

1. The Problem

A central property of grammatical processes is that they are structure dependent. Chomsky 2013 (henceforth POP) illustrates this well-established fact with Yes/No question formation in English.¹ In (1a) the fronted *can* must relate to the matrix verb *swim* and cannot link to the linearly closer *fly*.² Thus (1)a has the paraphrase (1)b, not (1)c:

- (1) a. Can eagles that fly swim?
b. Is it the case that eagles that fly can swim?
c. #Is it the case that eagles that swim can fly?

This follows if grammatical operations like T-to-C must be structure dependent, based on hierarchical relations rather than linear proximity.

Taking this assumption as a starting point, POP asks two related questions: (a) why must syntactic operations exploit hierarchical conceptions of proximity and never linear conceptions?³ and (b) assuming that “inversion depends on locality independent of category” (POP: 43), why does T-to-C move T rather than (a subpart of) the expression in Spec T?

POP’s answer for (a) is that the objects of grammatical manipulation are only hierarchically specified. They have no linear order, the latter arising from the mapping to the sensory and motor systems (S&M) at spell out (SO). Thus, until an object has been transferred to S&M, phrase markers are unordered and so operations that transform them (including T-to-C I-merge) cannot refer to such order. The idea, both simple and elegant, is that grammars cannot use absent information.⁴

* Thanks to Samuel Epstein and Hisa Kitahara for sharing insights into POP; to the University of Michigan for organizing the 2013 Linguistics Society of America’s summer institute where the ideas for this paper originated; to the University of Missouri’s South African Education Program for funding Xhosa research reported in §2.4; and to Brandon Fry for eloquently articulating in EKS’s LSA class that things other than locality should be considered in the analysis of T-to-C, and for helpful comments on an earlier draft.

¹ This was first discussed by Chomsky in Piatelli-Palmarini (1980).

² As Chomsky notes, there are parallels that don’t involve fronted T, among them that the adverb *instinctively* must modify *fly*, and cannot modify *swim*:

(i) Instinctively, eagles that swim fly

³ POP points out that linear conceptions are in some sense “simpler” in that they can be defined with visible properties like word order rather than more abstract conceptions of phrasal structure.

⁴ Though the solution described has obvious virtues, there are alternative hypotheses that would work equally well. For example, it is well-known that subjects are islands to

POP gives a variant of this answer to (b) as well. Here's the proposal: Were (2) the structural input for T-to-C,⁵ then we would expect that either of D or T could move to C as they are equidistant from C.⁶

(2) [C [_{TP} [D NP] [_{T'} T vP]]]

POP's proposed solution to the locality puzzle in (2) is the following: The reason that only T moves to C is that D (and the phrase that contains it) is in its vP-internal base position when C is Merged. The structural input to T-to-C movement is not (2) but (3), on the assumption that the external argument only raises after C-T Feature Inheritance (Chomsky 2007, 2008, Richards 2007). Thus at the crucial point there is nothing as close to C as T, and that's why T alone can move.⁷

(3) *Chomsky's claim: only T can raise to C because the C-T relationship is established when EA is still in situ*

[C [_{TP} T...[_{vP} [D NP] v...]]]

Summing up, T and not D raises to C because D is not there to raise. As in the solution to problem (a), the key assumption is that the derivation cannot exploit absent information.

In what follows we concentrate on POP's approach to (b). We argue that when a fuller range of head movement operations are considered, POP's conclusion, viz. that D does not count because it is not *there* to be moved (I-merged), turns out to be inadequate in a

extraction. If this were so, then the relative clause would not be a potential launch site for T-to-C movement. Note that if islandhood is explained in terms of Transfer (viz. the reason it is not a source of movement is that it is not there), then an explanation similar in kind to the one POP offers would be available; only the matrix T is visible at the point where the operation would apply. In what follows we abstain from discussing this alternative and stick to the assumptions in POP.

⁵ Labels such as *TP*, *T'*, *vP*, are employed for convenience. POP suggests that labels are not an available part of syntactic objects, and the argumentation we are presenting here does not rely in any way on labels; only on the assumption that D and T in (2) are equidistant from C (see (4) for a label-free schematic).

⁶ POP proposes that both labeling and identification of candidates for internal Merge are based on minimal search. The labeling algorithm cannot freely choose between α and β in a configuration like (4). Compare two passages from POP: 43, the first about I-Merge: "...inversion could just as well yield 'eagles [young are flying]' rather than 'are [young eagles flying]' as the interrogative counterpart to 'young eagles are flying'." The second is about labeling: "The interesting case is $SO = \{XP, YP\}$. Here minimal search is ambiguous... There are then two ways in which SO can be labeled: (A) modify $SO \dots$ or (B) X and Y are identical in some relevant respect, providing the same label..." Our working assumption for this paper is that the stalling effect is restricted to ambiguous results for the labeling algorithm. We leave exploration of the basis for this difference to future research.

