

EPP Extensions

Idan Landau

The fact that the specifier of T^0 is subject both to the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) and to the Empty Category Principle (ECP) has remained an unexplained accident within Government-Binding Theory. I propose a principled account of this correlation. The EPP is a selectional requirement of functional heads (e.g., T, Top, C) that applies at PF—an instance of *p-selection* for an overt element. Like all selectional requirements, it applies to the *head* of the selected phrase, explaining why null heads cannot appear in EPP positions (thus deriving certain representational ECP effects). A wide range of empirical results follow, all unified by the exclusion of null-headed phrases from EPP positions: subject-object asymmetries in the distribution of bare nouns in Romance and sentential complements; failure of certain adjuncts to occur in clause-initial position; resistance of indirect objects to \bar{A} -movement; and phonological doubling of heads of fronted categories. I argue against the agreement/checking view of the EPP and show that only the selectional construal allows a natural explanation of its puzzling properties.

Keywords: EPP, selection, PF interface, ECP effects, bare nouns

1 Introduction

Two major research strands, launched in the Government-Binding Theory era, studied the distribution of empty categories and the distribution of subjects. The first strand attempted to formulate and refine a central theoretical construct: the Empty Category Principle (ECP). The second strand studied the consequences of an equally central concept of GB: the Extended Projection Principle (EPP). In retrospect, it is striking to observe that there has been hardly any interaction between those two topics. That is, the ECP and the EPP reigned over disjoint empirical kingdoms, and nothing in their declarative content suggested that they should be collapsed, or even unified under a broader principle. The situation became much more diffuse within the Minimalist Program, where the EPP has been reinterpreted in radically different ways, while the ECP simply dissolved, its effects either derived differently or left unexplained.

The starting point of this article is an attempt to view some of the effects of the classical ECP and EPP as instantiations of the same underlying generalization. The first step in this direction will be to refine a specific theoretical version of the EPP, inspired by certain recent proposals. The second step will revisit some classical ECP effects and show how they follow from this novel understanding of the EPP. I will further show that this understanding sheds light on new puzzles in the distribution of empty categories. Overall, it will be seen that a fairly simple view of the EPP, taken to its limit, yields a surprisingly diverse array of empirical consequences.

To begin, let us review the major approaches to the EPP in the last decade or so. It is useful to classify these approaches by the nature of the answers they provide for the following key

questions:

- (1) a. What kind of principle is the EPP?
- b. Where in the grammar does the EPP apply?
- c. Where in the clausal hierarchy does the EPP apply?

Question (1a) focuses on the grammatical type to which the EPP belongs: is it a principle of predication? of agreement? or of selection? Question (1b) focuses on the grammatical component/level at which the EPP applies: is it S-Structure, PF, or LF? Question (1c) focuses on the localization of the EPP in the syntactic tree: is it a property of T alone (hence, affecting only subjects), or perhaps of other functional categories (v , Agr_S, C, etc.)? Naturally, answers to the various parts of (1) potentially restrict each other.

According to the syntactic approach, the EPP essentially operates in the syntax, on standard syntactic features. The first explicit formulation of the EPP—“Every clause must have a subject” (Chomsky 1982)—was syntactic, insofar as the only requirement on the subject was that it bear some syntactic feature (e.g., categorial feature, Case, ϕ -features). It followed that phonologically empty elements (e.g., *pro*) and semantically empty elements (e.g., expletives) can legitimately satisfy the EPP.

This view carried over pretty much unchanged into minimalism. Chomsky (1995) reduces the EPP to a strong D-feature on T, which triggers either subject raising or expletive insertion in Spec,TP (see also Bobaljik and Jonas 1996, Déprez 2000). Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) follow this idea, although expanding the options for D-checking beyond Chomsky’s original proposal. Haeberli (2003) argues that EPP (and abstract Case) phenomena result from negatively valued categorial features on T that need to locally “bond” with their positive counterparts, found on the DP subject. All these authors assume a derivational model where the triggering feature for EPP is checked during the syntactic computation. Significantly, the underlying mechanism is agreement, or some version of Agree (Chomsky 2000).

The phonological approach to the EPP takes literally the word *filled* in the statement “The subject position must be filled.” That is, only elements with phonological content are eligible as subjects for the EPP. This view has grown prominent within the interface-driven syntax of recent years. It is expressed in one form or another in Holmberg 2000, Ndayiragije 2000, Miyagawa 2001, 2005, Bobaljik 2002, Takahashi 2002a,b, and Holmberg and Hrǫarsdóttir 2003.

A significant change introduced by Chomsky (2000), related to (1c), is the extension of the EPP property from T to all core functional categories (v , T, and C), contingent on the presence of a full set of the appropriate agreement features. Thus, finite and control T have an EPP feature, raising and exceptional-Case-marking (ECM) T do not; transitive/unergative v has an EPP feature, passive/unaccusative v does not; interrogative C has an EPP feature, declarative C does not (barring intermediate landing sites of \bar{A} -movement). Crucially, Chomsky (2000) treats the EPP as a selectional feature requiring overt Merge, thus potentially subsuming the “strong” features of Chomsky 1995.

Semantic approaches to the EPP have been quite marginal, owing to the lack of obvious semantic contribution of expletive subjects. Indeed, Rothstein (1983) admits that expletives are

required by a syntactic condition on predicates; yet the claim that it applies to predicates (a semantic category), plus the modeling of the condition on semantic saturation, make her analysis at least “quasi-semantic.” É. Kiss (2001) decomposes the EPP into two conditions, morphological and semantic. The latter requires that declarative, nonquantificational statements express predication (of an element in Spec,TopP). Rosengren (2002) construes the EPP as a visibility requirement on Spec,FinP (where expletives are found) or Spec,TP (where subjects are found), imposed by the semantic interface, where existential and specific/generic readings of subjects must be distinguished. Finally, there are also eliminative approaches, which view the EPP as an artificial label for a cluster of independently explained phenomena, with no explanatory role whatsoever (Grohmann, Drury, and Castillo 2000, Bošković 2002).

I believe that there is something to be learned from various features of the above proposals. In what follows, I concentrate on those features that strike me as most fruitful and synthesize them into a coherent system.

2 The Proposal and Its Predictions

The conception of the EPP that I would like to articulate combines features of both the syntactic and phonological approaches. Strictly speaking, though, I take the EPP to be a pure PF constraint. Its misleading syntactic guise owes to the fact that the EPP almost always works in tandem with some other syntactic feature (e.g., Case, [wh]). However, once the syntactic effects are factored out, it becomes clear that a phonological construal of the EPP is to be preferred on grounds of generality.

The key aspects of the proposal are given in (2).

- (2) a. EPP is a *selectional* feature governing PF configurations.
- b. *Every* functional head may bear an EPP feature.

Following Holmberg (2000), let us call the EPP feature simply [P]. [P] is a selectional feature that must be locally satisfied by some element with phonological content.¹ It is best to think of the relation between the [P]-bearing head and the element that satisfies it as a true instance of selection; call it *p-selection*. Like *s-selection*, which governs LF configurations, *p-selection* is an interface condition, which governs PF configurations. Strictly speaking, the only type of selection that is part of narrow syntax is *c-selection*.

As Holmberg makes clear, [P] does not specify or care what phonetic matrix is used to satisfy it, as long as some such matrix is found. Crucially, though, in contrast to Holmberg, I do not assume that [P] is syntactically visible; correspondingly, [P] does not enter agreement relations by itself (it is not a probe for Agree), just as the *s-selectional* feature [____ [+animate]] is not directly active in the syntax. Again, apparent syntactic EPP effects are always parasitic on some independent syntactic feature; I return to this issue in section 5.2.

¹ To keep our terminology clear: selectional features are *satisfied*; uninterpretable agreement features are *checked* (and deleted). The distinction is important, and I return to it in section 5.1.

As to the distribution of [P] on functional heads, little can be stipulated on universal grounds. The phonetic realization of functional heads, as well as their role in driving movement to the left periphery of the clause, is a primary source of crosslinguistic variation. Much of this variation is mediated by [P] features; hence, we expect their presence to vary both across functional heads within the same language and on the same functional head across different languages. Learning the obligatory and optional word-order patterns of a language is to a large extent learning the distribution of [P] features in that language.


Given the nature of [P], its effects will always be phonologically visible. Notice that on this view, null elements—such as *pro* and *PRO*—cannot satisfy the EPP. Copies of movement, however, can do so, if the condition is derivational, not representational. This view leaves open the possibility that intermediate copies (e.g., in *Spec,TP*) are required by something other than the EPP—for example, locality constraints (Bošković 2002). I return in section 6 to the status of null subjects vis-à-vis the EPP.

The view outlined in (2) is not particularly remarkable. However, once spelled out explicitly, it has some striking consequences, which, I believe, have so far escaped attention. The key concept here is the idea that the EPP is a species of selection (see Chomsky 2000). As such, it should be subject to familiar syntactic conditions on selectional dependencies. Two such conditions are stated in (3).

(3) *Syntactic conditions on selection*

- a. *Locality*: A head may only select elements in its complement/specifier.
- b. *Headedness*: A head may only select the *head* of its complement/specifier.

If selectional features percolate from a head *H* to *H'*, then (3a) is reducible to the simple statement that selectional features must be satisfied under sisterhood, that is, between *H* and its complement or between *H'* and its specifier. Consider the schematic situation in (4).



The selectional feature []_alpha on the head *H* is satisfied upon merger of the complement *YP*. The selectional feature []_beta is satisfied upon merger of the specifier *ZP* with *H'*, which

inherits [— β] from H.² Since features—selectional or not—percolate from heads to higher projections, α and β are really features of the heads Y and Z, respectively, and only derivatively mark YP and ZP. This is captured by (3b).

In the context of discussions of the EPP, (3a) guarantees that only elements overtly adjoined to H, or merged in its specifier, are eligible for EPP satisfaction. In particular, the EPP cannot be satisfied by covert movement or by long-distance Agree.

The interesting part is (3b). That selection in general is constrained by the headedness condition is well known. For example, if a verb c-selects a PP or an AP, then it is not enough for these selected categories to occur somewhere in the complement of the verb; the relevant P or A must be the *head* of the complement itself.

- (5) a. John lives [_{PP} *in* Canada].
 b. *John lives [_{DP} a town [_{PP} *in* Canada]].
 c. John remained [_{AP} *neutral* about the news].
 d. *John remained [_{PP} about [_{DP} the [_A *neutral*] news]].

Consider the implications for the EPP embodied in the feature [P]. As a selectional feature, it must conform to (3). (3a) entails that [P] may only be satisfied by sisters or specifiers to [P]-bearing heads. Which option is taken may be a parametric choice. According to Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998), EPP on T is checked by adjoined Agr heads in null subject languages and by merged specifiers (subjects) in non-null subject languages. Similarly, Miyagawa (2001) proposes that EPP on C is checked by an adjoined Q head in *wh*-in-situ languages and by merged specifiers (*wh*-phrases) in languages with *wh*-movement. This much seems reasonable.

What is generally overlooked is the implication of (3b) for the EPP: [P] may only be satisfied by the *head* of the selected complement/specifier. Given that the property required of that head is that it bear some phonetic material, we derive the result that the head of the EPP satisfier must be phonetically realized. This result is trivial for EPP satisfiers that are themselves bare heads—like the Agr and Q morphemes mentioned above. It becomes nontrivial when the EPP satisfier is a full phrase. What (3b) now implies is that phonetic realization is specifically required of the *head* of that phrase, and not of any other part of it. Let us state this result explicitly.

- (6) In [_{HP} ZP [_{H'} H_[P] . . .]], Z must be pronounced.

That is, if ZP satisfies the [P] (= EPP) feature of H, then its head Z must be pronounced. Put differently, the head of ZP is selected to be phonetically realized. Importantly, this formulation is much more specific than the general statement “The specifier of H must be filled.” Just as it is not enough for a PP to be found *somewhere* in the complement of *live* in (5b), so it is not enough for phonetic material to be found *somewhere* in the specifier of T or C_[+wh] in English; it must be found on the head of that specifier.

² See Adger 2003 for a similar execution of this idea.

Three major predictions follow from this formulation. They are listed in (7).

