SEVERAL REMARKS ON THE THERE-CONSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH*

HIDEKAZU SUZUKI

1. In English we have sentences like (1), which we will call the there-construction:

   (1) There is a book under the table.

In transformational generative grammar, it has been suggested that there are a number of problems in the description of the there-construction; we can recapitulate them in (2):

   (2) a. What is the status of there in the there-construction? In other words, (i) must it be present in deep structure or be introduced transformationally? and (ii) if it is introduced transformationally, what transformation will introduce it?

   b. What kind of verbs may occur in the there-construction? More specifically, (i) what properties does the verb be have, which is a typical predicate verb of there-constructions? and (ii) what verbs can occur in the there-construction other than be?

   c. What characteristics does the "logical" subject NP of the there-construction (e.g. a book in (1)) have? Particularly, is it correct to say that the subject NP is indefinite? and (ii) if correct, how can we account for sentences like there was the sound of a motor-car, where the logical subject contains a definite article the?; then, how should we characterize the notion "definite"?

In this paper, we will re-examine the previous descriptions of the there-construction, in particular, Emonds' (1970) and Haraguchi's
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1970), and we would like to suggest an alternative explanation. We will concern ourselves principally with the problems of (2a) and (2b), especially, (2b-i), owing to the limits of space.

2. In this section, we will consider the status of there in the there-construction. First of all, let us compare the following sentences:

(3) We expect there to be a good chance.
(4) We expect you to pass the exam.

Sentence (4) will be derived roughly from the deep structure (5):

(5) We expect [you pass the exam]

To derive (4), a rule called Subject Raising applies to (5), moving the subject of the embedded clause, i.e. you, into the object position of the higher clause. Similarly, (3) has a structure like (6) when Subject Raising applies.

(6) We expect [there is a good chance]

When we compare the structures (5) and (6), it is clear that there in (3) and you in (4) are subject NP's of the embedded clause, if we want to keep the formulation of Subject Raising quite general.

Secondly, let us consider yes-no questions in (7) and (8):

(7) Is there a car in the garage?
(8) Is John good at baseball?

(8) will be derived from, approximately, a deep structure like (9):

(9) Q John is good at baseball

Subject-Aux Inversion applies to (9), deriving (8). In the same way, (7) will be derived from an underlying structure such as (10):

(10) Q there is a car in the garage

Subject-Aux Inversion applies to (10), permuting there with is, and finally, deriving (7). From this consideration, it is clear that there in (7) is a subject NP, as is John in (8), if we want Subject-Aux Inversion to be formulated in a general way.

Thirdly, let us consider the following sentences:

---

1 The following discussions depend on Jespersen (1956) and others.

2 The deep structure (9) for a yes-no question should be regarded as an oversimplification. For a detailed discussion of the yes-no question, see Suzuki (1971).
(11) There seems to be a great difference.
(12) John seems to be honest.

(12) can be derived from a deep structure like (13):

(13) It seems [John is honest]

We will apply It-Replacement to (13), replacing a higher clause subject it with an embedded clause subject John, finally deriving (12). Correspondingly, (11) will be derived from (14):

(14) It seems [there is a great difference]

In this case, too, we may take there in (11) to be the subject NP of the embedded clause when It-Replacement is applied.

From the above arguments, we may conclude that there in the there-construction is a subject NP at the derivational stage of the applications of Subject Raising, Subject-Aux Inversion and It-Replacement, so that we can leave the formulations of these rules quite general.

Next, we will turn to the question: must there in this construction be present in deep structure or be introduced transformationally? We have seen above on syntactic grounds that there in the there-construction has a status of noun phrase, and now we will explore its intrinsic or semantic properties. First of all, we will consider the meaning of the sentences in (15):

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

The meaning of these sentences may be represented as (16):

(16) Ex: a man (x is in the garden)

We assume that (15b), which clearly corresponds to (16) in meaning, is ruled out as ungrammatical on purely syntactic grounds. If it is correct to say that (15a) has a meaning something like (16), we can say that, in (15a), a man is a logical subject and there is a semantically empty element. This observation will be made clearer by the examples in (17):

(17) a. There is a boy there.¹
    b. *A boy is there.

