

The EPP and Mad Magazine Sentences

Satoko Osawa

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to provide support for an approach to the EPP (Extended Projection Principle) that predication and structural Case are independently involved to license a syntactic subject. In particular, it is argued that Case is not only motivation for the EPP but predication also plays a role for the subject requirement. The view has been controversial that only the morphology of T (Tense), such as Case feature or Φ -feature, causes the EPP effects. Based on Hungarian, É. Kiss (2002) claims that the EPP is actually composed of two requirements, predication and Case licensing. Osawa (2010) further argues that the two requirements are needed to explain the syntactic behavior of derived subjects of small clauses in English. In this paper, I will provide further evidence to support the claim that predication is independently involved in the EPP.

In section 2, I will introduce an approach to the EPP that both predication and Case independently license a syntactic subject with motivations from Hungarian and English. As evidence for this approach, I will discuss MM (Mad Magazine) sentences in section 3 as default case environments, where no structural Case licensing is needed, and argue that the EPP is still applicable in such environments. Section 4 examines two potential analyses and I will claim that predication is a more essential notion to account for the EPP in MMs. A conclusion will be given in

section 5.

2. Hybrid Approach to the EPP

2.1. Hypothesis

There have been two major approaches to derive the EPP: a predication approach and a morphological approach. Here, I will pursue a hybrid approach that both predication and Case are independently involved in the EPP to license a syntactic subject.

(1) Hybrid Approach to the EPP

Predication and Case licensing are involved in the EPP.

In English finite clauses, in particular, both requirements induce subject movement into the same position, Spec TP¹. In this sense, the EPP in English finite clauses includes the two aspects, though each effect cannot be attested independently because the two requirements raise the same DP into the same position. Let us review motivations for the hybrid approach from Hungarian and English.

2.2. Motivations

2.2.1. Hungarian: É. Kiss (2002)

Based on Hungarian data, É. Kiss claims that the EPP is composed of both EPP1 (predication requirement) and EPP2 (Case licensing).

(2) EPP1: A sentence expressing predication must contain a topic.

EPP2: Of the arguments of a predicate, one must be marked as a subject. (É. Kiss (2002: 116, 119))

EPP1 is the predication requirement of a syntactic subject as a topic in English, and a topic, or a focus in Hungarian². EPP2 requires that one of the arguments be Case-marked as subject, i.e. nominative-Case-marked. In Hungarian, where Case marking takes place in the lexicon and hence subjects need not move to Spec TP for Case licensing, EPP1 and EPP2 are fulfilled in distinctive ways. Since the Case requirement of EPP2 is

met in the lexicon rather than in the syntax in this language, EPP1 can be satisfied with a non-nominative argument, as illustrated in (3).

(3) [_{TopP} Mairt [_{VP} meghívta János vascorára]]

Mary-Acc invited John-Nom for. Dinner

‘John invited Mary for dinner.’ (É. Kiss (2002: 113))

In (3), the subject position, Spec TopP, is filled with an accusative-Case-marked argument that is interpreted as a topic of the sentence³, while the nominative-Case-marked argument stays inside the lexical phrase, VP (or *v*P more specifically), because Case-marking does not involve a syntactic process such as the feature checking through a spec-head relation assumed in the minimalist framework (Chomsky (1995)). This fact demonstrates that the EPP1 and EPP2 are independently motivated.

It should be noted here that, in her treatment of the EPP, É. Kiss seems to regard the EPP as a subject licensing condition rather than a structural condition because EPP2 does not necessarily force the EPP effects as shown in (3). In this sense, EPP2 should be considered the morphological requirement of Case licensing for subjects⁴.

While Hungarian exploits the lexicon to license Case, English adopts structural Case for arguments, and thus it is expected that EPP1 and EPP2 are both fulfilled syntactically. É. Kiss claims that English subjects move out of the TP domain when they are +specific while they remain in Spec TP when they are –specific. Compare (4a) with a +specific subject and (4b) with a –specific subject.

(4) a. John luckily [_{TP} was born on time]

b. Luckily [_{TP} a baby was born on time] (ibid: 117)

Specific subjects such as (4a) necessarily rise from their thematic position in *v*P to Spec TP for structural Case licensing (or feature checking in the minimalist terms), and then they can further move to Spec TopP, interpreted as a topic as a result.

(5) [_{TopP} DP_i [_{TP} *t*_i [_{VP} *t*_i]]]

This analysis suggests that subject movement is motivated independently

by both predication and Case licensing.

