

SESSION IV: MORE ON ROMANCE NSLS AND SOMETHING ON PARTIAL AND SEMI-NSLS

1. ANOTHER DELETION APPROACH TO ROMANCE NSLS
 - Roberts (2007) builds on Holmberg (2005), focusing on Romance languages and considering the nature of Romance null subjects in a little more detail
 - *pro* is a weak pronoun (cf. C&S 1999):
 - it can only occur in designated specifier positions (Spec-TP) – see below
 - “given the choice between a strong pronoun and a *pro* counterpart, *pro* is always chosen” (C&S 1999: 175)
 - (1) *Gianni ha telefonato quando pro/*lui è arrivato a casa*
 Gianni has telephoned when he is arrived to home
 “Gianni called when he arrived home”
 - *pro* can appear in Aux-to-Comp contexts (cf. Rizzi 1982):
 - (2) *Avendo Gianni/egli/ pro telefonato a Maria ...*
 having Gianni/ he(weak)/*pro* telephoned to Maria
 “Gianni/him having called Maria ...”
 - *pro* isn’t a clitic because:
 - it occupies a specifier position (Spec-TP) and clitics are usually thought to be heads – cf. Holmberg’s (2005) argumentation on this point
 - it’s also clear that *pro* can’t appear in the “freely inverted” subject position (≠ Spec-TP) (Burzio 1986):
 - (3) a. *Ci sono io alla festa*
 there am I at-the party = “I (emphatic) am at the party”
 b. **Ci sono pro alla festa*
 - it can’t license a floated quantifier, which is something only preverbal subjects can do (Rizzi 1987)
 - (4) a. *Tutti i bambini sono andati via*
 all the children are gone away
 “All the children have gone away”
 b. *I bambini sono andati tutti via*
 the children are gone all away
 c. *Sono andati via tutti i bambini*
 are gone away all the children
 d. **Sono andati i bambini via tutti*
 are gone the children away all
 e. *Pro sono andati tutti via*
 pro are gone all away = “They have all gone away”
 - We don’t see any agreement failures (3SG instead of 3PL) with *pro* (“anti-agreement” only turns up when the subject is postverbal, i.e. where we have VSO and not SVO order) – cf. Cardinaletti (1997: 38 – 39):
 - (5) a. *Questo, lo fa sempre i bambini* [Ancona dialect]
 this it do-3SG always the children
 “This, the children always do”
 b. **Questo, i bambini lo fa sempre*
 this the children it do-3SG always
 c. *Questo, i bambini lo fanno sempre*
 this the children it do-3PL always
 d. **Questo, lo fa sempre pro*
 this it do-3SG always pro

- e. *Questo, pro lo fanno sempre*
 this pro it do-_{3PL} always

So: *pro* is a weak pronoun which can satisfy T's EPP-requirement by moving to Spec-TP

- Why isn't the weak pronoun spelled out, though? How can it be null?
- Roberts's (2006) theory of **defective goals** (NB: this is defective terminology, as the author readily admits!)

(6) A goal G is a **defective goal** iff G's formal features are a proper subset of those of G's Probe P

- Another example of a defective goal: object clitics (=φ-bundles in relation to *v*)
- 2 scenarios:
 - (A) Probe lacks EPP-feature (= movement trigger) and Goal = defective → **cliticization** (Agree = "Move" in this case: valuation of Probe's features followed by "chain reduction" (cf. Nunes 2004))
 - (B) Probe bears EPP-feature and Goal = defective → **null subject**
 i.e. defective goals never have a PF-realisation independently of their Probe

(7) **Null Subject Parameter:** *pro*'s features are a proper subset of those of its probe
 "The D-feature on T in null-subject languages means that *pro* counts as a defective goal in such languages."

- But what determines whether a language will have D on T or not?

