

# Agnostic Movement

Steven Franks

Indiana University

## 1. Overview

The question of *what drives movement* has been a recurring theme of generative grammar. Under minimalism, where all operations require motivation, a standard answer has been to posit some feature (either of the item that moves, aka “Move”, or of its target, aka “Attract”) that drives the movement. There exist, however, some persistent apparent counterexamples to feature driven movement, most notably *intermediate wh*-movement and successive cyclic A-movement. Standard examples are given in (1) and (2):<sup>1</sup>

- (1) I wonder [<sub>CP</sub> **what** C<sup>0</sup> [<sub>TP</sub> Mary claimed [<sub>CP</sub> ~~what~~ that [<sub>TP</sub> they stole ~~what~~]]]]?
- (2) [<sub>TP</sub> **The students** T<sup>0</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> the students seem [<sub>TP</sub> the students to [<sub>AspP</sub> the students have [<sub>VP</sub> the students been [<sub>AspP</sub> the students [<sub>VP</sub> invited ~~the students~~]]]]]]].

Here I take a fresh look at the familiar problem of intermediate movement, arguing that it is motivated by the presence, at the end of a ph(r)ase, of *unvalued* features on the moving items ([wh] in (1) and [case] in (2)). This movement, by placing them at the edge, allows such items to remain syntactically active, in the “hope” that a head to license their unvalued features will eventually be merged. I call such movement **Agnostic Movement**. The paper is basically programmatic. After examining intermediate movement, it presents the leading idea, showing how Agnostic Movement can accommodate certain object shift constructions in Lithuanian, and lastly offers some speculations about extending Agnostic Movement to obtain various *wh*-movement patterns described in the literature.

## 2. Some Approaches to Intermediate Movement

Under the reasonably standard set of minimalist assumptions in (3), it is unclear *why* movement should ever target intermediate landing sites:

---

<sup>1</sup> Pronounced copies are in **boldface**, (silent) intermediate ones are in **outline**, and the lowest unpronounced copy is ~~stricken through~~. No special significance should be ascribed to choice of node labels.

- (3) A. Movement is driven by a feature of the target.  
 B. Syntax is built from the bottom up:  
   i. Merge can only introduce items only at the root of the tree.  
   ii. Move also respects the extension condition.  
 C. The features driving movement in (1) and (2) are associated with  
   (i) matrix  $C^0$  ([+wh]) and (ii)  $T^0$  ([+nominative] or EPP), respectively.

This particular combination of assumptions gives rise to the “look-ahead” puzzle: at the point in the derivation where intermediate movement applies, the motivating information is not yet available (i.e., the attracting features only pertain to the ultimate landing site). There are, however, (at least) the following three ways of tinkering with the system in (3) to obtain intermediate movement:

- (4) a. With respect to A, one could argue that the items which move have some feature driving the movement, i.e., one could reinstate Move.  
 b. With respect to Bii, one could allow movement without extending the tree.  
 c. With respect to C, one could endow intermediate sites with an attracting feature.

These have all been proposed, in one form or another. Bošković (2005) optionally endows *wh*-phrases with a feature that is involved in *wh* movement, to handle examples like (1). Takahashi (1994) makes use of chain formation, at the point when the attracting head is merged, to create the intermediate sites (interpreting the extension condition as pertaining to chains). Chomsky (2000) optionally endows intermediate  $C^0$  with the EPP property, to attract *wh*-phrases that need to move through the relevant landing site.

### 3. Motivation for Intermediate Landing Sites

This section reviews some familiar overt effects of intermediate movement.<sup>2</sup> One piece of evidence for intermediate steps is due to Henry (1995). She argued that T-to-C movement (subject-auxiliary inversion) in embedded clauses in Belfast English serves as a diagnostic that the fronted *wh*-phrase must have passed through the intermediate SpecCP:

- (5) [<sub>CP</sub> What did [<sub>TP</sub> Mary claim [<sub>CP</sub> ~~what~~ did [<sub>TP</sub> they steal ~~what~~]]]]?

Torrego (1984) demonstrated that “V-Preposing” inversion is triggered in Spanish not only by a *wh*-phrase ultimately landing in SpecCP, but also by its passing through a SpecCP in the course of successive cyclic *wh*-movement, as in (6).

- (6) Qué pensaba *Juan* que le había dicho *Pedro* que había publicado *la revista*?  
 ‘What did Juan think that Peter had told him that the journal had published?’

