# The Typology of Expletive *THERE*

William Earl Griffin
*The University of Texas at Austin*

## 1.0 Introduction

In this article I propose an alternative account of expletive THERE based on the theory that formal features may move overtly at PF.[1] Specifically, I argue that the «inadequacies» of expletive THERE alluded to in Chomsky (1993: 33) are the result of the fact that THERE is simply a collection of formal features, an «alternative» spell-out of the Case and Agreement features of a lexical NP and has no independent category (NP) features. In other words, expletive THERE is an instance of Overt Move F, following Blight (1998) and Roberts (1998), without «generalized pied-piping» in the sense of Chomsky (1995). I depart from the proposals of Blight (1998) and Roberts (1998) however in maintaining that Overt Move F is motivated by the need to satisfy economy principles, specifically, the Principle of Economy of Projection (EOP) proposed in Speas (1995).

The rest of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, I present cross-linguistic evidence which shows that expletive THERE occurs only in languages which mark for both morphological (subject-verb) Agreement and morphological or structural Case. In section 3, I consider two recent analyses of THERE, Chomsky's (1993, 1995) LF-Affix analysis and Lasnik's (1992, 1995) Partitive Case analysis, and show that both not only encounter empirical and conceptual problems, but also fail to account for the cross-linguistic distribution of expletive THERE. Section 4 introduces the Overt Move F analysis of expletive THERE in relation to English and shows how such movement is driven by the need to satisfy the EOP. In addition, I show how the cross-linguistic distribution of expletive THERE is readily explained by the fact that THERE is a collection of formal (Agreement and Case) features. The proposed analysis has three immediate advantages over previous analyses. First, it provides an adequate account of expletive THERE in English without positing a new class of morpho-syntactic objects («phrasal» affixes) as proposed in Chomsky (1993). Second, it readily accounts for the Case and Agreement properties of expletive-associate pairs while also accounting for the chain-like properties of expletive-associate pairs, a robust observation which is lost under Lasnik's Partitive Case analysis. Third, it provides a principled explanation for the fact that languages without both morphological Agreement and morphological or structural Case do not have expletive THERE. Since THERE is an «alternative» spell-out of both the Agreement and Case features of an associate NP, the Overt Move F analysis readily

---

* This work is still very much a work in progress, and I would greatly appreciate any comments and suggestions. I would especially like to thank Lisa Green since this work is a direct result of her graduate syntax seminar. I would also like to thank Susan Smyth-Long and Ralph Bight for comments and suggestions on various aspects of this work.

[1] I use the general term THERE to refer to the class of elements corresponding to English *there*, Germen *es* Italian *ci*, etc.

predicts that THERE will not occur in languages which lack either (or both) of these features.

In section 5, I present additional evidence in support of the proposed analysis based on the complementary distribution of expletive THERE and *pro* subjects in Italian. I show that expletive THERE only occurs with lexical NP's and not pro-subjects in languages like Italian. These facts immediately follow from the proposed analysis given the fact that pro-subjects do not have independent Agreement features, but instead receive these by being in a spec-head relation with morphologically rich INFL. Since THERE is an «alternative» spell-out of both Case and Agreement features, THERE cannot co-occur with pro-subject associates because there are no agreement features which may undergo Overt Move F.

One rather important consequence of this work is that we may eliminate the EPP (formulated more recently as a «strong» NP/DP feature of Tense) from the theory of grammar since its empirical consequences may be derived independently from the theory of movement (which incorporates the theory of Overt Move F) and the Principle of Economy of Projection. Section 6 presents the general conclusions.

## 2.0 The Cross-linguistic Distribution of Expletive THERE

Current work on the syntax of expletive THERE has largely focused on theoretical problems English *there* poses for the licensing requirements on arguments with regard to thematic roles, case, and agreement (Postal and Pullum, 1988; Authier, 1991; Chomsky and Lasnik, 1991; Chomsky, 1993, 1995; McCloskey, 1991; Lasnik, 1992, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c, 1996; den Dikken, 1995; Groat, 1995, among others).[2] While this line of work has made much progress in delineating many important issues concerning the licensing requirements on arguments and their implications for economy considerations, it has virtually ignored the broader typological question of explaining why expletive THERE occurs in Germanic and Romance languages like English, German and Italian (1)-(3) which mark for both morphological or structural Case and morphological Agreement but not in languages like Chinese (4) or Japanese (5) which do not mark morphological Agreement (for related discussion see Huang, 1989, Speas, 1995) and languages like Cherokee (6) which do not mark for morphological or structural Case (for discussion see Scancarelli, 1987).

(1) English
  a. A man is in the garden.
  b. He/*him is in the garden.
  c. The men are in the garden.
  d. There is a man in the garden.

