

A Study on the Associate NP of *There* Constructions*

Sun-Woong Kim

(Kwangwoon University/UCONN)

Kim, Sun-Woong. 2002. **A Study on the Associate NP of *There* Constructions.** *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 2-1, 31-52. This paper discusses the nature of the associate NP of English *there* constructions and attempts to capture the underlying similarity between the associate NP in English and the nominative object in Korean. Specifically, this paper is centered on the Case property of the associate NP. As the first step, previous proposals on the case of the associate NP are critically reviewed. Through the criticism, this paper opposes to Chomsky's (1995, 2000, 2001) analysis and to Lasnik's (1999) partitive Case analysis. In particular, convincing reason for the partitive Case assignment to the associate NP, other than other cases, cannot be found. This paper, therefore, adopts a recent claim of Boeckx (2000) that the Case under consideration is nominative by Agree. His idea is extended to the analysis of the presentational expletive construction. This paper draws a conclusion that the associate NP of the presentational expletive construction has accusative by Agree. This dichotomy (or split) is also observed in the nominative object construction in Korean. In the nominative object construction, the nominative object has nominative Case by Agree, whereas the regular object has accusative by Agree.

1. Introduction

The expletive *there* construction in English has been one of the most frequented topics of research in the Generative Grammar

*I am greatly indebted to Myung-Kwan Park and Yoshihisa Goto for their interest in this paper. I also thank two *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* reviewers for their comments and criticism. The present research has been conducted by the Research Grant of Kwangwoon University in 2001.

tradition. As McClosky (2002) remarks, there are as many theories about expletives as the number of linguists. In particular, the exact nature of the associate NP in English *there* construction has been a “pervasive mystery” (Lasnik 2001) in the minimalist syntax.

This paper is focused on what Case properties the associate NP has in English *there* construction. It will be claimed in this paper that the associate NP is the object but carries nominative Case rather than accusative Case. This Case is not a regular nominative but what Boeckx (2000) calls nominative by Agree. Based on such a proposal, it will also be claimed that the nominative object in Korean carries the same nominative by Agree and that they share similar syntactic properties with each other. In addition, an attempt will also be made to extend the proposal to cover the Case of the associate NP in English presentational *there* construction. The accusative counterpart of the nominative object in Korean will be shown to carry accusative Case by Agree.

Section 2 critically discusses the Case properties of the associate NP, focused on recent proposals under the Minimalist Program. The conclusion will be drawn in this section that the analysis in terms of “Case by Agree” in the sense of Boeckx (2000) is plausible in explaining the syntactic behavior of the associate NP. In section 3 this will be further extended to explain the nominative object in Korean. Section 4 draws the conclusion of the paper.

2. The Case of the Associate NP

To the best of my knowledge, there are at least three different views to the Case that the associate NP carries. This is summarized below in the table in (1):

(1) The Case of the Associate NP

Case of <i>there</i>	Chomsky 1995, 2000, 2001
Partitive Case	Lasnik 1999
Nominative Case	Boeckx 2000

Chomsky (1995, 2000, 2001) claims that it is the Case of *there*. To Lasnik (1999), it is partitive Case, and it is nominative Case by Agree to Boeckx (2000). Let us discuss their claims in turn.

2.1. Chomsky (1995)/Lasnik (1999)

Chomsky (1995:288) claims that since the expletive necessarily lacks Case, the associate provides it with one. Look at the following sentences:

- (2) a. There is a book on the shelf.
 b. I expected [there to be a book on the shelf].

The associate has the Case that would be borne by *there* in (2): nominative Case in (2a) and accusative Case in (2b). He explicitly rejects the partitive Case analysis of Belletti (1988).¹ Lasnik (1999), however, argues that Chomsky's (1995) analysis is faced with a few technical problems. In (2a), at the point of Case checking, the relevant feature of Tense is no longer available to check the Case feature of the associate NP, since Tense already checked the Case of *there* in overt syntax. Therefore, since the associate NP has no way for its (structural) Case to get checked, on Chomsky's (1995) assumptions, it will bring about a PF crash. This is an incorrect consequence.

