How many *es* are there?
Roland Hinterhölzl
University of Venice, Ca'Foscari

1   Introduction

(1)   Hans   traf   das Mädchen   und   küsste es   (object pronoun)
           John   met   the girl   and   kissed it

(2)   a.   Es   regnet   (subject expletive)
             It   rains

       b.   Heute   regnet   es
             Today   rains   it

(3)   a.   Es   scheint   die Sonne   (V2-*es*)
             It   shines   the sun

       b.   Die Sonne   scheint   (*es)
             The sun   shines   (it)

(4)   a.   Es   ist   eine Schande   dass   Peter Maria verlassen hat (correlate-*es*)
             It   is   a shame   that   Peter Mary   left has

       b.   Maria   hat   (es)   verlangt,   dass   Peter   kommt
             Mary   has   (it)   requested   that   Peter   comes

Observation 1: there are two types of Object correlate-*es*

(5)   a.   Hans hat (es) geglaubt, dass Peter Maria geküsst hat
             Hans has it believed that Peter Maria kissed has

       b.   Was hat Hans geglaubt? (what has John believed)
             Hans hat (*es) geglaubt, dass Peter Maria geküsst hat

       c.   Hans hat (es) bedauert, dass Peter Maria geküsst hat
             Hans has it regretted that Peter Maria kissed has

       d.   Was hat Hans bedauert? (what has John regretted)
             Hans hat es bedauert, dass Peter Maria geküsst hat

Stefan Sudhoff (2016): (5a) is a case of Right-dislocation, as in (6), which needs to be distinguished from extraposition

(6)   Hans hat sie geliebt, die Maria
       Hans has her loved, the Maria

Analysis: the pronoun in (5a) stands in for the entire sentence, the pronoun in (5b) is part of the embedded sentence

Observation 2: correlate-*es* is different from Subject- and V2-*es*

(7)   a.   Dass Peter Maria verlassen hat, ist (*es) eine Schande
             That Peter Maria left has, is it a shame

       b.   Dass Peter kommt, hat (*es) Maria verlangt
             That Peter comes has it Maria requested

       c.   Peter hat Maria verlassen. Das ist eine Schande.
             Peter has Maria left. That is a shame

       d.   Peter kommt. Das hat Maria verlangt.
             Peter comes. That has Maria requested

(8)   weil *(es) eine Schande ist, dass Peter Maria verlassen hat
       because (it) a shame is, that Peter Maria left has

Observation 3: also subject-correlate *es* can be optional

(9)   a.   eine Schande ist *(es) dass Peter Maria verlassen hat
             a shame is it that Peter Maria left has
       b.   klar ist (es), dass Peter Maria verlassen hat
             clear is (it) that Peter Maria left has

Conclusions:
putting apart the cases in (1) where *es* refers to or stands in for an individual, and in (5a), where *es* refers to or stands in for a proposition, three different occurrences of *es* remain, confronting us with - at least - the following questions:

1) how can we explain the differences between subject expletive, V2-*es* and correlate-*es*
2) how can we explain the optionality with subject and object correlate-*es*
3) is a uniform account of these three occurrences of *es* feasible

Proposal:

a)   there is only one type of *es* which has semantic content and serves to anchor the utterance in the context
b)   the distributional differences of the diverse occurrences of *es* follow from the syntactic properties of the diverse environments in which it is inserted

2   Towards an Analysis of *es*

2.1   Thetic and Categorial Judgements

Proposal:
thetic judgments are not sentences without a topic; but can be analysed as characterizing a situation, and hence contain a so-called situation topic (cf. Hinterhölzl 2019)

The Theory and Historical Development of Expletives   Bochum 9-10 June 2022

How many *es* are there?   Roland Hinterhölzl, Venice

(10) a.   Hubert Haider spricht
           Hubert Haider speaks
      b.   Es spricht Hubert Haider
           it speaks Hubert Haider

(10a) characterizes an individual; *Hubert Haider* is an individual topic, the aboutness topic of the sentence; (10b) characterizes a situation and a situation topic constitutes the aboutness topic of the sentence

in a similar vein, the clauses in (11) can be analysed as thetic judgments, in which *es* refers to a situation

(11) a.   Es regnete
           It rained
      b.   Es gab viele Braunkohlewerke im Ruhrgebiet
           it existed many brown-coalmines in the Ruhr area

Question:

a)   What situation is referred to in (10) and (11)?
b)   How can we explain that *es* is optional in (10) but obligatory in (11)?

