Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics 39, 2004, pp. 175-195

RAISING EXPLETIVES

JACEK WITKOŚ
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

ABSTRACT

This paper constitutes another contribution to the ongoing discussion concerning the structure and properties of the existential construction in English. The paper puts forward a proposal related to the ideas of Lasnik (1995) and Bošković (1997) and opts for a solution, in which both the expletive and its associate need independent Case. However, unlike these two proposals it claims that the expletive and its associate initially form a constituent and the expletive moves away from the associate. The idea of the overt raising of the expletive helps explain lack of independent evidence for LF movement of the associate and lack of expletive constructions with transitive verbs in English. It also questions the rationale of the minimalist mantra of Merge-over-Move and some empirical evidence for derivational phases.

1. General properties of expletive constructions[1]

Standard analyses of Existential Constructions in English focus on their several typical properties.

First, expletives are related to their associates by some kind of movement. This assumption has been widely adopted since Chomsky (1986), where it was demonstrated that *there* and its associate have chain like properties. For example, the relation between *there* and *someone/a beer* in (1a) and (1b) shows the same locality properties (Tensed Sentence Condition and Specified Subject Condition) as between *someone/a beer* and the trace in (2a) and (2b).

(1a) *There seems that someone is in the room.
(1b) *There is the man drinking a beer.

(2a) *Someone seems that t is here.
(2b) *A beer is the man drinking t.

[1] This is a report on a joint project with Norbert Hornstein run partly at the University of Maryland under the aegis of the Kościuszko Foundation. I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer for *PSiCL* for valuable comments and to Przemysław Tajsner for an insightful discussion of many aspects of this work.

This follows if the relation between expletive and associate in (1) is analogous to the A-movement relation between the antecedent and the trace in (2).

Second, the associate acts as if it were in the position of the expletive as regards agreement.[2]

(3a) There is/*are a man in the room.
(3b) A man is/*are in the room.
(3c) There *is/are dogs in the park.
(3d) Dogs *is/are in the park.

Third, there is a one to one correlation between expletives and associates.

(4a) It/*There was preferred for there to be someone at home.
(4b) It/*There was difficult for Bill for there to be someone at home.
(4c) *There seems there to be someone in the room.

If each *there* must be coupled with an associate at some grammatical level (say Logical Form, LF) then the biuniqueness relation holding between *there*s and their associates follows.

There are other well-known facts that support the idea that the expletive and associate form a chain-like relation at some point in the derivation. For instance, there is the well-known definiteness effect. Thus, cases like (5) are unacceptable:

(5a) *There is everyone in the room.
(5b) *There is the man drinking a lot of beer.[3]

These well-known facts all point to the same conclusion; that the associate and expletive form an (A-)chain at some point in the derivation. Typically, it is said that the associate moves to(wards) the expletive at LF.[4] A standard implementation assumes that a LF structure like (6b) corresponds to (6a).

(6a) There is someone in the room.
(6b) [There+someone [is [someone [in the room]]]].

[2] The subtleties involve examples like (3b) where the use of singular is not as bad as it should be for many speakers. This is particularly true if the copula is cliticized as in (i).

(i) There's dogs in the park.

[3] This paper chiefly concerns existential constructions with expletive *there* and does not address the issue of presentational sentences with unaccusative verbs, where a definite associate of *there* is admitted, e.g.:

(i) There came into the room first the man with a black moustache.

[4] It would be just as good if we assumed that some sort of Agree relation held or feature movement. But for concreteness, we will assume some sort of covert movement.

2. Problems with LF-raising of the associate

If the associate moves then in LF it is expected to occupy the position that is different from the one it (phonologically) occupies in overt syntax. Its scope position is not supposed to be identical to its overt position. Den Dikken (1995) shows that this is incorrect. For example, in (7a), *many people* scopes under negation, in (7b) under the modal, in (7c) under *seems*, and (7e) does not license ACD ellipsis that is licensed in (7d).

(7a) There aren't many people in the room.
(7b) There may be someone in the room.
(7c) There seems to be someone in the room.
(7d) John expects someone that I do to be in the room.
(7e) *John expects there to be someone that I do to be in the room.

For the sake of demonstration, let us consider the first and the last example in more detail. Example (7a) does not exhibit the scope ambiguity shown by its non-expletive counterpart:

(8a) Many people are not in the room.
(8b) [$_{IP}$ [many people] are [$_{NegP}$ not [$_{PP}${many people} in the room]]].
(8c) many > not
(8d) not > many

Assume that (8b) represents the LF of (8a). Following the Predicate Internal Subject Hypothesis of Koopman and Sportiche (1991) and the copy theory of movement of Chomsky (1995), the subject quantifier phrase is accessible to interpretation in two positions: its surface one in [spec, I] and its base one in [spec, P]. The former is outside the scope of negation, whereas the latter is in the scope of negation; hence the ambiguity of scope in (8c-d). Example (7a) above cannot be interpreted with the scope fixed as in (8c); thus the associate is not raised to [spec, I].

On standard assumptions (Bošković 1997; Hornstein 1995; Lasnik 1993), ACD in (7d) is licensed because the subject of the embedded clause is raised to its case position in [spec, v], overtly or in LF, which removes the antecedent from the ellipsis site, solves the regress problem and helps resolve the ellipsis. The subject in (7d) is said to behave like a regular object in the ACD construction in (9b):

(9a) John beat everyone that Bill did [$_{VP}$ e].
(9b) [$_{IP}$ John beat$_i$ [$_{AgroP}$ [everyone that Bill did [$_{VP}$ e]]$_j$ [$_{VP}$ t$_i$ t$_j$]]].

