

## The Typology of Expletive *THERE*

I propose an alternative account of expletive *THERE* based on the theory that formal features may move overtly at PF. 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 the Principle of Economy of Projection (EOP) proposed in Speas (1995).

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 (see selected examples in (1-4) below). Next, I consider two recent analyses of expletive *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*. Then I introduce the Overt Move F analysis of expletive *THERE* in relation to English *there* 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 predicts that *THERE* will not occur in languages which lack either (or both) of these features.

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 (see (5) below). 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.

Two important theoretical consequence emerge from this work. First, the proposed analysis, in conjunction with that of 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 show 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.

- (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) 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
- (3) 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.'
- (4) 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.'
- (5)
  - a. *pro* Sono alla festa.  
(I) am at the party
  - 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)

### Selected References

- Blight, R. (1998) Formal Features and Movement at PF. Presented at the Penn Linguistics Colloquium.
- Burzio, L. (1986). Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- 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.
- 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.
- Roberts, I. (1998). Have/Be Raising, Move F, and Procrastinate. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 113-125.
- Speas, M. (1995). Economy, Agreement and the Representation of Null Arguments. Manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.