⁷ See §2.3 for discussion of some problems for this "timing" approach to T-to-C.

very important way: the crucial ambiguity regarding movement should arise in any configuration of the form in (4), where α and β correspond to XPs or intermediate projections in the traditional X' schema and H, X, and Y are heads.⁸ But POP's solution is not applicable in most such cases. One consequence of this state of affairs is that, when combined with the VP Internal Subject Hypothesis (VPISH), POP assumptions falsely predict that raising D to T from an external argument should always be a licit alternative to V-to-T movement.



We present several arguments from V-to-T movement in favor of the more traditional view that head-movement is sensitive to categorial and other features of the target and the moving item, not just to locality. If this is true of V-to-T, it stands to reason it could be true of T-to-C as well.⁹

The second half of our paper addresses T-to-C movement in Wh-questions. It is well-known that local subject Wh-questions disallow T-to-C while all other direct Wh-questions require it.¹⁰

- (5) a. Which boys (*did) eat the pizza
 b. Which pizza *(did) the boys eat
 c. Which boys₁ *(did) you say t₁ ate the pizza

We argue in §3 that, like the facts of V-to-T movement, this asymmetry shows that factors other than locality are involved in motivating and constraining head-movement. See Pesetsky & Torrego 2001 for a proposal that T and a subject Wh-phrase are indeed equidistant from the local C. Both have features relevant to C, but the subject has more of them; its movement hence blocks T-to-C. In §3 we compare this approach to a potential alternative based on a POP proposal that subject Wh surface in Spec, TP. We show that such an account also relies crucially on features of T and C to explain the distribution of T-to-C movement, a state of affairs that seems at odds with the spirit of POP's purely locality-based approach to (1).

⁸The argument that POP presents relies crucially on analysis of T-to-C as syntactic. We adopt this view and generalize it. See Roberts 2010 for arguments that head-movement is syntactic, including the licensing effect of T-to-C on subject NPIs: **Anybody didn't leave* is ill-formed, but *Didn't anybody leave?* is fine.

⁹ Chomsky 2007:21, comparing C and v*, notes that "T may or may not raise to C, but V must raise to v* which therefore is an affix." Consider however English T, some but not all choices of which are affixes (i.e. past versus future). Analogously interrogative C might be affixal and declarative C not. See §3.3.2 for a slightly different interpretation.

¹⁰ The *do* in (5) is unstressed. Stressed *do* is permitted in (5)a with an emphatic interpretation, but this is irrelevant to the T-to-C movement question explored here.

This paper is structured as follows. §2 explores V-to-T movement. §3 addresses the distribution of T-to-C in Wh-questions and how to account for it. §4 concludes.

2. V-to-T: the equidistance problem

2.1 Introduction

As noted above, POP's proposed solution to (b), i.e. to why there is a T-to-C relation but not a D-to-C relation, exploits the fact that in this case, the configuration [H [XP, YP]] arises when XP raises from a lower position after H is Merged. The solution therefore cannot be extended to many familiar cases of head-movement. We begin in §2.2 by illustrating the problem with respect to V-to-T movement across an external argument. §2.3 briefly considers whether it is relevant that in SVO languages, the subject raises out of vP: assuming the tail of a chain is invisible, this might yield a potential remedy in terms of the relative timing of EA and V-raising. §2.4 shows that V-to-T is possible in subject-in-situ VSO languages; hence V-to-T is not contingent in any way upon EA raising. §2.5 adds that V-raising across negation is also erroneously ruled out by Chomsky's solution to (b).

2.2 V-raising across EA

Consider the structural relations between T and material in vP. By the logic of POP, V-v and D, the immediate daughters to vP and DP respectively, are equally close to T. Therefore the puzzle POP raised for T-to-C movement arises here as well. Why is it that in (6) there can be a V-v-to-T relation but not a D-to-T relation? In fact, D and T should be equally available for a relation to T, since both are equally close to it. Minimal search should obtain an ambiguous result. Yet V-v can raise to T in familiar languages, and D cannot.¹¹

(6) *Minimal search should find D and v equidistant from T*

...[_T T [_α ...DP ... vP]]

Chomsky's argument that C-to-T is evidence of a C-T relation prior to EA-raising is weakened by the recurrence of the same phenomenon at this lower point in the clause. A parallel account of v-to-T movement would have to claim that a relation existed between T and v prior to Merge of the EA. However, in this case, there is no apparent lower position to shunt the external argument to in order to finesse the problem. Thus, if VPISH is correct, POP's proposed solution to (b) above is too narrow to account for the regularities of v-to-T movement.^{12, 13}

¹¹ For expository ease we briefly delay discussion of C's potential role in this through the Feature Inheritance hypothesis.