2.2.2. English

Although É. Kiss formalizes predication as a relation between a topic/focus and its predicate, predication is also a relation between a subject and its predicate (Rothstein (1983), Williams (1980)). If predication can be established by either a topic/focus or a subject, the role of predication in the EPP emerges.

In what follows, I will formalize syntactic predication, and present an argument made by Osawa (2010) that predication plays a role in the EPP of small clauses in English.

2.2.2.1. Predication

It is assumed in the literature that predication is represented in a certain syntactic configuration to establish a relation of a predicate and its subject. The similar relation can be established between a predicate and a topic/focus as well. Rizzi (2006) claims that subject and topic/focus share the same element, +aboutness, which expresses an argument that serves as a starting point for an event described by a predicate. I will assume with the view that a predicate contains an open place that must be syntactically saturated, and further assume that saturation can be implemented by either a +aboutness argument (a subject or a topic/focus) or an expletive, as in (6) (cf. Rothstein (1995)).

(6) Predication

Every syntactic predicate must be syntactically saturated by a syntactic argument: a +aboutness argument or an expletive

As formalized in (6), syntactic predication can be saturated by a +aboutness argument such as a subject or a topic/focus as well as an expletive. In this respect, predication is purely formal as Rizzi (2006) points out.

2.2.2.2. The EPP in Small Clauses in English

Revealing a fact that derived subjects of small clauses involve two-step movement, Osawa (2010) claims that the two movements are induced independently by predication and Case licensing. Assuming that a small clause is a clause headed by a functional head (F), Osawa argues that the derived subjects of small clauses with a passive or unaccusative predicate move to the subject position of the clause, Spec FP, at first, and then they further move to the Case checking position of the higher clause, Spec AgrOP, as illustrated in (7).

(7) We saw [_{AgrOP} John_i [_{VP} $t_{(saw)}$ [_{FP} t_i F-kissed [_{VP} $t_{(kissed)}$ t_i]]]]

The movement is observed in the small clause of perception verbs, which is devoid of tense and agreement. Thus, the movement into the syntactic subject position in the T-less and Agr-less clauses strongly indicates that the EPP effects inside the small clause is irrelevant of any feature of T and Agr, such as the D feature or EPP feature of T (Chomsky (1995, 2000)), a Case feature (Epstein and Seely (2006), Martin (1999) among others) or ϕ features (Miyagawa (2010) among others). Despite the absence of T and Agr, small clauses do have a predicate, which obviously needs a syntactic subject for predication. Therefore, the first movement inside the small clause is induced by the predication requirement. The second movement, on the other hand, is induced by the Case theoretical reason because the derived subjects move to the Case position of the higher clause.

The analysis suggests that the movement of the derived subjects of small clauses is motivated by both predication and Case licensing as shown in (8).

(8) We saw [_{AgrOP} John_i [_{VP} $t_{(saw)}$ [_{FP} t_i F-kissed [_{VP} $t_{(kissed)}$ t_i]]]]

↑
↑

Case
predication

If the subject movement at issue involves both predication and Case licensing, it is plausible to assume that the same is true for the subjects of finite clauses. The DP raised to Spec TP is interpreted as the subject of

the predicate TP, satisfying the predication requirement, while in the same position, its Case is licensed.

As discussed, the claim that predication and Case licensing independently determine the positions of the derived subjects of small clauses provides indirect evidence for the two aspects of the EPP of finite clauses.

3. The EPP in Default Case Environments

The approach that predication and Case independently license a syntactic subject entails that the EPP effects can be induced only by predication as part of the EPP. Thus, the EPP effects should be observed even if Case licensing does not require syntactic licensing through a spec-head relation with a Case-licensing head. I will argue that the EPP is still valid in MM (Mad Magazine) sentences (Akmajian (1984)), where default Case, instead of structural Case, is available.

3.1. Mad Magazine Sentences as Default Case Environments

In English, the structural Case of subjects is considered to be licensed under the spec-head configuration with T in the syntax, but the same mechanism cannot apply for the Case of subjects of nonfinite clauses such as MMs. Let us compare (9) and (10).

(9) She calls me up every morning.

(10) What! Her call me up?! Never. (Akmajian (1984: 3))

Under the feature-based account, the uninterpretable Case feature of the subject DP in the finite clause in (9) is checked off against the Case feature of T. The Case of the subject in the nonfinite clause in (10), however, cannot be licensed in the same way because the clause contains no T that bears a Case feature. While subjects in finite clauses receive an uninterpretable Case feature to be checked off in the syntax when inserted into the derivation, the example in (10) indicates that subjects in nonfinite

clauses have no uninterpretable feature that must be checked off in the syntax.

