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## Up until now

- CP is a phase
- Evidence from Numeration Chunking required for Merge over Move
- Spell-out involves adding CP to a new Numeration


## CP in the numeration



Syntactic operation
Merge
Move

## Not everything is frozen

- PIC needed, if not for anything else than for CP to be Cselected by higher functional heads.
- Head C and Spec CP are available for subsequent syntactic computations.
- Complement of C is not


## What is sent to PF (S-M)



- C and Spec-C need to be accessible to further computation that affects PF and LF
- Complement of $C$ is 'frozen' PF wise


## PIC provides escape hatch for cyclic move

- Spec CP is available for movement out of CP that does not terminate at CP but moves up further
- Note there is an inherent 'look ahead' in such an approach
- We need to have a C with EPP/P features a priori before we have access to the terminal $C$ that actually triggers move


## Phases and PIC force cyclicly

One Numeration
[ ${ }_{\mathrm{CP}}$ What do $\left[_{\mathrm{TP}}\right.$ you think $\quad\left[\begin{array}{l}\mathrm{CP}\end{array}\left[_{\mathrm{TP}} \quad\right.\right.$ Bill loves what $\left.\left.\left.\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}\right]\right]\right]$


Two Numerations
$\left.\left.\left[\begin{array}{ll}\text { CP } & \text { what }_{\mathrm{i}}\left[\begin{array}{c}\text { TP }\end{array} \quad \text { Bill loves what }\right.\end{array}\right]\right]\right]$ Build CP


Bill loves what ${ }_{i}$ ]]]]

Add CP to new Numeration - making CP edge accessible

## Evidence for cyclic move

- CP cyclic movement is supported by
- Stranding effects - bits and pieces of moved wh are left behind in intermediate CP's
- Agreement at CP - wh moves via CP and triggers C-Wh agreement
- Languages with dedicated CP’s for movement are sensitive to cyclic move
- V2 is triggered in cyclic movement
- Inversion phenomena in embedded CP's


## Wh All stranding

- Stranded all in West Ulster English (James McCloskey. 2001. Quantifier float and wh-movement in an Irish English. Linguistic Inquiry 31:57-84.)
- a. What all did he say (that) he wanted?
- b. What did he say (that) he wanted all?
- c. What did he say all (that) he wanted?
- a. Where do you think all they'll want to visit?
- b. Who did Frank tell you all that they were after?
- c. What do they claim all (that) we did?


## Irish all stranded at intermediate position

- The data is argued to show that 'all' is left behind in an intermediate position of movement
- All does not need to check an wh feature
- Whatever P feature intermediate C had was checked via wh movement, so was the EPP
- Wh expression must raise further to license wh feature


## Agreement in CP

- K-u Isaa foog [CP k-u a bëgg]? agr-c Isaa think agr-c 2sg love 'Who does Isaa think you love?'
- F-u Isaa wax ne [CP f-u-ma jàng-e taalif $y$-a]? agr-c Isaa say frc agr-c-1sg read-loc poem def 'Where did Isaa say that I read the poems?'
- (Torrence 2012:22) Wolof phi agreement between C and moved wh phrase as far as class.
- Agreement in lower C suggests a local configuration between C and WH - this is called parasitic agreement.


## 2 CP in Irish

- Creidim [CP gu-r inis sé bréag]. believe.1sgc.dcl-past tell he lie 'I believe that he told a lie.'
- an fhilíocht [CP a chum. sí__] the poetry. c.ext composed she 'the poetry that she composed'
- There two types of C in Irish, one via which an XP has moved, and one which has not (McCloskey 2002:185186)


## Cyclic movement trigger Extraction trace

- an t-ainm [CP a hinnseadh dúinn [CP a bhí ___ ar an áit]] the name. c.ext was-told. to-us. c.ext was on the place 'the name that we were told was on the place'
- (McCloskey 2002:185)
- Wh movement triggers a movement type C in embedded Cps


## V2 effects

- Wen sagt Johan [CP__sehe er___]?
who. acc says Johan see.sbj he 'Who does Johan say that he is seeing?'
- *Wen sagt Johan [CP er sehe__]? who.acc says Johan he see.sbj
'Who does Johan say that he is seeing?'
- German has V2 effects (German; Thiersch 1978:135)


## V2 effects in cyclic move Coppe Von Urk (2020)

- In welche Schule sagte Leo [CP ___ sei er gegangen]? to which school said Leo is.sbj he went 'To which school did Leo say he went?'
- *In welche Schule sagte Leo [CP er sei gegangen] to which school said Leo he is.sbj went 'To which school did Leo say he went?'