Failure to invert at intermediate sites results in ungrammaticality, as in (7):

- (7) \*Qué pensaba *Juan* que *Pedro* le había dicho que *la revista* había publicado?

---

<sup>2</sup> See also Boeckx (2003), who argues that resumptive pronouns are a robust cross-linguistic effect, although he adopts a version of Takahashi’s (1994) chain-formation system, so that for him there is no literal successive cyclic movement at all. This view rejects cyclicity (and phases) entirely, requiring instead “one fell swoop” movement. Additional possible overt effects of successive cyclic movement are past participle agreement, *wh*-agreement (cf. Boeckx 2003:56–63), and partial *wh*-movement.

Moreover, fronted *wh*-phrases that do not generally trigger obligatory matrix inversion also fail to trigger it in intermediate landing sites, as shown by (8).

- (8) En qué medida *Juan* había pensado que *Pedro* le había asegurado que *la revista* se arriesgaría a publicar eso?  
 ‘To what extent had Juan thought that Peter assured him that the journal would risk publishing that?’

Interestingly, in keeping with Rizzi’s proposal that (in Italian) S’ rather than S is a bounding node, inversion need not obtain on the lowest cycle:

- (9) Qué libro dice *María* que *Ana* le ha regalado?  
 ‘What book does Mary say that Ann has bought her?’

Q-float provides an additional possible way of tracking movement. McCloskey (2000) shows that, for *wh*-movement in West Ulster English, quantifiers can be stranded. Thus, alongside (10a), we also find (10c-d):

- (10) a. What *all* do you think (that) he’ll say (that) we should buy?  
 b. What do you think *all* (that) he’ll say (that) we should buy?  
 c. What do you think (that) he’ll say *all* (that) we should buy?  
 d. What do you think (that) he’ll say (that) we should buy *all*?

This is of course an extension of Sportiche’s well-known wisdom regarding Q-float as an indicator of intermediate structure for A-movement, as in (11).<sup>3</sup>

- (11) [<sub>TP</sub> **The students** [<sub>VP</sub> (*all*) the students seem [<sub>TP</sub> (*all*) the students to [<sub>AspP</sub> (*all*) the students have [<sub>VP</sub> (*all*) the students been [<sub>AspP</sub> (*all*) the students [<sub>VP</sub> invited (*\*all*) ~~the students~~]]]]]]].

Another traditional argument for intermediate landing sites is based on connectivity effects—binding of anaphors in the intermediate sites is possible. In (12), the reflexive *herself* can be bound on-line and locally, by *Sue* or *Mary*, as its containing *wh*-phrase moves through the SpecCP (or VP) immediately below each potential antecedent:

- (12) [<sub>CP</sub> **Which pictures of herself** did [<sub>TP</sub> *Sue* [<sub>VP</sub> say [<sub>CP</sub> which pictures of herself (that) [<sub>TP</sub> *Mary* [<sub>VP</sub> thinks [<sub>CP</sub> which pictures of herself (that) [<sub>TP</sub> *Bill* [<sub>VP</sub> likes ~~which pictures of herself~~]]]]]]]]]]?]

The argument also pertains to A-movement; cf. e.g. Bošković (2002a). In (13), *the teachers* can only bind *each other* in its intermediate landing site. Its presence there, moreover, also arguably gives rise to an intervention effect, blocking matrix *the students* from binding *each other*, given that elsewhere binding out of *to*-phrases is perfectly fine.

- (13) [<sub>TP</sub> **The teachers** seem to the students [<sub>TP</sub> the teachers to appear to each other [<sub>TP</sub> ~~the teachers~~ to be drunk]]].

---

<sup>3</sup> See Bošković (2004) for why stranding of the quantifier is impossible in  $\Theta$ -positions.

Finally, one might attempt to construct an argument basic on parasitic gaps:<sup>4</sup>

- (14) a. Which proposal did you reject *e* [after considering *pg*]?  
 b. ?Which proposal did Mary say that you agreed that Bill should reject *e* [without (yourself) considering *pg*]?  
 c. Which painting did Mary say that you claimed that you love *e* [in order to get me to look at]?

Although the data are complex and judgments are subtle, (14b, c) seem possible. Given these kinds of evidence, we return to the question of what drives intermediate movement.

