DUTCH EXPLETIVES AND SMALL CLAUSE PREDICATE RAISING

C. Jan-Wouter Zwart

University of Groningen

1. Introduction

The proper analysis of constructions with expletives like English *there* has been the source of some controversy in the recent literature. First, the more or less traditional analysis of Chomsky (1986a), according to which expletives are meaningless elements, freely inserted at S-structure, and replaced at LF by the NP they are associated with, has been challenged by an analysis put forward in Moro (1990), according to which expletives are D-structure predicates of a Small Clause, and are raised to the structural subject position at S-structure. Second, there exists considerable unclearness about the way the NP associated with the expletive is assigned Case, whether in situ (Belletti 1988, Lasnik 1991) or by its association with the expletive (Safir 1982, Koster 1987).

   The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, I will argue that expletive constructions in Dutch provide evidence for the analysis of *there* as a Small Clause predicate. Dutch expletive constructions in which the expletive can be analyzed as a Small Clause predicate have exactly the properties of expletive constructions in English. Dutch expletive constructions in which the expletive cannot be analyzed as a Small Clause predicate are ungrammatical in English. This leads to the conclusion that there

are two types of expletive construction, *expletive raising* constructions and *expletive replacement* constructions, and that English has only expletive raising constructions, whereas Dutch has both. Second, I will suggest that this difference between Dutch and English can be explained if we make certain assumptions about the way the NP associated with the expletive (henceforward, the *associate*) is assigned Case. I will argue that in expletive raising constructions the associate is assigned Case in its Small Clause subject position, whereas in expletive replacement constructions the associate is assigned Case in the specifier position of TP.

2. Small Clause Predicate Raising

Small Clauses are subject-predicate combinations occupying a single argument position.[1] An uncontroversial example of a Small Clause is presented by the bracketed constituent in (1).

(1)   John considers [Mary intelligent]

In (1) *Mary* is not the object of *considers*, but the subject of *intelligent*. *Mary intelligent* as a whole is the object of *considers*.

   More controversy surrounds examples of the type in (2) (cf. Larson (1988), Den Dikken (1991)).

(2)   John put [the book on the table]

Clearly, *the book* is not the object of *put* (since *John put the book* is ungrammatical), and it could be argued that *the book* is the subject of a predicate *on the table*. If so, the bracketed constituent in (2) could be considered as another instance of a

---

[1] More exactly, subject-predicate combinations lacking most of the make-up of full clauses, such as complementizers and tense. I will leave open the question whether Small Clauses contain functional heads or not (see a.o. Hoekstra (1991), Nakajima & Tonoike, eds., (1991)).

Small Clause.

   In Dutch, Small Clause predicate PPs can be identified by their inability to undergo extraposition (Hoekstra 1984:243).[2] Adjunct PPs can be extraposed, as in (3).

(3) a.   *dat   Jan   het boek <u>op de tafel</u> las*
           that John the book on the table read
           "that John was reading the book (while sitting) on the table."
     b.   *dat Jan het boek las   <u>op de tafel</u>*
           that John the book read on the table
           "that John was reading the book (while sitting) on the table."

In the Dutch version of (2), the PP *op de tafel* 'on the table' cannot be extraposed:

(4) a.   *dat   Jan   het boek <u>op de tafel</u> legde*
           that John the book on the table put
           "that John put the book on the table."
     b.   **dat Jan het boek legde <u>op de tafel</u>*
           that John the book put   on the table

Accepting the inability to extrapose as a test for Small Clause predicate status, we must conclude that *op de tafel* 'on the table' in (4) is a Small Clause predicate, and similarly, as a null hypothesis, for *on the table* in (2).

   As demonstrated by Hoekstra & Mulder (1990), the same test leads to the conclusion that *in de sloot* in the reading 'into the ditch' in (5) is a Small Clause predicate.[3]

---

[2] 'Extraposition' is used here as a descriptive term for the phenomenon that an element appears to the right of a verb that has not been fronted as an instance of verb second.
[3] The sentences in (5) also have a non-directional reading, describing a jumping event taking place in the ditch. In this reading, the PP <u>in de sloot</u> 'in the ditch' is an adjunct and (5b) is grammatical.

(5) a.   dat Jan <u>in   de sloot</u> *springt*
             that John into the ditch jumps
             "that John jumps into the ditch."
     b. *dat Jan *springt* <u>in   de sloot</u>
             that John jumps   into the ditch

Similarly, then, for the main clause version of (5), where the subject is in the structural subject position.

(6)   <u>Jan</u> *springt* [<u>t</u> *in   de sloot*]
        John jumps   into the ditch

As indicated, the subject of the construction as a whole, *Jan*, originates as the subject of the Small Clause predicate *in de sloot* 'into the ditch'. The verb *springt* 'jumps' must be considered as an unaccusative verb in this type of construction (see Hoekstra & Mulder 1990 for this analysis).

   The complement of the copular verb *be* is, arguably, another instance of a Small Clause. *be* is an unaccusative verb, lacking an external argument. This makes the analysis of (7) comparable to that of (6).