¹ Notice that the sentence-initial there is pronounced as [ðeə], while that in sentence-final position is pronounced as [ðə].
c. The boy is there.

The meaning of (17a) and (17b) may be represented as (18a), and that of (17c) as (18b):

(18) a. Ex: a boy (x is there)
b. Ex: the boy (x is there)

It must be noticed that the there's in (18a) and (18b) correspond to those in the sentence-final position of (17a) and (17c), respectively (sentence (17b) is ruled out for the same reason as (15b)).

Now, we might assume that there in the there-construction would be introduced in deep structure; then, (19) would be derived from a deep structure like (20):

(19) There is a girl in the garden.

(20)

```
S
  └─ NP
    └─ V
      └─ NP
          └─ PP
            └─ there
            └─ is
            └─ a girl
              └─ in the garden
```

Under this analysis we will face many difficulties. The most serious difficulty is that the deep structure (20) does not represent a grammatical relation relevant to the semantic interpretation of (19). With this analysis, moreover, the there under study must be specified in the lexicon as follows: it can occur only in a subject position: and the NP following a main verb is indefinite. This second specification is necessary in order to rule out the following sentences, where the NP following a verb is definite:

(21) a. *There is the girl in the garden.
b. *There is John in the garden.

If we assume there to be introduced transformationally, however, we can avoid such difficulties.¹

¹ Further, consider the number agreement in the following sentences: (i) There is a book on the desk. (ii) There are five books on the desk. To account for the difference between them in number agreement, we must assume that a book and five books are subject
Fillmore (1968) proposes that there in the there-construction is the pronominal form of a locative; he assumes that (22a) is derived from (22b):

(22)  a. There are many toys in the box.
     b. M
         V
         O
         L
           Pres
            Ø
            many toys
            in the box

A copying rule applies to (22b), copying the locative at sentence-initial position, as in (23):

(23)  L
      M
      Y
      O
      L
        in the box
        Pres
        Ø
        many toys
        in the box

In (23), the copied locative is pronominalized into there, and the verb be is introduced under the node M, finally (22a) being derived. However, this analysis, too, has some serious defects. First, in case grammar, the case frame is to be determined by the verb; if (22a) is derived from (22b), how can we specify the case frame in (22b), where no verb is contained? Secondly, the rule of pronominalization converting the locative into there violates the generally accepted constraint that pronominalization is not applicable backwards in simplex sentences.\(^1\) Thirdly, it is only reasonable to assume that a copied element has the same meaning as its source; then, it is incorrect to derive there from a locative, because there in (22a) does not mean “in the box”.

---

\(^1\) See Langacker (1969).
Finally, we also have the examples of the *there*-construction like (24), in which no expressed locative is contained:

(24) There is a man with a hat on.

Under Fillmore's analysis, *there* in (24) cannot have a locative as its source, and therefore, (24) cannot be derived in the manner of (22a).¹

We have argued that the two possible ways of taking care of *there* are not untenable; one introducing it directly in deep structure, and the other deriving it from a locative.

We are now in a position to suggest a more adequate alternative: a way of introducing *there* in this construction by a transformational rule. So far, several proposals have been made along these lines. In this paper, we will adopt that of Emonds' as a point of departure because his analysis of the *there*-construction itself seems adequate in its essentials, and also because the "structure-preserving constraint" proposed by him, which is brought to bear on the *there*-construction, seems to be a linguistically significant hypothesis. Briefly stated, his structure-preserving constraint is as follows:

(25) A phrase node *X* in a tree can be moved, copied, or inserted into a new position in the tree, only if the tree satisfies at least one of the two conditions: (i) the new position into which *X* is moved, copied, or inserted is immediately dominated by the highest *S*, or (ii) the new position of *X* can be generated by a phrase-structure rule which is motivated independently of the transformation in question.

It is easy to see how this constraint works in the case of the *there*-construction.

