

Carrie 1995, Noonan 1994, Duffield 1995.

²⁰ This phenomenon should almost certainly be related to that of dative subjects found in some root infinitival clauses in Russian. On this, see Moore and Perlmutter 2000 and references cited there to much earlier work.

²¹ It seems plausible to take *do* to be a head *K* which forms an extended projection, in Grimshaw's (1991) sense, with DP.

²² I am grateful especially to Eibhlín Ní Mhurchú and to Brid Ní Shuilleabháin for their patient help with the material of this section.

²³ Dónall Ó Baoill makes the interesting observation that in Ulster the option of lower positioning seems to be associated with a transitivity restriction - it is possible for intransitive but not for transitive clauses.

APPENDIX - SOURCES

Examples are frequently cited from published sources. When this is the case, it is indicated by a tag which consists of an abbreviation of the title of the publication, followed by a page-number. The abbreviations used have the interpretations specified below. For each text, the major dialect with which it is associated is also indicated.

- AFAP: *An Fear a Phléisce*, Micheál Ó Conghaile, Galway
 AG: *An Gabhar Sa Teampall*, Micheál Ua Ciarmhaic, Kerry
 AGMST: *Ar Gach Maoilinn Tá Siócháin*, Pádraig Ó Ciobháin, Kerry
 AI: *Allagar na hAise*, Tomás Ó Cnombhain, Kerry
 BF: *Bruighean Feille*, Niall Ó Dónaill, Donegal
 CC: *Cruinneacht agus Ceannabháin*, Tomás Bairéad, Galway
 CLIA: *Cliathán na Seilge*, Micheál Ua Ciarmhaic, Kerry
 CST: *An Chaint sa tSráidbhaile*, Breandán Ó hÉithir, Galway
 DO: *Dialann Oilithrigh*, Donchadh Ó Céileachair, Cork
 EB: *Eadarbhaile*, translated by Seosamh Mac Grianna, Donegal
 EDD: *Eist le Dubh Dorcha*, Seán Óg Caomhánach, Kerry
 FBF: *Fiche Bilan ag Fás*, Muiris Ó Súilleabháin, Kerry
 FEB: *Fiolar an Eireabail Bháin*, Seán Pheats Tom Ó Cearnaigh, Kerry
 GLL: *An Gealas i Lár na Léithe*, Pádraig Ó Ciobháin, Kerry
 LA: *Lá de na Laethanta*, Míci Sheáin Néill Ó Baoill, Donegal
 LG: *Le Gealaigh*, Pádraig Ó Ciobháin, Kerry
 ODR2: *Ó Donnabháin Rossa 2*, Seán Ó Lüing, Kerry
 PF: *Paróiste an Fhétreáraigh*, Tomás Mac Síthigh, Kerry
 RGB: *Na Rosa go Bráthach*, Fionn Mac Cumhaill, Donegal
 RR: *Róise Rua*, Pádraig Ua Cháimhisi, Donegal
 S: *Séudna*, An tAlhair Peadar Ua Laoghaire, Cork
 SAB: *Seanchas Annie Bhán*, Annie Ní Ghrianna, ed. Gordon W. MacLennan, Donegal
 SMB: *Seallta ón mBlascaod*, Peig Sayers, ed. Kenneth Jackson, Kerry
 SR: *Sciúird chum na Ruise*, Pádraig Ó Fiannachta, Kerry
 SSGD: *Stair-sheanchas Ghaoth Dobhair*, Cait Ní Ghiolla Bhríde, Kerry
 STL: *Seanchas Thomáis Laighléis*, ed. Tomás de Bhaldraithe, Galway
 U: *Ungu*, translated by Eoghán Ó Neachtain, Galway

GRANT GOODALL

THE EPP IN SPANISH*

0. INTRODUCTION

One of the unsolved questions in current syntactic theory is why argument DPs that start out within the lexical layer of the clause (i.e., within vP or VP) must sometimes move overtly to a SPEC position within the inflectional layer. It is true that a relationship must be established between the DP and an inflectional head, in that the inflectional head must check a case feature on the DP and the DP must sometimes check phi-features on the inflectional head, but we know that this checking can be done even when there is no overt movement. Given the standard minimalist assumption that movement occurs only when necessary, we would then expect that the checking would always be done without overt movement. Since this does not appear to be true, we must say that certain features can only be checked through overt movement to the SPEC position of the head on which the feature appears (or, alternatively, through merger of an expletive in this position). Features that trigger this type of movement or merger are said to have the "EPP property" (Chomsky 1998).

An obvious question which arises is why certain features have this property and others don't. One way to try to get closer to an answer to this question is to ascertain to what extent there is cross-linguistic variation in this regard. One could look, for example, at the patterns of raising out of the lexical layer which are attested, or at whether a feature which triggers overt movement in one language does so in all languages. It is this latter approach which will be the focus of this paper. The particular feature (or bundle of features) that I will examine is that found on T. In English, it is well known that T has a feature with the "EPP property," yielding the result that SPEC of T must be occupied, either by overt movement or by merger of an expletive.² This requirement imposed by a feature on T is often called simply "the EPP," and it is in this more narrow, traditional sense that I will use the term here (as opposed to the wider sense mentioned above in which it refers to any feature of any head which requires overt movement or merger). This EPP requirement has been widely discussed in the literature, but there is still remarkably little consensus on its cross-linguistic status. Chomsky (1998), for instance, presumes that it is universal, while McCloskey (1996b, this volume) proposes that it is not, based on evidence he provides that there is no EPP effect in Modern Irish. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998), on the other hand, propose that it is

universal but may be satisfied in different ways. In non-null subject languages it is satisfied in the usual fashion, by agreement between SPEC of T and T, but in null subject languages it is satisfied by head movement of V to T, thus making phrasal movement or merger of an expletive in SPEC of T unnecessary. The EPP in the traditional, strict sense, then, only occurs in non-null subject languages in their analysis.

The language I will concentrate on here is Spanish, which is of particular interest with regard to the EPP for two main reasons.³ First, it has a number of properties which would seem to indicate that it does not have an EPP requirement. Some of these are apparent at first glance and others require more analysis, but they point to the conclusion that SPEC of T does not need to be filled. Spanish would thus seem to provide straightforward evidence against the universality of the EPP. Second, since Spanish is a quintessential null-subject language, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou's typology predicts that it will not have the traditional EPP requirement, and in fact they use Spanish as evidence for their proposal. This type of link (such as they propose) between the presence/absence of the EPP and some independently needed property of the language is highly desirable, because it can provide the beginnings of an explanation for why some languages have the EPP and others don't, if that is indeed the case. If it should turn out that Spanish does have the EPP, however, this would seem to destroy any possible link between the absence of the EPP and the presence of null subjects. Thus there is a lot at stake in this apparently simple question of whether or not Spanish requires that its SPEC of T be filled.

One might think that determining whether Spanish has an EPP requirement would be a straightforward matter. V is assumed to occupy T, after all, so a DP immediately to the left of V could then be construed as evidence that there is an EPP, and the lack of such a DP could be taken as evidence showing the opposite. However, some independent properties of Spanish will make our job more difficult. For example, Spanish is a null subject language, so the lack of an overt DP to the left of V does not preclude the possibility of a null DP in that position. In addition, Spanish has very robust topicalization and focus-fronting processes, so it could be that a DP to the left of V is there by virtue of that type of movement, rather than by being attracted by an EPP feature. These processes involve A'-movement to the CP layer of the clause, but if there is no EPP and thus nothing in SPEC of T, they could have the effect of placing a DP immediately to the left of the V. Thus two major tasks in exploring the possibility of the EPP in Spanish will be determining whether there is a null DP in cases where SPEC of T appears to be unoccupied and whether preverbal DPs are there as a result of A'-movement or A-movement.

This paper will be organized as follows. In section 1, I will give an overview of some of the evidence from the literature that has led to the now predominant view that Spanish does not have an EPP requirement. In section 2, I will examine the status of preverbal subjects more closely and conclude that their surface position must result from EPP-induced movement. In section 3, I attempt to resolve this apparent contradiction by returning to the evidence from section 1 and showing how it can be accounted for insightfully under the assumption that there is an EPP. General conclusions will be drawn in section 4.

1. APPARENT EVIDENCE AGAINST THE EPP IN SPANISH

The first sign that might make us suspect that the EPP does not force movement to SPEC of T in Spanish is the fact that verb-initial word order is possible (see Ordoñez 1997 for discussion), as seen in (1).

- (1) Leyó Juan el libro.
read the book
'Juan read the book.'

