

The Mystery: The clause is often divided into three domains—roughly vP, IP, and CP (e.g., Chomsky 1986, Rizzi 1997, Grohmann 2003). IP is the only domain which is not a phase, and may even be defective, inheriting all of its features from C (Chomsky 2008). What unites the operations of IP remains poorly understood. This paper focuses on the Extended Projection Principle (EPP, Chomsky 1981, 1982), which is especially problematic. Various approaches have thus tried to eliminate it by attributing its effects to independent processes, such as the labeling algorithm (Chomsky 2013). However, such approaches cannot account for all of the attested EPP processes cross-linguistically, such as why both the verb head and the subject undergo raising in languages such as French and Finnish.

Main Claim: I argue that all of the operations of the inflectional domain, including the EPP, share the purpose of anchoring, providing formal links between the event and the utterance.

Background: My proposal that all operations in the inflectional domain are related to anchoring builds on Ritter and Wiltschko’s (2014, henceforth R&W) analysis, whereby verbal inflection (VI) is the manifestation of an anchoring requirement formalized by a [\pm coin(cidence)] feature indicating whether the event and the utterance coincide.

The EPP: I define the EPP as the obligatory move of some element to the inflectional domain, taking different forms cross-linguistically (Biberauer 2010, *a.o.*). I formalize the EPP as an unvalued [u Anchor: $___$] feature on Infl $^\circ$ that must be locally valued by an index. In many languages, a person index is used, but other elements that are tracked through indices are also used (e.g., times, locations, possible worlds; Schlenker 2015). Unlike R&W’s [\pm coin] feature, the EPP picks out an element in the real or irrealis world that is being tracked. The index formalizes identity between an argument and some element in the evaluation situation. That is, it locates an argument in time, in space, or in worlds in the evaluation situation.

Parallels between VI and the EPP: My hypothesis that anchoring is the underlying function of both the EPP and VI predicts parallel properties between both operations. I discuss two such parallels: (a) variability in what type of element may substantiate the anchoring and (b) differing anchoring properties in different clause types. Although VI and the EPP have different formal properties, the same elements should be able to function as anchors in both, and clause types which result in dependent anchoring should exist for both operations.

Parametric Substantiation. R&W show that, alongside time (e.g., tense), verbs can inflect and anchor for person, as in Blackfoot (1a), or for location, as in Halkomelem Salish (1b).

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| (1) a. kit-ino-o-hp-oaawa | b. í qw’eyílex tútl’ò [R&W 2014: 1341] |
| 2-see.TA-1:2-LOCAL-2PL | PROX dance he |
| ‘I saw you (pl).’ | ‘He is/was dancing [here].’ |

Likewise, the EPP can be substantiated by person, location, or time. π . The EPP is checked by person in English, through a subject DP, or in Greek, by the rich agreement features on the verb (cf. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998). Although the [D] feature is traditionally considered to check the EPP (Chomsky 1995), I argue that the EPP is sensitive to ϕ -features. For example, Davies and Dubinsky (2001) show that English non-nominal subjects can bind anaphors (e.g., [*That I saw the girl*]_i *itself*_i *was unexpected*.) and trigger subject-verb agreement in number (e.g., [*Very brawny*] and [*very studious*] **are** *what Cindy aspires to be*, D&D 2001:249.) In both these cases, the non-nominal subject necessarily has ϕ -features but does not necessarily have [D]. **LOC.** The EPP can be checked by locative PPs in English locative inversion constructions such as ‘*Into the room walks Robin*,’ where the PP targets spec,IP before moving to spec,CP (Bruno 2016). **TIME.** Finally, the EPP can be substantiated by time in Finnish, where temporal non-Case-marked adverbs, such as *nyt* ‘now,’ *nykyään* ‘nowadays,’ and *eilen* ‘yesterday,’ can raise to check the EPP. Raising an adverb is in complementary distribution with inserting an expletive (2a), showing they both check the EPP (Holmberg 2005). In contrast, non-temporal adverbs cannot check the EPP (2b).