Following Emonds, (26a) will be derived from the deep structure (26b):

(Henceforth, we will use subscripts only for expository purposes and ignore all the details in a P-marker irrelevant to the present discussion.) Under this analysis, we can represent in deep structure a grammatical relation necessary to interpret (26a); that is, *a dog* is a logical subject of the sentence. To drive (26a) from (26b), we must first apply to it the rule of Indefinite Subject Postposing, which may be formulated roughly as in (27):²

---

¹ Here we ignore the facts about the historical development of the *there*-construction.
² Emonds does not give any formulation of the rules needed to derive *there*-constructions. The formulation of the rules given here should be regarded as only a first approx-
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(26) a. There is a dog in the room.
b.

(27) \[ X \ NP_1 \ V \ NP_2 \ Y \]
\[ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \rightarrow 1 \ \emptyset \ 3 \ 2 \ 5 \]
where (i) \( V \) is \textit{be}.
(ii) \( NP_1 \) is an indefinite noun phrase.
(iii) \( NP_2 \) dominates nothing.

Rule (27) has the effect of moving an indefinite subject \( NP \) into an empty \( NP \) if the verb is \textit{be}. This rule meets the structure-preserving constraint, i.e. (25ii), because \( NP_2 \) in (27) can be generated by a base rule (28), which is motivated independently to generate sentence (29):

(28) \( VP \rightarrow V \ NP \)

(29) Mary kicked John.

The rule will convert (26b) into (30):

(30)

Next, the structure (30) will undergo the rule of There-Insertion (31):

(31) \[ X \ NP_1 \ V \ NP_2 \ Y \]
\[ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \rightarrow 1 \ \text{there} \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \]

imation; condition (i) of the rules (27) and (31) is insufficient to generate such a there-construction as \textit{there lies a man under the tree}; condition (ii) of the rules is also inadequate to account for examples like \textit{there was the sound of a motor-car}. 
where (i) \( V \) is be.
(ii) \( NP_2 \) is an indefinite noun phrase.
(iii) \( NP_1 \) dominates nothing.

Rule (31) inserts \textit{there} under \( NP_1 \) in (30), deriving (32):

\[(32)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{NP}_1 \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{NP}_2 \\
\text{PP}
\end{array}
\]


(there) is a dog in the room

(Notice that this rule, too, meets the constraint (25ii) because \( NP_1 \) is generated by an independently motivated base rule such as \( S \rightarrow NP \text{VP} \).) With this analysis, we can not only represent that the logical subject of (26a) is \textit{a dog} and its grammatical subject is \textit{there}, but also account for the difference in the grammaticality of the sentences in (33) in terms of the applicability of the \textit{there}-construction rules (henceforth, we will refer to rules (27) and (31) as the \textit{there}-construction rules for convenience):

\[(33)\]

a. There is a ring in the case.
b. *A ring is in the case.
c. *There is the ring in the case.
d. The ring is in the case.

These examples are all derived from, essentially, the structure (34):

\[(34)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{NP}_1 \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{NP}_2 \\
\text{PP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\{ \text{a ring} \} \\
\{ \text{the ring} \}
\]

\[
\text{is} \\
\text{in the case}
\]

(In the cases of (33b, d), \( NP_2 \) in (34) is not present.)
In the cases of (33a) and (33b), the there-construction rules must apply to (34) because the subject NP, i.e. *a ring*, is indefinite; hence, (33b) is ungrammatical. On the contrary, in the cases of (33c) and (33d), the rules must not apply to (34) because of the definiteness of the subject NP, i.e. *the ring*; then, (33c) is ungrammatical.

To sum up, we have argued that it seems adequate to assume that *there* in the there-construction must be introduced transformationally and we have shown how the there-construction can be accounted for by the analysis adopted here. It may be well to notice that we are claiming that there-constructions are not of a special sentence type but that it is only a syntactic variant of an ordinary "existential" sentence such as *John is in the garden*.

3. In this section, we will discuss the problem: what properties does the verb *be* in the there-construction have?

In section 2, we argued that sentence (1), which is repeated as (35) for convenience, is derived from a deep structure like (36):

(35) There is a book under the table.

