

Expletive *There* in Generative Grammar

Hakyeon Kim
(Catholic University of Daegu)

Kim, Hakyeon. 2004. Expletive *There* in Generative Grammar. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 12(3), 207-224. This paper deals with the status and role of expletive *there* in Generative Grammar. In particular, the main concern of this paper has to do with a historical survey of the models of Generative Grammar and its effects in the mechanism of introducing expletive *there*. In doing so, we will see how different models of Grammar affect a particular element, and why constructions containing expletive *there* invoke such vivid discussions in the minimalist program. We can see from this historical survey that the nature of expletive *there* is revealed by many theoretical devices.

Key Words: expletive *there*, EPP, Case, economy, MoM, model of grammar

1. Introduction

Since Generative Grammar was launched, it has undergone several theoretical shifts and interests of research have changed accordingly. Meanwhile, many interesting puzzles in natural language have gained fruitful answers though they still have remaining problems. Considering the theoretical shifts in Generative Grammar, we can distinguish elements that have been treated differently as the model of Grammar changed. Among these elements expletives are particularly interesting because ways of introducing them into derivations seem to be closely related to economy conditions in the minimalist program.

This paper deals with the status and role of expletive *there* in Generative Grammar. In particular, the main concern of this paper has to do with a historical survey of the models of Generative Grammar and its effects in the mechanism of introducing expletive *there*. In doing so, we will see how different models of Grammar affect a particular element, and why constructions containing expletive *there* invoke such vivid discussions in the minimalist program.

Section 2 deals with the analysis and explanation of *there*-insertion in early Generative Grammar. Section 3 explores the advantages and problems of the P&P approach with *there*. In section 4, we will see that the minimalist program raises many interesting questions about the relation of expletive *there* and other aspects of theoretical development. Section 5 presents some concluding remarks.

2. *There*-insertion in early Generative Grammar

Early Generative Grammar (from the 1950s to the 1970s) has the property of Grammar as a rule system. The rule system includes PS rules, Transformational rules and semantic rules, which relate to D(eep)-structure, S(urface)-structure, and the semantic component respectively. Transformational Grammar seems to many linguists to be identical to Generative Grammar because Generative Grammar has used some forms of transformation since its birth. However, as is well-known, Generative Grammar might not have to do with transformations. Chomsky (1986) points out that Generative Grammar means Explicit Grammar to the effect that if a theory of language pursue explicit characterization of Grammar, it can be called Generative Grammar. Then, a question can be immediately raised: Why has Chomsky consistently adopted transformations throughout the history of Generative Grammar? This question is very fundamental one, which any basic course in syntax try to work out. For example, consider the following rules and sentences.

- (1) $S \rightarrow NP \text{ Aux } VP$
- (2) a. $\text{Aux} \rightarrow C^1$
 - b. $\text{Aux} \rightarrow C \text{ M(odal)}$
 - c. $\text{Aux} \rightarrow C \text{ have}$
 - d. $\text{Aux} \rightarrow C \text{ be}$
 - e. $\text{Aux} \rightarrow C \text{ M have}$

1) Here, C is a complex of tense and agreement features. The reader should not confuse it with C for complementizer.

- f. Aux \rightarrow C M be
 - g. Aux \rightarrow C have be
 - h. Aux \rightarrow C M have be
- (3)
- a. John left
 - b. John will left
 - c. John has left
 - d. John is leaving.
 - e. John will have left.
 - f. John will be leaving.
 - g. John has been leaving.
 - h. John will have been leaving.

With verbal morphology put aside for a while, the PS rules in (1) and (2) can generate the sentences in (3). However, the rules introducing Aux are too huge to adopt in an appropriate rule system. Chomsky's (1957) solution to this problem is to reduce the descriptive power using notational convention.

- (4) Aux \rightarrow C (M) (have) (be)

Here, the elements in a parenthesis is optional, and hence (4) covers all the rules in (2) resulting in a great simplicity. However, different problems arise if verbal morphology comes into consideration. There are some discontinuous dependencies between auxiliary verbs themselves and between auxiliary verbs and main verbs. Consider the following sentences.

- (5)
- a. *John will left.
 - b. *John have leaving.
 - c. *John is left.