(7)   <u>John</u> *is* [<u>t</u> *the culprit*]

Interestingly, as Moro (1990) shows, the predicate *the culprit* in (7) can be raised to the structural subject position as well, leaving *John* in its original position indicated by the trace in (7):

(8)   <u>The culprit</u> *is* [*John* <u>t</u>]

   Turning back to Small Clauses with PP predicates, it appears that these predicates can raise to the structural subject position as well, as argued at length by Hoekstra & Mulder (1990). These are the phenomena familiar under the name of Locative Inversion:

(9)   Down the hill rolled [the baby carriage t]

   In the next section, we will see how these aspects of the theory of Small Clauses have been applied to the analysis of expletive constructions in recent years.

3.   Expletives as Raised Predicates

A striking feature of expletive constructions in English is that they require an unaccusative verb. Thus (10a), with an unergative transitive verb, and (10b), with an unergative intransitive verb, are excluded.

*(10) a. *   There bought a man a house*
*   b. *   There danced a couple*

This is not a universal property of expletive constructions, as the Dutch versions of (10) are grammatical:

(11) a.   Er   kocht een man een huis
*   there bought a   man a   house*
*   b.   Er   danste een paar*
*   there danced a   couple*

With unaccusative verbs, English expletive constructions are fine.

(12) a.   There was a boy
*   b.   There arrived a man*

   If unaccusative verbs invariably take Small Clause complements, as in (7)-(8), and also in (6) and (9) if Hoekstra & Mulder are correct, then *a boy* and *a man* must be in a Small Clause. Thus, Moro (1990, 1991) proposes that *a boy* and *a man* in (12) are subjects of a Small Clause, the predicate of which is the trace of a raised *there*. This is illustrated in (13).

(13) a.   <u>There</u> was [a boy <u>t</u>]
     b.   <u>There</u> arrived [a man <u>t</u>]

Thus, expletive constructions are analyzed in the same way as ordinary copular constructions and Locative Inversion constructions (in the analysis of Hoekstra & Mulder 1990).

   In the remainder of this paper I will present some empirical evidence from expletive constructions in Dutch supporting the expletive raising analysis of Moro (1990). But before that, let us compare this analysis with the more or less standard analysis of expletive constructions in Chomsky (1986a, 1989).

4. Expletive Raising and Expletive Replacement

The analysis of expletives as raised predicates is at variance with the standard analysis of expletive constructions since Chomsky (1986a). According to this analysis, expletives are meaningless elements, inserted in the structural subject position at S-structure. Because no meaningless elements may survive a derivation (by the principle of Full Interpretation), the expletives have to be replaced by their associate NP.[4]

   One advantage of this analysis is that it explains the fact that the expletive and the associate NP have to be in a *local* relation, as can be seen from (14).

(14)   * <u>There</u> seemed that <u>many men</u> were in the garden

This follows from the fact that the replacement at LF leaves a trace behind which has to be (locally) antecedent governed to satisfy the Empty Category Principle (ECP). In (14), expletive replacement would leave a trace in the position of *many men*, yielding a *that*-trace configuration.

---

[4] For reasons not to be discussed here, this replacement takes the form of adjunction rather than substitution, see Chomsky (1989).

However, this analysis does not explain why the choice of verbs in English expletive constructions is limited to unaccusative verbs, which falls out naturally from the predicate raising analysis (since unaccusative verbs are the only verbs that permit raising). Also, some locality effect is predicted to exist under the predicate raising analysis as well, as can be seen from (15).

(15)   * *In the garden* seemed that *many men* were

In fact, in a predicate raising analysis, (14) and (15) would never occur, because the subject position of the embedded clause would be occupied by the trace of *there* and *in the garden*, respectively, blocking movement of *many men* to that position.[5]

   I will therefore drop this issue and turn to another point of comparison between the two types of analysis.

5. *er* 'there' as a Raised Predicate

Another point of comparison between the expletive replacement analysis and the expletive raising analysis is the way the two analyses account for the paradigm in (16).

(16) a.   *Many men are in the garden*
     b.   *There are many men in the garden*

(16a) is ambiguous between a proportional reading ('many *of* the men') and an existential reading (see a.o. Partee 1988). (16b) has only the existential reading. The question is: Why does the presence of *there* block the proportional reading?

   For Chomsky (1989) a paradigm like that in (16) indicates that

---

[5] Notice that this eliminates Lasnik's (1991) main argument against Case transmission. This argument is based on the ungrammaticality of <u>there is likely someone to be here</u>, which is exactly like (14) and (15) in the relevant respects, if the expletive raising analysis is correct. Crucially, <u>someone</u> would not be able to move to the embedded subject position, which is occupied by the trace of <u>there</u>.

the expletive cannot be *fully* replaced at LF. If the expletive is fully replaced in (16b), the LF-representation would be indistinguishable from (16a), and the absence of the proportional reading would be mysterious. Therefore, Chomsky (1989) concludes that the expletive must still be present at LF, and that the associate NP does not replace the expletive but adjoins to it. However, as Chomsky notes, this requires some additional assumptions, for instance that in expletive replacement configurations the adjoined associate takes scope in the position of its trace (Chomsky 1989:66, see also Zwart (to appear)).