(36)

\[ S \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{a book} \\
\text{is} \\
\text{under the table}
\end{array} \]

An ordinary existential sentence such as (37) will be derived from a deep structure like (38):

(37) The book is under the table.

(38)

\[ S \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{the book} \\
\text{is} \\
\text{under the table}
\end{array} \]
If these derivations are correct, the deep structures (36) and (38) are identical except that (36) but not (38) contains the node NP dominating nothing in post-verbal position. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that (35) and (37) can be directly related to each other.

We have other examples of the *there*-construction such as in (39):

(39) a. There is a boy running along the street.
    b. There was a new house built next door.
    c. There are many students absent.

Emonds assumes that (39a)–(39c) are directly related to (40a)–(40c), respectively:

(40) a. A boy is running along the street.
    b. A new house was built next door.
    c. Many students are absent.

First of all, we will consider (39a) and (40a) to examine the adequacy of his assumption. He assumes that (39a) is derived from an underlying structure such as (41):

(41)\[
S \rightarrow NP_1 VP
\]
\[
NP_1 \rightarrow a \text{ boy}
\]
\[
VP \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\text{AUX} \\
\text{NP}_2 \\
V
\end{array}
\]
\[
\text{running} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\text{PP} \\
\text{along the street}
\end{array}
\]

To generate the structure (41), we will need the base rules in (42):

(42) i. \( S \rightarrow NP \text{ AUX VP} \)
    ii. \( VP \rightarrow V \text{ AUX NP V NP}^2 \)

What is crucial for the present discussion is that we must posit NP between \( V \text{ AUX} \) and \( V \); this NP is required to reserve a position into which a subject NP is moved. Assuming the base rule (42ii) is inconsistent

---

1 Quirk et al. (1972), too, claim that *there*-constructions can be directly related to certain basic sentence types. See below, p. 307 in this paper.

2 The status of the node \( V \text{ AUX} \) is quite unclear. It seems, however, that the node may dominate at least *be*+Infl, *be*+Inf and *have*+Inf.
with the structure-preserving constraint, because we don’t have any sentence other than *there*-constructions which contains an NP between V and V; sentences in (43) are all ungrammatical:

(43)  a. *I am John running in the garden.
     b. *John has Mary been in Japan.  cf. John had his hair cut.
     c. *John was Bill kicked by Mary.

For this reason, the derivation of (39a) from (41) cannot be allowed under the structure-preserving constraint.

Next, let us consider a sentence such as (44):

(44)  There is a boy resembling his father.

Following Emonds, (44) might be derived from the structure (45):

(45)  

\[
S \rightarrow \text{NP} \rightarrow \text{VP} \\
\text{VP} \rightarrow \text{V} \rightarrow \text{AUX} \rightarrow \text{NP} \\
\text{NP} \rightarrow \text{a boy} \rightarrow \text{is} \rightarrow \text{resembling} \rightarrow \text{his father}
\]

Sentence (46), however, is ungrammatical:

(46)  *A boy is resembling his father.

For, it has been pointed out, so-called stative verbs such as know, have, resemble, and so on cannot take the progressive aspect. Thus, it is implausible to derive (44) from (45) because (45) is an ill-formed deep deep structure where resemble co-occurs with be-Ing.

Finally, we believe that (39a) is different from (40a) in meaning; on the one hand, (39a) states the existence of a boy, but on the other hand, (40a) describes the action of a boy. Hence it follows that they must be derived from different deep structures.

These three arguments show that it is incorrect to relate (39a) directly to (40a), or to derive them from deep structures similar to each other. And the same is true for the case of (39b) and (40b).

Now we will turn to the case of (39c) and (40c). Emonds also assumes that absent in (40c) is an adverb, more precisely, an intransitive
preposition; that is, he assumes that *absent* is an adverb as well as *here*, *around*, *inside*, and so on, one of the examples being shown in (47):

(47) The people bought up all the seats inside.

