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This paper presents an analysis of Transitive Expletive Constructions (TECs) within the framework of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky (1995)). In particular, my concern goes to the following two issues. The first one is why English does not allow TECs unless the subjects undergo Heavy NP Shift. The second one is why TECs with a non-postposed subject are acceptable in languages like Icelandic, but not in English. I will provide a unified account of these phenomena by arguing that overt subject movement out of vP is essential for convergence of TECs.*

1. Introduction

It is generally known that Transitive Expletive Constructions (henceforth, TECs) are usually excluded in English, while they are very often acceptable in languages like Icelandic. Relevant examples are given below.

(1) a. *There someone entered the hall.
   b. *There a man visited us.

(2) það hafa margir jólaveinar boroðað buðing.
   there have many Christmas trolls eaten pudding
   ‘Many Christmas trolls have eaten pudding.’
   [Ice] (Bobaljik and Jonas (1996: 209))

The examples in (3), however, show that they are improved when the subjects are postposed to the clause final position by Heavy NP Shift (henceforth, HNPS).
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(3) a. Suddenly there entered the hall an ugly old man.
   b. There was slowly making its way toward us a figure in black.
   c. There visited us last night a large group of people who traveled all the way from India.

((a) Levin (1993: 90), (b) Bolinger (1977: 102),
(c) Chomsky (1995: 343))

On the basis of these facts, I will investigate the following two issues within the framework of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky (1995)).

(I) Why does the postposing of the subjects affect the acceptability of TECs in English?

(II) Why does the acceptability of TECs with a non-postposed subject vary among languages?

Specifically, it will be argued that the overt subject movement out of vP is essential for convergence of TECs.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly outlines theoretical assumptions which are relevant to discussion in subsequent sections. Section 3 and section 4 are dedicated to TECs in English. I will also examine some syntactic properties of HNPS in section 4, because the analysis to be presented there depends heavily on the analysis of HNPS. Section 5 examines 'there'-constructions in the languages with TECs, and shows that subjects obligatorily undergo overt raising to [Spec, TP].^1 This fact strongly supports a close correlation between TECs and overt subject movement. Section 6 gives the conclusion of this paper.

2. Theoretical Assumptions

In this paper, I follow Chomsky (1995) in assuming the operation Attract F and the clause structure of (4) which presupposes a Larsonian shell.

(4) \([CP \ C \ [TP \ T \ [vP \ Subj \ v \ [vP \ V \ Obj]]]]\)

The definitions of Attract F and closeness are given below.

(5) K attracts F if F is the closest feature that can enter into a checking relation with a sublabel of K.

(Chomsky (1995: 297))

^1 Henceforth, 'there' expresses an expletive in these V2 (Verb Second) languages which is equivalent to English there.
(6) $\beta$ is closer to $\tau$ than $\alpha$ unless $\beta$ is in the same minimal domain as (a) $\tau$ or (b) $\alpha$. (ibid.: 356)

*Attract F* is different from *Move $\alpha$* in that a set of formal features, rather than a whole category, moves throughout the derivation.

Now, let us consider the derivation of active transitive constructions in English. First, the subject overtly moves to [Spec, TP] to eliminate a strong D feature of T, thereby deriving the effect of the EPP (Extended Projection Principle). This movement yields the structure of (7):

\[
(7)\quad [\text{TP Subj} [T \overset{\uparrow}{\text{T}} [\text{vP tSubj V-v} [\text{VP tV Obj}]]]]
\]

\[\text{D feature, Nom}\]

Given that *Move F* automatically carries along a set of formal features of a lexical item (Chomsky (1995: 265)), it follows that the subject pied-pipes its Case feature and $\phi$-features in (7). I postulate that checking takes place automatically as soon as a checking configuration is formed. Therefore, the overt subject raising results in the simultaneous deletion of the D feature and nominative Case feature of T, because they are in a spec-head relation with an appropriate checker, namely T.

LF movement is induced for checking of [\text{Not-Interpretable}] features (e.g. Case features of T, V and D); these features must be checked for convergence at LF because they play no role in interpretation. (8) and (9) show the covert process of checking. Firstly, FF(Obj) attracts FF(V-v) to have its [\text{Not-Interpretable}] accusative Case feature and $\phi$-features checked.

\[
(8)\quad [\text{TP Subj} [T \overset{\uparrow}{\text{T}} [\text{vP tSubj} [\text{v' FF(Obj) V-v} [\text{VP V Obj}]]]]]
\]

\[\text{Acc, } \phi\text{-features}\]

Given that a trace of A-movement has no formal features and thus is invisible to *Attract F* (Chomsky (1995: 303)), FF(Obj) is the only candidate for attraction in (8), because there remain no Case feature and $\phi$-features in [Spec, vP] after the overt subject raising. This implies that

\[2\text{ I do not assume the distinction between }\text{deletion} \text{ and }\text{erasure} \text{ in the sense of Chomsky (1995).}\]

\[3\text{ I use the notation FF(LI) in referring to a set of formal features of LI. (LI=} \text{lexical item)}\]
subjects block the attraction of FF(Obj) only when they remain in [Spec, vP] until LF.

Secondly, FF(V-v) raises and adjoins to T in order to discharge its V-features.

(9) \[TP \text{Subj} [T' \text{FF(V-v)-T} [\text{vP tSubj} [T' \text{FF(Obj) V-v [vP ...]]]]] \]

The complex [FF(V-v)-T], which is formed by this v-to-T movement, enters into checking relations with \(\phi\)-features of the subject via spec-head relation.

An important point of this checking system is that formation of the complexes ([V-v] in (7) and [FF(V-v)-T] in (9)) precedes feature attraction. The operation Attract \(F\) never takes place unless the attractors are formed properly, and hence is applied cyclically throughout the derivation.

3. TECs with a Non-Postposed Subject in English

Based on the theoretical assumptions presented in section 2, we claim that the derivation of TECs with a non-postposed subject proceeds as follows. As shown in (10), the expletive there is inserted into [Spec, TP] to satisfy the EPP as soon as T is merged at the root.