Following the raising of the nominal object to [spec, v]/[spec, Agro], the antecedent VP does not contain the ellipsis site. Now, if the associate moved in LF in (7e),

ACD should be licensed on a par with (7d). Example (7e) is ungrammatical because the associate does not move to the expletive and further to [spec, v]/[spec, Agro].

In fact, all the properties in (7a-e) follow if the associate's LF position is also its overt one.[5]

Consider another interesting fact. Specifiers of associates are less adept at binding than are specifiers in regular DPs, *e.g.* the binding indicated in (8a), (8c) and (8e) is not possible in (8b), (8d) and (8f). Why not?

(10a) Yesterday, someone's$_1$ mother was saying that he$_1$ liked beer.
(10b) *Yesterday, there was someone's$_1$ mother saying that he$_1$ liked beer.
(10c) When I walked in, nobody's$_1$ father was talking to him$_1$.
(10d) *When I walked in, there was nobody's$_1$ father talking to him$_1$.
(10e) Nobody's/Somebody's$_1$ father was kissing his$_1$ mother.
(10f) *There was nobody's/somebody's$_1$ father kissing his$_1$ mother.

This property is unexpected if: (a) LF is the relevant level of representation for variable binding and (b), the associate is moved to the position of the expletive in LF.

The defective agreement patterns witnessed in some existential constructions support the idea that the agreement witnessed here is indirect. It may so happen, that the agreement patterns in existential constructions are not identical to what we find in their non-existential counterparts, *e.g.* we can find less than full agreement in (11a-b) but not in (11c-d).

(11) (?)There seems to be men in the garden.
(11b) There is a dog and a cat on the roof.
(11c) *Men seems to be in the garden.
(11d) *A dog and a cat is on the roof.

The defective agreement pattern in (11a-b) makes sense if the predicate directly agrees with features of *there* rather than those of *men* or *a dog and a cat*. More concretely, let's say that *there* need not always fully agree in number with its complement. If so, when *there* agrees with finite T^0, it is a default form for number that is manifest. This is what we get in (11a-b). Note that if the number agreement here is a default form (that is that singular agreement is what we get in the absence of agreement for number), then we expect that the converse pattern, that is singular associate

[5] See Den Dikken (1995) for further illustrations. Bošković (1997: 85) provides more examples of the same type, including well-known facts that the binding domain of the associate does not expand, example (ii), and that the associate cannot license an NPI it does not c-command overtly, example (iv):
(i) Someone seems to himself to be in the garden.
(ii) *There seems to himself to be someone in the garden.
(iii) No NBA team seems to any European team to be beatable.
(iv) *There seems to any European team to be no NBA team beatable.

and plural subject-predicate agreement, should be unacceptable. This is confirmed by examples in (12).[6]

(12a) *There were a man in the room.
(12b) * There seem to be someone here.

Another aspect of the default agreement pattern in existential constructions is observed in Bošković (1997); coordinate nominals in the subject position usually require plural agreement on the verb, while their existential construction equivalents do not and seem to work best with agreement reflecting the number features of the first conjunct:

(13a) A man and five women are in the house.
(13b) *A man and five women is in the house.
(13c) There is a man and five women in the house.
(13d) *There are a man and five women in the house.
(13e) There are four men and w woman in the house.
(13f) *There is four men and a woman in the house.

Again, this agreement pattern is not expected if the associate were to be raised to the position occupied by the expletive.

An additional problem arises in an approach, where movement into thematic positions is possible. Let us assume that it is possible.[7] Note that example (14) below presents a problem; it is unclear how to prevent its generation if associates raise to *there* at LF:[8]

(14a) *There expects to be someone in the room.
(14b) *There expects someone to be in the room.

Consider the details, where (15a) is the numeration and (15b-g) the derivation:

(15a) {there, expects, someone, to, be, in, the, room}
(15b) [in [the room]]

[6] That singular is the default in English makes sense as this is what we find when subjects are not really specified for number:
(i) Under the table *is/*are* quiet.
(ii) It *is/*are* under the table that I like to hide.
(iii) How Bill likes to cook *is/*are* very unclear.

[7] Many have argued for it including Bošković (1994); Lasnik (1995); Hornstein, (1999, 2001) and Manzini and Roussou (2002) among others.

[8] Actually, movement need not be to *there*. It is sufficient to assume that the associate moves/agrees with the matrix T^0.

(15c) [someone [in [the room]]]
(15d) [be [someone [in [the room]]]]
(15e) [there [be [someone [in [the room]]]]]
(15f) [expects [there [be [someone [in [the room]]]]]]
(15g) [There [expects [there [be [someone [in [the room]]]]]]].

(15b-g) yields (14a). Note that in (15f) *there* merges, rather than *someone* moving. This conforms to economy. The derivation of (14b) differs from the above at (15e) where *someone* raises to Spec TP, in place of *there* merging.

The problem that (14a-b) present starts when we consider the part of the derivation that relates *there* to *someone*. Note that the external argument of *expects* has not been discharged. If we assume that movement into theta positions is possible, *someone* could move at LF to discharge this theta role as part of the movement relating *there* and *someone* and thereby allow the derivation to converge, that is (16a-b) with interpretation (16c):

(16a) [There [someone [expects [(there) [be [someone [in [the room]]]]]]]].
(16b) [There [someone [expects [someone [be [someone [in [the room]]]]]]]].
(16c) Someone expects to be in the room.