This is what we expect if phrases move to the left of the verb only by means of A'-movement, but it is surprising if T contains an EPP feature that attracts the closest DP to its SPEC. Assuming that V is located in T, we should then find this DP in preverbal position. The only way out is to say that there is a null expletive which satisfies the EPP feature, allowing the other DPs to remain VP-internal. This seems implausible, however, since the expletive should induce a definiteness effect, and (1) clearly shows that this does not obtain, as Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) point out.

More subtle evidence in favor of an inactive EPP in Spanish comes from Uribe-Etxebarria 1992, who shows that quantified subjects in preverbal position have their scope frozen in place, while those in postverbal position do not. Thus in (2), *cada senador* 'every senator' has obligatorily narrow scope with regard to the *wh*-phrase *quién* in (a), while both narrow and wide scope are possible in (b).

- (2)a. A quién dices que *cada senador* amaba?
whom say-2ps that each senator loves
b. A quién dices que amaba *cada senador*?
whom say-2ps that loves each senator
'Who do you say that every senator loved?' (Uribe-Etxebarria 1992)

This is surprising if *cada senador* has moved leftward in (a) to satisfy an EPP feature, since such movement should not affect scope possibilities, as seen by the fact that *every senator* in the English translation may have either wide or narrow scope. Uribe-Etxebarria suggests that the facts in (2) are related to those in (3), first discussed by Lasnik and Uriagereka (1988).

- (3)a. Someone thinks that **every problem**, Mary solved.
b. Someone thinks that Mary solved **every problem**.

Lasnik and Uriagereka claim that *every problem* in (b) may have either narrow or (marginally) wide scope, but that when *every problem* is topicalized, as in (a), only the narrow scope reading is possible. The descriptive generalization that emerges is given in (4) (see Epstein 1992, Kayne 1998 for more recent discussion).

- (4) Overt A'-movement may not be followed by covert A'-movement of the same item.

(4) can then account for the lack of ambiguity in (3a), and it can do so in (2a) as well, Uribe-Etxebarria suggests, if we make the crucial assumption that *cada senador* has moved leftward by means of A'-movement.

Ordóñez (1997) shows that this same account can be extended to facts regarding *wh-in-situ* first discussed by Jaeggli (1987). Jaeggli showed that an embedded subject *wh*-phrase may remain *in situ* when it is postverbal, but not preverbal, as seen in (5).

- (5)a. *Qué dijiste que **quién** compró el otro día?
what say-2ps that who bought the other day
- b. Qué dijiste que compró **quién** el otro día?
what say-2ps that bought who the other day
'What did you say that who bought the other day?'

(4) allows us to account for (5a): *quién* must undergo covert movement so that it has scope over the entire clause, but it cannot, if we assume that it has already undergone A'-movement.

A further reason for thinking that preverbal subjects are the result of A'-movement and have not been attracted by an EPP-feature is that they are incompatible with fronted focus phrases or fronted *wh*-phrases, as seen in (6) and (7), respectively.⁴

- (6) *EL LIBRO Juan compró (no la revista).
the book bought not the magazine
'THE BOOK Juan bought (not the magazine).'

cf. ✓EL LIBRO compró Juan (no la revista).
the book bought not the magazine

- (7) *Qué Juan compró?
what bought
'What did Juan buy?'

cf. ✓Qué compró Juan?
what bought

This is surprising if the EPP is responsible for the preverbal position of the subject, since we then expect that the subject would be in SPEC of T and that the focus phrase or *wh*-phrase would be to its left within the CP layer. If, on the other hand,

the preverbal subject has undergone A'-movement, it is not difficult to imagine an analysis of (6) and (7) in which the movement of the subject to a preverbal position either competes for the same position as the focus phrase or *wh*-phrase (see, for example, Zubizarreta 1998) or otherwise results in two A'-processes interfering with each other (see, for example, Ordóñez 1997).

2. EVIDENCE IN FAVOR OF THE EPP IN SPANISH

We have now seen some good reasons for thinking that there is no requirement that SPEC of T be occupied in Spanish, i.e., that there is no standard EPP requirement. If this is true, it means that subjects appearing preverbally must be there as a result of A'-movement into the CP layer of the clause above TP. However, we shall now see evidence that seems to point in the opposite direction, suggesting that it is the EPP which triggers movement of the subject to a preverbal position.

2.1 Preverbal subjects do not have information status of topic or focus

A'-fronted elements in Spanish typically have a special information status that preverbal subjects do not share.⁵ Fernández Soriano (1999), for instance, points out that in a neutral context, preverbal subjects are possible but other fronted elements are not. Thus (a) is a possible answer to the question in (8), but (b) is not.

- (8) ¿Qué pasó?
what happened
'What happened?'
- a. Juan me regaló el anillo en el parque.
me gave the ring in the park
'Juan gave me the ring in the park.'
- b. #En el parque me regaló el anillo.
in the park me gave the ring
'In the park he gave me the ring.'

If we assume that there is a relatively direct relationship between the information status of an element and its syntactic position, at least in the sense that phrases within the CP layer have a more specific informational role (e.g., topic or focus) and phrases within the inflectional level do not, this casts doubt on the idea that subjects are always fronted to the same position as topics such as *en el parque* 'in the park' in (b).⁶

There may also be differences in the reference possibilities of preverbal subjects when compared to other fronted elements. Cardinaletti (1997) claims that there are in Italian, and examples such as the following in Spanish seem to support this:⁷

- (9) Ayer premiaron una película acerca de Almodóvar.
yesterday gave-prize-3pp a film about of
'Yesterday they gave a prize to a film about Almodóvar.'
- (a) El director, el premio lo recibió en el teatro del centro.
the director the prize it received in the theater of-the downtown
'The director, the prize he received at the downtown theater.'
- (b) El premio, el director lo recibió en el teatro del centro.
the prize the director it received in the theater of-the downtown
'The prize, the director received at the downtown theater.'

The initial sentence in (9) brings up two possible directors: Almodóvar and the one who made a film about Almodóvar. This sentence may be followed in the discourse by either (a) or (b), both of which contain the DP *el director* 'the director.' We would expect this DP to be able to refer to either of the possible directors, but in (a), where it is syntactically a topic, it prefers to refer to the director of the film and not to Almodóvar. In (b), on the other hand, the DP is a preverbal subject, and it is able to refer equally well to either Almodóvar or the director of the film.⁸ It is not known why this difference should arise, but trying to account for it in a theory in which topics and preverbal subjects are in the same position would seem to be much less promising than doing so in a theory in which they occupy distinct positions. This in turn lends support to the idea that subjects are fronted by a mechanism different from that which fronts topics.⁹

2.2 Only one preverbal non-topic is allowed

Another distinctive property of preverbal subjects is that only one of them is allowed. With a psych-verb such as *gustar*, for instance, either of the internal arguments may be fronted, as seen in (10) and (11), but not both, as seen in (12).

- (10) [A nadie] le gusta esa música.
to no one pleases that music
- (11) [Esa música] no le gusta a nadie.
that music NEG pleases no one
- (12) *[A nadie] [esa música] le gusta.
to no one that music pleases

We shall see in the next section that bare quantifiers like *nadie* 'no one' cannot be topics, and the fact that *esa música* 'that music' is to the right of *nadie* in (12) means that it cannot be a topic either. Thus in (12) neither of the fronted elements is a

topic, and the contrast between (10)/(11) and (12) shows that only one such non-topic, fronted element is possible. Multiple topics, on the other hand, are possible (see (9a), for instance), which again suggests that *nadie* in (10) and (12) is not a topic. This contrast between the obligatorily single preverbal subject and possibly multiple topics is consistent with the idea that subjects are fronted because of the (single) EPP feature while topics are fronted by means of A'-movement.

This analysis predicts that if the order of *a nadie* 'to no one' and *esa música* 'that music' in (12) is reversed, then the sentence should be fine, and indeed this is the case:

- (13) Esa música, a nadie le gusta.
that music to no one pleases

(13) is grammatical because *esa música* is able to be a topic (since unlike in (12), it is not to the right of a subject), leaving *a nadie* as the preverbal subject.

2.3 Preverbal subjects are not in topic position

There is also substantial syntactic evidence that preverbal subjects and topics do not occupy the same position in Spanish. First, it has often been noted that bare quantifiers are not able to be topics, as shown in (14) (see, e.g., Rizzi 1997).

- (14) *A nadie, Juan lo ha visto.
no one him has seen
'No one, Juan has seen.'

Bare quantifiers are perfect as preverbal subjects, however, as in (15).¹⁰

- (15) Nadie ha visto a Juan.
nobody has seen
'Nobody has seen Juan.'