Following sentences also demonstrate the inadequacy of Chomsky's (1995) analysis:

¹This is generally called Case transmission analysis, Lasnik (class lecture, Fall 2001), however, is very much doubtful about the notion of transmission of the case. He strongly rejects it.

- (3) a. *We consider [there a man in the room].
 b. We consider [there to be a man in the room].

If *there* has accusative Case given by the matrix verb *consider*, (3a) has no reason to be ungrammatical. Furthermore, Chomsky (1995) has no way to explain the contrast between (3a) and (3b), the only difference of which lies on the presence/absence of the verb *be* between *there* and *a man*.

The same problem can be found in the following pair (Lasnik 1999:82):

- (4) a. *I want there someone here at 6:00.
 b. I want there to be someone here at 6:00.

Here also, the crucial point is that *be* matters in the grammaticality of (4b).

The following different set of sentences also provides an argument against Chomsky's (1995) Case transmission analysis.

- (5) a. ??There usually arrives a bus (at this time).
 b. *There arrives usually a bus (at this time).

If the associate NP shares a Case with *there*, the sentences in (5) will have no way for their grammaticality difference to be explained since the Adjacency Condition for Case-marking does not matter in the Case transmission analysis.

Case transmission would have difficulty in explaining (6), too:

- (6) There is a man/some man/*every man/*the man in the garden.

The analysis does not explain why a definite expression is not compatible with existential *there*.

As a solution to overcome such problems, Lasnik (1999) suggests that the associate NP has partitive Case.²⁾ According to him, the associate NP is given a partitive Case from *be* (or an unaccusative verb). If this is true, the associate NP has no reason to move for Case reasons. Sentences like (3b) and (4b) are salvaged by the presence of *be*, since *be* assigns partitive Case to the following NP. The contrast in (6) can be explained by the fact that partitive Case is conceptually compatible with indefinite NPs and existential NPs but not with definite NPs and universal NPs.

2.2. Partitive Case?

Lasnik's (1999) partitive Case analysis, however, has both conceptual and empirical problems, as is discussed in Law (1996, 1999). Most of all, it is not at all clear what partitive Case means in English, which has no partitive Case morphology. Besides this naive criticism, partitive Case analysis faces a couple of syntactic problems.

First, the partitive interpretation has totally nothing to do with the indefiniteness of the associate NP even though Lasnik claims that the indefiniteness of the associate NP is guaranteed by partitive Case. Law (1996) reports that some English expletive sentences are not possible even with an NP with partitive interpretation:

- (7) a. *There are some of the students in the garden.
b. *There are several of the congressmen in the room.

On the other hand, some expletives are still allowed even without partitive interpretation.

- (8) There are many unicorns.

²See Belletti (1988) for the nature of partitive Case in Italian.

According to Law (1996), (8) is an assertion about the existence of many unicorns in the universe. However, *many unicorns* here carries no partitive meaning.

Second, in some languages other than English, there is no consistent relation between the existential expletive and partitive Case (Law 1996). In Finnish, for example, partitive NP is not allowed in existential sentences.

(9) Finnish (Law 1996)

- a. Jukka kokeili kaikia respetej_a.
 tried all-par recipes-par
 ‘Jukka tried all the recipes.’
- b. *P_oyadlla on kaikia resptej.
 on the table is all-par recipes-par
 ‘There are all the recipes on the table.’

In German, the associate NP carries accusative Case.

(10) German (Law 1996)

- Es gibt einen/*ein Mann im Garten. (Law 1996)
 it give a-acc/a-nom man in-the-dat garden
 ‘There is a man in the garden.’

