for four 2-year-old children acquiring Italian monolingually (all data taken from corpora on the CHILDES database): Camilla (Antelmi corpus³) Diana, Rosa and Rafaello (all from Calambrone corpus, Cipriani *et al.* (1989)). Below is a table of the files that were used for each child.

Diana	Camilla	Rosa	Rafaello
01 (1;8.5)	17 (2;2.6)	16 (2;10.14)	03 (1;10.20)
	20 (2;4.6)	18 (2;11.30)	04 (1;11.25)
			05 (2;00.10)
			06 (2.00.28)
			07 (2;1.15)
			08 (2;3.24)
			09 (2;4.29)
			10 (2;5.13)
			11 (2;6.13)
			17 (2;11.20)

Table 1. CHILDES files examined for each child: file# (age of child)

 $^{^2}$ Cf. also Kayne (1993) for arguments that the verb *have* is the spell-out of a *be*+P complex.

³ No reference for Antelmi corpus in given on the CHILDES database.

2. THE DATA

For each child, I looked at predicative, possessive, existential, locative and auxiliary⁴ *essere* 'be' and possessive and auxiliary *avere* 'have'. The following are some examples of these constructions:

predicative <i>essere</i> (ES. pred.)	Papá è cattivo.
	dad is bad
possessive essere (ES. poss.)	Il libro è della mamma.
	the book is of mom
existential essere (ES. exist.)	C' è un uomo alla porta.
	there is a man at-the door
locative essere (ES. loc.)	Mamma è in cucina.
	mom is in the kitchen
auxiliary essere (ES. aux.)	Papá è arrivato.
• · · · ·	dad is arrived
	'Dad arrived.'
possessive avere (AV. poss.)	Mamma ha un libro.
	mom has a book
auxiliary <i>avere</i> (AV. aux.)	Papá ha dormito.
•	dad has slept

I also looked at idiomatic expressions with *avere* (AV. idiom), the occurrences of auxiliary *stare* (the auxiliary of the progressive forms in Italian) and *ecco* constructions corresponding to deictic expressions with *be* in English. The following are some examples of these constructions:

idiomatic avere (AV. idiom.)	Mamma ha fame
	mom has hunger
	'Mom is hungry'
auxiliary stare (STAR)	Luca sta dormendo
	Luca is sleeping
ecco constructions (ECCO)	Ecco Luca
	here is Luca

For each construction, I counted how many times it occurs with or without the verb in each file and how many times the children omit it. As far as omission is concerned, I counted only those cases in which omission is completely impossible in adult speech.

⁴ In Italian, *essere* occurs as an auxiliary with unaccusative verbs (*è andata* '(she) has gone') and in passive constructions (*è stato arrestato*, '(he) has been arrested).

2.1. Diana

In Table 2 and all the tables below, the number in each cell means the number of times a certain construction occurs with or without the verb (Total N). When the child omits the verb, the number of omissions is expressed by a second number (Omission N) that precedes Total N and is separated from it by a slash. If verbs are omitted, the omission rate is expressed by percentage.

Table 2. DIANA

Age	ES.	ES.	ES.	ES.	ES.	AV.	AV	AV.	STARE	ECCO
	pred.	poss.	exist.	loc.	aux.	poss.	aux.	idiom	aux	
1;8.5	4	2	2	7	3/10		2/2		2/2	
					30%		100%		100%	

For instance, the first cell of Table 2 should be read in the following way (I repeated part of Table 2 in (4) below and I shadowed the relevant cell):

(4)	_	
	Age	ES.
		pred.
	1;8.5	4

The shadowed cell in (4) means that, in her File 1 when she is 1;8 old, Diana produces 4 contexts in which predicative *essere* is required and she never omits it. The fifth cell of Table 2, instead, should be read in the following way (I repeated part of Table 2 in (5) below and I shadowed the relevant cell):

(5)		
	Age	ES.
		aux.
	1;8.5	3/10
		30%

The shadowed cell in (5) means that, in her File 1 when she is 1;8.5 old, Diana produces 10 contexts in which the auxiliary *essere* is required and she omits it 3 times. Thus, the omission rate is 30%.

As can been seen in Table 2, Diana never omits *essere* when it is a main verb, even in the first file we have, when she is less than

2 years old. In the following files her performance is even better. For this reason, I have reported only the results of the analysis of her File 1.