The ungrammaticality of sentences in (5) and the grammaticality of relevant well-formed sentences in (3) suggest that verbal morphology is determined by preceding elements. For example, modal auxiliaries require the immediately following verb to have base form. The perfective auxiliary *have* needs perfective participle to be its adjacent verb, etc.. These discontinuous dependencies can

be described by modifying (4) as follows.

(6) Aux \rightarrow C (M) (have-en) (be-ing)

But, (6) does not solve all the problems of verbal morphology. We need some device for getting right verb forms. Here, a transformational rule is called for in order to resolve this problem. We can see a clue from (2a) and (3a). In (2a), "C" is a kind of affix that is obligatorily attached to a verbal root. (3a) is derived by putting this affix together with the adjacent verb. Chomsky (1957) called this transformational rule Auxiliary Transformation, which has been called Affix Hopping afterwards.

(7) T20 Auxiliary Transformation (obligatory)²⁾

SA: X - "Af" - "v" - Y

(where "Af" is any C or is *en* or *ing*; "v" is any M or V, or *have* or *be*)

SC: X₁ - X₂ - X₃ -X₄ \rightarrow X₁ - X₃ -X₂# - X₄

Thanks to the transformational rule (7), we can simplify PS rules and hence the entire system of grammar. The tenet for positing a transformational rule is that we need a transformational rule if there is a dependency between constituents, which cannot be captured by PS rules.

In this regard, expletive *there* has some intricate properties that signify the need of a transformational rule (cf. Akmajian & Heny 1976: 166). We will see three distributional properties of expletive *there*, which any grammar should account for.

First, expletive *there* functions only as the subject of a sentence. This is proved by the fact that it can be copied into tags, as other NP subjects can, and may undergo Subject-Auxiliary inversion, as other NP subjects do.³⁾

2) Here, "T20" is one of the numbers of transformational rules assigned by Chomsky (1957). SA means Structural Analysis and SC Structural Change, though SD (Structural Description) is more prominent term rather than SA.

3) Notice that locative *there*, as an adverbial, never acts like an NP subject.

(i) a. *There's John, by the tree, isn't there?

- (8) a. There's a boy on the dock, isn't there?
 b. Is there a boy on the dock?

Second, though it functions as the subject of a sentence, expletive *there* cannot occur as the subject of just any sentence. It occurs only in sentences with the verb *be* and some (again not all) unaccusative verbs like *occur* and *arise*. Therefore, sentences with existential *there* plus other verbs are ungrammatical.⁴⁾

- (9) a. There were two men in the room.
 b. *There laughed two men in the room.
 c. *There died two men in the room.

Third, there is a restriction to the semantic properties of the associate NP. This NP must not refer to a specific, definite individual.

- (10) a. There were some students in the ballroom.
 b. *There were they/them in the ballroom.
 c. *There were Tom and John in the ballroom.
 d. *There were the students in the ballroom.

Thus, we may make the following condition: expletive *there* may occur only with indefinite associate NP.

In sum, we can pick up three important distributional properties of expletive *there*: (i) it may occur only in subject position; (ii) it may occur only in sentences with narrow set of unaccusative verbs; (iii) the associate NP must be indefinite. Given these properties, we can formulate a transformational rule called *there*-insertion.

b. *Is there John, by the tree?

4) Of course, languages like Icelandic allows an expletive to appear in sentences even with a transitive verb. We will ignore these languages.

(11) *There* Insertion

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|
| SA: | NP _[-def] | - | X | - | V _[BE] |
| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 |
| SD: | there | | | | 3+1 |

Note that the associate NP in SA is in subject position because in early Generative Grammar, PS rules don't offer postverbal position to NPs. But, the picture has been much changed after Generative Grammar was provided with new theoretical devices that seem to have improved the system of Grammar entirely. In the next section, we will see how the Principles and Parameters (P&P) approach touches problems with expletive *there*.

3. *There* insertion in the P&P approach

3.1. The Projection Principle and the EPP

In the late 1970s, Chomsky seemed to try to make up a new model of Grammar. This new model revealed itself in Chomsky's (1981) book *Lectures on Government and Binding*, which cause the title of the new model to be called the Government and Binding theory. At that time, Vernaud suggested that most of the surface filters introduced in Chomsky and Lasnik (1977) could be unified if Case is required for morphological realization. Chomsky (1981) extends Vernaud's suggestion to abstract Case, and presents the Case filter (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977: 111).