(8) Müller's (2006, 2007) ***pro* generalisation:** An argumental *pro* DP cannot undergo Agree with a functional head α if α has been subjected (perhaps vacuously) to person-feature neutralizing impoverishment in the Numeration."

i.e. for Müller, 'morphological richness' = 'absence of person impoverishment [in the technical sense – TB]' (cf. connection to Jaeggli & Safir's (1989) Morphological Uniformity) and: the prediction is that T will bear D wherever there is no "system-defining syncretism"

2. PARTIAL NULL-SUBJECT LANGUAGES

(cf. Holmberg 2005, Holmberg, Nayudu & Sheehan 2007)

- these languages lack a D(efinite) feature on T
- they share the following properties:
 - a. they exhibit null subjects when the subject is generic and 3rd person null subjects can never be referential
 - b. they exhibit null subjects when the subject is controlled by a higher argument

(10) a. *Kesällä herää aikaisin*
 [Finnish]

in-summer wake-PRES.3SG early
 "In the summer, one wakes up early"

b. *Juhani_i kertoi että (hän_i) oli ostanut talon*
 Juhani say-PAST that he had bought house
 "Juhani said that he had bought a house"

(11) a. *Nesse hotel não pode entrar na piscine bêbado* [BP]
 in-this hotel not can enter in-the pool drunk

“In this hotel, one is not permitted to go into the swimming pool drunk”

- b. *A Maria_i admite que (ela_i) não fala muito bem inglês*
 the Maria admits that she not speak very well English
 “Maria admits that she does not speak English very well”
- (12) a. *unahlyat lavkar utthavla jato*
 [Marathi]
 summer-in early wake GO-PRES-3SGM
 “In the summer, one wakes up early”
- b. *Ram mhanala ki ghar ghetla*
 Ram say-PAST-3SGM that house buy-PAST-3SGM
 “Ram said that he bought a house”

- Compare consistent NSLs, which differ on both properties (9a) and (9b): generics must always be overtly realised in some way – cf. (13) – and 3rd person null subjects are just as amenable to referential interpretations as other persons

[NB the distinction drawn between **generic** and **arbitrary**: **generic** refers to people in general, including the speaker, and corresponds to English *one*, while **arbitrary** is best translated as *they*. NSLs have arbitrary null subjects, but not generics]

- (13) a. *Nesse hotel não se pode entrar na piscine bêbado* [EP]
 in-this hotel not REFL can enter in-the pool drunk
 “In this hotel, one can’t go into the pool drunk”
- b. *xsse-k texdem htta l-xamsa-w-settin* [Moroccan Arabic]
 need-2SG work-2SG until the-5- and-60
 “One has to work until the age of 65”
- c. *La y-usbah- u hunaa* [Standard Arabic]
 not 3-swim.PASS- PL here
 “One can’t swim here”
- d. *Ewaru-aynaa ii kurcii loo sukham gaa kuurcoo waccu* [Telugu]
 who even this chair in comfortably sit may
 “One/Anyone can sit comfortably in this chair”

- Why partial NSLs behave the way they do:
 - their 3rd person pronouns, unlike their 1st and 2nd person pronouns are ϕ Ps, lacking the D-layer present in strong pronouns (cf. Session III’s (29ai-ii))
 - T lacks the D-feature present in NSLs; therefore only null 1st and 2nd person pronouns will be able to have a referential interpretation, whereas null 3rd person pronouns will have to be interpreted as generic (the 3rd person case); the only exception is where they’re bound by a higher referential DP:

- (14) a. *Täällä istuu mukavasti*
 [Finnish]

here sits comfortably = “Here one can sit comfortably”

- b. *täällä [istuu + T [_{VP} t_{istuu} ϕ P mukavasti]]*
- (15) *Jari_i mainitsi että ϕ P₁ oli ostanut talon*
 Jari mentioned that had bought house
 “Jari mentioned that he’d bought a house”
 i.e. ϕ P is an anaphor here

- Why don’t non-NSLs permit a null subject here then? They also have T lacking D and at least some of their pronouns might be ϕ Ps (cf. Déchaine & Wiltschko

(2002) who suggest that precisely the 3rd person pronoun is) ... These languages have a “**phonological EPP** condition”; therefore Spec-TP always has to be spelled out and pronounced.