Interestingly, Diana only omits auxiliary verbs. She omits the auxiliary *essere* 30% of the time, while she never omits the auxiliaries *avere* and *stare* the few times those constructions occur.

2.2. Camilla

The situation with Camilla is similar to the one with Diana. She omits nothing but the auxiliary *essere* once. Unfortunately, CHILDES does not contain any file with Camilla's language production earlier than 2;2.6. For this reason, I have reported only the results of the analysis of the first two Camilla files CHILDES contains. Nevertheless, Camilla's files are still relevant for a comparison with Becker's since in these files Camilla is still in the same age range as the children Becker looked at.

Table 3. CAMILLA

Age	ES.	ES.	ES.	ES.	ES.	AV.	AV	AV.	STARE	ECCO
	pred.	poss.	exist.	loc.	aux.	poss.	aux.	idiom.	aux.	
2;2.6	3	1		4	1/6	1	3			
2;4.6	9	1	5	1	1	10	2	1 ⁵		
Total	12	2	5	5	1/7	11	5	1		
					14%					

⁵ Ho paura di 'I am afraid of' (lit. 'I have fear of').

2.3. Rosa

Rosa's average linguistic development is much slower than the one of the children we have looked at so far. When she is 2;10, she still rarely produces strings of more than two or three words. For this reason, the files of her language production at earlier stages are not very telling. Nevertheless, even if she does not say a lot, she has low omission rates when she is 2;10 and 2;11.

Table 4. ROSA

ES. pred.	ES. poss.	ES. exist.	ES. loc.	ES. aux.	AV. poss.	AV aux.	AV. idiom.	STARE aux.	ECCO
10	1	9	3	4	4	1/1	1 ⁶		
9 ⁷ /38	2	7	5	2/5	2	1/7			
9/48	3	16	8	2/9	6	2/8	1		
	ES. pred. 10 9 ⁷ /38	ES. ES. poss. 10 1 97/38 2 9/48 3	ES. ES. ES. pred. poss. exist. 10 1 9 9 ⁷ /38 2 7 9/48 3 16	ES. ES. ES. ES. Icc. 10 1 9 3 3 9 ⁷ /38 2 7 5 9/48 3 16 8	ES. ES. ES. ES. ES. ES. pred. poss. exist. loc. aux. 10 1 9 3 4 9 ⁷ /38 2 7 5 2/5 9/48 3 16 8 2/9	ES. ES. ES. ES. ES. AV. pred. poss. exist. loc. aux. poss. 10 1 9 3 4 4 9 ⁷ /38 2 7 5 2/5 2 9/48 3 16 8 2/9 6	ES. ES. ES. ES. ES. Ioc. aux. AV. AV. 10 1 9 3 4 4 1/1 9 ⁷ /38 2 7 5 2/5 2 1/7 9/48 3 16 8 2/9 6 2/8	ES. ES. ES. ES. ES. AV. AV. AV. poss. exist. loc. aux. poss. aux. idiom. 10 1 9 3 4 4 1/1 1 ⁶ 9 ⁷ /38 2 7 5 2/5 2 1/7 9/48 3 16 8 2/9 6 2/8 1	ES. ES. ES. ES. Ico. AV. AV. AV. AV. STARE aux. 10 1 9 3 4 4 1/1 1 ⁶ 9 ⁷ /38 2 7 5 2/5 2 1/7 1/7 9/48 3 16 8 2/9 6 2/8 1

2.4. Rafaello

Rafaello's files are the most interesting from the point of view of the omission of the copula. Rafaello's language development is at a stage between that of Diana and Rosa. He omits *essere* and *avere* in all the constructions with an omission rate that ranges between 14% for existential *essere* and 45% for possessive *essere*. For this reason, I concentrated my attention on Rafaello's files.

I looked at 10 of Rafaello's files from the age of 1;10 to 2;11. In Table 5, I grouped the results of the first 9 files together in the 'Partial Total' row since they are within the age range that is the most relevant for a comparison with Becker's results. I added a tenth file (File 17) in which Rafaello is much older (age: 2;11) to show that at that age Rafaello's omission rate is almost zero.

⁶ The expression with idiomatic *avere* that Rosa produces is: *Ha fame* 'he/she is hungry' (lit. 'has hunger').