- (7) In $[_{HP} ZP [_{H'} H_{[P]} \dots]]$, where ZP is merged (internally or externally) to satisfy [P]:
- If Z is null, the result is ungrammatical.
 - If Z normally alternates between a lexical and a null variant, the latter will be excluded.
 - If Z satisfies another [P] feature in the structure, head doubling (of Z) might result.

In other words, [P] may force phonetic doubling, or exclude null variants of lexical heads in its specifier. The remainder of this article shows that these predictions are borne out across a surprisingly diverse range of constructions. Although the particular problems we will look at have received various local solutions, the view of the EPP advanced above allows a simple, unified account for all of them.

3 Impossible Merge of Empty-Headed Phrases

Consider first situations where the head of the phrase merged in the EPP position can only be realized as a phonologically null element, an overt variant being unavailable as a matter of a lexical gap. Lacking any phonetic content, this head will not be able to satisfy the selectional [P] feature. The structure is thus predicted to be ungrammatical, even if some phonetic material exists in a nonhead position within the merged phrase.

- (8) $*[_{HP}[_{ZP}[_Z \emptyset] \dots] [_{H'} H_{[P]} \dots]]$

Identifying structures of this type is a subtle matter; often the strongest evidence for the presence of the offending null head is the very ungrammaticality it induces. Still, there are situations where independent evidence supports the existence of the null head, which then predictably cannot appear in structures like (8).

A well-known class of such cases falls under the classical ECP, where ZP in (8) is the subject and H is the T head. During the 1980s, configuration (8) was taken to instantiate an ECP violation, with $[_Z \emptyset]$ the offending empty category that fails to be properly governed (Kayne 1981, Stowell 1981). In this section, we will look at two ECP effects manifesting configuration (8): bare nouns in Romance, with a null D or Q head; and sentential subjects, with a null C head. We will see that the present EPP analysis shares with the classical ECP the insight that certain positions do not tolerate null heads, although, importantly, we will discard the assumption that null heads are subject to specific licensing conditions.

3.1 ECP Effects

3.1.1 Bare Nouns in Romance The distribution of bare nouns (BNs) in Romance displays a subject-object asymmetry, which has been traditionally explained by the ECP (Contreras 1986, Longobardi 1994, 1996). The basic facts are the following. Singular count nouns must be introduced by an overt determiner wherever they occur; presumably, there is simply no null determiner with the indefinite existential meaning of 'a' or 'one'. By contrast, bare plurals and mass nouns

are tolerated in object positions of all sorts, but not in subject positions.³ This state of affairs characterizes most Romance languages (French is a notable exception, where BNs are uniformly excluded).

(9) *Spanish* (Contreras 1986)

- a. Quiero café.
'I want coffee.'
- b. *Café me gusta.
coffee me pleases
'I like coffee.'
- c. El café me gusta.
the coffee me pleases
'I like coffee.'

(10) *Italian* (Longobardi 1994, Michela Ippolito, pers. comm.)

- a. In questo ufficio incontro sempre marocchini.
in this office I.meet always Moroccans
'In this office I always meet Moroccans.'
- b. *In questo ufficio marocchini telefonano sempre.
in this office Moroccans call.up always
'In this office Moroccans always call up.'
- c. In questo ufficio dei marocchini telefonano sempre.
in this office of.the Moroccans call.up always
'In this office some Moroccans always call up.'

As (9a) and (10a) show, Spanish and Italian do provide null determiners for indefinite plurals and kind terms.⁴ For some reason, however, these determiners, which freely alternate with overt ones (the definite and the partitive) in nonsubject positions, are not licensed in subject positions; the latter require phonologically overt determiners.

Sardinian is another language exhibiting a subject-object asymmetry in the distribution of BNs. A nice illustration is provided by the noun *adziccu* 'little', used before mass nouns. This item occurs with an optional indefinite article in complement positions to V or P, but in subject positions the article becomes obligatory (Jones 1993:62).

- (11) a. Appo mandicatu (un') adziccu de pane kin (un') adziccu de casu.
I ate (a) little of bread with (a) little of cheese
'I ate a little bread with a little cheese.'

³ Postverbal BN subjects may only be interpreted existentially, not generically. Longobardi (2000) argues that existential subjects remain inside VP (with the verb possibly raising to T), whereas generic ones raise to Spec,TP (followed by leftward movement of the VP remnant). Consequently, only nonexistential postverbal subjects need to satisfy a [P] feature.

⁴ Following much work on the topic, I assume that argumental nominals are necessarily DPs; bare NPs are licensed only in nonargumental positions (predicative, vocative, etc.).

- b. *(Un') adziccu de pane est rutt'a terra.
 *(a) little of bread is fallen floor
 'A bit of bread fell on the floor.'


A parallel subject-object asymmetry is found in Korean. Structural Case markers are optional in object position (12a) but obligatory in subject position (12b);⁵ notice that the nominative marker becomes optional when attached to objects (12c), confirming that the restriction is configurational rather than morphological. Ahn and Cho (2006) argue that these Case markers lexicalize the D position in Korean nominals. If so, the paradigm in (12) reduces to the BN paradigm in Romance.

- (12) a. Mary-ka Sue-(lul) manna-ss-e.
 Mary-NOM Sue-ACC meet-PAST-DECL
 'Mary met Sue.'
 b. John-ul Mary-*(ka) po-ass-e.
 John-ACC Mary-NOM see-PAST-DECL
 'John, Mary saw.'
 c. Sue-ka Mary-(ka) silh-ess-e.
 Sue-NOM Mary-NOM dislike-PAST-DECL
 'Sue disliked Mary.'

The ECP account of these facts assumed that BNs contain an empty category (a QP in Spec,NP for Contreras, a D head for Longobardi) that is subject to the ECP. In subject positions, this empty category is not properly governed, violating the ECP (unless it is lexicalized). The theoretical assumptions embedded in the ECP account are no longer tenable; therefore, it would be desirable to derive the same restriction from currently available assumptions.

In fact, BNs with null D heads instantiate the illicit configuration (8), as shown in (13).

(13) *Bare noun subjects*



The [P] feature on T selects a specifier with a phonologically overt head; this is nothing but the plain old EPP, now construed as any other selectional feature. (9b), (10b), (11b), and (12b) fail to meet this requirement. (9a), (10a), (11a), and (12a,c), by contrast, do not impose this requirement on their object BNs, since V and P do not bear a [P] feature.

⁵ To guarantee that the subject in (12b) is not left-dislocated, the object is dislocated.

One may wonder, at this point, how the present account is compatible with Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou's (1998) idea, adopted here, that the EPP in null subject languages is satisfied by V-to-T raising. Italian and Spanish being null subject languages, the [P] feature on T should have been satisfied already by the raised V, thus failing to force a lexical D in the subject position. To answer this question, we may further follow Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (see also Solà 1992, Barbosa 1996) in assuming that preverbal subjects in null subject languages occupy an \bar{A} -position, distinct from Spec,TP. The head licensing this position, then, would bear a [P] feature distinct from T's, similarly excluding a BN in its specifier.

Despite their similarities, the present EPP account and the classical ECP accounts differ in some crucial respects. First, as noted above, null elements are not subject to any specific licensing conditions in the current account. Second, within the classical analysis, the offending configurations were excluded at LF, whereas here they are phonologically ill formed. In this respect, the current account is more akin to PF versions of the EPP than to LF versions of the sort adopted by Contreras (1986) and Longobardi (1994).

There are also empirical advantages to this shift. First, it has been observed that BNs are impossible as small clause subjects.

(14) a. *Spanish*

*Consideramos caro café.
we.consider expensive coffee
'We consider coffee expensive.'

b. *Italian*

*Consideravo studenti intelligenti.
I.consider students intelligent
'I consider students intelligent.'

This is a problem for standard versions of the ECP, including Longobardi's (although not Contreras's), since the null D head is externally governed by the matrix verb. It is not a problem for the EPP account, on the simple assumption that small clauses too impose an EPP requirement on their subject; hence, its head must be overt.

Second, consider a puzzle noted by both Contreras and Longobardi: namely, the fact that *conjoined* BNs are possible in subject position.

(15) a. *Spanish*

Viejos y niños escuchaban con atención sus palabras.
old.people and children listened with attention his/her words
'Old people and children listened attentively to his/her words.'

b. *Italian*

Cane e gatto sono sempre nemici.
dog and cat are always enemies
'The dog and the cat are always enemies.'

The grammaticality of these examples is a total mystery for any approach that posits special

licensing conditions on null categories. Why should the null category inside a BN be exempt from the ECP when the BN is conjoined? A straightforward explanation is offered by the selectional EPP account. The head of the conjunction is *y/e*, a phonologically overt item. Since *this* is the head of the phrase in Spec,TP, rather than the D heads of its constituents, it serves to satisfy the [P] requirement of T.⁶

The present proposal faces some obvious challenges. First, within Romance, it is well known that certain nouns can occur without any determiner in subject positions. Importantly, proper names are such nouns, as well as N(egative)-words. For these, I will essentially adopt Longobardi's solution: proper names in Romance overtly raise to the D position (see Longobardi 1994 for compelling evidence). Consequently, the head of the subject DP is phonologically overt, satisfying the EPP. The same analysis is extended by Déprez (2000) to N-words (see the next section).

A second challenge concerns the occurrence of BNs of various types in subject positions outside Romance (e.g., *Children were playing in the yard*). For these cases we will need to set up some space of parametric variation. I return to these issues in section 5.2.

3.1.2 Bare Negative Polarity Items Independent support for the present analysis comes from a parallelism in Romance between BNs and N-words functioning as negative polarity items (NPIs) or negative quantifiers. Déprez (2000) observes that the subject-object asymmetry in the distribution of BNs in Romance is mirrored by an asymmetry in the distribution of N-words: the latter require the co-presence of negation when occurring as objects and preclude it as subjects (under the 'negative concord' reading).

- (16) a. *(Non) ho visto nessuno.
 *(not) I.have seen nobody
 'I didn't see anyone.'
 b. Nessuno (*non) ha telefonato.
 nobody (*not) has called
 'No one called.'

Déprez argues that within the scope of Neg, N-words are introduced by a null D, interpreted as a variable. Because it is null, however, this head cannot satisfy the EPP. As a last resort operation, N-to-D movement applies inside subject N-words, endowing them with intrinsic quantificational force and allowing them to check the D-feature of T. Indeed, this internal head movement yields visible word order effects. The correlation with BNs is obtained by assuming that in the same Romance languages, BNs are truly bare NPs, lacking a DP layer. Thus, they too cannot check the D-feature of T. Without D, however, N-to-D movement cannot apply; therefore, BNs are excluded from subject positions.

⁶ A similar line is taken by Déprez (2000). However, Déprez follows Chomsky (1995) in reducing the EPP to D-checking; consequently, she must posit a D-feature on Conj⁰, even when conjoining two BNs, an unnecessary stipulation in the present analysis. Heycock and Zamparelli (2003) explain the alleviating effect of conjunction on BN subjects in Romance by assuming an internal raising of the conjoined NP to the specifier position of a null D, to check a Quantifier feature; this specifier-head agreement somehow licenses the null D. Although the proposal has some interesting semantic effects, the resulting notion of 'licensing a null D' is rather artificial.

The account proposed here shares with Déprez's the insight that the asymmetric distribution of BNs in Romance should fall under the EPP, rather than the ECP. Still, there are significant differences. First, I assume that NPs are intrinsically predicative, hence cannot occur in argument positions. The source of the ban on subject BNs thus must be the null D head introducing BNs (as in Contreras's and Longobardi's accounts). In fact, in Déprez's analysis, it is not clear what prevents generating BNs in Romance as null-headed DPs and "saving" them in subject positions by N-to-D movement, on a par with N-words.

Second, in the account proposed here, the EPP translates to a PF requirement, not to syntactic feature checking. What makes BNs and weak N-words a natural class in Romance is, plainly, the fact that they are both headed by a null D, incapable of satisfying [P]. Strong N-words (like proper names) lexicalize the D position via N-to-D movement, thus becoming eligible for EPP positions.

