Locative Inversion and EPP

Yong-Ha Kim
(Taegu University)
kyocheon@netsgo.com

1. Introduction

⊙ From the beginning of the minimalist program, many researchers have sought the key to the Extended Projection Principle. It was treated as the satisfaction of the strong feature checking of T or Agr (Chomsky 1993, 1995), as the universal requirement of thematization of the subject, or as a side effect of Case feature checking (Martin 1999). On the other hand, Collins (1997) claims that the EPP simply requires that some material occupy the position of Spec-T. On the way of his argumentation, he shows that *Locative Inversion* (henceforth *LI*) and *Quatotive Inversion* are representative cases of the EPP satisfaction. Since then, *LI* has been in the center of debate concerning the nature of the EPP. In this paper, we will show that *LI* is driven by defective feature checking/Agree not for the mere EPP satisfaction. Thus, the approach we take in this paper supports the view that the EPP is not an independent requirement but is closely related to feature checking/Agree.

2. Problems with the the EPP in the phonological component

⊙ Phonological EPP: EPP requires some material to occupy Spec-T in the phonological component. (cf. Jang 1997, Kim 2001, Lee 2001)
⊙ Non-argument PPs cannot undergo *LI*.

(1) a. Down the hill rolls John.
   b. *From the top of the hill rolls John down.
(2) a. Into the hole jumped the rabbit.
   b. *Into the hole excreted the rabbit.

⊙ It is not the case that any material can satisfy the phonological EPP requirement.

(3) *Quickly rolls John down the hill.

⊙ Only limited classes of verbs permit *LI*.

(4) a. On the floor lies a big man.
    b. *On the shelf is put a book.

⊙ It is necessary to conclude that every *LI* cannot be attributed to a requirement in the phonological component. Thus, it seems that some derivational consideration is required in explaining *LI* constructions.

3. Issues

3.1. What drives *LI*?

⊙ If *LI* occurs at narrow syntax, which feature is responsible for it?

◆ Chomsky (1998): (Suppose) quirky Case is inherent Case with an additional structural Case feature.

⊙ Suppose that locative PPs that undergo LI have quirky Case with an additional structural Case feature. Then, what happens? Suppose further that the locative PPs have a defective ϕ-set. Then, the probe features of T continue to seek the full ϕ-set of the real subject.

3.2. Argument Structure and Equi-distance

⊙ In Collins's (1997) analysis, the argument structure of *LI* constructions are roughly as follows.

(5) [Subj V PP_{loc}]

◆ Collins (1997) argues that the subject and the locative PP, as in the argument structure of (5), are equi-distant from a higher probe/attractor because they are in the

182

same minimal domain.

◆ Hiraiwa (2000) claims that equi-distance is not only unnecessary but eliminable.

⊙ Following Ura (1996), let's suppose that the locative PP is higher than the subject. Further suppose, following Hiraiwa (2000), that equi-distance is not applicable. *LI* is driven by feature checking/Agree. This means that the argument structure of *LI* constructions are different from that of normal constructions.

(6) a. 어머니께 이 옷이 잘 어울리신다.
    b. *이 옷이 어머니께 잘 어울리신다.

3.3. Default T and Multiple Agree

(7) a. Henni   voru   genfnar   bækurnar.
       her(DAT)   were(3.PL) given   books(NOM.PL)
       "She was given the books."
    b. Stelpunum   var   hjálpað
       the girls(DAT) was(3.SG)   helped(SG)

(8) a. *?There seem to Mary to be men in the room.
    b. There seems to Mary to be men in the room.

⊙ The data in (7)-(8) suggest that some kind of default T strategy is available in English as well as Icelandic. Furthermore, (8b) shows that the experiencer is active, and interferes in the feature Agree between matrix T and the associate. As Chomsky (1998) suggests, if *there* has only the defective φ-feature [3rd person], (8b) can be analyzed as a result of multiple Agree. This analysis can provide an answer to the question: Why the EPP feature of T in *LI* can be satisfied the locative PP, while the experiencer argument such as *to me* in (9) cannot satisfy the EPP feature of matrix T.

(9) a. *To me seems that Tom read the book.
    b. It seems to me that Tom read the book.

4. Conclusion