One solution would be to disallow *LF* movement into thematic positions, e.g. if theta features were universally strong (carried EPP features), covert movement into theta positions would be illicit. However, aside from being *ad hoc*, this position is also empirically untenable. Manzini and Russou (2002) and Bošković and Takahashi (1998) argue for LF movement into theta positions. If hey are correct, theta features need not be strong and so the problem in (14) stands.

3. The proposal

There are likely to be various technical solutions that could get around the difficulty the example in (14) offers. However, the problem can be resolved by proposing that associates do not move, and so, cannot move into thematic positions. Without such movement, derivations of (14) will fail to converge by leaving undischarged theta features. Thus, we adopt as general principles (17a-d):

(17a) Expletives cannot check theta roles.
(17b) Derivations with undischarged θ-roles do not converge.
(17c) An expression discharges a theta role by merging into a theta position.[9]
(17d) Associates never move.

[9] If covert movement is abandoned in favor of Agree then assume a theta role is discharged when an element Agrees with a theta feature.

We are now left with a question: how to derive the chain properties of existential constructions if associates do not move. The proposal we propose to pursue here is that existential constructions like (18a) have derivations like (18b):

(18a) There is someone in the room.
(18b) [There is [[there someone] in the room]].

In (18b), *there* forms a unit with the associate before overtly moving away. This derivation puts the expletive and associate in a chain relation, allows movement into thematic positions, but avoids generating sentences like (14).[10]

4. Immediate consequences

The core of the proposal is that whatever chain relation exists between the associate and the expletive is due to the latter's moving away from the former rather than the former's moving towards the latter. This retains the benefits of standard approaches to existential constructions that involve movement between the associate and expletive. Let us consider some details.

The A-chain properties of *there*/associate pairs follows straightforwardly if (18b) is a case of A-movement. The one-to-one correlation between expletives and associates follows on the assumption that *there*s initially merge with associates. The multiple merger of *there*s to associates could be blocked on several grounds.

First, if *there* requires case (as proposed in Belletti 1988 and Lasnik 1995), then stacking them would likely prevent them all from checking case. Take example (19a). If *there* needs case, it is unclear how both instances are to discharge this requirement. One might move to spec T to check/get nominative. However, there is no second case for the second *there* to discharge. Furthermore, even if there were a second case, it is plausible that the more embedded *there* cannot move across the higher

[10] The idea presented here was suggested to Hornstein by Lisa Descroisantes in a graduate intro syntax course in about 1996. This proposal is reminiscent of Moro's (1997) view that *there* is a predicate that moves from the small clause predicate to syntactic subject position. It is also related to Kayne's recent proposal which also takes *there* to form a constituent with the associate in D-structure. Lastly, it is the inverse of the proposal in Bošković (1997) where *there* lowers and forms a unit with the associate at LF. The difference between our account and his is twofold:

(i) The process of LF lowering, as argued in Bošković and Takahashi (1998) need not be inherently clause-bound and thus cannot naturally accommodate the locality restrictions between the expletive and the associate. In our account the A-type locality conditions fall out naturally if *there* searches for the nearest case position.

(ii) Our account, where the expletive moves away from the associate, with which it initially forms a constituent, avoids a great deal of derivational 'look ahead' as far as agreement feature sharing between the expletive and the associate is concerned.

one without violating minimality, that is if the *there*-DP in (19a) had the structure in (19b):

(19a) T^0 is [[there[there[someone]]] in the room]

(19b) [$_{DP}$ there D^0 [$_{DP}$ there D^0 [$_{NP}$ someone]]]

Chomsky's (1995) (implicit) approach to the definiteness effect would also discourage *there* stacking. It derives the definiteness effect by analyzing *there* as a kind of dummy D(-eterminer) (or specifier of D). Being D-like, *there* requires a nominal (N-type) complement. If one assumes that only DPs can be definite, or alternatively, that D-less NPs cannot be definite, then the fact that *there* is a D or Spec D forces the thing it merges with to be a bare NP and so indefinite.[11] Chomsky (1995) executes this idea uniting the associate and expletive at LF.[12] The approach advocated here differs only in having *there* merge with the associate overtly.

Our proposal offers an answer to the issue of the defective binding from the associates. We have assumed that *there* is D-like and takes a nominal complement. If so, the associate in, for example, (20b) is structurally different from the indefinite subject in (20a):

(20a) [$_{DP}$ Someone's [$_{NP}$ mother]]

(20b) [$_{DP}$ there [$_{NP}$ someone's mother]]

Someone is in spec DP in (20a) but inside the nominal complement in (20b). It should thus not surprise us that the binding capacities of *someone* in the two cases is not the same as the latter instance is structurally lower down in the phrase than the former. If *there* takes a nominal complement then *someone's mother* is structurally different in (10a-b).[13] This structural difference lies behind the acceptability differences in (8).[14]

Needless to say, without covert movement of the associate, derivations of (14a-b) will fail to converge by leaving undischarged theta features.

Our proposal in (17-18) can also help to account for the agreement facts in existential constructions. In many languages, D or [spec, D] agrees with their nominal complements. For example, in French, *les, la, le, sa, son, ses, mes, mon, ton, etc.* are determiners that agree for φ-features with their nominal complements. If *there* is a dummy version of these, then it too could agree with its complement. This would allow the agreement witnessed in existential constructions to not be a function of direct agreement between T^0 and the associate, but agreement once removed with the agreement between D and NP serving as intermediary. The defective agreement pattern in (11a-b) makes sense if the predicate directly agrees with features of *there* rather than those of *men* or *a dog and a cat*. More concretely, let's say that *there* need not agree in number with its complement. If so, when *there* agrees with finite T^0, it is a default form for number that is manifest. This is what we get in (11a-b).