¹² Of course, one might reconsider VPISH, locating the Merge position of the subject elsewhere. Exploring alternatives to the VPISH lies beyond the scope of the present paper. We think that the problems of head-movement for POP will recur in any case (consider N-to-D movement, and verb-raising across Negation to be discussed in §2.5 below).

2.3 A timing account?

Suppose the external argument raised to Spec, TP before V-v-to-T movement. Its unpronounced copy in vP would be invisible to T under POP assumptions, hence solving the problem we presented in §2.2.

- (7) a. $[_{TP} EA T [_{vP} <EA> [_v VP]]]$ *EA raises making v unambiguously closest to T*
 b. $[_{TP} EA v+T [_{vP} <EA> v VP]]$ *V-v subsequently raises to T*

Note that this timing solves one problem: it provides an explanation for why it is true that only V-v, and not D, can raise to T in languages with verb raising. But it presents its own set of difficulties. For one thing, it appears to conflict with POP's account of T-to-C. Recall that POP explains the fact that only T (and not D of spec T) raises to C in questions by assuming that the C-T relation is established BEFORE the EA raises from spec vP to spec TP. Crucially, POP assumes that D of the subject cannot raise to C because the subject is "not there."

- (3) *Chomsky's claim: only T can raise to C because the C-T relationship is established when EA is still in situ*

$[C [_{TP} T \dots [_{vP} [D NP] v \dots]]]$

To maintain POP's timing solution to the original puzzle while at the same time adopting the timing solution we just suggested for (7), we would have to assume that T-to-C and EA-raising *both* precede V-v-to-T. This is highly stipulative, suspiciously counter-cyclic, and incompatible with the fact that V-v-to-T feeds T-to-C movement in languages such as Spanish (Torrego 1984), Kilega (Kinyalolo 1991) and many others. We illustrate with Spanish in (8) (from Torrego 1984:103).

- (8) a. Qué querían esos dos?
 what wanted those two
 'What did those two want?'
 b. $[_{CP} \text{what want}+T+C [_{TP} [_{DP} \text{those two}] <T> [_{vP} <EA> <v> \dots]]]$

Another problem arises for *any* appeal to timing in relation to these issues. Recall that POP adopts both the VPISH and the Feature Inheritance hypothesis of Chomsky 2007, 2008 and Richards 2008. Under FI, only phase heads have edge and Agree features, and hence after operations in the vP phase are completed, there are no further operations until C is merged. Chomsky 2008:151 writes, "It follows that the edge and Agree properties of

¹³ It is also worth noting that whereas C-T and v-V share features through Feature Inheritance in the current framework, there is no analogous relationship between T and v. Were the EA to originate lower than Spec, vP, this fact and the operation of phasal Transfer would seem to necessitate EA raising to Spec, vP if it is ever to interact with C/T. See Kandybowicz 2008 on problems for the combination of PIC and Feature Inheritance; further discussion would take us too far afield.

P[hase] H[ead] apply in parallel: EF raises XP...to Spec, PH, while Agree values all uninterpretable features and may or may not raise XP to form an A-chain....the edge and Agree features of the probe apply in either order, or simultaneously...”

This approach raises questions about whether it is even possible to claim that the C-T relation necessarily precedes EA raising, as POP does; or to couch a potential account of V-v-to-T in terms of timing. Any timing solution is incompatible with simultaneity since simultaneity expressly *denies* timing.

Summing up, we have explored the possibility of a timing solution to the puzzle of V-v-to-T across EA in Spec, vP. We have argued that such a solution is incompatible with POP’s approach to T-to-C. Lastly we have argued that, in fact, *any* timing solution is incompatible with the simultaneity of application of operations internal to a phase proposed in Chomsky 2007, 2008.

We turn in §2.4 to a final piece of evidence against such a timing approach, namely that it is founded on the assumption that V-v-to-T is possible *only if* EA raises to TP. §2.4 shows that V-v-to-T is possible in cases where EA does NOT raise to TP.


2.4 Subject-in-situ VSO languages

VSO order in languages such as Irish and Xhosa demonstrate that V-v-to-T is not contingent in any way upon EA raising.¹⁴ In such cases no timing approach could explain why D-raising from EA does not compete with V-v-to-T raising.

McCloskey 1996, 2005 provides persuasive empirical evidence that a sentence like (9) is the product of V-to-v-to-T across the in situ subject. By the logic of POP’s approach to (1), D of the subject should be equidistant from T and the crucial ambiguity should arise.