Emonds presents little evidence to motivate this assumption. On the contrary, it seems to me that *absent* and *around*, for instance, must be distinguished from each other even if they would share some features. Let us compare the following two sentences:

(48) A few students seem to be absent in this class.
(49) All the books seem to be around the table.

They seem to be distinct on syntactic grounds, as shown in (50), (51):

(50) a. *It is absent in this class that a few students seem to be.
    b. It is around the table that all the books seem to be.

(51) a. What a few students seem to be is absent in this class.
    b. Where all the books seem to be is around the table.

(48) and (49) are different in two respects: first, (49) but not (48) has a cleft construction counterpart; second, when they have a pseudo-cleft counterpart, (48) has *what* as a relative pronoun while (49) has *where*. Notice that, in these respects, *absent* behaves like *pretty*, as clear from (53):

(52) Mary seems to be pretty.
(53) a. *It is pretty that Mary seems to be.
    b. What Mary seems to be is pretty.

Summing up, it is inadequate to assume *absent* as an adverb as well as *around*. Rather, it should be assumed to be an adjective just like *pretty*, as has been the general practice; the difference between *absent* and *pretty* may be that the latter can occur both in prenominal and predicate positions but the former only in predicate position.

In order to accommodate (39c) and (54a), it was necessary for Emonds to assume that *absent* is an adverb.

(54) a. *There are some girls pretty.
    b. Some girls are pretty.

He assumes that *pretty* in (54b) is a predicative attribute (or complement) and that the *there*-construction rules are constrained so as not to

---

*Compare the girl is pretty, the pretty girl, with the girl is absent, *the absent girl. For a detailed discussion, see Bolinger (1967).*
apply to the structures in which the predicative attribute is contained; thus, according to his reasoning, (54a) cannot be derived from a structure like (54b).

Let it be stated, in this connection, that Haraguchi (1970) claims that adjectives must be classified according to the applicability of the there-construction rules to account for the difference between (39c) and (54a). Now compare the following sentences:

\[(55)\]
\[a. \text{*There are some girls pretty.} \]
\[b. \text{There are some girls pretty in smiling.}\]

Following Haraguchi, these will be derived from underlying structures corresponding to (56a) and (56b), respectively:

\[(56)\]
\[a. \text{Some girls are pretty.} \]
\[b. \text{Some girls are pretty in smiling.}\]

Since the rules can apply to (56b) but not to (56a), however, the difference between (55a) and (55b) cannot be explained by the assumption that the adjective \textit{pretty} cannot undergo the rules. Let us further compare the sentences in (57):

\[(57)\]
\[a. \text{*There are many problems important.} \]
\[b. \text{There is something important.}\]

These sentences would, again, be derived from underlying structures corresponding to (58a) and (58b), respectively:

\[(58)\]
\[a. \text{Many problems are important.} \]
\[b. \text{Something is important.}\]

In this case, too, the difference between (57a) and (57b) cannot be explained by the inapplicability of the rules to the adjective \textit{important}. From these examples, we may conclude that the there-constructions examined above cannot be accommodated by classifying adjectives according to the applicability of the there-construction rules.

To summarize, it should be correct to relate (35) directly to (37) but it is incorrect to relate (39a)-(39c) directly to (40a)-(40c), respectively. In other words, only the verb \textit{be} in (37) can occur in the predicate verb position of the there-construction, but not three \textit{be}'s in (40).

4. Now we will examine the properties of the verb \textit{be} in more details in this section. The verb \textit{be} can occur in the following sentences:
(59) a. John is in the room.
b. Bill is handsome.
c. John was hit by Mary.
d. Mary is standing there.

Among these examples, the last two be's, those of the passive voice and the progressive aspect, can be distinguished from the others at least in two respects: first, they do always cooccur with another verb as in (59c, d) except in short answers to questions (e.g. Yes, she is (standing there).); secondly, they alone cannot appear as a main verb in the subject clause of the pseudo-cleft construction.

(60) a. *What John is is standing there.
b. *What John was was hit by Mary.