#### 4. Another Possible Solution: Agnostic Movement

Solution (4c) above is the system of Chomsky (2000, 2001). Here movement takes place to satisfy the target's EPP requirement; intermediate movement is handled by endowing intermediate  $C^0$ s with an optional EPP feature. This is needed because subsuming all movement under Attract means the rejection of both "self-interest" and "altruism" as motivating forces. However, this solution is not only stipulative, counterintuitive, and runs up against "look ahead", but it is also empirically suspect.<sup>5</sup> The system of Bošković (2005) avoids these pitfalls, essentially, as in (4a), reinstating the insight that movement can be driven by a deficiency of the moving element. Note that, since there is no way to know in advance of merger of a matrix [+wh]  $C^0$  whether or not a *wh*-phrase will need to move, his system similarly relies on optionality of the feature motivating movement. As Bošković observes, both (15a) and (15b) will look like (16a) before the embedded  $C^0$  is merged, but since ultimately *what* only moves in (15b), only there must the relevant feature be present, producing (16c).

- (15) a. Who thinks that Mary bought what?  
 b. What do you think that Mary bought?
- (16) a. [<sub>TP</sub> Mary bought what]  
 b. [<sub>CP</sub> that [<sub>TP</sub> Mary bought **what**]] (=intermediate stage for (15a))  
 c. [<sub>CP</sub> **what** that [<sub>TP</sub> Mary bought **what**]] (=intermediate stage for (15b))

An important liability of a return to Move is that this gives up a chief advantage of Attract, namely that Superiority is built into movement itself. Finally, Takahashi's (1994) approach—a variant of solution (4b)—has the advantages of needing neither Chomsky's nor Bošković's featural optionality and of preserving Attract, but suffers from the problem that it requires an extra mechanism, namely, "Form Chain".

The present paper explores instead a theory that accommodates non-feature-driven movement and proposes a specific way of accomplishing it. I assume a standard bottom-up syntax. Variation is a matter of the features on lexical items. These are inserted either with valued or unvalued features, but unvalued features need eventually to be syntag-

<sup>4</sup> See Nissenbaum (2000) for discussion of intermediate licensing of parasitic gaps.

<sup>5</sup> See Bošković (2002a, 2005) for critical discussion of EPP-driven movement. Boeckx (2003:13) observes that using strong intermediate EPP features runs counter to the otherwise inviolable principle that a well-formed chain have at most one occurrence with a strong feature in it.

matically determined. If an item is sent to Spell-Out with unvalued features, then the derivation will crash, but if such an item moves to the left edge of its ph(r)ase, then it can remain syntactically active.<sup>6</sup> In this way, the offending feature retains the potential of being later valued. This movement is “agnostic”, in the sense of Franks and Lavine (in press), in that it takes place in the “absence of knowledge”. Rejecting Chomsky’s EPP approach to intermediate movement implies that it is always the item which moves which must have the feature deficiency. I contend that movement obtains because movement has at least the potential for convergence, whereas failure to move would be fatal to the derivation. **Agnostic Movement** is thus last-resort, locally-determined movement. Attract is retained in that only features of targets can drive movement, but a highly limited version of Move also applies, namely, movement to circumvent crash by moving to the left edge in order to keep a feature active for possible eventual valuation. The question I then pose in this paper is simple: Can Agnostic Movement be made to work?

## 5. Agnostic Movement in Lithuanian

Before considering in Section 6 how Agnostic Movement might apply to intermediate and multiple *wh*-movement, I review the data which Franks and Lavine (henceforth, F&L) argue call for such a mechanism and present the general format of our analysis.

### 5.1 Basic Data: Three “Object Shift” Constructions

Like Russian, Lithuanian admits scrambling but has unmarked SVO word order. The direct object receives either structural case (accusative) or lexical case (dative, genitive, instrumental, or locative). As shown in (18), this is preserved in infinitival complements.

- (17) a. Vaikas                skaito **knygą**.  
           child:NOM        reads book:ACC  
           ‘The child is reading a book.’                [Ambrasas et al. 1997:605]
- b. Jis atstovavo **darbininkams**.  
           he represented workers:DAT  
           ‘He represented the workers.’                [Ambrasas et al. 1997:459]
- c. Mes vengiame **to profesoriaus**.  
           we are-avoiding that:GEN professor:GEN  
           ‘We are avoiding that professor.’
- (18) a. Jis nežino, [kada skaityti **knygą**].  
           he not-know when to-read book:ACC  
           ‘He doesn’t know when to read the book.’
- b. Jis bijojo [atstovauti **darbininkams**].  
           he was-afraid to-represent workers:DAT  
           ‘He was afraid to represent the workers.’
- c. Mes pamiršome [vengti **to profesoriaus**].  
           we forgot to-avoid that:GEN professor:GEN  
           ‘We forgot to avoid that professor.’