---

[2] Some well known exceptions to this trend include Taraldsen (1991), Vinker (1995), and Koenman and Neelman (1998). While more recent analyses of expletive constructions such as Vinker (1995) and Koenman and Neeleman (1998) are reasonably successful at extending current analyses to account for expletive constructions in Germanic languages, I do not believe these accounts may be readily extended to account for the absence of expletive THERE in non-Germanic languages Cherokee, Chinese and Japanese. In addition, I have more serious doubts that these analyses may be extended along previous lines (assuming no Overt Move F) to account for (7) while also allowing for Speas' (1995) account of overt versus null arguments based on the Principle of Economy of Projection.

(2) German

a. Ein Mann ist in der Garten.
   a man is in the garden
b. Drei Mann sind in der Garten.
   three men are in the garden
c. Er ist ein Mann in der Garten.
   There is a man in the garden

(3) Italian

a. Un ragazzo è nel negozio.
   a guy is in the store
b. (pro) sono nel negozio.
   I am in the store

c. Ci è un ragazzo nel negozio.
   THERE is a guy in the store

(4) Chinese (Mandarin)

a. huayuán li yo‡u yi ge rén.
   garden in exist one CL person
   'One person is in the garden.'
b. huayuán li yo‡u lia‡ng ge rén.
   garden in exist two CL person.
   'Two people are in the garden.'
c. *THERE huayuán li yo‡u yi ge rén.
   THERE garden in exist one CL person
   'There is one person in the garden.'

(5) Japanese

a. Sono hito-ga hiwa-ni iru.
   that person-NOM garden-LOC exist
   'A person is in the garden.'
b. Sono hito-tati-ga hiwa-ni iru.
   those persons-NOM garden-LOC exist
   'Those people are in the garden.'
c. *Sono THERE hito-ga hiwa-ni iru.
   that THERE person-NOM garden-LOC exist
   'There is a person in the garden.'

(6) Cherokee

a. (pro) ganulv-hi ges-sv?i.
   (it) grass-LOC be.3sg-PAST
   'It was in the grass.'
b. Asgaya ganulv-hi igi.
   a man grass-LOC be.3sg-PRES
   'A man is in the grass.'
c. *THERE asgaya ganulv-hi ges-sv?i.
   there a man grass-LOC be.3sg-PAST

«There was a man in the garden.'

As illustrated in (1)-(3), languages like English, German, and Italian which mark for Agreement and Case allow a form of expletive THERE.[3] In contrast, in languages like Chinese and Japanese which do not mark for morphological agreement, though perhaps for structural Case in Chinese (for discussion see Li, 1990) and morphological Case in Japanese, there is no element which corresponds to expletive THERE. Similarly, in languages like Cherokee which mark for morphological Agreement but not for morphological or structural Case, there is likewise no corresponding element to expletive THERE.

The facts illustrated above, and additional evidence from many other languages which cannot be presented here, suggest the following generalization concerning the cross-linguistic distribution of expletive THERE:

(7) Expletive THERE occurs only in languages which mark for morphological (subject-verb) agreement and morphological or structural case.

In so far as the languages discussed above are concerned, it is clear that an adequate analysis of expletive THERE must account not only for the properties of expletive constructions within languages which allow expletive THERE, but must also account for the fact that expletive THERE does not occur in languages which do not mark for both Agreement and Case. As we will see in the following section, neither Chomsky's (1993, 1995) LF-affix analysis nor Lasnik's (1992, 1995) Partitive Case analysis will account for the generalization in (7).

## 3.0 Problems for Previous Analyses of Expletive THERE

The standard minimalist view of expletive THERE, developed in Chomsky (1993, 1995), is premised on an important distinction developed in Chomsky (1993) between *legitimacy* and *interpretability*. According to Chomsky, a legitimate or well-formed representations at the interface levels consists only of legitimate syntactic objects, a derivation must converge. Chomsky (1995) maintains that expletive-associate pairs of the form in (8a) involve LF raising of the associate NP where the expletive is affixed to the associate as in (8b). To account for the fact that (8) is a legitimate syntactic object at the PF and LF interface, Chomsky's analysis relies on two principles: i) Procrastinate, which requires that movement take place at LF if possible, and ii) Greed (1991, 1993) or Attract (1995) which essentially prohibits a category from undergoing a syntactic operation (e.g., MOVE) without engaging in feature checking operations which contribute to the legitimacy of the syntactic object formed by that operation.[4] Thus, raising of the associate NP at LF in (8) is allowed by Procrastinate and Greed/Attract

[3] This generalization holds not only for all the Romance and Germanic languages, but also, to the best of my knowledge, for the Indo-European languages more generally. This does not say that all languages with Case and Agreement must have expletive THERE, only that languages must have these properties if expletive THERE does occur.