If topics and preverbal subjects occupy the same position, it is difficult to see why this contrast would arise.¹¹ If, on the other hand, topics are in the CP layer and preverbal subjects are in SPEC of T, then the contrast between (14) and (15) is as expected, given the generalization in (4) (or the related account from Rizzi 1997 mentioned in footnote 11).

Second, Castelles (1997) has pointed out that bare nouns in Spanish are able to appear as postverbal subjects, as in (16a), but not as preverbal subjects, as in (16b).

- (16a) Jugaban niños en el parque.
played children in the park

- b. *Niños jugaban en el parque.
children played in the park
'Children were playing in the park.'

Crucially, bare nouns are able to be topics, as shown in (17), making it appear unlikely that preverbal subjects and topics occupy the same position.

- (17) Yo a él libros no le dejo.
I to him books no him-DAT lend
'Books, I don't lend him.'

(17) in fact contains three topics (*yo* 'I', *a él* 'to him', and *libros* 'books'), but what matters here is that the bare noun *libros* is a topic. Castiellas proposes that bare nouns are NP's, not DP's, and that only DP's are allowed in SPEC of T. This then gives us a plausible account of the ungrammaticality of (16b). (17), in contrast, is fine, because topics may be of any phrasal type.

Third, it is well known that topics may be followed by a *wh*-phrase, as seen in (18).

- (18) Ese libro, cuándo lo compraste?
that book when it bought-2ps
'That book, when did you buy it?'

Within the system of Rizzi 1997, for instance, this is because the TopP projection may appear higher than the FocP projection which hosts the *wh*-phrase. If preverbal subjects are in SPEC of Top⁰, they too should be able to appear to the left of a *wh*-phrase, and at first glance it appears that they can, as in (19).

- (19) Ese libro, cuándo fue comprado?
that book when was bought
'That book, when was it bought?'

However, the intonation and discourse context for (19) should make us wonder whether *ese libro* here is actually a topic. We can avoid this problem by using a subject which we know cannot be made into a topic, such as a bare quantifier, as seen in (20).

- (20) *Nadie, en qué clase (no) estudió?
no one in what class no studied
'No one, in which class did they study?'

cf. En qué clase no estudió nadie?
in what class no studied no one
'In which class did no one study?'

As (20) shows, a bare quantifier is incapable of appearing to the left of a *wh*-phrase, which again strongly suggests that preverbal subjects are not in topic position.

Another contrast between topics and preverbal subjects is that topics create an island for *wh*-movement out of an embedded clause, whereas preverbal subjects do not. This is seen in (21)-(22).¹²

- (21) *A quién crees que el premio se lo dieron?
who think-2ps that the prize him-DAT it gave-3pp
'Who do you think that the prize they gave to?'

- (22) A quién crees que Juan le dio el premio?
who think-2ps that him-DAT gave the prize
'Who do you think that Juan gave the prize to?'

If we assume that *wh*-movement is successive-cyclic, and that the *wh*-phrase must move to the left periphery of the embedded clause in order to be visible on the higher cycle (Chomsky 1998), we can then conclude that only the topic is in the left periphery and thus blocks movement of the *wh*-phrase. The preverbal subject, on the other hand, must be lower within the embedded clause and thus does not interfere with the movement of the *wh*-phrase to the left periphery.

A final piece of evidence concerns dialects in which preverbal subjects are possible in infinitival clauses.¹³ In at least one such dialect, Northern Mexican Spanish, preliminary work indicates that although preverbal subjects are possible in this context, topics are not, as seen in the contrast between (23) and (24).

- (23) Para Juan lavar las sábanas, tienen que estar muy sucias.
for wash-INF the sheets have-3pp that be very dirty
'For Juan to wash the sheets, they have to be very dirty.'

- (24) *Para las sábanas lavarlas Juan, tienen que estar muy sucias.
for the sheets wash-INF-them have-3pp that be very dirty
'For the sheets, wash-INF-CL Juan, they have to be very dirty.'

Once again, this contrast is difficult to explain if topics and preverbal subjects occupy the same position, but it follows without stipulation if topics are in the CP layer and subjects are in SPEC of T. Notice that under Rizzi's (1997) analysis of the structure of CP, we expect *para* to occupy FIN⁰, above the TP projection but below the position of topics. (23) and (24) are consistent with this view.

We have now seen evidence of various types that the topic and preverbal subject are in distinct positions. Significantly, the data in (18)-(24) point also to a more specific conclusion: that the preverbal subject is in a position lower than the topic. This followed from the fact that preverbal subjects, unlike topics, are not able to appear to the left of a *wh*-phrase and do not interfere with *wh*-extraction from an embedded clause, but are able to appear to the right of a complementizer in FIN⁰.

2.4 Preverbal subjects are not in focus/*wh*-position

The facts we have seen so far would be consistent with the idea that preverbal subjects are in the same position as that of fronted focused phrases or *wh*-phrases (SPEC of FOC⁰ in Rizzi 1997), which is generally below that of topics in Spanish. In this section, I will argue that this idea must be rejected and that the position of preverbal subjects is still lower than SPEC of FOC⁰.

First, Torrego (1985) has shown that it is possible to extract a *wh*-phrase out of a *wh*-phrase which has itself been fronted, as seen in (25).

- (25) Este es el poema del cual no sé [cuántas traducciones ___]
 this is the poem of which no know-1ps how-many translations
 han publicado.
 have-3pp published
 'This is the poem of which I don't know [how many translations ___]
 they have published.'

As we would expect, assuming that focused phrases occupy the same position as *wh*-phrases, the same is possible with a fronted focused phrase, as seen in (26).¹⁴

- (26) Este es el poema del cual [TU TRADUCCIÓN ___] publicaron
 this is the poem of which your translation published-3pp
 pero no el original)
 but not the original
 'This is the poem of which [YOUR TRANSLATION ___] they published
 (but not the original).'

Now if preverbal subjects occupy this same position, then *wh*-extraction should be possible out of them. But this is not the case, as seen in (27).¹⁵

- (27) *Este es el poema del cual [tu traducción ___] ha ganado premios.
 this is the poem of which your translation has won prizes
 'This is the poem of which [your translation ___] has won prizes.'

So we conclude that preverbal subjects are not in SPEC of FOC⁰.

A second argument concerns the fact that focused phrases and *wh*-phrases create islands for further *wh*-movement, as seen in (28) and (29).

- (28) *A quién crees que EL CARRO le dieron (no la
 who think-2ps that the car him-DAT gave-3pp not the
 moto)?
 motorcycle
 'Who do you think that THE CAR they gave to (not the motorcycle)?'

- (29) *A quién quieres saber cuál premio le dieron?
 who want-2ps know which prize him-DAT gave-3pp
 'Who do you want to know which prize they gave to?'

As mentioned earlier, one possible line of explanation here is that in order to undergo successive cyclic movement, the *wh*-phrase must move to the left periphery of the embedded clause so that it will be accessible to movement in the higher cycle. (28) and (29) are out because this left periphery is already occupied by a focused phrase and another *wh*-phrase, respectively. As we have already seen in (22), repeated here as (30), preverbal subjects do not create islands.

- (30) A quién crees que Juan le dio el premio?
 who think-2ps that him-DAT gave the prize
 'Who do you think that Juan gave the prize to?'

This very strongly suggests that preverbal subjects are in a position lower than SPEC of FOC⁰.

Finally, it is well known that movement of a *wh*-phrase (or focused phrase) licenses the appearance of a parasitic gap, as in (31).

- (31) Cuáles libros tiraste [sin haber leído]?
 which books throw-out-2ps without have-INF read
 'Which books did you throw out [without having read]?'

A preverbal subject, on the other hand, does not license a parasitic gap, as seen in (32).

- (32) *Estos libros fueron tirados [sin haber leído].
 these books were thrown-out without have-INF read
 'These books were thrown out [without having read].'

This suggests that preverbal subjects, unlike *wh*-phrases, are not the result of A'-movement into the CP layer.¹⁶

We are now able to conclude that preverbal subjects in Spanish are not located in the same position as *wh*-phrases and focused phrases.¹⁷ Moreover, (28)-(30) indicate that preverbal subjects are in a position lower than these others.

3. ANOTHER LOOK AT EVIDENCE AGAINST THE EPP

At this point we have reached the following three conclusions: preverbal subjects are syntactically located in a position lower than the major phrasal elements in the CP layer (i.e., fronted topics, focused phrases and *wh*-phrases), only one preverbal subject is allowed, and preverbal subjects do not have the information status or reference possibilities of topics. We have seen that these conclusions cast doubt on

the idea that a preverbal subject is a topic or is otherwise the result of A'-movement. They are perfectly consistent, on the other hand, with the idea that Spanish has an EPP requiring SPEC of T to be occupied.¹⁸ SPEC of T is structurally lower than the SPEC positions within the CP layer, it is generally assumed that there is a single EPP feature which is only checked once, and SPEC of T is generally assumed to be devoid of the special interpretational properties of SPEC positions within the CP layer.