## Inversion in Belfast English

- Who did John hope [CP would he see $\square$
- What did Mary claim [CP did they steal $\square$
- Irish fires inversion in embedded CP (Belfast English; Henry 1995:109)


## CP spell out predicts that There should be C-I and SM effects

- CP's are propositions - semantic units
- CP's are targets of binding, quantifier scope resolution
- Phonological processes, such as ellipsis are CP sensitive


## Sluicing

- Sluicing elision of TP
- I met someone but I do not who lmet
- Susan though that John met someone but I do not know who Susan though that John met
- Ellipsis targets complement of C but spares its Spec.
- Ellipsis is Suppression of PF


## Reconstruction and Binding

- We also observe reconstruction effect that are CP sensitive
- Binding conditions apply at intermediate positions
- Scope interpreted at intermediate positions


## QR

- There needs to be a component of syntactic computation that has no effect on PF:
- Some boy read every book
- One book read every book
- For every book there was a boy who read it
- Quantifier Raising (here movement of every above some) derives second meaning
- QR has no effect on word order
- Need for syntactic computation after word order is established


## Binding/reconstruction effects

- Reconstruction in Wh movement
- Condition A - reconstruction has to be below Sam above Kim
- Which picture of herself1/2 did you tell Sam1 $\downarrow$ [Kim2 likes_]?


## Binding combined with scope

- Relative clause does not need to be interpreted in base position:
- [DP Which argument that John ${ }_{i}$ made] did hei believe?
- Condition C - wh expression has to reconstruct to t' for 'every student' >he, and no violation of Condition C
- [Which (of the) paper(s) that he1 gave to Ms. Brown2] did every student1 hope [CP t' that she2 will read t?]
- *[Which (of the) paper(s) that he1 gave to Ms. Brown2] did she2 hope [CP t' that every student1 will revise t? ]
- (Fox 1999: 173, citing Lebeaux 1990, Citko 2014, van Urk 2020)


## CP phase

- Shows overt syntactic evidence of phase
- Binding/ reconstruction evidence of phase at C-I
- Ellipsis evidence of phase at S-M


## Spell out~transfer

- For PIC to operate for such operations like Move, we only need to have spell out to S-M since Move changes word order
- How about 'covert' operations, like Agree or covert move argued to be responsible for English multiple wh-move or Japanese Wh move
- Is Move blocked at the same time as covert operations?


## The nature of covert operations crucial

- We can have simultaneous C-I and S-M Transfer if we assume that covert movement is copies spelled out in situ (movement has no PF effect)
- This predicts that covert movement is not different from overt i.e same island sensitivity in covert phrasal movement
- That is problematic


## Islands in wh and QR QR behaves like wh

- Coordinate Structure Constraint: movement must not originate from only one conjunct.
- (2) *Which beer did someone [ate fries and drink t] after leaving class?
- Someone [ate fries and drank every beer] after leaving class
- *every>someone no wide scope for every beer there was a student who drank it after class


## Islands in WH and QR QR does not behave like wh

- subject are islands for wh movement (Subject Island Constraint).
- *What country does [someone in t] adores Chomsky?
- [Someone in every country] adores Chomsky.
- every> someone For every country, there is someone who adores Chomsky


## Intervention effects

- German: intervention above wh-in-situ, rescued by scrambling
- Wer hat Luise wo angetroffen? who has Luise where met 'Who met Luise where'?
- *Wer hat niemanden wo angetroffen?
who has no one where met
- Wer hat wo niemanden angetroffen?
who has where no one met
'Who didn't meet anybody where'?
- Covert move - pair list reading. John in Boston, Mary in Syracuse, etc (Beck 1996)
- Covert wh move does not alleviate intervention effects, which are arguably not PF effects.
- Covert and overt wh are not identical.


## Maybe PF has an impact

- Fox \& Pesetsky 2005, linearization (via C-command a la Kayne 1995) at Phase edge
- wh>C1
- C2>C1
- wh>C2->wh>C1
- Richards 2011 Wh-movement is PF driven (Prosodic locality between C and WH)
- Japanese vs English


## PF deletion impacts Islands

- Well known facts, sluicing alleviates islands
- They hired a linguist who spoke some dialect but I do not know which dialect [they hired a linguist who spoke]
- Island alleviation maybe associated with
- Linearization wh does not need to move because of PF deletion
- Deletion of intermediate copies alleviates (Fox and Lasnik 2001) - but then islands are not derivational but representational


## VP Phases

- vP's seem to have phase properties
- PF - vP ellipsis
- Mary will buy groceries on Monday and Bob will too buy groceries on Monday


## vP cyclic movement Effects (via von Urk 2020)

- Defaka -kè appears on all intermediate verbs (Bennett et al. 2012:294):
- Bruce ndò Bòmá jírí-kè [CP__ á ésé-mà] Bruce foc Boma. know-ext her see-nfut 'It is Bruce that Boma knows saw her.'
- áyá jíkà ndò Bòmá ì bíè-kè [CP ì ísò___ sónó-mà-kè] new house foc Boma I ask-ext I iso buy-nfut-ext 'It is a new house that Boma asked me if l'm going to buy.'
- First example subject long distance extraction, Second non subject wh.
- Note no ke in subordinate vP in Su extraction since that is where Su originates.


## Subject in Spec-v Does not trigger ke

- Ke- does not show up in simple clause Su raising to T
- But in simple clause non su extraction out of vP triggers ke
- ì kò Bòmá ésé-kà-rè Ifoc.sbj Boma. see-fut-neg 'It is me that will not see Boma.'
- tárì ndo Àmànyà ómgbìnyà sónò àmà-kè___ kílá !té? who foc Amaya shirt buy. give-ext market $p$ 'Who did Amaya buy a shirt for at the market?'


