interpretive requirements, hence the syntax-CI interface (Subject Criterion) requirements of the Case-agreement system, hence the syntax-morphology interface; (14) What justifies movement to subject position in compliance with (1)?

'To Gianni please these ideas' (15) A Gianni piacciono queste idee

(16)a Le idee che a Gianni piacciono di più sono queste

The ideas that to Gianni please most are these

The ideas that to Gianni Maria recommends are these. b?(?) Le idee che a Gianni Maria raccomanda sono queste

(17) An argument is selected and taken as the starting point in the description of the event, which is

presented as "being about" that argument.

What happened? (18)A: Che cosa e successo?

'A truck bumped into the bus for Rome' B: Un camion ha tamponato l'autobus per Roma

B': L'autobus per Roma è stato tamponato da un camion

B,;; # L'autobus per Roma, un camion lo ha tamponato , The bus for Rome was bumped into by a truck?

The bus for Rome, a truck bumped into it?

(91) ... then  $\frac{\dot{}}{}$  e ripartito (after (18)B: the truck. After (18)B': the bus)

(Calabrese 1986)

[± D-linking] (18)b Subj: [+ aboutness] (20)a Top: [+ aboutness]

[+ D-linking]

articulation (much as Topic-comment, Focus-presupposition, etc. are determined by dedicated functional field. It attracts a nominal expression [+N], and determines the Subject-Predicate (21) The Subject Criterion (EPP): A nominal head, Subj is an obligatory component of the high

functional heads).

[[ YP qoT ] qX ] (22)

(23) [XP [Foc YP]]

(24) [XP [Subj YP]]

..... ina ... idus ... (22)

(26) Le ragazze le son venute (NID, adapted from Brandi & Cordin 1989)

The girls Scl have+3pl come,

fact that the position is dedicated to a scope-discourse property; and with the latter the (27) Why expletives? Subj is at the junction of the CP and IP systems; it shares with the former the

(Cardinaletti 2004, etc.)

McGill, March 28, 2006

Luigi Rizzi - University of Siena

### Criterial Freezing, EPP and ECP

1. Criterial Freezing (Rizzi 2003)

(Reinhart 1995, Fox 1997, based on Chomsky 1986) (1) Movement as last resort: movement takes place to satisfy some interface requirement.

properties, and properties of scope-discourse (criterial) semantics (Chomsky 2001, 2004). (2) A' chains are a way to associate two kinds of interpretive properties to elements: s-selectional

(3)3. Which book did you read <which book>?

b. This book, I read <this book> yesterday

c. THIS BOOK I read <this book>, not that one

(Rizzi 1991, 1997) (4) Criteria:  $X_F$  and  $XP_F$  must be in a Spec-head configuration, for F = Q, R, Top, Foc, ...

..... Jas-2<sup>X</sup> \_\_\_\_ ..... InJ<sup>X</sup> \_\_\_ ..... (2)

p \* Which book Co does Bill wonder [<which book> Co [she read <which book>]]? (6)a Bill wonders [which book CQ [she read <which book>]]

(7) Criterial Freezing: An XP meeting a criterion is trozen in place

(8)a Pensavo che avessero scelto la RAGAZZA, non il ragazzo

b La RAGAZZA pensavo che avessero scelto ..., non il ragazzo I thought they had chosen the GIRL, not the boy

, Luc CIKT I thought they had chosen \_\_\_\_ not the boy'

(9)a Mi domandavo quale RACAZZA avessero scelto, non quale ragazzo

'I wondered which GIRL they had chosen, not which boy'

Which GIRL I wondered \_\_\_ they had chosen, not which boy' b \* Quale RAGAZZA mi domandavo avessero scelto, non quale ragazzo

It wasn't clear how many book by Piero they had censored? (10) Non era chiaro [ [quanti libri di Piero] avessero censurato ]

Piero, by whom it wasn't clear how many books they had censored,... (11)a Piero, del quale non era chiaro [ [quanti libri \_ ]  $C_Q$  avessero censurato ],...

b \* Piero, [quanti libri del quale] non era chiaro [ [ \_\_\_ ] CQ avessero censurato ],...

c? Piero, [ [quanti libri del quale] CQ avessero censurato ] non era chiaro \_\_\_\_, ... Piero, how many books by whom it wasn't clear they had censored,...

Piero, how many books by whom they had censored was not clear,....

