The EPP in Breton: An unvalued categorial feature

1. Introduction: A third A-feature

This paper investigates the syntax of the unique pre-verbal position of Breton V2 clauses, which will be identified as [Spec, TP], and the morphology of T (glossed R), which will be shown to code the syntactic category of [Spec, TP]. The focus will be on [Spec, TP] as an A-position, exemplified in (1):

(1)

a    Bez’   e  oa  (Azenor)  gwelet (Azenor).
     EXPL    R    was    Azenor    seen    Azenor
     Azenor was seen.

b  Azenor₁   a  oa  t₁  gwelet.
c  Gwelet₁   e  oa  t₁  Azenor.

We will see that when such [Spec, TP] is filled by movement, the feature responsible cannot be Case or φ-features, which are usually associable with A-movement. The identity of the feature can be established from a convergence of two properties. First, it is restricted to the closest syntactic object in the c-command domain of T, regardless of its properties: Case, φ-features, syntactic category, phonological content, or even dislocatability. Since locality follows from limitation of syntactic dependencies to the closest matching pair of features (Rizzi 1990, Chomsky 1995, 2000), the feature responsible for the A-movement must be satisfiable by all syntactic objects. Second, the Breton T contains a morpheme which codes the syntactic category of [Spec, TP]. This morpheme is the morphological reflex of a syntactic dependency, and results from the Agree operation (Chomsky 2000); in this case, it values an unvalued categorial feature with such values as [N] or [A]. Since a category is a property possessed by all syntactic objects, an unvalued categorial feature has the required locality property as well. This feature will be noted [δ-].

We will find further that in Breton there is evidence for a one-to-one correlation between [δ-] Agree and the projection of [Spec, TP]. [δ-] Agree is responsible for filling [Spec, TP] as an A-position with the closest syntactic object. If T has an Ā-feature as well, this may fill [Spec, TP] as an Ā-position with the characteristic selective locality of Ā-movement. How-
ever, in that case \([\delta]\) must be valued at the same time, as a free rider. This correlation between [Spec, TP] projection and \([\delta]\) Agree characterizes the EPP property of Chomsky (2000), which determines whether a head offers a non-thematic Merge position. However, unlike the EPP proposal, \([\delta]\) as an unvalued categorial feature can itself Agree.

The organization of this paper is as follows. The rest of this introduction reviews the role of categorial features in implementing the EPP in the Minimalist Program. Section 2 introduces those aspects of Breton syntax which relate to [Spec, TP], and establishes the clausal architecture of the complement of T. This lays the groundwork for section 3, which shows that there is a class of movements to [Spec, TP] that are not driven by either \(\tilde{A}\)-features or Case/\(\phi\) features. This option is limited to moving the closest syntactic object in the c-command domain of T, which may be the subject, a predicate adjective, and various verb forms. Section 4 shows that T in Breton bears a morphological marker tracking the syntactic category of [Spec, TP]. The rest of section 4 and section 5 show that \([\delta]\) correlates with the projection of [Spec, TP], and explore its identification with the EPP feature of Chomsky (2000).

As an uninterpretable categorial feature, \([\delta]\) is an extension of the specific affixal categorial features of Chomsky (1995), particularly the nominal [N-] and [D-] features. These features regulate the licensing of non-thematic DP positions in the clause, and are distinct from Case and \(\phi\)-agreement features. The most comprehensive argument for the need for a third A-feature beyond Case and \(\phi\)-agreement is due to Schütze (1993, 1997), particularly his investigation of the properties of [Spec, TP] in Icelandic. I will begin by reviewing the argument.

In Icelandic, the [Spec, TP] A-position is not reserved for arguments with structural Case. It can be occupied by an oblique DP provided it is the highest argument in the clause (Zaenen et al. 1985, Sigurðsson 1992). In (2) \textit{henni} is in this position, although it has dative Case and cannot agree with the verb:

\begin{verbatim}
(2) Henni \textit{hýkir} t\textsubscript{1} bróðir sinn leiðinlegur.
   Her brother seems boring to her.  (Zaenen et al. 1985:450)
\end{verbatim}

This provides the initial motivation for divorcing Case/\(\phi\) from A-movement to [Spec, TP]. By itself, this fact does not go very far, since it is possible that oblique DPs which appear in [Spec, TP] have structural Case
as well as theta-related oblique Case, as proposed in Belletti and Rizzi (1988); the nominative could then be licensed by long distance φ-Agree as in Chomsky (2000). However, Schütze's (1993) point, elaborated in Schütze (1997:II, IV), is that both such 'quirky' Case DPs and regular nominative DPs in Icelandic have their Case licensed under no relation to either [Spec, TP] or T. This is illustrated in (3), where the φ-agreement normally required between T and a nominative as in (3)a is impossible when an unmoved DP intervenes between them (Chomsky 2000:130-1, Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2003). Yet the nominative is perfectly fine here, although it is not in [Spec, TP] and cannot enter into φ-agreement with T.

(3)

a  Mér virðast/??virðist ti î [hestarnir hafa verið me.D seem.PL/seem.SG horses.N have.INF been gefnir konunginum] given king.the.D
The horses seem to me to have been given to the king. (Schütze 1997:107)

b  Það virðist/*virðast einhverjum manni [hestarnir there seem.SG/*seem.PL some.D man.D horses.the.N vera seinir] be.INF slow
A man finds the horses slow. (Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2003:1000)

c  Mér fannst/*fundust ti î [TP henni leiðast þeir me.D seemed.3.SG/*3.PL she.D bore.INF they]
I thought she was bored with them. (Taraldsen 1995:317)

Just as nominative does not require a relation to T or [Spec, TP] to be licensed, [Spec, TP] need not be occupied by a constituent with structural Case. Setting aside expletives and quirky Case DPs whose Case is in question, Holmberg's (2000) work on Stylistic Fronting shows that [Spec, TP] may be filled by an adverb, a PP, a particle, or a participle. Stylistic Fronting indeed makes available a stronger conclusion: even if [Spec, TP] can be filled by an agreeing nominative, it does not have to be, as the coexistence of the options in (4) indicates: These facts lead Holmberg (2000) to conclude that there is a non-Case/φ-related P(honological) feature which can drive movement to [Spec, TP] in the syntax (cf. section 5 here).
A difficult decision has been taken. (Holmberg 2000:448)

Chomsky (2000) continues to maintain the separation of [Spec, TP] licensing and Case. However, a separate nominal feature is replaced by an EPP property of heads, which requires a head to project an unselected position but is not itself a feature capable of forming syntactic dependencies via Agree. For [Spec, TP] in Icelandic, it is $\phi$-Agree which identifies the goal for movement. As the paradigm in (3) has already shown, $\phi$-Agree in contrast to nominative assignment does require a syntactic dependency. Furthermore, there is evidence that oblique DPs that move to [Spec, TP] do enter into a relation with the $\phi$-features of T, because they disable person (not number) agreement with a nominative, as (5) shows (Chomsky 2000:128, Boeckx 2000, Anagnostopoulou 2003:V, Béjar and Rezac 2003):

(5) Henni, *leiðumst/*leiðust/*leiðist $t_1$ við
she.D bored.1.PL/3.PL/3.SG we.N
She was bored with us. (Taraldsen 1995:308-9)

Chomsky (2000) therefore concludes that DP A-movement to [Spec, TP] is a consequence of the $\phi$-Agree of T, which moves the first matching goal if the EPP of T has not yet been satisfied. However, this approach also seems insufficient when faced with the data in (4).

The Breton A-movement investigated here shows similarities both to oblique subjects and to Stylistic Fronting in Icelandic in terms of locality and separation from Case. However, as we will see in section 3, in Breton it can be demonstrated that $\phi$-features are not involved because of the Complementarity Principle of Celtic $\phi$-agreement systems, which suspends $\phi$-agreement with overt DPs. This leaves us with a search for the relevant licensing property, and again the Breton data provide a unique perspective; there is a morphological spell-out of the relevant Agree relation, which identifies the third A feature as an unvalued categorial feature.
2. The Breton clausal architecture


(6) Nolwenn a gred e vo tomm an amzer.
    Nolwenn R believe.3.SG R will.be hot the weather
    Nolwenn believes that the weather will be hot.

Our focus is the pre-verbal position in V2 clauses. It is a unique position; any constituent that precedes it is clause-external, such as left-dislocated DPs. Constituents that fill it may have either A or Ā properties. The theory of unique specifier positions that can be of either A or Ā type is developed in Diesing (1990) for Yiddish and by Zubizarreta (1998:99f., 117f.) for Spanish. Adapting the terminology of Zubizarreta, we will call a head whose specifier can be either A or Ā a syncretic category. The A/Ā type of the specifier is determined by the feature which causes the specifier to be filled (cf. Chomsky 2000:108-110 and accompanying notes 45, 53 on p. 144-5): an A-position for a Case/φ/nominal feature, an Ā-position for one of the perhaps structured class of features such as [wh] (cf. Rizzi 2000, forthcoming). The concept of a syncretic category naturally captures the complementarity of A and Ā constituents. We may see the complementarity in the following paradigm, where the preverbal position is variously filled by a fronted participle, a subject, and wh object. As we will see below, a fronted participle cannot have an Ā properties, a fronted subject can but need not, and a fronted wh object must have them. Yet these elements cannot co-occur (Stephens 1982:210; cf. Schafer 1995:141-2, 154 nt. 10):

(7)
  a Debret he deus Nolwenn krampouezh.
      eaten R.3.SG.F have Nolwenn pancakes
      Nolwenn has eaten pancakes.
  b Nolwenn he deus debret krampouezh.
      Nolwenn/NOLWENN has eaten pancakes.
  c Petra he deus debret Nolwenn?
What has Nolwenn eaten?

*Debret Nolwenn he deus krampouezh.

*Petra Nolwenn he deus debret.

*Debret petra he deus Nolwenn?