Schütze (1997) claims that a DP without a Case feature realizes as the default Case, and its form of English pronoun is always accusative (*her* in (10)). While the structural Case requires feature checking under a spec-head configuration in the syntax, the default Case does not because it is spelled out by the morphological component when a DP lacks a Case feature and cannot be licensed in the syntax. Given this analysis, unlike the structural Case on finite clause subjects, the default Case on MM subjects does not require feature checking in the syntax, but it is just spelled out as accusative by the morphology.

The default Case analysis provides us with an environment to examine the hybrid approach to the EPP. If a subject DP lacks a Case feature and is spelled out as the default Case by the morphological component, the default Case cannot induce the EPP effects. In other words, the Case theoretical reason for subjects to move to the structural subject position is lost in MMs. Under such environments, the hybrid approach predicts that the EPP effects are still observed since MMs involve predication (*call me up* in (11), for instance), which requires a structural subject by definition.

3.2. The EPP Effects in Mad Magazine Sentences

3.2.1. Subject Position

Despite the absence of a Case-feature bearing T, subjects appear in the clause initial position in MMs. Consider (11). (Example (11a) is taken from Schütze (1997: 191).)

- (11) a. What! Him not pick up the kids on time??? Never!
 b. *What! Not him pick up the kids on time??? Never!

Given the internal subject, the subject *Him* originates in Spec ν P as a thematic subject. Since the negation appears higher than ν P, the contrast in (11) indicates that the subject cannot stay inside ν P but it must move out of ν P and rise to the structural subject position in MMs. If we assume

with Schütze that MMs are headed by a null T, the sentence (11) is derived as illustrated in (12).

(12) [_{null T} Him_i not [_{VP} t_i pick up the kids]]

The subject movement over the negation strongly suggests that the EPP is tenable even in MMs where a Case-feature bearing T is missing. Derived subjects in MMs such as in (13) and (14) also confirm this result. (Example (14a) is taken from Schütze (1997: 191) with a slight modification.)

(13) a. What?? Him arrive on time??? Never!

b. *What?? Arrive him on time??? Never!

(14) a. What?? Him prosecuted??? Never!

b. *What?? Prosecuted him??? Never!

Since unaccusatives and passives take an internal argument, the facts in (13) and (14) again indicate that the EPP is at work in MMs, requiring a structural subject as shown in (15).

(15) Him_i arrive t_i on time

Moreover, the derived subjects must move over the negation. Consider (16) and (17).

(16) a. What?? Him not arrive on time??? Never!

b. *What?? Not him arrive on time??? Never!

(17) a. What?? Him not prosecuted??? Never!

b. *What?? Not him prosecuted??? Never!

As shown in (16) and (17), the subject position over the negation clearly indicates that the derived subject must move out of VP and rise to the structural subject position.

(18) [_{null T} Him_i not [_{VP} arrive t_i on time]]

The subject position observed here indicates the EPP is applicable in MMs⁵, suggesting that the EPP effects in the default Case environments cannot be explained by the Case theoretic reason.

3.2.2. Expletives

If the EPP is at work in the default Case environments, it is expected

that expletives would be allowed as a structural subject in MMs as well. Contrary to the expectation, Akmajian (1984) observes that expletives are unacceptable in MMs.

(19) Speaker A: Damn! There's no more beer left.

Speaker B: What! *There (be) no more beer?!

(20) Speaker A: It's false that the world is flat.

Speaker B: What! *It (be) false that the world is flat!

(Akmajian (1984: 7))

The data in (19) and (20) show that expletives are excluded in MMs with or without the copula.

The unacceptability of expletives, however, does not detract from our result of the EPP in MMs. Akmajian argues that the subjects of MMs must form an intonation center, and thus they are always stressed with no falling intonation. This specific intonation pattern contradicts the intonation pattern of expletives. Since expletives never form an intonation center and no stress is put on them, they cannot be qualified as the subject of MMs. Given the claim that an intonation center is part of the condition for the subjects of MMs, it is plausible to conclude that the absence of expletives in MMs does not reflect the absence of the EPP.