2.2   A situation-based account of Tense and the Role of the Reference Situation

It is generally assumed that the clause is anchored by tense (and mood) to the context. Tense in this conception has the role of temporally situating the event expressed by the verb with respect to the utterance situation. For instance, in event semantics, the interpretation of (12a) can be specified as in (12b), that is, the sentence represents the claim of the speaker that there is an event of visiting in the past (at a time before the speech event) in which a certain individual, named John, figured as the agent of this event and the individual's mother figured as the theme of the event.

(12) a.   John visited his mother.
      b.   ∃e visiting(e) & past (e) & agent (e, John) & theme (e, his mother)

(13) a.   John visited his mother. (e_1)
      b.   She was sick. (e_2)
      c. $e_1 < e_2 < s$, $e_2 < e_1 < s$, e_1 o $e_2 < s$
      d.   She was sick one week before/later

(14) Situation-based account of Tense (SAT):
      Tense is a predicate that relates situation arguments

(15) Past (s_1, s_2) = s_1 precedes s_2 = : τ (s_1) < τ (s_2)

(16) A situation-based account of Aspect (SAA):
      a. s_R is an extended stage of the verbal event e (imperfective aspect)
      b. s_R is a minimal (initial or final) stage of the verbal event e (perfective aspect)

2.3   Subject-expletive and V2-es

In Hinterhölzl (2019), it is argued that categorical judgments are anchored to the context via a given individual, while thetic judgments are anchored to the context via the reference situation. If a verb has no individual argument, the predicate can only be anchored via the reference situation to the context. The statement is about a particular situation. In a nutshell, the anchor has to be a definite expression.
Proposal: *es* is a definite (demonstrative) element that binds a situation argument

If a verb has an individual argument, the predicate can either be anchored via this argument or via the reference situation. In the latter case, *es* is inserted in [Spec,TP] and moved to the C-domain into a projection in which aboutness topics are licensed (cf. Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007).

(17) a.   Es regnet
           ιs. rains (s) (= s_R is characterized by rain)
      b.   Es scheint die Sonne
           ιs. the sun shines in s (= s_R is characterized by the sun shining)

the event argument is existentially closed by Aspect by default, such that Aspect expresses a relation, normally an inclusion relation between the reference situation and the verbal event;

if the clause does not have a contentful subject to be predicated of, existential closure is suspended and the reference situation of tense becomes an argument of the verbal predicate, as is illustrated in (17a); this also happens if the clause does have an individual argument that qualifies as an anchor for the predicate, as is the case in existential statements (comprising an indefinite subject)

Consequence: *es* is obligatory and receives Case as all arguments do

if the clause has a contentful subject that qualifies as an anchor for the predicate, existential closure of the verbal event occurs and *es* is inserted as a means of last resort in [Spec,TP] due to the prosodic nature of V2 (cf. the rule on V2 in (18)), just in case no other argument is available for topicalization

Consequence: *es* is optional and does not receive Case since it is not an argument of the verb, but it derives its content from being inserted as an argument of Tense that functions as an adjunct with respect to the verb

V2 is a complex rule being composed of a syntactic part (deriving the bottle neck) and an optional prosodic part, given in (18); (18a) excludes V3 orders with base-generated frame adverbials; (18b) excludes V1 orders in declaratives clauses only; allowing for V1 orders in imperatives and yes/no-questions

(18) Interface condition on the definition of the phase edge (ICPE):
      a. V_{fin} must occupy a left-peripheral position in its phonological phrase in the phase edge.
      b.   In declaratives clauses, V_{fin} must not occupy a left peripheral position in the intonation phrase in its position in the phase edge.