For Moro (1990) the absence of the proportional reading in (16b) follows from the status of *there* as a raised predicate. Since *there* is a predicate, it is not a meaningless element and there is no need for the associate to adjoin to it at LF.[6] Therefore the expletive naturally takes scope over the associate (see also Moro 1991).

It is interesting to note that the paradigm in (16) is not repeated in Dutch (De Hoop 1990, Zwart (to appear)). Thus, both sentences in (17) are ambiguous between a proportional and an existential reading.[7]

(17) a.   *dat veel mensen in de tuin   zijn*
           that many people in the garden are
           "that many people are in the garden"
     b.   *dat er   veel mensen in de tuin   zijn*
           that there many people in the garden are
           "that there are many people in the garden"

Recall that in Dutch, not all expletive constructions require unaccusativity of the verb (see (11)). This means that, even if Moro's analysis is on the right track, not every expletive in

---

[6] Unless, possibly, adjunction to the expletive is the only way for the associate to get Case (Chomsky 1991).

[7] There are several ways to disambiguate (17b), one of them making use of distinct intonational patterns. See fn 10, and Zwart (to appear) for more discussion of this paradigm. For most speakers, it appears to be hard to get an existential reading for sentences like (17a). I will leave that issue aside.

Dutch can be analyzed as a raised predicate. If so, it is tempting to analyze *er* as ambiguous between a raised predicate and a meaningless element in the sense of Chomsky (1986a, 1989).

As a meaningless element, *er* would have to be replaced (or better: adjoined to) at LF, and we would expect the associate NP to be able to have wide scope (which would rid us of the stipulation that the adjoined associate takes scope in the position of its trace). As a raised predicate, *er* would yield the existential reading like in the English example (16b).

Fortunately, there is a way to empirically test this hypothesis about *er* as being ambiguous between a raised predicate and a 'meaningless' element. Recall that in Dutch the status of a PP can be detected by checking its ability to undergo extraposition (sentences (3)-(5)). If *er* is a raised predicate, then the PP *in de tuin* 'in the garden' is an adjunct and should be able to appear to the right of the verb.[8]

Moreover, we predict that if the PP is extraposed, (17b) has the same status as (16b). This is because there has to be a predicate for the Small Clause subject *veel mensen* 'many people', and *er* is the only candidate. Therefore, we expect *er* to force an existential reading, like *there* in (16b), when the PP appears to the right of the verb.

The relevant sentence is (18).[9]

---

[8] Thanks to René Mulder for bringing this to my attention.
[9] It is probably more correct to say that in (17b) the PP must be a Small Clause predicate, and that a sentence like (18) is not derived from (17b), but from <u>dat er in de tuin veel mensen zijn</u> 'that there in the garden many people are' (if PP-extraposition is movement, that is). The existential interpretation of (17b) is not necessarily due to <u>er</u> being a raised predicate. In a sentence like (i), the PP must be a Small Clause predicate (because it is a postpositional PP), yet an existential reading is available.
(i)   dat er   veel mensen de straat op   gingen
       that there many people the street onto went
       "that many people went out on the streets"
We already know from transitive expletive constructions that not all expletive constructions with an existential reading are expletive raising constructions. However, all expletive raising constructions necessarily have an existential interpretation only.

(18)   *dat   er   veel mensen zijn in de tuin*
        that there many people are   in the garden

The fact that (18) is grammatical shows that the PP *in de tuin* 'in the garden' is not a Small Clause predicate here. In this respect, (18) differs from (19), (cf. (17a)).

(19)   * *dat   veel mensen zijn in de tuin*
         that many people are   in the garden

In (19), *in de tuin* is the only candidate for being the Small Clause predicate, since there is no *er*. As before (in (4b) and (5b)), Small Clause predicates cannot appear to the right of the verb. Conversely, *in de tuin* 'in the garden' is not a Small Clause predicate in (18), because it can appear to the right of the verb.

   Thus, in (18) *er* 'there' must be the Small Clause predicate, and, as predicted, (18) behaves exactly like (16b): (18) has only an existential reading. The proportional reading, available in (17b), is impossible in (18).[10]

   This fact follows from the analysis of expletives as raised predicates. Since the PP cannot be a Small Clause predicate in (18), the expletive must be the Small Clause predicate. Hence, the only reading available is the existential reading. Since there seems to be no easy way to accomodate these facts on the traditional analysis of expletives as 'meaningless' elements, we must conclude that the pattern (16)-(18) presents empirical support for the analysis of expletives as (potentially) raised Small Clause predicates.[11]

---

[10] The different readings are linked to distinct intonational patterns. Thus, in (17b) the existential reading has stress on <u>mensen</u>, and the proportional reading has stress on <u>veel</u> and <u>tuin</u>. The latter intonational pattern is impossible in (18).

[11] In transitive expletive constructions involving a Small Clause complement, such as (i), extraposition of the PP is impossible.
(i) a.   dat er   iemand een boek op de tafel legde
           that there someone a   book on the table put
     b. * dat er   iemand een boek legde op de tafel

6. Expletive Raising and Locative Inversion

There is yet another piece of evidence for the analysis of the expletive as a raised predicate in Dutch. This evidence comes from a comparison of expletive constructions and Locative Inversion constructions in Dutch.