Syncretic categories can be construed as an implementation of Rizzi’s (1997, forthcoming) multiple left-periphery heads $T^0$, $\text{Fin}^0$, $\text{Foc}^0$, $\text{Int}^0$, and $\text{Topic}^0$ in languages like Breton, where these heads are "compressed" in the sense that only a unique head (at the V2 position) and a unique specifier (the preverbal constituent, which can be a neutral, focused, topicalized, or interrogative XP) may be realized for the whole complex. I set aside here the way this compression should be implemented: it could be, for example, that some languages simply lexicalize $[T^0+\text{Fin}^0+\text{Foc}^0+\text{Int}^0+\text{Topic}^0]^0$, or it could be that there is a syntactic principle responsible for such a compression of independently projected syntactic heads (cf. Roberts & Roussou 2002, Roberts 2003). I will label the pre-verbal position as $[\text{Spec, TP}]$, the specifier of the syncretic head $T$ which hosts the finite verb (cf. Hewitt 2002). V2 clauses project $[\text{Spec, TP}]$, while V-initial TP complements of certain complementizers (including negation) do not; this and the complementizer system will be discussed in discussed in section 4.

Most constituents fronted to $[\text{Spec, TP}]$ cannot receive a neutral interpretation suitable to out-of-the-blue contexts or responses to what happened questions, unlike the participle in (7)a and subject in (7)b which can. Instead, they receive a variety of marked interpretations: they are interpreted as new information focus which corresponds to the wh-word of a question, as contrastive focus, or as discourse (switch) topic; or they are wh-words, the highest of which must appear in $[\text{Spec, TP}]$ (Hendrick 1990:154). These all involve $\bar{A}$-feature Agree (Rizzi 1997, forthcoming). To such non-neutral readings are limited non-subject DPs, PP arguments and adjuncts, low adverbs, and $\nu$Ps (ex. (7)c, (8)a, (8)b). All constituents which undergo such $\bar{A}$-movement can undergo it both locally within their clause and over unbounded distance, with sensitivity to strong and weak islands and superiority (Stephens 1982, Borsley, River, and Stephens 1996:73 note 2, Hendrick 1990:154). Examples of long distance extraction are $\nu$P-fronting in (8)c and subject extraction in (8)d, where the latter contrasts with the local movement in (7)b in lacking a neutral reading (Jouitteau 2003b) and showing strong cross-over (Schafer 1995:143-4). The basic limitation is that certain non-branch sub-trees cannot displace, unlike
vPs: finite and non-finite clausal complements (see note 27; cf. Stephens 1982:40), and the constituent headed by a past participle, regardless of whether or where it contains the subject (ex. (8)e, (8)f).

(8)
a Krampouezh\textsubscript{1} / goustadik\textsubscript{1} / er gêr\textsubscript{1} a zebran\textsubscript{1}, pancakes slowly at home R eat.I
I eat PANCAKES/SLOWLY/AT HOME.
b [Debr\textsubscript{1}iñ krampouezh\textsubscript{1}] a ran\textsubscript{1}.
eat pancakes R do.I
I EAT PANCAKES.
c [Sevel ar mogerioù] a ouien e rae ar vasonerien\textsubscript{1} build the walls R knew.1.SG R did the masons
I knew that the masons built the walls. (Stephens 1982:99)
d Anna am eus klevet he deus desket\textsubscript{1} he c'hentelioù
Anna R.1.SG have heard R.3.SG.F have learned her lessons
ANNA, I have heard she has learned her lessons.
*e I have heard that Anna has learned her lessons. (Jouitteau 2003b)
e *[E vo tomm an amzer] a gred Nolwenn\textsubscript{1}
R will.be hot the weather R believes Nolwenn
f *[((Manon) debret (Manon) krampouezh\textsubscript{1}) he deus (Manon) t\textsubscript{1}.
eaten pancakes pancakes R.3.SG.F have

vP fronting provides a good starting point for examination of TP-internal clausal architecture. The verb contained in the fronted vP is always in infinitival form. We will assume that the infinitival morphology is assumed by the verbal root if it cannot raise out of the vP to receive either participial or finite morphology. This morphology is in turn stranded by vP-fronting, and rescued by insertion of the verb ober ‘do’, as in (8)b.

We see that the verb under vP-fronting does not raise to the head that contains the participial affix -et, because the constituent headed by the past participle cannot front (8)f. This head must be fairly high, since the participle in it obligatorily precedes temporal adverbs such as c’hoazh ‘yet, still’, biskoazh ‘(n)ever’, and dalc’hmat ‘continuously’ (Favereau 1997:326-7, contrasting French), as in ex. (9). The head in question will be labeled Agr(Prt), although the participial affix -et is φ-invariant. AgrPrt must c-command the site of adverbs like c’hoazh ‘yet, still’, which are left and right vP-adjoined.'
We will call the highest DP argument the subject, whether it is the external argument of transitives and unergatives or the internal argument of unaccusatives and passives. We find that the subject and the participle both necessarily precede the transitive object (cf. Stephens 1982, Hendrick 2000), while either order is possible between the subject and the participle.¹⁰

This asymmetry between subject and transitive object is supported by considering the vP-fronted constituent. It obligatorily includes the transitive object DP and all subcategorized internal argument PPs (Stephens 1982:V). On Chomsky’s (2000, 2001) assumptions, it must be a phase, while the unfrontable constituents of (8)f and (8)e are non-phases. A phase contains at least the entire argument structure, so that for transitives the vP but not the VP is a phase. vP-fronting therefore affects the vP.¹¹ However, vP-fronting cannot include the subject of either transitive/unergative or unaccusative/passive constructions, which is left behind (8)e. Therefore, the highest DP argument must obligatorily move out of the vP to some higher position, while the transitive object must stay within the vP. This can be summarized as follows, where c’hoazh-type adverbs left/right-adjoin to vP:
(11) Transitive: $[T (subject_1) \text{participle (subject_1)} \{V P \text{... object}\}]$

Passive/unaccusative: $[T (subject_1) \text{participle (subject_1)} \{V \text{... } t_1\}]$

These schemata accord well with conclusions based on cross-linguistic investigation of derived A-positions for DPs in McCloskey (1997). The neutral [Spec, TP] where we see the subject in (7)b above and which we will investigate in the next section is a high A-position. The post-T position of subjects in (7)a is a low derived A-position, to which the highest DP obligatorily moves out of the VP. The two correspond to [Spec, AgrsP] and [Spec, TP] respectively in Bobaljik and Jonas's (1996) investigation of Icelandic. Like Icelandic, Breton allows transitive expletive constructions as in (12)a, which Bobaljik and Jonas connect to the availability of two distinct derived A-positions for subjects: the expletive occupies the high A-position, and the subject is in the low derived A-position. Furthermore, also as in Icelandic (Jonas 1996:79), Hendrick (1990:157) observes that the low derived A-position is available for raising (12)b (along with [Spec, TP], ex. (15) below).

(12)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Bez e nevo hennez traou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXPL R.3.SG.M have he things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He will have goods. (Gros 1984:110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>N' en deus ket Yann semblantet $[t_1 \text{ karout ar vugale}]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEG R.3.SG.M have NEG Yann seemed love the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yann didn't seem to love the children. (Hendrick 1990:157)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can identify the low A-position as [Spec, AgrPrtP] of the AgrPrt functional head which is needed independently for participial morphology. The obligatory movement of the subject here is possibly driven by Case/φ-agreement of AgrPrt (cf. McCloskey 1996 for Irish, from which Breton differs principally in offering [Spec, TP]). Although this differs from the usual identification of the low derived A-position in Icelandic as member of the expanded INFL, it is supported by the fact that the Breton participle in AgrPrt precedes temporal adverbs, which in Icelandic occur between INFL and the participle (cf. Jonas 1996:35f.). A further difference between the two languages is that there are no semantic restriction on the specificity of the DP in either the high or low A-position in Breton. The transitive object in Breton stays in the VP, with no object shift available to it, and VP-fronting obligatorily pied-pipes.
Finally, to account for the existence of participle > subject orders, we need to posit a higher functional head F between T and vP, to which AgrPrt optionally raises. We thus reach the following structure, exemplified for a transitive verb:

Figure 1  Breton extended VP architecture

We will assume that each of these heads is present if and only if it has content. A functional head has content either if it is lexicalized by an affix or by head movement, or if its specifier is filled by virtue of its feature content (Speas 1995, Grimshaw 1997). AgrPrt is thus always present, since [Spec, AgrPrt] is always projected for subject movement. F is present only if there is a feature which attracts the verb to it, so that it is absent in subject > participle orders. We assume further that v is always present as the locus of voice, but nothing hinges on this fact except for the definition of a phase for vP-fronting, which does not distinguish transitives from unaccusatives and passives (cf. note 11).

The important aspects which the structure captures are the following:

(13) Breton clausal architecture
(i) There is a constituent affected by vP-fronting that necessarily excludes the subject and includes all subcategorized internal arguments. A verb stranded within this constituent has not raised up to the participial affix -et and takes infinitival form.
(ii) There is a derived A-position for subjects between the vP and T.
(iii) The head that contains the participial affix -et c-commands all possible attachment sites for temporal adverbs like c’hoazh ‘still'.
(iv) There is interaction between the derived subject position(s) and the head raising position(s) for the participle, so that both orders are possible.

The structure in Figure 1 lies within the space of possible solutions to these requirements, and chooses between various option by following the general trend of associating an obligatory A-movement position with an Agr head and accounting for variation in participle height by V-raising. Some probable elaborations have already been mentioned, e.g. note 11. However, what is truly important for the locality facts discussed in the next section are the properties in (13). They will be crucial in accounting for the limitations on A-movements to [Spec, TP], to which we now turn.