The Theory and Historical Development of Expletives   Bochum 9-10 June 2022

How many *es* are there?   Roland Hinterhölzl, Venice

3   Weak and strong definite elements in German

there are two types of criteria imposed onto definite determiners in the literature:
a) the uniqueness based approch (Russell 1901)
b) the familiarity based approach (Heim 1983)

(19)   (out of the blue): The sun is shining today
(20)   A man and a woman came into the room. The man wore a green hat.

3.1   The definite determiner in Standard German and in Germanic dialects

Several Germanic languages / dialects have long been known to have two full article paradigms (cf. Heinrichs (1954) for the Rhineland dialects, Scheutz (1988) and Schwager (2007) for Bavarian and Ebert (1971) for the Frisian dialect of Fering).

In Standard German, the distinction becomes apparent in certain preposition - article combinations, as is illustrated in (21).

(21)   a.   Hans   ging   ins   Haus   (D-weak)
                   John   went   into-the   house
       b.   Hans   ging   in das   Haus   (D-strong)
                   John   went   into the   house

As is illustrated in the example in (22) adopted from Schwarz (2012), the weak definite determiner in this context is subject to a uniqueness requirement, as expected, while such a requirement is irrelevant for the strong definite determiner, given the fact that a government has only one chancellor but is composed of a number of ministers.

(22)   a.   In der Kabinettssitzung   wird   ein neuer Vorschlag vom Kanzler / ?? vom
              Minister   erwartet
              In the meeting   is   a new proposal by the cancellor / by the
              minister   expected
       b.   Hans   hat   gestern   einen Minister   interviewt.
              John   has   yesterday   a minister   interviewed
              In der Kabinettssitzung   wird   ein neuer Vorschlag   von   dem   Minister
              erwartet.
              In the meeting   is   a new proposal   by   the   minister
              expected

According to Schwarz (2012) the core meaning of the definite article involves the uniqueness property relativized to a situation. In his account, the situation argument is introduced by the definite determiner. The interpretation of a weak definite determiner is given in (23).

(23) $[[\text{the}_{\text{weak}}]] = \lambda s\, \lambda P.\, \iota x\, P(x)\, (s)$

What is then the correct definition of the denotation of a strong definite DP? Given the above observations it seems that while the weak determiner can refer to entities that are new to the discourse, the account of the strong determiner should be built on its discourse-anaphoric nature (strong familiarity).

(24)   Der Kühlschrank war so groß, dass der Kürbis problemlos *im* Gemüsefach
         The fridge was so big that the pumpkin without-problems in the crisper
         untergebracht werden konnte
         placed have could
         'The fridge was so big that the pumpkin could easily be stowed in the crisper'

(25)   Das Theaterstück missfiel dem Kritiker so sehr, dass er in der Besprechung kein gutes
         the theater-piece disliked to the critic so much that he in his review no good
         Haar *an dem* Autor ließ
         hair on the author left
         'The play displeased the critic so much that he tore the author to pieces in his review'

Observation: there is a devision of labor; it is the (de)accentuation of the nominal predicate that indicates whether a given discourse referent is also part of D with $D \subset CG$, as is illustrated in (26) and (27). (adopted from Umbach 2002)[1]. In (26) stressed syllables are indicated by capital letters. In other words, what Donnellan (1967) calls the referential and the attributive use of the definite determiner is the most typical combination of weak determiner and accentuation and the strong determiner and de-accentuation.

(26)   Hans hat sich neulich ein kleines Häuschen am Land gekauft
         Hans has himself recently a small house in the country bought
         a.   Nächste Woche will er die alte HÜTTE abreissen (attributive use)
                Next week will he the old shed tear-down
         b.   Nächste Woche will er die alte Hütte ABreissen (referential use)
                'Next week he wants to tear down the old shed'

In standard German the morphological difference between the strong and the weak version of the determiner is not visible. In my Austrian dialect the distinction is evident (cf. 27).