- (9) a. Sciob an cat an t-eireaball de-n luch
snatched the cat the tail from-the mouse
‘The cat cut the tail off the mouse’

- b. *Subparts of EA and V+v are equally close to T, but only V+v raises*

[_{TP} ...T [_{VP} [the cat] [_V snatched+v [_{VP} <snatched> from the mouse]]]]

Minimal search fails to single out V+v alone

Carstens & Mletshe 2013 provide examples of VSO in Xhosa embedded clauses with overt complementizers. They argue that in a clause with default (= Class 17) subject agreement like (10)a, the subject remains very low in the structure. The verb raises across it and adjoins to a middle-field inflection below Tense, identified in the Bantu linguistics literature as Mood (see (10)b); (10) adapted from Carstens & Mletshe (2013).¹⁵ The

¹⁴ It is not our intent to suggest that VSO has this derivation universally; only that there are languages where it works this way.

¹⁵ We disregard a low FocusP between vP and T proposed in Carstens & Mletshe’s analysis. Its inclusion reproduces exactly the same problem of head movement across the

subject cannot surface higher as (10)c,d illustrate. The locations of C and T morphemes make it particularly unlikely that EA has raised to Spec, TP in the licit example (as it would have to for the proposal in §2.2 to be applicable). Had it so raised, the subject would be expected to surface between *okokuba* – ‘that’ and the future auxiliary *be*, contrary to fact.

- (10) a. ...okokuba ku-be ku-fund-a wena i-si-Xhosa
 that 17SA-FUT 17SA-study-MOOD you 7-7-Xhosa
 ‘...that you will study Xhosa’
 [Lit: that will study you Xhosa]
- b. [_{CP} that [_{TP} FUT [_{MoodP} study+MOOD ... [_α you ...<study+v> Xhosa...]]]]
- c. *...okokuba **wena** ku-be ku-fund-a i-si-Xhosa
- d. *...okokuba ku-be **wena** ku-fund-a i-si-Xhosa

We conclude that verb-raising is possible in Xhosa across an EA that remains low. As (11) illustrates, this means that D of the EA is as close to Mood as V+v is. But (12) shows that D cannot raise instead of V.¹⁶

(11) *EA and V+v are equally close to Mood.*

[_{MoodP} ... Mood ... [_α [EA] [study+v [_{VP}...]]]]

(12) *D cannot move instead of V:*

- a. ...okokuba ku-be ku-fund-a lo mntwana i-si-Xhosa
 that 17SA-FUT 17SA-study-MOOD 1this 1child 7-7-Xhosa
 ‘that this child will study Xhosa’
- b. *...okokuba ku-be **lo(-a)** m-ntwana ku-fund(-a) i-si-Xhosa
 that 17SA-FUT 1this(-MOOD) 1-1child 17SA-study(-MOOD) 7-7-Xhosa
 ‘that this child will study Xhosa’

low subject again, one notch higher in the structure. Because EA of VSO constructions raises into Spec of the low FocusP in Carstens & Mletshe’s account, Xhosa VSO clauses are not incompatible with the POP proposal that the labeling algorithm LA forces EA raising out of vP. Whether Irish is compatible with this proposal is not clear to us. See §3.3 on a contradiction between the LA approach to EA raising and the POP proposal that Feature Inheritance leaves a copy of the inherited features on the phase head.

¹⁶ (12)b illustrates that the derivation fails regardless of whether or to what the Mood suffix *-a* attaches. In more traditional approaches, such an affix (overt or null) can select for the category of what raises for it to attach to. Recall however POP’s proposal that T-to-C should be explained by “locality independent of category” (see citation in §1). We see no principled reason why the expectation should not hold equally here.

2.5 V-raising across intervening negation

A second class of problems for POP (and the strategy sketched out in §2.3) lies in one of the standard diagnostics for V-v-to-T movement. Following Pollock 1989, we take the presence of negation between the surface position of V and its object to indicate that V has raised out of VP.

- (13) a. Je n' aime *pas* les fraises
 I ne like not DET strawberries
 'I don't like strawberries'

b. [TP SU...V+v+T [NegP Neg [vP <SU> <v> ...]]]

Recall POP's assertion that "inversion depends on locality independent of category," hence only hierarchical relations are involved in the calculus of closeness relevant to T-to-C movement. If we extend this idea to V-v-to-T movement, then it cannot be relevant whether the raised item is a verb, and Neg itself ought to be a candidate for movement to T, contrary to fact. If we assume that the subject does not pass through a Spec, NegP en route to Spec TP, then Neg should be the *only* candidate, since it is most local to T (see (14)a). Neg's structural relation to T parallels that of T to C in (3), repeated below. If we assume instead that the subject occupies Spec, NegP at a point before verb-raising, then minimal search should yield an ambiguous result. Neg and D in the subject should compete for raising to T in (14)b, just as POP argues would be true of T-to-C across a subject in Spec, TP in the hypothetical (2). In neither case is raising of the verb expected to cross Negation.