⁷ Rosa's omissions of predicative *essere* always occur in the following construction with the demonstrative *questo/a* 'thisMASC/FEM': *Questo/a* \emptyset DP/AP (e.g. *Quetta* \emptyset *un'atta seggiola* 'This \emptyset another chair')

Table	5.	RAFAELLO	Œ
	-		<u>(-</u>)

Age	ES. pred	ES.	ES. exist	ES. loc	ES. aux	AV.	AV	AV. idiom	STARE	ECCO
	preu.	P000.	enise.	100.	uux.	P000.	uun.	iuroni.	uux.	
1;10.20	2	4/5				1/1				1
1;11.25	4/9	3/6	2/3			1				1
2;00.10	3/4	1/3	2/3				1/2			
2;0.28	11		1	1	1/2		1			1
2;1.15		1	2				3/4			
2;3.24		1	2	1/1	2		2/2			2
2;4.29	5/9				1/2		1			1
2;5.13	4	3	2	1	2/3		1/7			1
2;6.13	1/15	1/1	7	1/4	2	1	2/7		2	
Partial	13/54	9/20	4/20	2/7	4/11	1/3	9/24		2	7
Total	24%	45%	20%	28%	36%	33%	37%			
2;11.20	2/18		9	2	2	3	3/8	1		1
Total	15/72 20%	9/20 45%	4/29 14%	2/9 22%	4/13 30%	1/6 16%	12/32 37%	1	2	8

In order to check if Rafaello's omissions may depend on some finer grained distinction, I looked at Rafaello's files more deeply, focusing on more details (full omissions *vs.* phonologically indistinct forms, stage level predicates *vs.* individual level predicates, etc.). The results do not seem to show any interesting pattern, and are summarized in Table 6 in the Appendix.

3. ANALYSIS

3.1. Differences between Italian-speaking children and English speaking children

The data above show two main differences between children acquiring Italian and children acquiring English as far as the omission of *essere/be* and *avere/have* is concerned. First, children acquiring Italian either do not omit *essere* and *avere* or their omission rates are much lower than the ones for children acquiring English. Second, children acquiring Italian do not show any relevant variation in the omission rates of *essere* and *avere* according to constructions (predicative, locative, etc.).

Diana, Camilla and Rosa never omit possessive, existential and locative *essere*. Only Rosa omits 9 predicative *essere* out of 38 (18%). But all her omissions occur in just one file and always in the context *Demonstrative* + \emptyset + DP/AP (ex. *Quetta* \emptyset *un'atta seggiola* 'This (is) another chair'; *Quetto* \emptyset *rosa* 'This (is) pink') and she never omits predicative *essere* in any other context (ex. È rosso '(It) is red', *la mamma sono io* 'I am mommy'). Rafaello omits 20-28% of predicative, existential and locative *essere*. The omission rates are lower if we take into account File 17, when he is almost 3 years old (14-22%).

Rafaello omits possessive *essere* 9 times out of 20 (45%). In two of those cases, he omits the verb in the context *Demonstrative* + \emptyset + POSSESSIVE (ex. *Quetto* \emptyset *mio* 'This (is) mine'). In three cases, he omits the verb just before the possessive as in \emptyset *mio* 'mine' instead of \hat{e} *mio* '(it) is mine'. Since no other words precede or follow the possessive, it is not clear if we are dealing with a true sentence with two words, one of which is omitted, or just a one-word expression. Like English, bare possessives can be used in Italian, but in completely different contexts from the ones in which Rafaello uses them. If we do not take these three cases into account, the omission rate of predicative *essere* falls to 30%, very close to the omission rates of all the other contexts in which copula occurs.

None of the children but Rafaello omit possessive *avere*. Rafaello omits it once out of three occurrences. All four children but Camilla omit auxiliaries *essere* and *avere*, but there is a large inter-child variation in the omission rates, which range from 22% to $100\%^8$.

⁸ Diana is the child that omits auxiliary *avere* 100% of the time. But she produces only 2 contexts where auxiliary *avere* is required (see Table 2).

The children acquiring English that Becker studied behave quite differently. As already mentioned, *have* is virtually never absent in their early stages of language production (avg. 96-98% overt *have*), whereas the production rate of *be* is not uniform across constructions. It is high in existential/deictic and demonstrative constructions (avg. 80% overt *be*), low in locatives (avg. 28% overt *be*) and varies in progressives and predicatives across the children.