First, we will use as our test sentences for expletive constructions sentences with the PP in extraposition. As we have seen in section 5, only in these constructions can the expletive unambiguously be identified as a raised predicate.

Second, we will compare this type of construction with Locative Inversion constructions. A *caveat* is in order here. It is very difficult to identify Locative Inversion constructions in Dutch, due to a complex of reasons. Locative Inversion in an SVO language like English is unmistakeable because the subject will show up to the right of the verb, in the verb's complement Small Clause:

(20)   In the garden were [many people t]

But in embedded clauses in Dutch, the subject will still appear to the left of the verb, because Dutch is an SOV language (Koster 1975).

(21)   dat in de tuin [veel mensen t] waren
*   that in the garden many people   were*

Secondly, in main clauses in Dutch subject-verb inversion is very common, due to the circumstance that topicalization triggers verb movement to C (Den Besten 1976). Therefore, (22) may as well be topicalization as Locative Inversion.[12]

---

[11] (...continued)
      that there someone a   book put   on the table
Since predicate raising is only possible with unaccusative verbs, this is as expected. Er cannot be a raised predicate in (i), therefore the PP must be the Small Clause predicate and cannot be extraposed. See Zwart (to appear).
[12] I assume, with Travis (1984) and Zwart (1991a, 1991b, 1992), that the structural subject position in Dutch and other so-called verb second languages
                                                  (continued...)

(22)   In de tuin   waren veel mensen
*   in the garden were many people*

So in both main and embedded clauses in Dutch, Locative Inversion constructions are hard to detect.

If Hoekstra & Mulder (1990) are correct, a crucial feature of Locative Inversion is that the Small Clause predicate PP occupies the structural subject position. On the assumption that expletives also occupy the structural subject position, we could say that constructions with fronted PPs are Locative Inversion constructions if an expletive cannot cooccur with the fronted PP.

Again, this doesn't yield a rock solid test, because nothing prevents the fronted PP to appear in a scrambling position (23a) or in a topic position (23b).[13]

(23) a.   dat <u>er</u> [in de tuin] [veel mensen <u>t</u>] zijn
*   that there in the garden   many people   are*
*   b.   [In de tuin] zijn <u>er</u> [veel mensen <u>t</u>]*
*   in the garden are there many people*

However, a mysterious feature of Dutch expletive constructions is that *er* can remain unexpressed if and only if a locative PP is fronted (cf. Reuland 1985). Thus, there is a clear constrast between (24a), where a locative PP is fronted, and (24b), where a temporal adverb is fronted.

---

[12] (...continued)
has to be distinguished from the topic position. Thus, the subject appears in Spec,AgrS in non-topicalized declarative main clauses.
[13] As expected, the sentences in (23) have only an existential reading.

(24) a.   In de tuin   werd gedanst
*   in the garden was   danced*
*   "People were dancing in the garden."*
*   b. ??Gisteren   werd gedanst*
*   yesterday was   danced*
*   "Yesterday people were dancing"*

If a locative PP is added to (24b), the construction is fine again.

(24) c.   Gisteren   werd in de   tuin   gedanst
*   yesterday was   in the garden danced*
*   "Yesterday people were dancing in the garden."*

The analysis of the paradigm in (23)-(24) usually involves expletive drop. But this leaves mysterious why the expletive drop is only possible in the context of a locative PP. If, on the other hand, (24a,c) involve Locative Inversion, it is immediately clear why there is no expletive, because in Locative Inversion constructions the fronted PP occupies the structural subject position.[14] (24b) is excluded, on this account, because the adverb *gisteren* 'yesterday' cannot be a Small Clause predicate.[15]

   Let us therefore conclude that Locative Inversion exists in Dutch as well as in English. If so, we predict that expletive

---

[14] Perhaps significant is the fact that there appears to be a clear preference for constructions without <u>er</u> when a locative PP is fronted (ANS 1984:822, cf. De Rooij 1991). Thus, (i) is strange compared to (ii) and (iii):
(i)   ?? In de kast   zit er   een lijk
          in the closet sits there a   body
          "There's a body in the closet"
(ii)   In de kast   zit   een lijk
          in the closet sits a   body
          "In the closet is a body"
(iii)   Er   zit een lijk in de kast
          there sits a   body in the closet
          "There's a body in the closet"
[15] Some more needs to be said about the implementation of the predicate raising analysis for impersonal passives, but I will leave that issue aside. The paradigm is the same with expletive passives and transitive actives, but in these cases the fact that the overt subject can get a specific reading or even be in the structural subject position may create disturbances. So (24) are in fact the clearest examples.

raising constructions (i.e., expletive constructions with an 'extraposed' PP) and Locative Inversion constructions have identical properties.