As for the examples in (13), we can mirror Bošković's reasoning and submit that the structure of the coordinate NPs in question is not a symmetrical one and is as follows:[15]

(21) [$_{DP}$ there [$_{ConP}$ [$_{NP}$ one man] [$_{Con'}$ and [$_{NP}$ five women]]]]

The default agreement pattern results from economy considerations: whether agreement for number features results from an LF N-to-D raising Longobardi (1994)-style, or more stationary Agree, Chomsky (1999)-style, the NP in the left conjunct, in [spec, Con] is a closer target to D than the other conjunct NP. In the non-expletive equivalent in (13a), the coordination involves two DPs.

Once again, note that if the number agreement here is a default form (singular agreement is what we get in the absence of agreement for number), then we expect that the converse pattern, that is singular associate and plural subject-predicate agreement, should be unacceptable, (see (12), repeated below as (22)):

(22a) *There were a man in the room.

(22b) *There seem to be someone here.

[11] Incorporated nominals are always indefinite and they always lack overt determiners.

(i) John went to hunt the tiger.

(ii) John went (*the) tiger hunting.

In (ii), *tiger* only has an indefinite reading.

The same seems true for bare plurals. Thus, (iii) can have a specific reading for *some men* but this sort of reading is not available in (iv) with *men*.

(iii) I saw the woman that some men like.

(iv) I saw the woman that men like.

[12] Chomsky (1995) adopts the idea of the LF movement of N to D from Longobardi (1994).

[13] Observe that this fact could also follow on a theory like Bošković's where *there* lowers and merges with the associate. If binding is determined at LF, the standard view, then the adjoined *there* could drive *someone* into spec NP making it unavailable for pronoun binding. Note that this story assumes that it is possible to get genitive case on DPs inside NPs. With the advent of the DP hypothesis, it's been unclear whether anything occupies spec N. A natural assumption is that in such cases *someone* is sitting in Spec NP, as in the pre DP days.

[14] Hornstein (1995) suggests that c-command be sensitive to the functional lexical distinction. It proposes that binding is possible under *almost c-command*. This allows binding from spec D, something that English clearly permits. However, this would also *forbid* binding from spec N. This would suffice to account for the contrasts noted here.

[15] The asymmetric nature of conjunction is supported by the Crossover and Principle C effects observed in coordinate structures, Bošković (1997: 88):

(i) [Every father]$_i$ and his$_i$ son went fishing on Sunday.

(ii) ?*His$_i$ son and [every father]$_i$ went fishing on Sunday.

(iii) John's$_i$ dog and he$_i$/him$_i$ went hunting.

(iv) *He$_i$ and John's$_i$ dog went hunting.

In sum, the idea that the associate and *there* begin their derivational lives as a unit with *there* overtly (A-)moving away yields the standard account of locality effects in ECs. Additional assumptions concerning the D-like (or Spec D-like) structure of *there* can be used to account for the definiteness effect and the agreement pattern found in existential constructions.

Note that the idea that an inter-constituent dependency between the expletive at one end of the clause and its associate at the other should be reinterpreted as an initial intra-constituent dependency, with both *there* and the nominal associate within the same DP, is similar to recent analyses of anaphoric binding (Zwart 2002), and pronominal binding (Kayne 2002). These authors argue that surface long distance dependencies in (23b) and (24b) pass through early derivational stages where antecedents and their dependants form single DPs:

(23a) $[_{VP}$ loves [[John]$_i$ him(self)]
(23b) $[_{IP}$ [John]$_i$ $[_{VP}$ loves [t_i himself]]].

(24a) thinks [[John]$_i$ he$_i$] is smart
(24b) [John]$_I$ thinks [t_i he$_i$] is smart.

Zwart (2002) proposes that core anaphoric binding relations can be captured through a derivational approach, where the antecedent R-expression or pronoun is merged with an underspecified generic [+variable referential] element. Binding is taken to be feature sharing between the antecedent in the specifier position and the variable referential element within their constituent, (23a). Next, the antecedent moves away for the licensing of its thematic and case features. Kayne (2002) uses an almost identical idea to derive properties of bound pronouns; at some early stage in the derivation the pronoun and its antecedent form a constituent, (24a), and then the antecedent moves away. The common denominator for our account and the two mentioned above, is the movement out of the DP breaking the early DP structure.

5. Further consequences

Let's now turn our attention to a cross linguistic property of existential constructions that has resisted a principled explanation so far. This involves the availability of transitive expletives across languages. In particular, they are unavailable in English, available in matrix clauses in German and in all clauses in Icelandic.[16] Consider

[16] Lasnik (1995) provides a case based account for this in English. We adopt part of his proposal in what follows, indicating some problems.

these English data:[17]

(25a) *There didn't men eat lunch.
(25b) *There didn't eat lunch men.
(25c) There weren't men eating lunch.
(25d) *There weren't eating lunch men.

We take (25a), (25b) and (25d) to be transitive expletive constructions (TECs). Example (25c) is not a TEC. Sentences like (25a-b) obtain in Icelandic and in matrix clauses in Dutch and German but not in English. In what follows we first account for the absence of transitive expletives in (25a-b) and then say why (25c) is acceptable in English. We then export this proposal to Icelandic.