In contrast, Déprez's account cannot directly appeal to the phonological content of D as relevant to the EPP, since the latter is taken to be a syntactic condition (checking of a D-feature). Déprez is thus led to the unappealing position whereby a null D in N-words effectively lacks the D-feature needed to check the EPP. Furthermore, to explain how N-to-D movement amends this situation, she assumes that N checks some ϕ -feature on D, this operation somehow producing a categorial D-feature. These stipulations can immediately be dispensed with once we make the EPP sensitive to purely phonological visibility.⁷

Kayne (1975, 1981) discusses a pattern in French similar to (16). Kayne claims that *de*-NPs in French, licensed in negative environments, are introduced by a null quantifier. This claim is motivated by the syntactic and semantic parallelism between (17b) and (17c).

- (17) a. *Jean a trouvé de livres.
 Jean has found of books
- b. Jean n'a pas trouvé [\emptyset_Q de livres].
 Jean NEG-has not found of books
 'Jean hasn't found any books.'
- c. Jean n'a pas trouvé beaucoup de livres.
 Jean NEG-has not found many of books
 'Jean hasn't found many books.'

Although Kayne (1981) analyzes the empty category inside the object of (17b) as a QP specifier of NP, I will follow more recent practice and take it to be the head of a QP projection, *de livres* being its complement. Interestingly, Kayne observes that such null-headed QPs are excluded from subject positions, exhibiting the familiar ECP asymmetry.⁸

⁷ Déprez also argues that N-to-D movement in subject N-words is a substitution operation, "suppressing" the null D (and inducing a semantic type-shift). It is unclear how this suppressed D, removed from both the syntactic and semantic representations, can check the EPP feature. The Romance-internal split between BNs, which cannot resort to N-to-D movement, and N-words, which can, must therefore be dealt with on a par with the contrast between BNs and proper names (Longobardi 1994). Evidently, semantic criteria restrict the class of "raising" nouns in Romance.

⁸ Following the discussion of N-words above, the null category may be a D rather than a Q head, depending on whether or not it is associated with intrinsic quantificational meaning. I leave this issue open, as the only thing that

- (18) a. Jean ne voudrait pas que tu boives [_{QP} \emptyset_Q de bière].
 Jean NEG would.like not that you drink of beer
 ‘Jean wouldn’t like you to drink beer.’
- b. *Jean ne voudrait pas que [_{QP} \emptyset_Q de bière] lui coule dessus.
 Jean NEG would.like not that of beer to.him spill on
 ‘Jean wouldn’t like beer to spill on him.’

In present terms, the contrast is reduced to the fact that T bears a [P] feature that selects for a specifier with a phonologically overt head; QPs headed by a null Q violate this selectional requirement. By contrast, inside VP there is no [P] feature to force an overt head in the object QP.

To summarize, the selectional view of the EPP provides a natural, straightforward account of the fact that BNs and null-headed QPs in Romance are subject to stricter conditions in subject positions than in object positions. Importantly, it does so by using the same principle that already distinguishes subject from object positions (namely, the EPP), not postulating any additional theoretical difference between them (like the ECP). One corollary of this particular view of the EPP is that no null head will be able to satisfy [P], regardless of how it came to be null—by base generation or movement. In that respect, this view of the EPP shares the basic intuition of representational approaches to the ECP (Kayne 1981, Stowell 1981, Contreras 1986). Whether and how this view can be incorporated into a derivational model of grammar is a question I return to in section 7.⁹

3.1.3 Sentential Subjects Let us now turn to prediction (7b): if a head alternates between a lexical and a null variant, only the former will be possible when selected by [P]. In other words, an EPP environment forces pronunciation of heads that are otherwise optionally null.

matters in the present context is the phonetic invisibility of the head, not its syntactic label or logical denotation. Déprez (2000:(42)) provides a pair parallel to (18), where the (lexically frozen) BN *grand monde* ‘many people’ is felicitous in a postverbal but not in a preverbal position.

⁹ Clearly, a vast number of phenomena have been treated under the classical ECP, many of which my proposal does not address. This partial overlap should not, in itself, be considered a weakness, since it may well be the case that ‘classical ECP effects’ in fact never formed a natural class. Subject-object asymmetries in extraction, for example, are treated by Rizzi and Shlonsky (to appear) as reflecting ‘criterial freezing’ of the subject position. Rizzi and Shlonsky argue that strictly speaking, structural subjects can never move; subject extraction either skips the structural subject position (proceeding directly from the thematic position) or leaves a resumptive pronoun. The effects of these strategies—which vary greatly across languages—are not always phonologically transparent, since expletives and pronouns may be incorporated or even null. Quite plausibly, then, these facts lie outside the domain of the present investigation.

Similarly, the ban on extraction of quantitative *en* from derived subjects in French—as opposed to free extraction of genitive *en*—was taken to be an ECP effect (Rizzi 1990). Yet Boivin (2000) shows convincingly that the contrast reduces to Case theory. Perhaps the strongest argument against an ECP account is the fact that a null N head is licensed precisely where a null N trace is not.

- (i) *_{[DP} Trois _{t_i]} _{en_i} sont déjà cassés _{t_j}.
 three of.them are already broken
 ‘Three of them were already broken.’

- (ii) [Trois \emptyset_N]_j sont déjà cassés _{t_j}.
 three are already broken
 ‘Three were already broken.’

On the view that neither the ECP nor the EPP distinguishes empty categories by their origin, the ungrammaticality of (i) should be attributed to some independent principle, as it is in Boivin 2000.

One case that nicely fits this description is the head of a sentential subject. It is well known that the complementizer is obligatory in such contexts; compare (19) with (20).

- (19) a. People widely assume (that) politics is corrupting.
 b. Everyone would prefer (for) Mary to be our representative.
- (20) a. *(That) politics is corrupting is widely assumed.
 b. *(For) Mary to be our representative would be preferred by everyone.

It is a matter of some dispute whether the preposed clause occupies subject or topic position (or both, via a chain). Happily, we need not take any position on the issue. Whether selected by $T_{[P]}$ or by $Top_{[P]}$, the head of the preposed clause must be phonetically realized. Such facts have received various treatments in the literature, based on certain interpretations of the ECP (Stowell 1981) or pronunciation principles (Pesetsky 1998). Pesetsky and Torrego (2001), in a rather technical proposal, derive the obligatory presence of *that* in declarative clausal subjects from the idea that in order to be attracted by the matrix T, such clauses must bear a T-feature, and *that* is, in fact, a spell-out of the embedded T raised to C.

Within the current framework, the ECP is not available; Pesetsky's appeal to the privileged PF status of edge elements—complementizers and *wh*-phrases—is not necessary, and neither is the intricate featural analysis of the T-C system developed by Pesetsky and Torrego. In present terms, what makes the C position special is that it is a head (hence, subject to selection), rather than that it is peripheral or needs a “visible” T-feature. Indeed, being a head is the single feature of a null category that potentially restricts its distribution. The merit of the present proposal lies in the fact that it situates the phenomenon of C-deletion in preposed clauses within a natural class of other EPP-related phenomena, with no recourse to auxiliary assumptions.¹⁰

3.2 Initial Adjuncts

A different instantiation of configuration (8), not covered by standard ECP accounts, involves PP adjuncts headed by a null P. The present analysis helps explain some puzzling gaps in the distribution of these adjuncts. Let us look at examples from Hebrew.

¹⁰ In Pesetsky's (1998) Optimality Theory analysis, a specific constraint (the DCP—Deletion in CP Principle) guarantees that null C heads will incur violations in all but complement positions. This principle seems to extend to obligatory-C effects in adjunct positions as well—at the cost, however, of treating C-less object relatives (e.g., *the man I met*) as complements. The present proposal is not intended to capture all obligatory-C effects; I simply point out that an important subset of them (i.e., those found in sentential subjects) naturally fall under the selectional view of the EPP. The absence of such effects from (bridge) complement positions thus follows from the lack of [P] features on lexical heads; it need not be stipulated. Note that if “extraposition” is analyzed as movement to the specifier of some functional projection, obligatory-C effects in extraposed clauses will also follow.

Potentially troublesome for the proposed account are preposed infinitives and *wh*-clauses, whose C head is presumably null.

- (i) To fail this exam would be disastrous.
 (ii) Where she found this wreck of a car is unclear.

As to (i), one might speculate that the infinitival head *to* somehow “counts” as the head of CP—perhaps by truncation of the CP layer (see Pesetsky 1998 for a somewhat different implementation of this idea, where *to* is allowed to satisfy Left Edge). I return to (ii) in section 5.2.

In Hebrew, PP adjuncts that contain full finite clauses may appear either initially or at the end of the sentence; as usual, the initial position signifies topicality of the adjunct.

- (21) a. Azavnu mukdam axrey/lifney/lamrot še-Rina ne'elva.
left.1PL early after/before/even.though that-Rina was.insulted
'We left early after/before/even though Rina was insulted.'
b. Axrey/Lifney/Lamrot še-Rina ne'elva, azavnu mukdam.
after/before/even.though that-Rina was.insulted left.1PL early
'After/Before/Even though Rina was insulted, we left early.'
- (22) a. Azavnu mukdam mipney/keyvan/biglal še-Rina ne'elva.
left.1PL early because that-Rina was.insulted
'We left early because Rina was insulted.'
b. Mipney/Keyvan/Biglal še-Rina ne'elva, azavnu mukdam.
because that-Rina was.insulted left.1PL early
'Because Rina was insulted, we left early.'

Notice that unlike in English, in Hebrew the overt complementizer (*še*- 'that') is preserved after the preposition heading the adjunct; in fact, it is obligatory. The pattern seen in (21)–(22) is entirely systematic, with one exception. In addition to the reason adjuncts illustrated in (22), Hebrew has another reason adjunct, headed by the morpheme *ki*, normally glossed as 'because'. Interestingly, *ki* is incompatible with the complementizer *še*-.

- (23) Azavnu mukdam (*še) ki (*še) Rina ne'elva.
left.1PL early (*that) ki (*that) Rina was.insulted
'We left early because Rina was insulted.'

The simplest account of this fact would be that unlike the morphemes *mipney/keyvan/biglal* 'because' in (22), *ki* is a complementizer, not a preposition, hence occupies the position normally reserved for *še*-. In fact, Hebrew provides both synchronic and diachronic evidence for this claim. First, *ki* can actually replace *še*- as the standard declarative complementizer (24a) (this is typical of formal registers, including news reports). Second, in Biblical Hebrew *ki* functioned as the conditional complementizer (24b) (alongside its modern functions).

- (24) a. Dover cahal masar od še/ki ha-xakira adayin be-icuma.
spokesman IDF notified more that/that the-investigation still in-its.middle
'The IDF spokesman further notified that the investigation is still underway.'
b. Ve-haya ki tavo el ha-arec ašer adonay elohexa noten lexa
and-it.shall.be ki you.will.come to the-land which the.Lord your.god gives to.you
naxala, vi-yrišta ve-yašavta ba.
inheritance and-possess.it and-dwell in.it
'And it shall be, when thou art come in unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance, and possesseth it, and dwellest therein.'
(Deuteronomy 26:1)

Accepting the conclusion that *ki* is a complementizer, the question arises, where does the adverbial ‘reason’ semantics come from? Given that *ki* can only carry the ‘bleached’ semantics of a declarative complementizer in Modern Hebrew, its association with the particular ‘because’ meaning—an association that is strictly obligatory in (23)—is somewhat puzzling.

The solution, I argue, lies in some hidden ‘zero syntax.’ In particular, let us suppose that the *ki*-adjunct in (23) is actually introduced by a null preposition with the requisite semantics of a reason.

- (25) *Structure of adjunct in (23)*
 [PP \emptyset_{bec} [CP *ki* [TP Rina ne’elva]]]

\emptyset_{bec} is the null counterpart of *mipney/keyvan/biglal* in Hebrew and *because* in English. As a matter of lexical selection (I-selection), it selects a *ki*-headed complement. This is the reason why *ki*-adjuncts are interpreted as reason adverbials and why Hebrew speakers often translate *ki* as ‘because’. Strictly speaking, though, it is \emptyset_{bec} , not *ki* (with which it is uniquely associated), that determines the adverbial semantics.

This analysis—independently supported on Hebrew-internal grounds—now combines with the EPP theory outlined above to yield a remarkable prediction: *ki*-adjuncts will resist topicalization. This can easily be seen by substituting \emptyset_{bec} for Z and Top for H in (8). The null preposition cannot satisfy the Topic selectional [P] feature.

- (26) *[TopP [PP \emptyset_{bec} [CP *ki* . . .]] [Top, Top_[P] . . .]