To sum up so far, contrary to Lasnik’s (1999) claim, *be* in expletive construction is not a Case-assigner of partitive or whatever, and partitive interpretation has nothing to do with expletive *there*.³) And cross-linguistically we find some languages

³*Be* does not seem to be a Case assigner, let alone a partitive Case assigner. Lasnik’s (1999) conclusion that *be* is a partitive Case assigner heavily depends on the following contrast, repeated from (3) and (4).

- (i) a. *We consider there a man in the room.
 b. We consider there to be a man in the room.
 c. *I want there someone here at 6:00.
 d. I want there to be someone here at 6:00.

in which NPs with other than partitive Case are still allowed in expletive constructions.

2.3. Case by Agree

Recently, Boeckx (2000) makes an interesting suggestion that the associate of the expletive is an object rather than a subject. His argument begins with the observation the experience blocks the agreement relation between the matrix verb and the embedded associate NP.

- (11) a. There seems to Mary to be men in the room.
 b. *?There seem to Mary to be men in the room.

Contrary to expectation, the matrix verb shows the (3rd person) singular agreement, as shown in (11a). According to Boeckx (2000:39), this is due to the blocking effect of the

(ib) and (id) are good with *to be* but not without it, as shown in (ia) and (ic). This sheer contrast can be explained if *be* is obligatory as a Case assigner, partitive in particular (Lasnik 1999). Law (1996), however, argues that the post-copular NP in (i) does not have to be Case-marked since they are predicates. He reports the following pair of sentences in which *be* is optional.

- (ii) a. We considered [these proposals (to be) good solutions to the problem].
 b. I believed [the students (to be) suitable candidates for the job].

He takes these to demonstrate that the post-copular NPs are predicates rather than arguments. The present study, however, does not follow Law's (1996) claim that the post-copular NPs are predicates.

Law (1996) attributes the ungrammaticality of (ia) to the ban on double small clause structures, which in turn is attributable to violation of Full Interpretation.

- (iii) *We consider [_{sc} there [_{sc} a man in the room]].

The ungrammaticality of (ia) then is due to the non-thematic nature of the position where *there* is located.

experiencer as evidenced by (11b). The agreement anomaly in (11a) can be explained if the matrix verb must have the 3rd person singular agreement in the presence of a (dative) experiencer. Boeckx (2000) attributes the blocking effect of the experience in (11) to the Person-Case Constraint of Bonet (1994):

(12) Person-Case Constraint (PCC)⁴

If a verb agrees with a dative element and an accusative element, the morphology of the agreement relation with the accusative element is necessarily 3rd person.

This is illustrated in (13):

(13) Catalan (Boeckx 2000)

*Me li ha recomanat la seyora Boffil
 Me-acc-1-sg him-dat-3-sg has recommended the Mrs. Boffil
 'Mrs. Boffil has recommended me to him.'

(13) is bad since the accusative clitic has 1st person agreement in the presence of a dative clitic.

According to Boeckx (2000), the syntactic behavior of the quirky subject in Icelandic is also explained under the PCC. In Icelandic, the verb agrees in full with the regular nominative subject with respect to person and number.

⁴Boeckx (2002) revises the PCC into (i) below:

(i) Person-Case Constraint (revised)

In the presence of dative agreement on a verb, the direct object can only agree with that verb in number, not person.

This revision incorporates his later findings about Case and agreement that person agreement is not relevant in the PCC. This does not matter much to the present paper, though, since what is relevant to us is the fact that the presence of dative agreement imposes some restriction on the object, whatever it may be.

(14) Icelandic (Boeckx 2000)

Við kusum stelpuna.
 we-nom-1-pl elected-1-pl the-girl-acc-3-sg
 'We elected the girl.'

If a quirky element occupies the subject position, the verb agrees with the nominative element, but only in number (not in person).

(15) Icelandic (Boeckx 2000)

- a. Henni leiddust við.
 her-dat-3-sg bored-3-pl we-nom-1-pl
 'She was bored with us.'
- b. ?*Henni leiddist við.
 her-dat-s-sg bored-s-sg we-nom-1-pl
 'She was bored with us.'