[4] Lasnik (1995, 622) shows that Chomsky's (1993) arguments for the formulation of Greed are inadequate and suggests an alternative principle, Enlightened Self-Interest. Since this is essentially the same notion of Attract proposed in Chomsky (1995), I will simply use the term Attract to refer to these alternatives to Greed.

since this results in the case features of the associate NP being checked such that the derivation converges; that is, (8) is legitimate and interpretable

(8) a. There is *a man* in the garden.
b. [TP [NP *a man*]$_i$ + there [VP is $t_i$ in the garden.]]

Based on the assumption that expletive *there* is an «LF affix» which must be adjoined to an NP at LF to be interpretable at the LF interface, the Principle of Full Interpretation (FI) requires raising of the associate NP in (8), otherwise the result is an uninterpretable derivation.

Given this view, Chomsky accounts for the ungrammaticality of forms like (9) as follows. Since the case properties of the associate NP are satisfied internally to the Prepositional Phrase headed by *to*, raising of the associate NP at LF will violate Greed/Attract. Thus, failure of the associate NP to raise at LF results in the LF-affix *there* being uninterpretable since it is not adjoined to an NP at LF.

(9) *There seems to [*a strange man*] [that it is raining outside]

Under Chomsky's account it is only the case requirements of the associate NP which force LF raising in (9). Case properties alone however are insufficient to account for constructions of the form in (10).

(10) a. [a strange man]$_i$ is $t_i$ in the garden.
b. * e is a strange man in the garden.

If case requirements may be satisfied by raising the associate NP at LF, we cannot account for the ungrammaticality of (10b). According to Chomsky (1995), the fact that English clauses require an overt subject (either a lexical NP or an expletive, but not *pro*) presumably follows from the Extended Projection Principle, which may be reduced to a strong EPP (NP/DP) feature of T which requires that its specifier position be filled overtly at PF. Given Chomsky's hypothesis that strong features are not legitimate PF objects, the strong EPP feature of T may be satisfied in either of two ways, by overt movement of a lexical subject to spec of TP or insertion of expletive THERE, failure to do so results in the strong EPP feature of T being unchecked before spell-out as in (10b) and thus the derivation crashes.

There are at least two immediate problems with maintaining this analysis. Groat (1995) and Lasnik (1996) show that the LF-affix analysis fails to predict the absence of binding in construction like (12).

(12) a. Some applicants$_i$ seem to each other$_i$ to be eligible for the job.
b. *There$_i$ seem to each other$_i$ to be some applicants eligible for the job.

If binding relations are determined at LF as Chomsky (1995) suggests, the LF-affix analysis incorrectly predicts that raising of the associate NP in (12b) at LF should result in a well-formed binding relation. In addition, Groat (1995) points out that this analysis of expletive THERE introduces a new class of morpho-syntactic objects (LF phrasal affixes) which has no independent motivation. These problems are not in themselves

fatal for the LF-affix analysis, depending on the assumptions we make concerning the «level» at which binding relations should hold (either at PF or LF) and whether LF-raising necessarily involves «generalized pied-piping» (whole category movement of the associate NP) or movement of only the formal (agreement) features of the associate (see Lasnik 1996 for discussion).

More serious problems emerge for this analysis however with respect to the facts in (1)- (6) above. If THERE is an LF-affix as Chomsky suggests, then how may we account for the fact that languages like Chinese, Japanese and Cherokee lack this class of morpho-syntactic objects? One possibility would be to formulate a lexical stipulation: these languages differ from languages like English in that they to do not have a lexical element THERE specified in the lexicon. The problem with this is that it fails to account for the generalization in (7), that expletive THERE occurs only in those languages which mark for both morphological Agreement and morphological or structural Case, in a principled way. An alternative analysis which accounts for these differences in a principled way and avoids the additional problems discussed above would clearly be preferable on empirical and conceptual grounds.

Lasnik (1992, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c, 1996) develops an alternative analysis of expletive THERE, which we may refer to as the Partitive Case analysis, which essentially maintains that expletive THERE and the associate NP have distinct case properties: *there* has nominative case features which are checked against Tense (or Agrs) and the associate NP has partitive case features which are assigned or checked in a VP-internal position. Under this view, expletive *there* and full NP's are viewed as NP category elements which differ in at least one crucial respect: full NP's have ϕ-features while expletive *there* does not.

Following Belletti (1988), Lasnik (1992) argues that partitive Case is assigned only to indefinite NP's in a VP-internal position, which may account for the fact that expletive THERE occurs only with indefinite NP's as illustrated in (13).

(13) a. There is a man in the garden.
b. *There is the man in the garden.

Extending this analysis, Lasnik (1996) suggests that only the Agreement features of the associate (and not the entire category) raise at LF. This will not only account for the fact that the associate (post-verbal) NP agrees with the verb, but may also account for the absence of binding in constructions like (12) above if the category features of the associate NP are stranded in a VP-internal position. This analysis avoids many of the problems encountered by Chomsky's LF-affix analysis without positing a new class of morpho-syntactic objects: expletive THERE is «inadequate» only in the sense that it lacks agreement features.