Turning to be's in (59a, b), we will refer to be in (59a) as a true verb be and be in (59b) as a copulative verb be for expository purposes.\(^1\) Though it is quite difficult to distinguish them on syntactic grounds, we assume that they can be made distinct by means of their contextual features. The true verb be and the copulative verb be will be assigned the contextual features (61) and (62), respectively:

(61) be: \([+PP]_2\)
(62) be: \([+NP]_\text{Pred}, [+AP]_\text{Pred}, [+PP]_\text{Pred}\)

PP in (61) is a prepositional phrase representing location including an adverb, and [NP]\text{Pred}, [AP]\text{Pred} and [PP]\text{Pred} in (62) stand for a noun phrase, an adjective phrase, and a prepositional phrase, respectively, dominated by the node Predicate. The contextual feature (61) permits sentence (59a), and the features in (62) permit the following sentences:

(63) a. John is a linguist.
b. John is intelligent.
c. John is in good health.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) We are not concerned here with the question whether these two be's are two usages of one verb or they are two distinct verbs.

\(^2\) We assume that only PP representing location strictly subcategorizes the true verb be in the sense of Chomsky (1965).

\(^3\) Sentences (59a) and (63c) seem to have apparently the identical structure, i.e. NP be PP; in fact, however, they are syntactically distinct, as shown below:

(i) a. Where (*What) John is is in the garden.
b. What (*Where) John is is in good health.
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From the arguments adduced above in this and the last sections, it is reasonable to assume that only the true verb be can occur in the there-construction. Although (61) specifies that the true verb be always co-occurs with PP of location, we also have a sentence like (64), where PP is not present:

(64) There is a man with a big bag.

Thus, the verb be must be specified to co-occur with such a PP only optionally (i.e. be: [+ - (PP)]). If the verb be is specified in this way, however, an ungrammatical sentence such as (65) could be generated:

(65) *The man with a big bag is.

To accommodate these facts, the verb be must be specified in the following way:

(66) be: [+ - ([A]NP \land PP)]

By the use of the parentheses notation ( \land ), we can specify that the true verb be may co-occur with PP optionally in the there-construction, in the case of which [A]NP is always chosen, while otherwise it must co-occur with PP.\(^2\) (That is, both [A]NP and PP are op-

(ii) a. It is in the garden that John is.
    b. *It is in good health that John is.

That is, (59a) but not (63c) can have a cleft construction counterpart, and (59a) will have where as a relative pronoun but (63c) will have what in the pseudo-cleft constructions corresponding to them. In these respects, in good health behaves like the adjective healthy, as in (iii):

(iii) a. What (*Where) John is is healthy.
    b. *It is healthy that John is.

(In this connection, see Ross (1969: 358), where he argues that adjectives can occur in the predicate position of pseudo-cleft sentences, and also see Emonds (1970), in which he suggests that prepositional phrases may occur in the focus position of cleft sentences.)

\(^1\) The linked parentheses notation is owing to Fillmore (1968: 28).

Without the structure-preserving constraint, these facts could not be explained in a natural way, if at all. If the present argument is valid, in return, it will motivate the constraint.

Further, notice that Hasegawa (1973) suggests that the verb believe will be assigned a contextual feature like [+ - [A]NP-S] to characterize that it can occur in a sentence such as I believe John to be innocent. Such a feature will be permitted only within the structure-preserving constraint.

\(^2\) To my knowledge, the only exception to this specification is a sentence: God is.
tional elements but one of them must be chosen.) With the feature specification (66), the sentences (35), (37) and (64) will be derived from the deep structures (36), (38) and (67), respectively, under the structure-preserving constraint:

\[
(67)
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S}^1 \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{NP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{a man with a big bag}
\]

However, the deep structure (68) for (65) cannot be permitted, because in (68) neither of the optional elements in (66) is chosen.

\[
(68) \quad \ast [\text{the man with a big bag}]_{NP} [[\text{is}]_V]_{VP}
\]

We can now explain the counterexamples to the analyses of Emonds and Haraguchi in the way suggested here. To begin with, let us consider sentence (44), which is repeated as (69) conveniently:

\[
(69) \quad \text{There is a boy resembling his father.}
\]