This is indeed the case. A peculiar property of Locative Inversion constructions in Dutch is that the subject of the Small Clause is not allowed to move out of the Small Clause as an instance of scrambling. This is illustrated in (25).[16]

(25) a.   <u>In de krant</u>   heeft gisteren [een artikel over
          taalkunde <u>t</u>] gestaan
          in the paper has   yesterday   an   article on
          linguistics stood
          "In the newspaper there was an article on linguistics
          yesterday."

     b.   *<u>In de krant</u>   heeft <u>een artikel over taalkunde</u>
          gisteren [<u>t</u> <u>t</u>] gestaan
          in the paper has   an   article on   linguistics
          yesterday stood

Why (25b) is ungrammatical is unclear at the moment (see section 7a for a possible answer). But clearly this is a property of Locative Inversion constructions, witness the grammaticality of (26), with the Small Clause predicate in its basic position.

(26)   Er heeft <u>een artikel over taalkunde</u> gisteren [<u>t</u> in
         de krant] gestaan
         there has an article on linguistics yesterday   in
         the paper stood
         "There was an article on linguistics in the paper
         yesterday."

Now, if the hypothesis that er 'there' is a raised predicate is correct, we expect the Small Clause subject (i.e. the associate NP) not to be able to move out of the Small Clause as

---

[16] It is important to note that scrambling of an indefinite NP is not ungrammatical, even though it may change the interpretation of the NP. (25b) however is completely ungrammatical.

an instance of scrambling. In other words (27) should show the same pattern as (25) (recall that the relevant test sentence must have the PP to the right of the verb, because in that case the expletive must be the predicate of the Small Clause). As will be clear, (27) patterns exactly like (25).

(27) a.   *Er* *heeft* *gisteren* [*een artikel over taalkunde* *t*]
          gestaan in de krant
          there has   yesterday   an   article on   linguistics
          stood   in the paper
          "There was an article on linguistics in the paper
          yesterday."
     b.   *Er heeft* <u>*een artikel over taalkunde*</u> *gisteren* [<u>*t*</u> <u>*t*</u>]
          gestaan in de krant
          there has an   article on   linguistics yesterday
          stood in the paper

In (27b), as in (25b), the subject has moved out of its Small Clause, and the sentence is ungrammatical. Both facts are instances of the same phenomenon if both Locative Inversion in (25) and the expletive placement in (27) are analyzed as raising of a Small Clause predicate. A comparable generalization does not appear to be readily available if all expletives are considered to be 'true' expletives, as in Chomsky (1986a, 1989).

   The facts in sections 5 and 6 clearly support the analysis of *er* 'there' as a raised predicate in certain constructions of Dutch. Like English expletive constructions, these constructions necessarily have an existential interpretation. Indirectly, then, these facts from Dutch support Moro's (1990) hypothesis of *there* as a raised predicate.
   However, not all expletives in Dutch can be analyzed as raised predicates. Especially, transitive expletive constructions (such as (11)) and expletive constructions with a Small Clause predicate in its basic position (such as (17b)) can receive both an existential and a non-existential (proportional or presuppositional) interpretation. I suggest that in these cases

the expletive is analyzed as a 'meaningless' element in the sense of Chomsky (1986a, 1989), to be replaced at LF by its associate.

In the remainder of this paper I will address the question why the latter type of expletive construction (henceforward 'expletive replacement') is possible in Dutch but not in English.

7. Case in Expletive Constructions

In order to answer the question why expletive replacement (as defined in section 6) is not available in English, I suggest we turn to the issue of how Case is assigned to the associate NP in expletive constructions. I will focus on expletive raising constructions first.

a. Expletive Raising
In a restrictive syntactic theory, arbitrary movements are not allowed. Chomsky (1991) proposes that *all* movements take place in order to check abstract morphological features (such as Case, tense, etc.). By principles of economy, no further movement is allowed once elements are licensed in this way. Features are checked in heads and specifier-head configurations of functional projections (as in Chomsky 1989), and checking can take place both in overt syntax and at LF.[17]

Locative Inversion constructions are problematic in this approach. Movement to the structural subject position is ordinarily triggered by a licensing requirement on subjects (Case or agreement).[18] Locational PPs, even if fronted, do not show agreement with the verb, and PPs are most likely not endowed with Case features. So the fronting of the locative PP in Locative Inversion seems anomalous in the restrictive theory of movement mentioned above.

---

[17] In this approach, it is assumed that elements are inserted in fully inflected form.
[18] Ignoring for the moment the role played by as suspect a principle as the Extended Projection Principle.

   Similarly, the position of the subject in Locative Inversion
constructions is exceptional. Although Case checking at LF is
allowed and, in fact, preferred in Chomsky (1991), subjects in
English always seem to have to move to the structural subject
position in overt syntax. So Locative Inversion constructions
present at least two problems for the 'minimalist approach': Why
does the PP move?, and: Why doesn't the subject move in overt
syntax?.

   In Hoekstra & Mulder (1990:33) the second of these questions
is answered in the following way. Nominative Case is assigned to
the locative PP in the structural subject position, and through
its trace (the Small Clause predicate) shared with the Small
Clause subject.[19]

   In a checking approach, this proposal would have to be
reformulated. We would have to assume that the NP's Case features
can be checked indirectly, through the locative PP and its trace.
This assumption doesn't seem to be justified independently.