New problems arise with this analysis however when we consider additional data from other Germanic languages which make greater use of overt Case marking. Vinker (1995) shows that Lasnik's Partitive Case analysis of the Definiteness/Indefiniteness effect (13) encounters serious empirical problems when we consider passive constructions in German and Icelandic as in (14) and (15) below.

(14) a. Es wurde am Tatort *ein dänischer Linguist* gesehen.
There was at crime-scene a Danish linguist (nom) seen

b. *Es wurde am Tatort *ich* gesehen.
There was at crime-scene I (nom) seen
c. *Es wurde am Tatort *einen dänischen Linguisten* gesehen.
There was at crime-scene a Danish linguist (acc) seen
d. *Es wurde am Tatort *einem dänischen Linguisten* gesehen.
There was at crime-scene a Danish linguist (dat) seen
'There was a Danish linguist/*I seen at the crime-scene.'
(Vinker, 1995, 175)

(15) a. pað höfðu sennilega sokkið einhverjir bátar í firðinum.
There had probably sunk some boats (nom) in bay-the
b. *það höfðu sennilega sokkið einhverja báta í firðinum.
There had probably sunk some boats (acc) in bay-the
'There were probably some boats sunk in the bay.'
(Vinker, 1995, 175)

According to Lasnik, indefinite associate NP's must be assigned partitive case independently of the expletive (which receives nominative case) within a VP internal position. This however fails to predict that the indefinite associate NP may only appear in nominative case. The problem here is that Lasnik's analysis fails to adequately capture the chain-like properties of expletive-associate pairs, a robust observation which remains unexplained under Lasnik's Partitive Case analysis.

Another problem with Lasnik's Partitive Case analysis is that it may not be extended to account for the generalization in (7) in a principled way. We might attempt to explain (7) by assuming that languages like Chinese, Japanese and Cherokee simply lack a partitive case; if NP's cannot receive case in a VP-internal position, they must move overtly to a higher position (spec of TP, the canonical subject) where case may be assigned or checked. Thus, expletive THERE may not occur in these languages because this position is already occupied by a lexical NP. This solution is stipulative however and fares no better in accounting for (7) than the lexical solution for Chomsky's LF-affix analysis discussed above.

Given the empirical and conceptual problems discussed above, the prospect that either Chomsky's LF-affix or Lasnik's Partitive Case analysis may be extended to account for the range of data reported here and elsewhere is doubtful and perhaps dubious (for a detailed discussion see Vinker, 1995; also see Griffin, 1998). In the rest of this article, I will show that an alternative Over Move F analysis of expletive THERE will not only account for the range of facts discussed in previous analyses, but will account for many additional facts and the generalization in (7) in a principled way.

## 4.0 The Overt Move F Analysis and Economy of Projection

In this section I propose an alternative analysis of expletive THERE based on the theory of overt feature movement proposed by Blight (1998) and Roberts (1998) and Speas' (1995) theory of economy of projection. According to Chomsky (1995), overt movement of features always entails movement of the category associated with those features for reasons of PF convergence, an operation which is referred to as generalized pied-piping. Covert movement, on the other hand, is not subject to PF constraints and involves only movement of pure formal features at LF. The distinction here between overt versus

covert movement is stipulative however, and is at odds with the more general intuition that movement operations apply «freely» and are constrained only by the economy principles of UG and the requirements imposed by the interface levels for convergence.

Roberts (1998) points out that the differential properties of overt versus covert movement operations in relation to PF requirements on derivations may be eliminated as a theoretical redundancy given that identical consequences obtain based on the difference between weak and strong features and their sensitivity to PF requirements. Assuming that the same properties may determine whether generalized pied-piping may apply, Roberts formulates the following proposal concerning the difference between overt and covert movement operations.

(16) Weak features do not require pied-piping of $\alpha$, whereas strong features do.

Under this view, there is no need to stipulate that only category features, and not formal features, may undergo overt movement at PF. Instead, whether or not category and formal features may raise at PF or LF will depend on the *strength* of those features or their sensitivity to PF requirements.

While this view may eliminate a redundancy within Chomsky's (1995) theory and the stipulation that only category features are sensitive to PF requirements, this proposal encounters new problems when we consider previous criticisms of attempts to reduce PF requirements to a distinction between weak and strong features. A brief review of Speas' (1995) theory of economy of projection and her analysis of null vs. overt subject languages will better illustrate the problem, as well as a possible solution based on the Principle of Economy of Projection.

Speas (1995) posits an account for the distribution of null subject languages like Italian and Japanese and overt subject languages like English based on the properties of agreement morphology and the Principle of Economy of Projection which may be stated as in (17).