3.2. A tentative explanation

How can these differences be accounted for? A first possible answer is a methodological one and concerns the data. The files I looked at are much smaller than Becker's and they contain many fewer occurrences of the relevant constructions. For instance, the four Nina files Becker studied contain 160 occurrences of demonstrative and predicative be^9 and 48 occurrences of existential/deictic *be* against 54 occurrences of predicative/demonstrative *essere* and 27 occurrences of existential *essere*/deictic *ecco* in Rafaello's 9 files¹⁰. When the numbers are small, omission rates are not as telling as when the numbers are bigger. Nevertheless, it would be quite surprising if the general pattern would change radically if new larger files were considered.

A second option is to take the results above as reliable and conclude that Becker's proposal is not correct since it does not apply to children acquiring Italian.

A third more interesting option is to take both the results above and Becker's proposal as reliable and try to account for the differences between children acquiring Italian and children acquiring English by means of differences in how the agreement system works in these two languages and how it is acquired by children.

Becker's idea is that the presence of additional functional material in Infl drives overtness even in the early stages of language production. She assumes that *be* in locatives is just the spell-out of the head Infl, while *be* in existential and *have* in possessive are the spell-outs of one (I+Agr) or two (I+Agr+P) heads that have been incorporated into Infl.

If we accept Becker's assumptions, we have to conclude that in Italian Infl by itself is enough to drive overtness even in the early stages of language production. The data from children acquiring Italian shows no relevant differences between the omission rates of locatives on the

⁹ Becker (1998a,b) keeps predicatives and demonstratives separate, while I grouped them together as 'predicatives'.

¹⁰ I am not taking into account File 10 when Rafaello is already 3 years old.

one hand, and existentials and possessives on the other. The omission rates are quite low in all the constructions and are comparable with the ones that Becker found for existentials and possessives in children acquiring English. It is true that Rafaello omits a third of possessive *avere*, while the children Becker studied almost never omit possessive *have*. But the datum for Rafaello is not very telling since it results from one omission out of only three occurrences of the possessive construction.

What is the difference between Infl in Italian and English that accounts for the different behavior of children acquiring these languages? There are at least two important typological differences between the two languages that may be relevant: Italian is a pro-drop language, English is not; Italian has a rich verbal morphology, English does not.

It follows that English always overtly realizes subject agreement features (person and number) by means of the obligatory subject, while the verbal morphology only distinguishes between the 3rd person singular and all the others¹¹. On the other hand, Italian always realizes subject agreement features by means of the verbal morphology, while subject agreement features show up on the subject only when the subject is a non-pronominal DP.

Hoekstra and Hyams (1995) show that the crosslinguistic differences observed in the occurrences of RIs can be accounted for by the hypothesis that number features (and only number features) can remain unspecified in the early grammar. Thus, there seems to be independent evidence in favor of the hypothesis that at least subject person agreement features must be realized even in the early stages of language acquisition (Overt Subject Person Agreement Requirement, OSPAR)¹².

If OSPAR is assumed, two main options are available: OSPAR is satisfied by either an overt subject or a verbal form with overt subject person morphology. Children acquiring English "learn" that English is not a pro-drop language and subjects must always be overtly realized. It follows for free that, even if they drop the copula in locative constructions they never violate either OSPAR or Becker's requirements that head incorporation in Infl must be overtly realized.

1st person singular. Simple past, future and modals lack any person features.

 $^{^{11}}$ The verb be is an exception since it also has a morphologically distinct form for

¹² As Nina Hyams [p.c.] pointed out to me, OSPAR is reminiscent of more general hypotheses according to which either the head or the specifier of a projection must be overtly realized (e.g. Speas (1994)).

On the other hand, Italian children "learn" that Italian is a pro-drop language and pronominal subjects never occur unless they are focused. They also "learn" that the rich verbal morphology of Italian always overtly realizes subject person agreement features. Thus, overt verbal forms are the only sufficient condition that is always available in Italian in order to satisfy OSPAR.

The hypothesis above makes at least two relevant predictions. First, children acquiring English should never omit both the subject and the copula, otherwise they would violate OSPAR. This prediction is really hard to verify since it is very difficult to distinguish a sentence with an overt PP/DP predicate that lacks both the subject and the copula from a simple PP/DP. In order to be sure about the sentential nature of the utterances, Misha Becker (p.c.) only coded utterances with an overt subject.

