



snippets

Issue 19

July 2009

Contents

1. Bridget Copley and Heidi Harley. *Futurates, directors and have-causatives.*
2. Xuan Di. *Predicate types in relative clauses and complementizer deletion.*
3. Aviad Eilam. *Evidence for covert syntax in complement coercion.*
4. Nancy Hedberg and Richard C. DeArmond. *On complements and adjuncts.*
5. Ken Hiraiwa. *Kakarimusubi in Okinawan and its microparametric implications.*
6. Karine Megerdooian. *Telicity in Persian complex predicates.*
7. Andrea Moro. *Rethinking symmetry: a note on labeling and the EPP.*
8. Lucia Pozzan and Giuliano Bocci. *Here there is an ambiguity: two readings for the sequence here/there-P in Italian.*
9. Emilio Servidio. *A puzzle on auxiliary omission and focalization in English: evidence for cartography.*



7.

Andrea Moro – Università Vita-Salute San Raffaele
Rethinking symmetry: a note on labeling and the EPP

moro.andrea@hsr.it

The following sentence, uttered with neutral intonation (that is, with no focus intonation -- see the end of the snippet) stands out as a puzzle for syntactic theory:

- (1) * pro è [[una foto del muro] [la causa della rivolta]]
(pro is a picture of the wall the cause of the riot)

In a pro-drop language like Italian, pro-insertion as an alternative to DP raising should make the sentence grammatical as in the case of passives and unaccusatives satisfying the EPP. The copula, instead, requires raising of either the subject (*una foto del muro*) or the predicate DP (*la causa della rivolta*), yielding a canonical (2a) or an inverse (2b) copular sentence (in the sense of Moro 1997, 2000):

- (2) a. [una foto del muro] è [t [la causa della rivolta]]
(a picture of the wall is the cause of the riot)
- b. [la causa della rivolta] è [[una foto del muro] t]
(the cause of the riot is a picture of the wall)

This puzzle may lead to a rethinking of the EPP and the core mechanism of labelling in grammar along the following lines of reasoning.

Labels are not given (cf. Chomsky 2006 and, for an interesting advancement, the Probing Algorithm proposed in Cecchetto and Donati, in press): rather, they are derived computationally, via inspection within the search space of a head. When two maximal projections are Merged (either IM or EM), the resulting {XP, YP} can be either an adjunct structure – where either XP asymmetrically projects turning the other into a specifier – or an unlabelled syntactic object where none projects. If this is the case, such as for copular sentences, it is reasonable to assume that the configuration crashes because the search space for any head H that merges with it is ambiguous.

On the other hand, if either XP or YP is targeted by H and then raised (yielding, for example: {YP, {H, {XP, YP}}}), the problem of labelling is solved: YP is no longer available for inspection to H - it being a discontinuous constituent - and the label can be properly assigned. This is why pro-insertion does not help in (1). (This is immediate within a representational perspective. Within a derivational perspective, instead, things are less clear: one possibility could be to assume that Merge and the copy mechanism yielding movement are simultaneous.)

Given these premises, the prediction is that there is no necessity to raise either DP to the copula: it is sufficient that either one is raised to *any* head that merges with {XP, YP}, neutralizing the problem given by the absence of a label. This prediction appears to be borne out, once we assume that the process of focalization involves raising to a specialized Foc^o head, available in Italian in postverbal positions as suggested by Belletti (1999):

- (3) a. pro è [UNA FOTO DEL MURO Foc [t la causa della rivolta]]
 (pro is a picture of the wall the cause of the riot)
- b. pro è [LA CAUSA DELLA RIVOLTA Foc [una foto del muro t]]
 (pro is the cause of the riot a picture of the wall)

In these structures pro-insertion can take place successfully, since the postcopular constituent is not unlabelled any more. The fact that pro-insertion does not meet the EPP in (1) shows that the EPP phenomena are not due to any special property of preverbal positions but rather they are the consequence of much more general computational mechanisms forcing movement from a symmetrical structure.

References

- Belletti, A. (1999) "Inversion as focalization." In *Inversion in Romance*, ed. A. Hulke and J.-Y. Pollock. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cecchetto, C. and C. Donati (in press) "On labeling: principle C and head movement." *Syntax*.
- Chomsky, N. (2006) "On phases," in *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, ed. R. Freidin et al. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Moro, A. (1997) *The Raising of Predicates*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Moro, A. (2000) *Dynamic Antisymmetry*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.