3. δ-driven movement in Breton

In contrast to filling [Spec, TP] by local or long-distance Ā-movement, there are three possibilities of filling [Spec, TP] which are interpretively neutral, local, and do not satisfy an Ā-criterion. These are: by an expletive, by the highest DP (the subject), and by so-called Long Head Movement; all are already exemplified as (12), (7)a, and (7)b above. We will approach them in this order. The expletive will demonstrate the existence of a [Spec, TP] without Ā-properties, subject movement will show that there is a movement to [Spec, TP] which cannot be driven by either Ā or Case/φ-features, and Long Head Movement will show that this movement affects the closest syntactic object in the c-command domain of T. This is a consequence of the unselective locality of the feature that implements the movement, [δ-], which looks for a property common to all syntactic objects: their category.

The first option for a non-Ā [Spec, TP] is an expletive. The expletive, taking such forms as bez’ and bout, originates as an infinitive of the verb bezañ/bout 'be', but it is not synchronically identical with it (Kervella 1995:185, 390-1, Gros 1984:109-111, Favereau 1997:217, 230, 295). It is limited to occurrence in [Spec, TP] of finite V2 clauses. Adopting Chomsky’s (1995, 2000) analysis of expletives to which we return in section 4, it is base-generated directly in [Spec, TP], and satisfies the nominal or EPP requirement of T which we will argue is due to [δ-].

(14) Bez’ ech evas kalz gwin.
EXPL R drank lot wine
(In fact,) he did drink a lot of wine.

The second non-ā option for [Spec, TP] is movement of the subject. This singles out the same class of DPs that obligatorily move out of the vP to [Spec, AgrPrtP]. The A/ā contrast between subjects and other arguments in [Spec, TP] can be seen in two ways. First, SV(O) orders as in (7)b can have out-of-the-blue, wide focus interpretation, which is not the case for any other preverbal argument (Stump 1984:300, Gros 1984:108, Timm 1991, Favereau 1997:297). Second, the subject in [Spec, TP] can be an idiom chunk subpart as in (15), which are not compatible with the interpretative load of ā positions. Following Stump (1984), we conclude that the preverbal subject always has the option of being in an A-position.

(15) Ar bik1 a zeuas da t1 gregiñ en e skouarn.
the magpie R came to bite.INF in his ear
He decided to get married. (Borsley & Stephens 1989:417)

Although the movement is not ā-movement, in Breton we are in a unique position to show that it cannot be attributed to either Case or φ features. First, the movement is certainly not Case-driven. As we have seen in section 2, subjects in Breton are licensed in the low [Spec, AgrPrtP] A-position, regardless of their semantic properties: cf. (9), (10), (12). We could take this to be their Case position. More interestingly, movement of the subject to [Spec, TP] can also be shown not to be driven by φ-features, which as we saw in section 1 is debatable for Icelandic. Breton is a pro-drop language, but like the other Celtic languages it is subject to the Complementarity Principle, which enforces a complementary distribution between overt DPs and φ-agreement morphology on T (Stump 1984):

(16)

a Levriou a lennont/lennan.
books R read.3.PL/1.SG
I/they read books.

b Ar vugale/me a lenn/*ont/*an levriou
the children/I R read.3.SG/*3.PL/*1.PL books
The children/I read books.

c Levriou a lenn/*ont ar vugale
books R read.3.SG/*3.PL the children
The children are reading BOOKS.

There are three types of approaches to the Complementarity Principle in Celtic. The first is the Incorporation Hypothesis, which takes $\phi$-agreement on the verb as the spell-out of an independent pronominal argument. This pronoun incorporates into the finite verb either via syntactic movement (Anderson 1982 for Breton) or through a prosodic merger, rebracketing, or allomorphy (Pranka 1983, Doron 1988, Ackema and Neeleman 2003 for Irish, Adger 2000 for Scottish Gaelic). In response, Stump (1984, 1989) for Breton and McCloskey and Hale (1984:525f.) for Irish pursue the Agreement Hypothesis, where inflection reflects $\phi$-agreement with pro rather than pro itself. The Complementarity Principle is then handled by means of a condition which excludes the presence of AGR on INFL unless it governs a phonologically empty category. Finally, Jouitteau and Rezac (2003), for Breton, argue that there is always $\phi$-agreement, but in Complementarity Principle contexts it is with $v$ which is in Breton a nominal category (Jouitteau 2003a). As a nominal category, $v$ has $3^{rd}$.sg. $\phi$-features available for $\phi$-Agree, and because it moves to T by head movement it will be the closest goal for $\phi$-Agree unless the subject also incorporates into T; following the Incorporation Hypothesis, this is an option available only to pro and not to overt DPs. While the three approaches differ significantly from each other, they agree on the following point: there is no $\phi$-agreement with overt DPs. This happens because a DP cannot incorporate to allow $\phi$-agreement or because there is a condition that limits $\phi$-Agree to empty categories. There is no $\phi$-relation between T and a DP subject that could drive movement of the latter to [Spec, TP], and the Complementarity Principle reflects this fact.

Thus, we are led to the conclusion that the feature which drives DP movement to [Spec, TP] is neither Case nor $\phi$ feature, and it does not result in $\tilde{A}$-movement. A first approximation of its identity can be reached by examining its locality properties, under the feature-relativized locality adopted in Chomsky (1995, 2000). A-movement to [Spec, TP] is limited to the highest argument, which is always a DP. The transitive object, and PP internal arguments, can only move to [Spec, TP] by $\tilde{A}$-movement. We thus need a feature for which the closest DP is a match:

\[
(17) \quad \underline{T} \quad \text{subject DP} \quad \text{internal argument DP/PP} \\
[\underline{X-}] \quad \text{------>}
\]
The nominal [D-] and [N-] features of Schütze (1993) and Chomsky (1995) would show appropriate behavior. We will modify this conclusion below in favour of an uninterpretable categorial feature [δ-], which can be valued by a DP to [δ=D]. However, we reach our first important result: there is a non-Â, non-Case/φ feature that drives movement to [Spec, TP] in Breton, and that feature selects the closest DP in preference to all other arguments. Before we proceeding, we note that pro subjects behave in the same way as overt DPs: although pro itself cannot move to [Spec, TP] to give neutral V-initial orders, it blocks A-movement of internal arguments just like an overt subject does. Pro is thus visible but not available for movement. We will return to this once we have a more complete picture of neutral movements to [Spec, TP].

The third non-Â way of filling [Spec, TP] is by movement of a non-finite form of the verb over an auxiliary in T, so-called Long Head Movement (LHM): see Stephens (1982), Borsley, Rivero and Stephens (1996), Schafer (1997), Hewitt (2002). LHM takes two forms in Breton. In constructions where the verb would be realized as a participle without LHM, that is the perfect and passive where T is filled by the have/be auxiliaries, it is the participle that moves to [Spec, TP]; this is exemplified in (18)a and (18)b. In constructions where the verb would normally raise to T and receive inflection for tense and φ-features, LHM moves to [Spec, TP] the infinitival form of the verb, which is the default form assumed by a verbal root in the absence of other morphology; the tense and φ-features of T are rescued by insertion of ober ‘do’. This is exemplified in (18)c and (18)d. Ober-insertion and the assumption of infinitival morphology by the verb under LHM are both last-resort: while in auxiliary constructions all that changes under LHM is the position of the participle, there is no non-LHM construction where tense and φ-features are carried by ober which takes an infinitival complement; the equivalent is movement of the verb to T.

(18)

a Debret em eus t1 krampouezh.
    eaten R.1SG have pancakes
    I have eaten pancakes.

b Lakaet e vo t1 al levr-se da vezañ kaset deoc’h.
    caused R will.be the book-this to be.INF sent to.you
    The book will be made to be sent to you. (Kervella 1995:173)

c Kouezhañ a ra/reas glav.
    fall.INF R do.3.SG/did.3.SG rain
It rains/rained.

d Lakaat a rin t₁ kas deoc’h al levr-se.
cause R will.do.1.SG send to.you the book-this
I will cause this book to be sent to you. (Kervella 1995:173)

Although LHM and vP-fronting sometimes have similar results, they are completely different constructions. LHM is places into [Spec, TP] a head alone, the participle or infinitive, while vP-fronting places there the vP with the verb limited to the infinitive form and all internal arguments present. LHM unlike vP-fronting cannot undergo long distance Ā-extraction, as (19) contrasting with (8)c shows (Stephens 1982:III). Interpretively, LHM constructions lack any emphasis on the fronted constituent and the whole clause necessarily receives wide focus. These two properties are the same as those characterizing subject A-movement to [Spec, TP].

(19) *Debriñ [a ouien [e rae t₁ Yann krampouezh ed-du]]
eat.INF R knew did Yann pancakes buck-wheat

The two forms of LHM, participle + be/have auxiliary and infinitive + ober, have the same properties, but they differ in that the latter does not have a non-LHM analogue, because without LHM the verb moves directly to T. The question arises whether it displaces the verb directly from T, or from within the complement of T as LHM of the participle evidently does. The second alternative accounts for the sole set of exceptions to LHM, in part observed by Stephens (1982:104). LHM cannot apply to the perfect and passive auxiliaries bezañ/bout 'be' and endevout/kavout 'have' when they would normally occupy T to give the infinitive + ober construction, (20)a, although it can apply to the participle bet of these auxiliaries when another auxiliary fills T in the perfect passive (20)b and the passé surposé. Thus, we are not dealing with a restriction on auxiliaries themselves. The proper distinction can instead be achieved if finite auxiliaries are base-generated in T, and LHM can only move material that originates in the complement of T. The class that cannot undergo LHM in fact extends beyond Stephens's generalization: the copula bezañ/bout 'be' (20)c and the main verb endevout/kavout 'have' (20)d (as noted by Kervella 1995:169-170), not just their homophonous auxiliaries, show the same limitation of LHM to their participles (20)e. On the other hand, the lexical verb bezañ/bout 'exist' can undergo LHM to give the infinitive + ober construction, as in (20)f. This supports the account of the distinction if we assume
that the copula is base-generated in T, and that the verb *kavout/endevout*
*have* in Breton is based on the incorporation of a preposition into the cop-
ula, as shown in Jouitteau and Rezac (2003). Heads base-generated in T
cannot undergo LHM; those base-generated lower, such as the auxili-
ary/copula participle *bet* or the lexical *bezañ/bout* *exist*, can.