Boeckx (2000) argues that this contrast is explained under the PCC if it is assumed that the quirky subject covertly agrees with the verb. That is, in the presence of a quirky (dative) element, the morphology of the agreement relation with the nominative object (accusative element) is necessarily 3rd person.

In a similar vein, the same PCC effect can be said to hold for English existentials: some agreement relation with a nominative element is blocked by the presence of a dative element as shown in (11). This leads Boeckx (2000) to propose that agreement between the matrix verb and the nominative element is an instance of object agreement in the case where the nominative element is an associate NP. This can be disrupted by dative (experiencer) agreement. This is exactly what the PCC captures. Based on this similarity, he carefully concludes that the associate is not so much a subject than an object. The phenomena that can be explained under the PCC are summarized below:

(16)

Language	Construction/ Phenomenon	Dative element	Accusative element
Catalan	Clitic agreement	<i>lui</i>	<i>me</i>
Icelandic	Quirky subject	quirky subject	nominative object
English	<i>There</i> -construction	experiencer PP	associate NP

Boeckx (2000) proposes that the Case which the associate NP of the expletive construction in English does not carry a standard nominative Case but nominative Case by Agree.⁵⁾ According to him, differently from regular structural Case, the Case is checked and erased via Agree. Since nominative by Agree has no EPP effect, the merger of a Generic Case bearing element (=there) is the only way for English to erase the nominative Case of T without moving the nominative element.

In this regard, I propose that the associate does not undergo movement to Agro for Case-checking, even though it functions like an object. Instead, it gets its Case checked and erased by Agree in the sense of Chomsky (2000, 2001).⁶⁾

⁵⁾It is noteworthy that the Case by Agree analysis is further supported if the assumption that the verb *be* is not a Case assigner is right.

⁶⁾Boeckx (2000) is silent about the exact mechanism of Case by Agree. According to Chomsky (2000), Agree takes place between Probe and Goal. For Agree to hold, both Probe and Goal must be activated first, if they have uninterpretable features. So, it can be conjectured that an uninterpretable φ -feature of T (Probe) and an uninterpretable (nominative) Case feature of the nominal element (Goal) make T and the nominal activated, respectively. Once activated, they agree with each other, and the matching features are valued and deleted. In the same vein, an interpretable φ -feature of V (Probe) and an uninterpretable (accusative) Case feature of the nominal element make V and the nominal activated, respectively. Once activated, they agree with each other, and the matching features are valued and deleted. However, through exactly what operations Case by Agree is assigned/checked is not the primary concern of this paper. I leave this open for further research.

Although, I propose, the associate functions like an object, its Case can be manifested either as nominative in the existential *there* construction or as accusative in the presentational *there* construction. To be concrete, look at the following simple examples:

- (17) a. There is a man in the garden.
 b. There entered the room the man from India.

I propose that in (17a), an existential *there* sentence, *a man* has nominative by Agree and in (17b), a presentational *there* sentence, *the man from India* has accusative by Agree. The idea that the associate NP in the presentational is accusative is empirically motivated by the examples of the following (Abbot 1992):

- (18) a. There are only thee and me.
 b. There are only me and thee.

If we assume that the definite expressions are not allowed in existential *there* sentences, then the examples in (18) can belong to presentationals. Notice in (18) that the associate NPs have accusative Case.⁷⁸ This is in fact an extension of Boeckx's (2000)

⁷Some speakers judge (18b) is a little better than (18a). For (18a), they suggested to me (i) instead:

- (i) There are only thee and I.

I have no explanation for their preference of (i) to (18a). It may be related to the distance of agreement that also provides the contrast in (ii):

- (ii) a. between you and I/?me
 b. between me and you

⁸It is noteworthy that Schütze (2001) reports a number of examples in which accusative Case shows up unexpectedly.

nominative by Agree analysis to the presentational *there* construction. Before going to section 3, let us digress a little to clarify the distinction of two expletive constructions in English.

