

ACADEMIA SINICA
Institute of Linguistics, Preparatory Office

Nonovert Subjects in Malagasy in Simple & Complex Constructions
April 20, 2001

by
Charles Randriamasimanana

Point # 1.1: Deictics & AGR from Randriamasimanana (1987: 194).
Alternation **Weak/Strong** Forms of Malagasy **D**(eictics).

(2a)	Mianatra	tsara	i	Paoly.
	pres.-study	well	deictic	Paul
(2b)	Hoc mianatra	tsara	i	Paoly.
	quote			
(2c)	Izany mianatra	tsara izany	i	Paoly.
	that	that		
(2d)	Ity mianatra	tsara ity	i	Paoly.
	this	this		
(2e)	Io mianatra	tsara io	i	Paoly.
	this	this		
(3a)	Mianatra	tsara	i Paoly	io.
				this
(3b)	Mianatra	tsara io	i Paoly.	
		this		

(2a) means that 'Paul studies well'. The versions in (2b)–(2e) also have this reading, but in addition (2b) says that Speaker S is merely quoting from someone else and that, as a consequence, s/he should not be held personally responsible for the statement if the latter should turn out to be untrue. The (2c) version implies that Speaker S is not quite positive about his/her statement, that Hearer H has within his/her capacity the means to verify this on his/her own, and that ultimately s/he will have to decide for her-/himself whether s/he should believe S's statement or not. The (2d) version implicates S more than the others since s/he is ready to testify to the truth of the statement. Finally, (2e) introduces the idea of mutual verifiability in that both H and S share a common Here and Now or share some common knowledge.

Point # 1.2: Discourse context-based null subjects.

From Randriamasimanana (2000)b.

- (1) Date: Fri, 05 Mar 1999 12:19:59 -0500
From: JR<r@magma.com>
To: R<uzsmav@uni-bonn.de>

M-amerina ny arahaba ho an'i Mia sy ny rehetra **Ø** [1 st S]
pres-renew the greeting for art Mia and the all **Empty**
'(I) renew my greetings to Mia and to everybody...'

- (2) Date: Thu, 24 Dec 1998 06:52:17-0500
 From: CRab114103.442@compuserve.com
 Sender: CRab114103.442@compuserve.com
 To: Charles Randriamasimanana
 M-anao ahoana indray **Ø** ? [1 st S in message]
 Pres-do how once-more **Empty**?
 'How are (you)?'

Point # 1.3: Linguistic utterance-based null subjects.

Point # 1.3.1: Head-Specifier Relation - AGR & Overt Subject.

From Randriamasimanana (2000)b.

Illustrative from Abinal & Malzac (henceforth A & M) (1888) as well as from contemporary sources using [+ **CONTROL**] predicates:

- (3) **Ireo** m-iady **ireo** ny zanakao.
 AGR pres- fight AGR the children-of-yours
 Plural verb plural
 'Voilà vos enfants qui se battent.' A & M 1888: 282
 From French to English: 'Your children are there, fighting.'
 Literally: 'Your children are fighting --as we can see for ourselves.'
- (4) **Io** tamy **io** ny zanako.
 AGR coming AGR the child-of-mine
 Singular verb singular
 'Voici mon enfant qui vient.' (A & M 1888: 281)
 Eng.: 'Here is my child coming.'
 Literally: 'My child is coming --as you can see for yourself.'
- (5) To: fbraz2@bigfoot.com
 Date: Mon, 18 Jan 1999 00:38:14 -0500
 From: crazafi@juno.com (Carol M Razaf...)

Ireto manaraka **ireto** ny valin'ireo ohabolana 11-20...

AGR verb AGR the answers-of those proverbs

These pres-follow these the answer-of-those proverbs 11-20

'The answers to proverbs 11 to 20 are following...'

Point # 1.3.2: Head-Specifier Relation - No AGR & Null subject.

From Randriamasimanana (2000)b. Note [- **CONTROL**] predicates.