The prediction is borne out; *ki*-adjuncts with the ‘reason’ semantics can never be initial.

- (27) *Ki Rina ne’elva, azavnu mukdam.
 KI Rina was.insulted left.1PL early
 ‘Because Rina was insulted, we left early.’

(27) should be contrasted with (23), where the *ki*-adjunct is legitimate in a final position, and with (22b), where the overtly headed reason adjuncts are legitimate in initial position. It is only when \emptyset_{bec} occupies a position that is phonologically selected by an EPP feature that it becomes ungrammatical. Moreover, since \emptyset_{bec} has no lexical allomorph—recall that the other ‘because’ prepositions I-select a *še*-clause, not a *ki*-clause—there is no alternative pronunciation that would redeem the structure. Notice that (27) is predicted to be ungrammatical whether the topic *ki*-adjunct merges internally or externally—that is, whether it ends up in its surface position by movement or base generation; either way, it cannot satisfy [P] on Top.¹¹ That the nontopicalizable PP adjunct is precisely the one independently established to be headed by a null head is directly predicted by the present analysis.

Similar findings emerge in other languages. In Korean, the reason postposition *se* is optional in the base position of the adjunct and obligatory when the adjunct is initial (Ahn and Cho 2006).

¹¹ Lack of reconstruction effects suggests that base generation is more likely.

- (28) a. Mary-ka manhi apha-(se) kyelsekhay-ss-ta.
 Mary-NOM a.lot sick-(because) absent-PAST-DECL
 'Mary was absent because she was very sick.'
 b. Manhi apha-*(se) Mary-ka kyelsekhay-ss-ta.

Likewise, the Italian preposition *per* is obligatory in initial adjuncts (forming *perché* with the complementizer) and optional in the base position (Caterina Donati, pers. comm.).

- (29) a. Giovanni piange (per)ché Maria se ne è andata.
 Giovanni cries (because)that Maria CL CL is gone
 'Giovanni cries because Maria has gone.'
 b. *(Per)ché Maria se ne è andata Giovanni piange.

Thus, what appears superficially to be a quirky gap in the syntax of adjuncts in unrelated languages proves to be a principled consequence of the present view of the EPP.

3.3 Bare NP Adverbs

Larson (1985) has drawn attention to a class of adverbials in English, expressing time, place, or manner, that have the surface form of bare NPs.

- (30) a. I saw John *that moment/hour/day/week/year*.
 b. You have lived *every place* that Max has lived.
 c. We were headed *that direction*.
 d. You pronounced my name *that way*.

Although Larson himself analyzes these adverbials as bare NPs, subsequent research has followed Bresnan and Grimshaw (1978) in favoring the view that these are PPs headed by a null P (Emonds 1987, McCawley 1988). The present analysis therefore predicts that such adverbials will be excluded from environments like (8).

The prediction is mostly borne out. Durative time adverbials can indeed be fronted only when introduced by an overt preposition, which is otherwise optional (Morzycki 2001). The same restriction is attested with locational NP adverbs, and with punctual time adverbials containing proper time names ((33) is from Czepluch 1982:fn. 16).

- (31) a. They slept (for) an hour and then went to work.
 b. *(For) an hour, they slept, and then went to work.
 (32) a. She has lived (in) few places with so much sunlight.
 b. *(In) few places with so much sunlight has she lived.
 (33) a. He came back (on) October 1st.
 b. *(On) October 1st, he came back.

Oddly, other punctual time adverbials (generally, anaphoric ones) seem to be tolerated in the preposed position with or without a preposition.

- (34) a. (On) that day, he met Jane.
 b. (On) the same evening, the murderer hit again.

(31b), (32b), and (33b) are predictably ungrammatical, on the assumption that “bare NP adverbs” are really PPs headed by a null preposition. Assuming that the preposed adverbial occupies Spec,Top, the null preposition fails to satisfy the [P] feature of Top. The prepositionless versions of (34) present a problem, then. One can imagine two solutions: (a) without the preposition, the adverbials in (34) are truly bare NPs, or rather DPs (hence, D satisfies [P]); (b) the adverbials in (34) are adjoined to TP, hence not selected by any [P] feature. I tend toward solution (b), but the question remains, of course, what criterion distinguishes “specifier” adverbials like those in (31)–(33) from adjunct adverbials like those in (34).¹²

Interesting facts concerning the distribution of accusative durative NPs in Russian are reported by Fowler and Yadroff (1993). These adverbials optionally occur with unergative verbs; however, when the verb carries the aspectual prefix *pro-*, the adverbial assumes a “quasi-argument” status, in Fowler and Yadroff’s terms, and becomes obligatory.

- (35) a. On prygal na odnoj noge (ves’ den’).
 he hopped on one foot (all day.ACC)
 ‘He hopped on one foot all day.’
 b. On proprygal na odnoj noge *(ves’ den’).
 he hopped.through on one foot *(all day.ACC)
 ‘He spent all day hopping on one foot.’

Correspondingly, the accusative adverbial may be marginally passivized only with a *pro-* verb; if *pro-* is absent, the result is strictly ungrammatical.

- (36) a. *Ves’ den’ prygalsja (im) na odnoj noge.
 all day.NOM was.hopped (by.him) on one foot
 ‘All day was hopped on one foot (by him).’
 b. ?Ves’ den’ byl proprygan (im) na odnoj noge.
 all day.NOM was hopped (by.him) on one foot
 ‘All day was spent (by him) hopping on one foot.’

Fowler and Yadroff propose that durative NP adverbials are introduced by a null preposition Dur, and they further suggest that (36b) involves a “pseudopassive” derivation, where Dur affixes to and reanalyzes with the verb. Plausibly, such affixation is excluded for nonarguments, which is why it fails to apply in (36a).

Notice, though, that this proposal only goes halfway toward explaining the ungrammaticality of (36a). With V-P reanalysis excluded, Fowler and Yadroff correctly rule out DP-movement to

¹² For unclear reasons, directional and manner-NP-based adverbials resist fronting even when introduced by an overt preposition, rendering them irrelevant for our purposes.

- (i) * (In) that direction, I think they went.
 (ii) * (In) that way, he always pronounces my name.

Spec,TP (37a) (presumably, PP is a barrier); but movement of the entire PP, pied-piping the null Dur, is still an option (37b).

- (37) a. * $[_{TP} DP_i T [_{VP} V_{pass} \dots [_{PP} Dur t_i] \dots]]$
 b. * $[_{TP}[_{PP} Dur DP]_i T [_{VP} V_{pass} \dots t_i \dots]]$

In order to rule out (37b), we need only invoke the now-familiar condition (8): a null category may not head a phrase merged in an EPP position. Only with this assumption can the explanation for the ungrammaticality of (36a) be considered complete.¹³ Thus, we have another piece of evidence favoring of the selectional view of the EPP.

The failure of null-headed PPs to undergo passive in Russian may in fact provide a clue for a much broader restriction on verbal passives across languages. As documented in detail in Landau 2002b, object experiencer verbs fail to passivize in many languages. This failure, I argue, is due to the fact that accusative object experiencers are actually concealed PPs, headed by a null P (termed \emptyset_P). In languages lacking a pseudopassive strategy, the null P (and its complement) will end up in Spec,TP, an EPP position, in violation of condition (8).¹⁴

3.4 Indirect (Applied) Objects

Among the numerous analyses of the double object construction (DOC), there is a notable class of proposals treating the first object (the “goal”) as a PP headed by a null P (Czepluch 1982, Kayne 1984, Den Dikken 1995, Baker 1997).

- (38) a. George kicked $[_{PP} \emptyset_P [_{DP} the boy]]$ the ball.
 b. Fred baked $[_{PP} \emptyset_P [_{DP} the kids]]$ coconut cookies.

Without delving into the complexity of issues surrounding DOCs, let me point out a straightforward dividend of the proposed account. If null-headed PPs are excluded from certain peripheral positions, and if the indirect object in a DOC is indeed such a PP, we immediately derive a well-known but poorly understood restriction: namely, that the indirect object in a DOC resists displacement of the \bar{A} -type (Culicover and Wexler 1973, Hornstein and Weinberg 1981, Whitney 1982, Den Dikken 1995).

- (39) a. *Who did George kick the ball?
 b. *Those kids, Fred baked coconut cookies.
 c. *It was Larry that we gave the keys.

¹³ Fowler and Yadroff attribute the marginality of (36b) to a morphological conflict between Dur and the passive affixes on the verb. Notice that the present proposal does not predict that overtly headed PPs will be freely passivizable in Russian. Presumably, passivization is contingent on the verb’s ability to absorb the Case of the promoted object, which will be impossible with nonaccusative objects.

¹⁴ See Landau 2002a, to appear, for much evidence that object experiencers are universally oblique. In those works, I maintained that as a parametric option, $[_{PP} \emptyset_P DP]$ may occupy Spec,TP in languages with quirky subjects (e.g., Finnish). That idea is not obviously compatible with the claim that condition (8) universally holds of TP projections. In section 5.2, I pursue a possible interpretation of condition (8) that sometimes allows certain null heads to appear in Spec,TP (as in the case of English subject bare nouns). Quirky experiencer subjects may fall under the same analysis.

The attracting heads—C and Top—bear the [P] feature, which selects for a phrase with an overt head. The indirect object of a DOC is precisely not such a phrase.¹⁵

4 Head Doubling

In this section, I examine a class of topic/focus constructions in which the head of the topic/focus constituent is pronounced twice: both in the Topic/Focus position, to which it moves, and in some lower position. We will see that both phonetic occurrences of that head are required by some [P] feature or an equivalent PF condition.

4.1 DP-Doubling in Split Topicalization

In split topicalization, attested in languages like German and Croatian, a phrase is broken up into two or more pieces, each occupying some derived position (Van Riemsdijk 1989, Fanselow and Čavar 2002). The following German example illustrates the splitting of a plural DP:

- (40) *Neue Bücher hat sie keine interessanten gekannt.*
 new books has she no interesting known
 ‘As for new books, she knew no interesting ones.’

There is solid evidence, from island sensitivity, that the two parts of the split phrase are related by movement. However, there is equally solid evidence that the source phrase cannot be literally split up by some syntactic operation. In particular, DPs that are otherwise islands for extraction—subjects of non-unaccusative verbs, dative and genitive objects—can be split. Most importantly, when singular count nouns are split, the determiner must be doubled, which is completely unexpected if the fronted constituent is a proper subpart of DP.

- (41) *Einen alten Professor kennt sie keinen.*
 an old professor knows she no
 ‘As for old professors, she knows none.’

Fanselow and Čavar propose that these data can be explained if we assume that the entire DP is copied into each of its surface positions, followed by partial deletion of complementary portions in the different locations. They note additionally that ‘the right part of the XP must be focal, while the left-hand part may be a (link-) topic or a second focus’ (p. 85). Thus, both parts occupy

¹⁵ In principle, the same logic could be extended to movement to Spec,TP, to account for the restrictions on passivization of DOCs. However, it is well known that these restrictions vary widely across speakers and lexical choices. One dialect is represented in (i).

- (i) Mary was given/?bought/*baked a cake.

Perhaps reanalysis of θ_P with the passive verb is an interfering factor here, but this is just a speculation.

If Landau, to appear, is correct, all object experiencers are in fact of the form [_{PP} θ_P DP], predicting similar restrictions on displacement. Indeed, object experiencers resist passivization in many languages and sometimes require resumption under relativization. Still, they seem to be more tolerant to *wh*-movement than indirect objects in DOCs. I suspect that this difference stems from the greater susceptibility of θ_P to reanalysis with the verb in the case of psych verbs as compared with DOC verbs; this makes sense if the inner object in a DOC is some sort of small-clause subject.

Observe next that split topicalization of a PP can—in fact, must—give rise to P-doubling. Both copies of P are required in (44).

- (44) *In Schlössern habe ich noch in keinen gewohnt.*
 in castles have I yet in no lived
 ‘So far, I have not yet lived in any castle.’

This case naturally falls together with D-doubling; the head P must be pronounced in both the PP positions that contain an EPP feature.