OSPAR also predicts that children acquiring Italian should be allowed to omit the copula whenever the subject is overtly realized. This seems to be the case of the constructions Demonstrative + *essere* + DP/AP we discussed above. In these constructions, *essere* can be omitted because the demonstrative in subject position already satisfies OSPAR since it overtly realizes the person features of the subject.

OSPAR does not distinguish between auxiliary *essere* and non-auxiliary *essere*. Thus, it cannot account for the fact that auxiliary *essere* is omitted more often than non-auxiliary *essere*. The difference seems to be related to the nature of auxiliary forms, since auxiliary *avere* patterns like auxiliary *essere* as far as omission is concerned. Further research is needed.

4. CONCLUSION

According to the data Becker (1998a,b; 1999) presents and the data I collected from 15 files of 4 children, 2-year-old children acquiring English and 2-year-old children acquiring Italian behave differently as far as the omissions of *belessere* and *havelavere* are concerned. The former virtually never omit *have*, while their production rate of *be* is not uniform across constructions. It is high in existential/deictic and demonstrative constructions, low in locatives and varies in progressives and predicatives across the children. Young Italian-speaking children, instead, either do not omit either of the two verbs or their omission rate is quite low and does not vary across constructions.

I suggested that these differences can be partially accounted for by refining Becker's (1998a,b) hypothesis that the presence of additional

functional material in Infl drives overtness even in the early stages of language production. Becker does not seem to consider subject agreement features (person and number) as functional material that can drive overtness. I suggested, instead, that at least subject person agreement features need to be overtly realized (OSPAR). English and Italian satisfy this requirement in two different ways. English, a non-pro drop language, satisfies OSPAR by means of subjects; Italian, a pro-drop language, by means of a rich verbal morphology. Thus, children acquiring English can drop *be* without violating OSPAR, while children acquiring Italian cannot drop *essere* if the subject is not overtly realized.

Appendix. Details of Rafaello's omissions

In Table 6 below I repeated the contents in Table 5 adding more details to each cells. The following is a list of the abbreviations I used:

- **x**, where x is the bold face topmost number in each cell, means the number of times that context occurs in the file;
- Ø: x means the verb has been omitted x times in that context;
- @:x means that the verb has been replaced by a phonologically indistinct form (a kind of schwa);
- **1sg, 3pl, ...: x** means that the verb occurs x times in the 1st person singular, or the 3rd person plural, etc.; all the occurrences of verbs whose person and number are not specified should be assumed to be in 3rd person singular, the default form, the one that children seem to acquire earlier;
- *agr: x means that the agreement between the verbal form and the following predicate fails x times (e.g. *È tuoi '(they) is yours-PL' instead of Sono tuoi 'They are yours-PL');
- *aux: x means that the wrong auxiliary has been chosen x times (ex. **Ha cascato* lit. '(he) has fallen' instead of *è cascato* lit '(he) is fallen');
- **Dem: x** means that the construction "demonstrative + (copula) + ..." occurred x times (ex. *Questo è mio*, 'This is mine'; *Quello è brutto* 'That is bad');
- **Past: x** means that the verb occurs x times in the past form;
- **Pass: x** means that the verb occurs x times in the passive form;
- **Rifl: x** means that the verb occurs **x** times in the reflexive forms;
- St: x means that the copula precedes a stage-level predicate x times;
- In: x means that the copula precede an individual level predicate x times;
- **xØ** means that the form has been omitted x times;
- **x**@ means that the form has been realized as a phonologically indistinct form x times.