(17) Principle of Economy of Projection (EOP)
Project XP only if its head X or its specifier [Spec, XP] has independent semantic or phonetic content.

Under this view, it is the properties of agreement morphology which determine whether a language allows null subjects or requires overt subjects; These properties are divided into three basic types: so-called «mixed» agreement morphology (English), «uniform» and rich agreement morphology (Italian), and «uniform» and null agreement morphology (Japanese). In the case of morphologically «mixed» languages like English which require overt subjects, agreement morphology cannot head its own projection and must be realized directly on the verb. As a result, since AgrsP must be projected in order for the derivation to converge at LF (presumably the projection where case and agreement features are checked) a lexical NP must be moved into the specifier position of AgrsP so that the phrase is projected in accordance with the EOP as illustrated in (18a). In the case of morphologically «uniform» and rich languages like Italian which allow null subjects, agreement morphology may head its own projection as illustrated in (18b). Since movement of an overt subject to the specifier position of AgrsP is not required by the EOP, languages like Italian will allow null subjects. In the case of uniform languages like Japanese which do no mark agreement morphology and allow null subjects, no

agreement phrase is projected. Instead, the surface position for subjects is the specifier of Tense Phrase (TP). Since TP is headed by independent semantic content, overt movement of a subject to the specifier position of TP is not required by the EOP as illustrated in (18c). Thus, languages like Japanese will allow null subjects.

Speas (1995) shows that so-called «licensing and identification» theories (e.g., Jaeggli and Safir 1989) which attempt to account for the distribution of null subject languages like Italian and Japanese and overt subject languages like English and German by stating the distinction between weak and strong (agreement) features in terms of whether the features must disappear before PF reduces the distinction between (agreement) features to a mere stipulation which bears no correlation to the type of agreement (uniform vs. mixed and marked vs. unmarked) morphology. These criticisms pose an immediate problem for my claim that expletive THERE is an instance of Overt Move F in the sense of Roberts (1998). If expletive THERE is an instance of Overt Move F as I have suggested, then how may we account for the more general PF requirements on subject positions? In other words, how may we maintain the view that overt movement of a lexical NP to a subject position is required in overt subject languages due to the need to project AgrsP in accordance with the Principle of Economy of Projection as suggested in Speas (1995)?

(18) a. [AgrsP $NP_i$ Agrs [TP [VP $t_i$ V ...]]]
b. [AgrsP pro $V_i$+Affix [TP [VP $V_i$ ...]]]
c. [TP pro T [VP ...]]

One possible solution is to assume that both Overt Move F and generalized pied-piping are subject to the EOP. If this is the case as I will suggest, then there is no need to stipulate that only «strong» features undergo generalized pied-piping in the course of a derivation. Instead, both operations may be derived from the EOP and interpretive constraints imposed by the interface levels. Adopting this view, as I will show below, will not only allow us to maintain Speas' account of null vs. overt subject languages but will also allow us to account for the distribution of expletive THERE based on the EOP.

Now consider how the well known properties of expletive THERE in an overt subject language like English may be analyzed under an Overt Move F approach. In support of my claim that both Overt Move F and generalized pied-piping may apply «freely» to satisfy the EOP, consider the optionality in the use of expletive *there* and lexical NP's as subjects in constructions like (19).

(19) a. [AgrsP A $man_i$ is $t_i$ in the garden]
b. [AgrsP $There_i$ is a $man_i$ in the garden]
c. [AgrsP Some $men_i$ are $t_i$ in the garden]
d. [AgrsP $There_i$ are some $men_i$ in the garden]

Notice that movement of either expletive *there* or a lexical NP to the spec of AgrsP will satisfy the EOP. Thus, where the EOP and additional derivational constraints on *legitimacy* and *interpretability* are satisfied, Overt Move F and generalized pied-piping may apply «freely», there is no need to stipulate that only «strong» features undergo overt movement. More specifically, there is no need to maintain that it is the «strong» +EPP feature of T, which is generally assumed to be adjoined to Agrs (Bobaljik and

Jonas, 1996), which requires English clauses to have overt subjects. Instead, these effects follow from the fact that agreement morphology in English may not head its own projection and the EOP.

If expletive *there* is an «alternative» spell-out of both the case and agreement features of a lexical NP as I have suggested, we may account for the ungrammaticality of (20) as follows. While the presence of expletive *there* may satisfy the EOP, the constructions in (20) fail to converge since the agreement features of the lexical NPs (spelled-out by *there*) do not agree with the verb and result in illegitimate derivations.

(20) a. *There is some men in the garden
b. *There are a man in the garden.