(27)   a.   neksti Woacha wü ea d(i) oiti HITN oraissn (attributive use)
                next week wants he the$_{\text{weak}}$ old shed tear-down
         b.   neksti Woacha wü ea dei oiti Hitn Oraissn (referential use)
                next week wants he the$_{\text{strong}}$ old shed tear-down

Thus, the definition of the determiner meaning only makes reference to givenness in CG:

(28)   a. $[[D]] = \lambda P\, \exists s\ s\ in\ CG\,.\, \iota x\, P(x, s)$ (weak definite determiner)
         b. $[[D]] = \lambda P\, \exists s\ s\ in\ CG\ \&\ \iota x\ in\ CG\ \&\ P(x, s)\,.\, x$ (strong definite determiner)

Conclusion: the presence of a book in the CG implies the presence / existence of its author;
                  the presence of a fridge in the CG does not imply the existence of a light even
                  though this is typically the case (the fridge light is given in a weaker way)

3.2   Weak and strong demonstratives in descriptions of situations

Differently from the strong definite determiner, however, *das* only combines with propositions (as properties of situations) that are de-accented or elided due to their discourse-givenness, but it cannot be used to refer a proposition that is only implied in the CG, as is

illustrated in (29). It seems that a proposition implied in the CG has to be activated before it licenses the use of a strong demonstrative pronoun.

(29) a.   Hans hat Maria besucht. Das ~~dass Hans Maria besucht hat~~ hat mich überrascht
     b.   Context: Speaker and hearer who have a common friend Hans know that
             each of their friends has visited Mary
     c.   ??Das hat mich überrascht dass Hans Maria besucht hat
     d.   Es hat mich überrascht dass Hans Maria besucht hat
             That / it has me surprised that Hans Maria visited has

Thus, I will assume that *es* as a weak demonstrative element is compatible with new and given discourse referents, but since its alternative *das* is only compatible with discourse-given propositions, there is a Q-based implicature (cf. Horn 1984) that correlate-*es* combines with propositions new in the discourse. However, this implicature can possibly be cancelled by de-accenting the relevant clause (induced by the context or the semantics of matrix predicate).

Conclusion: we know that definite determiners have been grammaticalized from demonstrative pronouns, it does hence not come as a surprise that the basic distinction between elements with a strong and a weak reading is present in the original system.

3.3   The weak demonstrative elements that bind an argument of Tense

As far as the D-pronoun that binds the reference situation of the Tense predicate is concerned, I will argue below that there is no alternation between a silent strong pronoun and a weak overt pronoun, namely *es*, since both readings, the referential and the attributive one, are available in both cases, as we will see.

Observation: the distinction between the referential and the attributive use is also present in the use of the Tense predicate, as is illustrated in (30)

(30)   John said that Mary left

     a.   Mary left at the time John said that she left (referential use)

     b.   Mary left at a time prior to John's saying (attributive use)

The standard account figures under the name Sequence of Tense rules:
a) *present* ($s_1 = s_2$) in (30a) that is spelled out as *past* for reasons of temporal agreement
b) real *past* ($s_1 < s_2$) in (30b).

Alternative: the reference situation argument of Tense is bound by a silent demonstrative element.
             a) referential use, the embedded tense predicate presupposes the presence of a past Tense predicate whose reference situation it picks up,
             b) the attributive use, the embedded Tense predicate introduces a new reference situation that is located in the past with respect to the matrix event.

The choice is determined by aspectual / *Aktionsart* properties of the relevant verb:
a)   a non-dynamic verb (denoting a state or an activity) goes hand in hand with a referential interpretation

b)   a dynamic verb (denoting an achievement or an accomplishment) gives rise to an attributive interpretation.

As we have seen above in (9b) a stative predicate triggers the referential use of Tense, while as is illustrated in (31), a dynamic predicate involves the attributive use of Tense: the dynamic event s_2 is interpreted as non-overlapping with event s_1.

(31)   A man entered the room (s_1). He asked for information (s_2).

(32) $[[es]] = \lambda T + v \; \exists_{s_U} \; s_U \; in \; CG \; . \; \iota s \; T \; (s, s_U)$
         identification of s: a) if $\exists_{s_R} \; s_R$ in CG & v is non-dynamic, then $s = s_R$;
                                 b) if $\exists_{s_R} \; s_R$ in CG & v is dynamic, then $s \neq s_R$.