Note that on both Van Riemsdijk’s (1989) and Fanselow and Čavar’s (2002) accounts, the emergence of the doubled D or P is attributed to German-specific well-formedness conditions on the phonological shape of DPs and PPs. By contrast, the present account holds that D- and P-doubling in split topicalization arise from the need to satisfy two distinct [P] features occurring on two separate heads. Whether or not the head of the fronted DP/PP bears the feature to be checked—[+top] or [+foc]—its head status forces it to be pronounced in every site to which it is fronted. I take it that this type of account, avoiding reference to language-specific spell-out strategies, is to be preferred on grounds of generality.

4.2 Intermediate P-Stranding

The possibility of partial deletion in chain copies, illustrated in (42), raises interesting issues for other “split” constructions. Consider P-stranding. Postal (1972) first observed that P-stranding is restricted to base positions; stranding a preposition in an intermediate Spec,CP (or Spec,TopP) position always results in strong ungrammaticality (46). Note that in and of themselves, embedded *wh*-phrases or topics are relatively weak islands (47); hence, the strong deviance of (46) must be independently explained.

- (45) a. Which bed did Mary sleep in?
 b. That bed, Mary slept in.
- (46) a. *Which bed did he say [_{CP} in (that) Mary slept]?
 b. *That bed, he said [_{CP} in (that) Mary slept].
- (47) a. ?Which artist did he wonder which picture of people like best?
 b. ?That artist, he said that quite a few pictures of people misunderstood.

Sentences like (46a) have two possible derivations. On the first derivation, the PP *in which bed* is pied-piped to the intermediate Spec,CP, from which the complement DP is subsequently extracted; on the second derivation, the entire PP is copied to both embedded and matrix Spec,CP positions, but only P is “subdeleted” in the highest copy. The two derivations are schematized in (48).

- (48) a. *Subextraction*
 Which bed_j did he say [_{CP}[in ~~which bed~~]_j]_i (that) Mary slept [~~in which bed~~]_i?
 b. *Subdeletion*
 [~~in which bed~~]_i did he say [_{CP}[in ~~which bed~~]_j]_i (that) Mary slept [~~in which bed~~]_i?

The crucial difference between (48a) and (48b) lies in the target of the second step of the *wh*-movement. In (48a), the DP is extracted from within the higher PP copy. There are two distinct chains—a PP chain and a DP chain—each of which receives standard pronunciation, that is, full deletion of the lower copy and full pronunciation of the higher one. In (48b), on the other hand, there is a single PP chain with three copies; the lowest one is fully deleted, and the two higher copies undergo complementary partial deletions, with P deleting in the highest copy and DP in the middle one.

The subextraction derivation (48a) can be ruled out by the Minimal Link Condition (MLC). Without delving into the complexities of pied-piping, let us assume a simple feature-copying convention that marks a head with a feature (say, [+wh]) of its complement or specifier.

(49) *Pied-piping convention*

- a. $[_{XP} ZP [_{X'} X YP_{[+wh]}]] \rightarrow [_{XP} ZP [_{X'} X_{[+wh]} YP_{[+wh]}]]_{[+wh]}$
 b. $[_{XP} ZP_{[+wh]} [_{X'} X YP]] \rightarrow [_{XP} ZP_{[+wh]} [_{X'} X_{[+wh]} YP]]_{[+wh]}$

Under standard assumptions, the [+wh] feature copied from the complement/specifier to the head X will project to the entire XP, making it visible to *wh*-movement. Thus, in order for the PP *in which bed* to be attracted to the intermediate Spec,CP in (48a–b), (49a) must have applied. Since the entire PP is marked [+wh] (we assume that the effect of (49a) cannot be undone), it must proceed to move as a unit: by the MLC, the matrix $C_{[+wh]}$ cannot attract the DP *which bed*, which is properly contained inside the PP, but must instead attract the closer [+wh] category, which is the PP itself.¹⁶ Notice that P-stranding is licensed in (45) since the (optional) pied-piping convention had not applied in the first place; hence, the closest [+wh] category is the only such one, namely, the DP object of P.

The alternative, subdeletion derivation (48b) can only be ruled out by the present EPP analysis. Following Fanselow and Ćavar (2002), I take it that partial deletion of chain copies is possible in the grammar; hence, derivation (48b) is in principle available and cannot be dismissed without comment. What goes wrong in it is the failure to pronounce the P head of the fronted PP in an EPP environment: namely, the specifier of $C_{[+wh]}$, which also bears the [P] feature. In that sense, (48b) is ruled out for the same reason that forces P-doubling in (44): a head must be pronounced to satisfy the selectional EPP.¹⁷

4.3 V-Doubling in VP-Fronting and Predicate Clefts

Split topicalization of DPs and PPs is rather uncommon crosslinguistically, presumably because most languages do not make available clause-internal Focus projections, over and above the

¹⁶ (47a) allows subextraction of the inner *wh*-phrase because the [Q] feature of the outer one has already been checked and deleted in the embedded Spec,CP. The marginality of the example is on a par with that of other *wh*-island examples, which presumably violate the Phase Impenetrability Condition, not the MLC.

¹⁷ On an economy interpretation, PF should *only* target EPP positions. Thus, if the embedded clauses in (46) contained no TopP projection, there would be no [P]-bearing head in their left periphery to justify the pronunciation of *in*. The analysis in the text then applies to situations where the stranded P can be somehow phonologically justified, and still, its null copy in the matrix clause is illicit. A natural question, which I leave open, is why P-doubling is excluded in English (and most languages, for that matter), unlike German (**In which bed did he say (that) in (that) she slept?*).

clause-peripheral ones. Lexical doubling, in contrast, is much more common when the fronted category is V or VP; in that situation, the higher V copy spells out a topic/focus feature, while the lower copy carries inflection and tense.

V-doubling is attested in many African languages of the Kwa/Kru families, Caribbean creoles, Russian, Yiddish, Brazilian Portuguese, Korean, and Hebrew (for a recent survey, see Landau 2006 and the references therein). Some examples are given in (50) (the two verbal copies are italicized).

- (50) a. *Yoruba* (Dekydtspotter 1992)
Fifín ni Tolú *fín* mi ní ìgbá.
 giving COP Tolu gave me CASE calabash
 ‘Tolu GAVE me the calabash.’
- b. *Russian* (Abels 2001)
Dumat’ o ženit’be (-to) on *dumaet*—no nikogda on ne ženitsja.
 to.think about marriage (PRT) he thinks but never he not marry.self
 ‘He does think about marriage, but he will never marry.’
- c. *Korean* (Jo 2003)
 Chelswu-ka ku chayk-ul *ilk*-ki-nun *ilk*-ess-ta.
 Chelswu-NOM the book-ACC read-NMZ-TOP read-PAST-DECL
 ‘Chelswu did read the book (but . . .)’
- d. *Hebrew*
Liknot et ha-praxim, hi *kanta*.
 to.buy ACC the-flowers she bought
 ‘Buy the flowers, she did.’

There are a number of differences among the various instantiations of V(P)-fronting in the world’s languages, which I briefly mention. In the African/creole constructions, the fronted predicate is syntactically clefted and expresses focus; in languages like Russian and Yiddish, the fronted predicate functions as a topic. Furthermore, in some languages the fronted category can only be a bare verb (Vata, Haitian, Igbo); in others VP-internal material can be freely carried along (Yoruba, Brazilian Portuguese, Hebrew). These differences are important in themselves; but as they do not bear on the present discussion, I leave them aside.

What is relevant here are the following observations. First, topic/focus V-doubling constructions typically exhibit island sensitivity. Second, it appears to be universally true that while the lower verbal copy carries the normal inflection of the clause, the higher one receives some ‘‘default’’ form: a bare root (Vata, Haitian), a nominalized verb (Yoruba, Korean), or an infinitive (Russian, Hebrew). Third, in the constructions at hand, V-doubling is obligatory; failing to pronounce either the low or the high verbal copy results in ungrammaticality.

The first observation is standardly accounted for by assuming that V-doubling constructions are derived by \bar{A} -movement. The second observation is naturally explained if the copied element is either the root itself \sqrt{V} or the stem V, prior to its fusion with the T/Agr-features that reside under the T node (see Landau 2006 for discussion).

The third observation follows from the present analysis of the EPP. Let us assume that a topicalized VP is attracted by a Top head at the left periphery. Assume also that the head of the copied VP is itself already a copy of V-raising to T. The base VP is deleted, and pronunciation targets both remaining copies of V.

$$(51) \text{ [}_{\text{TopP}}[\text{VP V}_{[+\text{top}]} \text{XP YP}] \text{Top}_{[\text{P}]} [\text{TP Subj V-T}_{[\text{VP}]} \text{Subj V XP YP}]]$$

The V copy in T must be pronounced because of an independent PF requirement: namely, the need to support the T/Agr-features (the Stray Affix Filter).¹⁸ The V copy in Spec,Top must be pronounced because Top bears a [P] feature, effectively selecting a phonetic head for its specifier. The important thing to note in this analysis is that pronunciation of the low V copy in T does not exempt the high V copy from pronunciation; the EPP requirement of Top is strictly local and cannot be satisfied by the occurrence of phonetic V copies anywhere outside Spec,Top. The inevitable result is doubling.¹⁹

5 The EPP as P-Selection

5.1 Selection or Agreement?

So far I have been assuming, following Chomsky (2000), that the EPP is a selectional requirement. In section 2 (see (3)), I briefly mentioned two properties of the EPP that naturally follow from this view: locality and headedness. The latter property, however, central to the empirical discussion above, may be equally explained on an Agree-based view of the EPP. That is, just as selection applies to the head of the selected phrase, so does agreement; the goal in a probe-goal Agree relation is a head, some projection of which may be attracted to the probe to check the triggering (uninterpretable) strong feature.

Such an Agree-based view of the EPP has indeed been proposed by Chomsky (1995). Chomsky argued that EPP satisfaction is nothing but checking a strong D-feature on T. Pursuing this line, later proposals diverged only in the identity of the triggering feature (see, e.g., Roberts and Roussou 2002, Haeberli 2003). Others settled for an intermediate position, whereby selection is formalized as a species of agreement—basically identifying strong features with selectional features (Adger 2003).

It is worth emphasizing that the issue is substantive, not merely terminological. To the extent that we acknowledge a set of real differences between selectional relations and agreement relations, we are more justified in keeping them apart. And to the extent that the EPP displays core selectional

¹⁸ If V remains in situ, PF would still force its pronunciation to host affix hopping or morphological merger with T.

¹⁹ In Landau 2006, I attribute the obligatory high V copy in Hebrew to the need to realize the high pitch accent characteristic of V(P)-fronting. This may well be true; however, the present EPP-based account provides an overriding general answer to this puzzle, independent of language-particular phonological rules.

features, and so on; and on the other hand, selection, applying to θ -relations, extended projections (v-V, D-N, C-T relations), and the like. Observationally, at least, the EPP relation belongs to the second category.

There is an additional, compelling argument for the selectional view of the EPP, drawing on a fundamental asymmetry between the EPP and normal checking relations. It is developed in the next section.

5.2 *The Parasitic Nature of [P]*

One of the most puzzling aspects of EPP phenomena is this: [P] can never trigger movement on its own. If an element moves to the specifier of the [P]-bearing head, then it must check some independent feature against that head. In other words, [P] is always parasitic on the presence of some *anchoring feature* (F_A).²² This generalization, unviolated to my knowledge, is well documented but remains a sore thumb for most current treatments of the EPP. The present analysis derives it in a principled way.²³

Consider first well-known cases. The same [P]-bearing T head that requires an overt subject also checks Case/ ϕ -features with it. Alternatively, it may check those features against a lower associate DP, [P] being satisfied by an expletive or a quirky subject. There is evidence that quirky subjects check some formal feature against T, over and above EPP satisfaction, possibly [person] (Sigurðsson 2004). Thus, whenever something moves to Spec,TP, something beyond the EPP is checked; pure EPP satisfaction occurs only with pure (external) Merge of expletives.

Moving to other functional heads, light v in Scandinavian checks accusative Case against the DP that satisfies its [P] feature (under object shift). And the [P] feature of C in *wh*-movement languages, of course, is satisfied by the element that checks the [wh] feature as well.