(12) Every phonetically realized NP must be assigned (abstract) Case.

Furthermore, Chomsky (1981) extensively introduces levels of representation after the so called linguistic war with Generative Semantics. He assumes four levels of representation: D-structure, S-structure, LF, and PF. D-structure is the level of representation that is more abstract equivalent of Deep Structure in the Standard Theory. Chomsky posits that this level meets the properties of lexical items to the effect that the θ -roles and subcategorization properties of lexical items are represented at this level. In this sense, D-structure is

a pure representation of θ -role assignment. The reason why we use the adjective “pure” here is that a criterion about θ -roles and arguments should be observed in (S-structure and) LF as well as in D-structure. This criterion is called the “ θ -criterion” (Chomsky 1981: 36).

- (13) Each argument bears one and only one θ -role, and each θ -role is assigned to one and only one argument.

An argument is assigned a θ -role by virtue of the θ -position that it or its trace occupies in LF. Here, the trace is an element that is created by Move- α , which applies to D-structure to derive S-structure representation. Move- α creates a chain consisting of the antecedent and traces. The antecedent in the final landing site is called the head of the chain, and the trace in the starting point is called the tail of the chain. If the landing site of Move- α is an A'-position, the chain is A'-chain, whereas it is A-chain if its head is in A-position. Given that the LF-representation consists of chains, the θ -criterion in (13) is observed by chains. A derivation of a sentence or mapping between levels of representation starts at D-structure. Recall that D-structure is a pure representation of θ -role assignment and the θ -criterion requires each chain bears one θ -role. This means that lexical properties are observed all the levels of representation. To ensure this, Chomsky (1981) posits the Projection Principle, which is stated as follows adopting from Radford (1988: 548).

- (14) Syntactic representations are projected from the Lexicon in that they uniformly observe the lexical properties of the items they contain.

Given above discussions, the sentence in (15) has (16a) and (16b) as its D-structure and S-structure/LF representations respectively.

- (15) John was arrested.
 (16) a. [_S [e] was [_{VP} arrested John]]
 b. [_S John_i was [_{VP} arrested t_i]]

In (16a), θ -properties of *arrest* is satisfied by *John* in its complement position to observe the θ -criterion.⁵⁾ In (16b), *John* is not in θ -position, but is assigned a θ -role being coindexed with its trace. Therefore, (16a,b) satisfies the Projection Principle.

However, there are certain constructions that the θ -criterion and the Projection Principle don't come into effect. These constructions involve expletives like *there* and *it*. Consider the following sentences from Chomsky (1981: 26).

- (17) a. There is a good reason for his refusal.
 b. I believe there to be a good reason for his refusal.
 c. I'd prefer for there to be a better reason for his refusal.
 d. I'd prefer there being a better reason for his refusal.

The positions that are occupied by underlined *there* cannot be omitted; some element must appear in these positions. This obligatory insertion of *there* follows from the fact that the constructions illustrated require subjects for some structural reason. Chomsky (1981) calls it the principle *P*. This mysterious principle seems to Chomsky (1981) to be irreducible to other principles or conditions. It does not derive from the θ -criterion because expletives cannot bear any θ -role. It does not derive from subcategorization properties because subject position is not subcategorized one. Thus, Chomsky (1981) claims that the principle *P* is the structural requirement that certain configurations must have subjects; i.e., the principle *P* is simply the rule (18) ((25) in Chomsky 1981: 25).

- (18) S \rightarrow NP INFL VP

Though the NP position in (18) is not motivated directly by the Projection

5) The external θ -role of *arrest* is not assigned in (16a). Chomsky (1981) assumes that the unique property of the passive morphology is that it in effect absorbs Case. Given this, (by Burzio's generalization) *arrest* + the passive morpheme absorbs the accusative Case, and hence the VP of which this morphological complex is the head assigns no θ -role.

Principle, Chomsky (1982) claims that the requirement that clauses have subjects are conceptually quite closely related to the Projection Principle. He proposes that the Projection Principle be extended subsuming the principle *P*; henceforth, the Extended Projection Principle. Notice that constructions containing expletive *there* play a central role in deriving the extended part of the Projection Principle. Furthermore, existential *there* constructions trigger some troubles with the Case theory.