Now consider how we may account for the definiteness/indefiniteness effect illustrated in (21). While the ungrammaticality of (21c) might be taken as counterevidence for the claim that Overt Move F and generalized pied-piping apply «freely», the ungrammaticality of (21c) may be accounted for independently as a failure of interpretability (and not a failure of legitimacy) based on Diesing's (1992) theory of indefiniteness as suggested in Groat (1995).

(21) a. A man is in the garden.
b. There is a man in the garden.
c. *There is the man in the garden.
d. The man is in the garden.

According to Diesing (1992), nonspecific indefinite NP's must reside in the domain of VP (= nuclear scope) while specific indefinites and definite NP's must reside outside VP (= restrictive clause) at the LF interface. If we take this to be an interpretability constraint on the category (± D) features of subject NP's, this explains why definite NP's cannot be associates of expletive *there*; while the result in (21c) is a legitimate derivation, it is uninterpretable at the LF interface. The advantage of this analysis is that we may account for the facts explained by Lasnik's Partitive Case analysis without requiring that expletive *there* and the associate NP have distinct Case features; since expletive *there* is an «alternative» spell-out of the case and agreement features of an associate NP, we may readily account for the facts in (14) and (15) which show that the expletive and the associate NP have nominative Case, facts which are unexplained under Lasnik's analysis.

The absence of binding effects in constructions like (12) above (shown as (22) below) may be explained in the same way as under Lasnik's (1996) analysis. If a proper binding relation requires the category features of the associate NP to c-command the reciprocal in the course of the derivation, the absence of binding in (22b) will follow from the fact that only the Case and Agreement (formal) features c-command the reciprocal.

(22) a. Some applicants$_i$ seem to each other$_i$ to be eligible for the job.
b. *There$_i$ seem to each other$_i$ to be some applicants eligible for the job.

A number of other facts also follow from the proposed analysis. Consider again the ungrammaticality of (9) above (shown here as (23) below). Since expletive *there* is a spell-out of both the Case and Agreement features of the associate NP, we readily expect the ungrammaticality of (23); if the Case features of the associate NP are checked by the

preposition *to*, they cannot raise to the subject position of the matrix clause in (23) without violating Greed/Attract.

(23) *There seems to [*a strange man*] [that it is raining outside]

Now consider again the ungrammaticality of (10b) above (shown here as (24) below) where the subject position is not filled overtly by either expletive there or a lexical NP. Contrary to Chomsky's account which views (24) as a violation of the EPP (formulated as a Strong NP/DP feature of T), (24) instead reduces to a violation of the EOP. Since AgrsP does not have phonetic or semantic content at PF, it cannot be projected and thus violates the EOP. As a result, the Case and Agreement features of the associate NP cannot be checked because there is no appropriate head position (Agrs) against which these features may be checked, so the derivation fails to converge.

(24) *[*AgrsP* e [TP is a strange man in the garden]].

Additional facts from English provide further support for the view that expletive *there* is a spell-out of the Case and Agreement features of an associate NP. Consider the raising facts in (25).

(25) a. There seems to be a strange man in the garden.
b. A strange man seems to be in the garden.
c. I believe there to be a strange man in the garden.
d. I believe a strange man to be in the garden.

If expletive *there* is a spell-out of the Case and Agreement features, and if Overt Move F and generalized pied-piping may apply freely as I have suggested, then we readily predict the overlapping distribution of expletive *there* and lexical NP's in constructions involving NP movement to subject and object (ECM) positions as in (25).

Conversely, we correctly predict the fact that expletive *there* cannot occur with clausal antecedents as illustrated in (26).

(26) a. It seems [CP that he is correct]
b. *There seems [CP that he is correct]
c. It is believed [CP that he is correct]
d. *There is believed [CP that he is correct]

If clausal complements differ from NP complements in that only the latter are assigned or checked for Case as is widely assumed, the ungrammaticality of (26b) and (26d) will result from the fact that the Case properties of the matrix clause cannot be checked by expletive *there* since there is no case (NP) feature which may raise to the matrix subject position and be spelled-out as expletive *there*, resulting in illegitimate derivations.

As shown in the discussion above, the Overt Move F analysis of expletive *there* may account for the range of facts accounted for by previous analyses without positing a new class of morpho-syntactic «LF-objects» as required under Chomsky's LF-affix analysis while accounting for the chain-like Case properties of expletive-associate pairs, a generalization which is lost under Lasnik's Partitive Case analysis. More significantly, it provides an account for the generalization in (7) that expletive THERE only occurs in

those languages which mark for subject-verb agreement and morphological or structural Case. Since expletive THERE is a spell-out of the Case and Agreement features of an associate NP, the Overt Move F analysis readily predicts the absence of an element corresponding to expletive THERE in languages like Chinese and Japanese which lack subject-verb agreement morphology and languages like Cherokee which do not mark for morphological or structural Case, facts which provide strong support for the Overt Move F analysis and the claim the expletive THERE is a spell-out of the Case and Agreement features of an associate NP.