This will be derived from the underlying structure (70):

\[
(70) \quad [\text{A boy who resembles his father}]_{NP} [[\text{is}]_V [\text{A}]_{NP}]_{VP}
\]

Relative Clause Reduction applies to the subject NP in (70), converting it into (71):\(^1\)

\(1\) Note that the feature specification \([A]_{NP}\) specifies that the node NP cannot dominate any item in deep structure, as in (67). This notion is not novel; in Chomsky (1970), the feature \(by\! +\! A\) is postulated to reserve a position into which a subject NP will be moved by the application of the passive rule. Chomsky (1970: 198) also assumes that a pseudo-cleft sentence such as \(\text{what John did was hurt himself} \) may be derived roughly from \([it \ that \ John \ hurt \ John]_{NP} \ was \ [A]_{Pred.}\)

\(2\) We assume that Relative Clause Reduction consists of four rules: Relative Pronoun Deletion, \(In\!g\!+\!Insertion\), Tense Deletion and \(Being\) Deletion. The noun phrase \(a \ wise \ boy\) in (i) will be derived in the manner shown in (ii):

(i) \(I \ know \ a \ wise \ boy.\)

(ii) (1) \(a \ boy \ who \ [Pres]_{TNS} \ be \ wise \)

\(\downarrow\) Relative Pronoun Deletion

(2) \(a \ boy \ \emptyset \ [Pres]_{TNS} \ be \ wise\)
(71) [A boy resembling his father]_{NP} \, [[is]_{V} \, [d]_{NP}]_{VP}

It is clear that \(-ing\) in \(resembling\) is not that of the progressive aspect but appears from the application of Relative Clause Reduction. This derivation does not violate the restriction that stative verbs cannot take the progressive aspect.

Next, (77b) (= (72)) will be derived from the structure (73):

(72) There is something important.
(73) [something which is important]_{NP} \, [[is]_{V} \, [d]_{NP}]_{VP}

Relative Clause Reduction also applies to (73), converting it into (74):

(74) [something important]_{NP} \, [[is]_{V} \, [d]_{NP}]_{VP}

At this stage of derivation, the subject NP has the structure which may undergo Modifier Fronting, but the rule cannot apply in this case be-

\[\text{Ing-Insertion}\]
\[\text{a boy [-ing+Pres]_{TNS} be wise}\]
\[\text{Tense Deletion}\]
\[\text{a boy [-ing+∅]_{TNS} be wise}\]
\[\text{Affix Hopping}\]
\[\text{a boy being-wise}\]
\[\text{Being Deletion}\]
\[\text{a boy wise}\]
\[\text{Modifier Fronting}\]
\[\text{a wise boy}\]

We will briefly comment on this derivation: \text{Ing-Insertion} is assumed to daughter-adojins \(-ing\) to the node Tns (Tense) and Tense Deletion is assumed to delete a tense morpheme, Pres or Past, when it is identical with that of a higher clause, but not otherwise; these assumptions seem necessary to account for sentences like \(I\) \text{know a lady having been pretty when young}, in which a tense morpheme is not deleted in the relative clause. Note that in the case of (69), \text{Being Deletion} does not apply, because \text{being} does not appear in its derivation. (We will discuss Modifier Fronting below in footnote 1, p. 305.) We must admit, however, that there are many unsolved problems concerning Relative Clause Reduction. See Burt (1971) for further discussion.

Further notice that all the operations for the relative clause reduction except Relative Pronoun Deletion can be used to derive participle constructions. See Nakamura (1973).