- (6) Tsy mbola teraka hono **Ø** !
 Not yet born be-said Empty
 Nonverbal predicate
 "X is said to be not yet born!"
 From Randriamasimanana (1998):
- (7) ***Ity** teraka **ity** ilay saka.
 [- **CONTROL**]
 AGR born AGR the cat
 ?*"The (previous mention) cat is being born."

- (8) Ity teraka ity ilay saka.
 [ity ...] [the cat]
 "This is where the cat was, giving birth!"

where 'ity...ity' heads a complex NP comprising a doubly-headed relative clause surrounding the predicate 'teraka' = '(was) born'. a simpler form of the same sequence would be the following:

- (9) [Ity] [ilay saka]
 [this] [the cat]
 "Here [Emphasis] is the (previously mentioned) cat!"

Point # 1.4: Distribution of AGR (generally) restricted to main clause.
 From Randriamasimanana (1998).

- (10)a. N-itady [... h-anjaka ---] Ravoniarisoa ...
 Past-seek [... fut-dominate EC] Ravoniarisoa
 "Ravoniarisoa was seeking to dominate."
 b. *N-itady [ity h-anjaka ity --] Ravoniarisoa.
 AGR AGR
- (11)a. M-angataka anao aho[h-itondra ity any amin-dRama ---].
 Pres-ask you I [.. fut-take this to Rama EC]
 "I am asking you to take this to Rama."
 b. *M-angataka anao aho [ity h-itondra ity ity any amin-dR.-]
 AGR AGR

Point # 1.5: Raising Predicates.
 From Randriamasimanana (1998).

- (12)a. **I Paoly** aloha marina tokoa [fa n-amono tena ---].
 Art Paul first true truly [that past-kill self EC]
 "First of all, it is true that Paul killed himself."
 b. Marina tokoa [fa ... n-amono tena ... **i Paoly**].
 true really [that ... past-kill self ...art. Paul]
 "It is true that Paul killed himself."
 c. Marina tokoa [fa **iny** n-amono tena **iny** i Paoly].
 true really [that **AGR** past-kill self **AGR** art. Paul]
 "It is true that Paul AGR killed himself."

Point # 2: Reflexivization & Null Subjects in Malagasy.
 From Randriamasimanana (1998).

- (13) N-amono tena i Paoly.
 past-kill self art Paul
 "Paul killed himself."

- (14)a. N-ilaza tamin'i Jaona i Paoly [fa h-amono **tena** ---]
 past-say to art John art Paul that fut-kill **self EC**
 "Paul told John that he (Paul) would kill himself."
 b. N-ilaza tamin'i Jaona [fa h-amono tena ---] i Paoly.
 "Paul told John [that he (P.) would kill himself EC]."
 *"Paul told John to kill himself."

Point # 3: Distribution of Null Subjects: Subtypes.
 Adapted from Randriamasimanana (1998)

CONTROL structures and AGR in matrix clause:

- (15) M-ikasa [h-amono tena ---] i Paoly.
 pres-intend [fut-kill self EC] Paul
 "Paul intends to kill himself."
 (16) N-angataka [an'i Paoly h-amono tena ---] i Jaona.
 past-ask DO Paul fut-kill self ---] John
 "John asked Paul to kill himself."

Case of Adjunction:

- (17) Lasa [n-andeha ---] [n-amono tena ---] i Paoly.
 gone [past-go ---] [past-kill self EC] Paul
 "Paul went and killed himself."

Raising structures and embedded Agr:

- (18) I Paoly aloha marina tokoa [fa n-amono tena ---]. = (12)a.
 Art Paul first true truly [that past-kill self EC]
 "First of all, it is true that Paul killed himself."

Previous mention (i.e. Antecedent-governed):

- (19)a. ... H-amp-anambadiana ahoana ange ---- ?
 ... Fut-CAUS-marry-passive how Q EC
 "To be married, how?"
 b. Ity h-amp-anambadiana ity i Jeanne ê!
 AGR fut-CAUS-marry-passive AGR art. Jeanne Excl.
 "Jeanne is just about to be married off!"