(20)
a *Bezañ a ra t₁ gwelet Azenor.*
be.INF R does seen Azenor
b Bet eo t₁ gwelet Azenor.
been is seen Azenor
Azenor was seen.
c *Bezañ a ra t₁ brav an amzer*
be.INF R does fair the weather
d *Kaout/endevout a ra t₁ (debret) krampouezh.*
    have R does eaten pancakes
    He has pancakes / He has eaten pancakes.
e Bet eo t₁ koant
been is pretty
(S)he has been pretty. (Favereau 1997:187)
f Bezañ/bout a ra
be.INF R does
She/he/it exists. (Favereau 1997:207, 227)

Thus, LHM displaces a head from the complement of T to [Spec, TP],
with a last-resort insertion of infinitival and *ober* morphology. The next
step in understanding LHM is to observe that it is restricted by a very
strong locality constraint (Rivero 1991, Borsley, Rivero and Stephens
1996). It is limited to the participle construed with the auxiliary in T, if
there is one, or to the lexical verb that would otherwise move to T:’’ A
more distant head cannot be affected by it: a lower complementizer or the
T/V of finite or non-finite complements, for example. Interestingly, we can
narrow this locality still further. LHM cannot skip AgrPrt with *-et* in it, and
raise the lexical V(+v) itself, as shown in (21)b, where *-et* could presum-
ably be rescued by *ober*-insertion as in parallel vP-fronting in (21)c.

(21)
a Azenor he deus debret krampouezh.
Azenor R.3.SG.F have eaten pancakes
Azenor has eaten pancakes.
b *Debret₁ he deus graet Azenor t₁ krampouezh.
c [Debriñ krampouezh]₁ he deus graet Azenor t₁
Azenor has EATEN PANCAKES.

These restrictions are summarized in Figure 2: LHM is restricted to a head in the circled space, F or AgrPrt, on one of which the lexical verb finds itself:

**Figure 2** LHM search-space

Let us call the feature of T that implements LHM [H-]. Locality restrictions in the Minimalist Program typically follow from Relativized Minimality applied to features, so the search-space condition on LHM should be reduced to the nature of [H-]. Since we assumed in section 2 that F is only present if V-movement takes place into it, the locality generalization about [H-] is simply that it looks no farther than the closest head in the sister of T, which is F or AgrPrt. When we compare LHM with subject A-movement, we see that their properties are identical: both yield the same neutral interpretation, and both are limited to the closest matching object, which turns out to always be within the same absolute search-space circled in Figure 2. Further, when there is no Ā-feature on T, one of [H-] and [D/N-] must be present to enforce some neutral movement to [Spec, TP] satisfying V₂, while at the same time [H-] and [D/N-] are in complementary distribution since there is only one neutral movement to [Spec, TP]. The postulation of both an [H-] and [D/N-] features fails to capture these generalizations. An
explanatory solution calls for a single feature, provided we can explain how it drives both LHM and subject movement. We will call this feature $\delta$-, and since we want it to attract both subject DPs, verbal roots, participles, and as we will see below predicate APs, it must be looking for some property common to them all: provisionally, we will assume that this is their syntactic category. $[\delta]-$ is thus an unvalued categorial feature.

Let us now see how positing $[\delta]-$ accounts for the properties of both movements to [Spec, TP]. These properties are the following:

(22) Properties of Breton $\delta$-driven movement
(i) Complementarity of LHM and subject A-movement.
(ii) If Ā-features are not present, one of the two must take place.
(iii) The possible candidates are found in the circled space in Figure 2.
(iv) There is free choice between LHM and subject movement.
(v) An empty category is never attracted by $[\delta]-$, which would give apparent V-initial orders in V2 clauses, but it blocks $[\delta]-$.

Property (i) follows immediately from the fact that a single feature implements both neutral movements. Property (ii) also follows, if we assume that T in V2 clauses always has a $[\delta]-$ feature. We could at this point qualify this by saying that T has a $[\delta]-$ feature if and only if it does not have Ā-features. However, we will see in section 4 that a general principle, Maximize Agree, will automatically delete the $[\delta]-$ feature if an Ā-feature fills [Spec, TP], so we set this question aside for now and assume with full generality that Breton T always has $[\delta]-$ if it projects [Spec, TP]. Since the subject in Breton always raises to [Spec, AgrPrtP] while the verb raises at least to AgrPrt, there will always be a matching goal in the circled search-space in Figure 2, explaining property (iii).

Turning to property (iv), recall that F is present in our clausal architecture to implement the fact that both subject > participle and participle > subject orders are possible in the complement of T. The first order reflects the participle in AgrPrt, the second in F. For locality of feature attraction, syntactic objects stand in the partial order given by c-command, which reflects containment. Applying this strictly, we see that $F^0$ c-commands [Spec, AgrPrtP], and [Spec, AgrPrtP] c-commands AgrPrt$^0$. A syntactic object at each of these positions qualifies for $\delta$-driven attraction to T and blocks attraction of an object c-commands. Consequently, we see that if the participle raises to F, it will block attraction of the subject in [Spec, AgrPrtP] by $[\delta]-$; and if the participle stays in AgrPrt$^0$, the subject in [Spec,
AgrPrtP] will block its attraction. This is the answer to property (iv): the free choice between neutral subject movement and LHM is a consequence of the independently attested variation between the position of the verb and the subject in the sister of T. The only extension made here beyond what we see overtly is the assumption that the same variation in the presence vs. absence of F is found when we are dealing with verb roots undergoing V-to-T raising, as well as participles. This, however, is the default hypothesis: F does not stand in a selectional relation to participles specifically (in other words, to AgrPrt filled by -et), since they are compatible both with the presence and absence of F.

Finally, consider property (v). We wish to prevent [δ-] from attracting an empty category to [Spec, TP], giving apparent V1 orders. Two empty categories are in principle at issue: a trace, and a phonologically empty head. We noted above that pro acts as an intervener which blocks neutral OVpro orders, but it is not itself available for subject A-movement to give proVO orders. This is a species of defective intervention effects (Chomsky 2000:123), which must be caused either by pro, or by its trace if it incorporates into T prior to Agree by [δ-]. Similarly, the trace of V-to-T movement in F must not be available for movement by [δ-]; its visibility for the [δ-] Probe as a defective intervener is not determinable, since there will be an intervener (defective or not) in [Spec, AgrPrtP] in any case. Chomsky (2001:23-4) explores the nature of the empty categories we need, observing that some empty categories must be visible for Agree but unavailable for Move; he attributes this to the lack of phonological content which renders them unable to determine pied-piping for second Merge. To pursue this approach, we would have to assume that it is an intrinsic property of the [δ-] feature that it must be valued not only by Agree, but by second Merge of the goal from which it is valued. We will return to this in section 5; at present, the issue is independent of whether we use a [δ-] feature or any other kind of feature.

Thus, the collapse of LHM and subject movement under a single feature [δ-] that seeks for the closest syntactic object provides an explanatory account of the properties of non-Â movement to [Spec, TP] in Breton. In addition, the unselective locality of the [δ-] feature makes an interesting prediction. All constructions we have seen so far have the subject as the highest 'branch'. There is one systematic exception to this generalization in Breton, which confirms the [δ-] approach to non-Â movement: copular constructions with predicate adjectives.
Constructions where a DP is predicated of an adjective phrase AP are limited to the order AP > DP in Breton prior to any movement to [Spec, TP] as in (24)a (Kervella 1995:372-6).” As discussed above, the copula is base-generated in T and cannot undergo LHM. The unselective locality of [δ-] makes two predictions here, show in (23): first, the AP should be available for neutral movement to [Spec, TP], and second, it should block the DP subject from neutral movement, leaving to it only Ā-movement. An approach relying on a nominal feature to produce neutral subject-initial orders, or for that matter on Case and φ-features, makes the opposite predictions as shown in (23)b.

(23) 
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a} & \quad \text{T=} \copula \text{AP} \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \delta- \quad \longrightarrow \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{T=} \copula \text{AP} \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad D/N- \quad \longrightarrow 
\end{align*} \]

The predictions of the [δ-] approach are correct. Schafer (1997:195-6) shows that AP-initial orders like (24)b are informationally neutral like LHM, and Favereau (1997:224, 226) draws exactly the distinction we are predicting between neutral adjective-initial (24)b and marked DP-initial (24)c.

(24) 
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a} & \quad \text{Bez} \quad \text{e} \text{oa} \quad \text{brav} \text{amzer} \quad (*\text{brav}) \\
& \quad \text{EXPL R was fair the weather} \\
& \quad \text{The weather was fair.} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Brav} \quad \text{e} \text{oa} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{an amzer.} \\
& \quad \text{The weather was fair.} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{An amzer, a oa brav t} \\
& \quad \text{It is THE WEATHER that was fair. (cf. Gros 1984:107)} 
\end{align*} \]

The facts of neutral movement in predicate AP constructions are a strong indication that non-Ā-movements to [Spec, TP] are driven by a feature whose locality is unselective, our [δ-]. In the next section, we will see morphological evidence that this an uninterpretable categorial feature. However, before proceeding, it would be well to examine how adjuncts fit into the locality story, particularly given the role that they play in Holmberg’s (2000) approach to Stylistic Fronting in Icelandic which is similar
to neutral movement in Breton in some respects (see section 5). As shown in section 2, AgrPrt to which the participle obligatorily raises is higher than temporal adverbs like c’hoazh 'still', bemdez 'every day'; these in turn can be attached higher than any internal arguments and manner and locative adjuncts like gant aked 'with care' or war ar wezenn 'on the tree'. Locality predicts that the [δ-] feature should never be able to attract these adverbs:

(25)  \( \begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c} \text{Spec, AgrPrtP} & \text{AgrPrt} & \text{c’hoazh} & \ldots & \hline \hline \end{array} \) \\

This is correct. These adverbs in [Spec, TP] necessarily bear a marked reading as in (8)a, (26)a, which renders such sentences infelicitous as answers to what happened questions (wide focus, out-of-the-blue contexts), but felicitous as answers to how, where, when questions questioning the adverb (cf. inter alia ar Bihan 2002:V, Jouitteau 2003b). Narrow focus on the adverb is not the only possible reading that adverbs in [Spec, TP] have; (26)b illustrates another marked interpretation, parallel to the English translation. However, the neutral reading in all these sentences can only be produced by the subject or LHM filling [Spec, TP], as in Evañ a ra dour gant aked/bemdez/er gêr for (26)a.