Thus, there is again a division of labor at work, this time between the semantics of the D-pronoun, the semantics of the verbal stem and discourse pragmatics: that s_2 follows s_1 in (31) follows from the Gricean maxim of manner.

4   Towards a unified analysis of so-called expletive *es*

4.1   Correlate-*es* in Object Clauses

if correlate-*es* were a D-head as proposed by Sudhoff (2016) then it could be straightforwardly analysed as a weak definite determiner, as is illustrated in (33).

(33) a.   [$_{DP}$ [$_{D'}$ es [$_{CP}$ dass Maria auch Peter eingeladen hat]]]
     b.   CP = λs. Mary has invited also Peter in s
     c.   DP = ιs. Mary has invited also Peter in s

The structure in (33a) corresponds to the structure proposed by Kastner (2015) for selected presuppositional complements with *es* lexicalizing the silent definite determiner Δ in his analysis, as is illustrated in (34).

(34)   Bill remembers / denies that John stole the cookies
         [$_{VP}$ remembers / denies [$_{DP}$ Δ [$_{CP}$ that [$_{IP}$ John stole the cookies]]]]

Kastner (2015) takes up the three-way classification of Catell (1978) of verbs taking CP complements and argues that *non-stance* (factive) verbs like *regret*, *know*, *remember*, etc. and *response-stance* verbs like *deny*, *accept*, *agree, admit*, etc. in contradistinction to *volunteered stance* verbs like *think*, *suppose, assume*, *claim,* etc. can take DP complements; Kastner (2015) calls the first two classes presuppositional verbs.

The problem with the structure in (33a) is that the parallel clause in (34) gives rise to only weak islands, while CP-complements headed by *es* in German give rise to strong islands, as is illustrated in (35).

(35)   *Was hat Peter es verlangt, dass Maria t sagen soll
         What has Peter it requested that Maria say should

For overt definite presuppositional Kastner (2015) proposes the structure in (36b)

(36)   a.   Bill remembers / denies the fact / claim that John stole the cookies.
        b.   [VP remembers/denies [DP the [NP [NP fact/claim] [CP that [IP John stole the cookies]]]]]

In other words (33a) should be analysed as (36b) with the nominal predicate remaining silent with the CP adjunct being interpreted as specifying the content of s2 (content (s2) = CP) and the predicate *claim* (s2 , s1) being interpreted as s1 is a claim(ing) of s2.

(36)   a.   Hans hat es verneint, dass Maria krank war
        b.   [VP verneint [DP es [NP [NP *claim* (s2 , s1)] [CP dass Maria krank war]]]]

what is actually presupposed to be given in the CG is the previous claim but not necessarily its content, as is illustrated in (37):

(37)   a.   Hans hat behauptet dass Maria krank ist. Das / *es verneint Peter
              John has claimed that Mary sick is. That / it denies Peter.
        b.   Hans hat behauptet und Peter verneint es / *das dass Maria krank ist
              John has claimed and Peter denies it / that that Mary sick is

Simial considerations apply to factive verbs, with *uncontr-claim* representing a claim in the CG that is held by speaker and hearer to be uncontroversial:

(38)   a.   Hans bedauert es dass Maria krank ist
              John regrets it that Mary sick is
        b.   [VP bedauert [DP es [NP [NP *uncontr-claim* (s2 , s1)] [CP dass Maria krank war]]]]

We can ask for the content of a regret in the presence of *es*, as is indicated in (39a), since *es* only presupposes that there is a claim to the end that its content is true in the CG. Only if the truth / uncontroversiality of the embedded clause is in question, *es* is excluded, as indicated in (39b), and the verb appears with a *bare* CP complement in (39c).