The particular association between anchoring features and [P] is precisely where languages differ. The case of T is especially illuminating, exhibiting this variation in its broadest. In null subject languages (of the Italian type), [P] is anchored by verbal agreement features; V-to-T movement thus satisfies the EPP (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998). In Irish, [P] on T is linked to nominative Case: the subject position of unaccusatives is filled if and only if the internal argument is a DP, which needs Case, while PP arguments are left in situ (McCloskey 1996). [P] on T in aspectual complements in Fòngbè appears to be anchored either by verbal Agr or by D; thus, one finds an alternation between V-doubling in T and object shift to Spec,TP (Ndayiragije 2000). Finally, Miyagawa (2001, 2005) argues that in focus-prominent languages like Japanese, [P] on T is anchored by a [wh] or a [foc] feature. No doubt other options exist.²⁴

²² Chomsky (2000) associates an EPP feature only with fully specified core functional categories.

²³ The only potential refutation of this generalization would be a genuine case of expletive movement, where the expletive is of the *there*-type (i.e., Caseless and ϕ -featureless). However, there are strong arguments that expletives are always generated in their surface position and never move (Bošković 2002).

²⁴ Holmberg and Nikanne (2001) argue that in topic-oriented languages like Finnish, EPP is satisfied by almost any [-foc] element, the thematic subject having no privileged status. According to them, the EPP position in Finnish is located in a projection higher than TP (see É. Kiss 2001 for a similar claim for Hungarian). Interestingly, a few adverbials are excluded from this position, suggesting that [P] is also semantically parasitic in this language (see the discussion below on stylistic fronting in Icelandic).

The underlying rule, however, is that in all these cases, [P] always depends on some other feature to attract a category. This appears to hold even in the most dramatic illustration of the EPP in its pure form: stylistic fronting (SF) in Icelandic. As shown in detail by Holmberg (2000), SF may front almost any category—participles, negation, adverbs, particles, DPs, or PPs—to Spec,TP, whenever it is occupied by a subject gap. Only two constraints are at work: first, the fronted category must be phonologically visible (i.e., bear [P]); and second, it must be the closest such category to T, an MLC effect according to Holmberg. In (54a), an adverb blocks SF of a lower participle; in (54b), the adverb itself is SF-ed (SF-ed categories are italicized; their gap is marked with an underline).

- (54) a. *sá sem skrifað* hefur (*sennilega) _____ þessa bók
 he that written has (*probably) this book
 b. *sá sem sennilega* hefur _____ skrifað þessa bók
 he that probably has written this book
 ‘the one that has probably written this book’

Holmberg concludes from the syntactically indiscriminate nature of SF that it operates on purely phonological features. There is, however, a notable exception: auxiliary verbs do not block SF of lower elements by intervention, as (55a–b) show. Nor can they be SF-ed themselves.

- (55) a. *Tekin* hefur verið _____ erfið ákvörðun.
 taken has been difficult decision
 b. **Verið* hefur _____ tekin erfið ákvörðun.
 been has taken difficult decision
 ‘A difficult decision has been taken.’

Holmberg proposes that SF-ed material must have “sufficient” semantic features, in addition to a phonological matrix; auxiliaries lack the requisite semantic content. It is conceivable that the SF operation itself is triggered by some discourse-related feature on T, serving as the anchoring feature for [P]. While the former acts as a probe under standard Agree, the latter is purely selectional.²⁵ Even here, then, where the element selected by [P] is unrestricted in syntactic category or semantic type, it is still minimally required to bear some independent (nonphonological) features, confirming that [P] never operates on its own.

The parasitic nature of [P] may explain some puzzling facts concerning the distribution of bare nouns (BNs) in Romance. Recall from section 3.1.1 that BNs are excluded from subject positions, an ECP effect presently reanalyzed in terms of the selectional EPP. Several authors

²⁵ See Davis and Prince 1986 and Landau 2006 for a similar restriction on V-topicalization in Yiddish and Hebrew.

Holmberg attempts to derive the semantic restriction from the idea that SF is \bar{A} -movement, subject to obligatory reconstruction. In the absence of semantic content, reconstruction of the SF-ed auxiliary will fail. It is not clear how this is supposed to follow, given Holmberg’s assumption that SF moves *just* p(honological)-features. So defined, the effect of “obligatory reconstruction” is inescapable, since no s(ematic)-features are moved in the first place. What is left is a stipulation that p-features may be moved only when associated with s-features—clearly, an odd situation. Notice that the present account assumes that Copy is an unselective operation, hence that movement carries along all features of the moved item. Semantic restrictions, then, are imposed by the anchoring feature for [P].

have observed that subject BNs are rendered grammatical when focused; witness the contrast in Spanish (56), from Contreras 1986.

- (56) a. *Esclavos construyen pirámides. [nonfocused subject]
 ‘Slaves build pyramids.’
 b. ESCLAVOS construyeron las pirámides. [focused subject]
 ‘Slaves built the pyramids.’

Why should a null D be excluded in Spec,TP but allowed in Spec,FocP, given the (plausible) assumption that both T and Foc are [P]-bearing heads? The answer might lie with the different anchoring features for [P]. On T, [P] is anchored by Case/ ϕ -features; on Foc, the anchor is simply [+foc]. Suppose that within DP, Case/ ϕ -features are specified on D (possibly spread to N by concord) but [foc] is a feature of N. This is motivated by the observation that D is the prototypical locus of morphological contrasts in Case/ ϕ -values, while it is N that bears the semantic content targeted by the focus interpretation.

The contrast in (56) now follows. Since [P] on T is anchored by a feature that is checked against D, it is D that must be phonologically visible to satisfy [P]; hence, BNs (with a null D) are excluded in Spec,TP. By contrast, since [P] on Foc is anchored by a feature checked against N, it is N that must be phonologically visible to satisfy [P]; hence, a null D is tolerated in Spec,FocP. Note that Spec,TP can but need not be lexicalized in Romance (e.g., postverbal subject constructions). Hence, the focused subject in (56b) could raise directly from its VP-internal position, leaving no potentially offending null-headed copy in Spec,TP. While this scenario calls for further testing, I believe that it holds some promise of insight into the puzzle posed by (56), which has so far resisted explanation.²⁶

In fact, once we take a broader look at the distribution of BNs outside Romance, it becomes evident that the anchoring mechanism for [P] is precisely where crosslinguistic variation is located with respect to the EPP. It is well known that BNs are possible subjects in Germanic languages (e.g., English). In Hebrew, all indefinite DPs lack an overt determiner, and in Russian the same is true of all DPs, definite or not (excluding those with demonstratives). Presumably, in all these cases the DPs are headed by a null D.

- (57) a. Firemen are available.
 b. *Hebrew*
 Yeled sixek ba-gina.
 child played in.the-garden
 ‘A child was playing in the garden.’

²⁶ Contreras (1986) reports further complications: singular BNs resist focalization, while all (deep subject) BNs resist topicalization. These are the expected patterns on the null hypothesis that [P] is satisfied in a uniform fashion everywhere. Caselles (1996) argues that Spanish has no genuine topicalization operation; instead, fronted BNs are left-dislocated, binding a null clitic. This is supported by the fact that like clitic left-dislocation, BN fronting is island insensitive. If left-dislocated phrases are adjoined to TP (rather than occupying a specifier position), this would explain the absence of a [P] requirement, allowing them to surface in an initial position, at least for some speakers.

c. *Russian*

Devočka čítala knihu.
 girl read book
 ‘A/The girl read a/the book.’

Keeping to the assumption that nominals in argument positions are introduced by D, one must explain how the EPP is satisfied in the context of these null-headed DP subjects.

Notice that there is no a priori reason to believe that a unique solution will apply to all languages. For V-raising languages, an appealing approach would have the EPP satisfied by (the Agr features of) V in T, rather than by a merged specifier (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998). This could be true for Hebrew and Russian.

Another possibility, however, is to parameterize the anchoring feature for EPP. Déprez (2000), in a different context, proposes that the EPP feature itself is parameterized: D in Romance, N in English. Under the present account, what must be parameterized is the anchoring feature for [P], rather than [P] itself (which is invariant). One way of doing it, following Déprez, would be indeed to link [P] to an uninterpretable D- or N-feature on T. I will not pursue this idea, as it seems to reintroduce a “syntactic” EPP feature by the back door.

Instead, suppose we anchor [P], as is quite standard, to the uninterpretable Case/ ϕ -features on T. This means that whatever XP is used to check these features must be headed by an overt head X. The locus of crosslinguistic variation, then, could be the location of syntactically visible Case/ ϕ -features within DPs. Specifically, suppose that in Romance, it is the head D that bears those features. Since [P] is anchored to Case/ ϕ -features, the p-selectional requirement of T will be imposed on D. In contrast, suppose that in languages allowing subject BNs (e.g., English, Hebrew, Russian), Case/ ϕ -features are syntactically visible on N, not on D (which may nonetheless exhibit partial morphological concord with N). Then the p-selectional requirement of T will be imposed on N, permitting D to be null.

Undoubtedly, these matters deserve further study, but it appears that several routes are available within the present system to approach facts like (57a–c). It should be clear that *some* hidden parametric contrast between Romance, on the one hand, and Germanic/Semitic/Slavic, on the other hand, is needed in any account of the generalization that BNs exhibit a subject-object asymmetry only in the former language group.

One last “anchoring effect” may be involved in the preposing of *wh*-clauses, as observed in footnote 10.

(58) [_{CP} Where $\emptyset_{[+wh]}$ she found this wreck of a car] is unclear.

Recall that the problem with such examples was that the clause appearing in the EPP position is headed by a null C, a situation otherwise excluded with declarative clauses. It is tempting to relate the special behavior of *wh*-clauses to another special characteristic of the [wh] feature: namely, its ability to percolate to a maximal projection from the complement or specifier position, as schematized in (49). Suppose now that we take seriously the idea that [P] on an interrogative C is anchored by the [+wh] feature that triggers *wh*-movement. Then it should be possible for

[P] to percolate to CP along with its anchoring feature. The *wh*-clause thus comes to be marked [+wh, P]. As a [P]-bearing category, the clause may satisfy the [P] feature of the matrix T (or Top)—even though its head is null. This joint effect of percolation and anchoring may thus circumvent the standard way of satisfying [P].

Having established the parasitic behavior of [P], we may ask *why* it is so. Strikingly, there is little in current theorizing to explain this curiosity. On the dominant approaches, which are essentially syntactic, the EPP is reduced to feature checking (e.g., a strong D-feature on T). But why should the ability of one feature to trigger movement depend on the presence of other features? For Case and agreement, one might argue that morphological bundling simply results in their being checked simultaneously. However, there is no obvious morphological link between the requirement for phonetic realization and, for example, Case or [wh].

This sort of anomaly was precisely what lay behind the introduction of “strength” as a grammatical property. In Chomsky 1995:chap. 2, strength is not conceived as a formal feature in itself, but as a property of an independent feature. Notice that this view did explain why EPP effects are parasitic, but only at the cost of introducing the unwieldy concept of strength, a second-order feature. Abandoning this concept and reanalyzing strength as a distinct, independent “EPP feature,” Chomsky (2000) cleared the conceptual confusion, but the original puzzle now re-emerged: why is EPP—an independent grammatical feature—parasitic? The paradox is especially pressing in light of the current tendency to speak of EPP features as “triggers for movement.” As we saw above, this description is highly misleading. An EPP feature is never sufficient for movement to occur; it is just necessary.

The view of [P] as a selectional feature, specifically p-selectional, gives a principled answer to the puzzle. P-selection operates at PF; accordingly, p-selectional features do not drive movement, any more than s-selectional features do. As a rule, selectional relations are inspected, satisfied, or violated at the interfaces, after all movement (at least, within a given phase) has taken place. Consider, for example, the following failed attempts to satisfy selection via movement:

- (59) a. *We showed Mary to ~~Mary~~.
 b. *Jane seemed to ~~Jane~~ to be fortunate.

In (59a), *Mary* moves from the indirect object to the direct object position (the intended reading is ‘We showed Mary to herself’). Evidently, the fact that *show* s-selects both a theme and a goal cannot trigger movement of the latter to satisfy the former.²⁷ Existing accounts resort to Case theory to rule out (59a) (double Case marking, “inactive” goal for Agree), hence presupposing that selection alone cannot trigger movement. The PF analogue is (59b), where the Case-marked indirect object moves to the nonthematic subject position (the intended reading is ‘Jane seemed to herself to be fortunate’). Again, p-selection by the matrix T for a phonologically visible specifier cannot trigger movement of *Jane* if Case cannot be simultaneously checked.

