Criterial Freezing, EPP and Asymmetries.

I. A Criterial Approach to the EPP

(15) EPP: Clauses must have subjects.  (Chomsky 1981)

(16) What justifies movement to subject position in compliance with “last resort” guidelines?
   i. requirements of the Case-agreement system, hence the syntax-morphology interface;
   ii. interpretive requirements, hence the syntax-CI interface (Subject Criterion)

(17) A Gianni piacciono queste idee
   ‘To Gianni please these ideas’

(18)a Le idee che a Gianni piacciono di più sono queste
   ‘The ideas that to Gianni please most are these

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

(19) An argument is selected and taken as the starting point in the description of the event, which is presented as “being about” that argument.

(20)A : Che cosa è successo ?
   ‘What happened ?’
   B : Un camion ha tamponato un autobus
      ‘A truck bumped into a bus’
   B’ : Un autobus è stato tamponato da un camion
      ‘A bus was bumped into by a truck’
   B’’ : # Un autobus / l’autobus per Roma, un camion lo ha tamponato / lo ha tamponato un camion
 discorsivo
      ‘A bus / the bus for Rome, a truck bumped into it / bumped into it a truck’

(21) … poi ___ è ripartito  (after (20)B: the truck left. After (20)B’: the bus left)
   ‘… then ___ left’
   (Calabrese 1986: *pro* picks out the referent of the subject of predication)

(22) Top: [+ aboutness]
     [+ D-linking]

(23) Subj: [+ aboutness]

(24) [ XP [ Top YP ] ] : “About XP, a familiar referent, [YP … ___i …] holds”

(25) [ XP [ Subj YP ] ] : “About XP, [YP … ___i …] holds”
(26) Properties of Subj:

a. … Fin … Subj … T ……………… (Cardinaletti 2004, etc.)

b. Subj is [+N] and attracts a nominal element to its Spec.

(27) Le ragazze le son venute (NID, Brandi & Cordin 1989, Poletto 2000, Manzini & Savoia ‘The girls Scl have+3pl come’ 2005)

(28) Why expletives? Subj is at the junction of the CP and IP systems; it shares with the former the fact that the position is dedicated to a scope-discourse property; and with the latter the obligatoriness of the position, much as the backbone of the IP structure. There is a tension between these two requirements (scope-discourse positions typically are specified only when required by 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.

(29) Was glaubst du welchen Mantel Jakob heute angezogen hat?
‘What do you believe which coat Jakob put on today?’ (McDaniel 1989)

II. Subject-Object Asymmetries: ECP Effects as Criterial Freezing

(30)a * Who do you think [ that [ t Subj will come ] ]?
   b Who do you think [ that [ Mary Subj will meet t] ]?

(31) ECP : t must be properly head-governed (Chomsky 1981, Rizzi 1990)

(32) Subject extraction is blocked by Criterial Freezing

(33)a * Who would you prefer [ for [ ___ to win ]]?
   b Who do you work for ___?
   c * Who would you prefer [ for [ ___ Subj to win ]]?

(34)a * Combien de personnes veux-tu [ que [ ___ Subj viennent à ton anniversaire ]] ?
   ‘How many people do you want that come to your birthday?’

   b ? Combien veux-tu que [ [ ___ de personnes ] Subj viennent à ton anniversaire ] ?
   ‘How many do you want that of people come to your birthday’
   (Obenauer 1976, Kayne 1983, thanks to P. Hirshbühler)

3. Null Subject Languages.

(35)a Chi credi che verrà? (Rizzi 1982, 1990)
   ‘Who do you think that will come?’

   b Credo che verrà Gianni
   ‘I think that will come Gianni’

   c Chi credi [che [pro verrà t]]
(36) 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:

(37)a. BP * (João disse que) saíram eles
    b. Sp (Juan dijo que) salieron ellos
       ‘J. said that left they’

(38) Quem o João disse que vai chegar tarde?
    ‘Who J. said that is going to arrive late?’

(39) Menuzzi (2000) provides an argument based on Sportiche’s (1988) analysis of Qfloat that subjects are wh moved from a lower position:

(40)a Que rapazes o Paulo desconfia que tenham beijado todos 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?

(41) 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 (37)a has to do with the availability of a lower focal position (Belletti 2001, 2004), an option partially independent from subject extraction (see also Nicolis 2005 for recent discussion).

(42)a pro parece que o José passou por aqui
    ‘seems that J. came by here’
    b pro choveu a noite inteira
    ‘rained all night’

(43) Evidently, the Q todos is insufficient to satisfy the Subject Criterion in (40c) and allow the extraction of the wh subject qua subextraction. Presumably, it lacks the required nominal features (cf. (34b), where the Q is subextracted and the nominal part of the DP remains in the criterial configuration).

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

(44) menu we a vedo do *(e) na wa? (Gungbe, E. Aboh)
    ‘Who FOC you believe that he will come?’

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

(45) ima -ta -taj Maria-ka Juzi miku-shka -ta kri-n?
    what ACC Q Maria TOP Jóez eat-NOMINALIZER ACC believe-AGR
    ‘What does Maria believe that Jóez ate?’