Since the unacceptability of expletives in MMs does not affect the result we have reached, it is clear that the EPP holds in MMs, where no syntactic mechanism for Case licensing is needed. What is crucial here is that the EPP in MMs cannot be explained by the Case theoretical reason (or any other feature of T) and some other factor should be considered. This result suggests that the hybrid approach to the EPP is on the right track, in which the EPP is composed of predication as well as Case licensing.

4. Analysis: Predication as Part of the EPP

As we have argued, the EPP effects are observed in the default Case environments such as MMs. The result leads us to conclude that the EPP

effects cannot be accounted for by the Case theoretical reason in MMs because this nonfinite clause contains no T with a Case feature to license the subject through checking in the syntax. In what follows, examining two potential analyses for the nature of the EPP in MMs, the event binding analysis and the EPP feature analysis, I will claim that predication is a more essential notion for the EPP in the default Case environments.

4.1. Event Binding vs. Predication

Schütze (1997) suggests that subject licensing in the default Case environments correlates with event binding of a null T that heads MMs. This claim amounts to saying that the EPP effects in the default Case environments correlates with event binding. Assuming that “true ECM” clauses contain no event binder and hence no subject, he argues that nonfinite clauses with a subject necessarily contain an event binder⁶.

(21) a. I believe John [to run to school (everyday)]

b. I want [John to run to school (right now)] (Schütze (1997: 29))

As illustrated in (21), the “true ECM” complement with no subject in (21a) cannot have a single event interpretation but it rather has a habitual or generic interpretation, while the other type of ECM complement with a subject in (21b) has a single event interpretation as is obvious from the temporal adverbial, *right now*. Schütze claims that nonfinite clauses with the default Case environments have the same interpretation as (21b), which indicates the correlation with subjects and event binding. Temporal adverbials in the nonfinite clauses such as (22) suggest a single event interpretation and hence the existence of an event binder in these clauses.

(22) a. Jane remembers [John breaking the lamp yesterday]

b. Jane is envisioning [John naked tomorrow morning] (ibid.)

The same is true of MMs, where temporal adverbials are allowed as in (23).

(23) What? Me run to school (now/tomorrow)?? You’ve got to be kidding! (ibid: 30)

The correlation between the EPP and event binding observed in

(22), however, seems to be enforced by the higher verbs that select complements expressing a single event. If so, it is questionable whether or not the same correlation holds in MMs, which are free from selection by higher verbs.

Moreover, it is known that the existence of an event argument is determined by predicate types. Kratzer (1995) and Diesing (1992) claim that an event argument is involved in stage-level predicates but not in individual-level predicates. Given this, it is predicted that clauses in the default Case environments allow stage-level predicates but not individual-level predicates since only the former contain an event argument that would bind a subject. The correlation between the EPP and event binding in MMs entails that clauses in MMs would involve only stage-level predicates but not individual-level predicates. This prediction is wrong, however. Consider (24).

(24) Speaker A: I think Bronsky is such a clever author.

Speaker B: What! Bronsky clever?! Ha. (Akmajian (1984: 5))

Akmajian discusses the difference in meanings between adjectival predicates with and without the copula: *Bronsky be clever?!* and *Bronsky clever?!*. The former has an irrealis interpretation in which the speaker can presume that the state, event or action is controllable. In this sense, the predicate *be clever* has a stage-level predicate interpretation. On the other hand, an adjectival predicate without the copula is ambiguous between stage-level and individual-level predicates. In addition to an irrealis interpretation, it can refer to a simple fact. In the context of (24), the predicate *clever* refers to the fact based on speaker A's judgment but not an unrealized event that can be controlled by the subject or the speaker. The example in (24), thus, shows that MMs allow an individual-level predicate as well as a stage-level predicate. Given the fact that MMs allow both stage-level and individual-level predicates, the correlation between the EPP and event binding cannot be maintained any longer because individual-level predicates do not contain an event binder.

It turns out that the correlation between the EPP and event binding in MMs proposed by Schütze is untenable because MMs allow individual-level predicates without an event binder. This is exactly consistent with the hybrid approach to the EPP. Under this approach, it is predicted that MMs need a subject regardless of the existence of event binder. Since a syntactic subject is required by predication rather than event binding, it is expected that there is no correlation between the EPP and event binding. In other words, the presence of subjects correlates not with event binding but with a predicate that must establish a syntactic predication relation with a syntactic subject.

