

**NOTES ON SESSION 12 (19.01.2009)**

Since we are still stuck with Kayne (1994), and since Benni's and Andreas's handouts really seem to capture the essential points about this 1994-monograph, and since we did not really progress further through Chomsky (1994), I here can only very summarily point out some of the major issues we were talking about.

To be frank and to the point, to me Kayne's attempt to establish a rigid and formal relation between the vertical and horizontal dimensions in Syntax seems appealing. Why? Because it is done using strictest rules of, e.g., antisymmetric c-command and domination. The striking thing about them is that they are arranged in such a way as to allow the supposedly correct ordering of terminals in a representation. As Andreas has shown quite convincingly, as soon as an Adjunction operation is going on, an amended version of c-command is necessary: the notion of element exclusion (and thus inclusion) is included into a further specification of c-command. This amendment neatly rules out a c-command relation in (3), p. 4. The amended c-command would sound like the following (for graph (3)):

***L c-commands Q iff L and Q are categories and no segment of L dominates Q (=exclusion) and every category that dominates L dominates Q.***

But in (3), there is one segment, call it  $L_2$  that dominates Q and so no c-command in the sense of Kayne is present. And if no c-command is present, then the linear order  $\langle L, Q \rangle$  is prohibited. A problem however arises if we want to have a multiple adjunction structure. In these structures, you would have a linear contradiction. Solution: no multiple adjunction.

Briefly, this is how far we got through Andreas's handout. Some questions arose:

(1) Is Kayne's approach to Syntax representational or derivational? Andreas said that you could not really group him into neither of the views.

(2) Could a further improvement of the c-command relation account for multiple Adjunction processes? How could such an improvement look like? I cannot exactly remember what some of the solutions were,

but as far as I recollect, Benni suggested to have c-command definitions via sisterhood. Andreas wanted to recur to "first node above" phrases – this reminded me of the terminological distinction between immediate and non-immediate dominance or something along these lines. Personally, I do not know how to give an amended c-command account for, say, three-segment categories.

**Chomsky and Kayne**

Of absolute interest to us should be Chapter 6 of BPS, named "Order". It is really an attempt to put BPS and the LCA together. Jumping ahead a bit, what to me seems to be the most critical thing is the following:

"We take LCA to be a principle of the phonological component that applies to the output of Morphology, optionally ignoring or deleting traces" (BPS: 420).

Now, from what I gather from, e.g. Barrie (2004), the search for a unification of LCA and BPS has long been going on. Check also the literature given there.<sup>1</sup> Maybe some interesting thing for those who want to delve deeper into the topic.

Next session, we should be finishing Andreas's handout and Chapter 5 of BPS.

<sup>1</sup> Barrie, Michael (2004): "On Unifying Antisymmetry and Bare Phrase Structure". In: NELS 35.