

Licensing of Grammatical Properties: Features

1. **formal features**: two-way distinction between (i) strong and weak features and (ii) interpretable [F]/[iF] and uninterpretable features [uF] (Chomsky 1995/HNG: [+interpretable] vs [-interpretable])
 2. **interpretable features**: features that can be interpreted by LF (e.g. Tense, Wh...)
uninterpretable features: purely syntactic property without LF-relevance (Case is the standard example or grammatical gender; possibly also c-selection)
 3. **strong features**: need to be checked overtly, prior to Spell-Out
weak features: cannot be checked overtly, to be checked at LF
- **Checking Theory** (Chomsky 1995)
 - *concept of checking*: matching features in Spec-Head configuration
 - *technical consequence*: the earlier-mentioned “proliferation of agreement”
 - *practical consequence*: find Spec-Head relations where possible – or create them
- (1)
 - a. **What** should the students read <what> next? *English*
 - b. The students should read **what** next? *Japanenglish*
 - c. **What** should the students read <what> next? *Russinglish*
 - (2)
 - a. **When** should the students read **what** <when>? *English*
 - b. The students should read **what when**? *Japanenglish*
 - c. **When what** should the students read <what> <when>? *Russinglish*
 - (3) **Last Resort** (*coupled with some form of Greed / Enlightened Self-Interest?*)
A movement operation is licensed only if it allows the elimination of [-interpretable] FFs.
- **duplication** of information: [F_i] on Spec and [F_j] on Head and much movement (cf. above)
 - technical issues: **Move** vs **Attract**, Move/Attract **XP** vs Move/Attract **F** (Greed-family)
 - added wrinkle: the nature and identification of the **EPP** (Extended Projection Principle)
 - **Agree**: long-distance agreement (Chomsky 2000; adapted from Adger 2003)
 - valuation approach to feature checking through the **Probe-Goal** configuration
- (4) **Checking Requirement**
Uninterpretable features must be checked, and once checked, they can delete.
 - (5) **Agree**
An [uF] on a syntactic object X (‘probe’) is checked when X is in a c-command relation with a syntactic object Y which bears a matching feature [iF] (‘goal’).
- EPP is now something like a **P(eripheral)-feature** (more HNG: chap. 10), in essence:
 - EPP is different from FFs in that it is ‘only’ a **Head’s requirement to fill its Spec**