Point # 4: Feature-checking – Head-Specifier.
AGR & Features vs No AGR & No Features.

Illustrative examples from Randriamasimanana (1997):

- (20)a. M-ianatra lesona ny mpianatra.
 pres-study lesson(s) the student(s)
Head Specifier
 "The student is studying his/her lesson." or
 "The students are studying their lesson."

- b. Ity m-ianatra lesona ity ny mpianatra.
 AGR pres-study lesson AGR the student
Head **Specifier**
 [Sing.] [Sing.] [Sing.] But see Point # 6 below.
 "The student is studying his/her lesson."
- c. Ireto m-ianatra lesona ireto ny mpianatra.
 AGR pres-study lesson AGR the students
Head **Specifier**
 [Plural] [Plural] [Plural] But see Point # 6 below.
 "The students are studying lessons."
- (21)a *Ity m-ianatra lesona ity ø.
 AGR pres-study lesson AGR Empty
Head **Specifier**
 [Sing.] [Sing.] [ø-Feature]
 "The student is studying his/her lesson."
- b. *Ireto m-ianatra lesona ireto ø.
 AGR pres-study lesson AGR Empty
Head **Specifier**
 [Plural] [Plural] [ø-Feature]
 "The students are studying lessons."

Both situations in (21)a and (21)b. exclude antecedent-governed cases (previous mention where an antecedent is available in an immediately adjacent utterance). Matrix/Independent clause with a [+ CONTROL] predicate with an empty AGR containing no matrix features:

- (22)a. M-ianatra lesona ny mpianatra. = (20)a.
 pres-study lesson(s) the student(s)
 [+ CONTROL]
Head **Specifier**
 Ø AGR
 No features
Context dependence (Marked Structure)
 "The student is studying his/her lesson." or
 "The students are studying their lesson."
- (23) Tsy mbola teraka hono ø ! = (6)
 Not yet born be-said Empty
 [- CONTROL]
Head **Specifier**
 Nonverbal predicate
Context dependence (Unmarked Structure)
 "X is said to be not yet born!"

Point # 5: Head-Specifier Relation – Tense as Head of S (= clause).

Adapted from Handout # 2, March 16, 2001:

First, note contrast between **Weak Tense** (Active) and **Strong Tense** (Passive)

- (24).a N-an-didy ilay mofo i Paoly.
Pres-prefix-root the bread art Paul
Active Voice
Head **Specifier**
'Paul cut the bread.'
- b. No-didi-n' i Paoly ilay mofo. Passive 1 (Direct Object > Subject)
PastPassive1-by art Paul the bread
Head **Specifier**
PUNCTUAL-----'The whole of N'
'The (whole) bread was cut by Paul.'
- c. N-an-didi-an' i Paoly ilay mofo. Passive 2 (Oblique > Subject)
PastPassive2-by art Paul the bread
Head **Specifier**
DURATIVE-----PARTITIVE
'(Some of) the bread was cut by Paul.' See Randriamasimanana (2000b.)

Second, note contrast between interpretation of Specifier in (24)c, above & in (25)b..

- (25).a. N-an-didy mofo t-amin' ny antsy i Jeanne.
Past-prefix-cut bread perf-with the knife art Jeanne
Head **Specifier**
Active Voice
'Jeanne was cutting bread with the knife.'
- b. N-an-didi-an' i Jeanne mofo ny antsy.
Past-Passive2-cut-by art Jeanne bread the knife
Head **Specifier**
#DURATIVE—00000000000000000000PARTITIVE
[+ CONTROL]-----CAUSEE
'The knife was being cut-the-bread-with by Jeanne.'
- (26) N-a-tsipin-dRabe ny rano. Ballistic meaning
Past-passive-throw-by-Rabe the water
Head **Specifier**
[+ CONTROL] CAUSEE
'The water was thrown away by Rabe.'