3.2. Case and chains

As mentioned above, it is generally assumed that *wh*-traces must be Case-marked. If the post-verbal associate NP in existential *there* constructions happen to be a *wh*-phrase, it moves to COMP via *wh*-movement.

If it is a plain indefinite NP and *there*-insertion does not apply, it moves to the subject position. Here a kind of paradox appears as Stowell (1978) points out (cf. Chomsky 1981: 178).

- (19) a. [_{NP} e] is NP ... (e.g., "there is a man in the room," after *there*-insertion)
 b. NP_i is t_i ... ("a man is in the room")
 c. *wh*-phrase_i is [_{NP} e] t_i ... ("who is there in the room," after *there*-insertion)

If *wh*-traces must be Case-marked as generally assumed, we should conclude that the post-verbal position in (19a) must be Case marked. However, NP-movement in (19b) should not occur if the NP is Case-marked in the position occupied by *t_i*. Chomsky (1981) tries to explicate this paradox by assuming that expletive *there* has only an underspecified number feature in its lexical entry. This assumption leads us to admit that *there* must be coindexed with the post-verbal NP due to its feature deficiency. Chomsky (1981) further presents the following Case-assignment principle for partly independent reason.⁶⁾

6) We do not discuss the content of Chomsky's (1981) arguments for (20) and the reason why (20) is necessary independently. The reader should refer to Chomsky 1981.

- (20) Case is assigned to an index and inherited by lexical NP with this index.

Here, the index plays very important role. It makes *there* get the number feature from the coindexed NP. It make Case inherited to the NP in non-Case position. Note that *there* and the associate NP are combined into a kind of chain under those assumptions presented here.

In fact, Chomsky (1986) takes the approach that makes it possible to regard *there* and the associate NP as members of a (kind of) chain. In the mid 1980s, there had been efforts made by some linguists to unify θ -role marking and Case marking. Of them, Aoun (1985) suggests that an element is visible for θ -marking only if it is assigned Case. Chomsky (1986) adopts this suggestion and calls it the visibility condition. Then, he thinks of a chain as an abstract representation of the phrase that is its head and assumes that θ -roles and Case are assigned to chains. Hence, The theta criterion has been reformulated as a property of chains (Chomsky 1986: 97).

- (21) Each argument α appears in a chain containing a unique visible θ -position P, and each θ -position P is visible in a chain containing a unique argument α .

Due to the visibility condition and the reformulated θ -criterion (21), a chain is supposed to have its head in a Case position and its tail in a θ -position. Furthermore, Chomsky (1986) claims that every level of representation should meet the full interpretation principle, according to which only chains are legitimate elements in LF. With this in mind, consider the following sentence.

- (22) There_i seems [t_i to have been [[a unicorn] $_j$ killed t_j in the garden]]
(where $i = j$)

Here, we have two chains (there_i, t_i) and ([a unicorn] $_j, t_j$), each of which violates the visibility condition, the θ -criterion, and hence ultimately the full interpretation principle. If we use the strategy of Case assignment to indices as in (20), *there* and *a unicorn* constitute a chain-like pair, the former being

in a Case position and the latter being in a θ -position. Chomsky (1986) thinks that the properties of links of a chain are quite generally carried over to this pair. If this expletive–argument pair has the same properties as A-chains, it is not implausible to modify the notion of chain so as to include the expletive–argument pair. Thus, Chomsky (1986) presents the notion of CHAIN: A chain is a CHAIN and an expletive–argument pair is a CHAIN. Furthermore, Chomsky (1986) assumes differently from Chomsky 1981 that *there* is inserted and linked to the associate NP at D-structure. Thus, t_i occupies the D-structure position of *there* and constitutes a CHAIN with *a unicorn*. Note that (*there*, t_i) constitutes another chain-like material. Chomsky (1986) claims that this chain can be unified with the CHAIN (t_i , [a unicorn]) so as to constitute the CHAIN (*there*, t_i , [a unicorn]), t_i).