But how can these conclusions be reconciled with the data we saw in section 1 which suggested that there is no EPP in Spanish, or at least that phrasal movement into SPEC of T is not required? In this section we will examine each of the arguments from section 1 in turn and see what sort of analysis is available to us if we assume that there is an EPP requirement in Spanish.

3.1 *Word order, expletives, and the definiteness effect*

The first fact we have to face is that verb-initial orders are possible. Assuming that V is in T, an EPP feature would seem to require a DP to the left of the verb. There are two possible ways this problem could be handled. First, we could say that the EPP feature is simply optional in Spanish, and that the verb-initial order is what results when the feature is not present. The second and more interesting possibility is to say that the EPP feature is obligatory, so the verb-initial order must actually have a null element to the left of the verb.

Suppose that this second possibility is what we want to adopt. This immediately leads us to the second problem that we saw in section 1, which was that if there is a null expletive, we should observe a definiteness effect, whereas in fact none obtains. Zubizarreta (1998) suggests that this problem could be avoided if instead of an expletive, we have a null adverb or locative, which would not be expected to trigger the definiteness effect. As evidence for this, she shows that in Italian (based on work by Pinto (1994) and Adger (1996)), a non-focused postverbal subject is possible only where a null locative is plausible. That is to say, with verbs where a location seems intimately tied to the verb's meaning, even though it is not overtly expressed syntactically, a non-focused postverbal subject is possible, as seen in (33).

- (33)a. E arrivato Gigi.
is arrived
'Gigi has arrived.'
- b. Ha telefonato Gigi.
has telephoned
'Gigi has telephoned.'

With verbs that do not seem to imply any locative argument, this non-focused postverbal subject is not possible, as seen in (34).

- (34)a. *Ha riso Gigi.
has laughed
'Gigi has laughed.'
- b. *Hanno starnutito tre leoni.
have sneezed three lions
'Three lions have sneezed.'

These facts can be explained if we say that it is the null locative which satisfies the EPP in (33). This null locative is the destination in (33a) and either the source or destination in (33b). Since no locative argument is possible in (34), the EPP can only be satisfied there by overt movement of the subject, which is then why the postverbal subject is disallowed.

This neat explanation can only go through, of course, if we allow for the possibility of null locatives, so the contrast between (33) and (34) thus constitutes evidence for their existence. Given this, it is now at least possible that they exist in Spanish as well, which could explain why there is no definiteness effect with postverbal subjects. However, the equivalents of both (33) and (34) are possible in Spanish, which would suggest, as Zubizarreta points out, that Spanish allows a wider set of null adverbials than does Italian (perhaps including, for example, null temporal adverbials).

If this is true, then evidence along the lines of (33) and (34) will be difficult to find in Spanish, since some null adverbial will always be available to satisfy the EPP, thus allowing the subject to remain in place. But what we should be able to find are cases where adverbials do not need to be expressed overtly in Spanish, but where they do in languages like English (assuming that English does not allow null adverbials). Such cases seem to exist, as seen in (35).

- (35) (as sign in store)
a. Hay pan.
'There is bread.'
- b. #There is bread.

(35a) is very natural as a sign in a store, whereas (35b) would be quite odd in this context. This can be explained if (a) allows for the possibility of a null adverbial, in this context understood as "here" or "today," while (b) does not, which results in the impression that (b) is a statement of general existence rather than one about a particular place and time. Li (1990) notes a similar contrast between existentials in Chinese and English:

- (36)a. Wo zhidao you gui.
I know have ghost
'I know that there are ghosts.'

- b. I know that there are ghosts.

(36a) is pragmatically natural only when discussing a particular place or time, while (36b) may be understood as a general statement of existence independent of any particular place. Li attributes this contrast to the possibility of a null adverbial subject in Chinese.¹⁹

If it is true that verb-initial clauses in Spanish contain a null adverbial which satisfies the EPP, how can this be reconciled with the fact that overt adverbials in English generally do not satisfy the EPP? One possibility, of course, is that the EPP in Spanish is simply different from the EPP in English, in that the former may be satisfied by a wider range of categories, but this is not a very appealing solution. A more tempting possibility is to say that the EPP is the same in Spanish and English, but that (some) locative and temporal adverbials in Spanish have a different categorial status than their equivalents in English. This actually has some plausibility, in that it has been known for a long time that Spanish locatives and temporals display a number of nominal characteristics. For instance, a number of locatives require the preposition *de* 'of' in order to take an object:

- (37)a. encima de la mesa
on of the table
'on top of the table'
b. detrás de la casa
behind of the house
'behind the house'
c. enfrente de la iglesia
facing of the church
'facing the church'

Requiring a default preposition in order to take an object is a property of nouns (and adjectives), but not of prepositions. Pavón Lucero (1999) points out as well that these locatives, unlike ordinary prepositions, may themselves be the object of a preposition when within a DP:

- (38)a. Se ha roto [el jarrón de encima de la mesa]
SE has broken the vase of on of the table
b. ??Se ha roto [el jarrón de sobre la mesa]
SE has broken the vase of on the table
'The vase on top of the table has broken.'

This suggests that *encima de la mesa* in (38a) is a DP (or NP), not a PP.

Another sign of nominal characteristics of some locatives is that basic locatives like *aquí* 'here' and *allí* 'there' can occupy argument positions ordinarily reserved for DP's, unlike their English counterparts:²⁰

- (39)a. Aquí me da miedo.
here me-DAT gives fear
b. Allí no me gusta.
there NEG me-DAT pleases
(40)a. *Here scares me. (cf. This place scares me.)
b. ?*I don't like there. (cf. I don't like that place.)

Even more suggestive is the fact that these locatives can trigger plural agreement, as in (41), and can raise, as in (42).

- (41) Aquí y allí me gustan.
here and there me-DAT please
'I like here and there.'
(42) Aquí parece darle miedo.
here seems give-INF-him fear
'Here seems to scare him.'

As Davies and Dubinsky (this volume) point out, these are typical nominal properties. Crucially, these facts show that these locatives seem to have phi-features (allowing for agreement, as in (41)), and case-features (allowing for raising, as in (42)), i.e., just the features that may have the EPP property.

This area is clearly worthy of further exploration, but at this point we may conclude that it is at least plausible that certain locatives satisfy the EPP in Spanish, given that they behave like DP's in significant ways. If we assume that null locatives with these properties exist as well, it is then possible that it is this type of element that satisfies the EPP in cases where there is nothing overt in the preverbal position. The Spanish EPP under this view is the standard one; what makes the apparent verb-initial order possible is the existence of null locatives with DP properties.²¹

Thus the fact that Spanish allows clauses with an apparent verb-initial order in which there is no definiteness effect on the postverbal subject is not necessarily the clear evidence against an EPP requirement in this language that it appeared to be at first. As we have seen, there is some evidence for the existence of null locatives/temporals, and it is conceivable that it is these which satisfy the EPP in those cases in which the subject does not raise.

3.2 Quantifier scope

We now turn to the fact that quantified preverbal subjects in Spanish seem to have their scope frozen in place, as we saw earlier in (2), repeated here as (43).

- (43)a. A quién dices que cada senador amaba?
whom say-2ps that each senator loves
- b. A quién dices que amaba cada senador?
whom say-2ps that loves each senator
'Who do you say that every senator loved?'

As we saw, (b) is ambiguous, whereas in (a) *cada senador* must have narrow scope. Uribe-Etxebarria (1992) argued that this freezing of the scope is a sign of A'-movement. This A'-movement property of the preverbal subject would be completely unexpected if Spanish has an EPP requirement, since EPP-induced movement of the subject to a preverbal position should exhibit only A-movement properties.

However, let us take a new look at this contrast between (43a) and (b) from the perspective of the theory of quantifiers of Hornstein 1999. Hornstein proposes that the freezing of scope in a particular position is not a property of A'-movement per se, but is characteristic of quantified DP's that are in positions of "informational demand." This follows from the following three assumptions: that within a copy theory of movement, all copies but one are deleted, that a copy which is in an informationally important position will need to be the one which survives, and that the position of the surviving copy is the one which determines scope. Now it is uncontroversial that there is some informational demand on the preverbal subject in Spanish, and indeed this is expected given the fact that there are (at least) two possible positions for the subject, just as we expect informational demand on shifted objects, in languages in which this is possible, since there is also another position in which objects can occur (see Chomsky 1999).²² Thus independently of the type of movement involved, preverbal subjects are in a position of some informational demand, which in Hornstein's theory means that a quantified DP in that position will have its scope frozen.

