

Case, Tense and Multiple AGREE

Pesetsky & Torrego (P&T) (2004 a,b) propose an approach to Nominative case that involves a relation established during the course of the derivation between an interpretable T(ense)-feature on the category Tense, which is valued by the lexical verb, and an uninterpretable T-feature on the subject DP; φ -features play no role in the valuation of Nominative. Structural case in general is an uninterpretable T-feature on DP. The licensing of structural Case in a simple transitive clause requires multiple applications of AGREE, and results in feature sharing as indicated by identical indices in (1).

- (1) [T_{nsP} [T_{ns} T_{ns_{iT}} [1]EPP [vP DP_{uT} [1]] [v'V_{uT} [1] [VP V_{uT val} [1] DP_{uT} [1]]]]]]]
-

First step (1): Uninterpretable T on v probes and AGREEs with uninterpretable T on DP and with uninterpretable, valued T on V, creating multiple instances of T, valued in each location.

Second step (2): Interpretable T on Tns probes and AGREEs with uninterpretable T on v and with uninterpretable T on DP, thereby valuing T on Tns as well as T on the subject DP (Case). Under P&Ts analysis, the value for T enters the derivation in (1) via the lexical verb.

Here, we propose that the valued tense feature is located on the finite auxiliary when one is present, rather than on the lexical verb. Thus, whenever one or more auxiliaries are present, the lexical verb has an unvalued T-feature which requires probing of multiple heads by Interpretable T on Tns. We capitalize on this to derive the Passive, which will turn out to be no different from an ordinary clause with one or more auxiliaries.

In Raising constructions with a transitive infinitival complement clause, AGREE proceeds as in (1), except that the shared feature T remains unvalued, as the infinitival verb is not valued for T. For P&T, valuation of T on the subject DP occurs as a result of raising it at least to Spec, TnsP in the infinitival clause where it is accessible to probing by finite Tns. We argue against this aspect of their analysis and propose that the DP low in the infinitival complement clause is accessible to probing by matrix Tns. The central Raising (2) and Passive data (3) we discuss in this paper are shown below.

- (2) a. Det verkade (*många män) vara (många män) här. (Sw)
 b. There seemed (*many men) to be (many men) here. (Eng)
 c. Það höfðu (margir menn) virst (*margir menn) vera (margir menn) hér. (Icel.)
 there had (many men) seemed (*many men) be (many men) here
 (3) a. Det har (*många älgar) blivit (*många älgar) skjutet många älgar. (Sw)
 b. Det har (*många älgar) blivit många älgar skjutna (*många älgar). (Sw)
 c. There have (*many elk) been many elk shot (*many elk). (Eng)
 d. Það hafa (margir elgir) verið (*margir elgir) skotnir (margir elgir). (Icel.)
 there have (many elk) been (*many elk) shot (many elk)

In Swedish and English Raising structures with inserted expletives, the associate DP must stay in its base position, whereas Icelandic allows a higher DP position, [Spec, TnsP], in these structures. Essentially following Jonas (1996), we assume that the availability of the higher subject position depends on V-to-Tns movement, independent of V-to-C (V2). Here we argue that verb raising interacts with our proposal for the mechanism of feature sharing to account for the distribution of DP positions in (2) and (3).

References

- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2004a. Tense, case and the nature of syntactic categories. In *The syntax of time*, ed. by Jacqueline Guéron and Jacqueline Lecarme, 495-538. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2004b. The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. Ms. MIT and UMass Boston.