Reconsidering the EPP and Spec-TP in Germanic[*]

Theresa Biberauer

Department of Linguistics, University of Cambridge

This paper focuses on the longstanding assumption within Chomskyan generative syntax that the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) as originally formulated in Chomsky (1982) is necessarily satisfied by a(n overt or covert) nominal category. Much recent work on languages not belonging to the Germanic family has implicitly or explicitly departed from this assumption in various ways, but Germanic linguists have, for the most part, retained the view that Germanic languages feature a specially designated subject position, Spec-TP, with (non-referential) *pro* being assumed to satisfy the EPP whenever an overt subject is absent. In this paper, I challenge the view that *pro* was ever licensed in Germanic and propose that none of the Germanic languages initially featured an EPP-type subject position of the kind that is synchronically identifiable in Modern English. Instead, I argue that Spec-TP was licensed by an alternative XP-raising operation targeting T's complement which is still operative in Icelandic and the SOV Germanic languages today. Empirical support for this proposal comes from the synchronic and diachronic behaviour of subjects and expletives in the Germanic languages generally and also, more specifically, from word order variation observable in Modern Spoken Afrikaans.

1   INTRODUCTION

Since Chomsky (1982), the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) has been widely adopted in Chomskyan circles as the default assumption for **all** languages. In terms of this principle, every clause must feature a subject-related element in the canonical subject position, Spec-TP (formerly ***Spec-IP***), with expletive elements compensating for the absence of a raised thematic nominal (DP) wherever necessary.

As was observed from the outset (cf. Rizzi 1982 in particular), many of the world's languages clearly do not, however, exhibit this type of subject behaviour, with both referential pronouns and expletives failing to surface where expected and subject DPs also ostensibly being able to occur "low down" in the syntactic structure. In order to deal with these apparent "problem cases" (so-called *null subject languages*), it was therefore proposed that the EPP need not be overtly satisfied, but that it is nevertheless covertly satisfied in all apparently problematic instances by means of a "silent" pronominal element dubbed *pro* (cf. Rizzi *op. cit.*).

More recently, it has, however, been proposed that the EPP does not, in fact, require an overt or covert D-element to occupy Spec-TP, and that the introduction into the TP-domain of appropriate "argumental" morphology associated with a verb which undergoes raising to T is sufficient (cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou [A&A] 1998). On this analysis, languages featuring appropriately "rich" verbal morphology can therefore satisfy the EPP without the need for the **literal** extension of lexically required structure (cf. the original Projection Principle), a significant departure from the EPP as it was originally conceived and also from