Two important theoretical consequence emerge from the discussion above. First, and rather significantly, the proposed analysis, in conjunction with that in Speas (1995), will allow for an account of the properties of subjects positions based solely on the Principle of Economy of Projection. As a result, since the empirical consequences of the EPP (formulated as a Strong NP/DP features of T) may be explained independently by the EOP, the EPP may be eliminated from the theory of grammar as argued in Speas (1995). Second, it eliminates the need to stipulate that only «strong» category features may undergo overt movement at PF as suggested by Roberts (1998). Instead, I have shown that Overt Move F and «generalized pied-piping» may apply freely in accordance with economy constraints, though its application may be restricted by further constraints on interpretability at the LF interface. In addition, it should be noted that the proposed analysis may achieve both of these ends while maintaining the correlation between overt subject and null subject languages and the type of agreement (uniform vs. mixed and marked vs. unmarked) morphology as discussed in Speas (1995).

In the rest of this article I will present additional arguments in favor of the Overt Move F analysis of expletive THERE and show how the proposed analysis may be extended to account for additional facts.

## 5.0 The Distribution of THERE and pro Subjects

A number of facts from languages like Italian provide addition support for the analysis of expletive THERE outlined in section 4. Even though Italian is a null subject language (in contrast to English), Italian*ci/ce* (THERE) shares a number of similar distibutional properties with English *there*: i) the associate NP must agree with the verb (27), ii) it allows optionality in the use of expletive *there* and lexical NP's as subjects in constructions like (28), iii) it exhibits the definiteness/indefiniteness effect (29), and it allows NP but not clausal associates (30).

(27) a. C'eravata voi nel negozio.
There were you-pl in the store
b. *C'era voi nel nel negozio.
There was you-pl in the store
(Burzio, 1986; 133)

(28) a. Io sono alla festa.
I am at the party
b. Ci sono io alla festa.
There am I at the party
(Burzio, 1986; 129)

(29) a. Molte ragazze erano nel negozio.
Many girls were in the store
b. C'erano molte ragazze nel negozio.
There were many girls in the store
c. * C'erano quei ragazze nel negozio.
There were those girls in the store
d. Quei ragazze erano nel negozio.
Those girls were in the store

(30) a. Si sembra que lui sie giusto.
It appears that he is correct
b. *Ci sembra que lui sie giusto.
There appears that he is correct
c. Si cride que lui sia giusto.
It is believed that he is correct
d. Ci cride que lui sia giusto.
There is believed that he is correct

These facts may be explained in the same way as the English facts discussed above. One particularly interesting difference however in the distribution of expletive *ci* (THERE) in Italian is that it cannot co-occur with a *pro* subject as illustrated in (31).

(31) a. *pro* Sono alla festa.
(I) am at the oarty
b. *Ci sono *pro* alla festa.
There am I at the party
c. Ci sono io alla festa.
There am I at the party
(Burzio, 1986; 129)

While (31b) receives no account under previous analyses of expletive THERE, it immediately follows from the proposed analysis where expletive THERE is taken to be an instance of Overt Move F. If expletive *ci* (THERE) is an «alternative» spell-out of the agreement and case features of an associate NP, we readily predict the ungrammaticality of (31b). Since *pro* does not have independent Agreement features, but instead receive these by being in a spec-head relation with morphologically rich INFL, only the case features of an associate NP (pronoun) may raise to the canonical subject position. As a result, the formal features of the associate cannot be spelled-out as *ci* (THERE) since this is a spell-out of both case and agreement features and the derivation fails to converge. In contrast, when the pronominal subject is realized overtly as in (31c), the pronominal subject *io* has both case and agreement features which may undergo Overt Move F and be realized as expletive *ci*. These facts provide strong support for the Overt Move F analysis and the claim that expletive THERE is an «alternative» spell-out of the Case and Agreement features of an associate NP.

## 6.0 Conclusions

In summary, I have argued that expletive THERE is an «alternative» spell-out of the Case and Agreement features of an associate NP, an instance of Overt Move F. I have

shown that such an analysis will not only account for the properties of expletive constructions in English, but will also account for the general observation that expletive THERE occurs only in languages which mark for both morphological (subject-verb) agreement and morphological or structural case--facts which do not immediately follow from Chomsky's LF-Affix analysis or Lasnik's Partitive Case analysis. In addition, the proposed analysis will allow us to account for the chain-like properties of expletive-associate pairs, an observation which is not explained under Lasnik's analysis. Furthermore, the proposed analysis readily account for the complimentary distribution between expletive subjects and *pro* subjects in languages like Italian, facts which receive no account under previous analyses. Given the empirical and conceptual inadequacies of Chomsky's LF-Affix analysis and Lasnik's Partitive Case analysis as discussed above and elsewhere, the Overt Move F analysis of expletive THERE outlined above is clearly preferable to these alternative analyses.