(46) ima -ta wawa miku-chun-taj Maria-muna-n?
    what ACC child eat FIN Q Maria want -AGR
    ‘What does Maria want (that) the child eat?’
    Lit. ‘[What the child eat] does Maria want
5. Other “Skipping” Strategies: que → qui.

(48) a. L’homme [ Op que [ tu as vu t ]]                          (French)
   ‘The man that you have seen’
   b. L’homme [ Op qui [ t est venu]]
      ‘The man that has come’

(49) Rizzi (1990): qui = que+Agr

(50) Taraldsen (2001): qui = que+Expl   (-i akin to il)

(51) L’homme Rel Op qu’[ –i Subj est t’ venu t]

(52) a. Il, la semaine prochaine, partira en Italie
      ‘He, next week, will leave to Italy’
   b. L’homme qui, la semaine prochaine, partira en Italie
      ‘The man qui, next week, will leave to Italy

(53) -i is [+N] in Fin

(54) a. Subj [ est venu Op ]
   b. qui+N [ Subj [ est venu Op ]]
   c. L’homme [ Op qui+N [ Subj est venu t ]]

(55) Vi ved hvem *(der) taler med Marit          (Danish, Taraldsen 1986, 1998)
   ‘We know who der talked with Marit’
   Vi vet hvem *(som) snakker med Marit         (Norwegian, Taraldsen, op. cit.,Vangsnes 2004)
   ‘We know who som talked with Marit’

(56) Danish and Norwegian lexicalize the nominal Fin allowing subject movement with a nominal element typical of the IP (Danish: an expletive) or CP (Norwegian: a relative complementizer) system. The the element is indeed in Fin is suggested by the incompatibility with V-2 in main questions.

(57) For [+F] a criterial feature, $H_{+F}$ is in a Spec-head configuration with $A_{+F}$.

(58) For [+F] a criterial feature, $H_{+F}$ is locally c-commanded by $A_{+F}$.
6. Local Subject Questions.

(59)a  Who came?
   b  Qui est venu?
(60)  Brazilian Portuguese:  Quem que vai chegar?
   ‘Who que came?’
(61)  Québécois French : a  Qui que tu as vu?
   b  Qui qui est venu?
(62)  Danish and Norwegian embedded questions (55)

(63)a  Subj [... [ Whsubj ...]]
   b  Fin [ Subj [... [ Whsubj ...]]]
   c  Finₙ [ Subj [... [ Whsubj ...]]]
   d  Who Foc [ t’ Finₙ [ Subj .... [ t left]]]

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

(65)  Who was throwing stones all around Butchers’ Gate?
(66)  * They were throwing stones all around Butchers’ Gate

(67)a  * The students left all
   b  * The students have been contacted all (by the advisor)

(68)a.  In the first step of A-movement, DP cannot be extracted from [ all DP ] because both all
   and D share the relevant attracting feature (perhaps number), so that, because of locality, the entire
   all phrase is always attracted and (66), (67) are excluded.
   b.  Further A movement may strand all in an intermediate position, as in They have [all ___] left
   because here the attractor (perhaps person) may be able to selectively target the DP.
   c.  If the attractor is Q, or Wh, the Wh DP can be extracted from [ all DP ] in its first merge
   position, as in (65).

(68’)a  Subj … Pers … Num …. [ allNum DPₚers, Num ]
   b  Q … Subj … Pers … Num …. [ allNum DPₚ Q, Pers, Num ]

7. Extraction in English

(69)a  Who do you think will come?
   b  Qui crois-tu qui viendra?
   c  * Who do you think that will come?
   d  * Qui crois-tu que viendra?

(70)a  Who do you think will come?
   b  % Qui crois-tu qui viendra?
c % Who do you think that will come?   (Sobin 1989, 2002)

d * Qui crois-tu que viendra?

(71)a the man that will come
    b l’homme qui viendra

(72) Normally, that, que etc. express both declarative force and finiteness: they are merged into Fin
and move to Force (alternatively, they express Force and Fin syncretically). Such elements, as
heads of a clausal argument, are incompatible with the expletive function; so (73) is incompatible
with subject extraction. Therefore, subject movement is only possible at the price of complicating
the C-structure, with Force and Fin (capable of functioning as an expletive) merged independently,
as in (74). This device is always available in local subject questions and subject relatives, as in (71)
(presumably for functional reasons: it must be possible to form a question or relative on the local
subject), but its extension to embedded declaratives, as in (70)b-c, is dialect-specific.

(72) Force   Fin   IP

(73)a Force   Fin   IP          b Force     Fin   IP
     que     tque         that     tthat

(74)a Force   Fin   IP          b Force     Fin   IP
     que   -i             that   [+N]

(75) She thought (*that) this book, you should read
(76) She thought (*that) never in her life would she accept this solution
    (adapted from Grimshaw 1997)

(77) John seems [ t to be happy ]

(78) * John seems [ that t is happy ]

(79) Who do you think [ t’ Fin+\text{-N} [ Subj [ will come t ] ] ]
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