2.4. Types of the *There* Construction in English

It has been widely agreed that it is necessary to divide the *there* construction in English at least two sub-types: one is existential (henceforth, ET) and the other presentational (henceforth, PT) (Milsark 1974; Safir 1984; Moon 2000; among others).

- (19) a. There is a man in the room.
 b. There walked into the room the man from India who had no secular desire.

(19a) is an ET, whereas (19b) is a PT. As the difference of their outlook alludes, there have been reported many syntactic differences in the literature. Firstly, ET does not have heaviness requirement on the associate NP, while PT does.

- (20) a. There was a man in the room.
 b. *There ran into the room a man.
 b'. There ran into the room a man who studied mechanical engineering at MIT.

(20a), ET, is perfect with light associate NP like *a man*, whereas (20b), PT, is ungrammatical, since the associate NP (*a man*) is not heavy enough. Note that if the associate NP is heavy enough, as shown in (20b'), PT turns out grammatical.

-
- (i) It's me/you/him/her.

The proposal of this paper with regard to accusative Case by Agree can be supported by such examples, though Schütze analyzes them in terms of default Case.

Secondly, ET is compatible with only a limited set of verbs of existence or appearance, whereas PT is possible with a more flexible set of verbs.

- (21) a. *There walked a dog in the street.
b. There walked into the room a fierce-looking dog.

(21b) shows that a verb like *walk* is allowed when it comes with PT. It is not compatible with ET as shown in (21a).

Thirdly, ET shows the Definiteness Effect, whereas PT does not.

- (22) a. *There was the man from Spain in the room.
b. There walked into the room the man from India with curly hair.

A definite NP is not qualified as an associate in ET as in (22a), while it is allowed in PE as in (22b).

Fourth, the associate of ET is not focused, whereas that of PT is.⁹⁾

- (23) a. Q: Where did you hear a lot of noise?
A: There was a lot of noise in the kitchen.
b. Q: Where did his favorite brother stand?
A: #There stood beside him **his favorite brother**.

(23aA) is a perfect answer to a question like (23aQ), since required information is appropriately provided. Note in (23aA) that the associate NP, *a lot of noise*, is not focused. On the other hand, for a question like (23bQ), an answer like (23bA) is

⁹⁾In school grammar, it is agreed that the principle of End-focus requires the associate NP to be at the sentence-final position. End-focus, however, does not have anything to do with focus under discussion.

inappropriate, since rather than the expression denoting location (i.e., *beside him*), the associate NP (*his favorite brother*) is focused.

Lastly, extraction out of IP is allowed in ET, whereas it is prohibited in PT.

- (24) a. What did he say [_{IP} there was on his desk]?
 b. *What did he say [_{IP} there stands on his desk]?

In (24a), the associate can be extracted from the embedded IP. (24b), however, turns out to be ungrammatical.

3. The Associate NP of the Presentational *There* Constuction in English

The proposal of the present study that the associate NP of the presentational expletive construction has accusative Case is supported by Safir's (1985) division of identificational *be* (I-BE) and predicational *be* (P-BE). Consider the following examples:

- (25) a. John is the president.
 b. John is a fool.

(25a) is an example of I-BE, and (25b) is an example of P-BE. As their names imply, I-BE semantically identifies or specifies an NP in terms of the other NP. On the other hand, P-BE functions merely to carry φ -features. This difference is syntactically reflected on its omissibility as shown in (26) below:

- (26) a. I thought John to be the president. (I-BE)
 a'. *I thought John the president.
 b. I thought John to be a fool. (P-BE)
 b'. I thought John a fool.

In the case of I-BE, *be* cannot be omitted as in (26a'), whereas in the case of P-BE, it can (26b'). Based on Safir (1985), Ahn (1991) attributes this difference to the Case assignability of the verb *be*. According to him, I-BE assigns Case, whereas P-BE does not. (26a') is ungrammatical since *the president* has no Case, whereas (26b') is grammatical even without *be* since the predicate nominal *a fool* does not have to be Case-marked. He further argues that *there* construction under the so-called list reading (Milsark 1974) essentially employs an I-BE.