So we are now able to explain the contrast in (43) while maintaining the idea that it is the EPP which forces the subject to move to a preverbal position. In fact, this account of (43) has an advantage over that proposed by Uribe-Etxebarria in terms of A'-movement. Many speakers have reported to me that they find the contrast between (43a) and (b) very weak, or even non-existent; that is, they at least marginally allow a wide-scope reading for *cada senador* in (43a) (see Gutiérrez-Rexach 1996 for discussion of some of the issues involved). This kind of variability in judgments is surprising if the contrast simply involves presence vs. absence of A'-movement, but makes more sense if what is at stake is the amount of informational demand on the preverbal subject position. As we have seen, there is some such demand, but we have also seen that preverbal subjects are allowed in discourse-

neutral contexts, suggesting that the demand is not as great as in the case of topics or fronted focused phrases. This intermediate status of the informational demand on the preverbal subject position, combined with Hornstein's theory of scope, could then explain why the contrast in (43) is relatively weak.

3.3 Word order with fronted *wh*-focused phrase

We now turn to the final argument that there is no EPP effect in Spanish, which involved clauses in which a *wh*-phrase or focused phrase has been fronted. If there is an EPP requirement, we would expect to find the *wh*/focused phrase within the CP layer followed by the preverbal subject in SPEC of T, but this is not what happens. Instead, we find that the subject is obligatorily postverbal in structures like this, as we saw in (6) and (7), repeated here as (44) and (45).

- (44) *EL LIBRO Juan compró (no la revista).
the book bought not the magazine
'THE BOOK John bought (not the magazine).'

cf. ✓EL LIBRO compró Juan (no la revista).
the book bought not the magazine

- (45) *Qué Juan compró?
what bought
'What did Juan buy?'

cf. ✓Qué compró Juan?
what bought

As discussed earlier, if there is no EPP and preverbal subjects are the result of A'-movement, then it is at least conceivable that such movement would prevent fronting of the *wh*-focused phrase.

There is one obvious way to try to preserve the EPP while still accounting for (44)-(45). If Spanish has obligatory T-to-C movement, we could then claim that the subject does occupy SPEC of T in the well-formed counterparts of (44)-(45), but that the verb has moved to a position to its left, just as occurs in *wh*-questions in English. This would indeed solve the problem of (44)-(45), but unfortunately, the thrust of the literature of the past several years is that T-to-C movement does not occur in environments like these in Spanish.

Let us now consider some of the evidence that has led to this conclusion. We will examine three main arguments against T-to-C movement in *wh*-questions in Spanish, involving properties of embedded clauses, auxiliaries, and adverb placement, before returning to the problem of how to account for (44)-(45).

First, in languages in which T-to-C raising does occur, it is at least very common for this raising to be blocked in embedded clauses, perhaps because the C position is filled with a null complementizer. This is illustrated for English in (46).

- (46)a. I don't know [what [John will buy]]
 b. *I don't know [what will [John *t* buy]]

In Spanish, however, this sort of contrast between matrix and embedded clauses does not occur (even though complementizers are generally obligatory in tensed embedded clauses), as seen in (47).²³

- (47)a. **No sé qué Juan compró.*
 no know-1ps what bought
 b. *No sé qué compró Juan.*
 no know-1ps what bought
 'I don't know what Juan bought.'

As (47a) shows, the subject may not follow the *wh*-phrase in an embedded clause, contrary to what occurs in English (46a). This suggests that T-to-C movement is not what is responsible for the word order found in *wh*-clauses.

Second, T-to-C movement typically affects the auxiliary, if there is one, leaving the main verb behind, as seen in English (48).

- (48)a. When **has** [John's mother *t* danced]?
 b. *When **has danced** [John's mother *t*]?

But in Spanish, as Ordóñez (1997) points out, this is impossible, as seen in (49).

- (49)a. **A quién había la madre de Juan visto?*
 who had the mother of seen
 'Who had Juan's mother seen?'
 b. *A quién había visto la madre de Juan?*
 who had seen the mother of
 'Who had Juan's mother seen?'

It is tempting to say that (49a) is out because auxiliaries in Spanish may never be separated from the verb, but Ordóñez shows that at least in principle, the auxiliary and the verb are separable, as in (50), where something like T-to-C movement seems to have applied to the infinitive auxiliary.

- (50) *De haberlo yo sabido, no te habría dicho nada.*
 of had-it I known no you-DAT have said nothing
 'Had I known, I would not have told you anything.'

Thus if Spanish truly had T-to-C raising in the context of a focused phrase or *wh*-phrase, then we would expect that the auxiliary alone would be able to raise, which (49a) shows to be impossible.

Finally, it has been argued by Goodall (1993) and Suñer (1994) that the placement of certain types of adverbs also provides evidence that T stays within TP in *wh*-questions (and presumably in focus constructions as well). This may be seen with adverbs such as *barely*, which are able to appear to the left of T, as seen in (51a). When *can* here raises to C, as in (51b), then of course *barely* can no longer appear to its left, as we would expect, and instead we get (51c).

- (51)a. You **barely** can see the screen from that seat.
 b. *From which seat **barely** can you see the screen?
 c. From which seat can you **barely t** see the screen?

In Spanish, the adverb *apenas* 'barely' seems to occupy the same position to the left of T (here occupied by the main verb *puedes*), as seen in (52a).

- (52)a. *Tú apenas puedes ver la pantalla desde ese asiento.*
 you barely can-2ps see the screen from that seat
 'You can barely see the screen from that seat.'
 b. *Desde cuál asiento apenas puedes ver la pantalla?*
 from which seat barely can-2ps see the screen
 'From which seat can you barely see the screen?'

But when there is *wh*-movement, as in (52b), then the adverb is able to remain in its preverbal position, suggesting that the verb has remained in T (and not raised up to C). This contrast between (51b) and (52b) would seem mysterious if both languages had obligatory T-to-C movement in *wh*-questions.

So we conclude that the inability of a preverbal subject to cooccur with a fronted *wh*-phrase or focused phrase cannot be explained by invoking T-to-C movement, and (44)-(45) thus continue to pose a serious problem for an account of Spanish which claims there is an active EPP.^{24,25}

In order to begin solving this problem, let us consider why it might be that T-to-C movement occurs at all in some languages, and how it is that others seem to do without it. We will adopt the standard assumption that C may contain a feature that induces overt movement of a *wh*-focused phrase to its SPEC, and let us assume as well, in the spirit of Rizzi 1996, that T may also contain such a feature. There are at least two types of motivation for this latter assumption. First, a number of languages exhibit special agreement morphology on the verb in clauses where a *wh*-phrase has been extracted (see, e.g., Chung 1982, Georgopoulos 1985, 1991, Finer 1998), suggesting that there is a *wh*-feature of some sort on one of the inflectional heads

(i.e., within TP). Second, fronting of a nominative *wh*-phrase does not trigger T-to-C movement, as seen in (53).

- (53)a. Who ate the rice?
 b. *Who did eat the rice? (OK only with emphatic reading)

This suggests that moving the *wh*-phrase to SPEC of T accomplishes the same thing that T-to-C raising ordinarily accomplishes, thus making the latter unnecessary in this case. This makes sense if there is a *wh*-feature on T: a nominative *wh*-phrase checks this feature when it is in SPEC of T, to which it is forced to move anyway by the EPP, but for other *wh*-phrases, which move to SPEC of C directly, T must raise to C in order for checking to occur.

The basic feature properties necessary to implement this idea are given in (54).²⁶

- (54)a. C has a Q feature (triggers overt movement)
 b. T has a Q feature (does not trigger overt movement)
 c. T is able to move to C²⁷

Consider the derivation of a sentence like (53a). *Who* is attracted to SPEC of T, at which point its case feature is checked and it checks the phi-features and Q-feature on T. As the derivation continues, *who* also moves to SPEC of C.²⁸ Since T does not need to move to C for any reason, it does not. Now consider the derivation of a sentence with a non-subject *wh*-phrase, as in (55).

- (55) Who can John see?

