**Predicate Raising Languages**

**Main Claims.** There is a set of languages where the Extended Projection Principle (EPP; Chomsky 1981, 1982) is checked by raising the predicate, such as Niuean (Massam and Smallwood 1997), Inuktitut, and Irish. I propose a requirement for ‘high predication,’ where the predicate, after it has been saturated, must combine a second time with an argument, and a cross-linguistic parameter based on the ordering of high predication and tense marking.

**A Typology of Verbal EPP.** I define the EPP as a formal requirement for the obligatory movement of some element into the inflectional domain. Alongside the DP-raising EPP of English (Chomsky 1981, 1982), a variety of other types involving raised verbs have been proposed. Although some of these verb-raising languages have nominal features which have been proposed to check the EPP (e.g., Greek, as in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998), there are also languages where it can be checked by raising verbal constituents without nominal features; I argue that the EPP is checked by predicate features in these cases. There are thus four classes of EPP checked by the verb, as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominal Features</th>
<th>Predicate Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head</strong></td>
<td>Greek, pro-drop Romance (A&amp;A 1998)</td>
<td>Celtic (not Breton) (Biberauer 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phrase</strong></td>
<td>Some Germanic (R&amp;B 2005)</td>
<td>Niuean (M&amp;S 1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Predicate EPP.** There is a set of languages in which the EPP probes for the predicate. For example, phrasal predicate-raising occurs in Niuean and checks the EPP (Massam and Smallwood 1997), although the verb does not agree with the subject, nor is there always a nominal in the fronted constituent. If the entire vP fronts, the object is a bare noun (1a); otherwise, only a remnant vP fronts (1b). The constituent that 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)

Likewise, Biberauer (2010) suggests that Irish verbs, which raise to a, also check the EPP, although verbs in Irish appear without subject agreement in a variety of contexts, as in (2).

2. Leanann an t-aímní 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 √-EPP for Inuktitut, which is manifested by the verb root appearing initially in the verbal complex (3). Although Inuktitut has rich agreement, the nominal features are not part of the constituent that raises, and do not check the EPP.


In all three of these languages, however, it can be shown that these are in fact predicates which raise, rather than verbs. 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 iš particle in Irish is in C.


Johns (2007) demonstrates that light verbs are unable to check the EPP in Inuktitut. In clauses with light verbs, a noun root must take the initial position in the verbal complex instead, resulting in phenomena such as argument doubling (6a) or even the insertion of the √-expletive pi (6b).

5. a. Saali iIisajji- u- juq Sally teacher-be-INTR.PART.3S EXPL-have-NEG-INTR.PART.3S ‘Sally is a teacher.’ ‘He has nothing.’ (Inuktitut; Johns 2007)

**When V-raising doesn’t check the EPP.** In contrast, there are some languages that have
verb raising (e.g., Finnish in (7) and French in (8)) but also still have an independent requirement for a DP subject, similar to English. Thus, either these languages require two separate EPP-triggered movements, for some reason, or verb-raising is insufficient for checking the EPP. I argue for the latter.

(7) Jussi (ehkä) osta-a (ehkä) sen kirja-n. (Finnish)
    Jussi buy-3SG perhaps 3SG GEN book GEN ‘Jussi will perhaps buy that book.’

(8) Jean embrasse souvent Marie. (French; Pollock 1989)
    John kiss.3SG PRES often Mary ‘John often kisses Mary.’

These languages require expletives, which indicates an EPP checked by DPs (9)-(10).

(9) Sitä meni nyt hullusti. (Finnish) (10) Il est arrivé trois filles. (French)
    EXPL was now crazily EXPL is arrived three girls
    ‘Now things went wrong.’ (Holmberg 2005) ‘There have arrived three girls.’ (Burzio 1986)

Unlike Irish, Inuktitut, and Niuean, the French and Finnish requirement for verb raising is truly a requirement for verbs, rather than predicates. Non-verbal predicates do not raise, but light verbs, auxiliaries, and modals do. For example, the negative auxiliary ei raises in the Finnish example in (11), and HAVE raises in the French example in (12).

(11) Jussi ei ehkä osta sitä kirja. (12) Il a souvent mangé des pommes.
    Jussi NEG perhaps buy 3SG PAR book PAR he has often eaten of the apples
    ‘Jussi won’t maybe buy that book.’ ‘He has often eaten apples.’

Verb-raising does not satisfy the EPP; only predicate-raising satisfies the EPP.

Why? I hypothesize that the EPP is a form of ‘high predication’ where the predicate must form a second link with an argument. In English, French, and Finnish, the predicate first combines with tense via merge, and then an argument is moved to the specifier of T, where it c-commands the predicate. In Irish, Niuean, and Inuktitut, on the other hand, the predicate raises to a position where it c-commands an argument, and then tense is merged afterwards. In these cases, the raised predicate still requires an argument, although the argument may be low. This can be seen in weather predicates. For example, in Irish, either an expletive or an existential marker is required (Kenji Oda, p.c.), while in Niuean, a case-marked nominal appears to be required, as shown in brackets in the examples in (13). (Niuean; Massam, p.c.)

(13) a. Makalili [e aho nei]. b. Kua tō [e uha].
    cold ABS day this ‘It’s cold today.’ PERF fall ABS rain ‘It’s raining.’

This requirement for high predication can occur only after the predicate has been saturated and the nominal has been case-marked. The two types of languages differ in (a) the order of operations (14), and (b) the directionality of c-command between the argument and predicate.


Summary. In predicate-EPP languages, the EPP is checked by the raising of predicates without nominal features, which must then c-command an argument lower in the structure, fulfilling the requirement for high predication. In contrast, nominal-EPP languages check the EPP by raising an argument so that it c-commands the predicate lower in the structure.