

NOTES ON SESSION 14 (02.02.2009)

Some corrections: In the preceding Notes, I thought it was deducible that the **Hierarchy of Projections** would be there all along for Kayne since he would have a rigid **Spec-Head-Comp** type of structure. (i) It is not deducible in any rigid sense. (ii) Even the notion of **Spec-Head-Comp** is ill-formed in the sense that for Kayne, there is only Adjunction and no bar-levels whatsoever. So you would actually have to say that there is always a fully projected XP to which something is adjoined.

As to my German examples of "heavy NP shift": They are actually no real examples of this. They are just "Scrambling" examples for ordinary German ditransitive constructions.

Now on with Chomsky (1994) Chapter 5 – *Properties of the Transformational Component*. As I see things, we ran into some problems with some of his principles. Those are (12), (14) and (21):

(12) Morphology gives no output (so the derivation crashes) if presented with an element that is not an X^0 .

(14) A chain is uniform with regard to phrase structure status.

(21) At LF, X^0 is submitted to independent word-interpretation processes WI.

As to (12) it would mean that the morphological component can only deal with or "read", if you will, X^{min} or terminals. After a complete derivation, these terminals are handed over by C_{HL} to morphology.¹

As far as I understand, (14) means that the moved elements and the traces/copies left thereby have to be of the same status. If, for example, a head (X^0) that projects moves, then it should also be of projecting nature after movement/adjunction. It just now come to my mind that the moved element never can project - neither in adjunction nor in substitution. So the problem with that is that (14) can be violated in such trivial cases as V-to-I/T raising. Why is this so? A quote:

¹ Maybe not a complete derivation but some part of it. This is difficult to pin down.

But suppose t is non-maximal as in the case of V-raising to INFL or to V. Then under a natural (though not necessary) interpretation, (14) is violated; CH is not a legitimate object at LF, and the derivation will crash. (BPS: 408-9)

In a Larsonian shell, what is Chomsky's V will become ν . The problem would be that the trace is of a different status than the moved V. In V-to-I/T movement, this is also so: t^{min} is the trace of V^{max} (since V does not project any more). This would be an infringement of (14). The solution to this seems to be a hedge, namely (21). WI can deal with this exception to (14):

WI is something like a covert analogue of Morphology, except that we expect it to be compositional, unlike Morphology, on the assumption that the $N \rightarrow \text{LF}$ mapping is uniform throughout. (BPS: 409)

As to the independent WI, we did not really know what this could be in detail. Does it mean that the head X^0 is interpreted at WI prior to movement to, say, INFL? Does it mean that LF can deal with the V+INFL complex and that WI can only deal with the V as such, somehow maybe extracting "core meanings"? How could WI be moulded into our Y-model of C_{HL} , PF and LF – what is its connection to the morphological component? Another point was the notion of compositionality entertained by Chomsky. What does he mean by saying, or implying, that morphology is not compositional? In a normal Suppletion such as *go* \rightarrow *went* \rightarrow *gone*, it looks reasonable to assume that morphology is not compositional. But, as far as I remember, in compounding processes such compositionality should not hold?²

Intermediate trace (t') deletions

Leaving WI-LF connective matters aside, one further problem was posed by (Non-)Operator-Variable constructions. (22) on page 410 would look something like in the following:

² Note that it is the many uses of the notion of compositionality that is problematic. Even in not strictly compositional compounding processes, there at least seems to be a *channel of compositionally valid interpretation*.

(22) [_{OP} which pictures of John's brother] did he expect that [~~<which pictures of John's brother>~~' [you would buy <which pictures of John's brother>]]

As to (22), one of the unclear points was why does *t'* occupy the place it does? I would like to ask why OP cannot move all the way up to where it is at PF? Anyway: What is important here is that only OP and the "lowest" *t* are of importance. The intermediate trace/copy can thus be erased – so only the endpoints of the CH are relevant here.

Chomsky's example (27) is odd:

(27) * John is illegal [_{IP} <John>₂ [_{IP} <John>₁ to leave]]

It is not clear why there is a second IP. It is unlikely that it is a mere typing or printing error.

Why at all is that important? What does Chomsky want to show us here? As far as I understood it, intermediate trace deletion is only possible if you have a complete OP (an Operator-Variable construction). If you only have a proper name such as *John*, then no intermediate *t* deletion is possible. Be that as it may, on the very same page (411), Chomsky says that reconstruction should be abandoned favouring something like copy deletion, which we implicitly knew all along, it being the more "modern" view.