F&L identify however three OV infinitival constructions in ordinarily VO Lithuanian:

---

<sup>6</sup> The Q-float data suggest the relevant domain should simply be a phrase, rather than a “phase”.

- (19) a. Pastatė daržinę [šienui sukrauti].  
 built hayloft:ACC hay:DAT to-keep  
 ‘They built a hayloft to keep hay.’  
 b. Tėvas parsivežė malkų [trobai kūrenti].  
 father brought firewood:PART.GEN cottage:DAT to-heat  
 ‘Father brought some firewood to heat the cottage.’ [Schmalstieg 1988:218]  
 c. Reikės ieškoti arklio [žemei arti].  
 it-will-be-necessary to-search-for horse:GEN land:DAT to-plow  
 ‘It will be necessary to search for a horse to plow the land.’
- (20) a. Išvažiavo [kelio taisyti].  
 went road:GEN to-repair  
 ‘They went to repair the road.’  
 b. Parvažiavo [suknelės pasiimti].  
 (she)-came-back dress:GEN to-take  
 ‘She came back to take the dress.’ [adapted from Schmalstieg 1988:174]  
 c. Siuntė mergaitę [vandens parnešti].  
 (he)-sent girl:ACC water:GEN to-fetch  
 ‘He sent the girl to fetch the water.’
- (21) a. Man nusibosta [laikraštis skaityti].  
 me:DAT is-boring:[-AGR] newspaper:NOM to-read  
 ‘It is boring for me to read the newspaper.’  
 b. Jam nepatiko [laukelis arti].  
 him:DAT did-not-like:[-AGR] field:NOM to-plow  
 ‘He didn’t like to plow the field.’ [Ambrazas et al. 1997:638]  
 c. Jiems buvo neįdomu [radijas klausyti].  
 them:DAT was uninteresting:[-AGR] radio:NOM to-listen  
 ‘It was boring for them to listen to the radio.’

The shifted objects in these constructions, which involve **infinitival purpose adjuncts** (19), **“supine” infinitival purpose complements** (20),<sup>7</sup> and **infinitival themes of (non-agreeing) psych verbs** (21), all display quirky case—dative, genitive, and nominative, respectively. Thus, in addition to the lexically determined case idiosyncrasy of (17b, c) and (18b, c), Lithuanian exhibits syntactically determined case idiosyncrasy: these cases depend on the general clause structure rather than on the particular infinitive. Moreover, unlike ordinary direct objects, here the object appears in some position preceding rather than following the verb. F&L thus refer to (19)–(21) as **Left Edge** (LE) constructions.

Verbs that assign lexical case to their objects, on the other hand, do not show either the special case or word order idiosyncrasies of (19)–(21).<sup>8</sup> Lexical case must instead be preserved, which goes hand-in-hand with canonical VO word order. For the dative, genitive, and nominative contexts, these are (22a-c), respectively:

<sup>7</sup> The Lithuanian genitive object construction is a vestigial supine, but has been extended beyond traditional verbs of motion, as shown by (20c). F&L show that the difference between *siuntė* ‘sent’ in (20c) and *parsivežė* ‘brought’ in (19b) is whether the purpose clause is merged as an argument or as an adjunct.

<sup>8</sup> It is much more natural to introduce purpose clauses containing such verbs using the overt complementizer *kad* ‘in order’, which however takes a subjunctive rather than infinitive.

- (22) a. Jie pasidavė [vengti ilgo karo].  
 they surrendered to-avoid long:GEN war:GEN  
 ‘They surrendered to avoid a long war.’  
 b. Parvažiavo [dėkoti motinai].  
 (she)-came-back to-thank mother:DAT  
 ‘She came back to thank her mother.’  
 c. Jam nepatiko [laukti pinigų].  
 him:DAT did-not-like:[-AGR] to-wait-for money:GEN  
 ‘He didn’t like to wait for money.’

## 5.2 The Franks and Lavine Account

F&L treat LE case in terms of leftward displacement of the direct object to the edge of the infinitival clause. We supported a movement analysis by showing that LE objects not only precede manner adverbs (23a, c), which are standardly analyzed as demarcating the left edge of VP, but also precede sentential adverbs (23b), which are higher.