It is by Piero that it wasn't clear how many books they had censored (12) E, di Piero che non era chiaro [ [quanti libri ] Co avessero censurato ]

'It is how many books by Piero that it wasn't clear they had censored' p \* E' [quanti libri di Piero] che non era chiaro [ [ \_\_\_\_ ]  $C_Q$  avessero censurato ]

It is how many books by Piero had been censored that wasn't clear c E' [quanti libri di Piero]  $C_Q$  avessero censurato ] che non era chiaro

7

availability of a lower focal position (Belletti 2001, 2004), an option partially independent from subject extraction (see also Micolis 2005 for recent discussion).

- (39)a pro parece que o José passou por aqui 'seems that J. came by here' by pro choveu a noite inteira
- rained all night?

# 5. Strategies of Subject Extraction (Rizzi & Shlonsky 2005): Fixed Subject Strategies

(40) menu we a vedo do \*(e) na wa? (Gungbe, E. Aboh)

Imbabura Quetchua: see Cole & Hermon 1981 and Hermon 1984, from where the data is taken. See also Richards 2001.

(41) ima -ta -ta) Maria -ka Juzi miku-shka -ta kri-n?
what ACC Q Maria TOP José eat-NOMINALIZER ACC believe-AGR
What does Maria believe that José ate?

(42) ima -ta wawamiku-chun-taj Mariamuna-n?

what ACC child eat FIN Q Mariawant -AGR

'What does Maria want (that) the child eat?'

Lit '[What the child eat] does Maria want

(43) a. \*pi -taj Maria-ka Chayamu-shka -ta kri -n?

ACC believe AGR
NOMINALIZER

Who does Maria believe (that) has arrived?

b [pi chayamu-shka -ta-taj] Maria believe??

Tit. [Who has arrived] does Maria believe AGR

Who arrive-NOMINALIZERACC Q Maria believe AGR

Lit. [Who has arrived] does Maria believe??

6. Other "Skipping" Strategies: que → qui.

b L'homme [ Op qui [ t est venu]]

'The man that you have seen'

(French)

The man that has come?

(45) Rizzi (1990); qui = que + Agr

(46) Taraldsen (2001); qui = que + Expl (-i akin to ii)

(47) L'homme Rel Op qu'[-i Subj est t' venu t]

He, he, neck, will leave to Italy,

obligatoriness of the position, much as the backbone of the IP structure. There is a tension between these two requirements (scope-discourse positions, whereas heads of the IP hierarchy are discourse conditions or communicative intentions, whereas heads of the IP hierarchy are fundamentally obligatory (Cinque 1999)). Expletives can be seen as a way to resolve this tension: when discourse conditions and communicative intentions require a presentational structure (where the event is not presented as being "about" a particular argument), an expletive is used to formally satisfy the Criterion.

(28) Was glaubst du welchen Mantel Jakob put on today?' (McDaniel 1989)

## 3. Subject-Object Asymmetries: ECP Effects as Criterial Freezing

- (29)a \* Who do you think [ that [ Nary Subj will meet t]]?

  b Who do you think [ that [ Mary Subj will meet t]]?
- (30) ECP: t must be properly head-governed (Chomsky 1981, Rizzi 1990)
- (31)a \* Who would you prefer [ for [ t to win ]]?

  b Who do you work for t?
- c \* Who would you prefer [ for [ t Subj to win ]]?

#### 4. Null Subject Languages.

(32)a Chi credi che verra? (Rizzi 1982, 1990)

'Who do you think that will come?'

b Credo che verra Gianni

'I think that will come Gianni'

c Chi credi [che [pro verrà t]]

(33) Chao (1981) pointed out that BP has no free inversion (at least not as free as Italian, Spanish, etc.) and still it allows Wh extraction of the subject:

(34)a. BP \* (João disse que) saíram eles

b. Sp. (Juan dijo que) salieron ellos 'J. said that left they'

(ξξ) Onem o logo disse que vai chegar tarde? (ξξ)

subjects are wh moved from a lower position:

(36) Menuzzi (2000) provides an argument based on Sportiche's (1988) analysis of Officet that

(37)a Que rapazes o Paulo desconfia que tenham beijado 10dos a Maria? Which boys Paulo suspects that have kissed all Maria?

b Que rapazes o Paulo desconfia que tenham todos beijado a Maria?

c \*Que rapazes o Paulo desconfia que todos tenham beijado a Maria?