Point # 5.1: Distribution of Null Subjects – Weak Tense & \emptyset in Spec.

Tense/aspect markers (i) **n-**, **m-**, **h-** for active voice (Weak T) vs

(ii) **no-**, \emptyset -, **ho-** for passive voice (Strong T).

See Handout # 2 dated March 16, 2001 for detail.

- (27) N-ikasa (ny) h-andeha \emptyset i Paoly.
past-intend (comp) fut-go **Empty** deic Paul
'Paul intended to leave.'

Randriamasimanana (1997: 488)

One complex verb, i.e. verb $V_1 + V_2$ combination & NO complement:

- (35) *N-am-(v)aky \emptyset i Paoly.
 Past-caus-broken \emptyset art Paul
 $V_1 + V_2$ acc.
 *'Paul broke.'

Note the absence of any overt aspect-marker on the lower verb V_2 in (35).

Lower V_2 requires Full Phrase in Specifier of VP in a **Causal Causative**:

- (36) Ny ditrany no n-ampa-**voa**-kapoka an' i Paoly.
 Themischief-his part past-caus-voa-passiveI-punish acc. art Paul
 V_1 -**voa**- V_2
 'It was his mischief which was the cause of Paul's being punished.'
 From Randriamasimanana (1986: 5)

- (37) * Ny ditrany no n-ampa-**voa**-kapoka \emptyset .
 Themischief-his part past-caus-passiveI-punish \emptyset
 V_1 -**voa**- V_2
 'It was his mischief which was the cause of \emptyset 's being punished.'

Note presence of the perfective aspect-marker **voa** on the lower verb V_2 in (36).

Point # 6.1: Nature of Feature Checking, given Malagasy data under Point # 4. Covalent Bonding, as in 'Towards deriving the EPP and abstract case' by Eric Haeberli in *Generative Grammar in Geneva* 1:105-139, 2000. Also see 6.3.

- (38)a. Ity m-ianatra lesona ity ny mpianatra. = (20)
 AGR pres-study lesson AGR the student
Head **Specifier**
 [Sing.] [Sing.] [NonVal. F] where F not yet valued*
or Missing F
 "The student is studying his/her lesson."
- b. Ireto m-ianatra lesona ireto ny mpianatra.
 AGR pres-study lesson AGR the students
Head **Specifier**
 [Plural] [Plural] [NonVal. F]
or Missing F
 "The students are studying lessons."

Haeberli (2000: 134): 'Suppose that language is, to use Chomsky's (1995) terminology, to a large extent a "perfect" system and that "perfection" in the domain of categorial feature matrices consists of having a complete feature matrix with all the categorial features positively specified. In terms of this assumption, feature matrices like [+N, -V] or [-D, +T; -N, +V] are "imperfect" because they contain negatively specified categorial features. Hence, we could argue **that such categories have to make up for their "imperfection" by establishing a local configuration with an element which contains the missing feature(s). Once such a local configuration has been established, the categorial feature**

matrix is licensed because the locally available features compensate for the "imperfection" of the category.

*As proposed in Chomsky (2000) and implemented, for instance, in Frampton & Gutman (2000). See references under Point # 6.3 below.

Point # 6.2: 'Covalent Bonding' & Feature Checking, given Malagasy data under Point # 5 above.

(39)a. **No-didi-n'** i Paoly ilay mofo. Passive 1 (Direct Object > Subject) = (24)

PastPassive1-by art Paul the bread
Head **Specifier**
 PUNCTUAL-----[Missing F]
 'The (whole) bread was cut by Paul.'

b. **N-an-didi-an'** i Paoly ilay mofo. Passive 2 (Oblique > Subject)

PastPassive2-by art Paul the bread
Head **Specifier**
 DURATIVE-----[Missing F]
 '(Some of) the bread was cut by Paul.' See Randriamasimanana (2000b.)

