AGAINST "PURE" EPP CHECKING:
EVIDENCE FROM FURTHER-RAISING[*]

Gerardo Fernández-Salgueiro

ABSTRACT

In this paper I attempt to throw some light on the issue of whether we need to appeal to an EPP feature (EPP-F) in order to account for why Tense heads demand that a specifier be created. I briefly review Bošković's (2002) proposal that there is no "pure" EPP checking, and that instances of DP movement to Spec-Tense can be motivated independently of an EPP-F in Tense. I argue that there are some problems with his conclusion because of confounding factors surrounding the data that he considers. I then provide data from Spanish further-raising constructions (see Fernández-Salgueiro, 2011), which constitute a much clearer test bed for Bošković's hypothesis. It turns out that the further-raising data provides stronger and less controversial empirical support for Bošković's claim that the EPP-F should be eliminated from the grammar.

Key words: EPP, further-raising, Case, A-Movement

1. INTRODUCTION: IS THE EPP AN EPIPHENOMENON?

In recent years, there have been various attempts to provide empirical support for the hypothesis that EPP effects can be accounted for by other principles of the grammar, thus leading to a possible elimination of the EPP as a feature of UG (see Bošković 2002, Epstein and Seely 1999, 2006, Castillo, Drury and Grohmann 1999, Martin 1999, Boeckx 2000 and others; see also Lasnik 2001 for arguments for the EPP).

As Epstein and Seely (2006:9), for example, note, the EPP-F is "redundant with numerous other independently motivated mechanisms of the grammar." Some of these include Case valuation, the so-called Inverse Case Filter, Null Complementizer Theory, Predication Theory, and Locality principles. If this is true, then one way to test the validity of the EPP as a property of UG would be to test it in isolation, that is, to test whether a Tense head can trigger movement of a DP to its specifier when no other mechanisms of the grammar would force this movement. Given the redundancy of the EPP with so many other principles, this test of pure EPP effects is hard to construct. The purpose of this squib is to show that further-raising constructions in Spanish (see section 4 for a summary of the properties of this construction) provide the desired testing ground for pure EPP effects and in fact fail to support the existence of an EPP-F in Tense.

2. ISOLATING THE EPP

Bošković (2002) has tried to show that the EPP alone cannot trigger any movement operation to Spec-Tense. He has used examples in which the only reason for moving a DP to Spec-Tense would be an EPP-F in Tense. For instance, movement of a DP to the specifier of infinitival *to* is not possible in an example like (1):

(1)   *It is important John to seem is smart

Assuming that the embedded Tense (occupied by to) has an EPP-F, the question that immediately arises is why this feature cannot be checked by raising the DP *John*. Bošković's answer to this question is that there is actually no EPP-F at all, so the infinitival to in (1) cannot attract the DP (see also Epstein and Seely 2006). More specifically, Bošković claims that the only scenario in which a DP would move to the specifier of to would be if this were a necessary step needed to move to an even higher position, given locality considerations (see Bošković 2002 for the details of this proposal and Epstein and Seely 2006 for a critique).

A problem with Bošković's conclusion is that there are a number of confounding factors that might be ruling out the sentence in (1) for independent reasons, not having to do with the EPP.

First of all, as argued by Chomsky (2000, 2001), after a DP gets its Case-F valued by means of Agree, the Case-F becomes inactive and unable to serve as a goal. Therefore, the DP is "frozen in place" and rendered unavailable for further A-Movement. Under this approach, then, Case-Fs, although they are not the trigger for A-Movement, are features required to license A-Movement.

Second, it is standardly assumed that A-Movement out of CP cannot occur (at least in a language lacking multiple specifiers, like English), since it would involve A'-movement to Spec-Comp and then movement to an A-position, which is an instance of improper movement (see May 1979, Chomsky 1986). This illicit movement is illustrated in (2):

(2)   *It is important [IP John to seem [CP _ [IP _ is smart]]]

For these reasons, Bošković's evidence is not conclusive, since a sentence like (1) might be ungrammatical for reasons orthogonal to the EPP. In the following section, I provide data from what F-S has called further-raising constructions, in which none of these confounding factors will arise and thus a much clearer test of Bošković's hypothesis can be constructed.