(10) \[TP \text{There} T [\text{vP Subj V-v [vP tV Obj]]} \]

\(D\) feature

There lacks both Case feature and \(\phi\)-features (Chomsky (1993, 1995)), so that nominative Case feature and \(\phi\)-features of T are checked by covert movement of FF(Subj) to T.\(^4\) At this point of derivation, there occur no problems which will lead the derivation to crash.

\(4\) When there-constructions are embedded under ECM verbs like believe, FF(Subj) enters into a checking relation with the matrix [V-v], as illustrated in (i).

(i) I believed there to arrive a man in the room.

\[\uparrow \quad \text{Acc, } \phi\text{-features} \]

This process of checking is parallel to that in ECM constructions like (ii), which means that a man in (i) bears accusative Case just like him in (ii).
Now, how about the derivation at LF? As mentioned in section 2, the first step at LF is to discharge the \([-\text{Interpretable}]\) features of \(\text{FF}(V-v)\); it must enter into a checking relation with the closest DP to have its Case feature and \(\phi\)-features checked. (11) shows that \(\text{FF}(V-v)\) is in a spec-head configuration with \(\text{FF}(\text{Subj})\). \(\text{FF}(\text{Obj})\), which would be an appropriate checkee, is outside the minimal domain of \(\text{FF}(V-v)\). Therefore, \(\text{FF}(V-v)\) automatically enters into a checking relation with \(\text{FF}(\text{Subj})\).

(11) \([\text{TP} \text{There} \left[\text{vP} \text{Subj} V-v \left[\text{VP} tV \text{Obj}\right]\right]]\)

\[\text{Feature mismatch}\]

However, this checking results in a feature mismatch; \(\text{FF}(V-v)\), an accusative Case checker, does not have nominative Case feature to check against \(\text{FF}(\text{Subj})\). Consequently, the derivation crashes because the configuration contains the mismatched features which are illegiti-

(iii) I believe him to be honest.

\[\ldots \left[\text{vP} \left[\text{FF(him) believed} V-v \left[\text{VP} tV \left[\text{TP} \text{him} \left[\text{T'} to be honest\right]\right]\right]\right]\right]\]

\[\text{Acc}, \phi\text{-features}\]

One might ask whether the subjects are actually nominative in (iiiia) and accusative in (iiiib).

(iii) a. There arrived \textit{a man} in the room.
 b. I believed there to arrive \textit{a man} in the room.

There is strong empirical evidence which shows that the NPs in question actually bear nominative Case or accusative Case. Let us consider the sentences from Icelandic.

(iv) a. \(\text{pæø høfðu sennileg} \text{a sokkið einhverjir bátar/}\)

\(\text{There had(3PL) probably sunk some boats (Nom/}\)

\(\text{einhverjá báta í firðinum}\)

\(\text{Acc) in the bay}\)

‘Some boats had probably sunk in the bay.’

(Sigurðsson (1991: 346–347))

b. Hann taldi \(\text{pro hafa sokkið}\)

\(\text{He believed (there) have sunk}\)

\(\text{einhverjir bátar / einhverja báta í firðinum}\)

\(\text{some boats (+Nom/Acc) in the bay}\)

‘He believed some boats to have sunk in the bay.’

(Vikner (1995: 175–176))

(iva) and (ivb) are syntactically equivalent to (iiiia) and (iiiib), respectively. (iva) shows that the subject must be nominative when \(\text{pæø ‘there’ occupies [Spec, TP]}\) in a tensed clause. On the other hand, (ivb) shows that it must be accusative when \(\text{pæø-constructions are embedded under the ECM verbs}. It may be possible to extend the same analysis to English \textit{there}-constructions.
mate syntactic objects at LF (Chomsky (1995: 309)).

To sum up, the derivation of TECs with a non-postposed subject crashes because the subject remaining in [Spec, vP] prevents FF(V-ν) from entering into a checking relation with an appropriate set of formal features, namely FF(Obj).

4. TECs with a Postposed Subject in English

Now, we expect that the derivation will converge if the subject overtly moves out of vP. This section deals with TECs in which the subject undergoes HNPS, and explores this possibility.

4.1. Heavy NP Shift

4.1.1. Strict Locality

Before going into detailed discussion of TECs, let us begin by examining the syntactic properties of HNPS.

Johnson (1985) and Rochemont and Culicover (1990) argue that the landing sites of the shifted NPs are strictly restricted to the VP-adjoined or the TP-adjoined position. As for objects, they are shifted to the right side of VP, but not to that of TP. Some widely accepted VP constituency tests clearly show that the relevant NPs attach to VP. Consider (12).

(12) a. VP-ellipsis
   John read in *The Times* a scathing review of his new book, and Sally did too.

b. VP-preposing
   John was told to buy for Mary every book he could find, and buy for Mary every book he could find he did.

c. Pseudo-cleft
   What Mary did was put on the mantel an old soiled portrait of her husband.

(Rochemont and Culicover (1990: 118–119))

The NPs shifted from object position pattern with VP under ellipsis, preposing and pseudo-clefting, which shows that they are within VP. Furthermore, consider (13).

(13) a. *Eleanor bought *t_i* apparently [brand new drapes for the whole house].

b. *Julie didn’t buy *t_i* until it became available [that book on Venus].

(Johnson (1985: 85))
The postposed objects cannot follow the elements adjoined to TP, apparently in (13a) and the until-phrase in (13b). It is obvious from this that the objects cannot be shifted to the TP-adjoined position.

Let us turn to HNPS of subjects. The postposed subjects, unlike the objects, cannot undergo ellipsis, preposing and pseudo-clefting with VP, as shown in (14).