(27) A: Who do we have to play Othello?

B: Well, there's John, his uncle, and the man with a limp.

From the viewpoint of the present study, (27B) can be considered as a typical presentational expletive construction. This can be confirmed by the fact that the presentational also shows no Definiteness Effect in (27B) as was discussed in section 2.4.¹⁰⁾ I assume that Ahn's accusative Case analysis is partly on the right track even though his idea that the verb *be* assigns accusative Case is counter-intuitive.¹¹⁾

On a par with the accusative Case analysis of (29B), I propose that in the presentational expletive construction the associate NP also has a special kind of accusative Case. Boeckx (2000) is right in that the associate NP is an object, whereas Ahn (1991) is right in that the associate NP has accusative Case.¹²⁾ Based on their

¹⁰According to Ahn (1991), in (29B), the verb *is* assigns strong Case to [*John, his uncle, and the man with a limp*].

¹¹Lee (1992) drew a similar conclusion through independent research in terms of "Case Minimality." I thank Myung-Kwan Park for this point.

¹²An anonymous reviewer comments that Ahn's (1991) proposal is not compatible with Boeckx's (2000) in that, according to Boeckx (2000), an associate NP would have nominative Case in the position where it would have (strong) accusative Case under Ahn's theory. The reviewer's view is right if Boeckx (2000) does not distinguish the two types of

proposals, I propose that the associate NP has accusative Case in the presentational expletive construction, whereas it has nominative Case in the existential expletive construction in English. However, to avoid the counter-intuitive idea that the verb *be* assigns accusative Case, I propose that the accusative Case under discussion is a Case by Agree.¹³) This is an extension of Boeckx's (2000) idea that the associate NP of existential expletive construction has nominative by Agree. The idea that a category which functions as an object has nominative Case in one context and accusative in another is not strange in that many languages have the so-called nominative object. Next section will be devoted to a new view to the nominative object construction in Korean from this perspective.

4. The Nominative Object in Korean

The above discussion sheds light on a possible explanation of the nominative object in Korean (and in Japanese as well). The

there construction in English. Boeckx, however, recognized the division in a different paper of his (1998). In Boeckx (2000), at least, he is mute about the Case property of the associate NP in the presentational *there* construction. This means that Boeckx's (2000) proposal of nominative by Agree does not apply directly to the presentational *there* construction.

¹³An anonymous reviewer raises the question about the role of accusative Case by Agree in (i) below:

- (i) a. There entered the room the man from India. (=17b)
 b. There walked into the room the man from India with curly hair.

In (ia), accusative Case is checked by *the room* before it is given to the associate NP, and in (ib), the verb, *walk*, being an intransitive, cannot check accusative Case. A conceivable solution may be to assume that the verbs like *enter* are, in fact, intransitives (Myung-Kwan Park, personal communication). If it is an intransitive, the apparent object *the room* in (ia) is not an object but a locative phrase which has a null preposition: [PP [P φ] [DP the room]].

following psych-construction is generally known to have a nominative object [underlined].

- (28) a. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-ka cohta.
 -nom -nom like-dec
 ‘Chelswu likes Yenghi.’
 b. Chelswu-ka horangi-ka mwusepta.
 tiger-nom be-afraid-dec
 ‘Chelwu is afraid of a tiger.’
 c. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-ka kulipta.
 miss-dec
 ‘Chelswu misses Yenghi.’

The underlined NPs in (27) are all understood as a notional object though they are nominative Case-marked. That is, each of (27) has the same meaning with the following set of transitive sentences.

- (29) a. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul cohahanta.
 -nom -acc like-dec
 ‘Chelswu likes Yenghi.’
 b. Chelswu-ka horangi-lul mwusewehanta.
 tiger-acc be-afraid-dec
 ‘Chelwu is afraid of a tiger.’
 c. Chelswu-ka Yenghi-lul kuliwehanta.
 miss-dec
 ‘Chelswu misses Yenghi.’