To conclude, existential *there* constructions had been a never-ending trouble-maker, and hence a trigger for the development of generative grammar. As the model of grammar changed, the way of treating the expletive *there* varied. In the next section, we will see that the expletive *there* still has been a notorious element in the minimalist program.

4. How has the minimalist program dealt with *there*?

4.1. Economy of representation and Greed

Chomsky (1991) makes an effort to make explicit economy of derivation and representation, which have effects on the theory of grammar implicitly in the P&P approach. The consideration of economy of representation, with strict application of the full interpretation principle, demands that every level of representation have no superfluous elements. This means that there are no expletives at the LF representation because they are supposed to have no semantic content. Chomsky & Lasnik (1993) carefully discuss the problem of *there* with the FI. Actually, the simplest way to meet the FI is deleting *there* completely in the mapping between S-structure and LF. However, they think that *there* has some inflectional features,⁷⁾ and recoverability condition

7) Note that Chomsky (1981) assumes *there* has an underspecified number feature.

on deletion does not allow to sweep away *there*. Furthermore, if we simply eliminate *there* from its surface position, it is the violation of the EPP. In order to overcome these two problems, Chomsky (1991) and Chomsky & Lasnik (1993) suggest that the associate NP raises to the position occupied by *there* at LF, because *there* is an LF-affix to be supported by a host. The raising of the associate NP results in an adjunction structure. Hence, (23a) has the LF representation (23b).

- (23) a. There is a man in the room.
 b. [There, a man] is t in the room.

Chomsky (1991) claims that this LF raising approach not only solves the two problems mentioned right above but also gives clues to many other problems. For example, the chain condition presented in Chomsky & Lasnik demands that the head of A-chain be in Case-marked position and the tale in θ -marked position.⁸⁾ As discussed above, the P&P approach stipulate the notion of CHAIN in order to treat the expletive–argument pair as a kind of chain. However, the LF raising approach obviates this ad hoc stipulation. If Case is assigned by Spec-Head relation between Agr and an appropriate element at S-structure(cf. Pollock’s (1989) Split INFL Hypothesis), *there* is assigned Case at S-structure by AgrS and its Case is checked and shared with the associate NP after LF-raising. Thus, the result of LF-raising of the associate NP meets the chain condition. Note that this approach eliminates the mechanism of Case transmission through indices assumed in Chomsky 1981. The amalgamation of *there* and the associate NP⁹⁾ automatically meets the chain condition via LF checking, which makes Case-transmission almost completely void.¹⁰⁾

As is well-known, Chomsky (1993) has launched the minimalist program, which seems to be a radical departure from the P&P approach. Many noble

This assumption is changed afterwards. See the discussion below.

8) The chain condition is assumed in the discussion of CHAIN in Chomsky 1986.

9) This amalgamation means feature sharing between *there* and the associate NP.

10) Belletti (1988) claims under her partitive Case analysis on the associate NP that Case transmission should be rejected. See also Lasnik 1992.

concepts and Conditions like Greed, Procrastinate, the Minimal Link Condition (MLC), Equi-distance have been suggested. As for the expletive *there*, Chomsky (1993) proposes an analysis similar to that of Chomsky 1991 and Chomsky & Lasnik 1993. However, Lanik (1995) points out that the LF-raising analysis poses a serious problem with Greed. The core concept of Greed is that every movement satisfies the mover's own morphological requirement. For example, NP-movement occurs in order for an NP to have its Case checked off, the result of which is an A-chain. Lasnik (1995) notes that the relevant morphological requirement of the associate NP, that its Case be checked off, is satisfied without movement to subject position if Belletti's (1988) and Lasnik's (1992) partitive analysis is tenable. Nevertheless, he insists that the associate NP must move to subject position to avoid the stranded affix filter at LF¹¹) and to satisfy FI by replacing semantically null element. Consequently, Lasnik (1992) suggests that Greed be reinterpreted as the Enlightened Self-Interest.