- (16) a. consistent NSLs: T has D, but no phonological EPP-requirement (of any kind)
 b. partial NSLs: T lacks D and no requirement that **subjects** be spelled out in Spec-TP, although there does appear to be some kind of “blind” phonological EPP-requirement (cf. Session III and Holmberg 2000, Roberts & Roussou 2002)
 c. non-NSLs: T lacks D, but has a subject-specific phonological EPP-requirement on Spec-TP
- Notably, T never has a D-feature in any language when it is non-finite, i.e. D-in-T is related to Tense
- (17) a. *John₁ decided [ϕ P₁ to fix the roof]*
 b. *It's important [ϕ P to fix the roof]*
 i.e. PRO is actually a null ϕ P in clauses with T lacking D. Or, the null subject of finite clauses in partial null-subject languages is actually PRO!
- Is there any role for (richness of) agreement?
- (18) a. Finnish: “verbal agreement paradigm which is almost completely free from syncretism”
 b. BP: only 3 distinct forms
 c. Marathi: 1st and 3rd forms in the singular and plural systematically non-distinct

What to make of Russian?

(19) Present tense conjugation of *čitat* – “read”

Person	Singular	Plural
1	<i>čita-ju</i>	<i>čita-em</i>
2	<i>čita-eš</i>	<i>čita-ete</i>
3	<i>čita-et</i>	<i>čita-jut</i>

- 1st and 2nd person null subjects much more common than 3rd person
 - overt subject pronouns possible in non-emphatic contexts
 - “generic interpretation of the omitted subject in 3PL and 2SG contexts” (Müller 2007: 6)
- (20) a. *Ob etom pro mnogo govornjat*
 about this much talk-_{3PL} = “There is much talk about this”
 b. *Pro prosjat [PRO ne kurit’]*
 ask-_{3PL} not smoke-_{INF}
 “It is requested that there is no smoking”
 c. *Etu knigu pro pročityvaeš’ za dva časa*
 this book read-_{2SG} in two hours
 “This book can be read in 2 hours/This book you can read in 2 hours”

- Radical person impoverishment in the past tense:

(21) Past tense conjugation of *čítat* – “read”

PERSON&NUMBER	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
1SG	<i>čítal</i>	<i>čítala</i>	<i>čítalo</i>
2SG	<i>čítal</i>	<i>čítala</i>	<i>čítalo</i>
3SG	<i>čítal</i>	<i>čítala</i>	<i>čítalo</i>
1PL	<i>čítali</i>	<i>čítaly</i>	<i>čítalo</i>
2PL	<i>čítali</i>	<i>čítaly</i>	<i>čítalo</i>
3PL	<i>čítali</i>	<i>čítaly</i>	<i>čítalo</i>

- But *pro*-drop can take place in past tense contexts:

(22) *Anna_i postupila verno čto pro_i rešila stat' vračom*
 Anna acted correctly that she decided become-_{INF} doctor
 “Anna made the right decision to become a doctor”

- Inflected past tense forms = historically *l*-participles which never realised any person features; thus these forms would never have been specified for [Person] and we can assume [Person] isn't part of their ϕ -bundle → no question of impoverishment; we have the same situation as with discourse *pro*-drop languages: because there's no impoverishment of any of the features associated with past-tense T, Russian can permit *pro*-drop (echoes of Jaeggli & Safir's (1989) Morphological Uniformity Principle??)

- Compare Shlonsky (2007: 20) on Hebrew: “Present tense verbs in Hebrew are morphologically participles.”