4.2. The EPP Feature vs. Predication

Chomsky (2000) proposes that the EPP effects are motivated by the EPP feature of T. It might be possible to assume that a certain kind of T of MMs has an EPP feature in analogy with the EPP feature of finite T. In fact, Schütze (1997) claims that MMs contain a null T (or null INFL in his term) to support tense and agreement. The analysis that MMs are headed by an unrealized T is plausible since MMs allow temporal adverbials as in (11) and (13), negation as in (16) and (17), and they have their own temporal interpretation of either irrealis or generic as discussed in 4.1.

As a descriptive generalization, it might be also possible to assume that inflectional heads have an EPP feature, but this is still far from the nature of the EPP. A question to ask here is what the general property of finite T and null T that characterizes the EPP is. It does not seem that they have much in common in their syntactic behaviors (see Schütze (1997)). First, finite T has a Case feature and ϕ -features but null T does not. While finite T marks the past forms of verbs and allows modals, null T does not. In negative forms, finite T needs “do-support” but null T does not. In null T, the copula optionally appears with different meanings and past participles only marginally appear.

Despite the differences above, finite T and null T share the same status

as the head of a predicate. If so, the EPP effects in finite clauses and MMs can be generalized as the effects that the spec of a predicate needs to be filled with a subject. This generalization is in favor of the hybrid approach to the EPP. Since finite T and null T is the highest head of a predicate, our approach correctly expects their spec to be reserved as a subject position of predication. Under the hybrid approach, the EPP effects observed in the spec of an inflectional projection (T or null T), in general, can be explained by predication. Although the EPP feature analysis is descriptive, it supports our approach to the EPP if we regard inflectional heads as the heads of a predicate, which must establish a predication relation with a syntactic subject.

5. Conclusion

In order to give support to the hybrid approach to the EPP that predication and Case licensing are involved in the EPP, the EPP effects in MMs were examined as the default Case environments. Under such environments, Case is spelled out by the morphological component and thus no feature checking mechanism in the syntax to ensure the presence of a syntactic subject is required. Our observation that the EPP effects are still found in such environments suggests that the EPP in MMs cannot be explained by the Case theoretical reason, suggesting that some other factor is involved in the EPP in MMs.

As potential analyses, we have discussed the event binding analysis proposed by Schütze and the EPP feature analysis in the minimalist framework, and claimed that predication is a more essential notion in both cases. It was shown that MMs allow not only stage-level predicates but also individual-level predicates, which indicates that event binding is irrelevant for the EPP in MMs but predication is more essential. Assuming a null T in MMs, it was claimed that the EPP feature analysis for inflectional heads of finite T and null T is still descriptive, but the notion

of predication can provide a more general analysis to explain the EPP in both inflectional projections.

The observations in MMs and the analysis we have provided led us to conclude that predication is an independent mechanism to require a syntactic subject.

NOTES

¹ Here I assume the standard view that a subject in English resides in Spec TP, but I do not reject a possibility of a discrete functional head that attracts a subject to its Spec for presumably semantic reasons. See Cardinaletti (2004), for instance, for the existence of SubjP along with AgrSP in null subject languages.

² É. Kiss claims that a quantified element also can satisfy the EPP1, assuming that it can fulfill predication. However, it is questionable whether a quantified element moves to an A-position like a topic or a focus, and I do not include Q as an element to satisfy the EPP1.

³ É. Kiss assumes that a lexical projection can be headed by different functional heads, such as Top, Foc, or Q, whose Spec must be occupied by a relevant DP to satisfy EPP1. This analysis is based on the premise that syntactic predication is not mediated by a specific head like Pr proposed by Bowers (1993), but rather it is established through the syntactic configuration of topic/focus/subject- predicate. See den Dikken (2006) and Rizzi (2006) for similar analyses.

⁴ The formalization of EPP1 and EPP2 apply to finite clauses but cannot explain the syntactic behavior of the derived subjects of small clauses, which will be discussed in 2.2.2.2. In order to account for the more extensive syntactic behavior of subjects including the relevant cases, EPP2 should be formalized in terms of more general considerations of morphology as below.

(i) *Morphological Requirement*

Every argument of a predicate must be morphologically licensed.

EPP1 is also problematic to explain the EPP of small clauses because small clauses are not exactly a “sentence,” but the formalization given in (6) can cover small clauses.

It is clear that a more general approach to account for the more extensive phenomena of

subjects is needed because EPP1 and EPP2 can apply to only finite clauses. For purposes of this study, however, I will not pursue this approach here and just give an emphasis on predication and morphology as two reasons for subject movement.

⁵ In MMs, subjects can be optionally realized as shown in (i).

(i) A: Why don't you get a respectable job?