(14)  
(a) VP-ellipsis  
*There actually entered the room a veritable army of revelers, and for some reason I had thought that there might.
(b) VP-preposing  
*They said that there would enter the room a herd of unruly elephants, and enter the room a herd of unruly elephants there did.
(c) Pseudo-cleft  
*What there might do is walk into the room someone who would be perfect for the part.

(Rochemont and Culicover (1990: 119))

These VP constituency tests demonstrate that the shifted subjects are not in the VP-adjoined position. Following Rochemont and Culicover (1990), I assume that the postposition from subject position attaches the NPs to TP.

A question which arises here is why objects and subjects cannot attach to TP and to VP, respectively. This strict restriction on HNPS can be immediately accounted for if we postulate that HNPS raises

---

5 It is well known that subjects, unlike objects, are not always affected by HNPS. The sentences in (i) show that HNPS cannot apply to the subjects in [Spec, TP].

(i)  
(a) \( ^*t_i \) left home [my favorite grandfather from Independence].
(b) \(^*I \) said (that) \( ^*t_i \) left home [my favorite sister from Austin].
(c) \(^*I \) wanted \( ^*t_i \) to come [my friends from the Iawrencestreet house].

(Johnson (1985: 84))

However, (ii) and (iii) show that subjects may undergo HNPS when [Spec, TP] is occupied by some other elements, such as the expletive there and the locative PP.

(ii) There \( ^*t_i \) visited us last night [a large group of people who traveled all the way from India].

(iii) Near that town was situated \( ^*t_i \) for many years after the war [an old ruin that the Germans had bombed].

(Fukuchi (1985: 91))

One speculation is that the EPP is responsible for HNPS of subjects. I will briefly discuss this problem in note 8.
Case feature and ϕ-features of the NPs. Let us first examine HNPS of objects. (15) and (16) show the structures in which the objects are adjoined to the right side of v' and T', respectively.

(15)  
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{Subj} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{Obj} \\
\text{V-v} \rightarrow \text{VP} \\
\text{f_v} \quad \text{f_{Obj}}
\end{array} \]

Focus feature, Acc, ϕ-feature

---

I assume, contra Kayne (1994), that an adjunct linearly following the head and the complement attaches to the right side of XP.

On the assumption that strong features must be eliminated as soon as possible (Chomsky (1995: 234)), a heavy NP adjoins to XP (X=v or T) with a strong Focus feature before a specifier is merged. The XP formed by the merger of the NP is downgraded to X' after the merger of the specifier, as in (ii).

(i)  
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{X'} \\
\text{NP}
\end{array} \]

(ii)  
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{NP} \rightarrow \\
\text{X} \quad \text{YP} \\
\text{X'} \\
\text{NP}
\end{array} \]

One might ask whether the NP is in the checking domain of X in (ii). Given the definition (iii), the relevant NP is in the same minimal domain as X.

(iii)  
\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Max } (\alpha) \text{ is the smallest maximal projection including } \alpha. \\
\text{b. } & \text{The domain } \delta(CH) \text{ of CH is the set of categories included in Max } (\alpha) \text{ that are distinct from and do not contain } \alpha \text{ or } t. \\
\text{c. } & \text{The minimal domain } \text{Min } (\delta(CH)) \text{ of CH is the smallest subest K of } \delta(CH) \text{ such that for any } \gamma \in \delta(CH), \text{ some } \beta \in K \text{ reflexively dominates } \gamma. \\
\text{(Chomsky (1995: 299))}
\end{align*} \]

Furthermore, the NP is narrowly L-related to X. Therefore, it can enter into a checking relation with X in this type of adjunction structure.

I assume with Chomsky (1995) that the merger (adjunction) to θ-related phrases should be prohibited. Given this, HNPS attaches NPs to TP or vP, but not to VP.
On the ground that the postposed NPs obligatorily obtain Focus interpretation (see Gueron (1980), Rochemont and Culicover (1990)), it will be reasonable to assume that HNPS is induced by a strong Focus feature of v or T.

What is crucial here is whether the shifted objects can enter into a checking relation with its appropriate checker, namely FF(V-v). In (15), FF(Subj) and FF(Obj) are in the same minimal domain as FF(V-v) and, hence, either can be a candidate for the checkee under the definition of closeness in (6). Therefore, FF(V-v) can check its strong Focus feature, accusative Case feature and $\phi$-features against FF(Obj) simultaneously, and the derivation converges if all [-Interpretable] features are discharged properly.

In (16), by contrast, the object is located in a higher position than its checker. Given the fundamental assumption that Attract F is the operation where an attractor pulls up the closest features, it follows that the downward movement of FF(Obj) to FF(V-v) never takes place. Therefore, FF(Obj) cannot enter into a checking relation with FF(V-v) and the derivation crashes. This is why the postposed objects adjoin to $v'$, but not to $T'$.

The current analysis also captures the distribution of the postposed subjects. (17) shows the structure in which the subject attaches to the right side of $T'$. ([Spec, TP] is occupied by some elements like the expletive there. See note 5.)
The subject, which is attracted by the strong Focus feature of T, enters into a checking relation with nominative Case feature of T in this adjunction operation. With respect to $\phi$-features, they are checked when FF(V-v) undergoes covert raising to T.

However, there is no way to establish this checking relation in (18) where HNPS attaches the subject to the $v'$-adjoined position.

As mentioned in section 2, the first step at LF is to eliminate the [-Interpretable] Case feature and $\phi$-features of FF(V-v). (18) shows that FF(Subj) is the only candidate for checking in this case since it is closer to FF(V-v) than FF(Obj) under the definition of closeness (6). However, needless to say, the Case feature of the subject does not match with that of FF(V-v). Therefore, these mismatched features
forces the derivation to crash, and the adjunction to \( v' \) is prohibited.

### 4.1.2. Clause-Boundedness

As we saw above, the assumption that HNPS raises a Case feature and \( \phi \)-features of the NPs properly captures the distribution of the postposed NPs. In addition, this analysis can account for another restriction on HNPS: clause-boundedness.