(26) a Gant aked / bemdez / er gêr e ev dour.
with care / always in.the house R drinks water
He drinks water CAREFULLY/EVERYDAY/AT HOME.

b Gwechall e laboure ar merhed er parkeier
once R worked the women in.the fields
Once, women laboured in the fields. (Gros 1984:122)

Jouitteau (2003b), however, observes that a class of high sentential adverbs like express-kaer 'voluntarily' and dre-zegouezh 'by chance' behave quite differently: they can receive a neutral reading in the pre-verbal position (as well as a marked one), and they block other neutral movements to [Spec, TP]. Jouitteau (2003b) points out that this is expected if neutral movements to [Spec, TP] obey the same locality conditions as Holmberg’s (2000) Stylistic Fronting in Icelandic, where sentential adverbs block participles from moving (usually, cf. Holmberg 2000:465 note 21). The Breton data is at this point compatible with either a movement or base-generation analysis of these adverbs in [Spec, TP] on the neutral reading (cf. note 6).
What is crucial is their contrast with the adverbs discussed above: sentential adverbs like *espresso-kaer* 'voluntarily' are very high in the tree, in contrast to those like *bemdez* 'every day' which are c-commanded by the subject in [Spec, AgrPrtP].

(27)

a  Kuzhet he doa (*espresso-kaer) Manon ar c'hazh.
    hidden R.3.SG.F had voluntarily Manon the cat
b  Espresso-kaer he doa Manon kuzhet ar c'hazh.  (Jouitteau 2003b)

We conclude then that there is considerable evidence that non-Å movements to [Spec, TP] in Breton are the result of a feature which moves to [Spec, TP] the closest syntactic object in the sister of T, [δ-]. This provides an explanatory account for the properties in (22), and makes the correct predictions about neutral movements in constructions with predicate APs and adjuncts. It now remains to address, if somewhat inconclusively, three aspects of the mechanics of feature-driven movement with respect to LHM itself: its violation of chain uniformity, apparent violation of the Head Movement Constraint, and why if F and [Spec, AgrPrtP] can move, can FP and AgrPrtP themselves not move to yield remnant movement. These issues are not particular to the approach in this paper, but do come to the fore since a uniform mechanism is exploited for both DP/AP and LHM.

Chain uniformity (Chomsky 1995:253) bars movement of a head to a specifier position. However, this has now been widely documented; beside LHM, see Holmberg (1999) on verb topicalization to [Spec, CP] in Swedish and Holmberg (2000) on Stylistic Fronting to [Spec, TP] in Icelandic. As Carnie (2000) argues, the X0/XP distinction and syntactic principles referring to it are stipulative under Bare Phrase Structure, where heads and their projections are non-distinct. Both empirical and theoretical considerations then suggest simply not assuming the uniformity condition. The consequences of the X0/XP distinction should be implemented as properties of the interfaces, particularly morphology. Roberts (2003:V) presents such a system, where a cyclic incorporation operation combines two elements in a local relationship if one is an affix, as Bare Phrase Structure objects are built up. The potential risk is unwanted movements. However, these seem to be either generally barred independently, or at least preventable. For example, φ/Case features will not produce the equivalent of LHM because the verb and its functional projections do not (normally) have interpretable φ-features or need Case. δ-driven movement on the other hand, which can
certainly affect heads to give LHM, can only do so if the head raises to be the closest object in the sister of T; thus in a language like Breton butwithout raising to F, the subject in [Spec, AgrPrtP] would always block LHM.

Like chain uniformity, the Head Movement Constraint should not have an axiomatic status in the Minimalist Program; following Rizzi (1990), it is an instance of intervener-based locality. Its consequences are thus to be implemented via the identity of the features (e.g. [V-]) which drive head movement (cf. again Roberts 2003).

The remaining problem is of a different nature. For Breton, in the clausal architecture only the vP and the CP (ForceP in Rizzi’s 1997 system) seem dislocatable. TP, FP, and AgrPrtP are not, as we saw in section 2 (ex. (8)). This is an instance of a general phenomenon: XPs that are recursive complements of a head H are not always available for movement to [Spec, HP]. In English, for example only the vP and CP constituents can move; finite and raising T’, TP cannot, and as noted in Rizzi (1982) and Chomsky (1981:62), and partly exemplified here:

\[(28)\]

a.
[b [p t2 kiss Wynn]], I never expected that Kate2 would t1

b. *[T would t1 kiss Wynn]], I never expected that Kate2 t1
c. *[TP Kate would kiss Wynn]], I never expected that t1
d. [CP That Kate would kiss Wynn]], I never expected t1
e. …but [PRO2 to kiss Wynn]], Kate2 promised t1.
f. *…but [t2 to kiss Wynn]], Kate2 seemed t1.

Chomsky (2000, 2001) develops a theory of cyclicity where certain categories called phases are granted special status because they define the domain of cyclic spell-out. As spell-out units, phases are independent at LF and PF. Consequently only phases have sufficient PF-cohesion to undergo operations like fronting. Independent considerations identify the CP and vP as phases, but not the TP (Chomsky 2000: 108-9, 144 note 48, 2001: 14-5). Chomsky (2000: 106, 2001: 8, 43 note 13) uses the PF-cohesion of phases to explain the contrasts exemplified in (28). The dislocatable constituents in Breton seem to fit phase theory perfectly, modulo perhaps the elaboration in note 11. Neither FP nor AgrPrtP are dislocatable constituents for either δ- or A-movement, and the [δ-] Probe affects instead their heads and specifiers, whichever is closest to T under c-command.”
4. [δ]- Agree and its morphological spell-out

The Breton T inflects not only for φ-agreement and tense/mood; it also codes the category of [Spec, TP]. The morpheme which tracks this has been glossed R in the above examples, for the rannig-verb 'a small part of verb' of traditional terminology (Kervella 1995:161f.). The rannig comes in two forms, a and e. This section will argue that a and e reflect the valuation of the [δ]- feature on T from the category of the constituent that fronts to [Spec, TP]. [δ-], which has so far been identified only in that it seeks for a property shared by all syntactic objects, is thus specifically an unvalued categorial feature. Furthermore, we will see evidence that [δ-] is always present on T when [Spec, TP] is projected at all, and valued by Chomsky's (1995) free rider principle it is Ā-movement that fills [Spec, TP]. This general correlation between [Spec, TP] and [δ-] will be explored in the conclusion: [δ-] has the properties that are expected of the general EPP feature responsible for non-selected positions in Chomsky (2000).

The rannigs a and e are proclitics associated with the T position in Breton. Their behavior can be instructively compared with that of object proclitics in the dialects that possess them (Kervella 1995:254f.), which Jouitteau (2003a) argues to be associated with v. Both the rannigs and the object pronouns are proclitics on verbal hosts: they are obligatorily destressed, and the they cause a phonological process called consonant mutation which is limited to local phonological relations (cf. Stephens 1982:30-2; for mutations, e.g. Kervella 1995:121f., Press 1986). Object proclitics in Breton may surface on T as in (29)a, but they do so only if the lexical verb itself moves to T. If it is instead realized as a participle or infinitive, the proclitics are attached to these forms instead, as in (29)b, (29)c. In contrast, the rannig must be realized on T. The positions of the rannigs and the object proclitics in (29), the only possible, illustrate this contrast.

(29)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>En noz ho kalvin.</td>
<td>At night I will call you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>En noz em eus ho kalvet</td>
<td>At night I have called you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Ho kervel a rin en noz</td>
<td>you call.INF R will.do.1.SG in.the night</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I will call you at night.

As we see in (29), rannigs and object proclitics are perfectly compatible when they have different hosts. When they share a host, although the rannig frequently disappears before the object pronoun as in (29)a, they can be retained: before the reflexive object proclitic en em as generally noted (Favereau 1997:264, rarer for a), as well as before other proclitics as in (30)a and (30)b. We conclude that the rannigs are T-related, and external to the constituent affected by LHM which includes v with its object proclitics.

(30)

a An hent-mañ az kasou da draouë gwashoc'h.
the road-this R.you will.bring to things worse
(Take care, or...) the road will bring you to worse things.

b Mar gellomp e adkavout em zrugarekaot.
if can.1.PL him re-find R.me thank.will.2.PL
If we can find him again, you will thank me (...before the end).

Moving beyond this into the left periphery, we find the (extended) complementizer system. Its analysis suggests that the presence of the rannig correlates with the projection of [Spec, TP]. Complementizers and conjunctions divide into two types according to whether they chose V2 ('embedded root') or V-initial complements. This division appears quite arbitrary (cf. Stephens 1982:47-8, Kervella 1995:361f., 403f., Favereau 1997:335f.): for example, peogwir 'because', and hag 'and' allow either V2 or V-initial complements; rak 'because' and met 'but' require V2 complements; pa 'when', ma 'if; so that', mar(d) 'if' require V-initial complements; there are two interrogative complementizers (Kervella 1995:400, Favereau 1997:284f, 314, 384f.), hag and hag-eñ, which differ only in that the first takes V2 and the second V-initial complements. V2 complements behave exactly as independent clauses described in the previous sections, while V-initial complements only differ in missing [Spec, TP] and the rannig.