- (14) a. *Minimal search should find and raise Neg to T, not v*

T [NegP Neg [vP EA v...]]

- b. *If EA raises to Spec, Neg, minimal search should yield ambiguous results*

T [NegP EA Neg [vP <EA> v...]]

- (3) *Chomsky's claim: only T can raise to C because the C-T relationship is established when EA is still in situ*

[C [TP T...[vP [D NP] v...]]]

3. Wh-questions: the Subject/non-subject asymmetry

3.1 The problem

Consider now a second case of English T-to-C movement not addressed in POP. T-to-C occurs in Wh-questions (WHQ) as well as Yes/No questions. Subject and non-subject Wh-questions display a well-known asymmetry in that T-to-C is *required* in matrix questions unless the moving WH is coming from the local Spec T:¹⁷

¹⁷ As noted in footnote 10, stressed *do* is irrelevant here.

- (15) a. Which boys (*did) eat the pizza
 b. Which pizza *(did) the boys eat
 c. Which boys₁ *(did) you say t₁ ate the pizza

As (15) demonstrates, T-to-C is obligatory in all direct English WHQ except local subject questions like (15)a, where it is forbidden. (16) sketches out the relevant structure before WH movement for the three examples prior to C-to-T Feature Inheritance (Chomsky 2007, 2008). Shading indicates areas to which Transfer has applied; following Chomsky 2000 we assume the VP complement of v* Transfers before WH moves to Spec C. This forces all but local subject WHs to move to the edge of the local vP phase edge, as is commonly assumed. Local subjects are externally Merged to the vP phase edge.

- (16) a. C [_{TP} T [_{VP} which boys [v [_{VP} eat the pizza]]]
 b. C [_{TP} T [_{VP} which pizza [_{VP} you [v [_{VP} eat <which pizza>]]]]]
 c. C [_{TP} T [_{VP} which boys [_{VP} you [v [_{VP} say ...]]]]]

The problem for deriving (15)a-c should be evident: there is no difference between subject and non-subject WHQ in terms of the relation between T and C or in terms of distance between C and WH, and hence no clear basis on which to predict when T-to-C movement applies.

3.2 A solution

There is a simple way around this problem. Suppose (contra Chomsky 2007, 2008) that subject WH movement proceeds to Spec, CP via Spec T, rather than directly from Spec v. Thus the two cases involve different configurations, sketched in (17):

- (17) a. C [_{TP} which boys [T [_{VP} <which boys> [v [_{VP} eat the pizza]]]]]
 b. C [_{TP} ...T ...[_{VP} which pizza [you v [_{VP} eat <which pizza>]]]]]

In (17)b, T is clearly closer to C than the Wh-phrase is, in marked contrast to (17)a. This assumption allows a potential account of the suppression of T-to-C movement in subject questions like (15)a on the basis of locality, much in the spirit of the POP attempt to explain why C rather than D raises in (3). That is, in (17)b T raises to C since T is unambiguously close(est) unlike in (17)a. But in a departure from POP assumptions, reference to features is crucial to ensure that a WH subject prevents T-to-C while a non-WH subject like that in (3) or (15)c does not. See Pesetsky & Torrego 2001 for an argument that T and a subject in Spec, TP are equally distant from C, as in POP. In Pesetsky & Torrego's account, both have features relevant to C, but a WH-subject has more of them, making a derivation that raises the WH-subject more economical than a derivation that raises both.¹⁸

¹⁸ We gloss over some details of Pesetsky & Torrego's analysis, which proposes that two options do exist if the subject is not interrogative. Where the object is WH, either T or the equidistant subject can raise to the CP edge, but an exclamative interpretation results in the latter case (*What a silly book Mary bought!*). We think that the necessity of T-to-C in Yes/No questions raises some problems for this approach similar to those we discuss in

This analysis is incompatible with POP assumptions in several ways. First, as we saw in §2, equidistant candidates for raising should yield completely free alternatives; hence it would be expected that T and (subparts of) the WH-subject would be equally able to raise to C(P) in a subject question. Second, POP proposes that WH-subjects never raise to Spec,CP, in contrast with Pesetsky & Torrego’s analysis. Hence either some POP assumptions must be abandoned or some alternative account of this asymmetry must be found.

3.3 A Possible Alternative

3.3.1 Subject questions in POP

POP proposes that subject and non-subject questions differ in a way that is potentially relevant to the asymmetry of concern. While non-subject WH move to Spec, CP, WH-subjects surface in Spec TP.