As is well known, HNPS cannot extract an NP outside the clause it originated in. For example, the object shifted from the embedded clause cannot appear after the materials associated with the matrix clause, as shown in (19).

(19) *[TP John [T' [T' claimed [CP that he will give \( t_i \) to Mary] yesterday] a big book]]

The ungrammaticality of (19) is straightforwardly explained under the current analysis of HNPS. FF(a big book) cannot enter into a checking relation with its appropriate checker FF(give) which is located in the lower position. Therefore, some \([-\text{Interpretable}]\) features remain unchecked and the derivation crashes.\(^7\)

\(^7\) As an anonymous EL reviewer points out, (i) might be the counterexamples to clause-boundedness of HNPS. The shifted objects follow the main clause constituents, for many years in (ia) and since 1939 in (ib).

(i) a. I have wanted PRO to know \( t_i \) for many years [exactly what happened to Rosa Luzembourg]
   b. I have expected PRO to find \( t_i \) since 1939 [the treasure said to have been buried on that island] (Postal (1974: 92 fn 8))

(ii) shows, however, that the situation is different when PRO is replaced by a lexical DP.

(ii) a. *I have wanted Bob to know \( t_i \) for many years [exactly what happened to Rosa Luzembourg]
   b. *I have expected Bob to find \( t_i \) since 1939 [the treasure said to have been buried on that island]

We may attribute the contrast between (i) and (ii) to restructuring proposed by Rizzi (1982) and advocated by Nishikawa (1990), Roberts (1997), Nishihara (1997) and Matsuyama (1997). Restructuring is the operation that changes a V-PRO-V sequence into a single predicate if the embedded subject is PRO and the main verbs are modal or aspectual, e.g. begin, continue, expect, start, try and want. Accordingly, some clause-bounded phenomena can take place across clause boundaries, and the contrast between (i) and (ii) naturally follows.

Here, we have another problem; how should we analyze this operation within the current framework? One might argue that restructuring involves the overt or the covert incorporation of a lower verb into a higher one. However, the matrix and the embedded verbs realize in the separate positions. Furthermore, materials may
4.2. TECs and Heavy NP Shift

On the assumption I made in 4.1, let us consider why TECs become acceptable when the subject undergoes HNPS.

(20) below shows that HNPS attaches the subject to TP as soon as T with the strong Focus feature is merged at the root. This merger (adjunction) of the subject results in the simultaneous deletion of the strong Focus feature and nominative Case feature of T.\(^8\)

\[\text{The strong Focus feature of the embedded } v \text{ is adjoined to the matrix } [V-v] \text{ and induces HNPS of the object. The object simultaneously checks the Focus feature, accusative Case feature and } \phi \text{-features against the complex } [FF(V-v)-[V-v]] \text{ in the } v' \text{-adjoined position.}\]

\(^8\) One might ask why the D feature of T does not enter into a checking relation with the subject in the T'-adjoined position. If it was checked in this checking relation, we would wrongly predict that the sentences in (i) were grammatical.

(i) a. *ti left home [my favorite grandfather from Independence];
   b. *I said (that) ti left home [my favorite sister from Austin];
   c. *I wanted ti to come [my friends from the lawrence street house];

However, recall that the EPP is a requirement that [Spec, TP] must be filled overtly (Collins (1997: 13)). It is intuitively reasonable to assume that the D feature of T must be checked in a spec-head configuration. Given this, some XP, such as the expletive there, must be merged into [Spec, TP] to eliminate the strong D feature of T.
Focus feature, Nom
Then, the expletive there is merged into [Spec, TP] in order to eliminate the strong D feature of T.

D-feature
What concerns us here is whether FF(Obj) can enter into a checking relation with FF(V-v) at LF. On the assumption that HNPS carries along the Case feature and \( \phi \)-features, those of the shifted subject are not left in [Spec, vP] any longer. Therefore, FF(V-v) successfully attracts FF(Obj) and discharges its Case feature and \( \phi \)-features, as illustrated in (22).

Acc, \( \phi \)-features
Finally, FF(V-v) adjoins to T and yields the complex [T-FF(V-v)]. It enters into a checking relation with FF(Obj) in the T'-adjoined position and checks \( \phi \)-features against it.

\( \phi \)-features
Thus, all [\(-\text{Interpretable}\)] features are discharged properly, and the derivation converges.

Summing up, the derivation of TECs with a postposed subject converges because the subject undergoes HNPS piped-piping its Case feature and \( \phi \)-features and nothing prevents FF(V-v) from attracting and checking FF(Obj).

5. TECs and Overt Subject Movement

A question to be asked next is why the acceptability of TECs with a non-postposed subject varies across languages.

According to Bures (1992), Vikner (1995), Bobaljik (1995), Holmberg and Platzack (1995) and Bobaljik and Jonas (1996), TECs are invariably allowed in such languages as Icelandic, German, Dutch, Yiddish, Frisian and one dialect of Faroese. It is a very controversial
problem to determine what kind of languages permits TECs with a non-postposed subject. Bures (1992) observes a correlation between TECs and object shift

(24) Within Germanic, the languages that allow NP OS (Object Shift) are those languages that also allow TECs.

(Bobaljik and Jonas (1996: 210))

However, this generalization has some exceptions. For example, Faroese allows object shift but not TECs completely. In addition, it poses the question why such Romance languages as Spanish and Italian exclude TECs, though they permit object shift.

Alternatively, I will analyze TECs in connection with overt subject movement, and suggest that the languages which allow TECs with a non-postposed subject are those in which subjects obligatorily undergo overt movement, and vice versa.

5.1. The Derivation of V2 Sentences

Before further discussion of TECs, a few remarks should be made concerning the derivation of V2 (Verb Second) sentences, because the languages which permit TECs with a non-postposed subject are all V2 languages.

In languages like German and Icelandic, finite verbs must appear in the second position in root clauses.9 Furthermore, the sentence initial position is obligatorily occupied by topicalized elements. The followings are examples from Icelandic.