B: (Me) get a respectable job? What do you think I am? (Akmajian (1984: 3))

The optionality, however, does not jeopardize the EPP effects in MMs. As we discussed in the text, an argument must move out of *v*P or VP, hence cannot stay in its thematic position. I assume that the optionality only reflects the possibility of PRO in MMs.

⁶ Schütze assumes that ECM complements fall into two classes depending on the presence of subjects. 'True ECM' complements (complements of *believe*-type verbs) cannot appear with a subject while the other type of ECM complements (complements of *want*-type verbs) can. The contrast below shows that the complements of *believe* cannot form a constituent with the subject, while that of *desire* can.

(i) a. *(For) Bill to know the answer is believed.

b. For Bill to know the answer is desired.

Under our approach to the EPP, however, true ECM complements are expected to have their own subjects. (See Lasnik (2006) for the discussion of the subjects of ECM complements based on intermediate traces.) If this is correct, the grammatical difference in (i) cannot be attributed to the presence/absence of subjects.

REFERENCES

- Akmajian, Adrian. 1984. Sentence types and the form-function fit. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2: 1–23.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2004. Toward a cartography of subject positions. In *The structural of DP and CP*, ed. by Luigi Rizzi, 115–165. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 2006. *Relators and linkers: The syntax of predication, predicate inversion, and*

- copulas*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. The EPP in a topic-prominent language. In *Subjects, expletives, and the EPP*, ed. by Peter Svenonius, 107–124. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Epstein, Samuel David, and T. Daniel Seely. 2006. *Derivations in minimalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. Stage-level and individual-level predicates. In *The generic book*, ed. by Gregory N. Carlson and Francis Jeffery Pelletier, 125–175. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2006. Conceptions of the cycle. In *Wh-movement: Moving on*, ed. by Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver, 197–216. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Martin, Roger. 1999. Case, the extended projection principle, and minimalism. In *Working minimalism*, ed. by Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 1–25. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why agree? why move?: Unifying agreement-based and discourse-configurational language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Osawa, Satoko. 2010. Kakudaitoushagenri-no nijuusei (The duality of the extended projection principle). Paper presented at the 141st Conference of the Linguistic Society of Japan, Tohoku University, 27–28 November.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2006. On the form of chains: Criterial positions and ECP effects. In *Wh-movement: Moving on*, ed. by Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver, 97–133. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rothstein, Susan. 1985. *The syntactic forms of predication*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Rothstein, Susan. 1995. Pleonastics and the interpretation of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 499–529.
- Schütze, Carson T. 1997. Infl in child and adult language: Agreement, case and licensing. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 203–238.

Synopsis

The EPP and Mad Magazine Sentences

Satoko Osawa

The purpose of this paper is to provide support for a hybrid approach to the EPP (Extended Projection Principle) that predication and structural Case licensing are independently involved in the EPP to license a syntactic subject (É. Kiss (2002) and Osawa (2010)). In particular, it is argued that Case is not only motivation for the EPP but predication also plays a role for the syntactic subject requirement. This hybrid approach to the EPP predicts that predication independently induces the EPP effects even under an environment where Case licensing does not require a syntactic process such as feature checking.

In order to see the validity of the approach, MM (Mad Magazine) sentences are discussed, where Case is spelled out by the morphological component and thus no feature checking mechanism in the syntax to ensure the presence of syntactic subjects is needed. It is observed that the EPP effects are still seen under such environments. Since the EPP effects in MMs cannot be attributed to Case, the observation suggests that our approach is on the right track.

Furthermore, two potential analyses for the EPP in MMs are discussed, and it is claimed that predication is more essential to account for the EPP in MMs. The first analysis for the EPP in MMs is the event binding analysis that claims subject licensing (i.e. the EPP) and event binding correlate. This analysis predicts that only stage-level predicates are allowed in MMs. On the other hand, under the hybrid approach, the EPP is at work whenever a predicate is present regardless of the type of predicate, and thus it is expected that MMs allow an individual-level predicate as well. It turns out that MMs allow not only stage-level predicates but also individual-level predicates without an event binder. The other analysis is the EPP feature analysis that claims the EPP feature of an inflectional head causes the EPP

effects. Although T in finite clauses and null T in MMs show different syntactic behaviors, they share the same status as a head of predication. The common property of the inflectional heads indicates that predication is a more essential notion to explain why inflectional heads bear the EPP feature. The discussion concerning potential analyses, in conclusion, provides support for the hybrid approach to the EPP.