It is not easy to decide whether the rannig is present in V-initial complements like the mar 'if' clause in (30)b. Since nothing can intervene between C and T except possibly the rannig in question, there is no possible rannig variation between a and e which depends on the content of [Spec, TP] to signal the presence of a rannig. Elseion of both final vowels and rannigs is the rule in Breton, so inquiry must focus on the different effects.
which rannigs have on the initial consonant of the verb in T: the e rannig causes so-called mixed mutation, e.g. debr-iñ 'eat-INF' vs. e tebr-an 'R eat-1.SG', and the rannig a causes lenition, e.g. a zebr-an 'R eat-1.SG'. Among complementizers that select V-initial complements, some cause mixed mutation on the verb, such as ma 'if, so that'; others cause lenition such as pa 'when'; and some cause no mutation at all such as the mar(d) 'if' in (30)b (Favereau 1997:274-6). For the last kind of complementizer, we clearly seen that its TP complement cannot have a rannig since there is no mutation, but for the first two the data is ambiguous between attributing the mutation (and a possible intervening vowel) to the complementizer itself, or to the corresponding rannig. 

However, there is one piece of evidence that the presence of the rannig correlates with the projection of [Spec, TP]. This comes from V1-imperatives and response fragments, whose relevance to this issue is attributed to Denis (1977) by Stephens (1982:42-3). Rannigs and their mutations are simply absent here.

(31) Ne gavit ket mat ma meuz? Kavan.
NEG find.2.PL NEG good my meal find.1.SG
Don't you like my meal? I do. (Stephens 1982:42)

Denis's generalization is that the rannig is present only when [Spec, TP] is projected, and that it indicates the nature of the link between the verb and [Spec, TP]. Stephens (1982:43-4) agrees that the first hypothesis is correct; we will return to the nature of the link directly. We conclude that the rannig correlates with the projection of [Spec, TP], and it is therefore absent in all V-initial TPs. Complementizers that select for V2 TP complements chose for a T with the rannig, and those that chose for V-initial TP complements simply chose for a T without the rannig. If the rannig spells out [ð]-, as will now be argued, the selection reduces to whether a complementizer selects for a T with [ð]- or without it.

We are now ready to establish the link between the rannig and [Spec, TP]. The correlation is in terms of the category of [Spec, TP], as observed by Urien (1987): rannig is a if [Spec, TP] is a nominal category, and e otherwise. This is the nature of Denis's (1977) link between T and [Spec, TP] that the rannig realizes. It cannot be stated in terms of semantic or grammatical function, as Stephens (op. cit.) observed. The rannig a is found when [Spec, TP] is filled by a subject, object, or predicate DP, an infinitival vP, or by LHM of an infinitive, regardless of their other semantic
properties: see (8), (18), and (32)a. The rannig e is found when [Spec, TP] is filled by a PP, AP, adjunct clause, or an adverb: see again (8), (18), and (32)b, (32)c. This leaves LHM of participles where due to independent factors, e.g. the inability of auxiliaries to show mutation, it is difficult to tell which rannig is present; both e and a are found written.

(32)

a Ur c'horr a zikouze bout kozh-tre.
   A dwarf R showed.3.SG be.INF old-very
   It turned out to be a very old dwarf.

b D'ar merched / gant ar post / dec'h e kasas ar pakad-se.
   to the girls / by the post / yesterday R sent.he the package-this
   He sent this package to the girls / by the post / yesterday.

c Brav e kavan ar pezh-c'hoari-se.
   beautiful R find.1.SG the piece-play-this
   I find this play beautiful.

As this catalogue shows, the choice of rannig is independent of the A/Ā-type of movement, the semantic nature of the moved constituent (e.g. referentiality, noting particularly that all DPs and infinitives take a), its grammatical function, and its origin site as argument or adjunct. However, if we make the assumption that infinitives are nominal in Breton, as argued by Jouitteau (2003a)," the distribution of the rannigs is predicted perfectly by saying that that a is found with a DP in [Spec, TP] and e otherwise.

The rannigs are thus verbal morphology correlating with the projection of [Spec, TP] and tracking its category. Under the assumptions of the Minimalist Program, there is a straightforward hypothesis that must be made about this correlation: a is the spell-out of a feature [F-], valued under Agree from the category of a goal which moves to [Spec, TP]. Since the value is a categorial value, [F-] is an unvalued categorial feature. This is completely parallel to Chomsky's (2000:124) proposal that φ-agreement is the valuation of an unvalued φ-set from the specific φ-value(s) of the DP it finds. Since all syntactic objects have a category, [F-] is matched by the closest syntactic object in its search-space, the sister of T. This is the unselective locality of the [δ-] feature that we explored in the last section.

We conclude that the rannig is morphological spell-out of the valued [δ-] feature. In the non-Ā movements of the last section, [δ-] moves to [Spec, TP] either the subject (rannig a), the infinitive (a), the participle (e/a), and the adjec (e). However, that the rannig distinguishes the cate-
gory of [Spec, TP] Ā constituents as well. This is an expected result if we assume as concluded above that the \([\delta\text{-}]\) feature is present on every T that projects [Spec, TP], regardless of what other features it possesses as well. \([\delta\text{-}]\) will necessarily be valued by any displacement to [Spec, TP], either because it itself identifies the goal for that movement through Agree to give non-Ā movement, or as a free rider on Agree by an Ā feature of T.

Any theory with syncretic heads must decide in what order features should become active in the syntax and how their operations interact. Chomsky (1995:265, 268-270, 275, 2001:15, 45 nt. 30) proposes that Agree by any feature of one syntactic terminal implies Agree by all other features as free riders; this is Maximize Agree. Put differently, it is a terminal as a whole that enters into Agree. Otherwise, we will assume that the order in which features of a head seek for goals as Probes is free subject to the Earliness Principle, as argued in Pesetsky and Torrego (2001:400), Rezac (2003):

(Maximize Agree: If a Probe \([F\text{-}]\) of a head H Matches an interpretable \([F\text{+}]\) on a goal G, all uninterpretable features on H attempt to Agree with G at that point in the derivation.

Earliness Principle: A feature \([F\text{-}]\) on a head H attempts Match as soon as possible.

Consider a sample derivation with movement of a subject to [Spec, TP], for which both neutral and Ā-movement is available. We assume now that a T which projects [Spec, TP] has always the \([\delta\text{-}]\) feature, and may have Ā features in addition (ignoring here irrelevant φ-features discussed in section 2).

**(33)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a Petra/An deliòù a gouezh goustadik</th>
<th>b __ T [AgrPrtP petra/deliòù AgrPrt [([\delta\text{-}])----------&gt;] [(\text{Ā}\text{-})----------&gt;]]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what/the leaves R fall slowly</td>
<td>([(\text{Ā}\text{-})----------&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is slowly falling? / The leaves are slowly falling.</td>
<td>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Earliness Principle lets either the \([\delta\text{-}]\) feature, or the Ā-feature if present as well, be the first Probe. If the \([\delta\text{-}]\) feature Probes first, it will
find the subject, Agree with it, and move it to [Spec, TP]. If an Ā-feature (e.g. [wh-]) is also present on T and the subject has a corresponding Ā-features (e.g. [wh-] and [Q], Chomsky 2000:128), Maximize Agree ensures that it Agrees as well. If the Ā-Probe goes first and identifies the subject for Agree and movement, Maximize Agree ensures that [δ-] Agree as well. Thus, whenever the first Agree between T and a goal is by a non-[δ-] feature that could move it to [Spec, TP], Agree by the [δ-] feature follows as well.

Suppose instead that the subject without an Ā-feature is moved to [Spec, TP] by [δ-], and the object has an Ā-feature with a corresponding Ā-feature on T. Subsequent to δ-Agree/Move, Ā-Agree should give rise to a multiple specifier construction of T, which does not happen. In such configurations, either another derivation is employed where the Ā-feature goes first and fills [Spec, TP], or a wh (etc.) in-situ results.

(34) __ T [AgrPrtP subject] AgrPrt [vP  v t1 [vP V object]]

It seems that δ-Agree is necessary to project [Spec, TP], as we already concluded. This is also suggested by the last issue that remains to be considered, base-generation of an expletive in [Spec, TP] (see note 6 for other possible cases). What we find in this case is that the value of [δ-] is any particular dialect is invariant, generally e. Thus base-generation of the expletive determines the value of [δ-]. Chomsky (1995, 2000) adopts the hypothesis that the expletive is base-generated as a reflex of whatever feature implements the EPP ([D] for Chomsky 1995:287, 364, EPP for Chomsky 2000:104-5), and that this entails an Agree relationship between the expletive and T (ibid.). Since the expletive determines the value of the rappig as e, [δ-] here cannot have the option of being valued by a long distance Agree with an in-situ goal. We conclude that base-generation of the expletive entails [δ-] Agree. This matches earlier conclusions: that [δ-] (the rappig) is present if and only if T projects [Spec, TP], and that an Ā-feature cannot cause movement to [Spec, TP] separate from δ-Agree. In other words, filling [Spec, TP] and δ-Agree necessarily correlate. In other words, non-thematic Merge in [Spec, TP] requires δ-Agree by the constituent that Merges. This is the issue that will be explored in the last section.
5. Conclusion

We have pursued the hypothesis in the last section that the unselective locality of $\delta$-driven movement is to be captured by construing it as an uninterpretable categorial feature. The locality of this non-$\Lambda$, non-Case/$\phi$ movement is similar to that of Icelandic Stylistic fronting which similarly cannot be implemented as $\Lambda$ or Case/$\phi$-driven movement. This leads Holmberg's (2000) to posit a P(honological) feature that drives movement in the syntax. Icelandic Stylistic Fronting differs from the Breton movement. The following are salient points of contrast:

(35) Breton non-$\Lambda$ movement vs. Icelandic Stylistic Fronting
(i) Breton neutral movement is not optional in the sense that SF is, so that [Spec, TP] in Breton always has to be filled by an overt constituent.
(ii) Breton neutral movement does not show the same phonological sensitivity as SF, which shows a dispreference for XPs as opposed to heads, and does not allow the fronted category to be separated from T by a parenthetical.
(iii) Perhaps most importantly, Breton neutral movement is blocked by the intervention of an empty category such as subject pro or its trace, while Icelandic Stylistic Fronting ignores empty categories because (on Holmberg's analysis) they lack phonological content, and indeed it is only made possible by the fact that the subject of the clause is an empty category (the subject gap condition).

