Chomsky (2001): "Derivation by Phase" [DbP] [pp. 16-26]

a. Re: ECM: [16, n. 16]

(1) [$_{TP}$ *we* T [$_{v*P}$ t_{we} *expect*+$v^*_{[u\phi, ACC]}$ [$_{VP}$ t_V [$_{TP}$ *there*$_{[uPERS:3]}$ $to_{def[EPP]}$ [$_{vP}$ *arrive* [*a man*]$_{[\phi, ACC]}$]]]]]

➲ **Maximize marching**[15] enables the probe to remain active after partial Agree(v^*,Expl)[17]!

(2) *Intervention*[16]

Only the head of an A-chain (equivalently, the whole chain) blocks matching under the Minimal Link Condition (MLC).

➲ Also, intervention must obey *Maximization*, i.e. only intervention if *all Fs* (of a bundle) match!

Note: As noted in n. 31, *there* cannot raise to [Spec, v^*P]; [Spec, VP] would require to stipulate an [EPP] on V (this is prior to the *Feature Inheritance* theory, where V could acquire one such by v…). Q: Where is *there* base-generated & licensed? Cf. 9 & n. 16!

b. Participial passives[17f.]

Prt = adjectival = Prt$_{def}$[18]; Prt bears [uCase:]$^{?[17]}$; smallest (strong) phase = β

P[$u\phi$] ⇨ Expl[uPERS] ⇨ Prt[uNUM, uGEND] ⇨ DO[ϕ, uCASE]

(3) i. [$_\alpha$ Prt$_{[uNUM:val, uGEND:val, uCASE:]}$ [caught [$_{DO}$ several fish]$_{[\phi:val, uCASE:]}$]]

ii. [$_\beta$ T seem [Expl$_{[uPERS:3]}$ to have been [$_\alpha$ Prt$_{[uCASE:NOM]}$ [caught [$_{DO}$ several fish]$_{[uCASE:NOM]}$]]]]

ii'. [$_\beta$ v expect [Expl$_{[uPERS:3]}$ to have been [$_\alpha$ Prt$_{[uCASE:ACC]}$ [caught [$_{DO}$ several fish]$_{[uCASE:ACC]}$]]]]

➲ To delete its own [$u\phi$], the probe (T/v) must Agree with **ϕ-complete** DO (**triple matching**)!

➲ I still wonder how [uF]…[uF] is possible; however, given a *valued* goal (e.g. Prt[$u\phi$:pl]) , the distinction [u/iF] collapses (i.e. [$u\phi$:]…[ϕ:pl])!

(4) *We expected there to have been believed to have been caught several fish*[19]

P[$u\phi$] ⇨ Expl[uPERS] ⇨ Prt$_1$[uNUM, uGEND] ⇨ P[$u\phi$] ⇨ Prt$_2$[uNUM, uGEND] ⇨ DO[ϕ, uCASE]

c. Expl-raising in ECM[19]

(5) a.   there is expected [$_{TP}$ t_{there} to arrive a man]

b. *a man is expected [$_{TP}$ there to arrive $t_{a\ man}$]

➲ No intervention (there *is* agreement), but *Maximization* in Match(T,Expl) forces Expl to move (*qua* [EPP])!

d. Expl-raising in unaccusatives: ungrammatical in English[19f.]

(6) a. *there arrived a strange package in the mail

   b. *how many packages did there arrive in the mail

   c. there were several packages placed on the table

   c'. ?there were placed on the table several (large) packages

   d. hoeveel   mensen zijn er   aangekomen   *Dutch*
       how-many men   have there arrived

e. **Th/Ex**: English seems to bar surface order **[V–DO]** ⇨ extraction of DO (left/right) edge by obligatory thematization/extraction rule **Th/Ex** (unlike e.g. OS, w/o 'surface semantics effects')[20]

(7) *Generalisation*[20]

   In transitive construction, something must escape the vP.

(8) *English TEC*[21]

   a. ?there entered the room a strange man

   b. ?there hit the stands a new journal

(9) *Hypothesis*[21]

   Th/Ex is an operation of the phonological component.

(10) *Th/Ex of XP bars subsequent movement of XP/extraction out of XP*[21f.]

   a. *[how many packages]$_3$ did there arrive t_1 in the mail t_2?
   b. *[how many men]$_3$ did there [arrive t_1] t_2?
   c. *[what]$_3$ are there [books about t_{what}]$_2$ being sold t_1 (in Boston these days)?

➲ Input to & output of Th/Ex are inaccessible to syntactic processes![22]

Q: Why should/how could NS care about phonological movement (look-ahead)?

EN (= nominal extracted by Th/Ex) must still obey Case Filter (*qua* Agree) and interface operations (binding absorption)[23]

(11) a. *he$_i$ thought there were [$_{EN}$ songs about John$_i$] being played t_{EN} on the radio
   b. they$_i$ thought there were [$_{EN}$ songs about [each other]$_i$] being played t_{EN} on the radio
   c. who$_i$ thought there were [songs about [each other]$_i$] being played t_{EN} on the radio

Simpler alternative: EN output of Th/Ex immune to all NS- and LF-operations; **copy (= 'trace', t_{EN}) is accessed**[23]

(12) a. Th/Ex is an operation of the phonological component.
   b. Traces are inaccessible to Move, but accessible to some other operations.

Locus of Th/EX = vP$_{def}$ (weak vP): substitution in [Spec, vP] (left) *vs.* adjunction to vP (right)

Q: How can Th/Ex – a Phon operation – apply at a 'non-phase' (weak phase)? How can NS-operations substitution/adjunction) apply in a non_NS 'component' (Phon)?

f. **Trace** = EN w/o [uF]s and [PF]s (removed by S-O)[23]

Argument: Inaccessability of t = inaccessibility to Move = inaccessibility to Agree, pied-piping and/or Merge ⇨ ECs accessible to Merge (Pro, *pro*), hence t inaccessible to Agree or pied-piping ⇨ active t accessible to Agree (EN must satisfy Case Filter) ⇨ head(t_{active}) must disallow pied-piping and Move; inactive t is additionally inaccessible to Match[24]

(13) *Sub-cases of (12b)*[24]

  a. EC disallows pied-piping.

  b. Inactive trace disallows Match.

(14) ***Th/Ex***[24]

  a. Th/Ex is an operation of the phonological component. (*English-specific*)

  b. Pied-piping requires phonological content. (*UG-specific*)

g. **Rightward Th/Ex** ≈ extraposition (non-iterative)

(15) *Problem case*[25]

  ?there are [many fish]$_{DO}$ expected [to be caught t_{DO}] (*iterative Th/Ex?*)

Source: existential [*there be NP*] ⇨ NP = reduced relative

(16) there are [$_{NP}$ many fish (that are) expected to be caught]

  → 'there are many fish such that they are expected to be caught'

➲ Extraction islands[46]

(17) a. there is [$_{NP}$ a building likely to be demolished]

  a'. *how is there [$_{NP}$ a building likely to be demolished t_{how}]

  b. there is likely to be [$_{EN}$ a building] demolished t_{EN} (*Th/Ex*)

  b'. how is there likely to be [$_{EN}$ a building] demolished t_{EN} t_{how}