

The Role of Functional Features in the Derivational Procedure: A New Account of the EPP-effects, Case and Agreement

Katarzyna Mieczowicz-Mathiasen (Adam Mickiewicz University, Vienna University)

In this presentation, I will propose an alternative analysis of feature checking/valuation based solely on categorial (functional [D, T] and lexical [N, V]) features. One of my main assumptions is that lexical heads have an exclusively lexical feature matrix ([N, V]), whereas functional heads have an exclusively functional feature matrix ([D, T]) (with relevant specifications for each head, e.g. N [+N, -V], V [-N, +V], D [+D, -T], T [-D, +T], etc.).

In the course of the derivation, syntactic items are forced to interact to check/value their features. Checking involves switching features from negative to positive, valuation involves mutual sharing of specific values (such as ϕ - or tense features). More often than not, the configuration between the items requiring checking/valuation provided in the derivation is not conducive to checking/valuation and a syntactic operation (Move/ Merge) must apply - 'when and why' is to a great extent the subject matter of my presentation. Crucially, my next assumption is that only lexical features allow local feature checking/valuation (i.e. under Agree), whereas functional features require Merge or Move to do so. Furthermore, functional heads can interact only with other functional heads, and they are allowed to interact with lexical categories through functional heads selecting them (e.g. D selects NP, v selects VP, etc.). These functional heads provides lexical categories with a functional feature layer indispensable for 'communication' with functional probes (as in Chomsky 1999: 9).

My analysis accounts for the facts traditionally ascribed to the EPP without resorting to the EPP itself. Similarly to some previous analyses based on categorial feature checking (Pesetsky & Torrego 2000, Haerberli 2000), I show that the uninterpretable D-feature on T is only partly responsible for the so-called EPP-effects, but I believe it must work in tandem with a T-feature. As opposed to the aforementioned analyses, I assume that T's T-feature, though interpretable ([+T]), is actually unvalued (lacks the specific tense content which is introduced in v) and must undergo valuation in the course of the derivation. Since in my analysis functional features require Merge/Move to satisfy their requirements, it explains why we have movement to TP of either the subject, or the verb (or both) - both the subject and v (or V-v) bear a specific valued T-feature (the subject has entered checking/valuation with v upon its Merge in Spec,vP). A comparable situation to the one in TP occurs within CP in wh-questions, where CP is assumed to be [-T] (see Pesetsky & Torrego 2000).

Furthermore, I will show that the EPP-effects cannot be reduced to Case (as proposed by Martin 1999, Boeckx 2000, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2001), especially NOM(inative) Case, which I claim does not exist. What is perceived as NOM is actually a basic form of a nominal expression bearing ϕ -features, but no Case. When an NP enters an Agree relation (possible between lexical heads only), e.g. N [+N, -V] and V [-N, +V], where the verb in traditional terms assigns ACC(usative) to the NP, its (lexical) ϕ -features are no longer accessible to outside probing, i.e. the functional head D ([+D, -T]) selecting this NP will not be able to access the ϕ -features and transmit them to any probe. A DP/NP that has not entered any Agree relation is free to share its ϕ -features with any probing functional head. Previous analyses attempting to reduce the EPP-effects to ϕ -features (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998) seem to have been on the right track, however, no matter how well they suit NSLs, they are not very successful with the English or Icelandic data, especially the notorious Expletive Constructions in their various guises. In this presentation, I will concentrate on exactly these difficult areas and show how my analysis copes with both the English and Icelandic data (unaccusative EXPL-constructions, TECs, raising EXPL-constructions) and predicts the observed Case/Agreement and word order facts.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. "Parametrizing Agr: word order, V-movement and EPP-checking." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16: 491-539.

- Alexiadou, Artemis & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 2001. "The Subject-in-Situ Generalization and the Role of Case in Driving Computations." *Linguistic Inquiry* 32.2: 193-231.
- Bailyn, John F. 2004. "Generalized Inversion." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22: 1-49.
- Bobaljik Jonathan D. & Dianne Jonas. 1996. "Subject Positions and the Roles of TP." *Linguistic Inquiry* 27.2: 195-236.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan & Höskuldur Þráinsson. 1998. "Two heads aren't always better than one." *Syntax* 1.1: 37-71.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2000. "EPP Eliminated." Ms., University of Connecticut.
- Bošković, Željko. 2002. "A-movement and the EPP." *Syntax* 5.3: 167-218.
- Bošković, Željko. 2004. (in press). "On the locality of Move and Agree: eliminating the Activation Condition, generalized EPP, Inverse case Filter and Phase Impenetrability Condition."
- Chomsky, Noam. 1998. "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework." *MITWPL* 15: 1-56.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1999. "Derivation by Phase." *MITWPL* 18: 1-40.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy." *MITWPL* 20: 1-28.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2005. "On Phases." (unpublished manuscript)
- Collins, Chris. 2005. "A Smuggling Approach to Raising in English." *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 289-298.
- Haeberli, Eric. 2000. "Towards Deriving the EPP and Abstract Case." *Generative Grammar in Geneva* 1: 105-139.
- Harley, Heidi. 2000. "Irish, the EPP and PRO." (unpublished manuscript)
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2001. "EPP: Object Shift and Stylistic Fronting in Scandinavian." In: K. Megerdooian and L.A. Barel (eds.) *WCCFL 20 Proceedings* 290-303. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2000. "Scandinavian Stylistic Fronting: How Any Category Can Become an Expletive." *Linguistic Inquiry* 31.3: 445-483.
- Holmberg, Anders & Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2003. "Agreement and movement in Icelandic raising constructions." *Lingua* 113: 997-1019.
- Landau, Idan. 2005. "EPP Extensions." Ms., Ben Gurion University.
- Lavine, James & Robert Freidin. 2002. "The Subject of Defective T(ense) in Slavic." *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10: 253-89.
- Martin, Roger. 1999. "Case, the Extended Projection Principle, and Minimalism." In: Epstein, S.D. & N. Hornstein (eds.) *Working Minimalism*. The MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego. 2000. "T-to-C Movement: Causes and Consequences" in Michael Kenstowicz, ed. (2000) *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*. MIT Press.
- Vangsnæs, Øystein A. 2002. "Icelandic Expletive Constructions and the Distribution of Subject Types." In: Peter Svenonius (ed.) *Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP*. Oxford University Press.