As noted in §1 and §2.3, POP follows Chomsky 2007, 2008 and Richards 2007 in assuming that T obtains features from C. In addition to the unvalued phi-features these works discuss, POP adds a proposal that the Q feature of an interrogative C is among those that T inherits, on the basis that “features of an LI cannot move independently of the feature bundle to which they belong” (POP:47). Copies of all of C’s features including Q are therefore inherited by T in a bundle. Crucially, POP argues that Feature Inheritance must be construed as copying “leaving Q in its original position for selection and labeling” (POP:47, note 47). We illustrate in (18):

(18) *Feature Inheritance in POP:* $C_{[Q, uPhi\dots]} T \rightarrow C_{[Q1, uPhi1\dots]} T_{[Q2, uPhi2\dots]}$

Phrases obtain labels in POP by means of a feature-seeking algorithm that applies at the phase level. In the configuration $[_\alpha XP, YP]$, α can obtain a label if XP and YP share a “prominent feature.” In subject questions, the copy of Q on T agrees with the Wh-subject and the constituent formerly known as TP is labeled QP (see (19)a).¹⁹ In contrast, it is the Q feature on C that agrees with a non-subject WH, labeling CP as QP (see (19)b). Sharing of prominent features between the raised EA and T labels their containing phrase PhiP.

- (19) a. $C_{[Q1, uPhi1\dots]} [QP [How\ many\ mechanics] [T_{[Q2, uPhi2\dots]} fixed\ the\ cars?]]$
 b. $[QP [How\ many\ cars] C_{[Q1, uPhi1\dots]} [PhiP [the\ mechanics] T_{[Q2, uPhi2\dots]} \dots]]$

POP does not address the question of why T must raise to C in the circumstances where this is required. The facts are puzzling on POP assumptions. C needs only its own Q-feature in order to interact with a non-subject WH-phrase for labeling or to participate in selection. In prior treatments including that of Pesetsky & Torrego mentioned above, C

relation to POP, but they lie outside this paper’s scope. See §3.3 for discussion of T-to-C in Yes/No questions and a POP-inspired suggestion on how it might work.

¹⁹ T also agrees with the WH-subject in phi-features. It isn’t clear from POP’s discussion how this factors into the labeling in (19)a.

has an additional feature that requires valuation in a local relation with a matching feature of T or the subject. But in the POP system, there is no comparable motivation for T-to-C movement in non-subject questions. Feature Inheritance ensures that C and T's features are the same ones. T therefore has nothing that C does not also have apart from their differing categories, and POP assumptions rule out reference to category. It is thus somewhat mysterious that T should have to raise. If we suppose that T-to-C simply happens freely in a move-alpha sort of way, with locality the only relevant issue, it is not clear why it should be barred in (19)a. Crucially, C is present in the derivation to supply T's features. The impossibility of T-to-C movement in subject questions therefore cannot be attributed to C being absent.

3.3.2 A speculation about multiple Qs

It seems to us in principle possible that POP's duplication of the Q-feature might yield a novel account of the subject/non-subject asymmetry for T-to-C in WH-questions. Our proposal relies on one crucial assumption: *both copies of Q must end up in a Spec, head relation with an interrogative operator*. In a subject question like (16)a or (19)a, C would lower to T (see (20)).²⁰ In a non-subject question like (16)b,c or (19)b, where the interrogative operator moves to Spec, CP, T must raise to place its copy of Q in a Spec, head relation with WH (see (21)).²¹

(20) <C_[Q1, uPhi1...]> [QP [How many mechanics] [C_[Q1, uPhi1...]+T_[Q2, uPhi2...] fixed the cars?]]

(21) [QP [How many cars] T_[Q2, uPhi2...]+C_[Q1, uPhi1...] [PhiP [the mech...] <T_[Q2, uPhi2...]> ...]]

To extend this analysis to Yes/No questions requires the further assumption that such questions involve a null Q-operator in Spec C. Roberts 1993, Grimshaw 1993, and Radford 2004 propose that such a null operator is indeed base-generated in Spec, CP of a Yes/No question. Assuming this, the approach we have sketched above might be extended to them.²²

²⁰ It is important that this hypothetical lowering operation be distinguished from the FI operation that copies the features of C onto T. The latter process does not remove the copied features of C from it. In contrast, the former leaves no copy in CP.

²¹ Given that labels are determined by a late algorithm, a possible interpretation is that T can't raise to C in a subject question because this would interfere with labeling TP as QP. By extension, though, we might expect labeling of TP as PhiP to be compromised by raising T to C in Yes/No and non-subject WH-questions. We leave this aside.