Two important theoretical consequence emerge from the discussion above. First, and rather significantly, the proposed analysis, in conjunction with that in Speas (1995), will allow for an account of the properties of subject positions based solely on the Principle of Economy of Projection. As a result, since the empirical consequences of the EPP (formulated as a Strong NP/DP features of T) may be explained independently by the EOP, the EPP may be eliminated from the theory of grammar. Instead, these effects may be derived from the EOP and the properties of Agreement morphology as argued in Speas (1995).

Second, it eliminates the need to stipulate that only «strong» category features may undergo overt movement at PF as suggested by Roberts (1998). Instead, I have shown that Overt Move F and «generalized pied-piping» may apply freely in accordance with economy constraints, though its application may be restricted by further constraints on interpretability at the LF interface. In addition, it should be noted that the proposed analysis may achieve both of these ends while maintaining the correlation between overt subject and null subject languages and the type of agreement (uniform vs. mixed and marked vs. unmarked) morphology as discussed in Speas (1995).

## References


Authier, J-M. (1991). V-Governed Expletives, Case Theory, and the Projection Principle. Linguistic Inquiry 22: 721-740.

Belletti, A. (1988). The Case of Unaccusatives. Linguistic Inquiry 19: 1-34.

Blight, R. (1998). Formal Features and Movement at PF. Presented at the Penn Linguistics Colloquium.

Bobaljik, J.D., and Jonas, D. (1996). Subject Positions and the Roles of TP. Linguistic Inquiry 27: 195-236.

Burzio, L. (1986). Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Chomsky, N., and Lasnik, H. (1991). "The Theory of Principles and Parameters," In J.Jacobs, A.von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, and T. Vennemann (eds.), Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research. Berlin: De Gruyter. Reprinted in Chomsky (1995).

Chomsky, N. (1993). "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory," In K. Hale and S.J. Keyser (eds.), The View from Building 20. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1995). "Categories and Transformations," In The Minimalist Program, 219-394. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

den Dikken, M. (1995). Binding, Expletives, and Levels. Linguistic Inquiry 26: 347-354.

Griffin, W.E. (1999). The Status of Agreement Phrase in Universal Grammar. To be presented at the 52 Annual Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, Lexington Kentucky.

Groat, E.M. (1995). English Expletives: A Minimalist Approach. Linguistic Inquiry 26: 354-365.

Huang, C.-T. J. (1989). Pro-drop in Chinese: A Generalized Control Theory. In O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), The Null Subject Parameter. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
Jaeggli, O., and Safir, K. (1989). The null subject parameter and parametric theory. In O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), The Null Subject Parameter. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
Koeneman, O., and Neeleman, A. (1998). Transitive Expletive Constructions in Flexible Syntax. Manuscript, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS at Utrecht University and Department of Phonetics and Linguistics at University College London.
Lasnik, H. (1992). Case and Expletives: Notes toward a Parametric Account. Linguistic Inquiry 23: 381-405.
Lasnik, H. (1995a). Case and Expletives Revisited: On Greed and Other Human Failings. Linguistic Inquiry 26: 615-633.
Lasnik, H. (1995b). Last Resort. In S. Haraguchi and M. Funaki (eds.), Minimalism and Linguistic Theory, 1-32. Hituzi Syobo.
Lasnik, H. (1995c). Last Resort and Attract F. In L. Gabriele, D. Hardison, and R. Westmoreland (eds.), Proceedings of the Sicth Annual Meeting of the Formal Linguistics Society of Mid-America, 62-81. Bloomington: Indiana University.
Li, Y.-H. A. (1990). Order and Constituency in Mandarin Chinese. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
McCloskey, J. (1991). There, It, and Agreement. Linguistic Inquiry 22: 563-567.
Postal, P., and Pullum, G. (1988). Expletive Noun Phrases in Subcategorized Positions. Linguistic Inquiry 19: 635-670.
Roberts, I. (1998). Have/Be Raising, Move F, and Procrastinate. Linguistic Inquiry 29: 113-125.
Scancarelli, J. (1987). Grammatical relations and Verb Agreement in Cherokee. Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA.
Speas, M. (1995). Economy, Agreement and the Representation of Null Arguments. Manuscript, University of Massachussets at Amherst.
Vinker, S. (1995). Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages. New York: Oxford University Press.
Taraldsen, K. T. (1991). NP-Movement and Expletive Chains. In H. Haider and K. Netter (eds.), Representation and Derivation in the Theory of Grammar, 53-69. Dordrecht: Klewer Academic Publishers.

William Earl Griffin
528A Calhoun Hall
Department of Linguistics
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78713
wgriffin@mail.utexas.edu