²⁷ That s-selection may trigger movement (and θ -roles are checkable features) has been argued by Hornstein (1999); see Landau 2003 for a detailed critique. If correct, the present analysis bolsters the case against conflating selection and checking.

Notice where the common statement ‘‘The EPP triggers movement’’ comes from. Indeed, without a [P] feature, there will be no motivation for phonological displacement; Agree can operate on a category in situ. Economy, then, rules out such unmotivated movements, but only at the PF interface, where the occurrence of [P] features is registered; if nothing requires pronouncing an element away from its base position, it should be pronounced there. Conversely, [P] is never a trigger for movement, strictly speaking. Rather, whenever it is present, failure to spell out p-features in its specifier results in a PF (selectional) violation. On a cyclic Spell-Out model, the violation is detected fairly quickly.

In short, the answer to the puzzle stated at the beginning of this section is very simple: [P] is parasitic (i.e., cannot trigger movement) because *selection* is parasitic. The interfaces are filtering devices, not computational components; LF/PF can at most weed out illicit representations independently generated by narrow syntax. The answer is principled in that it follows from the very architecture of the grammar, and the division of labor between syntactic computation (checking) and interface licensing (selection). As far as I can see, syntactic treatments of the EPP cannot offer equally satisfactory explanations for this important distinction between the EPP and standard syntactic processes.

6 Null Subjects

On the phonological construal of the EPP articulated here, the role of phonologically empty elements must be reconsidered. In particular, so-called null subjects can no longer satisfy the EPP requirement, since by definition, they lack the phonetic content selected by the [P] feature. In this section, I consider the four main types of null subjects: pro, PRO, unpronounced movement copies (‘‘traces’’), and null operators.

Regarding pro, the null subject of finite clauses in null subject languages (NSLs), I will simply adopt the line of research represented by Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998 (and the references therein). Within this framework, it is recognized that the function served by subject DPs and overt pronouns in non-NSLs is taken over by the inflectional morphology on the verb in NSLs. Importantly, the finite verb overtly raises to T, checking all the features an overt subject would—the D- and Agr features in particular. I would like to suggest that [P] as well is satisfied by the occurrence of the finite V in T; indeed, [P] is necessary for V-to-T movement to take place. We may assume, with Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) and Miyagawa (2001), that the choice between an X and an XP element, to satisfy [P] on T, is parametric.

Notice that on these assumptions, it is not even clear that pro exists. If the inflectional morphology on the finite verb is interpretable, just like a pronoun, then pro becomes redundant: it is needed neither for s-selection nor for p-selection. This conclusion is quite appealing, although nothing crucial rests on it in the present context.

Consider next the subject of control clauses—finite or nonfinite, obligatorily controlled or not—namely, PRO.²⁸ I take it that the reality of PRO is beyond reasonable doubt. Ample converg-

²⁸ See Landau 2004 for much evidence that PRO may occur in finite clauses.

ing evidence from agreement processes, binding, and other subject-sensitive phenomena points to the conclusion that PRO exists as a distinct formative in the grammar (see Landau 2003). Clearly, though, being null it cannot satisfy the EPP.

There are two possible responses to this state of affairs. Either we say that control clauses simply lack the EPP property; or they have it, but something other than PRO satisfies it, much like finite inflection in NSLs.

It seems to me that the second option faces considerable difficulties from a crosslinguistic perspective. Though one can find distinct T morphemes in control clauses in certain languages (e.g., English *to*), and possibly V-to-T raising in other languages, these options certainly do not represent a universal pattern. There are quite a few languages where control clauses clearly contain a PRO subject but no phonetic material in T whatsoever (e.g., Swedish; see Thráinsson 1993). Furthermore, stylistic fronting in Icelandic fails to apply in infinitives—presumably owing to the lack of the triggering feature [P] (see Holmberg 2000).

For these reasons, I conclude that T in control clauses simply lacks [P]. Nevertheless, standard subject properties indicate that PRO occupies the canonical subject position, namely, Spec,TP. What triggers the raising of PRO to this position, if it is not the EPP?

In Landau 2004, I develop a comprehensive analysis of control, focusing on the intricate factors that affect the licensing of PRO as opposed to lexical subjects in infinitives (uninflected or inflected), subjunctives (controlled or uncontrolled), and indicatives. The basic claim in that work is that T and C are associated with a feature, labeled [R(eferential)], that must be checked by either PRO ([−R]) or a lexical subject ([+R]). [R] is a ‘‘redundancy’’ feature, assigned on the basis of the values of the T-feature and the Agr features. Essentially, [+T, +Agr] implicates [+R], while [−R] is assigned elsewhere. I further show that a cluster of converging arguments demonstrate that PRO undergoes normal Case marking, indicating that its distribution must be divorced from Case theory.

Minimally changing the assumption in Landau 2004 that [R] is an agreement feature to the assumption that it is a selectional feature would resolve the current issue. Specifically, assume that the licensing feature of PRO (namely, [−R]) is an s-selectional feature of T. This is plausible, given that [R] ultimately reflects referential properties of the DP subject, which are relevant to LF. As a selectional feature, it can only be satisfied locally. Thus, just as [P] drives raising of overt subjects to Spec,TP, so [−R] drives raising of PRO to Spec,TP.²⁹

Notice that the logic of the proposal would remain unchanged if the driving feature for PRO raising is different, as long as it is a selectional feature. In fact, since agreement alone cannot drive movement, and p-selection does not apply to PRO, we conclude by elimination that s-selection (by the T head) is responsible for the occurrence of PRO in the canonical subject position. This result is achieved without reference to the EPP; indeed, subjecthood in control clauses is divorced from EPP effects, properly construed as restricted to PF.

²⁹ Notice that in both cases the selectional relation is parasitic on checking of Case/ ϕ -features, in line with the conclusions of the previous section. It is also worth stressing that [R] is a syntactic feature, not to be equated with ‘‘referentiality’’ in the broad semantic sense. What makes lexical DPs [+R]—even DPs like *no one*—is their inherent specification of ϕ -features, in contrast to PRO, which obtains this specification only via control.

Consider now unpronounced copies (traces) in EPP positions, created by A- or \bar{A} -movement. The simplest assumption to make is the one already made for selection in general: namely, selectional requirements are satisfied upon Merge in the selected position, before it is evacuated by movement. Thus, just as *which girl_i* in (60a) satisfies at LF the s-selectional requirement of V ([___ [+animate]]), so *which noise_i* in (60b) satisfies at PF the p-selectional requirement of T ([___ [P]]).

- (60) a. Which girl_i did that noise scare ~~which girl_i~~?
 b. Which noise_i do you think ~~which noise_i~~ scared that girl?

Notice that both semantic and phonetic features, of the type selected in (60), are interpretable at the (LF and PF) interfaces, hence are never deleted. An obvious implication is that a single category with phonetic content may satisfy the [P] feature of several distinct heads, by passing through their respective specifiers. As (60b) shows (with respect to the embedded T and the matrix C), this seems to be correct.³⁰

This logic straightforwardly carries over to null operators in subject positions of relative clauses. Prima facie, examples like (61a) pose a problem for the phonological view of the EPP, given that the (Op_i, t_i) chain contains no phonetic material. Notice, however, that a reasonable analysis of such examples involves movement of an overt *wh*-word followed by deletion of all copies (61b). Pesetsky (1998) argues that such ‘‘across-the-board’’ deletions are possible precisely where the content of the *wh*-word is recoverable from the head of the relative.

- (61) a. This is the proof_i [Op_i that I think [t_i is invalid]].
 b. This is the proof_i [~~which_i~~ that I think [~~which_i~~ [~~which_i~~ is invalid]]].

The ‘‘copy + delete’’ analysis of null relative operators allows a natural explanation for their unproblematic occurrence in subject positions. On a cyclic Spell-Out model, the EPP in the deeply embedded clause in (61b) is satisfied by the overt operator *which*, prior to its movement (see also Takahashi 2002a). That eventually this operator would be phonetically deleted does not affect the fact that the [P] feature of the deeply embedded T head had already been satisfied on the first PF cycle. This reasoning implies that null operators that are not produced by PF deletion should not be able to satisfy the EPP. Takahashi (2002a,b) claims that this is the source of familiar contrasts in the *easy-to-please* paradigm.

- (62) a. The proof_i is [Op_i easy to show t_i to students].
 b. *The proof_i is [Op_i easy to show [t_i to be invalid]].

As a direct object, the operator is not p-selected by any category; hence, nothing requires it to

³⁰ One may wonder how doubling—as in (41)—ever arises, given that a single phonetic matrix may satisfy distinct EPP positions via movement. It appears that particular PF circumstances may still force phonetic realization of more than one copy. In German split topicalization, for instance, the low D copy is anchored by a [+foc] feature, which also dictates a specific (prosodic) realization at PF. The high D copy is adjacent to [+top]-bearing elements, but is itself discourse neutral. Trying to realize the [+foc] prosody on this D, inside a [+top] category, would presumably create an ill-formed object at PF. Similarly, in V-doubling situations, the low verbal copy is required by an affixal T morpheme—an absolute, local PF constraint, which cannot be satisfied ‘‘at a distance’’ by a remote V copy.

be overt. As a subject (of an ECM complement), however, the operator must satisfy a [P] feature. Since the null operator in these complex adjectival predicates is not plausibly derived from any overt counterpart, the EPP requirement is never met in such constructions, explaining their deviance.³¹

To summarize, the main instances of null categories that appear to occur in EPP positions can be accommodated within current theories without raising remarkable challenges to the p-selection view of the EPP.

7 Conclusion

There is a fundamental observation, running through the entire GB era and up until the present day, which can be put as follows: the functional field is much less tolerant to empty categories than the lexical field. That is, while the occurrence of null elements in the lexical domain seems to be governed solely by semantic recoverability considerations, their distribution in the functional domain is subject to further syntactic conditions. Putting aside null subject phenomena, it appears that whenever a null category is possible outside VP, it is also possible inside VP, but not vice versa. This striking asymmetry poses a major challenge to any theory of syntax.

The classical ECP approach to these matters assumed that empty categories are *sui generis*, subject to specific conditions that exclusively target them. A notion of *licensing* was developed (with numerous versions: government, lexical government, θ -government, proper government, etc.), so constructed that lexical heads turned out to be suitable licensors whereas functional heads were deficient in some sense; consequently, the special licensing required for empty categories often failed in the vicinity of a functional head.

The present proposal recognizes the fundamental asymmetry to be accounted for. However, the approach taken is radically different. First, we assume no special licensing condition for empty categories. Second, we locate the contrast between lexical and functional heads not in the alleged deficient licensing capacity of the latter, but in their special selectional requirements. In particular, functional heads (may) bear a p-selectional feature [P], which must be satisfied by a phonologically visible element in a local configuration (namely, sisterhood). This, I argue, is the true content of the EPP, and for that matter, of the “strength” property.

This view has some clear benefits. First among them is the rationalization of a previously accidental matching between EPP-inducing heads and ECP-inducing heads. That is, within the existing accounts, it has never been clear why, for example, T has *both* the EPP property *and* the deficient-licensing property. In fact, there was something distinctly unnatural about the assumption that T requires a specifier but nonetheless excludes one that is either null or contains

³¹ If (62b) is to be analyzed as involving raising to object, the relevant [P] feature would reside on the matrix light *v* (instead of the infinitival T) to whose specifier the null operator raises.

Takahashi (2002a,b) further argues that the restriction of *easy-to-please* constructions to infinitives (**The proof is easy to show (that) students understand*) follows from the same reasoning. Movement out of finite clauses must stop in intermediate Spec,CP positions, invoking the same EPP requirement that null operators fail to meet. The validity of the proposal, of course, rests on the fate of the idea that intermediate \bar{A} -traces are licensed by optional “EPP features” on C (Chomsky 2000), an idea on which I take no stand at the moment.

a null category. This link now makes perfect sense. The EPP is a p-selectional requirement; it requires a phonologically visible category in Spec,TP (and in the specifier of other functional heads). As a selectional requirement, it applies to the head of the selected category, the result being that this head cannot be null. Thus, the *same* mechanism that explains EPP effects also explains ECP effects, and that is, I think, a mark of progress.