The derivation proceeds normally as TP is built up: *John* moves to SPEC of T, where its case feature is checked and it checks the phi-features on T. The Q-feature on T is left unchecked for the time being. After C is merged, *who* will need to move to SPEC of C, attracted by the Q-feature on C. As for the remaining Q-feature on T, there are two possibilities: *who* could have checked it by moving to SPEC of T on its way to SPEC of C, or T could move to C first, thus allowing *who* to move directly to SPEC of C, where it would then be able to check the Q-features on both T and C. The second possibility requires only one instance of movement of the *wh*-phrase *who*, and perhaps because of this is the option that English chooses (although it also involves one instance of head movement).²⁹ In embedded clauses where this second possibility is not allowed (because T-to-C movement is not allowed), it may be the first possibility that is chosen.

I have now sketched an analysis of T-to-C movement according to which this process occurs as a way to facilitate checking of the Q-features on both T and C. I

will assume that the Q features on T and C are universal and that T-to-C movement is simply one strategy available to allow both of these features to be checked. If it is true, as argued earlier, that Spanish does not have T-to-C movement, then it must use some other strategy to check these features. I propose that the strategy Spanish uses, in effect, is to move the *wh*-phrase first to SPEC of T and then to SPEC of C, checking each Q-feature in turn.³⁰ To accomplish this, Spanish has the properties in (56) (in place of those in (54) for English):

- (56)a. C has a Q feature (triggers overt movement)
 b. T has a Q feature (triggers overt movement)

Consider first a clause containing a subject *wh*-phrase. This phrase is attracted first to SPEC of T, where it checks the phi-features and Q-feature on T, and then to SPEC of C, where it checks the Q-feature on SPEC of C, as shown in (57).

- (57) [CP *wh*_{SUBJ} [TP t [_{VP} t ...

The result, then, is essentially the same as in English. When we have a non-subject *wh*-phrase, however, things will play out differently. This phrase will move to SPEC of T because of the Q-feature on T which forces overt movement. We would ordinarily expect the subject to be attracted to SPEC of T as well, by virtue of the EPP feature on the phi-features on T, but I will assume the descriptive generalization in (58).

- (58) Only one feature on a head may have an EPP-feature (force overt movement).

This generalization falls out straightforwardly if we assume, as was once standard, that movement to check a feature on head H must be to SPEC of H and that each head is limited to one such SPEC. This latter assumption in particular is no longer accepted uncritically (see Chomsky 1995 and 1999), with the result that it is no longer clear how to derive (58). Descriptively, however, (58) seems to be correct, and I will adopt it here. The effect of it for our purposes is that it will be impossible to have an EPP-feature on both the phi-features (or some particular phi-feature) and the Q-feature. I will assume that the result is that the EPP feature is only on the Q-feature, i.e., that only the Q-feature triggers overt movement.³¹ This means, then, that although the *wh*-phrase moves overtly to SPEC of T, the subject has no reason to, so it remains in place, as shown in (59).³²

- (59) [CP *wh*_{OBJ} [TP t [_{VP} SUBJ [_{VP} ... t

Given that the verb moves to T, this derives the obligatorily postverbal position of the subject that we observed in (45) (and in (44) as well, assuming that the fronting of focused phrases works in parallel fashion).

Notice that T-to-C movement does not occur here, because it does not need to. Comparing (54) and (56), we see that the essential difference between English and Spanish is that the Q-feature on T triggers overt movement in Spanish but not in English. Once the former option is chosen, the need for T-to-C movement disappears, because the Q-feature on T will always be checked by an element in its SPEC. If the English-style option is chosen, then T-to-C movement becomes at least a possibility, as we have seen, as one way to ensure that the Q-feature on T will be checked.

Given this analysis of the fronting of *wh*-/focused phrases in Spanish, let us now look more closely at the nature of the Q-feature on T, since this is the key element in the analysis. One question about it which arises is what determines whether or not it will appear on a given T. The answer seems to be that it appears on the T of the clause over which the *wh*-/focused phrase has scope. For example, in a sentence where a *wh*-phrase is extracted out of an embedded clause, Q is present only on the T of the matrix clause. This is seen clearly in (60), where the subject is obligatorily postverbal only in the matrix clause.³³

- (60)a. Qué quiere Juan que María compre?
 what wants that buy
- b. Qué quiere Juan que compre María?
 what wants that buy
- c. *Qué Juan quiere que María compre?
 what wants that buy
- d. *Qué Juan quiere que compre María?
 what wants that buy
 'What does Juan want María to buy?'

Within our analysis, it must be that T of the embedded clause contains the usual EPP feature (i.e., no Q-feature). Notice that these facts parallel the behavior of T-to-C movement in English, which also occurs only in the matrix clause in examples like these. This is as we would expect, since T-to-C movement would have no reason to occur if T does not contain a Q-feature.

We now predict that when the *wh*-phrase has scope only over the embedded clause, as in an embedded question, the T of that embedded clause will have the Q feature. This is borne out by the fact that the word order in embedded questions parallels that of matrix questions:

- (61)a. *Quiero saber qué María compró.
 want-1ps know-INF what bought

- b. Quiero saber qué compró María.
 want-1ps know-INF what bought
 'I want to know what María bought.'

(61a) is out because there is nothing to attract the embedded subject *María* to the preverbal position. Q on T has already attracted the *wh*-phrase *qué* there (on its way to SPEC of C), and given (58), T may have no other feature which triggers overt movement, so *María* must remain in place, as in (61b). In English, of course, embedded questions do not display T-to-C movement, but as mentioned earlier, this may be because such movement is independently prohibited in this environment, so a well-formed output is possible only if the *wh*-phrase checks the Q feature on T on its way to SPEC of C. Notice that this does not violate (58), because it is not the Q feature on T which triggers overt movement of the *wh*-phrase. The difference between Spanish (61a) and English (62), then, is that the Q feature on the embedded T in Spanish triggers overt movement, with the consequence that there will be no feature to trigger overt movement of the subject, whereas in English, the Q feature on the embedded T does not trigger overt movement.

- (62) I want to know what Mary bought.

The embedded T does trigger overt movement of the subject *Mary*, and the Q feature on C triggers overt movement of the *wh*-phrase.

It appears that in relative clauses, *wh*-movement is triggered by a feature distinct from that of *wh*-questions (or perhaps occurs for reasons other than feature-checking altogether), so in this environment we do not expect to find a Q-feature on either C or T.³⁴ That this is correct is shown by the relative clause in (63).

- (63) el libro que María compró
 the book that bought
 'the book which María bought'

Without a Q-feature on T, the usual EPP feature is able to force *María* to move to a preverbal position. Once again, this is also an environment in which T-to-C movement does not occur in English, as we would expect.

Another question which arises is whether the Q-feature on T and the Q-feature on C always co-occur, as they have in all the examples we have seen so far. As we shall now see, the facts suggest that they do not. Specifically, it seems that the Q-feature on T is present only when true quantifier-variable binding is established within the clause, whereas the Q-feature on C is not sensitive to this. This may be seen in the fact that when the fronted *wh*-phrase contains quantifier-variable binding within it, the subject may be preverbal, as noted by Ordóñez (1997) (see also Rizzi 1997).

- (64) [A cuál de estas chicas] **tu hermana** había visitado en Sicilia?
 which of these girls your sister had visited in Sicily
 'Which of these girls had your sister visited in Sicily?'

This would appear to mean that the Q-feature is not present on T here. Another case of this comes from *wh*-questions with the equivalent of *why*. These have been widely observed to behave differently from other *wh*-questions in a number of languages, perhaps because they do not involve quantifier-variable binding of the usual sort (see Rizzi 1990, 1996). If this is true, then the fact that preverbal subjects are possible with *por qué* 'why' in Spanish is not a surprise:

- (65) Por qué **Juan** compró el libro.
 why bought the book
 'Why did Juan buy the book?'

Thus the data in (64) and (65) suggest that it is possible to have the Q-feature on C without simultaneously having it on T, because the Q-feature on T is used only for true quantifier-variable binding. We would now also expect that T-to-C movement would be prohibited in the English equivalents of these environments, but as the English translations of (64) and (65) show, this does not appear to be true. I have no explanation for this.

We are now at the point where we can reach conclusions about the relevance of fronted *wh*-focused phrases to the question of the existence of the EPP in Spanish. As we saw at the outset of this section, a naive view of the EPP would lead us to expect that a fronted *wh*-focused phrase would be followed by the subject in SPEC of T, but this is impossible in Spanish. We saw, however, that a closer look at T-to-C movement suggests that T has a feature that needs to be checked by the fronted *wh*-focused phrase, and that if T-to-C movement does not occur, then the phrase will need to check it in SPEC of T. This in turn gave us an explanation for the inability of the subject to be fronted in this environment: the Q-feature on T forces overt movement in Spanish, and a single head can only have one feature with this property. Thus the traditional EPP is inactive in this environment, but it is inactive for a principled reason and in a way which sits comfortably with the view that there is an EPP in Spanish. If this analysis is on the right track, we may then conclude that fronted *wh*-focused phrases do not provide evidence for the view that Spanish does not have an EPP.

