

The Extended Projection Principle (EPP) is a formal requirement for the obligatory movement of some element into the inflectional domain. Alongside the DP-raising EPP of English (Chomsky 1981, 1982), Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) propose that subject-verb agreement checks the EPP in *pro*-drop languages, and Richards and Biberauer (2005) argue that nominal features check the EPP in some Germanic languages, by pied-piping the *vP* to *spec,TP*.

There are several languages for which a verb-raising EPP has been proposed but where the raised constituent does not always contain nominal features. I argue that these form a class of languages with a predicate-sensitive EPP. For example, predicate-raising occurs in Niuean and checks the EPP (Massam and Smallwood 1997), although the verbs do not agree with the subject, nor must there be a nominal in the fronted constituent; rather, it may include the object (1a), or only the verb itself (1b). The constituent which checks the EPP is underlined.

- (1) a. [*vP* Takafaga ika] tūmau nī a ia. b. Takafaga tūmau nī e ia e tau ika.
 hunt fish always EMP ABS he hunt always EMP ERG he ABS PL fish
 ‘He is always fishing.’ (Niuean; Massam 2001)

Biberauer (2010) suggests that in Celtic languages such as Irish, the EPP is checked by verb-raising. However, verbs in Irish do not exhibit subject agreement in many contexts, such as (2).

- (2) Leanann an t-ainmní an briathar i nGaeilge (Irish; H&C 1997)
 follow.PRES the subject the verb in Irish ‘The subject follows the verb in Irish.’

Finally, Johns (2007) proposes a $\sqrt{\text{EPP}}$ for Inuktitut, which is manifested by the verb root appearing initially in the verbal complex (3). I assume, following Compton and Pittman (2010), that an Inuktitut word is equivalent to a phase, and is formed syntactically. Although Inuktitut has rich agreement, as realized in the suffix *-tunga* below, the nominal features are not part of the constituent that raises, and therefore cannot participate in EPP-checking.

- (3) Niri-gaju- lau- nngit-tunga. (Inuktitut; C&P 2010)
 eat- always-DIST.PAST-NEG- DEC.1SG ‘I wasn’t always eating.’

In all three of these languages, however, it can be shown that these are in fact predicates which raise, rather than verbs, particularly. For example, in the Niuean example in (4), a locative predicate may front to initial position instead of a verbal constituent, while in the Irish example in (5), a nominal predicate fronts. Note that Carnie argues that the *is* particle in Irish is in C.

- (4) [_{PRED} Hā he fale] a ia. (5) Is [fear mór] Seán
 PRED in house ABS she C man big John

‘She is in the house.’ (Niuean; Massam 2001) ‘John is a big man.’ (Irish; Carnie 1995)

Likewise, Johns (2007) demonstrates that light verbs are unable to check the EPP in Inuktitut. In clauses with light verbs, a nominal root must take the initial position in the verbal complex instead, resulting in argument doubling (6a) or the insertion of the $\sqrt{\text{EPP}}$ -expletive *pi* (6b). Again, this demonstrates that a verbal element is not sufficient, but that, rather, a predicate is required.

- (6) a. Saali ilisaiji- u- juq b. pi- qa- nngit-tuq
 Sally teacher-be-INTR.PART.3S EXPL-have-NEG- INTR.PART.3S
 ‘Sally is a teacher.’ ‘He has nothing.’ (Inuktitut; Johns 2007)

These languages contrast with those where the EPP is checked by nominal features, whether a DP or on the verb (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998, Richards and Biberauer 2005), and languages like French and Finnish, which have verb-raising, not predicate-raising (i.e., targeting auxiliaries but not non-verbal predicates), and thus require a DP subject. Defining this contrast between nominal- and predicate-sensitive EPP allows us to better account for variation in EPP type, as well as providing clues as to the underlying purpose of the EPP.

References

- Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word order, V-movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16: 491-539.
- Biberauer, T. 2010. Semi null-subject languages, expletives and expletive *pro* reconsidered. In *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*, eds. T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts, and M. Sheehan. 153-199. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Carnie, A. 1995. *Non-Verbal Predication and Head-Movement*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Chomsky, N. 1982. *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Compton, R. & C. Pittman. 2010. Word-formation by phase in Inuit. *Lingua* 120: 2167-2192.
- Harley, H. & Carnie, A. 1997. PRO, the EPP and Nominative Case: Evidence from Irish infinitivals. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 4: 71-86.
- Johns, A. 2007. Restricting Noun Incorporation: Root Movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 535-576.
- Massam, D. 2001. Pseudo Noun Incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19: 153-197.
- Massam, D. & Smallwood, C. 1997. Essential Features of Predication in English and Niuean. In *Proceedings of NELS 27*, ed. K. Kusumoto. 263-272. Graduate Linguistics Student Union, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Richards & Biberauer. 2005. Explaining *Expl*. In *The function of function words and functional categories*, eds. M. den Dikken and C. Tortora. 115-154. Amsterdam: Benjamins.