Assume that in English objects overtly move to spec v.[18] Given this, a transitive expletive construction has roughly the form in (26) if *there* moves to Spec TP overtly from the position of the associate.[19]

(26) $[_{TP}$ there T^0 $[_{vP}$ Object $[_{vP}$ $[_{DP}$ there NP] v [V object]]]]

Note that the movement indicated in (26) is illicit, once the Minimal Link Condition and Equidistance are taken into account. *There* has moved across the fronted object, thereby violating minimality. To be more precise, although the complex of [*there* NP] and the object are in the same minimal domain in virtue of both being specifiers of the same *v* projection, *there* is not part of this domain if it is a constituent of DP. Thereby moving *there* violates MLC and the derivation is blocked. Two assump-

[17] (25d) is included to counter Chomsky's suggestions that transitive expletives do exist in English. He notes cases like (i).

(i) There were eating lunch several men that I knew.

Though relatively acceptable, we take these to be due to some kind of heavy NP shift operation that takes a phonologically 'heavy' NP and shifts it to the right. Note that (i) becomes unacceptable if we 'lighten' the post-verbal nominal.

(ii) *There were eating lunch men.

It is quite possible that the post verbal nominal in (i) is in A' position as it seems to be best when it is on the far right periphery.

(iii(a)) There were eating lunch because they were hungry several men that I knew.
(iii(b)) ??There were eating lunch several men that I knew because they were hungry.

Moreover, it seems to license a parasitic gap about as well as more standard cases of HNPS.

(iv(a)) I always recognized t right after I saw t my favorite uncle from Baltimore.
(iv(b)) There were t eating lunch right after I saw t several men that I knew.

[18] Lasnik (1999) provides some arguments for the assumption that movement to Spec vP for case is optional in English. It is natural to make it obligatory. Note that this assumption is also required to dispense with EPP features. See Castillo, Drury and Grohmann (1999) and Epstein and Seely (1999) for details.

[19] If accusative case is checked overtly, then the verb must move around the object in overt syntax in order to get the word order right. We abstract away from this short verb movement in what follows.

tions are required for minimality to be operative: the object must be raised to spec *v* and *there* must move from the complex [*there*+Associate] DP to Spec TP. This, plus the definition of minimality in Chomsky (1995: 356), excludes TECs in English.[20]

Interestingly, transitive existential constructions should be permitted if the DP containing *there* moves to a position above the object in outer spec *v*. With this in mind, consider what happens in (25c). Say the DP containing *there* needs to be case marked/checked and this case marking/checking takes place in the Spec of *be*. This yields a structure like (27):

(27) $[_{TP}$ there T^0 [$[_{DP}$ there NP] be $[_{vP}$ Object $[_{vP}$ $\{_{DP}$ there NP$\}$ v [V {object}]]]]

This derivation incorporates Lasnik's (1995) idea that the associate is case marked.[21]

This derivation also suggests a structure for the DP containing *there*. We can take it to be similar to genitive DPs like *John's book*. The principle difference between the postulated *there*+associate DP and genitive DPs is that *there* cannot carry genitive case, as confirmed by the fact *there* can occur in Acc-ing, but not Poss-ing gerunds.

(28a) I would prefer there being a guard in the room.
(28b) There being a guard in the room annoyed me.
(28c) *I would prefer there's being a guard in the room.
(28d) *There's being a guard in the room annoyed me.

If *there* cannot bear genitive case, but nonetheless it must be case marked, then the only option is to move to a case marked position. Moreover, given that the DP containing *there* must also be case marked, *there* must move to a position different from the one that contains the DP that it is originally a part of. This forces *there* to move away from its associate. In effect, sentences like (29) should be treated as case violations:

(29a) *[There a man] is here.
(29b) *I expect [there someone] to be drinking beer.

[20] As an anonymous reviewer for *PSiCL* observes, if the expletive is regarded as a head, it should not move into the phrasal position of [spec, T]. A possible solution lies in treating the expletive as a clitic, which gives it a status of both D and DP in the BPS approach to constituent structure. As such, the clitic can occupy both the phrasal and head positions.

[21] We need not assume the case is Partitive. There is actually very little independent motivation for postulating partitive case in existential constructions. Lasnik (1995) uses it to derive the definiteness effect *and* to track the absence of TECs in English. It accomplishes the latter by only allowing partitively marked associates from merging with *there*. This works, but it is stipulative. The core of Lasnik's idea can be revamped and adopted along the lines indicated in the text.

It must be added at this point that a strong argument for independent case marking of the associate and the expletive, that is in favor of Lasnik (1995) and this proposal, and contra Chomsky (1995, 1999), is provided in Bošković (1997). Bošković notes the following contrast between regular ECM constructions with verbs like *allege*, (30a), and their existential equivalents (30b):

(30a) *He alleged stolen documents to be in the drawer.
(30b) He alleged there to be stolen documents in the drawer.

The logical conclusion that follows from this contrast is that *allege* has no [+case] feature and this is why it cannot support the nominal subject of the infinitival complement in (30a).[22] The situation is markedly different in (30b), where the associate is case marked by an extra case checker in the form of the existential *be*.[23]

The proposal put forward in this paper also accounts for the absence of unergative existential constructions. Lasnik (1995) notes the absence of constructions like (31):

(31) *There someone jumped.

Lasnik (1995) accounts for this by assuming that partitive case cannot be assigned to the associate in such structures. We can essentially follow this reasoning. If both the DP containing *there* and *there* need case and if unergatives cannot assign case in their specs, then (31) will be a case theory violation; either *there* or the DP containing *someone* will fail to be case licensed.[24] We can repair the problem in (31) by

[22] Note that example (30) is inconvenient to our approach, as it may seem that *there* may be placed in a case-less position after all. This position, however, opens up a slew of unwanted options, as observed by a reviewer for *PSiCL*. In place of an analysis of these constructions, let me just observe that *allege*, unlike other more typical ECM verbs (*believe, expect*) cannot thematically support a nominal argument. This fact may be reflected by its quirky case properties, it cannot support a full DP but it can case-support the expletive.