²² How to explain the lack of scope ambiguities in Yes/No questions is an open question for such an account, since OP might be merged in a clause lower than the matrix. This would yield impossible interpretations consistent with answering (i) with (iii) as well as (ii):

- (i) Did Bill hear that Mary left?
- (ii) Yes, he did.
- (iii) *Yes she did.

- (22) a. Did the students leave?
 b. $[_{QP} OP T_{[Q2, u\Phi i2...]} + C_{[Q1, u\Phi i1...]} [_{\Phi iP} [the\ students] <T_{[Q2, u\Phi i2...]}> [_{VP} leave...]]]$

This is the only interpretation of the POP system that we have been able to cook up which might capture the distribution of T-to-C in questions.

Like Pesetsky & Torrego's approach to T-to-C movement, the possibility we have sketched out here ties head-movement to features of the moving element and its target.

In sum, there is a straightforward way of accounting for the distribution of T-to-C in matrix questions if we assume that WH moves to Spec C in all cases. A different account might be possible under POP assumptions, including copying C's features to T and moving subject WHs only to Spec, TP.²³ But if something along these lines can be made to work, it will be further evidence that head-movement is driven and constrained by factors other than pure locality, as we have argued to be the case for V-v-to-T. A natural move is to extend our conclusions to the question of why T and not D raises to C in questions, contrary to POP's approach.

3.3.3 Unsolved mysteries

POP's proposals about Feature Inheritance raise some important conceptual questions. While FI is not head movement, it is an important sub-case of head-head relations relevant to the material in this paper. We therefore offer a few observations on its implications.

Under the interpretation of Feature Inheritance as copying, it is not clear why the unvalued phi-features left on C do not cause the derivation to crash. POP's footnote 47 suggests that these phi-features may be "deleted or given a phonetic form (as in West Flemish) hence [are] invisible at the next phase."

Chomsky 2001, 2007, 2008 argues that transferring features before valuation is "too early" because unvalued features cause crash; and that transferring features after valuation is "too late" because they cannot be distinguished from intrinsically valued interpretable features and will therefore also cause a crash (see also Epstein, Kitahara & Seely 2010 for discussion). The upshot is that unvalued features must obtain values and be immediately transferred. They cannot be retained on a phase head, either valued or unvalued. Chomsky's two suggestions – that C's uPhi can be deleted unvalued, or given phonetic form – are not consistent with these prior positions on the status of uPhi, but POP contains no explanation as to how these inconsistencies are to be resolved.²⁴

²³ To repeat, there are many technical details left unaddressed. However, we believe that any analysis exploiting POP's core idea will face the problems outlined here.

²⁴ POP refers the reader to Ouali 2008 for discussion of the options and their consequences. Ouali argues that in subject questions, C does not give phi-features to T; and also assumes (i) that unvalued uPhi will cause the derivation to crash, and (ii) that valued uF on phase-heads are licit. It would take us too far afield to do a full review and comparison here. We leave these points for readers to explore.

One more unsolved mystery concerns POP's proposal that EA raises from vP because otherwise vP cannot be labeled. POP claims that with EA in situ, vP constitutes an [XP, YP] configuration in which there is no shared prominent feature to form the label. The subject therefore must move ((23) = POP's (17)).

(23) T [_β (EA) [v* [V IA]]]

POP, 44: "Since β is of the form {XP, YP} it is not labeled by LA...if EA raises to surface subject – SPEC-T, using the term SPEC here and below just for exposition – then β will be labeled v*, as required."

As noted in §3.2, POP proposes that when the EA raises to Spec, TP (= α in (24), reproducing POP's (16)) there is labeling of TP as PhiP because "NP and TP share prominent features, namely phi-features" (POP: 45). Once labeling has taken place, no further movement is possible.

(24) [c C [_α NP TP]]

But recall POP's proposal that Feature Inheritance is feature copying, leaving a copy on the phase head as discussed in §3.3.1. POP argues that "individual features cannot be moved independently of the bundle to which they belong" (POP:47) and that C must keep a copy of Q for selection and labeling. If these proposals generalize to the phase head v*, then v* will necessarily retain a copy of uPhi in spite of v*-to-V Feature Inheritance (see (25). Since EA also has phi-features, vP is predicted to be labeled PhiP (see (26)). Under POP assumptions, *critical freezing* should accompany successful sharing of a prominent feature, erroneously ruling out raising of the subject to Spec, TP (see discussion in POP: 47, citing Rizzi personal communication; see also Rizzi & Shlonsky 2007).

(25) *Feature Inheritance as copying: v* retains uPhi*

a. [v*_{uPhi...} [VP V...]] → b. [v*_{uPhi1...} [VP V_{uPhi2...} ...]]