(39)   a.   Was bedauert Hans? (What does John regret?)
              Hans bedauert es, dass Maria krank ist
              John regrets it that Mary sick is
        b.   Hans bedauert es dass Maria krank ist (% Dabei geht es ihr ganz gut)
        c.   Hans bedauert dass Maria krank ist (Dabei geht es ihr ganz gut)
              John regrets (it) that Mary is sick (while in fact she is quite well)

(39c) seems to indicate that the lack of *es* indicates the lack of presence of an uncontroversial claim in the CG; hence (39c) reports an attitude of John towards a proposition that he (alone) considers to be uncontroversial (*bedauern* / regret is always factive)

(40)   a.   Wen bedauert Hans dass Maria getroffen hat?
        b.   Wen bedauert es Hans dass Maria getroffen hat?
              Whom regrets (it) Hans that Maria met has

4.2   Correlate-*es* in Subject Clauses

(41)   a.   [DP D̶a̶s̶ [CP dass Maria auch Peter eingeladen hat]] hat mich überrascht
        b.   Maria hat auch Peter eingeladen. [Das [d̶a̶s̶s̶ ̶M̶a̶r̶i̶a̶ ̶a̶u̶c̶h̶ ̶P̶e̶t̶e̶r̶ ̶e̶i̶n̶g̶e̶l̶a̶d̶e̶n̶ ̶h̶a̶t̶]] hat mich überrascht

(42)   [Dass   Maria   auch Peter   eingeladen hat]   das   hat   mich   überrascht
        That   Maria   also Peter   invited has   that   has   me   surprised

Some consequences of the proposed analysis:
it is plausible to analyse the embedded CPs in (43) as propositions.

(43)   a.   Es scheint, dass Maria krank ist
              It seems that Mary sick is
        b.   Es ist möglich, dass Maria krank ist
              It is possible that Mary sick is

However, (44) and (45) show that the two cases are completely different: *es* with scheinen is inserted in [Spec,TP] while *es* with be possible is of the correlate type

(44)   a.   *[dass Maria krank ist] scheint (es) durchaus
              that Mary sick is seems indeed
        b.   *weil [dass Maria krank ist] scheint
              since that Mary sick is seems
        c.   Maria ist krank. *Das scheint
              Maria is sick. That seems

(45)   a.   [dass Maria krank ist] ist möglich
              that Mary sick is is possible
        b.   weil [dass Maria krank ist] möglich ist
              since that Mary sick is possible is
        c.   Maria ist krank. Das ist möglich
              Maria is sick. That is possible

In (46), a-Alt (s, sR) is interpreted as s is an accessible alternative to the reference situation.

(46)   [AP möglich [DP es [NP [NP *A-ALT* (s , sR)] [CP dass Maria krank war]]]]

4.3   V2-*es* (or Vorfeld-*es*)

I am following here work proposing that V2-*es* is to be interpreted as a topic in the C-domain and thus serves to anchor the clause in the context (cf. Platzack 1987, Holmberg and Platzack 1985, Svenonius 2002, Biberauer 2010), but differently from them I propose that V2-es is inserted in [Spec,TP] as a means of last resort in case no other element is moved or base-generated in the C-domain.

it seems that preverbal *es* has first replaced postverbal *thô* which had attributive reading (cf. Fuß and Hinterhölzl to appear)

(47)   a.   uuarun **thô**   hirta   In thero lantskeffi uuahante [...]   **OHG: V1**
              were   then/there shepherds in that country abiding (*Tatian*, 85,29; Lk, 2,8)
        b.   **es** waren Hirten in der selbigen gegend auff dem felde **MHG/ENHG: *es*+V2**
              it were shepherds in that country on the field   (Luther 1545 (letzte Hand))

This follows from a new type of V2-rule that combines syntactic with prosodic conditions (cf. Hinterhölzl 2017)

(48)   Interface condition on the definition of the phase edge (ICPE):
        a.   V$_{fin}$ must occupy a left-peripheral position in its phonological phrase in the phase edge.
        b.   In declaratives clauses, V$_{fin}$ must not occupy a left peripheral position in the intonation phrase in its position in the phase edge.

