

NOTES ON SESSION 7 (08.12.2008)**ERRATA:**

(1) The former Notes on *Binding* said Binding was a phenomenon that held exclusively at DS. This is only partially correct, since nobody really knows where Binding holds. As Michael said: Binding was supposed to hold at SS and not at DS. Today, it seems to be assumed that *Binding holds throughout the derivation*.

(2) In the following sentence I simply confused LF *wh*-Movement and overt *wh*-Phrase Movement.

* [TP John_i wondered [_{complex operator} which_k + [which woman]_j] [TP t_j liked [t_k pictures of himself_i]]]]

Actually, the representation in Hornstein et al. is correct and the bracketing is alright.

So now on to the core text – leaving “streamlined” (you are right, Andreas) secondary literature aside for a moment. Since Michael’s Notes are quite good on this, I can restrict myself here to some of the questions raised in the Session.

What is (26) (b)?

(26) (b) ?? There seems to a strange man that it is raining outside.

The grammaticality of this sentence is at least questionable. Still, this is a convergent derivation. Chomsky says: “The derivation thus converges as semigibberish” (MPLT: 33). In David Adger’s *Core Syntax*, the outputs of all the relevant syntactic operations that are at work during a syntactic derivation were at least arranged in such a way as to not produce gibberish, not even semigibberish. Anyway, Adger is ten years after and one should not forget that Chomsky’s article looks into the future and that many of his speculative moves are to be justified by

those who do the detailed elaboration – us, maybe. Chomsky then goes on in that he says: “Derivations are driven by the narrow mechanical requirement of feature checking only, not by a ‘search for intelligibility’ or the like” (MPLT: 33). The economy principles are nicely captured in Michael’s handout (see: *Last Resort*, *Procrastinate* and *Greed*).

Logical Structure and LF Reconstruction Phenomena

Generally speaking, one of the basic problems for any LF lies in the fact that it has to “mirror” the logical reconstruction of a given syntactic derivation. Chomsky uses the exemplary sentence in (1):

(1) (Guess) [[_{wh-} in which house] John lived t]

The relevant logical structure is:

(2) (a) [which x, x a house] John lived [in x]
(answer: *The old one.*)

(b) [which x] John lived [in [x house]]
(answer: *That (house).*)

In (2) (a), according to Chomsky, the answer can be *The old one.* and in (b) the answer can be *That (house)*. In *The old one.*, the DP variable ranges over houses¹ and in *That (house)*., the D ranges over entities². In (2) (a), the DP variable is more restrictive in some sense in that it restricts the *Scope* of the x in the PP. In (2) (b), however, the variable in D is not so restrictive and thus the *Scope* of the x in the PP must be limited *within* the PP (by *house*).

If we now only take a look at the *wh*-Phrase exclusively, how it looks at the logical structure and how it looks at LF, then it should look like the following at LF:

(3) (a) [which house] [_{wh-} in (_{copy} which house)]

(b) [which] [_{wh-} in [(_{copy} which) house]]

On the very same page, Chomsky explicitly assumes the copy theory of movement, but he still handles the phenomena using the item normally

¹ Or what one could call “the set of all houses” – I think this is the correct paraphrase.

² This means “the set of all entities” – a large range indeed.

representing traces (*t*) – it is not clear *why* he does so. I copied the relevant element and even told the bracket that I did.³ Be that as it may, the relevant logical structure is provided in (4):

- (4) (a) [which *x*, *x* a house] [in *x*]
 (b) [which *x*] [in [*x* house]]

The aim of all this is to eliminate the separate operation of “reconstruction” as it was conceived of in GB.

One more remark on traces: On p. 38 (ex. 37-8) Chomsky again assumes copy to take place, but in (38), (*t*) is still used. As Andreas remarked, (38) should read something like (5):

- (5) (a)
 John wondered [[which picture of himself] [_{wh-} (_{copy} which picture of himself)]] [Bill saw [which picture of himself] [_{wh-} (_{copy} which picture of himself)]]
 (b)
 John wondered [[which [_{wh-} (_{copy} which) picture of himself]] [Bill saw [which [_{wh-} (_{copy} which) picture of himself]]]

As in (5) (a), you can either copy the whole *wh*-Phrase, that’s what Michael I think metaphorically called “**semantic pied-piping**”, or you can copy the *wh*-Element exclusively. If you go the “**semantic pied piping way**”, then the interpretation given by Chomsky in (39) (a) p. 38 will be the relevant one; if you down-size the restrictor (as in (5) (b)), then the reflexive will be co-referential with *Bill*. In a daring attempt to make (39) clearer I have a very simple question: In a more streamlined version of the Chomsky (1993) text (Hornstein et al.), at a later point all the “redundant”, so to speak, elements are crossed out so that only one relevant copy remains. How could this be implemented in that Chomsky example (here (5))? How could we, by the operation “**cross out**” get

³ My humoresque interjections still need to be worked on.

even closer to the relevant logical structure at hand given in Chomsky (39)? He simply says that we **interpret** the given LF via (39). Could we find a relevant crossing mechanism?

Other important and remaining questions to me seem to be:

- The **Preference Principle** and its application in constructions containing reciprocals.
- **Anaphor Movement.**
- **Idiom interpretation at LF.** Idiom reading beats literal meaning?

From my very narrow perspective, these should be some of the more central points still to deal with – and then 1993 should be done.