3. FURTHER-RAISING: TESTING THE EPP ALONE

An example of a further-raising construction (possible in Galician, Spanish, European Portuguese, Catalan, Basque and Italian, at least) is shown in (3):

(3) Mis padres   parece   que son muy listos   (Spanish)
     my parents   seems   that are very smart
     'My parents seem to be very smart'

As can be seen, the DP *mis padres* agrees with Tense in the embedded clause but it does not agree with the matrix Tense. Even though (3) may look like a case of left-dislocation/topicalization, in Fernández-Salgueiro (2011) (henceforth F-S) I provide evidence that there is A-Movement of the DP from the embedded clause to an A-position (Spec-Tense) in the matrix clause. Here I reproduce some of the tests and expand the evidence provided in that paper.

First, further-raising is not possible if there is an island in the embedded clause, as in (4) below containing a relative clause. This constitutes evidence that the DP is not base-generated in a topic position:

(4) *Mis padres   parece   que los cuadros   que compraron
      my parents   seems   that the paintings that bought
     son muy bonitos
     are very beautiful
     Intended meaning: 'it seems that the paintings that my parents bought are very beautiful'

The movement of the DP in fact has A-Movement properties. First, the subject of an idiom can be raised without altering idiomatic interpretation:

(5) Mala hierba   nunca   muere
     Bad grass   never   dies
     'The devil looks after himself'

(6) Mala hierba   parece   que nunca   muere
     Bad grass   seems   that never   dies

Second, non-referential nominal elements can also undergo further-raising (7) although they cannot be topicalized, as shown in (8):

(7) Nada   parece   que vaya a   cambiar   España
     Nothing   seems   that goes to   change   Spain
     'It seems that nothing is going to change the way Spain is'

(8) *Nada,   yo   creo que va a   cambiar   España
      Nothing I   think that goes to   change   Spain
     Intended meaning: 'I think nothing is going to change the way Spain is'

Finally, QPs undergoing further-raising do not observe scope-freezing effects but allow scope reconstruction (Barss 1986). A universal quantifier can scope over the existential quantifier, both in a simple sentence (9) (contra Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998) and in a further-raising sentence (10).

(9) Alguna   lesión   afecta   siempre   a   todo   deportista
some   injury   affects   always   to   every   athlete
'Some injury always affects every athlete'
[some>every, every>some]

(10) Alguna lesión parece que afecta siempre a todo deportista
'Some injury seems to   always affect every athlete'
[some>every, every>some]

If indeed this movement is an instance of A-Movement, then it must be the case that the DP does not get its Case-F obligatory valued in the embedded clause in these cases. In fact, Ura (1994) makes the exact same claim about hyper-raising constructions in Brazilian Portuguese, in which the hyper-raised DP does agree with the matrix Tense. See F-S for a detailed analysis of Case-F Valuation "delay" in further-raising constructions.

Given the properties of further-raising constructions just discussed, we can use them to provide an optimal scenario in which to test whether the EPP-F exists, since (i) A-Movement out of a CP is possible and (ii) the Case-F of a DP does not obligatorily get valued under Agree in the embedded clause, so it is still active for movement.

If the EPP alone could trigger movement, then (11) (the Spanish analog of (1) above), with movement of the DP to the specifier of the infinitive, would be possible in a further-raising language like Spanish. Crucially, however, this is not the case:

(11) *Es importante   Juan parecer   que es   listo
       is   important   John to.seem   that is   smart

This phenomenon is consistent with the hypothesis that there is no EPP-F in a non-finite Tense head.

Before we continue, a clarification note is in order. If the DP is still available for movement (since its Case-F has not been valued) in further-raising cases, it could be the case that the DP is moving in order to check its Case-F. If this were true, then (11) would no longer be a test of pure EPP-driven movement. Recall, however, that in further-raising constructions the DP does not agree with the matrix Tense (see e.g. (3) above). Given that agreement is a necessary condition for Case-F checking/valuation, especially in Chomsky's 2000, 2001 approach to

Case and agreement, it seems that the DP would never raise to the matrix Spec-Tense *in order to* check its Case-F. Instead, the cases in which A-Movement of the DP is indeed licensed may be best accounted for in terms of some other feature attracting the DP. I consider two alternatives regarding this issue in the following section.

4. DO WE STILL NEED THE EPP-F, THEN?

As we have seen, A-Movement to non-finite (raising) Spec-Tense is not possible in a language with further-raising like Spanish, as evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (11). In this section I would like to consider two hypotheses that are consistent with the evidence provided in the previous section:

(i)   The EPP-F exists and triggers A-Movement to Spec-Tense, but only φ-complete Tense (not φ-defective Tense) bears an EPP-F.