4.4   The impersonal passive and the pro-drop parameter in German

(49)   a.   hier   wird   getanzt
              here   gets   danced
        b.   Es   wird   getanzt
              it   gets   danced
        c.   weil   (*es)   getanzt   wird
              because (it)   danced   gets

(50)   Pro-drop parameter (German):
        Defective Tense licenses an implicit impersonal (subject) argument

The impersonal passive in Geman can have two interpretations:
A)   it can have an episodic reading, where the implicit argument has an existential interpretation. In this case, the statement is anchored via the situation argument and the silent reference situation of Tense to the context.
B)   It can have an IL-reading, in which case the implicit argument has a generic interpretation. In this respect, it is interesting to note that the impersonal passive of an active sentence like (51a) that is ambiguous between an IL-reading (51b) and a SL-reading (51c) systematically only allows for the individual reading (52a), while the presumed SL-reading involving a situation topic is expressed by the corresponding middle construction in German, as is illustrated in (52b).

(51)   a.   In Österreich   kann   man   gut   Schifahren
              In Austria   can   one   well   ski
        b.   Austrians ski well (IL-interpretation)
        c.   When in Austria one can ski well (SL-interpretation)

(52)   a.   In Österreich   wird   gut   Schi gefahren (impersonal passive)
              In Austria   is   well   ski-gone
              Austrians ski well
        b.   In Österreich   fährt   es   sich   gut   Schi (middle construction)
              In Austria   goes   it   itself well   ski
              Whoever comes to Austria can find good ski facilities there

Explanation: IL-predicates can only be anchored via their individual argument, while SL-predicates can also be anchored via their situation argument; I have no good explanation of why *es* is obligatory in (51b): one option would be to assume that *es* is an argument in (51b);

5   The problem of optionality of Subject-correlate-*es*

(53)   a.   weil   *(es)   eine Schande ist,   dass   Peter   nicht   kommt
              because it   a shame   is   that   Peter   not   comes
        b.   weil   (es)   klar   ist,   dass   Peter   nicht   kommt
              because   (it)   clear   is   that   Peter   not   comes
        c.   A: Was ist klar? (What is clear?)
              B: Klar   ist (gewesen), dass   Peter   nicht   kommt
                    Clear   is   that   Peter   not   comes
        d.   Peter   kommt   nicht. Das   ist   klar.
              Peter   comes   not.   That   is   clear

Option 1:   the subject needs to be a DP (see also Kastner (2016)), if the clausal argument is a mere CP, we expect *es* to be obligatory - *es* needs to be inserted in [Spec,TP]

Option 2:   the clausal argument is always an extended CP; but SL-predicates have the option of being anchored via their event argument which may be silent

Some counter-evidence:

(54)   a.   ein Glück war dass Peter nicht gekommen ist
              a luck was that Peter not come is
        b.   glücklich war ??(es) dass Peter nicht gekommen ist
              lucky was (it) that Peter not come is
        c.   klar war da / in diesem Moment dass Peter nicht kommen wird
              clear was then / in that moment that Peter not come will
        d.   möglich war *(es) da / in diesem Moment dass Peter nicht kommen wird
              possible was (it) then / in that moment that Peter not come will

Option 3:   Predicates can be unaccusative or unergative; the difference is represented structurally by the position that the sentential argument occupies with respect to the event argument of the predicate : P (p, e) or P (e, p)

(55)   a.   ne erano chiare tre soluzioni
              of-it were clear thre solutions
        b.   *ne erano possibili tre soluzioni
              of-it were possible three solutions

by parallel movement / licensing if e is licensed by Tense; x has to be licensed by AgrS and y by AgrO

(56)   [$_{AgrS}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{AgrO}$ [$_{vP}$ P (x,e,y)]]]]

(57)   Spell-out corollary:
        a) an exponent that agrees with AgrS must be spelled out
        b) an exponent that agrees with AgrO may be silent

The Theory and Historical Development of Expletives   Bochum 9-10 June 2022

How many *es* are there?   Roland Hinterhölzl, Venice

6   References

Austin, John L. 1961. Truth. In *Philosophical papers*, ed. J. O. Urmson & G. J. Warnock, 117–133. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Biberauer, Teresa. 2010. Semi null-subject languages, expletives and expletive *pro* reconsidered. In *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*, eds. T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts and M. Sheehan, 153 - 199. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biberauer, Teresa and Janneke van der Wal. 2014. Expletives beyond English. Ms., Cambridge University, Cambridge.