[23] Two further observations are in order. First, the case feature on *be* must be optional, as otherwise the innocent example below should be ruled out as ungrammatical:

(i) John is honest.

The simple reason is that *John* could end up being involved in two case relations, one with *be* and the other one with T. This quirk of the analysis is certainly a problem for every other analysis assuming a separate case for the associate.

The other issue concerns the displacement of the associate from its case position:

(ii) There has been a man shot.
(iii) There has a man been shot.

We do not pursue this matter here but wish to point out that example (iii) may involve a regular case marking of the associate by *be* and a further process of Thematization/Extraposition of Chomsky (1999) and Julien (2002).

[24] There is another way of deriving the absence of unergative existential constructions. Assume with Hale and Keyser (1993) that unergatives are actually transitives with phonetically null objects. This phonetic status is can be attributed to some process similar to incorporation. What is useful here is that

adding a *be*, as accords both with our proposal and Lasnik's (1995) account. Here, *be* checks the DP containing *someone* finite T^0 licenses *there*.

(32) There is someone jumping.

Consider one more complication that can be turned into an argument in favor of overt expletive raising in English:

(33) *There seems [PP to a man] that it is raining outside.

Example (33) is unacceptable, though it is difficult to see why if the expletive and the associate can in principle check different cases. Lasnik (1995) uses partitive case restrictions on there merger to account for (33). As we have assumed that the case of the associate need not be partitive, example (33) seems to be a problem for us. However, an observation in Groat (1999) offers a possible solution. He notes that overt movement from within the experiencer PP with raising verbs is impossible:

(34) *Who does it seem [PP to t] that it is raining.

His conclusion is that the PP is an island impervious to movement. If so, there cannot move out of the PP in (33). Groat's proposal has a further consequence once one thinks about multiple Wh constructions in this context; consider (35), which seems to allow for a pair-list answer:

(35) Who seems to whom to have made a bad mistake?

If multiple interrogatives with pair-list readings involve covert movement of the Wh in situ to CP then moving the associate at LF in (35) should be possible. In other words, if (35) involves an island violation, then the movement must be overt. This certainly confirms our proposal that there moves overtly. Put another way; if the movement in existential constructions is covert then something like Lasnik's (1995) partitive case is required, assuming overt there movement, allows one to remove this stipulation.

Just to recapitulate this section: TECs are absent in English because overtly moving *there* from its DP violates minimality on the assumption that accusative case is checked in overt syntax in [spec, v]. If the *there*+associate DP overtly moves above the object, subsequent movement of *there* can occur without violating minimality.

assumption that unergatives have objects and so are actually hidden transitives. If this object must check case, much as an overt object must, then unergatives will block *there* movement in the way that any transitive verb does.

Let us now turn to Icelandic, a language that allows for TECs. Icelandic, unlike German, is V2 even in embedded clauses. There are various ways to describe this fact and the current view holds that the subject is in spec T in a simple embedded transitive clause. Consider the following contrast between Icelandic (V2 in embedded clauses) and Danish from Jonas (1996:173-174):

(36a) Það kom á óvart ad Maria les ekki bækur. (Ice.)
it was unexpected that Maria reads not books

(36b) *Það kom á óvart ad Maria ekki les bækur. (Ice.)
it was unexpected that Maria not reads books

(37c) *Peter tvivler på at Marie ryger ofte disses cigarer. (Dan.)
Peter doubts that Marie smokes often these cigars

(37d) Peter tvivler på at Marie ofte ryger disses cigarer. (Dan.)
Peter doubts that Marie often smokes these cigars

It is also further assumed that Icelandic carries an extra functional spec position within TP. For example, Chomsky (1995) and Bobaljik and Jonas (1996) assume that there is an extra subject position in Icelandic clauses. Let us assume, concretely, that in addition to spec T there is another functional phrase (FP) with an available spec. Now consider what happens in a transitive expletive construction holding to the assumptions that objects overtly move to spec *v* to check case, the expletive starts out as a constituent with the associate and moves out of the DP that contains it, and that this movement, like all movement, is subject to minimality.[25] Given these three assumptions, and the claim that Icelandic clauses have extra subjects, allows the derivation of transitive expletives in both main and embedded clauses. Consider a typical derivation, (37). The DP comprising *það* and the associate move over the object to spec F. From there *það* moves to spec T and the derivation converges. If spec F is a case checking position, then the mechanics behind this Icelandic case reduces to the English examples involving *be* plus gerundive participles.

(37) [TP *there* V+T [FP [there associate] F [vP object [vP [there associate] [VP V object]]]]]

(38) það klardu margar mys ostinn alveg
there finished many mice the cheese always

[25] We first consider cases where the object seems to overtly move and then consider cases where this movement need not occur. Note, that if objects do not move to spec *v* then nothing should block the generation of transitive expletives.

Consider a potential problem. In (39), the associate sits to the right of an object pronoun. This is a problem for our analysis, as the expletive appears to be moving over a pronominal DP in a higher domain in violation of minimality:

(39a) það V-fin obj-pronoun associate
(39b) það eta það mys
there eat it mice

It is unlikely that this is a true violation of minimality for several reasons. First, when we substitute a full DP for the pronominal clitic in (39b) the sentence becomes unacceptable.