4.2. Attract-F, Local Economy, and MoM

Chomsky (1995) makes a major theoretical shift in the minimalist program. Though it is not suitable to discuss the theoretical framework presented in Chomsky 1995, a short comment is in order. Just discussed above, Lasnik (1995) claims that Greed has serious problems especially with expletive *there* constructions. Chomsky (1995) partially admits these problems and take some misunderstanding of the self-interestness of movers to be modified. According to him, all movement in narrow syntax is feature-driven, and operations affect appropriate elements only enough for a derivation to be convergent. Thus, the most economical movement is feature movement. Overt operations affect categories for PF-convergence. He further admits that feature movement can be implemented without the need of movers as Lasnik (1995) points out. This point can be reinforced to the other direction: "feature movements occur for the need of attractor." In this sense, Chomsky's (1995) framework is called the Attract-F theory. Now, we consider the result of feature attraction/movement. After feature attraction, not only the attractee's uninterpretable

11) Recall that Chomsky (1993) assumes *there* to be an LF-affix.

features, but also those of the attractor's are checked and deleted. In this sense, the self-interestedness of the attractor is called "Suicidal Greed." Let's see how the Attract-F theory explains existential *there* constructions.

Consider (23a) repeated here as (24).

(24) There is a man in the room.

In (24), the associate *a man* is in its base position. But the agreement morphology indicates that covert feature movement occurs for checking. Which features are involved in the derivation of this sentence? Though Chomsky (1995) admits the problems of Greed, he denied the partitive analysis presented by Lasnik (1992) and Belletti (1988). Instead, he assumes that *there* has only the categorial feature [D], hence it cannot check off T's nominative assignment feature (i.e. T's N-feature or agreement features). Actually, *there*-insertion in (24) is solely for the EPP satisfaction of T because the EPP requirement is attributed to T's strong D-feature. After Spell-Out,¹²⁾ relevant features of *a man* (the Case-feature and ϕ -features) attracted and checked off¹³⁾ by T and T's uninterpretable feature are also checked and deleted. But, the categorial feature of *there* needs the N-feature of *a man*, which does not have full DP-status. Thus, the N-feature of *a man* further raises to *there*. Chomsky (1995) takes this raising as a kind of long-distance N to D raising (cf. Giorgi & Longobardi, 1991). Note that this further feature raising captures the key point of the analysis of *there* as an LF-affix discussed in 4.1. But this analysis poses another problem and is modified later in Chomsky 1999. We will discuss this point shortly.

Let us consider another problem caused by *there* regarding to computational

12) Spell-Out is the point at which a derivation diverges to PF and LF. In Chomsky 1995 (and earlier work in the minimalist program), Spell out applies once through $N \rightarrow \lambda$ computation. However, many generative grammarians like Brody (1995), Groat and O'Neil (1996), and Pesetsky (1996) have suggested that there is no overt/covert distinction in grammar, and Uriagereka (1999) further claims that Spell-out can be applied multiply in a derivation. Chomsky (1999, 2000) accepts these proposal so as to make up the cyclic Spell-Out hypothesis.

13) Clearly, NPs' φ -features are interpretable and hence they are not deleted after feature checking.

complexity. In early minimalist program, there are devices such as reference sets and economy consideration between derivations, which essentially have the problem of global computation complexity. However, Collins (1997) has this problem subject to a serious criticism, and claims that every operation applies without look-ahead consideration of economy. According to him, the global computational complexity should be overcome by strict local economy. Thus, devices like reference sets, comparison between derivations, and even Numeration should be eliminated. Here, a problem is raised by expletive *there* constructions.

- (25) a. A man is in the room.
 b. There is a man in the room.

Both (25a) and (25b) are completely grammatical sentences in English. However, we can ask how these two sentences can be compatible. Chomsky's consistent position is that the numerations of these two sentences are different and that Merge of *there* obviates the raising of *a man* if the numeration contains *there* in it. When Merge and Move competes in a certain point of derivation, the former always defeats the latter. This is called the Merge over Move preference (MoM).¹⁴ But consider the following sentences.

- (26) a. There is a rumor that a monk is in the temple.
 b. A rumor is that there is a monk in the temple.

Castillo, Drury & Grohmann (1999) point out that these sentences show the optionality between *there*-insertion and associate-raising as discussed in Collins 1997. This problem is overcome by the theory of phase in Chomsky 1999 and 2000. Chomsky (1999) claims that operational complexity also matters in local economy, and that it can be overcome if we take phases to be a unit of lexical selection (i.e. numeration) and derivational cyclicity. Suppose

14) Chomsky (1993) originally propose that Procrastinate blocks the raising of the associate NP when the numeration has selected *there*. Note that this explanation no longer holds because Procrastinate is eliminated due to its global nature. But the core spirit of the earlier explanation is kept by MoM.

phases are C and *v*. Then, the embedded clauses in (26) have a different numeration respectively. But this problem is still controversial and should be subject to careful consideration.