(ii)   The EPP-F does not exist; instances of A-Movement to (φ-complete) Spec-Tense are motivated by some other feature, namely the φ-Fs of Tense themselves.

Hypothesis (ii) is clearly preferable to hypothesis (i) if indeed well-formed cases of A-Movement to Spec-Tense can be explained by appealing to other features that are independently motivated without losing empirical coverage. First, it would mean that we can dispense with the EPP-F without losing "EPP effects," a welcome result, given the additional machinery surrounding EPP-F-based accounts. Second, (i) expresses an unwanted stipulation, namely, that some Tense heads display an EPP-F while others do not. This would be an *ad hoc* claim, since the only way to determine whether there is an EPP-F or not would be to examine whether there is movement to Spec-Tense or not, which is the very phenomenon that we are trying to explain. Moreover, if indeed the EPP-F is entirely redundant with φ-completeness, then one of those features should be eliminated, preferably the EPP-F, since it is not independently motivated.

The evidence I provided in the previous section should then lead to more research on why only φ-complete Tense heads can drive movement of a DP to its specifier, and this should be done without appealing to the

EPP-F, since this feature is redundant with other principles of the grammar (see section 2). In this respect, it is interesting to notice that in further-raising constructions, the DP moves to the φ-complete matrix Tense head, even though there is no agreement relation between this Tense and the DP (see (3)). This suggests that the movement of the DP is not greedy in this case, and it is the Tense head that is attracting the DP to its specifier. If this is true, then the research question is no longer why only φ-complete Tense heads have an EPP-F (see Chomsky 2001:8-9) but rather, *why do only φ-complete Tense heads attract a DP to its specifier?* In this respect, Boeckx (2008) claims (*contra* Bošković 2002 and Epstein and Seely 2006) that it is the φ-features of Tense that drive DP movement, rather than the need for the DP to check its Case-F. Whatever the right analysis of this phenomenon (Attract vs. Greed) is, there are strong reasons, both empirical and theoretical, to attempt to eliminate the EPP-F from the grammar and as a principle of UG, and the phenomena discussed here provide additional support for this research path.

REFERENCES

Barss, Andrew. 1986. Chains and Anaphoric Dependence: On Reconstruction and its Implications. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2000. Minimal obviation constraints. Ms. University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2008. *Aspects of the Syntax of Agreement*. London: Routledge.

Bošković, Željko. 2002. A-Movement and the EPP. *Syntax* 5:3: 167-218.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist Inquiries. The Framework. *Step by Step*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by Phase. *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Epstein, Samuel & T. Daniel Seely. 2006. *Derivations in Minimalism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Epstein, Samuel, Acrisio Pires & T. Daniel Seely. 2005. EPP in T. More Controversial Subjects. *Syntax* 8.1: 65-80.

Fernández-Salgueiro, Gerardo. 2011. Romance Null Subjects at the Sensory-Motor Interface. *Syntax* 14.1: 1-28.

Lasnik, Howard. 2001. A note on the EPP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 356-362.

Gerardo Fernández-Salgueiro

Martin, Roger. 1999. Case, the extended projection principle, and minimalism. *Working Minimalism*, ed. by Samuel Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 1-26. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

May, Robert. 1979. Must COMP-to-COMP Movement be stipulated? *Linguistic Inquiry* 10: 719-725.

Ura, Hiroyuki. 1994. Varieties of Raising and the Feature Based Bare Phrase Structure Theory. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 7.

Gerardo Fernández-Salgueiro
Department of English
National Taiwan Normal University
Taipei, Taiwan
gfsayang@ntnu.edu.tw

從多提升結構反「純」擴充投射原則查核

Gerardo Fernández-Salgueiro（颯楊）
國立臺灣師範大學

本文中，我關注的議題是，時式核心語要求標示語之生成是否需要藉助擴充投射原則特徵。我簡鍊地回顧了 Bošković (2002)所提出的，「純粹的」擴充投射原則查核是不存在的，以及限定詞組位移至時式的標示語位置可以和時式的擴充投射原則特徵無關。因其所考量的語料所帶來的干擾因素，我認為他的結論是有些許問題的。我於是提供了西班牙語中的多提升結構（參閱 Fernández-Salgueiro 2011，以下簡稱 F-S），因為該結構更適合驗證 Bošković 的假設。將此一結構納入考量後，Bošković 所聲稱的擴充投射原則特徵應從語法中剔除獲得較強且較無爭議的實證支持。

關鍵字：EPP，再提升，格位，A-移位