(23) *Dani loveš sveder*
 Dani wear⁺_{PRES.MS} sweater = “Dani is wearing a sweater”

- But Hebrew and other partial *pro*-drop languages which only permit *pro*-drop in specific tenses and not in others (e.g. Ben-Hassan Arabic – cf. Kenstowicz 1989) are problematic for Müller: partial *pro*-drop of that kind isn't compatible with (8) (cf. Müller 2007: 7).

(24) a. *lamad- ti albanit* [Hebrew]
 study._{PAST-1SG} Albanian = “I studied Albanian”

b. **lomed-et albanit*
 study._{PRES-MSG} Albanian

(25) a. *Fariid gaal *innu pro/inn-ha mištarya al-libaas* [Ben-Hassan Arabic]
 Fariid said that pro/that-she bought._{PERF[-pers]} the-dress
 “Fariid said that she had bought the dress”

b. *Fariid gaal innu pro mištarya al-libaas*
 Fariid said that pro bought._{PERF.[+pers]} the-dress
 “Fariid said that she had bought the dress”

- Modification proposed: “Assuming partial *pro*-drop phenomena do exist, the present approach lends itself to the following modification: instead of assuming that categories as such (like T) are subject to impoverishment, only categories of a certain type (such as T_{past}, T_{subj} or indeed T_{present-perfect} in Ben-Hassan Arabic) are in fact subject to impoverishment (perhaps vacuously, as before); i.e., **impoverishment does not spread from the domain that it is motivated for.**” (Müller 2007: 11)

3. SEMI PRO-DROP LANGUAGES

- These only permit omission of expletives and are very common, featuring both in languages with “rich” and with “poor” agreement (cf. Gilligan 1987)
- (26) a. Rich agreement: Icelandic, German, Dutch (?)
 b. Weak/no agreement: Afrikaans, Banungo, Cape York Creole, Duka, uaymí, Papiamentu, Tagalog
- 3 possible reasons for the absence of overt expletives:
 - (A) T has a(n obligatory) subject-oriented EPP-feature (EPP_D) and there is a weak expletive pronoun which is deleted as a ‘defective goal’
 - (B) T has a(n obligatory) subject-oriented EPP-feature (EPP_D) and there is no expletive because there is another category bearing the D-features T is probing for
 - (C) T lacks a(n obligatory) subject-oriented EPP-feature (EPP_D) and there is no expletive
- Focus: the Germanic species ... where there is no null expletive because either (b) or (c) applies
- Subject behaviour of the languages in question:

Icelandic

- (26) a. *Það rigndi í gær* (Icelandic)
 it rained yesterday = “It rained yesterday”
 b. *Í gær rigndi (*það)*
 yesterday rained it = “Yesterday it rained”
 c. *Í gær voru konunginum gefnir hestar*
 yesterday were-3PL king-the-DAT given horses-NOM
 “Yesterday horses were given to the king”
- (27) a. *Við settum allar bækurnar fyrir málstofuna í lestrarsalinn ...*
 we put all books-the for seminar-the in reading-room-the
- (i) ... *en það hafa margar af þessum bókum verið lesnar áður*
 ... but there have many of these books been read before
 “... but many of these books have been read before”
- (ii) *... *en það hafa verið lesnar margar af þessum bókum áður*
 ... but there have been read many of these books before
 (Jonas 1996: 63)

→ subject DPs that undergo raising to SpecTP are interpreted as “old” information

- b. *Við settum færeyskar bækur fyrir málstofuna í lestrarsalinn ...*
 we put Faroese books for seminar-the in reading-room-the
- (i) *... *en það höfðu íslenskar bækur verið lesnar í fyrra*
 ... but there had Icelandic books been read last year
- (ii) ... *en það höfðu verið lesnar íslenskar bækur í fyrra*
 ... but there had been read Icelandic books last year
 “... but Icelandic books had been read last year” (Jonas 1996: 63)

→ subject DPs that do not undergo raising to SpecTP are interpreted as “new” information (cf. also Vangsnes 2002 for further discussion; cf. also Bobaljik & Jonas 1996, Bobaljik & Thráinsson 1998))