(40) *það eta ostinn mys
there eat the cheese mice

Second, it is plausible that what we find in Icelandic with these light pronouns is analogous to what exists in the mainland Scandinavian languages; they allow sentences like (39b), though they do not permit object shift with full DPs. The standard analysis of this construction in mainland Scandinavian treats the light pronoun as a clitic adjoined to some higher functional projection (as in Holmberg and Platzack 1995):

(41) [það .....T+pronoun [.....associate.....]]

The key assumption, then, is that clitics do not induce minimality and that weak pronouns in sentences like (41) are clitics. The second assumption is sensible as it only *light* pronouns that are possible in (41). Concerning the first assumption, it has independent support from raising constructions in Romance. Chomsky (1995) notes that the French analogues of (42a) are unacceptable, however, if the indirect object in (42b) is cliticized, the sentence is fine as clitics do not induce minimality, as in example (43):

(42a) John seems to Mary to be nice
(42b) *Jean semble à Marie être gentil

(43) Jean lui semble être gentil.
Jean to-her seems to be nice

6. Further ramifications

Let us now briefly consider three further and more general consequences of the solution to the problem of existential constructions proposed here: the relationship between Agree(ment) and the spec/head configuration, the Economy principle of Merge over Move and the rationale for phase-based derivations.

Recall that if the whole DP moves to [spec, T], then it is the full DP that agrees with the ϕ features of T. This pattern should not be defective. The fact that agreement in non-spec head configurations can be defective, while this is rarely so in the canonical spec-head configuration, suggests that reducing all agreement to the latter case, as is done, for example, in an Agree-based system, is problematic.

The proposal presented above, if roughly correct, removes the argument for economy of derivations in Chomsky (1995) and one argument for phases in Chomsky (2000).

Let us start with the former; the argument that Chomsky (1995) runs presupposes that *there* merges directly into Spec TP. This, plus the assumption that the embedded clause licenses a subject position allows for the derivation of (44b).

(44a) There seems to be someone here.
(44b) *There seems someone to be here.

To account for the contrast in (44), Chomsky (1995) proposes that Merge is cheaper than Move (viewed as a sum of Copy plus Merge) and that grammars *locally* economize on operations. For example, in the derivation of (44a-b) one comes to a point of the derivation roughly analogous to (45):

(45) [to be someone here], with {there, seems} left in the Numeration

How to extend the phrase marker? One can, in principle, either Move *someone* or Merge *there*. As the latter operation is cheaper than the former (at this point in the derivation) one must do the latter and this blocks (44b).

If one assumes, however, that *there* first merges with the associate and then moves, this economy assumption will not serve to block (44b). How is it blocked then? There are two possibilities. One is to reject the assumption that infinitives have Spec TP positions for elements to move into. If so, there is only one potential landing site for *there* in the continuation of (45), the matrix [spec, T].[26] The second possibility is that movement of the expletive without the whole associate is more

[26] See Castillo, Drury and Grohmann (1999), Epstein and Seely (1999) and Hornstein (2001) for this suggestion. Note that our hypothesis is in no way harmed by lack of embedded TP, as we assume overt Object Shift for English, see note 19.

economical because less is moved and so is preferred if convergence is so possible. The derivation in this case will be as in (46):

(46) [$_{TP}$ there [seems [$_{TP}$ there [to be[[there+someone] here]]]]]

This second option adopts an economy condition on movement, known as the Lighter Load Principle (moving less is better than moving more); similar to Chomsky's (1995) idea that feature movement is cheaper than category movement.[27]

Our analysis also removes Chomsky's (2000) argument for phases. The first problem phases addressed concerns sentences like (47).

(47a) There is someone wondering whether someone is here.
(47b) Someone is wondering whether there is someone here.

Given standard assumptions, (47a) should be blocked by the acceptability of (47b). The derivation of (47a) involves moving *someone* to the Spec TP of the embedded clause rather than merging *there*, as in (47b). This should be out given economy. The problem is solved if, as Chomsky argues, the two clauses in (47) form two different phases constructed from two separate sub-arrays. Our solution does not require phases and separate sub-arrays; if *there* does not directly merge into Spec TP, the derivations of (47) are not comparable once (48) is reached. From this point on, they have divergent numerations. The partial derivation in (48) leads to (47b).

(48) [[there+someone] is here]

The derivation that leads to (47a) proceeds through an early stage shown in (49):

(49) [someone is here]

In sum, our proposed approach to existential constructions removes one empirical argument for phases.

[27] As a reviewer points out, the Lighter Load Principle may have unwelcome consequences in that the associate may now be expected to be stranded in the lowest available (i.e. thematic) position and in positions following unaccusatives:

(i) There is someone to be expected to come.
(ii) *There is to be someone expected to come.
(iii) *There is to be expected to come someone.
(iv) There appeared someone jumping.
(v) *There seems someone jumping.

These problems may be solved though our pivotal and entirely non-trivial assumptions that Case needs to be checked overtly in English and that the copula *be*, but not the obligation *be*, and some other unaccusative verbs (*appear* but not *seem*) may be equipped with a Case feature, in the spirit of Belletti (1988) and Lasnik (1995).

7. Conclusion

We are left with one last issue: why *must* the expletive and associate merge in overt syntax? What blocks a derivation that separately merges *there* and its associate in overt syntax and then unites them in some covert fashion? Here is one suggestion.