1 Modifier Fronting has the effect of deriving (ii) from (i):

(i) [[a man]_{NP} wise]_{NP} \rightarrow (ii) [a wise man]_{NP}

The application of the rule, however, must be constrained so as not to apply to the following cases; first, a head noun is an indefinite noun (e.g. something, anything, someone, anyone, etc.); second, the element to be fronted can occur only in predicate position (e.g. absent, available, missing, etc.); third, the element to be fronted is followed by modifiers but an infinitival phrase (compare a boy good at mathematics, *a good boy at mathematics with a boy easy to please, an easy boy to please).
cause of the property of the head NP something. Then, the there-construction rules apply to (74), deriving (72). On the other hand, sentence (73) will be derived from (76):

(73) There is an important matter.
(76) [a matter which is important]NP [[is]V [4]NP]VP

Similarly, Relative Clause Reduction applies to (76), yielding (77):


In this case, nothing will prevent Modifier Fronting from applying to the subject NP of (77), (77) being thereby converted into (78):


Along these lines of explanation, the ungrammaticality of (57a), i.e. *there are many problems important, can be explained for the reason that the subject NP of (78) must undergo Modifier Fronting ((57a) being derived from (78) without undergoing the rule) but not for the reason that important is an adjective which cannot undergo the there-construction rules.

Finally, we will consider sentence (39c), which is repeated here as (79):

(79) There are many students absent.

This will be derived from the underlying structure (80):

(80) [Many students who are absent]NP [[are]V [4]NP]VP

The subject NP of (80), too, undergoes Relative Clause Reduction, being transformed into (81):


The subject NP of (81) has the structure which Modifier Fronting

---

1 The deep structures (73) and (76) can be motivated on other grounds. Consider the following sentences:

(i) a. I want to tell you something important that there is in this paper.
    b. *I want to tell you something that there is important in this paper.

(ii) a. I’ll ignore students absent who there are in this class.
    b. *I’ll ignore students who there are absent in this class.

From these examples, it is clear that something important in (iii) and students absent in (iv) make up a single constituent.

(iii) There is something important in this paper.

(iv) There are students absent in this class.

This observation can be accommodated within the present analysis.
may apply to, but it cannot undergo the rule because of the property of the adjective absent.¹

By our analysis, we have just shown that the counterexamples to the analyses of Emonds and Haraguchi can be explained in terms of the independently motivated rules, Relative Clause Reduction and Modifier Fronting.

Notice incidentally, that the following example will lend a further support to our analysis.

(82) There was no one for us to talk to.

Quirk et al. (1972: 960) say that sentence (82) “is problematic to the extent that it cannot be directly related to the basic clause types ...” That is, we don’t have a sentence such as (83), which could be said to be a “basic” sentence for (82) if grammatical:

(83) *No one was for us to talk to.

Within the present framework, however, (82) will be derived from the structure (84):

(84) [No one who for us to talk to]_{NP} [[was]_{V} [Adj]_{NP}]_{VP}

Putting details aside, (84) will undergo the there-construction rules, and finally, (82) will be derived. Then, the examples of this sort, too, support our claim that it should be incorrect to relate such a sentence as (82) directly to a “basic” sentence like (83), as argued above.

5. In summary, in the second section, we have argued that the subject there in the there-construction has a status of noun phrase and must be introduced by a transformational rule. In the third and fourth sections, we have claimed that the predicate verb be of the there-construction is the true verb be with the contextual feature (66) and that the there-construction with the verb be as a predicate verb should be derived from a deep structure something like (85):

(85) [[NP]_{NP} [[be]_{V} [Adj]_{NP} ([PP]_{PP})]_{VP}]_{S}

Under the analysis suggested in this paper, we have argued that we need not regard such a word as absent as an adverb, as does Emonds (1970), nor need we classify adjectives according to the applicability of the there-construction rules, Indefinite Subject Postposing and There-

¹ This property of the adjective absent can be characterized by the lexical specification that it can occur only in predicate position but not in prenominal position.
Insertion, as suggests Haraguchi (1970). In addition, we need not posit an ill-formed deep structure for the example containing the form of V+-ing (e.g. resembling); we can explain such examples in terms of Relative Clause Reduction, which we believe can be motivated independently.

Insofar as our arguments are valid, our proposed analysis may be adequate more than those of Emonds, Haraguchi and others. Note also that our analysis of the there-construction will motivate the structure-preserving constraint more persuasively than that of Emonds.
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