Now, let's return to the N to D raising analysis for *there*-constructions. Consider the sentences below from Chomsky (1991).

- (27) a. I haven't met many linguistics students.
 b. There aren't many linguistics students.

(27a) has scope ambiguity between *not* and *many*, but (27b) does not. In the latter case, *many* has only the narrow scope. Thus, we can raise a question: Why feature movement does not affect the scope of quantifiers if all movements are essentially feature movement. Chomsky (1999) avoids this problem by assuming that there are no feature movement at all in grammar. Attract-F is replaced by Agree, which allow feature checking *in situ* without raising. This means that expletive *there* occupies subject position solely for the EPP satisfaction. As Bošković (2001) correctly notes, this does not seem to solve the problem of the nature of the EPP. Hence, the controversy about the relation of the EPP and expletive *there* constructions are still on its way.

5. Concluding remarks

So far, we have surveyed a short history of expletive *there* in generative grammar. As is well known, generative grammar has triggered a revolution in the field of linguistics. However, generative grammar itself has undergone numerous internal renovations in its development. As we have seen in this paper, Expletive *there* has played important roles in the development of generative grammar. We can see from this historical survey that the nature of expletive *there* is revealed by many theoretical devices. But we should admit that there remain many problems with this curious element yet to be explicated. Expletive elements never occur in other language-like system. Thus, Expletive *there* shows mysterious but interesting aspects of human language.

References

- Akmajian, A. & Heny, F. (1976). *An introduction to the principles of transformational syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Aoun, J. (1985). *The grammar of anaphora*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Belletti, A. (1988). The Case of unaccusatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19(1), 1-34.
- Bošcović, Ž. (2001). A-movement and the EPP. Unpublished manuscript.
- Brody, M. (1995). *Lexico-logical form*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Castillo, J. C., Drury, J. E., & Grohmann, K. K. (1999). The status of Merge over Move preference. Unpublished manuscript.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, N. (1982). *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of government and binding*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publication.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. (1991). Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. In R. Freidin (Ed.), *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1993). A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In K. Hale & S. J. Keyser (Eds.), *The view from building 20*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1999) Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, & J. Uriagereka (Eds.), *Step by step*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (Ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. & Lasnik, H. (1977). Filters and control. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 8(3), 425-504.
- Chomsky, N. & Lasnik, H. (1993). The theory of principles and parameters. In J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, & T. Vennemann (Eds.), *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

- Collins, C. (1997). *Local economy*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Giorgi, A. & Longobardi, G. (1991). *The syntax of noun phrases*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Groat, E. & O'Neil, J. (1996). Spell-Out at the LF interface. In W. Abraham, S. D. Epstein, H. Thráinsson, & C. J-W. Zwart (Eds.), *Minimal ideas*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Lasnik, H. (1992). Case and expletives: Notes toward a parametric account. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23(3), 381-405.
- Lanik, H. (1995). Case and expletives revisited. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26(4), 615-633.
- Pesetsky, D. (1996). Some optimality principles of sentence pronunciation. In P. Barbosa, D. Fox, P. Hagstrom, M. McGinnis, & D. Pesetsky (Eds.), *Is the best good enough*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pollock, J. Y. (1989). Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20(3), 365-424.
- Radford, A. (1988). *Transformational grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stowell, T (1978). What was there before there was *there*. In *Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting*, CLS.
- Uriagereka, J. (1999). Multiple Spell-Out. In S. D. Epstein, & N. Hornstein (Eds.), *Working minimalism*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Hakyeon Kim

Department of English Language and literature

Catholic University of Daegu

330 Geumrak 1-ri, Hayang-eup, Gyeongsan-si

Gyeongbuk, 712-702, Korea

Phone: 82-53-850-3128

Email: kimhy@mail.cu.ac.kr

Received: 18 Jul, 04

Accepted: 28 Aug, 04

Revised: 8 Sept, 04