(38) BP has null expletives, so it could be that the EPP position is filled by a null expletive and the thematic subject is extracted from a lower position. The impossibility of (34) a has to do with the

#### 8. Extraction in English

- b Qui crois-tu qui viendra? (65)a Who do you think will come?
- c \* Who do you think that will come?
- d \* Qui crois-tu que viendra?
- (65')a Who do you think will come?
- (Sobin 1989, 2002) c % Who do you think that will come? b % Qui crois-tu qui viendra?
- d \* Qui crois-tu que viendra?
- b Phomme qui viendra (66)a the man that will come
- relative on the local subject), but its extension to embedded declaratives is dialect-specific. questions and relatives (presumably for functional reasons: it must be possible to form a question or functioning as an expletive) merged independently, as in (70). This device is always available in only possible at the price of complicating the C-structure, with Force and Fin (capable of expletive function; so (69) is incompatible with subject extraction. Therefore, subject movement is and move to Force. Such elements, as heads of a clausal argument, are incompatible with the (67) Normally, that, que etc. express both declarative force and finiteness: they are merged into Fin

ь(07)	Force	Fin	dI	q ·	Force	Fin	ЧI
ь(99)	Force	Fin f <sub>que</sub>	dI	q	Force that	ni4 <sub>16A1</sub> 7	фI
(89)	Рогсе	пiЭ	dI				

- (71) She thought (\*that) this book, you should read
- (adapted from Grimshaw 1997) (72) She thought (\*that) never in her life would she accept this solution
- (73) John seems [t to be happy]
- (74) Who do you think [t' Fin+N [Subj [will come t]]]

#### References

[N+]

Kwa. New York, Oxford University Press. Aboh, Enoch. 2004. The morphosyniax of complement-head sequences: Clause siructure and word order patierns in

> The man qui, next week, will leave to Italy b L'homme qui, la semaine prochaine, partira en Italie

(49) is [+N], [aPl] in Fin

b qui+N [Subj [est venu Op]] [ subj [ est venu Op ]

c L'homme [Op qui+N [Subj est venu t]]

, Me know not who der invented the cheese slicer, (51) Vi ved ikke hvem \*(der<sub>+N</sub>) opfant ostehovelen (Danish, Taraldsen 1986, 1998)

4 4 4 4

(52) Der in Fin differs from normal expletive der in that

2. It interferes with V-2. I It is not sensitive to verb class (i.e., is compatible with transitive verbs)

(53) For [+F] a criterial feature, X+F is in a Spec-head configuration with A+F.

(54) For [+F] a criterial feature, X<sub>+F</sub> is locally c-commanded by A<sub>+F</sub>.

#### 7. Local Subject Questions.

(55)a Who came?

b Qui est venu?

Who que came? (20) Brazilian Portuguese: Quem que vai chegar?

b Qui qui est venu? (57) Québec French a Qui que tu as vu?

b Qui est-ce qui est venu? (58)a Qui est-ce que tu as vu?

b Fin [Subj [... [Wh<sub>subj</sub> ...]]] [[... [dus AW] ...] [dus 6(92)

c Fin<sub>+N</sub> [Subj [ ... ] Wh<sub>subj</sub> ... ]]]

d Who Foc [1'Fin+N [ Subj .... [t leff]]]

b What did he say all (that) he wanted? (60)a What all did he say (that) he wanted? (West Ulster English: McCloskey 2000)

c What did he say (that) he wanted all?

(62) \* They were throwing stones all around Butchers' Gate (61) Who was throwing stones all around Butchers' Gate?

(63)a \* The students left all

b \* The students have been contacted all (by the advisor)

(64) In subject chains, floated Q's can't be stranded in first-merge (thematic) position.