- (2) a. (Nyt/sitä) meni hullusti. b. ***Nopeasti** meni hullusti.
 Now/EXPL go.PST.3SG crazily quickly go.PST.3SG crazily
 ‘Now things went wrong.’ ‘Things quickly went wrong.’

Clause Type. R&W argue that the [\pm coin] feature in non-finite clauses is defective. It is valued anaphorically to the event situation of the embedding predicate. Aspectual verbs value the non-finite I^o with [+coin] (4a), while future irrealis verbs give a [-coin] feature (4b), allowing the non-finite clause to have independent temporal reference.

- (4) a. On Monday, Mika started to dance (*on Tuesday).
 b. In the morning, Konrad wanted to sleep (in the afternoon). [R&W 2014: 1353]

Likewise, English non-finite clauses typically require null subjects to check the EPP. In (5), the DP *which horse* can check the EPP in the non-finite clause when null in (5a), but the equivalent overt DP *the grey horse* is ungrammatical in (5b).

- (5) a. Which horse did John wager <which horse> to win?
 b. *John wagered the grey horse to win. [Harley & Carnie 1997: 82]

Covert EPP anchors systematically have dependent reference. In English non-finite clauses, covert subjects are dependent (through control or raising) on the main clause. Both defective subject licensing and the lack of tense marking are properties of non-finite clauses cross-linguistically (Cowper 2016), and both are explained by dependent anchoring.

Multiple Anchors: While R&W propose but a single anchor, there are at least two in my approach: the EPP and VI. Multiple anchors are required in every clause in order to properly orient the interlocutors by locating the event situation within the world (cf. triangulation). Each of the anchors have different characteristics. Where R&W’s VI features track whether the event situation and utterance coincide from the speaker’s perspective, the EPP tracks a particular ‘landmark’ that is relevant in the event situation, from the perspective of the event. Thus, although the EPP and VI are unified in their function as anchors, they operate separately and independently. It is my position that anchoring is formalized within the narrow syntax, although it has functional correlates. As such, I do not predict a one-to-one correspondence between functions and grammatical operations.

Conclusion: I proposed that the purpose of the inflectional domain is anchoring, by connecting the event (encoded in the ν P) with the world (the elements of which are tracked in the discourse through the CP). The IP is also the only domain which is not also a phase, which allows for such connections between the CP and the ν P. This proposal also provides an underlying purpose of the EPP by aligning it with broader requirements of the grammar.

Further research: My hypothesis that all operations in the inflectional domain are related to anchoring predicts that other operations, such as Case checking and viewpoint aspect, are also related to anchoring. This may explain the contrast between viewpoint and lexical accent. Viewpoint aspect can be viewed as anchoring a reference time with respect to the event time, analogously to tense anchoring the utterance time with respect to the event time (Giorgi and Pianesi 1997, Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria 2000).

▪ Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR. *NLLT* 16. ▪ Biberauer. 2010. Semi null-subject languages, expletives and expletive *pro* reconsidered. *Parametric Variation*. ▪ Bruno 2016. Three kinds of locative preposing. *TWPL* 36. ▪ Chomsky. 1981. *LGB*. ▪ *Ibid.* 1982. *Concepts and Consequences*. ▪ *Ibid.* 1986. *Barriers*. ▪ *Ibid.* 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. ▪ *Ibid.* 2008. On Phases. *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*. ▪ *Ibid.* 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130. ▪ Cowper. 2016. Finiteness and pseudofiniteness. *Finiteness Matters*. ▪ Davies & Dubinsky. 2001. Functional Architecture and the Distribution of Subject Properties. *Objects and other subjects*. ▪ Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria. 2000. The primitives of temporal relations. *Step by Step*. ▪ Giorgi & Pianesi. 1997. *Tense and Aspect*. ▪ Grohmann. 2003. *Prolific Domains*. ▪ Harley & Carnie. 1997. PRO, the EPP and Nominative Case. *PennWPL* 4. ▪ Holmberg. 2005. Is there a little *pro*? *LI* 36. ▪ Ritter & Wiltschko. 2014. The composition of INFL. *NLLT* 32. ▪ Rizzi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of Grammar*. ▪ Schlenker. 2015. Sign language and the foundations of anaphora. *LingBuzz*.