   Nevertheless, the paradigm (25)-(26) from the last section
seems to provide some circumstantial evidence for indirect Case
checking. (25) and (26) are repeated here for convenience.

(25) a.   <u>In de krant</u>   heeft gisteren [een artikel over
          taalkunde <u>t</u>] gestaan
          in the paper has   yesterday   an   article on
          linguistics stood
          "In the newspaper there was an article on linguistics
          yesterday."
     b.   *<u>In de   krant</u>   heeft <u>een artikel over taalkunde</u>
          gisteren [<u>t</u> <u>t</u>] gestaan
          in the paper   has   an   article on   linguistics
          yesterday stood

(26)   Er heeft <u>een artikel over taalkunde</u>   gisteren [<u>t</u> in

---

[19] The exact mechanism which allows the Small Clause predicate to share its
Case with the Small Clause subject is unclear. Mulder (p.c.) suggests that
this is an instance of Spec-Head agreement, which requires viewing the
predicate, an XP, as the head of the Small Clause.

> *de krant] gestaan*
> *there has an article on linguistics yesterday   in*
> *the paper stood*
> *"There was an article on linguistics in the paper*
> *yesterday."*

(25) shows that if the Small Clause predicate is raised (for whatever reason), the Small Clause subject is not allowed to leave the Small Clause as an instance of scrambling. In the framework we are considering here (Chomsky 1989, 1991), scrambling must also be regarded as movement for reasons of feature checking (see also Vanden Wyngaerd 1989, Mahajan 1990).

The fact that scrambling, which is possible in (26), is disallowed in (25b) might indicate that the Small Clause subject is licensed in its basic position. This would follow from a Hoekstra & Mulder type analysis, in which the subject is licensed through the trace of the raised Small Clause predicate.[20]

Let us therefore assume that Hoekstra & Mulder (1990) are on the right track, although many parts of the analysis, most prominently the trigger for the PP fronting, remain unclear.

This analysis would carry over, then, to expletive raising constructions. Since we are generalizing over Locative Inversion constructions and expletive constructions in English, it would be unattractive to propose different Case licensing mechanisms for the two types of construction. This disqualifies proposals by Belletti (1988) and Lasnik (1991), who make no such generalization.

b. Expletive Replacement

If we are correct in this paper, expletive replacement does not occur in English. Expletive replacement constructions have the

---

[20] Licensing of a scrambled Small Clause subject through its trace wouldn't make sense. First, the scrambling wouldn't have a trigger anymore, and second, Case licensing through a trace is only possible in operator-variable constructions. Wh-movement of the Small Clause subject is OK, even if the PP is extraposed:

(i) <u>Wat voor artikel</u> heeft <u>er</u>   gisteren [<u>t</u> t] gestaan in de krant ?
       what for article has there yesterday   stood in the paper
        "What kind of article was in the paper yesterday?"

following characteristics: the verb is not necessarily unaccusative, and the expletive does not force an existential interpretation (see section 5 and De Hoop (1990), Zwart (to appear)). To explain the latter characteristic of these constructions, I assumed that the associate raises to the expletive at LF, as proposed for English expletive constructions in Chomsky (1986a, 1989).

    An example is given in (28) (=17b).

(28)   *dat er   veel mensen in de tuin   zijn*
           that there many people in the garden are
           "that there are many people in the garden"
           "that many people are in the garden"

Now the question is, how the associate NP *veel mensen* 'many people' is assigned Case.

    As we have seen in section 7a (sentence (26)), the associate NP in expletive replacement constructions can undergo scrambling:

(29) a.   *dat er   gisteren veel mensen in de tuin   waren*
           that there yesterday many people in the garden were
    b.   *dat er   veel mensen gisteren in de tuin   waren*
           that there many people yesterday in the garden were

Patterns like the one in (29) often lead to the conclusion that scrambling is optional, on the assumption that the position of the adverb is fixed.

    However, in the restrictive theory of movement referred to above, there can be no such thing as optional movement. Thus, if an NP shows up to the left of a sentence adverbial like *gisteren* 'yesterday' we must conclude that it was forced to move there by a morphological licensing requirement. If so, the same requirement would force this NP to move to that particular position, even if the NP shows up to the right of a sentence adverbial, as in (29b). Therefore, we would have to drop the assumption that the position of the adverb is fixed. This is a welcome conclusion for two reasons. First, adverbs are

adjuncts, and there is no reason why adjuncts should have a fixed basic position like arguments. Second, sentence adverbs like *gisteren* 'yesterday' in Dutch also show up to the left of the structural subject position, as in (30).

(30)   dat gisteren Piet een huis gekocht heeft
         that yesterday Pete a   house bought has
         "that Pete bought a house yesterday"

As pointed out in Chomsky (1991), adverbs probably lack the morphological features that provide the trigger for movement of NPs and verbs. So, in the restrictive theory of movement there is no room for adverb movement. If so, adverbs should be allowed to be adjoined in various positions, in order to account for facts like (30).