- (23) a. Pastatė daržinę [šienui [VP gerai sukrauti]].  
 (they)-built hayloft:ACC hay:DAT well to-keep  
 ‘They built a hayloft to keep the hay well.’  
 b. Išvažiavo [kelio [VP tikriausiai taisyti]].  
 (they)-went road:GEN probably to-repair  
 ‘They went probably to repair the road.’  
 c. Jam nepatiko [laukelis [VP greitai arti]].  
 him:DAT did-not-like field:NOM quickly to-plow  
 ‘He did not like to plow the field quickly.’

Infinitives in Lithuanian can sometimes assign assign quirky dative to subject position, as in (24a) and (to the extent having both is felicitous) (23b) shows that LE objects move past the subject, i.e., higher than the more familiar kind of Germanic object shift:

- (24) a. Jis nežino, [kada jam skaityti knygą].  
 he not-know when him:DAT to-read book:ACC  
 ‘He doesn’t know when he should read the book.’  
 b. ?Pastatė daržinę [šienui [TP mums sukrauti]].  
 (they)-built hayloft:ACC hay:DAT us:DAT to-keep  
 ‘They built a hayloft for us to keep hay.’

Adopting Chomsky’s (2001) notions of **phase** in (25a) and his **Phase Impenetrability Condition** (PIC) in (25b), we concluded that LE objects shift to the left edge (or outer Spec) of the relevant phase, since this position remains visible from the outside.

- (25) a. **Phase:** Each phase consists of its phase-defining head, its edge (or specifier), and its complement. The complement is sent off to the interfaces upon completion of the phase. This material, once sent off, is no longer available to further syntactic processes.  
 b. **PIC:** In phase  $\alpha$  with head H, the domain of H (its complement) is not accessible to operations outside of  $\alpha$ ; only H and its edge are.

We further argued that they did so because, if left unvalued for case at the point in the derivation when the phrase containing them was being sent to Spell-Out, then the derivation would crash. Hence, the object moved as a last resort operation to save the derivation, in the uninformed, “agnostic” hope of eventually getting case features valued.

This approach raises serious questions. The one devoted most attention by F&L (in press) is the source of LE case. Noting a connection between the particular LE Case assigned and the unactualized possibility of assigning that case in the main clause, as in the examples in (26), we posited specific functional heads to probe and value the LE cases.

- (26) a. Aš atnešiau vandens **daržams.**  
 I brought water: PART.GEN kitchen-garden:DAT  
 ‘I brought some water for the garden.’ [adapted from Ambrazas et al. 1997:510]
- b. Išėjo **pieno.**  
 (he)-went milk:GEN  
 ‘He went for milk.’
- c. Studento sudeginta **namas.**  
 student:GEN burned-down:-TA house:NOM  
 ‘The student apparently burned down the house.’

In brief, the dative objects of infinitival purpose clauses in (19) are related to the dative benefactive of (26a), the genitive objects of “supine” purpose clauses in (20) are related to the genitive goal in (26b), and the nominative objects of psych-verb clausal themes in (21) are related to the nominative theme in (26c). What is special about the LE constructions is that the object must undergo Agnostic Movement in order for its case features to be valued. More specifically, F&L propose that (i) dative is valued by a null “prepositional complementizer” introducing the adjunct, (ii) genitive is valued by the Aspect head associated with the matrix verb of motion, and (iii) nominative (on objects) is valued by a [–AGR] verbal functional head, such as the frozen participial suffix *-ta* in (26c).<sup>9</sup>

## 6. Extensions and Speculations

In this final section, I address some conceptual issues that arise from the F&L account.

### 6.1 Generalized Exceptional Case Marking?

Although F&L assume Chomsky’s (2000) probe-goal system of feature valuation, there is little evidence in the Lithuanian data of “action at a distance” Agree; our earlier structures could easily be recast so that the target of case is the specifier of the complement of the relevant case-licensing head.<sup>10</sup> This configuration is of course one of ECM, which, I have argued in Franks (1995), should be generalized from familiar (27a) to Russian (27b):<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> We also called this “Aspect”, situating it between *vP* and *VP*, but noted that it embodies more than this. For detailed structures, see F&R (in press). Just like the nominative LE construction, evidential (26c) crucially lacks agreement: the *-a* in *-ta* was the etymologically neuter ending, but the modern system lacks neuter gender. Erstwhile neuter morphology is thus a clear indication of non-agreement.