However, the most important factor in determining the nature of the movement in Breton is that there is morphological spell-out on T of the valuation of an uninterpretable categorial feature, [$\delta$-], which has the correct locality properties for implementing the non-$\Lambda$ movement.

The conclusion the last section has come to is that aside from these properties, [$\delta$-] is required to project [Spec, TP] in Breton. This shows up in three ways: it is obligatorily valued by base-generation of [Spec, TP], it is absent when [Spec, TP] is not project as in response fragments and V-initial TPs, and $\Lambda$-movement cannot project a [Spec, TP] separately from $\delta$-Agree with another (in-situ) constituent. Therefore, [$\delta$-] is very close to the EPP feature of Chomsky (2000) which is responsible for all overt movement, save that [$\delta$-] evidently undergoes valuation by Agree. This conclusion can stand quite generally because of the Maximize Agree principle, which leads [$\delta$-] to be valued through the Agree by any other feature on its
head. $[\delta]$ can be taken to always implement actual overt movement, being usually 'hidden' by Maximize Agree. For example, in languages where $T$ always has $\varphi$-features and the subject is always the closest goal in the complement of $T$, purely $\delta$-driven movement would never be visible.

Under this hypothesis, $[\delta]$ implements the EPP: it is the (unique) feature whose Agree results in the non-thematic Merge of the Move operation or expletives base-generation. This can explain an issue left dangling in section 3: the fact that $\delta$-driven movement cannot affect an empty category such as $\text{pro}$ (or its trace) to give apparent V1 orders ($\text{pro} V(O)$). Suppose $[\delta^-]$ is such that there is a one-to-one correlation between $[\delta^-]$ Agree and non-thematic Merge. There is in that case nothing wrong in principle with $[\delta^-]$ Agree with an empty category. However, if we accept Chomsky's (2001:23-4) argument that empty categories cannot undergo Move because the pied-piping operation is undefined for them, then $[\delta^-]$ Agree with an empty category will fail because the category fails to be able to re-Merge in the position determined by $[\delta^-]$. A related way of approaching this is from Chomsky's (2000:123, 127) hypothesis that the goal of an Agree operation must itself have an uninterpretable feature, such as Case, which determines how much to pied-pipe. For $[\delta^-]$, phonological content may play this role.

Importantly, implementation of the EPP is potentially quite independent of the deeper nature of such a requirement. In recent work, Roberts & Roussou (2002) argue that the EPP is due to an anchoring condition on Tense, Bury (2003) and Jouitteau (2003b) argue that it is needed in order to linearize $T$ as an extended projection of $V$, and Koeneman & Neeleman (2001) implement Williams' (1980) predication hypothesis where the VP is a derived predicate that must compose with a subject. Each proposal has its attractions. However, in themselves they leave open a number of possibilities on how such requirements are satisfied: base-generation of an expletive, $\varphi$-driven movement, $\tilde{A}$-driven movement, etc. The Breton facts considered in this paper let us isolate one of the formal features that drives such movement, and the considerations we have just discussed suggest it may be correlate with non-thematic Merge generally.

If $[\delta^-]$ correlates with non-thematic Merge, its nature as an uninterpretable categorial feature comes to the fore. Chomsky (2000:122) refers to the EPP as an uninterpretable selectional feature, which compares it with selectional properties responsible for theta-theoretic Merge (ibid., p. 134). This conforms to construing the second Merge component of Move as being identical to theta-theoretic Merge (ibid., p. 101) even up to the property that drives it, the only difference being the selection of the goal. In the case
of theta-theoretic Merge, it is the semantic properties of the selecting head in its configuration that determine the object with which it is Merged, effectively acting as a Probe over goals in the Numeration which includes previously constructed syntactic objects (cp. Collins 2002 for such an approach to c-selection). These semantic properties presumably determine the identity of the possible syntactic categories that can be Merged to satisfy them, such as PPs for experiencers in English. If the EPP is such a selectional feature that is uninterpretable, then its behavior falls into place: it will not select for any specific objects, but for any object. The relationship of selectional features and the EPP is analogous to that of valued $\varphi$-features on DPs, where they are interpretable, and unvalued ones on T, which receive values from their Goal. In this analysis of the system in Chomsky (2000), there is no reason why the EPP could not be a Probe itself, though Maximize Agree usually hides it; and this is $[\delta-]$. 
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Notes

1. * I would like to thank Susana Béjar and Diane Massam for comments on this paper, and Mélanie Jouitteau for introducing me to Breton, discussion of the issues in this paper, and help with many aspects of the Breton data. I am also grateful to Hisatsugu Kitahara and to Jeroen van Craenenbroeck for discussion of my proposal at the Triggers conference to use the \( \delta \)- feature for IP-level scrambling in Japanese and quirky subjects in Spanish, which did not make it into the final version in order to allow for a more thorough and focused exploration. Thanks are also due to two anonymous reviewers. Any remaining errors are mine.

2. 1 The abbreviations used in this paper are N(ominative), D(ative), A(ccusative), INF(initive), SG for singular, PL for plural, 1/2/3 person, M/F for gender, NEG(ation), EXPL(etive), PROG(ressive particle), and R for Breton pre-verbal particles (\textit{rannigs}) described in section 5. Focus is indicated by capitalization in translations as necessary.

3. 2 Chomsky (2000:127-8, 148 note 87) uses the proposal that oblique DPs in Icelandic have additional structural Case to differentiate them from obliques such as English PPs which are not visible to A-movement. See McGinnis (1998) for this variation. Interestingly, Culicover and Levine (2001)'s work on Stylistic Inversion in English shows, with greater clarity than before, that PPs in English occupy [Spec, TP] as well: once heavy NP shift is taken into account to insure we are truly dealing with in-situ nominatives and with PPs that are not \( \bar{\bar{\Lambda}} \)-fronted, we see that the PP in [Spec, TP] is truly in an A-position unambiguously c-commanding the nominative from e.g. weak crossover as in (i), (ii).

4. (i) Next to none of the winning dogs, stood its owner.

5. (ii) *Next to none of the winning dogs, its owner stood.

6. (Culicover & Levine 2001:290)

7. 3 Other syntactic relations are also barred: for example, the definiteness effect of expletive constructions, which has been taken to signal a syntactic relation between the expletive or T and the nominative (Safir 1982, Chomsky 1995:364), is shown by Maling (1988:170 nt. 1 and passim) to hold in Icelandic between the expletive and the closer oblique DP in constructions like (3)b, with no restriction on the nominative. This also means that the nominative cannot be getting Belletti's (1988) partitive Case here (cf. Belletti 1988:14-15 nt. 33).
8. Definite DPs are not allowed in-situ here, (Holmberg 2000:456, 462), but they must quite generally raise out of the VP in Icelandic if possible (Diesing and Jelinek 1996; see Reinhart 1995, Fox 2000 for the form of such 'if possible' generalizations).

9. The locative copula emañ may be root-initial, but it arguably contains a locative element which fills [Spec, TP] at some point in the derivation (Jouitteau 2003b; cf. Kervella 1995:391, Favereau 1997:317); a similar explanation arguably obtains for the root-initial use of mont 'go' (ibid.). Other exceptions in connected discourse arise through topic drop (Jouitteau 2003c). We return to non-root and non-declarative clauses in section 4; negative sentences (see note 27) fall into this category, in the same way as optatives: both are headed by negative complementizers which select for V-initial (non-root) TP complements.

10. This is the consensus of both descriptive grammars, e.g. Kervella (1995) and Favereau (1997), and of generative treatments like Stephens (1982), Stump (1984), Schafer (1995). Aside from obviously dislocated DPs, a class of clause-external adjuncts (q.v. Schafer 1995:168) may freely precede the pre-verbal constituent, as they may in English (i), (ii): because-clauses, some locative phrases, etc. As well as having a clause-external analysis open to them though, such adjuncts in Breton may quite generally satisfy the EPP by filling the preverbal position of V2 clauses. Relevantly, Postal (2002:I) points out the class of constituents that satisfy the EPP in English through Stylistic ('locative') Inversion is much wider than locatives, e.g. (ii) (his ex. 5b). I abstract away from such adjuncts in the preverbal position until section 4, where we will examine the mechanism which allows constituents to be base-generated in as well as moved to [Spec, TP].

11. (i) Because there was nevertheless need of a dwelling place, eastward upon a shoulder of the mountains a city was built in the first year of the colony, to which the exiles looked in all the years that followed.

12. (ii) For that perverted cause were slaughtered thousands of innocents.

13. As Mélanie Jouitteau, p.c., originally pointed out to me, the verb is in no sense a second position clitic. It is polysyllabic, prosodically independent, and fully stressable (Stephens 1982:32), serves as the prosodic host for object proclitics (ex. (29) below), and stands on its own in a response fragment (ex. (31) below).

14. For approaches that allow right-adjunction, this is made clear by Favereau's (1997:326-7) examples, since the adverbs may precede as well as follow DP and PP internal arguments; cf. Desbordes (1995:79, 91). Obligatory raising of V to AgrPrt insures that the past participle necessarily precedes them even if they precede in-situ internal arguments. On the scope of participle movement with respect to adverbs see recently Cinque (1999), Caponigro and
Schütze (2003), Belletti (to appear), and Roberts (2003:3.2.2-3), all assuming systems which eschew right-adjunction, and differently Ernst (2002).