4. CONCLUSIONS

We have now seen that there is substantial evidence in favor of the EPP in Spanish, and that the major evidence against it can be reanalyzed to be made consistent with the EPP in what appears to be an insightful way. The most obvious conclusion that we can draw from this is that the typology proposed in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998, in which only non-null subject languages observe the traditional EPP involving XP-movement to SPEC of T, does not look very

promising at this point. Spanish is clearly a null subject language, yet what we have seen here suggests that it does have an EPP requirement.

This is not a particularly welcome result, since it may lead us to a scenario in which languages differ arbitrarily as to whether they have the EPP. This could be avoided if we say that the EPP is universal, which would be conceptually more pleasing, but this idea runs into the empirical problem that Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) and McCloskey (1996b) provide what seems to be compelling evidence that Greek and Irish, respectively, do not have the EPP (at least, not in the traditional sense). Now Spanish may give us hope that what was once thought not to be an EPP language will turn out to be one upon closer inspection, but at present that is only a hope with regard to Greek and Irish.

It is tempting to say that Spanish shows that the EPP must be part of UG because the child would have no access to evidence for its existence, but this does not seem to be true. First, there is positive syntactic evidence for the EPP in the form of sentences like (22), repeated here as (66).

- (66) **A quién** crees que **Juan** le dio el premio?
 who think-2ps that him-DAT gave the prize
 'Who do you think that Juan gave the prize to?'

The fact that the subject of the embedded clause does not block extraction should inform the child that this DP is in SPEC of T and not somewhere higher within the left periphery, since in that case it would block extraction. It is quite reasonable to assume that sentences such as (66) would be accessible to the child.

Further evidence for the child may come from the fact that preverbal subjects are possible in discourse-neutral contexts, as we saw in (8), repeated here as (67).

- (67) ¿Qué pasó?
 what happened
 'What happened?'
- a. Juan me regaló el anillo en el parque.
 me give the ring in the park
 'Juan gave me the ring in the park.'
- b. #En el parque me regaló el anillo.
 in the park me gave the ring
 'In the park he gave me the ring.'

If we make the assumption that phrases within the CP layer always have some pragmatically marked value (or very high information demand, in the sense of Hornstein 1999), then the fact that (67a) is possible in this context should suggest to the child that the preverbal subject is not within the CP layer.³⁵ Since this leaves SPEC of T as the only other plausible option, this should inform the child that there is an EPP requirement.

Thus, although the results of this paper may encourage us to look more seriously at the possibility of the EPP being universal, they are not incompatible with the possibility that languages vary with respect to the presence or absence of the EPP.

NOTES

* Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the 29th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (University of Michigan), New Mexico State University, Arizona State University, the Workshop on Grammatical Functions in Transformational Grammar (University of Illinois), Universidad Nacional del Comahue, the 10th Colloquium on Generative Grammar (Universidad de Alcalá) and the 6th Encuentro Internacional de Lingüística en el Noroeste (Universidad de Sonora). I have benefited greatly from the comments and suggestions of the audiences at these places, and I am especially grateful to Mark Baker, Elena Benedicto, Heles Contreras, Lori Donath, Sam Epstein, Paula Kempchinsky, Pino Longobardi, Pascual Masullo, Cecilia Poletto, Dan Seely, Myriam Uribe-Ekeburria and the anonymous reviewers of this paper for their useful suggestions. Special thanks to Bill Davies and Stan Dubinsky for their many detailed comments on this paper and for their excellent work in organizing the earlier workshop upon which this volume is based.

1 For possible ways of addressing these problems without use of the EPP, see Martin 1999 and Epstein and Seely 1999.

2 I will not address here the question of which feature on T (out of Case, Person, Number, or perhaps others) is the one which has the EPP property.

3 The term "Spanish" is of course an abstraction, and perhaps not a very useful one in this case. The data that I will present here are representative of most of mainland Latin American Spanish and at least some of Spain, but there are some significant differences between these varieties of Spanish and the many others not discussed here. The data presented here are the result of work with a large number of informants, most (but not all) of whom are from northern Mexico.

4 I am using the term 'focus' to refer to constructions such as (6), in which the fronted phrase has no corresponding resumptive clitic and in which there is typically a contrastive reading. I will use the term 'topic' to refer to cases like (i), also known as 'Clitic Left-Dislocation'.

- (i) El libro, Juan lo compró.
the book it bought
'The book, John bought.'

Here there is an obligatory resumptive clitic when the fronted topic is a definite object DP. There is no contrastive reading and no requirement that the subject be postverbal.

Both (6) and (i) involve fronting of an object. When it is a subject which is fronted, the distinction between the focus and topic constructions becomes less obvious, since there is no resumptive clitic:

- (ii) Focus
JUAN compró el libro (no María).
'Juan bought the book (not María).'

- (iii) Topic
Juan, compró el libro.
'Juan, bought the book.'

Still, differing intonation patterns (roughly indicated by all-caps in (ii) and by a comma in (iii)) and pragmatic contexts suggest that the distinction is nonetheless valid in the case of subjects.

5 A'-fronted elements also seem to have a special intonation pattern different from preverbal subjects, but I will not explore this area here.

6 See Goodall 2001 for further discussion of the idea that the CP layer is restricted to phrases such as topics and operators, and see Kempchinsky 2001 for analysis of the nature of PP preposing in Spanish.

7 Creating true minimal pairs that test for reference possibilities of subjects vs. topics without introducing unwanted pragmatic interference is very difficult. I am grateful to Giuseppe Longobardi and Stan Dubinsky for help in improving these examples, though they are not responsible for any remaining errors.

8 Notice that pragmatically, it is much more plausible for *el director* in (a) and (b) to refer to the director of the film and not to Almodóvar, given that one ordinarily gives prizes to directors of films, not to the people portrayed. It is thus all the more interesting that there is a contrast between (a) and (b), despite the strong pragmatic preference for only one of the readings.

9 By "subject" here I of course mean "non-topicalized subject." (9a) gives an example of a subject which has been topicalized, which is clear from the fact that it appears to the left of a topicalized direct object. Cases in which a subject appears immediately to the left of the verb, however, will generally be ambiguous in terms of the linear string between a topicalized and a non-topicalized structure, although the intonation and the pragmatic context do differentiate the two. Unless otherwise noted in what follows, what I refer to as "preverbal subjects" will be non-topicalized.

10 As would be expected, (15) remains grammatical when *Juan* is topicalized, making the sentence more parallel to (14):

- (i) A Juan, nadie lo ha visto.

11 Ordóñez 1997 and Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998 are two recent attempts to explain this contrast while maintaining the idea that topics and preverbal subjects occupy the same position. Ordóñez suggests that the ungrammaticality of cases like (14) is due to an incompatibility between the accusative clitic and the negative quantifier. But this type of explanation seems ad hoc and un insightful compared to Rizzi's (1997) proposal that quantifiers must bind a variable and that clitics don't count as variables. Notice that this phenomenon pertains not just to negative quantifiers:

- (i) *Algo, lo dijiste.
'Something, you said it.'

In addition, it is bare quantifiers that resist topicalization, not negative expressions in general:

- (ii) Ninguna de esas cosas, las tienes tú.
'None of those things, you have them.'

If (14) is out because of an incompatibility between the negative quantifier and the accusative clitic, it is not clear why (i) is not out also. In Rizzi's (1997) account, on the other hand, (ii) is allowed because *ninguna* 'none' is able to bind a variable within the topic phrase.

Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) attempt to show that bare quantifiers are possible with a clitic when they are specific. This suggests that specific bare quantifiers don't bind variables, so they require a resumptive clitic. But this doesn't address the fact that in Spanish the same quantifiers with apparently the same interpretation show a contrast with respect to topic vs. subject position, as we have seen. It appears that the topic position never allows binding of a variable, while the subject position does.

12 There is some disagreement in the literature about the grammaticality of sentences like (21). Masullo (1992) finds them ungrammatical, while Ordóñez reports that they are grammatical. My own informants report that (21) is seriously degraded (in contrast to (22), which is perfect), so I will proceed on the assumption that (21) is in fact bad.

¹³ Overt subjects are possible in infinitival clauses in some contexts in standard Spanish, but they are generally restricted to being postverbal (see Hernanz (1999) for an overview).

