

Chomsky (2001): “Derivation by Phase” [DbP] [pp. 26–42]

Preliminary note: Chomsky repeatedly points out that probe–goal relations are evaluated for the MLC only at the strong phase level (as initially laid out in (10), p. 14)! That’s actually the major innovation in DbP.

a. *Object Shift*^[26]

OS *has* surface semantic effects, thus is narrow-syntactic \Rightarrow DO raises to outer [Spec, v^*]

“Every language allows OS, but in languages of the English/Romance types, the object must move on beyond the position of OS”

- (1) a. (guess) $\text{what}_{Obj} [\text{TP John}_{Subj} \text{T} [vP t_{Obj} [t_{Subj} \text{read } t_{Obj}]]]$ ^[26]
 $\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{\text{HP}} \quad \underbrace{\hspace{5em}}_{\text{VP}}$
- b. $[\text{TP John}_{Subj} \text{T} [vP \text{that}_{Obj} [t_{Subj} \text{read } t_{Obj}]]$
 $\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{\text{HP}}$

Why is (b) not allowed in English?

(2) *The Equidistance Principle* (revised)^[27]

Terms of the edge of HP are equidistant from Probe P.

Dispense with *Equidistance*:

(3) The *phonological* edge of HP is accessible to probe P.^[28]

Further reducible to earlier conclusions (i.e. (36), p. 24):

(4) a. EC disallows pied-piping.

b. Inactive trace disallows Match.

(5) XP prevents Match of Probe P and Spec, under the MLC, only if XP has phonological content (*determined at ZP*).

a. $[\text{ZP} \dots \text{P} \dots \underbrace{[\text{HP } \text{XP} [\text{Spec} [\text{H YP}]]]}_{\otimes}]]$

b. $[\text{ZP } \text{XP} \dots \text{P} \dots \underbrace{[\text{HP } t_{XP} [\text{Spec} [\text{H YP}]]]}_{\text{HP}}]]$

Chomsky notes that a flavour of countercyclicity/backtracking remains (i.e. *what* first has to move to [Spec, CP] before T can see *Subj*). Does he return to the issue?

b. *Difference OS and non-OS languages (Icelandic vs. English/Romance)*

(6) *Holmberg’s Generalisation* (HG; Holmberg 1986) for OS-languages

a. $[\text{TP } \text{Subj } \text{V}+\text{T} [vP \text{DO} [t_{Subj} t_V t_{DO}]]]$ OS obligatory

b. $*[\text{TP } \text{Subj } \text{Aux}+\text{T} [vP \text{DO} [t_{Subj} \text{V } t_{DO}]]]$ OS licensed by V-to-T

(7) a. Pétur hefur_v eflaust aldrei t_v [vP lesið bækur].

Peter has doubtlessly never read books

b. Pétur las_v bækurnar_i eflaust aldrei [vP t_v t_i].

Peter read books-the doubtlessly never

Option ①: intervention effects applying to the output of OS

OS languages have a (phonological) dislocation rule *Disl* (similar to *Th/Ex*) moving *DO* to a still higher *vP*-external position (just like \bar{A} -moved *what* above)^[30]

(8) [TP *Subj* V+T [*DO*_{*Disl*} [VP *t*_{*DO*} [*t*_{*Subj*} *t*_{*DO*}]]]]

(9) [many students.DAT]_{*Subj*} find.PLV [the computers.NOM]_{*DO*} not [VP *t*_{*DO*} *t*_{*Subj*} [*t*_{*v*} ugly.PL *t*_{*DO*}]]]

⇒ Phonological movement rule bars subsequent movement/extraction (cf. pp. 21f.)

Option ②: application of OS in the first place

(10) *HG reformulated (by Holmberg 1999)*^[31]

- OS is a phonological operation that satisfies condition (b) and is driven by the semantic interpretation of the shifted object (new/old information, specificity/definiteness, focus or topic, etc.; call the interpretive complex *Int*). ⇒ *semantic requirements*
- OS cannot apply across a phonologically visible category (except adjuncts) asymmetrically c-commanding the object position. ⇒ *phonological adjacency*

(11) *Schematic clause structure*

[_{β} C [Spec T ... [_{α} XP [*Subj* *v** [VP V ...*Obj*]]]]]^[33]

Two factors

Interpretative bipartition [Int [Int']] (cf. [Top [Comment]], [Old [New]], etc.)^[33]

(12) The EPP position of *v**P is assigned Int.

...and phonological adjacency^[33f.]

(13) At the phonological *border* of *v**P, XP is assigned Int'. [*border* \supset *edge*] ⇒ *parameterised!*

(14) *OS language*

i. [TP *Subj* V+*v**+T [*v**P *t*_{*Subj*} *t*_{*v*}* [VP *t*_{*v*} *Obj*_{[PRN, +DEF]]]]] ⇒ *Obj at phonological border of v**P}

ii. [TP *Subj* V+*v**+T [*v**P *Obj* [*t*_{*Subj*} *t*_{*v*}* [VP *t*_{*v*} *t*_{*Obj*}]]]] ⇒ *Obj receives Int*

(15) *HG revised (by Chomsky)*^[35]

a. *v** is assigned an EPP-feature only if that has an effect on outcome.

b. The EPP position of *v** is assigned Int.

c. At the phonological border of *v**P, XP is assigned Int'. [*Parameterised! Intercats with parametrically variable V-raising, thus never applicable to English...*]

(16) *Re: HG explained*^[35]

a. *I have her_{*Obj*} not [VP seen *t*_{*Obj*}]. ⇒ *Obj not at phonological border*

b. I saw_{*v*} her_{*Obj*} not [VP *t*_{*v*} *t*_{*Obj*}].

Residue^[37ff.]

- Head-raising is phonological
- Chains are unproblematic SO's (sets of occurrences)
- EPP is an uninterpreted selectional 'feature'
- "internalist" "bio-linguistics"