   The minimalist approach to movement therefore forces us to analyze the sentences in (29) in such a way that the position of the NP is fixed and the position of the adverb varies. Maintaining the assumption that sentence adverbs mark the VP-boundary, in the sense that they can never appear *inside* VP, (29a) tells us that the NP must be outside VP in both sentences of (29).[21]

   Thus we are left with the question where the NPs in (29) go, and why. We can tell from transitive expletive constructions like (31) that the NPs in (29) cannot go to Spec,AgrO.[22]

(31)   ? dat er   veel mensen dat boek gisteren   gekocht

---

[21] It has been argued (by Den Besten 1985, 1990) that the subject in expletive passive constructions like (i) is in the (D-structure) direct object position in VP.
(i)   dat er   mensen gearresteerd werden
      that there people arrested   were
      "that people were arrested"
The empirical arguments advanced to support this rest on the assumption that so-called <u>wat voor</u>-split is only possible from the D-structure object position. But this is not correct, as (ii) shows (see also De Hoop 1989).
(ii) <u>wat</u> denk   je dat er <u>t</u> voor mensen gisteren gearresteerd werden?
      what believe you that there for people yesterday arrested   were
      "what kind of people do you think were arrested yesterday?"
[22] Assume a sentence structure as in Chomsky (1989), with, in descending order, C - AgrS - T - AgrO - V.

hebben
that there many people that book yesterday bought
have
"that many people bought that book yesterday"

In (31), the direct object has moved to a position to the left of the sentence adverb, i.e. out of the VP. Again, this movement must be triggered by a licensing requirement on the direct object, most likely, in this framework, Objective Case checking in Spec,AgrO.[23]   Therefore the Spec,AgrO position is not available for the movement of the subject in (29) or (31). On the assumption that the expletive occupies the Spec,AgrS position, the only position available for the subject in (29) and (31) is Spec,T.[24]

   Why would the subject in (29) and (31) move to Spec,T? The only acceptable answer within this framework would be that the movement to Spec,T makes it possible to check a feature that must be checked in overt syntax.

   Rather than making up a new feature, let us assume that the feature triggering movement to Spec,T is Nominative Case. This is at odds with the basic assumption made in this paper that Nominative Case is checked in a Spec-Head configuration in AgrSP. However, we could hypothesize that movement to Spec,T gets the NP 'close enough' for Nominative Case checking. This could be done by assuming that in Dutch, T moves to AgrS, and that as a result of this movement, Nominative Case can be checked in a Spec-Head configuration in TP as well. The fact that the associate NP in (29) and (31) agrees with the verb shows that it must have Nominative Case (equating subject-verb agreement and Nominative Case, as in Chomsky 1991).

   Obviously, the T-to-AgrS hypothesis would need independent justification. Also, we should wonder whether in Dutch the subject can be checked in Spec,T in expletive constructions only,

---

[23] The question mark in (31) is caused by a weak indefiniteness requirement on the object of transitive expletive constructions (cf. Bennis 1986:224).
[24] A similar proposal has been made for transitive expletive constructions in Icelandic by Jonas (1992).

or always.[25] But I will postpone discussion of these issues to a later occasion.

   If these, admittedly tentative, remarks are in the right direction, it may be possible to explain the absence of transitive expletive constructions in English and e.g. the Mainland Scandinavian languages (as opposed to Dutch and Icelandic) through the absence of T-to-AgrS movement in overt syntax in these languages. T-to-AgrS movement being absent, Case checking in the Spec,T position could never take place. Therefore, movement of the associate to Spec,T would not serve any goal and hence be ruled out on general grounds of economy.[26]

   If substantiated by further research, this could explain why expletive replacement constructions (as defined here) are present in Dutch but completely absent in English. This difference should receive a principled explanation, because apparently both types of expletive construction identified in this paper are part of UG.[27]

---

[25] Possibly the full pronouns in clitic doubling constructions in West Flemish (a dialect of Dutch) are also in Spec,T (cf. Haegeman 1990). In (ia), the verb is in COMP, but in (ib), the clitic-verb inversion shows that the verb must be further down, in AgrS (as also argued in Zwart 1992). If so, the doubling pronoun zie must be in Spec,T.
   (i)   a. Kom-t-ze   zie?
            come-3SG-SCL she
            "Is she coming?"
         b. Ze (*zie) kom-t   zie
            SCL she come-3SG she
            "She's coming"
[26] Notice that this doesn't exclude movement of a subject to the Spec,AgrS position to check Case, which must be allowed, of course. The point made here is that the NP-movement to Spec,T is allowed in English as well as in Dutch, but that only in Dutch this contributes to well-formedness, due to the possibility of Case checking in Spec,T.
[27] In the text, it is assumed that Nominative Case in Dutch and English must be checked in overt syntax. The obvious alternative, as pointed out in Chomsky (1991), is that Nominative Case in expletive constructions is checked at LF, after expletive replacement has taken place (possibly also, that Nominative Case checking is the trigger for the expletive replacement). A problem with this approach is that it doesn't offer an explanation for the scrambling-like movement of the subject of a transitive expletive construction. If Nominative Case checking could be postponed until LF, this movement would be unnecessary and therefore impossible, under the present assumptions.