<sup>10</sup> As argued by Wurmbrand (2004) *inter alia*, nominative in German and Icelandic calls for “non-local” Agree. It is probably no accident however that these languages also lack an EPP requirement for TP.

<sup>11</sup> The distributive preposition *po* assigns non- $\Theta$ -related (structural) dative to *pjati* ‘five’, the Spec of its complement; what unites these is that this complement (TP or QP) is not a case bearer. In (27a), *the*

- (27) a. I believe [<sub>TP</sub> **the students** to have been studying].  
 b. Každýj student polučil [<sub>PP</sub> po [<sub>QP</sub> **pjati** rublej]].  
 each student received DIST five:DAT rubles:GEN]]  
 ‘Each student received five rubles.’

What happens if the Lithuanian LE constructions are couched in terms of ECM? For LE dative (19) this is simple: the shifted object moves to the Spec of the phrase (arguably TP) that is the complement of the null prepositional complementizer. Then the target for dative valuation will be the Spec of its object, schematically (28a). For LE genitive (20) I assume the relevant head to be matrix Asp and the target NP to have shifted to the edge of a bare *v*P that is the highest internal argument of the motion verb, schematically (28b).<sup>12</sup> The LE nominative in (21) suggests a similar analysis. What is shared by nominative object constructions in Lithuanian, of which (26c) is but one type, is that there is no nominative subject and the verb is “defective” in the sense that it fails to show subject-predicate agreement. This is no accident: the fact that nominative objects appear precisely where the potential for nominative is not utilized by the subject implies a single source. In Lithuanian, then, nominative is assigned in both agreeing and non-agreeing predicates, but in the latter its target is in the essentially ECM-like configuration in (28c).

- (28) a. [<sub>PP/CP</sub> P<sup>0</sup>/C<sup>0</sup> [<sub>TP</sub> NP T<sup>0</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> ... NP]]]  
 b. [<sub>AspP</sub> Asp<sup>0</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>vP</sub> NP v<sup>0</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> ... NP]]] [[<sub>v'</sub> V<sup>0</sup> (NP)]]]]  
 c. [<sub>TP</sub> T<sup>0</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> NP T<sup>0</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> ... NP]]] [<sub>v'</sub> v<sup>0</sup> VP]]]

## 6.2 Adjunct Case in Lithuanian and the (LE?) Genitive

Before examining the LE genitive, consider some issues related to adjuncts. For the analogy to ECM to go through, the LE cases must be structural rather than inherent. The behavior of certain extent adverbials confirms this. As in many other languages, duration adjuncts can receive structural case: they are accusative, like direct objects, in affirmative sentences (29a), and they are genitive, again like direct objects, in negated ones (29b):

- (29) a. Jis skaitė (laikraštį) **valandą**.  
 he read newspaper:ACC hour:ACC  
 ‘He read (the newspaper) for an hour.’  
 b. Neskaitė (laikraščio) **nė valandos**.  
 (he)-not-read newspaper:GEN even hour:GEN  
 ‘He didn’t read (the newspaper) even for an hour.’

Significantly, when such adjuncts occur in infinitival purpose clauses they are dative (30) and within infinitival themes of psych verbs they can marginally be nominative (31):

- (30) Aš atnešiau kirvį [medžiams **visai dienai** kirsti].  
 I brought axe:ACC trees:DAT all:DAT day:DAT to-chop  
 ‘I brought an axe to chop trees all day.’

---

*students* presumably moves higher, into the matrix clause, but that movement is driven by the EPP independently of case valuation, whereas in Russian (27b), *pjati* is in SpecQP and has its case valued there.

<sup>12</sup> Here, the target NP is actually the Spec of the *v*P which itself is the Spec of the VP complement to Asp, implying iteration of the Spec–head relationship. (Alternatively, *v*P could be in SpecAspP.)

- (31) ??Man nusibosta [laikraščiai **visas mėnuo** skaityti].  
 me:DAT is-boring:[-AGR] newspapers:NOM all:NOM month:NOM to-read  
 ‘It is boring for me to read newspapers all month.’

Moreover, as shown in (32), the relative order of the fronted argument and the adjunct is not fixed.<sup>13</sup> These data suggest that Agnostic Movement fails to invoke Superiority.