(25) a. Peir faerdu alla bilana. (DP: subject)
They moved all the cars

b. Marga hluti veit Olafur. (DP: object)
many things knows Ofaf

c. Ila syngur Olafur. (AdvP)
Badly sings Olaf

d. Fallegur er kjöllinn. (AP)
beautiful is the dress

e. A Islandi Menn tala íslensku. (PP)
in Icelandic speaks one Icelandic

9 I will return to the V2 phenomenon in embedded clauses in 5.2.2.
Various kinds of study have been done about the V2 phenomenon, and it is generally agreed that finite verbs occupy the position of C with a topicalized XP in its specifier, as illustrated in (26).

(26) \[
\text{[CP \ XP \ [C' \ V-v-T \ C \ [TP \ Subj \ [T' \ tV-v-T \ [vP \ tSubj \ tV-v \ [VP \ tV \ Obj]]]]]]}
\]

Now, what triggers the overt verb raising to C? This question is closely related to the nature of C. Holmberg (1986) suggests that CP may be a predicate which requires a [+V] element in its head. Similar analyses are proposed by deHaan and Weerman (1986), Tomaselli (1990), Rizzi (1990) and Holmberg and Platzack (1995). On the basis of their argument, I propose that the V2 languages have a specification of predicational C and that the verb raising to C is motivated by a strong V feature of this C.

(27) \[
\text{[CP \ V-v-T \ C \ [TP \ ...]] (C=Predicational C)}
\]

Furthermore, I assume that predicational C intrinsically has a strong Topic feature which induces the overt raising of the topicalized XP. This is based on the fact that predicational C obligatorily licenses its specifier to be filled by the topicalized XP.

(28) \[
\text{[CP \ XP \ [C' \ V-v-T-C \ [TP \ ...]]]} (C=Predicational C)
\]

Based on these background assumptions, we discuss the derivation of TECs in subsequent sections.

5.2. The Derivation of ‘There’-constructions
5.2.1. Subject in [Spec, TP]

In the analysis of TECs proposed in section 3 and 4, the surface subject position is responsible for convergence of TECs; the derivation crashes when the subject remains in [Spec, vP] until LF. Now, we ex-
pect that the subject overtly raises out of vP in the languages with TECs. Consider the following examples from Icelandic.

(29) a. \( \text{páð luku einhverjur stúdenter [vP alveg there finished some students completely verkefninu] the assignment} \)

b. *\( \text{páð luku alveg einhverjur stúdenter [vP verkefninu]} \) 

(Bobaljik and Jonas (1996: 213))

(29) demonstrates that the subject in ‘there’-constructions, which must be indefinite (Definiteness Effect), precedes VP-adverbs. The same is true of ordinary V2 sentences. Consider the following examples.\(^{10}\)

(30) a. *Í gær klaraði [vP alveg mus ostinn] yesterday finished completely a mouse the cheese ‘A mouse finished the cheese (completely) yesterday.’

b. *Í gær klaraði [vP ostinni alveg mus] yesterday finished the cheese completely a mouse

As Diesing (1992), Bobaljik (1995) and Bobaljik and Jonas (1996) note, languages like German, Icelandic and Dutch have two hierarchically distinct positions for subjects. The following examples from Icelandic demonstrate that definite subjects must precede sentential adverbs.

(i) a. \( \text{I gær kláruðu pessar mys sennile gaostinn. yesterday finished these mice probably the cheese} \)

‘These mice probably finished the cheese yesterday.’

b. *\( \text{Í gær klárůdu sennile pessar mys gaostinn.} \)

(Bobaljik and Jonas (1996: 196))

By contrast, (ii) shows that indefinite subjects prefer to follow sentential adverbs and must precede VP-adverbs.

(ii) a. \( \text{I gær kláruðu sennilega margar mys ostinn. yesterday finished probably many mice the cheese} \)

‘Many mice probably finished the cheese yesterday.’

b. *Í gær kláruðu margar mys sennilega ostinn. (ibid.: 196)

It is obvious from these examples that the relevant languages have two subject positions: one before sentential adverbs and the other after them. However, the Agr-less clause structure postulated in this paper cannot guarantee the definite subjects to precede sentential adverbs and the indefinite subjects to follow them. This would immediately follow if we posit the projection of AgrS. As (iii) shows, AgrSP provides an additional landing site for the subjects, namely [Spec, AgrSP].

(iii) \[ \text{[AgrSP definite Subj [TP S-adv [TP indefinite Subj [AgrOP [VP VP-adv [VP ...]]]]]]} \]

We would obtain the word order in (ia) with the definite subjects in [Spec, AgrSP], and the word order in (iia) with the indefinite subjects in [Spec, TP].
(30) shows that indefinite subjects must undergo overt movement over VP-adverbs and the shifted object. I postulate that this subject raising is motivated by the strong D feature and the strong Case feature of T. As (31) shows, the subject moves up to [Spec, TP] in order to eliminate these strong features for convergence at LF.

\[
(31) \quad \text{[TP Subj [T' V-v-T [vP tsubj [v' tV-v [VP tV Obj]]]]]}
\]

D feature, Nom, $\phi$-features

The assumption that T has the strong Case feature enables us to obtain the relevant word order. If we assumed that the Case feature of T is not strong, the expletive 'there' would satisfy the EPP and the subject failed to raise overtly just as in English there-constructions. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that the Case feature of T is strong in these languages.

5.2.2. 'There' in [Spec, CP]

Let us now turn to a new question: the position of 'there.' It is generally assumed that the expletive 'there' is universally inserted in [Spec, TP] (or [Spec, AgrSP]) in order to satisfy the EPP (Bures (1992), Chomsky (1995), Bobaljik (1995) and Bobaljik and Jonas (1996), Jonas (1996)). However, as we saw in 5.2.1, [Spec, TP] is already occupied by the subjects and, hence, is unavailable for the expletive 'there' in the V2 languages with TECs. Then, where is it located? Contrary to the familiar assumption, I follow Vikner (1995) and Holmberg and Platzack (1995) in assuming that it occupies [Spec, CP]. This section briefly reviews some pieces of evidence for this claim provided by Vikner (1995).