- Nicolis, Marco. 2005. On pro drop. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Siena.
- Pesetsky, David. 1982. Complementizer-trace Phenomena and the Nominative Island Condition. The Linguistic Review
- Poletto, Cecilia. 2005. Si and e as CP expletives in Old Italian. University of Padova. Unpublished ms.
- Richards, Norvin. 2001. Movement in language. Interactions and architectures. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. Issues in Italian Syntax. Dordrecht, Foris.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. Relativized Minimality. Cambridge, The MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1996. Residual verb second and the Wh-Criterion. In Belletti, A. and Rizzi, L. (eds.). Parameters and functional heads, 2, 63-90. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Euigi, 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegeman, L. (ed.). Elements of grammar: A handbook of generative syntax, 281-337. Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. Relativized minimality effects. In Baltin, M. and Collins, C. (eds.). The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory, 4, 89-110. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Rizzi, L. 2003. On the Form of Chains: Criterial Positions and ECP Effects, to appear in L. Cheng, M. Corver, eds, On Wh Movement, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 2005.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. Locality and left periphery. In Belletti, A. (ed.). Structures and beyond. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2005a. Grammatically-based target-inconsistencies in child language. In Deen, K., Momujra, J., Schultz, B. and Schwartz, B. D. (eds.). Proceedings of the inaugural conference on generative accproaches to language and schwartz, B. D. (eds.). Proceedings of the inaugural conference on generative accproaches to language acquisition North America (GALANA). Cambridge, MA, UCONN / MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2005b. On some properties of subjects and topics. In Brugé, L., Giusti, G., Munato, N., Schweikerr, W. and Turano, G. (eds.). Proceedings of the XXX Incontro di Grammattica Generativa. Venezia, Cafoscarina.
- Shlonsky, Ur. 1988. Complementizer-Cliticization in Hebrew and the Empty Category Principle. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 6.2, 191-205.
- Shlonsky, Ut. 1997. Clause structure and word order in Hebrew and Arabic: An essay in comparative Semitic syntax.
- Shlonsky, Ur. 2000. Subject positions and copular constructions. In Bennis, H., Everaert, M. and Reuland, E. (eds.). Interface strotegies, 325-347. Amsterdam, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Sobin, Nicholas, 1987. The Variable Status of Comp-Trace Phenomena. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 5.1, 33-60.
- Sobin, Nicholas. 2002. The Comp-trace effect, the adverb effect and minimal CP. Journal of Linguistics 38, 527-560.
- Sportiche, Dominique, 1988. A Theory of Floating Quantifiers and its Corollaties for Constituent Structure. Linguistic
- Taraldsen, Knut T. 1978. On the MIC, Vacuous Application and the That-Trace Filter. Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Taraldsen, Knut T. 2001. Subject extraction, the distribution of expletives and stylistic inversion. In Hulk, A. and Pollock, J.-Y. (eds.). Subject inversion in Romance and the theory of universal grammar, 6, 163–182. New York, Oxford University Press.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk. 1984. On pied-piped infinitives in German relative clauses. In Toman, J. (ed.). Studies in German grammar, 165-192. Dordrecht, Foris.

- Belletti, Adriana. 2001. "Inversion" as focalization. In Hulk, A. and Pollock, J.-Y. (eds.). Inversion in Romance and the theory of universal grammar. New-York & Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- University Press. University Press.
- Benincà, Paola, and Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, Focus and V2: Defining the CP sublayers. In Rizzi, L. (ed.). The structure of CP and IP, 3, 52-75.
- Calabrese, A. (1986) "Some Properties of the Italian Pronominal System: An Analysis Based on the Norton of Thema as Subject of Predication", in H. Stammetjohann, ed. Tema-Rema in Italiano, Tuebingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 25-36.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2004. Towards a cartography of subject positions. In Rizzi, L. (ed.). The structure of CP and IP, 115-165. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: On the three grammatical classes. In van Riemsdijk, H. (ed.). Clitics in the Languages of Europe, 145-233. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carstens, Vicki, 2003. Rethinking Complementizer Agreement: Agree with a Case-Checked Goal. Linguistic Inquiry 34.3, 393-412.
- Chao, Wyn. 1981. PRO-drop languages and nonobiligatory control. In Chao, W. and Wheeler, D. (eds.) University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 7.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries. In Martin, R., Michaels, D. and Urtagereka, J. (eds.). Step by step: Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik, 3, 89-155. Cambridge, MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Nosm. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Kenstowicz, M. (ed.). Ken Hale: A life in language. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Cole, Peter, and Gabriella Hermon. 1981. Subjecthood and Islandhood: Evidence from Quechua. Linguistic Inquiry
- Culicover, Peter W. 1992. Topicalization, Inversion and Complementizers in English. In Delfitto, D. (ed.). Going Romance and Beyond. Utrecht, University of Utrecht.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1997. Projection, Heads, and Optimality. Linguistic Inquiry 28.3, 373-422.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1990. Subject pronouns and subject clitics in West Flemush. Linguistic Review 7, 525-365.
- Haegeman, Liliane, 1992. Theory and description in generative grammar, a case study of West Flemish. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hermon, Gabriela. 1984. Syntactic modularity. Dordrecht, Foris.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Thorbjorg Hroarsdottir. 2004. Agreement and Movement in Icelandic Kaising Constructions. Lingua 114, 651-673.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1989. Facets of Romance past participle agreement. In Beninca, P. (ed.). Dialect variation and the theory of grammar, 85-103. Dordrecht, Foris.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. The antisymmetry of syntax. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- McCloskey, James. 2000. Quantifier Float and Wh-Movement in an Irish English. Linguistic Inquiry 31.1, 57-84.
- McDaniel, Dana. 1989. Partial and Multiple Wh-Movement. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 7.4, 565-604.
- Menuzzi, Sergio. 2000. That-trace effects in Portuguese. Forum Lingüístico 2.1, 13-39. Florianópolis, UFSC.