- (32) a. Aš atnešiau kirvį [**visai dienai** medžiams kirsti].  
 b. ??Man nusibosta [**visas mėnuo** laikraščiai skaityti].

Curiously, adjuncts in the supine construction are *never* genitive; the accusative (which is almost always an option) is required instead:<sup>14</sup>

- (33) Aš atėjau [ (\***visos dienos/✓visą dieną**) medžių kirsti].  
 I came all:GEN day:GEN/ all:ACC day:ACC trees:GEN to-chop  
 ‘I came to chop trees (all day).’

This fact is problematic for F&L’s account of the LE genitive. The impossibility of genitive in (33) leads to the conclusion that whatever makes the object genitive in the supine construction must be a *lexical* rather than structural case property, otherwise we would expect it to pertain equally well to extent adjuncts. Apparently, verbs literally become genitive assigning in the scope of motion verb Aspect, obviating the shift represented in (28b).<sup>15</sup> Genitive then cannot be assigned to the adjunct, although, like any verb that governs a quirky case, such as *vengti* ‘to avoid’ in (22a)—extent adverbials remain targets for the appropriate structural case, as in (34). Treating the supine genitive in this way explains F&L’s observations that it is evolving from a true LE case (valued from outside) to a simple quirky case: unlike with the true LE cases, here VO and OV orders are equally unmarked and, for innovative speakers, genitive is giving way to accusative. (We posited the progression “ $V_{ASP} + [NP:GEN V_{SUP/INF}] > V + [V_{INF} NP:GEN] > V + [V_{INF} NP:ACC]$ ”.)

- (34) a. (Mes) vengiame to profesoriaus **visą dieną**.  
 we avoid that:GEN professor:GEN all:ACC day:ACC  
 ‘We are avoiding that professor all day.’  
 b. (Mes) slėpėmės to profesoriaus **visai dienai** vengti.  
 we hid that:GEN professor:GEN all:DAT day:DAT to-avoid  
 ‘We were hiding (in order) to avoid that professor all day.’

### 6.3 A Typology of *Wh*-Movement

Finally, if one hallmark of Agnostic Movement is absence of Superiority effects, and if it also characterizes the force behind intermediate *wh*-movement, this may lead to a way of reconciling the Attract–Move controversy associated with Bulgarian (Bg) (35) and (36):

<sup>13</sup> The adjunct can also appear at the end in (30), but not in (31). Space considerations preclude discussion of additional complexities in the adjunct case facts, which I am addressing in work in progress.

<sup>14</sup> Judgments as to the felicity of (*lower clause* and *durative*) dative adjuncts in examples like (33) are unclear. If acceptable, this reaffirms the LE dative’s structural nature, although raises other problems.

<sup>15</sup> For a verb to convert into a (lexical) genitive case assigner in the scope of a motion verb is formally identical to my 1995 account of how “genitive of negation” works in Polish *vis-à-vis* Russian.

- (35) a. **Kogo kak e** celunal Ivan?      b. Koj **kogo kak e** celunal?  
       whom how AUX kissed Ivan        who whom how AUX kissed  
       ‘Who did Ivan kiss how?’        ‘Who kissed who how?’
- (36) a. \***Kak kogo e** celunal Ivan?        b. Koj **kak kogo e** celunal?

The problem, as described in Bošković (2002b) and references therein, is that multiple *wh*-fronting shows Superiority effects only for the highest *wh* phrase. This implies that all the *wh*-phrases move agnostically, and only later is the highest one attracted to SpecCP.<sup>16</sup> Notice that *kogo* and *kak* in the (b) examples differ from English intermediate *wh*-movement in that there Agnostic Movement fails, leading instead to an LF solution:

- (37) [CP **Who** [TP ~~who~~ thinks [CP ~~what~~ that [TP Mary bought ~~what~~]]]]?

In Lithuanian, we saw that Agnostic Movement succeeds because the fronted NP is eventually valued for case. But can Agnostic Movement fail? While there may be a way of implementing this technically,<sup>17</sup> so far as I know *none* of the diagnostics for intermediate movement cataloged in Section 3 work for LF movement (aka “failed” Agnostic Movement). Compare, for example, (38a) and (38b) with (12) and (14c) above:

- (38) a. \*Who said that Mary thinks that Bill likes which pictures of herself?  
       b. \*Who said that you claimed that you loved which painting [in order to get me to look at *pg*]?