Cattell, Ray. 1978. On the source of interrogative adverbs. *Language* 54, 61 - 77.

Donnellan, Keith. 1966. Reference and definite descriptions. *Philosophical Review* 75:281–304.

Ebert, Karen. 1971. Zwei Formen des bestimmten Artikels [Two forms of the definite article]. In *Probleme und Fortschritte der Transformationsgrammatik*, ed. D. Wunderlich, 159–174. Munich: Hueber.

Fuß, Eric and Roland Hinterhölzl. to appear. On the historical development of pronouns refering to situations: the case of so-called expletives in Germanic. *Journal of Historical Syntax*.

Hartmann, Julia. 2008. Expletives in existentials: English *there* and German *da*. Doctoral thesis, Tilburg University, Tilburg, the Netherlands.

Hazout, Ilan. 2004. The syntax of existential constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:393–430.

Heinrichs, Heinrich. 1954. *Studien zum bestimmten Artikel in den germanischen Sprachen* [Studies on the definite article in Germanic languages]. Giessen, Germany: Wilhelm Schmitz.

Horn, Laurence R. 1984. Toward a new taxonomy for pragmatic inference: Q-based and R-based implicature, in D. Schiffrin (ed.) *Meaning, Form and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*. Georgetown University Pess, 11 - 42.

Hinterhölzl, Roland. 2019. Subjects, Topics and Anchoring to the Context. *Syntax,* Special Issue, 1 - 30.

Hinterhölzl, Roland. 2017. Decomposing V2. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 48:205–217.

Hinterhölzl, Roland. 1995. The Passive Implicit Argument and the Impersonal Pronoun *man* in German. In V. Samian and J. Schaeffer (eds.): Proceedings of WECOL XXIV. CSLI, Stanford University, California.

Kastner, Itamar. 2015. Factivity mirrors interpretation: The selectional requirements of presuppositional verbs. *Lingua* 164: 156 - 188.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1989. Stage-level and individual-level predicates. Ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. Stage-level and individual-level predicates. In *The generic book*, ed. G. N. Carlson & F. I. Pelletier, 125–175. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2004. Covert quantifier restrictions in natural languages. Ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2006. Situations in natural language semantics. Ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2007. On the quantification over times in natural language. *Natural Language Semantics* 13:317–357.

Scheutz, Heinrich. 1988. Determinantien und Definitheitsarten im Bairischen und Standarddeutschen [Determiners and definiteness types in Bavarian and Standard German]. In *Festschrift für Ingo Reiffenstein*, ed., 231–253. Göppingen, Germany: Kümmerle.

Schwager, Magdalena. 2007. (Non-)functional concepts: Definite articles in Bavarian. Talk presented at the eighth Szkarska Poreba Workshop, Szrenica, Poland, February 23–27.

Schwarz, Florian. 2009. Two types of definites in natural language. Doctoral thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Schwarz, Florian. 2012. Situation pronouns in determiner phrases. *Natural Language Semantics* 20:431–475.

Simonenko Alexandra. 2014. Grammatical Ingredients of Definiteness. Doctoral dissertation McGill University.

Stowell, Timothy. 1995. The phrase structure of Tense. In J. Rooryck and L. Zaenen (eds.), *Phrase structure and the Lexicon,* 277 - 291. Dordrecht: Kluwer Publications.

Sudhoff, Stefan. 2016. Correlates of object clauses in German and Dutch. In *Innersentential pro-propositional pro-forms: syntactic properties and interpretation effects*, ed. Kerstin Schwabe, Andre Meinunger and Werner Frey, 23 - 48. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Umbach, Carla. 2002. (De)accenting Definite Descriptions. *Theoretical Linguistics* 27, 251 - 280.

Wiltschko, Martina. 1998. On the Syntax and Semantics of (Relative) Pronouns and Determiners. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 2: 143 - 181.