Table 6. RAFAELLO

Age	ES.	ES.	ES.	ES.	ES.	AV.	AV.	AV.	STAR	ECCO
	pred	poss	exist	loc	aux	poss	aux	idiom	aux	
1;10.20	2	5				1				1
	@:2	Ø: 4 ¹³				Ø: 1				
	Dem: 1@	Dem: 1Ø								
1;11.25	9	6	3			1				1
	Ø: 4	Ø: 3	$\emptyset: 2^{14}$							
	@:1	Dem: 3Ø	@:1							
	3pl: 1@									
	Dem: 1, 2Ø									
	St:3(2Ø,1@)									
	In: 4 (1Ø)									
2:00.10	4	3	3				2			
,	Ø: 3	Ø: 1	Ø: 1 ¹⁵				Ø:1			
	@:1		@:1				1sg: 1Ø			
	Dem: 1Ø						2sg: 2			
	St: 1@						.0			
	In: 3Ø									
2:0.28	11		2	1	2		1			1
,	@:7		@:1	@:1	Ø: 1		1sg: 1			
	3 pl: 1@				@:1		8			
	Past: 2@				1sg: 1@					
	St: 11				Rifl: 1@					
2:1.15		1	2				4			
_,			_				Ø: 3			
							1sg: 2Ø			
							*aux: 116			
2:3.24		117	2 ¹⁸	1	2		2			2
_,			_	Ø: 1	@: 2		Ø: 2			
					1sg: 2					
2:4.29	9	2	1	1	2		1			1
,	Ø: 5	Dem: 1		@:1	Ø: 1					
	@:4				Dem: 1					
	Dem:1.2Ø.1@									
	St: 3Ø ¹⁹									
	In: 2Ø. 3@									
2:5.13	4	3	2		3		7			1
_,	3pl: 3 ²⁰	*agr: 1 ²¹	3pl: 1		Ø: 2 ²²		Ø: 1			-
					2sg: 1		1sg: 5			
2:6.13	15	1	7	4	2	1	7		2	
_,	Ø: 1	Ø: 1	Past: 1	Ø: 1	@:1	1sg: 1	Ø: 2		_	
	@:2	Dem: 1Ø			Pass: 1		189:3			
	Dem: $6(1\emptyset)$				Rifl: 1		289:20			
	St: 323				Dem: 1@					
	In: 4 (2@)									
2;11.20	18	1	9	2	2	3	8	125		1
,	Ø: 2		3pl: 3	3pl: 1	3pl: 1	2sg: 1	Ø: 3			
1	3pl: 10		past: 2				1sg: 5			
1	Dem: 4						3pl: 1			
1	St: 1 ²⁴						* '			
1	In: 3									

¹³ \varnothing mio ' \varnothing mine': 3 occurances. ¹⁴ piú instead of non c'è piú 'it is no longer here'. ¹⁵ piú instead of non c'è piú 'it is no longer here'. ¹⁶ ha cascato instead of the correct form è cascato '(he) fell down' with auxiliary essere.

¹⁷ \dot{e} mia '(it) is mine. ¹⁸ $c'\dot{e}$ 'there is'.

¹⁶ c'è 'there 1s'.
¹⁹ cattivo 'bad': 2 occurrances; brutto 'ugly': 1 occurrance.
²⁰ sono amici '(they) are friends'.
²¹ è tuoi 'is yours-PL'.
²² Ø andato '(he/she) Ø gone' instead of è andato '(he/she) has gone'.
²³ arrabbiato 'angry', freddo 'cold', brutto 'ugly'.

References

BECKER, MISHA. 1998a. *Have* as *Be*+P: Evidence from similarities in the Acquisition of *Have* and Existential *Be*. Ms. Los Angeles: UCLA

——. 1998b. Some surprising facts about the acquisition of *be*, Presented at Psychobabble, Los Angeles: UCLA. November 18.

———. 1999. Be or Be Not, Presented at the Syntax/Semantics Seminar. Los Angeles: UCLA. April 23.

- CIPRIANI, P. et al. 1989. Protocolli diagnostici e terapeutici nello sviluppo e nella patologia del linguaggio. 1/84 Italian Ministry of Health: Stella Maris Foundation.
- DEN DIKKEN, MARCEL. 1995. Copulas. Paper presented at GLOW, Tromsø.
- HOEKSTRA, TEUN and NINA HYAMS. 1995. The syntax and interpretation of dropped categories in child language: A unified account. *Proceedings of WCCFL XIV*. CISL, Stanford University.
- HOEKSTRA, TEUN and RENÉ MULDER. 1990. Unergatives as copular verbs: Locational and existential predication. *The Linguistic Review* 7, 1-79.
- KAYNE, RICHARD. 1993. Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection. *Studia Linguistica* 47.1, 2-31.
- MORO, ANDREA. 1997. The raising of predicates: Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SPEAS, MARGARET. 1994. Null Argument in A Theory of Economy of Projections. University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Lingusitics 17.

²⁴ aperto 'open'.

²⁵ avevan fame '(they) were hungry' (lit. '(they) had hunger').