In (39)a. the relevant missing F(eature) accompanying the Specifier = 'the whole of the referent of N' as a result of the Head F [+PUNCTUAL]; whereas in (39)b. the missing F inside the Specifier = 'a/some portion of the referent of N' will result from the relevant Head's F [+ DURATIVE].

Point # 6.3: 'Covalent Bonding' & English Illustrative Example.

(40) A beaver is building a dam. T.1 = present + PROGRESSIVE
 Spec T.1
 | Head
 [Missing F] [+ PROGRESSIVE]

[Missing F] --> [+ SPECIFIC] for the interpretation of indefinite article 'a' in (40) under Head-Specifier relation because of Head feature [+ PROGRESSIVE].

b. A beaver builds dams. T.2 = present + HABITUAL
 Spec T.2
 | Head
 [Missing F] [+ HABITUAL]

[Missing F] --> [+ GENERIC] for the interpretation of indefinite article 'a' in (41) under Head-Specifier relation because of Head feature [+ HABITUAL].

Haeberli (2000) in *Generative Grammar in Geneva* 1:105-139 is rather similar in spirit to John Frampton and Sam Gutmann (2000) 'Agreement is feature sharing' based on Chomsky's 'Derivation by Phrase' (2000) In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, eds. Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka. MIT Press, Cambridge and Chomsky, Noam. 1998. *Minimalist Inquiries: the Framework*.

Point # 7: Null Subjects & ‘Missing F(eatures).

If Infl or Head contains a Weak AGR, i.e. \emptyset or a Weak Tense, or a Weak Aspect, it will have no phonetic content; but the corresponding Specifier node is still present, but it may contain no F(eatures), i.e. is (or at least can be) a Null subject. At any rate the ‘missing F’ alluded to under Point # 6.1 and Point # 6.2 is still there in order to receive the relevant interpretation from the feature of the head.

- (42) Tsy tsara [ny [m-amono tena ---- .]]
 Neg good Comp pres-kill self
Head Spec(ifier)
[+ HABITUAL] [Missing F]
 ‘It is not good to kill oneself.’

The feature [Missing F] \rightarrow [+ GENERIC] for the interpretation of the null subject in (42) under Head-Specifier relation because of the Head feature [+ HABITUAL]. Hence, the arbitrary PRO interpretation of the null subject in this sentence.

- (43) M-ikasa [h-amono tena ---] i Paoly. = (15)
 pres-intend [fut-kill self EC] Paul
Head Spec
[+ PUNCTUAL] [Missing F]
 ‘Paul intends to kill himself.’

The feature [Missing F] \rightarrow [+ SPECIFIC] for the interpretation of the null subject in (43) under Head-Specifier relation because of the Head feature [+ PUNCTUAL]. The determination of whether this null subject is an anaphor or a pronominal will depend on the ‘relative distance’ between it and its putative antecedent, i.e. whether both the antecedent and the null subject show up inside one and the same domain (anaphor) or whether they show up in two different domains (pronominal).

- (44)a. N-ilaza h-andeha ---- i Paoly. Colloquial Malagasy
 Past-say fut-go EC art Paul
[+ Anaphor]
 ‘Paul said that he would go.’
- b. N-ilaza i Paoly fa h-andeha ----. Standard Malagasy
 Past-say art Paul that fut-go EC
[+ Pronominal]
 ‘Paul said that he would go.’

Point # 8.1: Consequences of our Feature Checking Analysis.

- (i) Raising (ii) Binary Branching –See example (16).
 (45) N-ikasa [(ny) h-itondra ilay fiara \emptyset] i Paoly. = (30)
 Past-intend [(comp) fut-drive the car **Spec**] art. Paul
Weak T \emptyset -F
 ‘Paul intended to drive the (previous mention) car.’
 Randriamasimanana (2000b)

- (46) No-kasa-in' i Paoly [**ho** entina **ilay fiara**]. = (29)
 past-intend-by deic Paul [**future** be-taken **the car**]
Passive **Passive**
Strong T **Spec/Features**
 "Paul intended to take the (previous mention) car."
 Randriamasimanana (1997: 490).