German:

- (28) a. *Es wurde gestern getanzt*
 it became yesterday danced = “There was dancing yesterday”

- b. *Gestern wurde (*es) getanzt*
yesterday became it danced = “Yesterday there was dancing”
- c. ... *dass dem Mann das Buch geschenkt wurde*
that the-DAT man the-NOM book presented became
“... that the book was given to the man (as a present)”
- (29) a. ... *dass ein Schüler gestern dem Lehrer imponierte*
that a pupil yesterday the teacher impressed
“... that a specific pupil impressed the teacher yesterday”
- b. ... *dass gestern ein Schüler dem Lehrer imponierte*
that yesterday a pupil the teacher impressed
“... that some (non-specific) pupil impressed the teacher yesterday”
- (cf. Diesing 1992, Rosengren 2002 and note the “defocusing” effect of scrambling more generally)

Dutch:

- (30) a. ... *dat (er) wordt gedanst/gedanst word*
that (there) becomes danced = “... that there is dancing”
- b. *Bij dit geluid liepen hem de rillingen over de rug*
at this noise leapt him-OBL the shivers over the back
“At that noise, shivers ran down his spine”
- c. *Fred denkt dat twee koeien op het dak liggen*
Fred thinks that two cows on the roof lie
“Fred thinks that two (specific) cows are lying on the roof”
- d. *Fred denkt dat er twee koeien op het dak liggen*
Fred thinks that there two cows on the roof lie
“Fred thinks that there are two cows lying on the roof”

Afrikaans:

- (31) a. ... *dat (daar) gedans word*
that (there) danced becomes – “that there is dancing”
- b. *Piet dink dat twee mense gekom het*
Piet think that two people come have
“Piet thinks that two people have come” (ambiguous)
- c. *Piet dink dat daar twee mense gekom het*
Piet think there two people come have
“Piet thinks that there are two people who have come”

- Icelandic and German clearly have optional subject-raising, where (non-)raising is associated with specific discourse effects → optional EPP-feature on T; thus assume no raising and empty Spec-TP in expletiveless structures
- Dutch and Afrikaans (and Faroese) feature an optional expletive in impersonal passives (and presentationals too); and they’re both OV languages → Biberauer (2003, 2004), Richards & Biberauer (2005): vP-raising to Spec-TP
 - presentationals: subject-DP (= T’s Goal) raises as part of raised category (piedpiping) and will therefore be located in Spec-TP; no absolute need for expletive
 - impersonal passives: “absorption” of external argument → D-feature associated with passive morphology (Baker, Johnson & Roberts 1989); therefore no absolute need for expletive

- Müller (2007) on semi-NSLs: NB his impoverishment story only relates to **referential subjects**

(32) Icelandic present and past conjugations of *dansar* – “dance”

Person	Present	Past
1SG	<i>dansa</i>	<i>dansaði</i>
2SG	<i>dansar</i>	<i>dansaðir</i>
3SG	<i>dansar</i>	<i>dansaði</i>
1PL	<i>dönsuðum</i>	<i>dönsuðum</i>
2PL	<i>dansið</i>	<i>dönsuðud</i>
3PL	<i>dansa</i>	<i>dönsuðu</i>

- 2nd and 3rd person distinction (present) and 1st and 3rd person distinction (past) systematically neutralized (i.e. no [+/-1] or [+/-2] distinctions in the relevant contexts); therefore system-defining syncretism → Icelandic couldn't be a consistent NSL

(33) German present tense conjugation of *werfen* = “throw”

Person	Singular	Plural
1	<i>werfe</i>	<i>werfen</i>
2	<i>wirfst</i>	<i>werft</i>
3	<i>wirft</i>	<i>werfen</i>

- 1st and 3rd person distinction systematically neutralized (i.e. no [+/-1] distinction); therefore system-defining syncretism → German couldn't be a consistent NSL
- Cf. Tamburelli (2007) for an alternative syncretism-based approach to the “richness” question: “Languages whose morphology distinguishes between a positive and a negative setting for the features SPEAKER, ADDRESSEE [Person features – TB] and SINGULAR [Number – TB] qualify as morphologically rich while other languages do not.”