The empirical predictions of the EPP account of the ECP also appear to be more finely tuned to the actual phenomena. Recall that the illicit configuration is the following:

$$(63) *[_{HP}[_{ZP}[Z \emptyset] \dots] [_{H'} H_{[P]} \dots]]$$

In other words, not just any element within the EPP satisfier, but specifically its head must be phonologically visible. Across a wide range of phenomena, this seems to be correct. Bare nouns in Romance are excluded from subject positions because they are headed by a null D; QPs headed by a null Q are equally excluded. Sentential subjects headed by a null C cannot occupy subject/topic positions; adjuncts headed by a null P are excluded from initial positions (plausibly, p-selected by Top); indirect objects headed by a null P resist displacement; and the head of fronted categories—DPs, PPs, and VPs—may be phonologically doubled if it has to satisfy two distinct [P] features.

Much of the theoretical simplification delivered by the proposal owes to the deep analogies found between general selectional relations and EPP effects. By maintaining the classical distinction between selection and agreement (checking), it is possible to explain why the EPP stands out among other syntactic processes with its remarkable properties. The most significant corollary of this treatment is a principled explanation for the parasitic nature of the EPP, namely, its inability to trigger movement by itself. The reason, simply, is that interface conditions (like selection) cannot drive syntactic operations; at most, they can filter out structures where some operations failed to apply.

There is, however, one point of disanalogy between s-selection and p-selection that we have so far ignored. In ordinary s-selection, what is being selected is not just any s-feature, but a particular one: [+animate], [−abstract], and so on. It is quite rare to find an indiscriminate selection for some [S] feature, whatever it may be.³² With p-selection, by contrast, the rule seems to be that *any* phonological feature is eligible for satisfying the requirement; as far as I know, there are no designated syntactic positions in specific constructions/languages that call for, say, a [+coronal] or [−back] feature. I think this is a real asymmetry, even if an exception to the general symmetrical pattern, and I have nothing insightful to say about it.

Throughout the discussion, I have intentionally skirted the question of why p-selectional features exist to begin with. Here one can only offer speculations. It seems that the very existence of p-selection serves some natural function: namely, to enhance the perceptual contrast between lexical information and discourse information. By forcing displacement of categories from the lexical domain to the functional domain, [P] features allow more communicative distinctions to

³² Although one might view cases like **There frightens us*, with an expletive in a thematic position, as violations of such a requirement.

be read off phonetic strings. Thus, from the perspective of language evolution, the introduction of [P] features into the grammar gives it a certain adaptive edge over grammars with fewer or no [P] features.

A final general issue that arises out of this discussion is the familiar opposition between derivational and representational views of the grammar. Within GB, there has been a pervasive sense that the ECP is a representational condition, as opposed to derivational conditions like Subjacency (Kayne 1981, Stowell 1981, Czepluch 1982, Lasnik and Saito 1984, Contreras 1986, Lasnik 2001a). Correspondingly, any (nonpronominal) empty category was subject to the ECP, whether derived by movement or not. With the advent of minimalism, representational conditions fell from grace, with the unfortunate result that their empirical substance has been unjustly neglected (see Lasnik 2001a for an illuminating discussion).

The present analysis “resurrects” some of the representational effects of the classical ECP (e.g., the restrictions on Romance BNs) within the confines of the derivational model. In particular, we observe that the ECP-qua-EPP effects are not strictly derivational, since the offending null head is not ruled out the moment it is introduced, but rather on the phase-level application of Spell-Out. On the other hand, they are not strictly representational either, since the same phonologically visible category may satisfy different [P] features in different locations via successive-cyclic movement. As with other topics, the derivational/representational opposition turns out to be blurred in a model incorporating both derivational computations and representational interfaces.

References

- Abels, Klaus. 2001. The predicate cleft construction in Russian. In *Proceedings of FASL 9*, ed. by Steven Franks, Tracy H. King, and Michael Yadroff, 1–18. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Adger, David. 2003. *Core syntax: A minimalist approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ahn, Hee-Don, and Sungeun Cho. 2006. Unpronounced Case-markers and apparent subject-object asymmetry. *The Society of Modern Grammar* 43:55–80.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word order, verb-movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16:491–539.
- Baker, Mark C. 1997. Thematic roles and syntactic structure. In *Elements of grammar: Handbook in generative syntax*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 73–137. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Barbosa, Pilar. 1996. A new look at the null subject parameter. In *Proceedings of ConSOLE 4*, ed. by João Costa, Rob Goedemans, and Ruben van de Vijver, 375–395. Leiden: Leiden University, HIL.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2002. A-chains at the PF-interface: Copies and “covert” movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20:197–267.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Dianne Jonas. 1996. Subject positions and the roles of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27:195–236.
- Boivin, Marie-Claude. 2000. Split noun phrases and the theory of Case. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Bošković, Željko. 2002. A-movement and the EPP. *Syntax* 5:167–218.
- Bresnan, Joan, and Jane Grimshaw. 1978. The syntax of free relatives in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 331–391.
- Casielles, Eugenia. 1996. On the misbehavior of bare nouns in Spanish. In *Aspects of Romance linguistics*, ed. by Claudia Parodi, Carlos A. Quicoli, Mario Saltarelli, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 135–148. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of government and binding*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Contreras, Heles. 1986. Spanish bare NPs and the ECP. In *Generative studies in Spanish syntax*, ed. by Ivonne Bordelois, Heles Contreras, and Karen Zagona, 25–49. Foris: Dordrecht.
- Culicover, Peter, and Ken Wexler. 1973. An application of the Freezing Principle to the dative in English. Social Sciences Working Papers 39. Irvine: University of California.
- Czepluch, Hartmut. 1982. Case theory and the dative construction. *The Linguistic Review* 2:1–38.
- Davis, Lori J., and Ellen F. Prince. 1986. Yiddish verb-topicalization and the notion “lexical integrity.” In *CLS 22*, ed. by Anne M. Farley, Peter T. Farley, and Karl-Eric McCullough, 90–97. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Dekydtspotter, Laurent P. 1992. The syntax of predicate clefts. In *NELS 22*, ed. by Kimberley Broderick, 119–133. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- Déprez, Viviane. 2000. Parallel (a)symmetries and the internal structure of negative expressions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18:253–342.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 1995. *Particles: On the syntax of verb-particle, triadic, and causative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emonds, Joseph. 1987. The Invisible Category Principle. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:613–632.
- Fanselow, Gisbert, and Damir Čavar. 2002. Distributed deletion. In *Theoretical approaches to universals*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou, 65–107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fowler, George, and Michael Yadoff. 1993. The argument status of accusative measure nominals in Russian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 1:251–279.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K., John Drury, and Juan Carlos Castillo. 2000. No more EPP. In *WCCFL 19*, ed. by Roger Billerey and Brook Danielle Lillehaugen, 153–166. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press.
- Haerberli, Eric. 2003. Categorical features as the source of EPP and abstract Case phenomena. In *New perspectives on Case theory*, ed. by Ellen Brandner and Heike Zinsmeister, 89–126. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Heycock, Caroline, and Roberto Zamparelli. 2003. Coordinated bare definites. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 443–469.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2000. Scandinavian stylistic fronting: How any category can become an expletive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31:445–483.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2003. Agreement and movement in Icelandic raising constructions. *Lingua* 113:997–1019.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Urpo Nikanne. 2001. Expletives, subjects, and topics in Finnish. In *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP*, ed. by Peter Svenonius, 71–105. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:69–96.
- Hornstein, Norbert, and Amy Weinberg. 1981. Case theory and preposition stranding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12:55–91.
- Jo, Jung-min. 2003. Variations in predicate cleft constructions in Korean: Epiphenomena at the syntax-PF interface. Paper presented at the 10th Harvard International Symposium on Korean Linguistics, Harvard University.
- Jones, Michael A. 1993. *Sardinian syntax*. London: Routledge.
- Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French syntax: The transformational cycle*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 1981. ECP extensions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12:93–133.
- Kayne, Richard. 1984. *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.

- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2001. The EPP in a topic-prominent language. In *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP*, ed. by Peter Svenonius, 107–124. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Landau, Idan. 2002a. Experiencer objects are oblique. *Glott International* 6:329–335.
- Landau, Idan. 2002b. A typology of psych passives. In *NELS 32*, ed. by Masako Hirotsani, 271–286. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- Landau, Idan. 2003. Movement out of control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:471–498.
- Landau, Idan. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:811–877.
- Landau, Idan. 2006. Chain resolution in Hebrew V(P)-fronting. *Syntax* 9:32–66.
- Landau, Idan. To appear. *The locative syntax of experiencers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Larson, Richard. 1985. Bare-NP adverbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:595–621.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2001a. Derivations and representations in modern transformational syntax. In *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, ed. by Mark Baltin and Chris Collins, 62–88. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2001b. A note on the EPP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:356–362.
- Lasnik, Howard, and Mamoru Saito. 1984. On the nature of proper government. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 235–289.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1994. Reference and proper names: A theory of N-movement in syntax and Logical Form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25:609–665.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1996. The syntax of N-raising: A minimalist theory. UiL OTS Working Papers of Theoretical Linguistics 96-005. Utrecht: Utrecht University, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2000. “Postverbal” subjects and the Mapping Hypothesis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31: 691–702.
- McCawley, James D. 1988. Adverbial NPs: Bare or clad in see-through garb? *Language* 64:583–590.
- McCloskey, James. 1996. Subjects and subject positions in Irish. In *The syntax of the Celtic languages: A comparative perspective*, ed. by Robert D. Borsley and Ian Roberts, 241–283. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2001. The EPP, scrambling, and *wh*-in-situ. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 293–338. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2005. On the EPP. In *Perspectives on phases*, ed. by Norvin Richards and Martha McGinnis, 201–236. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 49. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.
- Morzycki, Marcin. 2001. Interpreting measure DP adverbials. In *WCCFL 20*, ed. by Karine Megerdooimian and Leora Anne Bar-El, 442–455. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press.
- Ndayiragije, Juvénal. 2000. Strengthening PF. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31:485–512.
- Pesetsky, David. 1998. Some optimality principles of sentence pronunciation. In *Is the best good enough?*, ed. by Pilar Barbosa, Danny Fox, Paul Hagstrom, Martha McGinnis, and David Pesetsky, 337–383. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press and MITWPL.
- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2001. T-to-C movement: Causes and consequences. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 355–426. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Postal, Paul M. 1972. On some rules that are not successive cyclic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3:211–222.
- Riemsdijk, Henk van. 1989. Movement and regeneration. In *Dialectal variation and the theory of grammar*, ed. by Paola Benincà, 105–136. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi, and Ur Shlonsky. To appear. Strategies of subject extraction. In *Interfaces + recursion = language? Chomsky's minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics*, ed. by Uli Sauerland and Hans-Martin Gärtner. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, Ian, and Anna Roussou. 2002. The Extended Projection Principle as a condition on the tense dependency. In *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP*, ed. by Peter Svenonius, 125–155. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rosengren, Inger. 2002. EPP: A syntactic device in the service of semantics. *Studia Linguistica* 56:145–190.
- Rothstein, Susan D. 1983. The syntactic forms of predication. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Á. 2004. Icelandic non-nominative subjects. In *Non-nominative subjects*, ed. by Peri Bhaskararao and Karumuri Venkata Subbarao, 185–208. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Solà, Juame. 1992. Agreement and subjects. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Stowell, Tim. 1981. Origins of phrase structure. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 2002a. The EPP and null operator movement. In *Proceedings of Linguistics and Phonetics 2002*. Available at www.wata-net.com/proceedings/DTakahashi/LP2002DTakahashi.pdf.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 2002b. Scrambling and empty categories. In *Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics: Proceedings of FAJL 3*, ed. by María Cristina Cuervo, Daniel Harbour, Ken Hiraiwa, and Shinichiro Ishihara, 47–58. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 41. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1993. On the structure of infinitival complements. In *Harvard working papers in linguistics 3*, ed. by Samuel David Epstein and Susumu Kuno, 181–213. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Department of Linguistics.
- Whitney, Rosemarie. 1982. The syntactic unity of *wh*-movement and complex NP shift. *Linguistic Analysis* 10:299–319.

Department of Foreign Literatures and Linguistics
Ben Gurion University
P.O. Box 653
Beer Sheva 84105
Israel
idanl@bgu.ac.il