Case of Raising, i.e. different from the one under Points # 1.5 & 3 above:

- (47) N-anandrana [**n-itondra** (an) **ilay fiara** ---] i Paoly.
Past-try [**past-drive** (acc) **the car** Spec] art Paul
Weak T **ø-F**
 'Paul was trying to drive the car.'
- (48) N-andrama-n' i Paoly [**n-entina** ---] **ilay fiara**.
Past-passive-try-by art Paul [**past-passive-driven** Spec] **the car**
Weak T **ø-F**

In (47), the phrase 'ilay fiara' 'the car' is in the embedded clause; whereas in (48) it now is in the matrix clause. Yet in the pair of sentences below in (49) vs (50), the phrase 'ilay sakay' 'the chilli' remains inside the embedded clause:

- (49) N-anandrana [**n-ihinana** (an) **ilay sakay** ---] i Paoly.
Past-try [**past-eat** (acc) **the chilli** Spec] art Paul
Weak T **ø-F**
 'Paul was trying to eat the chilli.'
- (50) N-andrama-n' i Paoly [**no-hanina** **ilay sakay**].
Past-passive-try-by art Paul [**past-passive-eat-by** **the chilli**]
Strong T **Spec/Features**

Likewise, as in (47) vs (48), we see Raising with the following pair of sentences:

- (51) N-ihezaka [**n-ianatra** (an) **ilay lesona** ---] i Paoly.
Past-strive [**past-learn** (acc) **the lesson** Spec] art Paul
Weak T **ø-F**
 'Paul was striving to learn the (previous mention) lesson.'
- (52) N-ihezaha-n' i Paoly [**n-ianarana** ---] **ilay lesona**.
Past-passive-strive-by art Paul [**past-passive-learn** Spec] **the lesson**
Weak T **ø-F**

Again, in (51), the phrase 'ilay lesona' 'the lesson' is in the embedded clause; whereas in (52), the same phrase –according to our analysis-- now appears in the matrix clause. It looks as though there may be an 'escape hatch'.

Point # 8.2: Keenan (1976:283) and Raising-to-Object Verbs.

2.5 Raising

In general, Malagasy is rich in Raising processes. Raising to Object (R-O) is very productive, applying in a uniform way to a large class of predicates and satisfying the Relational Succession Law (RSL) discussed below. Raising to

2.5.1 Raising to Object (R-O): From an underlying structure like 104a, R-O may derive 104b.

- 104 a. nanantena [_Sfa nanasa ny zaza Rasoa] Rabe
 +act
 past-hope that washed the child Rasoa Rabe
- b. nanantena an-dRasoa ho nanasa ny zaza Rabe
 hoped acc-Rasoa comp washed the child Rabe
 "Rabe hoped that Rasoa washed the child"

- (53) N-anantena [an-dRasoa ho n-anasa ny zaza --] Rabe.
 Past-expect [acc-Rabe Comp past-wash the child --] Rabe
 Weak T Spec
 Ø-F

ECM

‘Rabe expected Rasoa to wash the child.’

- (54) M-ihevitra [azy_i ho mahay ----] i Paoly_i.
 Pres-believe [him/her_i comp intelligent Spec] art Paul,
 No T Ø-F

ECM

‘Paul considers himself intelligent.’

- (55) *M-ihevitra azy_i [ho mahay ----] i Paoly_i.
 Pres-believe him/her_i [comp intelligent ----] art Paul,

Where the pronominal ‘azy’ ‘him/her’ has actually been raised into the matrix clause and has become a direct object of the verb ‘m-ihevitra’ ‘pres-believe’: Coreference between ‘I Paoly’ and ‘azy’ is now totally impossible.