4. WHAT ABOUT THE CORRELATIONS??

- Sheehan (2006: 305): 3 parameters (and prosodic interface conditions) relevant to understanding properties associated with traditional NSP:
 - (a) Rich agreement parameter: I lacks/bears [uD]
 - (b) PF interpretability parameter: I lacks/bears * where * requires the specifier of I to be spelled out at PF [so that's like a strong EPP-feature which just means there needs to be some XP in Spec-TP]
 - (c) Weak/Strong Nominative Case parameter: Nominative Case feature [uI] lacks/bears * where * requires movement to Spec-IP
 All NSLs have in common: (a) set to “bear”; the other factors can differ.

Focusing on *that*-trace effects:

- (33) a. *What_i did you say t_i (that) John ate t_i?*
 b. *Who_i did you say t_i ate the sandwich?*
 c. **Who_i did you say t_i that t_i ate the sandwich?*
- (34) a. *Chi hai detto che ha scritto questo libro?* [Italian]
 who have-2SG said that has written this book
 “Who did you say wrote this book?”
- b. *Pjos ipes oti egrapse afto to vivlio?* [Greek]
 who said-2SG that wrote this the book
 “Who did you say wrote this book?”

- c. *Quién dices que compró un ordenador?* [Spanish]
 who say-_{2SG} that bought a computer
 “Who did you say bought a computer?”
- Rizzi & Shlonsky (2005): the availability of *pro* is not the only means of circumventing *that*-trace constraints
 - the availability of an overt expletive also allows the subject to remain lower/not to raise to Spec-TP, and extraction from a lower position is fine:
- (35) a. **What do you think that what is what in the box?*
 b. *What do you think that there is what in the box*
- (36) a. *Wat zijn (er) jouw vader voor rare verhalen verteld?* [Dutch]
 what are there your father for strange stories told
 “What strange stories was your father told?”
 b. **Wat zijn voor rare verhalen jouw vader verteld?*
- (37) a. **Qui as- tu dit qu’ __ a écrit ce livre?*
 who have-you said that __ has written this book
 b. *Qui as- tu dit qui a écrit ce livre?*
 who have-you said that+i has written this book
 “Who did you say has written this books?”

Prediction: Expect *that*-trace violations in languages which don’t have an obligatory (D-oriented) EPP-feature on T (Dutch, German, Icelandic ...). NSLs that have an obligatory (D-oriented) EPP-feature on T won’t permit *that*-trace violations; therefore we don’t expect all NSLs to permit *that*-trace violations.

- The availability of **clausal piedpiping** (cf. Richards 1997 for discussion):
- (38) a. [*ima-ta-taj Maria-ka Juzi miku-shka-ta kri-n?*] [Imbabura Quechua]
 what-ACC-Q Maria-TOP Juzi eat- NOM- ACC believe-AGR
 “What does Maria believe that Juzi ate?”
 b. [*ima-ta wawa miku-chun-taj Marija kri-n?*]
 what-ACC child eat- FIN- Q Maria believe-AGR
 “What does Maria believe that the child ate?”
- (39) a. **pi- taj Maria-ka chayamu-shka-ta kri-n?*
 who-Q Maria- TOP arrive- NOM- ACC believe-AGR
 b. *pi chayamu-shka-ta- taj Maria kri-n?*
 who arrive- NOM- ACC-Q Maria believe-AGR
 “Who does Maria believe has arrived?”

i.e. the only way to form a subject-extraction question is to make use of clausal piedpiping; the optionality available in non-subject contexts isn’t available for subjects