¹⁴ The assumption that fronted *wh*-phrases and focused phrases occupy the same position works well as a first approximation and I will continue to adopt it here, but it may not hold up under closer examination. Barbosa (1999), for instance, presents a number of arguments from Italian (based on data from Rizzi 1997) that they occupy distinct positions. First, focused phrases can be followed by a topic, as in (i), but *wh*-phrases cannot, as in (ii):

- (i) OUESTO a Gianni gli dovrete dire.
'THIS to Gianni we should say.'
- (ii) *Che cosa a Gianni gli dovremmo dire?
'What to Gianni should we say?'

Second, a focused phrase can be followed by a subject, as in (iii), but a *wh*-phrase cannot, as in (iv).

- (iii) QUESTO Gianni ha detto (non quello che pensavi).
'THIS Gianni said (not what you thought).'
- (iv) *Che cosa Gianni ha detto?
'What has Gianni said?'

Third, a focused phrase may marginally be followed by a *wh*-phrase in embedded clauses, as in (v).

- (v) ?Mi domando A GIANNI che cosa abbiano detto (non a Piero).
'I wonder TO GIANNI what they said (not to Piero).'

In addition, Lipták (2000) claims that in Hungarian, a focused phrase is possible in certain syntactic environments where a *wh*-phrase is not, suggesting that they occupy distinct positions. None of these facts from Italian and Hungarian appears to hold in Spanish, but focused phrases and *wh*-phrases do display differing behavior with regard to negation that may perhaps be attributable to distinct positions. As is well known, postverbal negative expressions generally require the presence of *no* to the left of the verb, while preverbal negative expressions prohibit it:

- (vi)a. *(No) ha venido nadie.
b. Nadie (*no) ha venido.
'No one has come.'

However, when a negative object undergoes *wh*-movement, *no* is still required, but when it is focused, *no* is prohibited:

- (vii) [A ninguno de cuáles estudiantes] *(no) has visto?
'Which students haven't you seen any of?'
- (viii) A NINGUNO (*no) has visto.
'NO ONE have you seen.'

I won't attempt an analysis of this here, but it is conceivable that this contrast between (vii) and (viii) might be due to different positions for focused phrases and *wh*-phrases.

¹⁵ (27) is ungrammatical under a neutral reading. As we would expect, though, it improves when *tu traducción* 'your translation' is focused, with appropriate intonation and a contrastive reading (parallel to (26)), since then the focused phrase is in SPEC of FOC^o, allowing for extraction.

¹⁶ The fact that (32) is perfect with a resumptive object clitic in the adjunct clause, as in (i).

- (i) Estos libros fueron tirados [sin haberlos leído].
'These books were thrown out [without having read them].'

shows that the problem with (32) does not involve control of the PRO subject of the adjunct clause.

¹⁷ See Goodall 1993 for additional discussion of this point.

¹⁸ Though I won't explore this option further here, the evidence we have examined is perhaps also consistent with the idea that the preverbal subject is lower than fronted topics, focused phrases, and *wh*-phrases but still higher than SPEC of T, as is argued for Italian by Poletto (2000). Also worthy of further exploration are the possible implications for the analysis presented here of the idea that there are two distinct subject positions within the inflectional layer (see McCloskey 1997 for an overview and Cardinaletti 1997 for arguments from Romance).

¹⁹ One would then predict that like Spanish, Chinese would allow postverbal subjects without a definiteness effect. This prediction cannot be tested with unergative clauses, since in this case postverbal subjects are not allowed (perhaps because the verb does not raise high enough). With unaccusative clauses, on the other hand, postverbal subjects are possible, and a definiteness effect is observed:

- (i) Lai le yige ren.
come ASP one man
'A man came.'
- (ii) *Lai le tamen.
come ASP they
'They came.'

This is surprising if Chinese allows null adverbials, because such an adverbial should be a possible subject for (i). Li suggests that these facts show that the definiteness effect should not be derived from properties of the expletive itself, under the assumption that the subject of (ii) is not necessarily an expletive.

²⁰ As an anonymous reviewer points out, the more complex locatives *somewhere*, *nowhere*, *anywhere*, and *elsewhere* are able to occupy DP argument positions, as is the temporal *now*. This may be seen in cases such as the following:

- (i) I don't think anywhere had depressed me more, or made me want to live less.
Guardian, Nov. 24, 2000 (p. 8, col. 6)
- (ii) If we have to go out, find somewhere near here that's nice and old.
Independent, Weekend Review, Sept. 30, 2000 (p. 20, col. 3)
- (iii) Now appears to be the time to buy your package holiday for next summer.
Times, Oct. 21, 2000 (Travel p. 4, col. 1)

At least with regard to the locatives, this is not surprising, since they resemble DP's in their internal structure.

²¹ There is evidence that temporal expressions also display some DP properties. Eguren (1999) shows, for instance, that temporals like *hoy* 'today' and *mañana* 'tomorrow' can be modified by temporal nominals such as days of the week and suggests that this is because of the nominal character of *hoy* and *mañana*:

- (i) hoy lunes
today Monday
- (ii) mañana domingo
tomorrow Sunday

It is interesting to note that this is impossible in English without a pause between the two words. In addition, Eguren shows that many temporal and locative expressions can take the diminutive suffix *-ito*, which is otherwise limited to nouns and adjectives:

- (iii) ahorita 'now'
ayercito 'yesterday'
aquicito 'here'

There is extensive dialectal variation with regard to this phenomenon, but most dialects seem to allow at least a few of these forms (see Eguren 1999 for a larger list).

²² The concept of "informational demand" clearly deserves a fuller exploration than what I can provide here. Hornstein's basic idea, however, is that topic and focus positions are canonical examples of positions of high informational demand, while subject and object positions in a language like English are canonical examples of positions of no informational demand. What I am suggesting here is that the preverbal subject position in Spanish is of an intermediate status, with less informational demand than a topic but more than an English subject.

²³ This may not be true for all dialects, however. See Masullo 1992 and Baković 1998 for examples of dialects in which the pattern in (47) does not hold for all types of *wh*-words.

²⁴ For further discussion on the issue of T-to-C movement in Spanish and Romance, see Ordóñez 1997 and Barbosa 1999.

²⁵ Groos and Bok-Bennema (1986) and Zubizarreta (1988) pursue approaches in which the fronted *wh*-focused phrase competes for the same position with the preverbal subject. These approaches are consistent with the idea that Spanish lacks T-to-C movement and bear some resemblance to the analysis to be proposed below. However, we have seen evidence that the preverbal subject is not in the same position as the fronted *wh*-focused phrase, so we cannot maintain these approaches without modification.

²⁶ I will use "Q" as the feature label, in an attempt to be neutral between *wh*-phrases and focused phrases. As will be discussed below, it is probably an oversimplification to say that C and T have the same feature in any event, but I will maintain this oversimplification here for convenience.

²⁷ I am not using a feature on C here to motivate movement of T, because I just want T to move to C when it needs to in order to yield convergence. There is at present very little consensus on how head movement of this type works, or even if it exists, but it is not implausible that it is not motivated by the type of features that drive phrasal movement. See Chomsky 1999, Mahajan 2000, and Pesetsky and Torrego 2001 for a range of recent work on this topic.

²⁸ Notice that (54a) forces us to assume that subject *wh*-phrases move to SPEC of C (as in (53a)), yielding an instance of "vacuous movement." See Campos 1997 for arguments in favor of such an analysis from Spanish (and Grimshaw 1997 for a recent analysis which does not make use of this assumption).

²⁹ As mentioned in footnote 27, it may be that head movement is fundamentally different from phrasal movement and is thus not treated the same way by economy conditions.

³⁰ This follows in spirit the analysis that I proposed in Goodall 1993.

³¹ This may follow from the principle that a specific property takes precedence over a more general one. The phi-features are more general in the sense that they are present in all tensed clauses, whereas the Q-feature is only a property of a few specific types of clauses.

³² Since the Q-feature is what triggers movement of the *wh*-phrase to SPEC of T, this would seem to be an instance of A'-movement. Diesing (1990), I believe, was the first to propose that SPEC of T may be a possible landing site for A'-movement (see also Goodall 1992 and 1993).

³³ In some dialects this does not seem to be true, however. See Torrego 1982 and Baković 1998 for discussion.

³⁴ See, for example, the discussion in Rizzi 1997 showing that relative operators appear in SPEC of Force, in contrast to the SPEC of Focus position of *wh*-phrases in questions.

³⁵ This issue merits further exploration. As Mark Baker points out to me, there are languages (Mohawk, for example) in which there is good evidence that arguments that have undergone A'-movement to the left periphery do not seem to have any special informational demand. This might then mean that the child could not conclude from the information content of preverbal subjects that they must be in SPEC of T in Spanish.