We can replace ‘m-ihevitra’ ‘believe’ with other verbs like ‘m-anao’ ‘pres-do’ (here meaning something like ‘consider’).

Supplement to Handout # 7

- 1- Chomsky (1974) proposes that the main categories can be defined on the basis of the features V and N. The feature system he proposed is in (2).
- (2)
 - a. verb: [-N, +V]
 - b. noun: [+N, -V]
 - c. adjective: [+N, +V]
 - d. preposition: [-N, -V]
- 2- On handout # 4 of March 1st, 2001 we saw that in Malagasy it should be the case that **P = [+V, +N]**.
- 3- Eric Haeberli (2000: 108): ‘Thus, the central proposal of this paper will be that categorial feature matrices basically start out with positive values (e.g. [+N, +V] for lexical categories) and that **the adequate feature matrices for particular categories are established through checking in the course of a derivation**. A verb for example starts out with an uninterpretable N-feature that has to be checked or a noun has an uninterpretable V feature that has to be checked so that the adequate categorial status is established for the interfaces.’
- 4- Eric Haeberli (2000: 109): ‘What about functional categories? Following Grimshaw (1991) and van Riemsdijk (1990), I will assume that functional categories are partly defined by the lexical features N and V. Thus, D is defined by a N-feature and T is defined by a V-feature. As for the functional component of a functional categorial feature matrix, I will propose, contrary to Grimshaw and van Riemsdijk, that it mirrors the lexical level in the sense that the functional part of a functional category consists of one functional feature which is verbal and another one which is nominal. More precisely, I will assume that the functional component consists of the features T and D.3 Given this feature system, D and finite T can be defined in terms of the following feature matrices:
 - (3) a. D: [+D, -T; +N, -V]
 - b. T: [-D, +T; -N, +V]
- 5- Haeberli (2000:110): ‘Thus, we do not have to stipulate that nominal constituents have to be assigned Case (GB) or that they have to check Case features (MP). Instead, **Case phenomena can be analyzed in terms of a theory of syntactic categories** which is based on the assumption that, at the beginning of a derivation, categorial feature matrices are always equipped with the entire set of categorial features (N, V for lexical categories; D, T, N, V for functional categories) and that the adequate content of a feature matrix is established through checking in the course of a derivation.’

6- Deriving the Extended Projection Principle:

Haeberli (2000: 110):

- (4) a. * (There) is a cat in the office.
b. * (It) seems that they left.

At the outset, T contains **uninterpretable** D- and N-Features in its feature matrix as indicated in note 5 above, i.e.

- (5) T = [+ D, + T; + N, + V]

Therefore T has to enter into a checking relation with another element containing D- and N-Features in order to get its features checked (i.e. in particular, to get rid of the positive values for relevant features).

Ideally the target should contain positively valued nominal features for D and N. As it turns out and as pointed in example (3) above the eligible ‘checker’ ‘it’ or ‘there’ in sentence (4) –assuming the presence of the pleonastic subject—contains the following features, i.e., [+D, -T; +N, -V] Once a feature has been checked it can be deleted, i.e. here as shown in (6) below assigned a negative value.

The expected output as a result of the Head T and Spec checking is:

- (6) T: [-D, + T; - N, + V]

which is precisely the set of features characterizing the grammatical category T, as given in note 3 (3)b. above.

Omitting the expletives in (4) would mean that no such checking relation could be established because no element with nominal features would be in the necessary local configuration for feature checking on T.

- 7- Haeberli (2000:111): ‘Given the basic assumption made so far that categorial feature matrices get modified through checking, we have obtained a system in which **the EPP and Case Theory simply turn out to be different manifestations of the same underlying phenomenon. What has been referred to as Abstract Case is the situation where a nominal element has to erase verbal features from its feature matrix, whereas the EPP is the effect of the opposite scenario, namely the one where a verbal element has to erase nominal features from its feature matrix.** Thus, the EPP and the Theory of Abstract Case are simply two sides of the same coin.’