It is one of the still unsettled topics of discussion how come two NPs in a sentence are nominative Case-marked at the same time in (28).¹⁴ In accordance with Boeckx (2000), I suggest that

¹⁴Readers are referred to Kim (1990), Kim (1996), and Koizumi (1995).

the nominative object in Korean renders support in favor of the object analysis of the associate in English. According to Boeckx (2000), *there*, as an expletive, carries Generic Case, whereas the associate NP carries nominative by Agree in existential expletive constructions. Furthermore, it is conceivable that the associate NP of the presentational seems to have accusative Case by Agree as is suggested in the previous section.

- (30) a. Chelswu-ka sakwa-ka mekko-sipta.
 -nom apple-nom eat-want-dec
 ‘Chelswu wants to eat an apple.’
 b. Chelswu-ka sakwa-lul mekko-sipta.
 -nom apple-acc eat-want-dec
 ‘Chelswu wants to eat an apple.’

In comparison with psyche verb nominative objects, (30) shows complete free variation between nominative and accusative NPs. I propose that (30a) corresponds to the existential expletive sentence in English and (30b) to the presentational. This juxtaposition is supported by a couple of reasons. One is that whereas the English existential expletive construction has the Definiteness restriction, the Korean nominative object construction has the restriction on the verb types that are compatible with it. The types of verbs that allow nominative object in Korean are restricted. They include psyche verbs and a few compound verbs of the form *V+ko-sipta*.¹⁵ According to Boeckx (2000) they are different manifestations of a deeper principle that underlie beneath the Definiteness Effect and the restriction of verb types.

The second piece of evidence in favor of the view that the accusative NP is syntactically equivalent to the nominative object comes from the following contrast (Lee 1991 for Korean; Ura 1996 and Hiraiwa 2002 for Japanese):

¹⁵See Koizumi (1995) for similar restrictions in Japanese.

- (31) a. Chelswu-ekey sakwa-ga mekko-sipta.
 -dat apple-nom eat-want-dec
 ‘Chelswu wants to eat an apple.’
- b. *Chelswu-ekey sakwa-lul mekko-sipta.
 -dat apple-acc eat-want-dec
 Lit: ‘Chelswu wants to eat an apple.’

In contrast to (30), if the subject is dative, only the nominative object is allowed, as shown in (31a). If the accusative object cooccurs with a dative subject, the sentence is ruled out, as shown in (31b). This contrast readily conforms to the PCC. That is, with the presence of a dative subject, the object is restricted to the nominative form. Since Korean does not have morphological distinction of person agreement, it is conceivable that the restriction is manifested in the form of Case realization. The discussion so far extends the table in (16) to (32) below:

(32)

Language	Construction/ Phenomenon	Dative element	Accusative element
Catalan	Clitic agreement	<i>lui</i>	<i>me</i>
Icelandic	Quirky subject	quirky subject	nominative object
English	<i>There-</i> construction	experiencer PP	associate NP
Korean	Dative subject	dative subject	nominative object

In conclusion, the juxtaposition of Korean nominative object construction with English expletive construction is supported by the fact that they conform to the same syntactic restrictions: one is a deeper principle that underlies the restriction of the verb types and the Definiteness restriction, respectively, and the other is the PCC.¹⁶⁾

¹⁶As a final point, it is noteworthy that the nominative object in Korean behaves in a very similar way with regular object in agreement