Firstly, consider the following examples from Icelandic.

\[
\begin{aligned}
(32)\quad &\text{a. Pað hefur komið strákur} \\
&\text{there has come a boy} \\
&\text{b. Í gær hefur komið strákur} \\
&\text{yesterday has come a boy} \\
&\text{c. *Í gær hefur pað komið strákur} \\
&\text{yesterday has there come a boy}
\end{aligned}
\]
(32c) demonstrates that *pao ‘there’ is incompatible with the topicalized elements. In order to account for the complementary distribution of them, we should assume that they occupy the same position, namely [Spec, CP]. Additionally, (32c) shows that *pao cannot appear after the finite verbs located in C. This fact empirically rules out the possibility that *pao occupies [Spec, TP].

Secondly, let us examine the distribution of German *es ‘there’ and Icelandic *pao ‘there’ in embedded clauses. Vikner (1995) notes that *es cannot appear after the complementizer *daß while *pao must be realized after the complementizer *að. This is illustrated in (33) and (34).

(33) a. *Ich weiß, *daß *es ein Junge gekommen ist.
    I know that there a boy come is

    I know there is a boy come

(34) Ég veit *að *pao hefur komið strákur.
    I know that there has come a boy

Although German and Icelandic are similar in exhibiting the V2 phenomenon in main clauses, they are different when it comes to embedded clauses; Icelandic permits the V2 order in embedded clauses with the overt complementizer as in (35), whereas German does not as in (36).

(35) *Er sagt, daß die Kinder haben diesen Film gesehen.
    he says that the children have this film seen

(36) Jon harmar að þessa bók skuli ég hafa lesið.
    John regrets that this book have I have read

In order to capture this contrast, Vikner (1995), among others, postulates the following structures for German and Icelandic embedded clauses, respectively.

(37) German: \[ ... V_{\text{matrix}} [ \text{CP } *\text{daß } [ \text{TP } ... V]] \rightarrow *\text{V2} \]

German: \[ ... V_{\text{matrix}} [ \text{CP Topic } [C' V-v-T-C [TP ...]]] \rightarrow \text{V2} \]

Icelandic: \[ ... V_{\text{matrix}} [ \text{CP } *að [ \text{CP Topic } [C' V-v-T-C [TP ...]]]] \rightarrow \text{V2} \]

The embedded clause contains one CP in German, which enables us to capture the complementary distribution of the complementizer and the V2 phenomenon. By contrast, the Icelandic embedded clause contains two instances of CPs. This analysis, which is called the \textit{CP-recursion}
analysis, makes possible the V2 phenomenon after the complementizer; the complementizer *ao* originates in the upper C and the finite verb moves to the lower C with a topicalized element in its specifier. Given these structures, we can straightforwardly account for the contrast between (33) and (34). (38a) and (38b) show the structure of (33a) and (34), respectively.

(38) a. *... [CP dass [TP es ein Junge gekommen ist]] (=33a))

b. *... [CP *ao [CP *pa*ð hefur [TP komið strákur]]] (=34))

The structure (38a) consists of one CP whose head is occupied by the complementizer *dass*. If *es* appeared in [Spec, TP] as illustrated in (38a), we had no way to explain why (33a) is ungrammatical. The structure (38b), on the other hand, has the recursion of CP. Therefore, *pa*ð can cooccur with the complementizer *ao* located in the upper C. In this way, the contrast between (33a) and (34) naturally follows if we assume that ‘there’ occupies [Spec, CP].

Finally, Jonas (1997) notes that *pa*ð ‘there’ cannot appear as the subject of the infinitival complement selected by the ECM verbs. The example is given below.

(39) *Ég tel [TP *pa*ð vera marga stúdenta í þessum bekk]

I believe there be.INF many students in this class

(Jonas (1997: 185))

It is generally agreed that the infinitival complement to the ECM verbs is TP, not CP. If *pa*ð occupied [Spec, TP], we would wrongly predict (39) to be grammatical just like the English counterpart in (40).

(40) I believe [TP there to be many students in this class]

In order to explain the contrast between (39) and (40), we should assume that *pa*ð is not in [Spec, TP].

Given these kinds of empirical evidence, it would be reasonable to conclude that the surface position of ‘there’ is [Spec, CP], not [Spec, TP], in these V2 languages. Essentially, I follow Thráínsson (1979) and Maling and Zaenen (1990) in assuming that ‘there’ is an expletive topic to satisfy the V2 constraint; it intrinsically has the Topic feature and hence is inserted into [Spec, CP] to eliminate the strong Topic feature of predicational C.11

---

11 One might expect that the sentence equivalent to (i) is ungrammatical in these V2 languages because a *wh*-phrase moves to the matrix [Spec, CP] skipping ‘there’
5.3. TECs with a Non-Postposed Subject

Now, let us examine the derivation of TECs with a non-postposed subject. First, the subject originated in [Spec, vP] is merged into [Spec, TP] to check the D feature, nominative Case feature and \( \phi \)-features against [V-\( \nu \)-T]. This is illustrated in (41).

\[
\text{(41) } \left[ \text{TP subj } \left[ T' \text{ V-\( \nu \)-T [vP tSubj tV-v [VP tV Obj]]} \right] \right]
\]

D feature, Nom, \( \phi \)-features

Second, 'there' is inserted into [Spec, CP] as soon as C is merged at the root. It eliminates the strong Topic feature of C via spec-head relation, as in (42).

\[
\text{(42) } \left[ \text{CP 'There' } \left[ C' \text{ V-\( \nu \)-T-C [TP Subj [T' ...]]} \right] \right]
\]

Topic feature

What remains to be discussed is whether FF(Obj) can enter into a checking relation with its appropriate checker. As Collins and Thráinsson (1996) note, some of these languages allow optional object shift. Based on this fact, we claim that FF(Obj) may undergo overt or covert feature checking. (44) shows the covert process of checking in which FF(Obj) checks its Case feature and \( \phi \)-features against the complex [V-\( \nu \)-T-C].