8. Conclusion

In this paper I presented evidence from Dutch in support of the analysis of *there* as a raised predicate (Moro 1990, 1991). Given standard assumptions on Small Clauses, in certain expletive constructions in Dutch the expletive *er* must be regarded as a Small Clause predicate. These constructions have exactly the properties of English expletive constructions: an existential interpretation is forced, and the verb has to be unaccusative. I suggested that to the other type of expletive construction in Dutch, absent in English, Chomsky's (1986a, 1989) expletive replacement analysis is applicable.

Scrambling phenomena in Dutch expletive constructions suggest that the associate NP is licensed in the position of the Small Clause subject in expletive raising constructions, and in Spec,T in expletive replacement constructions. It follows from a restrictive theory of movement that in either case the NP must be able to check its Case features in an indirect way: through the trace of a raised predicate in expletive raising constructions, and in a Spec-Head configuration in TP in expletive replacement constructions.
The analysis leads to the hypothesis that in Dutch, but not in English, T-to-AgrS movement takes place, making the latter kind of Case checking possible in Dutch, but not in English.

References
ANS (1984) *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Groningen/Leuven: Wolters.
Belletti, A. (1988) 'The Case of Unaccusatives'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 1-34.
Bennis, H. (1986) *Gaps and Dummies*. Dordrecht: Foris.
den Besten, H. (1976) 'On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules'. In H. den Besten, *Studies in Westgermanic Syntax*, University of Tilburg dissertation, 1990.

den Besten, H. (1985) 'The Ergative Hypothesis and Free Word Order in Dutch and German'. In J. Toman (ed.), *Studies in German Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.

den Besten, H. (1990) 'The Syntax of Nominatives in SOV Germanic'. In J. Mascaró & M. Nespor (eds.), *Grammar in Progress*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N. (1986a) *Knowledge of Language*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, N. (1986b) *Barriers*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1989) 'Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation'. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 10, 43-74.

Chomsky, N. (1991) MIT Fall term class lectures.

den Dikken, M. (1991) 'Particles and the Dative Alternation'. *Proceedings of LCJL* 2, 71-86.

Haegeman, L. (1990) 'Subject Pronouns and Subject Clitics in West-Flemish'. *The Linguistic Review* 7, 333-364.

Hoekstra, T. (1984) *Transitivity*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Hoekstra, T. (1991) 'Small Clause Theory'. Ms., University of Leiden.

Hoekstra, T. & R. Mulder (1990) 'Unergatives as Copular Verbs: Locational and Existential Predication'. *The Lingistic Review* 7, 1-79.

de Hoop, H. (1989) 'Extraction of *wat* from *wat voor*-Sentences'. Ms., University of Groningen.

de Hoop, H. (1990) 'Restrictions on Existential Sentences and Object Scrambling: Some Facts from Dutch'. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 9, 277-288.

Jonas, D. (1992) 'Nominative Case in Icelandic'. Ms., Harvard University, Cambridge.

Koster, J. (1975) 'Dutch as an SOV Language'. *Linguistic Analysis* 1, 111-136.

Koster, J. (1987) *Domains and Dynasties*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Larson, R. (1988) 'On the Double Object Construction'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335-391.

Lasnik, H. (1991) 'Case and Expletives: Notes Towards a Parametric Account'. Ms., MIT, Cambridge.

Mahajan, A. (1990) *The A/A'-Distinction and Movement Theory*. MIT dissertation, Cambridge.

Moro, A. (1990) '*There* as a Raised Predicate'. Paper presented at GLOW, Cambridge.

Moro, A. (1991) 'The Raising of Predicates: Copula, Expletives and Existence'. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 15, 119-181.

Nakajima, H. & S. Tonoike, eds. (1991) *Topics in Small Clauses*. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Partee, B. (1988) 'Many Quantifiers'. *Proceedings of ESCOL* 5, 383-402.

Reuland, E.J. (1985) 'Identifying Null Subjects: The Case of Dutch'. Ms., University of Groningen.

de Rooij, J. (1991) 'Regionale variatie in het gebruik van *er III*'. *Taal en Tongval* 43, 113-136.

Safir, K. (1982) *Syntactic Chains and the Definiteness Effect*. MIT dissertation, Cambridge.

Travis, L. (1984) *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*. MIT dissertation, Cambridge.

Vanden Wyngaerd, G. (1989) 'Object Shift as an A-Movement Rule'. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 11, 256-271.

Zwart, C.J.W. (1991a) 'Clitics in Dutch: Evidence for the Position of INFL'. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 33, 71-92.

Zwart, C.J.W. (1991b) 'Subject Deletion in Dutch: A Difference Between Subjects and Topics'. In M. Kas, E. Reuland, & C. Vet (eds.), *Language and Cognition 1*, University of Groningen.

Zwart, C.J.W. (1992) 'Verb Movement and Complementizer Agreement'. Paper to be presented at GLOW, Lisbon.

Zwart, C.J.W. (to appear) 'Expletive Raising and Expletive Replacement in Dutch'. *Proceedings of ESCOL* 8.