REFERENCES

- Baker, M., K. Johnson & I. Roberts (1989). Passive arguments raised. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 219 – 251.
- Biberauer, T. (2003). *Verb Second (V2) in Afrikaans: a Minimalist investigation of word-order variation*. Ph.D. dissertation: University of Cambridge.
- Biberauer, T. (2004). Reconsidering Embedded V2: how ‘real’ is this phenomenon? *Working Papers in English and Applied Linguistics* 8: 25 – 60.
- Biberauer, T. (2006). *Changes at the edge: tracking the rise of a canonical subject position in Germanic*. Paper presented at the Edges in Syntax conference (Nicosia).
- Bobaljik, J. & D. Jonas (1996). Subject Positions and the Roles of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 27(2): 195 – 236.

- Bobaljik, J. & H. Thráinsson, H. (1998). Two heads aren't always better than one. *Syntax* 1: 37 – 71.
- Burzio, L. (1986). *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Diesing, M. (1992). *Indefinites*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Gilligan, G. (1987). (1987). *A cross-linguistic approach to the pro-drop parameter*. Ph.D. dissertation: USC.
- Holmberg, A. (2000). Scandinavian Stylistic Fronting: how any category can become an expletive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(3): 445 – 483.
- Holmberg, A. (2005). Is there a little pro? Evidence from Finnish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36 (4): 533 – 564.
- Jaeggli, O. & K. Safir (eds.). (1989). *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Jonas, D. (1996). *Clause Structure and Verb Syntax in Scandinavian and English*. Ph.D. dissertation: Harvard.
- Kenstowicz, M. (1989). The Null Subject Parameter in Modern Arabic Dialects. In: Jaeggli, O. & K. Safir (eds.). *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 263 – 275.
- Müller, G. (2006). *Pro-drop and Impoverishment*. In: Brandt, P. & E. Fuß (eds.). *Form, Structure, and Grammar. A Festschrift presented to Günther Grewendorf on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 93 – 115.
- Müller, G. (2007). *Some consequences of an Impoverishment-based approach to morphological richness and pro-drop*. Unpublished ms: University of Leipzig.
- Nunes, J. (2004). *Linearization of chains and sideways movement*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Richards, M. & T. Biberauer (2005). Explaining EXPL. In: den Dikken, M. & C. Tortora (eds.). *The function of function words and functional categories*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 115 – 154.
- Richards, N. (1997). *Movement in Language: interaction and architectures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, L. (1987). Three remarks on null subjects. Talk given at the GLOW Workshop on Dialectology (Venice)
- Roberts, I. (2006). Clitics, head movement and defective goals. Unpublished ms: University of Cambridge.
- Roberts, I. (2007). *A deletion analysis of null subjects: French as a case study*. To appear in: Holmberg, A. & I. Roberts (eds.). *The Null Subject Parameter and the structure of parametric variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, I. & A. Roussou (2002). The Extended Projection Principle as a Condition on the Tense Dependency. In: Svenonius, P. (ed.). *Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 125 – 156.
- Rosengren, I. (2002). EPP: a syntactic device in the service of semantics. *Studia Linguistica* 56(2): 145 – 190.
- Sheehan, M. (2006). *The EPP and Null Subjects in Romance*. Ph.D. dissertation: University of Newcastle.
- [Available on-line at: <http://people.pwf.cam.ac.uk/mtb23/NSP/Sheehan%20dissertation.html>]
- Shlonsky, U. (2007). *Hebrew as a partial null-subject language*. Unpublished ms.: University of Geneva.
- [Available on-line at: http://www.unige.ch/lettres/linguistique/shlonsky/readings/shlonsky_null_subjects_hebrew_fixed.pdf]
- Tamburelli, M. (2007). *Remarks on Richness*. Unpublished ms: UCL.
- [Available on-line at: <http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/publications/WPL/06papers/tamburelli.pdf>]
- Vangsnes, Ø. (2002). Icelandic expletive constructions and the distribution of subject types. In: Svenonius, P. (ed.). *Subjects, Expletives and the EPP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 43 – 70.