References

9 There is also heavy NP shift, Favereau (1997:305).

10 There is considerable variation in preferences. Kervella (1995:373) and Guillevic and Le Goff (1902:139) have both orders as possible for the transitive subject. Favereau (1997:326-7) claims that the subject normally follows the participle, with the reverse order (in both transitives and unaccusatives/passives) characterizing the marked brezhoneg beleg 'breton de curé'. On the other hand, many works on the present spoken language do report the subject > participle order, e.g. Press (1986:159, 200), Hendrick (1990:137, 151); cf. the discussion of current preferences in Tír na nÓg 2000, 321:79f., 322:97f. (a bimonthly educational publication of Al Liamm). Both orders are clearly possible in most (all?) idiolects, setting aside the issue of markedness.

11 Schafer (1994:90), cited in Roberts (2003:I, note 16), comes to the same conclusion about Breton vP-fronting, through Huang’s (1993) hypothesis that apparent obligatory reconstruction of fronted VPs indicates the necessary presence of a subject trace, because the evidence holds in Breton as well.

12 More investigation of the position of subjects and various kinds of adverbs is needed (cf. the intricacy of the Icelandic data here). Although the adverb placement in (9) is due to the presence of a low NegP (indicated by ket) which provides an extra position for temporal adverbs (note 27), participle > temporal adverb > subject orders do occur in the middle field under conditions I have not been able to identify, beside the more normal subject > temporal adverb. This suggests the presence of vP peripheral AspP for these adverbs to adjoin to, where the subject has both [Spec, AgrPrtP] and [Spec, AspP] available to it.

13 Descriptive grammars tend to equate the expletive with long head movement or vP-fronting (first distinguished from each other in Stephens 1982) of bezañ/bout 'be', as in Kervella (1995:169-170), Favereau (op. cit.), Trépos (2001:299). This is made tempting by its restriction in some dialects, such as that of Gros (1984:110), largely to co-occurrence with the verb bezañ/bout 'be' and kaout/endevout 'have', which are both based on the same roots. How-
ever, even in such dialects there are exceptions, e.g. for Gros (ibid.) gouzout 'know', while other dialects have no such restriction (examples in text, 1997:230). It is independently demonstrable that the identification cannot be maintained, by using the verbal morphology called ranntig which tracks the category of [Spec, TP] (section 4): it takes one form, a, with long head movement of bezañ/bout and another form, e, with the expletive (e.g. Gros 1984:109-115).

22. The expletive is itself lexically and aspectually empty. Its presence can have the effect of narrow focus on the finite verb in T. This is not a property of the expletive itself, but arises rather from the fact that a semantically contentless element occupies [Spec, TP]. The finite verb in Breton cannot receive narrow focus either in T, in which case narrow focus is assigned to [Spec, TP] as required, or by Long Head Movement to [Spec, TP], which as we will see leads to the sentence as a whole receiving wide focus. Blocking blocks both options, the expletive as it were 'deflects' narrow focus from [Spec, TP] to T. This is very similar to stress shift in English from the most deeply embedded constituent if it is deficient in content, discussed by Reinhart (1997): I am waiting for JOHN vs. I am WAITING for someone; I have a point to EMPHASIZE vs. I have a POINT to make.

23. 14 Cf. (on the idiomatic reading) The cat seems to be out of the bag vs. #As for the bag, the cat is out of it, #It's the cat that's out of the bag.

24. 15 However, the subject may also be in an Ā [Spec, TP], and this is the only option if it undergoes long distance movement to a higher [Spec, TP]: Borsley and Stephens (1989:423), Schafer (1995:113-4), Jouitteau (2003b), Gros (1984:106f.).

25. 16 With one exception, ignoring resumption: the verb kavout/endevout 'have', structure very different from transitives (Jouitteau & Rezac 2003).

26. 17 There are constructions with multiple auxiliaries: the perfect passive and the passé surcomposé. These are formed from the passive and the perfect, respectively, by adding the participle bet 'been'. In such cases, either bet or the participle of the lexical verb may undergo LHM: cf. Borsley, Rivero and Stephens (1996:60). Similar equidistance characterizes some but not all LHM elsewhere; see Rivero (1991) for Czech, and cf. Holmberg (2000:468-71) for Icelandic Stylistic Fronting. I assume that this is not true equidistance, that is syntactic neutralization of structural asymmetry for locality, but rather as in Holmberg's explanation the result of somewhat different properties of the auxiliary in the two derivations; for example, when bet is skipped by LHM, it could be a clitic to T, as suggested by Mélanie Jouitteau p.c.

27. 18 We assume \( \alpha \) c-commands \( \beta \) iff \( \beta \) is contained in the sister of \( \alpha \) (Chomsky 2000:116), where we assume a Bare Phrase Structure representation of (i) as
(ii). Thus, a head such as H c-commands the specifier YP of its complement GP, and a specifier such as XP c-commands the head H which projects it.

28. (i) $[H [XP [G YP [G ZP]]]]$
29. (ii) $\{H, \{XP, \{H, \{G, \{YP, \{G, ZP\}\}\}\}\}\}$
30. 19 This seems to be a general characteristic of Breton small clauses predicating a DP of an AP, independent of their larger syntactic context; exceptions arise from rightward shift of heavy APs.

31. 20 In the original version of this paper, I had discounted adjuncts entirely, due to the availability of late insertion theories and the fact that $\delta$-driven movement is a narrow syntactic operation. An anonymous reviewer convinced me that the gap is too large; and since then, the results of Jouitteau (2003b) for sentential adverbs reported below have become available, which in combination with the behavior of $\epsilon$’hoazh-type adverbs nicely fits the story.

32. 21 In Breton, there are also constructions where the pre-verbal constituent is not derived by movement, and linked to a resumptive: the ‘double’ or ‘wrong’ subject construction of the literature, (i), which are also a possible form for relative clauses. This involve base-generation of the clause-external DP predicated of a $\lambda$-abstract whose base-generated operator binds the base-generated resumptive, along the lines proposed by Doron and Heycock (1999) and McCloskey (2002) for different constructions; see Rezac (in preparation).

33. (i) Ar menez a/e savas Yann e di warnañ
34. a mountain X built Yann his house on.it
35. Yann built his house on this mountain.

36. 22 In spoken Breton, the rannigs are often lost or neutralized to a single form, leaving only the two different series of consonant mutations as morphological signal of the nature of [Spec, TP]. Not all dialects possess the distinction; see particularly Favereau (1997:268f.). The double subject constructions of note 21, whether in independent or relative clauses, positive or negative, have a rannig-like complementizer which signals the presence of a $\lambda$-operator, and which is not subject to the principles as the rannigs (or as the negation marker); q.v. Rezac (in preparation).

37. 23 Alternatively, we find here the particle en (cf. Favereau 1997:272-3), which is limited to exactly the context where a rannig would be expected before an object pronoun.

38. 24 For a detailed study of the infinitival complementizer system, see Stephens (1990) and Tallerman (1997).

39. 25 C-T relation is sufficiently local for phonology to cause mutation, as can be seen both in preposition-nouns and complementizer-infinitive mutations.

40. 26 If we wish nevertheless to say that certain complementizers chose a specifier-less TP complement with a specific rannig, selection must provide the means for the complementizer to provide a default value for the [$\delta$-] feature,
which insures that the $[\delta-]$ feature does not seek a goal to move to and thus project [Spec, TP]. This is perhaps in the scope of C-T selection, but involves apparent counter-cyclicity; see Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998:526 nt. 43) for a similar issue.

41. Positive declarative complements, which seem to begin simply with the rannig $e$ as in (6), must in fact begin with a homophonous complementizer. The homophony is lost in dialects where declarative complements are headed by $la'$ rather than $e$ (Favereau 1997:357-9), lending credence to this hypothesis.

42. Breton negation behaves as a complementizer. Negative clauses are V-initial where the verb is preceded by a negative particle $ne$, but they count as having either V1 or V2 status as selection by a higher complementizer (compounding of overt complementizers is common in Breton) or a root context require. The high part of the negation, $ne$ (omissible but triggering lenition) selects a V-initial TP complement without the rannig. $Ne$ is licenses the negative marker ket, which immediately follows the verb in T, and negative polarity items (Kervella 1995:165), which may but need not co-occur with ket (Favereau 1997:310). Otherwise the post-T structure of negative sentences is identical to that of positive ones, with one difference: cloazh-type adverbs and their NPI counterparts may precede the participle. Together these facts suggest there is a NegP between T and FP in negative sentences, where ket and such adverbs may be localized. Finally, $ne$ differs from other complementizers in being able to trigger $\Lambda$-movement of a single constituent before it, a form of negative inversion perhaps restricted to NPIs (see particularly Schapansky 1996:IV). Some but not all other constituents may precede $ne$ through the resumptive 'double subject' kind discussed in not 21, which is characterized by having na for $ne$ in some dialects (Trépos 2001:247-8, Favereau 1997:280f., Kervella 1995:164-5), or as clause-external material of the as for $X$ type (esp. Schafer 1995:157f., 167f., Kervella 1995:396-8).

43. Thanks to Mélanie Jouitteau for pointing out to me that observation of the relevance of the category of the pre-verbal constituent is in fact due to Urien.

44. For example, objects receive Case by the Construct State, and the object proclitics described above are identical to possessive pronominal proclitics. The arguments are extended to cover unaccusative and passives in Jouitteau and Rezac (2003), which are also headed by a nominal category, the small clause of Chung and McCloskey (1987). For infinitives, cf. particularly Kervella's (1995:173) paradigm which is a crucial part of Jouitteau's argument: infinitival object complements take the Case-assigning preposition da if and only Case is already absorbed by a direct object of the matrix verb.

45. These points have not been addressed here; the first is evident in the examples, and throughout parentheticals like diouzh ar mod 'as it seems' may sepa-
rate [Spec, TP] from T in the case of any neutral movement. Stylistic Fronting and Breton also differ in how they treat auxiliaries and their participles, where LHM varies in general; cf. note 17.