5. Summary and Conclusion

In this paper, the similarity between the associate NP English construction and the nominative object in Korean was explored. This paper opposes to the proposal of Chomsky's (1995, 2000, 2001) analysis and, in particular, to Lasnik's (1999) partitive Case analysis. This paper adopts a recent view of Boeckx (2000) that the associate NP of *there* constructions in English is the object and that the Case of the associate NP is nominative by Agree. This paper extends his idea to the claim that the Case of the associate NP is nominative by Agree. This paper also draws a conclusion that the associate NP of the presentational construction has accusative by Agree. This dichotomy (or split) is also observed in the nominative object construction in Korean as well. In the nominative object construction, the nominative object has nominative Case by Agree, whereas the regular object has accusative by Agree. The Definiteness Effect found in English is a reflex of a deeper principle that is also responsible for what lies behind the limitedness of predicates that allow nominative objects. The accusative object of the nominative object construction conforms to the PCC in the presence of a dative subject. Through the discussion of the paper, it is confirmed that among the differences between the existential *there* construction and the presentational *there* construction described in section 2.4, the

morphology. In middle Korean, as was noted by Yoo (1993), the object had overt agreement morphology *zap* as shown in (i):

- (i) Mayapwuin-i yelay-lul na-zap-asi-ess-ta.
 queen-nom Buddha-acc give birth-objhon-past-dec
 [objhon=object honorific agreement]
 'The Queen gave birth to Buddha.'

This object agreement morphology shows that the nominative object in Korean has something crucial to do with accusative Case by Agree if *zap* is an agreement morpheme.

limitedness of verb types and the Definiteness Effect are clearly related to the division of Cases by Agree. This paper, however, leaves open how the entire syntactic differences between the two types of *there* construction can be explained under the division in terms of nominative/accusative Case by Agree.

References

- Abbot, B. 1992. Definiteness, existentials, and 'List' interpretation. *SALT* II, 1-15.
- Ahn, H.-D. 1991. *Light Verbs, VP-movement, Negation, and Clausal Architecture in Korean and English*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Belletti, A. 1988. The case of unaccusatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 1-34.
- Boeckx, C. 1998. Expletive split. Paper presented at NELS 29.
- Boeckx, C. 2000. EPP eliminated. Ms., Uconn, Storrs.
- Boeckx, C. 2002. Case and agreement in minimalist syntax. *Talk presented at Mayfest 2002: The Minimalist Fact*, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Bonet, E. 1994. The person-case constraint: a morphological approach. *MITWPL* 22, 33-52.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: the framework. *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, eds., 89-155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, In M. Kenstowicz, ed., 1-52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kim, S.-W. 1996. On the nominative objects in Korean. *The Journal of Korean Linguistics* 21, 241-61.
- Kim, Y.-J. 1990. *The Syntax and Semantics of Korean Case: The Interaction between Lexical and Syntactic Levels of Representation*, Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Koizumi, M. 1995. *Phrase Structure in Minimalist Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Lasnik, H. 1999. *Minimalist Analysis*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Lasnik, H. 2001. A note on the EPP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 2.
- Law, P. 1996. Remarks on the verb *be* and the expletive *there* in English. *Linguistische Berichte* 166, 492-529.

- Law, P. 1999. On the passive existential construction. *Studia Linguistica* 53, 183-208.
- Lee, J.-S. 1992. *Case Alternation in Korean: Case Minimality*. Doctoral dissertation, UConn, Storrs.
- McClosky, J. 2002. Expletives. Talk presented at Mayfest 2002: The Minimalist Fact, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Milsark, G. 1974. *Existential Sentences in English*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Moon, G.-S. 2000. Agreement in English existential constructions. *The Journal of English Language and Literature* 64.
- Safir, K. 1985. *Syntactic Chains*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Schütze, C. 2001. On the nature of default case. *Syntax* 4, 205-38.
- Ura, H. 1996. *Multiple Feature-checking: A Theory of Grammatical Function Splitting*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Yoo, D.-S. 1994. Agreement in Korean. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 4, 211-47 [In Korean].

김선웅

서울시 노원구 월계동 447-1번지

광운대학교 인문사회과학대학 영어영문학과

우편번호: 139-701

전화번호: 02) 940-5364

E-mail: swkim@gwo.ac.kr

접수일자: 2002. 1. 17.

게재결정: 2002. 2. 25.