(26) *Since EA and v* both have Phi under this approach to FI, shared prominent feature should label vP as PhiP, incorrectly ruling out EA-raising*

a. [_α EA_φ v*_{uPhi1...} [VP...]] → b. [_{PhiP} EA_φ v*_{uPhi1...} [VP ...]]

The labeling account of EA raising and the copying approach to Feature Inheritance thus seem to be incompatible components of the POP approach.

4. Concluding Remarks

POP's explanatory ambitions fall short of its goals, as revealed when one compares its outcomes with those of traditional accounts. In more conventional analyses of head raising, selection for category and other features work in concert with hierarchical locality considerations to dictate what moves. Thus, for example, V moves to T because of some specific requirements of T that V meets; D fails to have the relevant features or properties and hence is not a potential mover in these cases (the same is true for Neg).

Similarly, in cases of WHQs, features of T and C (and under Pesetsky and Torrego's account, the subject) determine when movement does and does not apply. The features of relevance are *ad hoc*, however. POP eschews such devices and tries to provide a more principled account. Sadly, the account appears to be incompatible with broad classes of phenomena and with standard assumptions about clausal architecture and the Merge location of subjects. Moreover, it is at least questionable *whether* one wants too principled an account for these cases. T-to-C movement and verb-raising are parametric options. It seems to us that features (including reference to category) are a reasonable way of distinguishing these grammar-specific options. If so, then POP's ambitions are misdirected. Sometimes *ad hoc* is just what we need.²⁵

In addition to approaching T-to-C in terms of locality only, POP presents some new and interesting proposals regarding Feature Inheritance as copying, and labeling as the driving force for XP-movement. While these have fascinating implications, we have pointed out some inconsistencies and problems that must be resolved in order for them to be workable.

References

Carstens, Vicki & Loyiso Mletshe. 2013. Implications of Xhosa expletive constructions. *LingBuzz* 001750.

Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130: 33-49.

Chomsky, Noam. 2007. Approaching UG from below. In *Interfaces + Recursion = Language?*, ed. by U. Sauerland and H.-M. Gartner, 1-29. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chomsky Noam. 2008. On Phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133-166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In *Ken Hale: a life in language*. Ed. By M. Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Epstein, Sam, Hisa Kitahara, and Daniel Seely. 2010. Uninterpretable features: what are they and what do they do? in *Exploring Crash-Proof Grammars*, ed. by Michael Putnam, 125-142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Epstein, S. D., H. Kitahara, and T. D. Seely. 2012. "Structure Building That Can't Be!" In M. Uribe-etxebarria and V. Valmala eds., *Ways of structure building*, in Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics D. Adger and H. Borer series eds, Oxford, 253-270.

Grimshaw, Jane. 1993. Minimal projection, heads, and optimality. Draft ms., Rutgers University.

Kandybowicz, Jason. 2008. On the incompatibility of Feature Inheritance and the PIC. Ms., Swarthmore College.

²⁵ *Ad hoc* does mean "to the point."

- Kinyalolo, K.K.W. 1991. Syntactic dependencies and the Spec, head agreement hypothesis in Kilega. UCLA PhD thesis.
- McCloskey, James. 2005. Predicates and Heads in Irish Clausal Syntax. In *Verb First: On the Syntax of Verb-Initial Languages*, Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley, and Sheila Ann Dooley, editors, John Benjamins: 155–174.
- McCloskey, James. 1996. ‘On the Scope of Verb Movement in Irish,’ *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14, 47–104.
- Ouali, Hamid. 2008. On C-to-T f-feature transfer: the nature of agreement and anti-agreement in Berber. In: D’Alessandro, Rl, Hrafnbjargarson, G.H., Fischer, S. (Eds.), *Agreement Restrictions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 115-180.
- Pesetsky, David and Esther Torrego. 2001. T-to-C movement: causes and consequences. in M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 355-426.
- Piatelli-Palmarini, M. (ed.), 1980. *Language and Learning: The Debate between Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pollock 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20.3: 365-424.
- Radford, Andrew. 2004. *Minimalist Syntax: exploring the structure of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Richards, M. 2007. On feature inheritance: an argument from the phase impenetrability condition. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 563-572.
- Rizzi, Luigi and Ur Shlonsky. 2007. Strategies for subject extraction. In *Interfaces + recursion = language?; Chomsky’s minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics*, edited by U. Sauerland and H.-M. Gartner, 115-160. Studies in Generative Grammar 89. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, Ian. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Publications.
- Roberts, Ian. 2010. *Agreement and head-movement: clitics, incorporation, and defective goals*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Torrego, Esther. 1984. On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. In R. Freidin and H. Lasnik (eds) *Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, pp. 362-393.