Since *LF movement invariably behaves like no movement*, I have to conclude that there is in fact no intermediate movement in (37). This conclusion has several consequences.

In my system, being unvalued is what induces Agnostic Movement.<sup>18</sup> Concurring with Bošković that multiple *wh*-movement is driven by **focus** features, I claim that, in the Bg lexicon, *wh*-words have unvalued features for both [wh] and [focus], whereas English *wh*-words only have unvalued [wh] features. This must, furthermore, be optional, in order to avoid failed Agnostic Movement in examples like (37).<sup>19</sup> In languages like Italian, which lacks multiple *wh*-movement, the valued [wh] option is unavailable. Next, in a language like Chinese, with no *wh*-movement, both types of feature are valued. In Russian, with multiple *wh*-fronting but no Superiority effects, only [focus] is unvalued on *wh*-words. Finally, in Serbian/Croatian (SC), which has multiple *wh*-fronting, but, Bošković (2002b) shows, only displays Superiority in the presence of C<sup>0</sup>, [focus] is unvalued while [wh] is only optionally so. The extent of this variation is summarized in (39):

---

<sup>16</sup> Since Agnostic Movement order is free, “highest” must be defined on the basis of A-position.

<sup>17</sup> For example, we could return to earlier conceptions of feature movement: only the relevant feature(s) move for agnostic reasons and, if they end up being valued, then they pied-pipe the remaining features to their final landing site. If not, no other features are moved, the stranded intermediate features are deleted, and the phrase remains for all intents and purposes *in situ*. (This may ultimately be a notational variant of Takahashi’s “Form Chain” approach.)

<sup>18</sup> It is thus similar to Bošković’s earliest characterization of the Bg facts in terms of Move applying to [wh] and Attract to [focus]. However, variation for me is entirely a matter of features of lexical items. Additionally, whether or not a particular functional projection enters the structure depends on the presence of a lexical item with a feature that needs that functional category in order to value it.

<sup>19</sup> The availability of the valued option implies the possibility of *wh*-in-situ in single *wh* questions.

- (39) Bulgarian: [wh], [focus]    SC: [(+)wh], [focus]    Russian: [+wh], [focus]  
Italian: [wh], [+focus]    English: [(+)wh], [+focus]    Chinese: [+wh], [+focus]

Languages in the top row of (39) require merger (cf. fn. 15) of a FocP to value [focus] on the agnostically moved *wh*-phrases, those in the bottom row do not. Bulgarian, Italian, and (optionally) SC and English additionally require merger of a CP to value [wh].<sup>20</sup>

This paper has examined some conceptual and empirical consequences of (40):

- (40) **Agnostic movement:** Elements which need, but have not yet received by the end of the ph(r)ase containing them, syntactic licensing of some kind, move to the left edge of that ph(r)ase in order to remain syntactically active.

### References

- Ambrazas, V. et al. (eds.). 1997. *Lithuanian grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.  
Boeckx, Cedric. 2003. *Islands and Chains*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.  
Bošković, Željko. 2002a. A movement and the EPP. *Syntax* 5:167–218.  
Bošković, Željko. 2002b. On multiple *wh*-fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:351–383.  
Bošković, Željko. 2004. Be careful where you float your quantifiers. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:681–742.  
Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of move and agree. *University of Connecticut Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 3.  
Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries. In *Step by step: Essays on minimalism in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.  
Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.  
Franks, Steven. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. Oxford: OUP.  
Franks, Steven and James Lavine. in press. Case and word order in Lithuanian. *Journal of Linguistics* 42.2.  
Henry, Alison. 1995. *Belfast English and Standard English*. Oxford: OUP.  
McCloskey, James. 2000. Quantifier float and *wh*-movement in an Irish English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31:57–84.  
Nissenbaum, Jon. 2000. Investigations of covert phrase movement. Dissertation, MIT.  
Schmalstieg, William. 1988. *A Lithuanian historical syntax*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.  
Takahashi, Daiko 1994. Minimality of movement. Dissertation, Univ. of Connecticut.  
Torrego, Esther. 1984. On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15:103–29.  
Wurmbrand, Susi. 2004. Licensing case. Ms., Univ. of Connecticut.

Department of Linguistics  
Memorial Hall 322  
Bloomington, Indiana 47405-7005

franks@indiana.edu

---

<sup>20</sup> I see no way, however, around the *Wh*-Criterion stipulation that a [+wh] CP needs a filled Spec.