

EPP: Romance (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998)

"Parametrizing AGR: word order, V-movement, and EPP-checking"
Artemis Alexiadou and Elena Anagnostopoulou, 1998, *NLLT* 6:491-539
March 17, 2004

1. Preliminary observations

Problem: the EPP does not appear to hold of VSO languages: e.g., Irish/Celtic, Greek/Romance, Arabic

Romance/Greek: no overt expletive in the VS(O)

- (1) a. O Petros pandreftike tin Ilektra. Greek
 Peter married Ilektra
 'Peter married Ilektra.'
- b. pandreftike o Petros tin Ilektra
 married Peter Ilektra

(2) Core observation

In these languages without an (overt) expletive (e.g., Greek), independently, the subject can be dropped ("pro-drop") (p. 494).

(3) Proposal

These languages (e.g., Greek) satisfy the EPP by verb raising because they have verbal agreement morphology with the categorial status of a pronominal element.

(4) Three predictions for these (e.g., Greek) languages:

- (i) Pre-verbal subjects are not in an A-position
- (ii) VSO orders never involve a covert expletive
- (iii) pro-drop languages **always** have verb raising

2. EPP

Greek/Spanish VSO type: two possibilities

- (5) (i) pro_{EXPL} -- EPP is "strong"
 (ii) no expletive *pro* -- "weak/no" EPP; in SVO, S is in A'-position
 [will adopt (ii), but EPP is strong]

Lack of Spec, AgrSP in Greek/Spanish

(Evidence that XP merge for EPP does not exist; hence there is no pro_{expl})

(evidence is for lack of A-position that would be the Spec of AgrSP)

SVO: involves Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) of the subject -- S in A' position: no Spec, Head relation between the subject and the verb.

(i) distribution: adverbs and other things may intervene between the subject and the verb

(6) a. O Petros xtes meta apo poles prospathies sinandise ti Maria
Peter yesterday after from many efforts met Mary
'After many efforts, Peter met Mary yesterday.'

b. Epidi o Petros an erthi i Mariatha figi.
because Peter if comes Mary FUT leave
'Because if Mary comes, Peter will leave.'

(ii) interpretation: subjects in SVO have unambiguously wide scope over object

(A-movement does not affect the scope of a quantifier)

(7) a. Kapios fititis stihiothetise kathe arthro. S>O, *O>S (SVO)
some student filed every article

b. stihiothetise kapios fititis kathe arthro. S > O, O>S (VSO)
filed some student every article

(8) a. #Enas oreos andras pandreftike kathe sinadelfo mu persi.
a handsome man married every colleague mine last year
'A handsome many married every colleague of mine last year.'

b. Persi pandreftike enas oreos andras kathe sinadelfo mu
last year married

Indefinite preverbal subject in Greek: strong (partitive/specific) reading (cf. the mapping hypothesis, Kratzer 1988, Diesing 1992)

(9)a. Ena pedhi diavase to 'Paramithi horis Onoma'.
a child read the 'Fairy-tale without a title'
'A certain child/one of the children read 'Fairytale without a Title.'

b. diavase ena pedhi to 'Paramithi horis Onoma'

preverbal subject does not reconstruct (more like control structures)

(10) a. Ena pedhi prepi na parousiasi tin ergasia mextri to telos tis vdomadas.
a child must Subj present the essay until the end of the week
(only deontic reading available)

b. prepi na parousiasi ena pedhi tin ergasia mextri to telos tis vdomadas.
must Subj present a child the essay until the end of the week
(epistemic reading available: "It must be the case that ...")

(iii) **Binding**: only postverbal subject pronoun can be a bound variable (Spanish) (=A position)

(11) a. *Tots els estudiants_i es pensen que elles_i aprovaran.
all the students think that they pass

b. Tots els jugadors_i estan convencus que guanyaran elles_i .
all the players are persuaded that win they

'All the players are persuaded that they are the ones who win.'

(Solà 1992, Barbosa 1994 -- only the postverbal subject is in A-position)

VSO ≠ pro_{expl} VSO

(12) standard analysis of VSO: pro_{expl} (Rizzi, 1982, Chomsky 1995)

argument against this: no DR effect -- in Greek, postverbal subject may be a strong universal QP

(13) eftase ena pedi/o Jorgos/kathe filos mu.
arrived a child/George/ every friend mine
'A child/George/every friend of mine arrived.'

In transitive constructions DR effects are systematically absent in Greek, but present in Icelandic.

(14) a. diavase ena pedi/kathe pedi to vivlio. (Greek)
read a child/every child book
'A/every child read the book.'

b. *Um nóttina hafði [e]sokkid báturinn. (Icelandic)
in the night had sunk the boat

(15) DR effect: Chomsky (1995): expletive is D, its associate is NP.
Prediction: if a language has an expletive, the language will exhibit DR effects; if there are no DR effects, the language lacks expletives.

3. Proposal

(16) Two possibilities for NSLs and VSO:

- (i) no/weak EPP;
- (ii) strong EPP, EPP checked not by moving/merging an XP, but by V-movement.

Adopt (ii):

One strong prediction: VSO languages are pro-drop languages

(17) NSLs: verbal agreement morphology includes a nominal element:

[+D, +interpretable phi-features, potentially +Case], this D triggers the EPP
basically the agreement is pronominal

(18)	English	Greek
	I love we love	agapo agapame
	you love you love	agapas agapate
	he loves they love	agapa agapane

(19) EPP feature checking is D-feature checking -- same in non-pro-dro and pro-drop

(20) **EPP is universally strong** - formal property of sentences that relates to the PF interface.

- (21) Why should there be two options to satisfy the EPP?
Overt V-movement is less costly -- V-movement does not extend the structure, hence more economical in the sense of Economy of Projection (cf. Speas 1994, but in a different sense).

V-raising in Non-Pro-Drop Languages

- (22) V-raising and the EPP:
V-raising for pro-drop: by the EPP. All pro-drop languages have V-raising.
What about non-pro-drop languages?

French: strong V feature of INFL attracts the verb. In pro-drop, it is strong D features in AGR. AGR only has D features while T has both V and N features (the latter for Case).