Suppose that associates cannot move in narrow syntax. Why not? Because they are case marked. We exploited this idea extensively above, following Lasnik (1995). If a case marked expression is computationally frozen (Lasnik 1995 and Chomsky 1995) a base generated associate could not move to the expletive after its case had been checked. Now observe that the case checking position of an associate is *below* that of its expletive, e.g. in (50) the associate checks case in spec *be* while *there* sits in spec of T. After moving to spec *be*, case checked *someone* can no longer move to *there* and so a relation between the associate and the expletive cannot be established:

(50) [$_{TP}$ There be+T^0 [someone be [{someone} here]]]

Note that case freezing does not affect the derivation in (51), as both *there* and *someone* need to check case. Thus, even if *there+someone* moves to spec *be* to check case overtly, this still leaves *there* active.

(51) [$_{TP}$ There be+T^0 [[{there} + someone] be [{there + someone} here]]]

We realize that this suggestion is sketchy,[28] yet promising. We have proposed that the expletive in existential constructions is a kind of dummy determiner that merges overtly with the associate and subsequently moves away. So analyzing existential constructions solves a problem for the assumption that movement into thematic positions is possible. It also straightforwardly accounts for the scope properties noted by Den Dikken (1995) and Bošković (1997). Moreover, it provides an account for why transitive expletives are forbidden in English, permitted (only) in main clauses in German and all over in Icelandic. We noted that movement of associates might be plausibly barred within existential constructions universally if case freezing in some form is adopted.

[28] The details of the case freezing principle has been left deliberately vague. It also seems that a closer look at properties of Thematization/Extraposition (TH/EX) of Chomsky (1999) may reveal reasons for a short distance displacement of the associate from its case position. Our account is also compatible to a large degree with a critique of Chomsky's TH/EX in Julien (2002), where this phenomenon is viewed as Focus Projection movement within the articulated left periphery of the clause in Rizzi (1997).

REFERENCES

Abraham, W., S. D. Epstein, H. Thrainsson and J. W. Zwart. (eds.). 1996. *Minimal Ideas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Belletti, A. 1988. "The case of unaccusatives." *Linguistic Inquiry* 19. 1-34.

Bobaljik, J. and D. Jonas. 1996. "Subject positions and the roles of TP." *Linguistic Inquiry* 27. 195-236.

Bošković, Ž. 1994. "D-structure, θ-criterion and movement into θ-positions." *Linguistic Analysis* 24. 247-286.

Bošković, Ž. 1997. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bošković, Ž and D. Takahashi. 1998. "Scrambling and last resort." *Linguistics Inquiry* 29. 347-66.

Castillo, J. C., J. E. Drury and K. Grohmann. 1999. "Merge over Move and the Extended Projection Principle." *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics* 8. 63-103.

Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 1999. "Derivation by Phase." *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18*.

Chomsky, N. 2000. "Minimalist Inquiries: the Framework." In Martin, R., D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds.). 89-155.

Delsing, L., C. Falk, G. Josefsson and H. Sigurdsson (eds.). 2003. *Grammar in Focus: Festschrift for Christer Platzak*. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages.

Den Dikken, M. 1995. "Binding, Expletives and Levels." *Linguistic Inquiry* 26. 347-54.

Epstein, S. D. and D. Seely. 1999. SPEC-ifying the GB 'subject': Eliminating A-chains and the EPP within a derivational model. Manuscript.

Epstein, S. D. and N. Hornstein (eds.). 1999. *Working minimalism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Epstein, S. D. and D. Seely (eds.). 2002. *Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Groat, E. 1999. "Raising the Case of Expletives." In Epstein, S. D. and N. Hornstein (eds.). 27-43.

Haegeman, L. (ed) 1997. *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Hale, K. and S. J. Keyser. 1993. "On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations." In Hale, K. and S. J. Keyser (eds.). 53-109.

Hale, K. and S. J. Keyser. (eds.). 1993. *The view from Building 20*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Holmberg, A. and C. Platzak. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hornstein, N. 1995. *Logical Form. From GB to Minimalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hornstein, N. 1999. "Movement and Control." *Linguistic Inquiry* 30. 69-96.

Hornstein, N. 2001. *Move! A minimalist theory of construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hornstein, N. and Witkoś, J. 2003. "Yet another approach to existential constructions." In Delsing, L., C. Falk, G. Josefsson and H. Sigurdsson (eds.). 167-184.

Jonas, D. 1996. "Clause structure, expletives and verb movement." In Abraham, W., S. D. Epstein, H. Thrainsson and J. W. Zwart. (eds.). 167-188.

Julien, M. 2002. On the syntax of 'TH/EX'. Manuscript.

Kayne, R. 2002. "Pronouns and their antecedents." In Epstein S. D. and D. Seely (eds.). 133-183.

Koopmann, H. and D. Sportiche. 1991. "The position of subjects." *Lingua* 85. 211-58.

Lasnik, H. 1993. "Lectures on minimalist syntax." *University of Connecticut Working Papers in Linguistics*, Occasional Papers Issue 1.

Lasnik, H. 1995. "Case and expletives revisited." *Linguistic Inquiry* 26. 615-633.

Lasnik, H. 1999. "Chains of arguments." In Epstein, S. D. and N. Hornstein (eds.). 189-215.

Longobardi, G. 1994. "Reference and proper names: A theory of N movement in syntax and Logical Form." *Linguistic Inquiry* 25. 609-65.

Manzini, R. and A. Roussou. 2002. "A minimalist theory of A-movement and control." *Lingua*.

Moro, A. 1997. "Dynamic antisymmetry: Movement as a symmetry breaking phenomenon." *Studia Linguistica* 51. 50-76.

Rizzi, L. 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery." In Haegeman, L. (ed.). 281-337.

Zwart, J. W. 2002. "Issues relating to a derivational theory of binding." In Epstein, S.D. and D. Seely (eds.). 269-304.