## Phase edge can be filled Via Merge

- External arguments are assumed to be Merged in Spec-v
- Extraction of non-subjects out of vP requires multiple Specifiers since even after subject raises to Spec-T it leaves a copy
- An EPP/P feature on a phase head can license an additional Spec
- English v has multiple Spec's
- But C cannot since then we would have multiple wh like in Slavic
- Komu co Ja chce by Jan kupił whom what I want subj Jab buy whom what What do I want John to buy for whom


## Parasitic agree on vP

- Wot nit pahtoliyas [CP Mali elitahasi-c-il this that priest Mary ic.think-3conj-part.obv
[CP eli wen kisi-komutonom-ac-il]
C someone perf-rob.ao-3conj-part.obv
'This is the priest that Mary thinks someone robbed.'
- il 3rd person obviate agreement (Passamaquoddy; Bruening 2006:34) via Coppe van Urk (2020)


## V2 in vP/CP

- Dinka (von Urk \& Richard 2015) has v2 in CP and vP
- CP V2
- Yè yà yùukù luêeel [CP be who hab.1pl say.nf 'Who do we say [CP $\qquad$ has eaten food]?'
- *Yè yà yùukù luêeel [CP cuîin à-cíi câam]? be who hab.1pl say.nf food 3sg-prf.ov eat.nf 'Who do we say [CPhas eaten food]?'


## V2 in vP

- vP has V2 effect:
- Yîin cé [vP Àyén gàam cáa]. you prf.sv Ayen give.nf milk 'You have given Ayen milk.'
- *Yîin cé [ vP___ gàam cáa Àyén]. you prf.sv give.nf milk Ayen 'You have given Ayen milk.'


## V2 in vP cyclic move

- Object extraction
- Yè nó [CP cíi môc [vP___ yiĚEn Bòll]? be what prf.ov man.gen give.nf Bol 'What has the man given Bol?'
- *Yè ŋó [CP cíi môc [vP Bòl yiĚEn]] be what prf.ov man.gen. Bol. give.nf" 'What has the man given'


# Does movement <br> Go through vP and CP edge? 

- All-stranding at vP and CP in East Derry English:
- What did he [vP all do $\qquad$ in Derry]?
- What did he say [CP all that he did $\qquad$ in Derry]?
- What did he [vP all say [CP that he did $\qquad$ in Derry]]?
- (Henry 2012:31)


## Reconstruction to intermediate vP (Legate 2003) - showing passive va phase head

- [At which of the parties that hei invited Maryj to] was every mani __ $\quad$ _ introduced to her $\mathrm{j}_{j}$ _ __
- *[At which of the parties that hei invited Maryi to] was she ${ }_{j}$ _*_ introduced to every mani _*_?
- Clauses with a wh-phrase must reconstruct below every man/woman in order for he/she to be bound, and above Mary/John for the construction to obey Condition C.


## QR, AC and VP

- ACD resolution via QR (Fox 1995)
- Infinite regress
- I visited every city that you did visit every city [that you did visit every city [that you....
- Need an antecedent with no DP and RC (RC late insertion)
- I every city visited t [that you did visited $t$ ]
- How do we know QR is vP


## QR to vP

- Negative polarity
- Mary didn't [vp introduce John to [DP anyone you did [vP2e ]]].
- Scope
- Some woman [vp gave John [DP every message you did [vP2 e]]].


## Agreement

- Examine PIC to account for Agreement
- Since we now have CP and vP how do they Spell out respective to each other.


## PIC revised

- The domain of H is not accessible to operations outside HP only H and its edge are accessible to such operations. STRONGPIC/PIC1 "Minimalist Inquiries"
- The domain of H is not accessible to operations at ZP only H and its edge are accessible to such operations. WEAKPIC/PIC2 "Derivation by phase"



## Agreement



- Henni höfðu leiðstPeir. [Icelandic] her.DAT had.3PLbored.at they.NOM

Diagram from Citko 2014
'She had found them boring.' (Sigurðsson2002: 692)

- Marii podobała się ta książka. (Polish Citko 2014) Maria.DAT please. REFL this book.NOM 'Maria liked this book.'


## Partial control Landau 2000



- Maria1preferred [PRO1+to go for a walk together]
- Partial control - allows plural PRO (together)


## Full control Landau 2000



- . Maria1 managed [PRO1 to go for a walk].


## Control and PIC

- PIC needs to be modified to allow Agree violating PIC if Goal has interpretable features Landau 2000
- Problematic
- Transfer and PIC are disjoint
- PIC more a condition on Merge (Internal and External)


## Long Distance Agreement

- enir [užā magalu bāc'ruti] b-iyxo.

Mother [boy bread.III.ABS ate] III-know
The mother knows [the boy ate the bread].
'The mother knows the boy ate the bread.'(Polinsky \& Potsdam2001: 584)

- Agreement between matrix verb and embedded object in tensed clause
- LDA either PIC needs revising
- Or there is movement going on here