What remains to be discussed is whether FF(Obj) can enter into a checking relation with its appropriate checker. As Collins and Thráinsson (1996) note, some of these languages allow optional object shift. Based on this fact, we claim that FF(Obj) may undergo overt or covert feature checking. (44) shows the covert process of checking in which FF(Obj) checks its Case feature and \( \phi \)-features against the complex [V-\( \nu \)-T-C].

in the embedded [Spec, CP].

(i) What, do you think \([\text{CP there } \left[ C' \text{ finished some student } t_i \right] \)]

However, this kind of argument does not pose any problems for the current assumption that 'there' occupies [Spec, CP]. Let us consider the following example.

(ii) ‘What, did Bill wonder [when John ate \( t_i \)]?’

In (ii), \textit{what} moves over \textit{when}, violating \textit{wh}-island condition. The ungrammaticality of (ii) is accounted for as follows in the Minimalist Program. The matrix C must attract the closest \textit{wh}-phrase to have its Q-feature checked off. In this case, \textit{when} is closer to this C than \textit{what} and, therefore, it must enters into a checking relation with the C.

(iii) \([\text{CP C did Bill wonder [when John ate what]]} \]

What is important here is whether the matrix C attracts the closest \textit{wh}-phrase, but not whether a \textit{wh}-phrase can raise to the matrix C successfully.

Now, let us turn to (i). ‘There’ never blocks \textit{wh}-movement because it does not bear the Q feature. Therefore, regardless of the acceptability, (i) cannot be the counterexample against the assumption that ‘there’ occupies [Spec, CP].
(43) það bóðuðu margir jólasveinar [vP stundum
there ate many Christmas trolls sometimes
búðinginn]
the pudding
‘Sometimes many Christmas trolls ate the pudding.’

(44) [CP ‘There’ [C' FF(Obj) V-v-T-C [TP Subj tV-v-T [vP tSubj tV-v [vP
tV Obj]]]]] ↑↑
Acc, \$-features
In this case, FF(Obj) is the closest feature to [V-v-T-C] since FF(Subj)
undergoes overt feature checking and no unchecked formal features in-
tervene between FF(Obj) and [V-v-T-C]. Therefore, [V-v-T-C] suc-
cessfully enters into a checking relation with FF(Obj). On the other
hand, (46) shows the overt checking of FF(Obj). It undergoes overt
movement to the outer specifier of vP and enters into a checking rela-
tion with [V-v] to have its Case feature and \$-features checked.

(45) það bóðuðu margir mys ostinn [vP aldrei]
there ate many mice the cheese never

(46) ... [vP Obj [tSubj V-v [vP tV tObj]]] ↑↑
Acc, \$-features
Consequently, all [—Interpretable] features are properly checked off
and the derivation converges.

5.4. TECs with a Postposed Subject

We must notice that, as well as English, such languages as Icelandic
permit TECs with a postposed subject. The followings are examples
from Icelandic.

(47) a. ... að það hefur bóðað þetta epli einhver
that there has eaten this apple some
strákur frá Danmörku.
boy from Denmark
b. það máluðu sennilega húsið vandlega
there painted probably the house carefully
margir stuðentar.
many students

In these languages, HNPS of the subjects is not a necessary condition
on convergence of TECs because subjects obligatorily undergo overt movement to [Spec, TP]. This is why TECs are permitted more freely in these V2 languages than in English.

5.5. TECs in Danish

As we saw above, TECs with non-postposed subjects are acceptable in the V2 languages where subjects are raised obligatorily. Now, how about the V2 languages without overt subject raising? This section examines TECs in Danish, and presents strong support for the claim that overt subject raising affects convergence of TECs.

(48) shows that Danish, just like English, completely excludes TECs.

(48) a. *... at der har spist nogen et æble.
   that there has eaten someone an apple
b. *... at der har spist et æble nogen.
   that there has eaten an apple someone
c. *Der har nogen spist et æble.
   there has someone eaten an apple
   [Danish] ((a) Vikner (1995: 198), (b) (ibid.: 200),
   (c) Bobaljik and Jonas (1996: 208))

It is predicted that Danish is similar to English in that the subjects in ‘there’-constructions remain in their original position at LF. This is born out, as shown in (49).

(49) a. ... at der kan være kommet et brev.
   ... that there may have come a letter
b. *... at der kan være et brev kommet.
   ... that there may have a letter come
c. *... at der kan et brev være kommet.
   ... that there may a letter have come
d. *... at der et brev kan være kommet.
   ... that there a letter may have come
   [Danish] (Vikner (1995: 171))

With respect to the position of the expletive der ‘there,’ we observe that it occurs in [Spec, CP] to satisfy the V2 order, as illustrated in (50).

(50) a. Der er kommet en dreng.
   there is come a boy
b. *pro er kommet en dreng.       [Danish] (ibid.: 185)

However, it may occupy [Spec, TP]. Let us compare (51) with (52) and (53).
(51) I går er der kommet en dreng.
  yesterday is there come a boy [Danish] (ibid.)

(52) *Gestern ist es ein Junge gekommen. [Ger]
  yesterday is there a boy come

(53) *Í ger hefur það komið strákur. [Ice]
  yesterday has there come a boy

*Der, unlike German *es and Icelandic *það, can cooccur with topicalized elements, which shows that it occupies [Spec, TP], not [Spec, CP].

Based on these observations, I postulate that the Case feature of *T is not strong and the Topic feature of *der is optionally strong in Danish. That is to say, *der ‘there’ is first merged into [Spec, TP] to satisfy the EPP and, then, it moves overtly to [Spec, CP] due to the V2 constraint.

\[
(54) \quad [\text{CP } \text{Der } V-v-T-C] \quad [\text{TP } t_{\text{der}} \quad t_{V-v-T} \quad [\text{vP Subj } t_{V-v} \quad [\text{VP } t_V \text{ Obj}]]] \]

Since the EPP is satisfied by *der and nominative Case feature of *T is not strong, the subjects do not raise overtly in TECs. Therefore, the derivation of TECs will crash because of the subjects remaining in [Spec, vP]; the complex [V-v] automatically enters into a checking relation with FF(Subj) via spec-head relation, resulting in a feature mismatch.

It would be concluded from these observations that convergence of TECs depends heavily on overt subject movement.

5.6. TECs and Parametric Variation

I argued in the previous sections that overt subject movement out of vP is crucial for convergence of TECs with a non-postposed subject. The following table demonstrates that TECs actually have a close relationship to the overt subject raising.\(^{12, 13}\)

---


13 As Bobaljik (1995), Jonas (1996) and Bobaljik and Jonas (1996) observe, the judgement of TECs varies among dialects of Faroese; one dialect labeled here as Faroese I accepts TECs, whereas the other one (Faroese II) does not.

(i) Tað bygdu nógvir íslendingar í hús í Havn.
  there built many Icelanders houses in Tirshavn
  [Fa I/*Fa II] (Jonas (1996: 106))
If my analysis of TECs is on the right track, the distribution of TECs can be reduced to a parameter concerning Case feature, that is, whether or not nominative Case feature of T is strong. In such languages as Icelandic, the strong Case feature of T triggers overt subject raising to [Spec, TP] and, consequently, the derivation of TECs converges without any problems. In English there-constructions, on the other hand, the EPP is satisfied by the expletive there and nominative Case feature of T is not strong. Therefore, the subject remaining in [Spec, vP] wrongly enters into a checking relation with FF(V-v) at LF, which forces the derivation to crash.

5.7. Semantic Constraints on TECs

Finally, we examine some more differences between TECs in English and those in languages like Icelandic.

It has been argued that HNPS of the subject leads to convergence of TECs in English. However, each sentence in (55) is ungrammatical though the subjects are postposed to the clause final position.

The present analysis predicts that the subjects undergo overt movement out of vP in Faroese I, but not in Faroese II. This is born out, as in (ii).

(ii) Tao hava nakrar lagkokuri verið [vP bakaðar ti til veitsluna] there have some cakes been baked for the party [Fa I/*Fa II] (ibid.: 107)

In passive ‘there’-constructions, the subject appears in the position following the finite auxiliary in Faroese I. However, speakers of Faroese II do not accept such distribution of the subject. This contrast might be explained if we assume that the Case feature of T is strong in Faroese I, but not in Faroese II.
We have at least two reasons to exclude these sentences. The first one concerns agentivity of the subjects. Jenkins (1975), Lumsden (1988), among others, suggest that there-constructions with intransitive verbs are more acceptable with non-agentive subjects. (56) with a non-agentive subject is acceptable whereas (57) with an agentive one is not.

(56) There waved a tattered banner from the flagpole.
(57) *There waved a bearded student from the roof.

Additionally, (58) shows that the subject in there-constructions cannot be modified by adverbs denoting intentional behavior.

(58) There stepped an old man into the bus (*cautiously).
(59) An old man stepped into the bus cautiously.

The contrast between (58) and (59) clearly shows that agentivity of the subjects is weakened or lost in there-constructions. Bobaljik and Jonas (1996: fn 17) suggest that same holds true of TECs. This is obvious from the contrast between (60) and (61).

(60) There entered the hall an ugly old man. (Theme)
(61) a. *Suddenly, there kicked the ball a striker. (Agent)
    b. *There ate a bone on the lawn a huge bulldog. (Agent)

These observations might lead us to conclude that agentivity of the subjects affects the acceptability of there-constructions, including TECs, in English.

The second one is a semantic constraint on the verbs. It has been traditionally argued that the verbs show an existence or appearance meaning in there-constructions. Given this, verbs like laugh, melt, kick and eat are excluded in there-constructions because their meaning is incompatible with this characterization of the constructions. This is another reason why (55) is ungrammatical.

However, it should be noted that such semantic constraints are not found in the V2 languages which completely allow TECs. Any class of verbs can appear with agentive subjects, as illustrated in (62).

---

14 However, not all of the verbs seem to satisfy this characterization in their basic meaning. See Levin (1993) for much more discussion.
(62) a. það hefur einhver étið hákarlinn.  
there has someone eaten the shark
b. það hafa margir sagt mét þessa sógu.  
there have many people told me this story

(Thráinsson (1979: 477))

Why are such semantic restrictions imposed on there-constructions in English, but not on those in these V2 languages? A speculation is that English there is not a ‘pure’ expletive whereas ‘there’ in the V2 languages is. The former yields the existential or the presentational interpretation by combining with the restricted class of verbs, which implies that it is not semantically empty. On the other hand, as Thráinsson (1979), Maling and Zaenen (1990) and Jonas (1996) suggest, ‘there’ in the V2 languages is semantically empty and inserted into [Spec, CP] to obtain the V2 order.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, I have provided a unified account of the following two issues by arguing that the derivation of TECs converges if the subject undergoes the overt movement out of vP.

(I) Why does the postposing of the subjects affect the acceptability of TECs in English?

(II) Why does the acceptability of TECs with a non-postposed subject vary among languages?

In particular, we answer the question II in terms of the strength of the Case feature of T.

Chomsky (1995) analyzes TECs by assuming a multiple specifier; the expletive and the subject occupy the outer and the inner specifier of T, respectively.

(63) [TP There [T Subj [T T ...]]]

Then, where is V located? How can we get the ‘there’-V-Subj-Obj order? In this respect, the analysis proposed in this paper might be more tenable than Chomsky (1995) in that it properly obtains the correct word order.
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