Chomsky (2000): "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework" [MI] [3.6]

3.6 Syntactic Objects[126-139]

a. Syntactic objects = Fs + objects constructed from Fs[126]

(1) a. Lexical items LI
b. Modified lexical items MLI [= LI with [*u*F] deleted]
c. Sets K constructed from given elements α, β

b. Greed (MP:§4) *vs.* Agree (= Sucicidal Greed) → [F]…[*u*F] *vs.* [*u*F]…[F][127]

c. Demotion of Case: "operations are not induced by Case-checking requirements", "what matters primarily are the **probes**, including φ-features of T, *v*"[127]

d. Agreement

[Expl/DP$_{[Quirky]}$ T$_{[\mathbf{3person}, Num]}$ [$_{vP}$ DP$_{[Nom, Num]}$ *v* […]]]
*Agree([*u*PERSON][PERSON:1/2])

➲ Default *vs.* remote agreement [i.e. single deletion *vs*. multiple deletion of T[*u*φ]]
a. [Expl$_{\textit{there}[u\text{PERSON: }]}$ T$_{[u\text{PERSON:3}]}$ [$_{vP}$ …]] – *there*-type Expl is φ-incomplete → partial ([PERSON]) agreement[128]
b. [Expl$_{\textit{it}[\varphi]}$ T$_{[u\varphi]}$ [$_{vP}$ …]]– *it*-type Expl is φ-complete → full agreement (Expl,T) [128] [*interpretable?*]

➲ Expls (*it*, *there*) are min/max → as X°, directly merged Expl can probe for T[*u*φ]!

Q: What's the relation between valuation, interpretability, and Probe-in this system? [*u*φ] on Expl$_{\textit{there}}$ seems to probe for the goal [*u*φ]on T?

e. *Wh*-movement: C$_{[uQ]}$ … *wh*$_{[uwh, Q]}$ ([*uwh*] = Case analogue)
Wh-Island Constraint = defective intervention (α > β > γ): C$_{[uQ]}$… *wh*$_{[\sout{uwh}, Q]}$… *wh*$_{[uwh, Q]}$ → β is inactive ([~~*uwh*~~]), but can still intervene ([Q])

f. Other inactiveness configurations (bold = inactive = unable to raise/Agree)[128]:
a. *[John to seem [**t*$_{\textit{John}}$** is intelligent]] (would be surprising)
b. *(we hoped) [PRO to be decided [**t$_{PRO}$** to be killed at dawn]]
c. *[$_{DO}$ this book] seem [t$_{DO}$ to read [**t$_{DO}$** [never [[$_{Subj}$ any students] t$_{\textit{read}}$]]]][129]
d. *there seem [$_{\alpha}$ **[$_{Subj}$ several people]$_{[\sout{Case}, \varphi]}$** are$_{[\sout{Case}, \sout{u\varphi}]}$ [$_{Pred}$ friends of yours]$_{[Case?, \varphi]}$] [*Btw: Where does* Pred *check its Case?*]
e. *there were$_{[u\varphi]}$ decided [$_{\alpha}$ **PRO$_{[\sout{Case}, \varphi]}$** to stay with friends]
f. *XP T-seem$_{[u\varphi]}$ that [$_{\alpha}$ **it$_{[\sout{Case}, \varphi]}$** was told friends$_{[Case, \varphi]}$ CP] ('superraising' of *it/friends* barred)

g. Re: Basic structural properties of CFCs[129]
(1) α = [XP [(EA) H YP]]
(2) a. If H is *v*/C, XP is not introduced by pure Merge.

b. In the configuration [$_\beta$ H$_\beta$ … α], H$_\beta$ a CFC and β minimal,
i. if H$_\alpha$ is C, H$_\beta$ is independent of α;
ii. if H$_\alpha$ is *v*, H$_\beta$ = T$_\beta$ agrees with EA, which may raise to [Spec, T$_\beta$] though XP cannot;
iii. if H$_\alpha$ is T$_{def}$, if H$_\beta$ is T then XP raises to [Spec, T$_\beta$] if there is no closer candidate γ for raising; and if H$_\beta$ is *v* then XP agrees with *v* (as may a lower associate if XP = Expl).

i: [$_\beta$ *v*$_{[u\varphi,\ EPP]}$… [$_\alpha$ XP [C [$_{TP}$ T$_{[\sout{u\varphi},\ EPP]}$ […]]]][130]
ii: [$_\beta$ T$_{[u\varphi]}$ [$_\alpha$ XP$_{[\sout{Case},\ \varphi]}$ [EA$_{[Case,\ \varphi]}$ [*v*$_{[\sout{Case},\ \sout{u\varphi},\ \sout{EPP}]}$ [$_{YP}$ V t$_{XP}$]]]]

iii. [$_\beta$ … [$_\alpha$ XP$_{[\mathbf{Case},\ \varphi]}$ [T$_{def}$ YP]]] – XP active
① [$_\beta$ *v*$_{ECM[\sout{Case},\ u\varphi]}$… [$_\alpha$ Expl$_{[\mathbf{Case},\ \sout{u}\mathbf{PERSON:3}]}$ [T$_{def[\sout{EPP}]}$ [$_{YP}$ … DP$_{[\sout{Case}:ACC,\ \varphi]}$ …]]]] (ex. *I expect there to be a proof discovered*) [*Case of Expl?*]
② [$_\beta$ *v*$_{ECM[\sout{Case},\ \sout{u\varphi}]}$… [$_\alpha$ DP$_{[\sout{Case}:ACC,\ \varphi]}$ [T$_{def[\sout{EPP}]}$ [$_{YP}$ … t$_{DP}$ …]]]] [*no RtO*]
③ [$_\beta$ XP$_{[\sout{Case},\ \varphi]}$ T$_{raising[\sout{Case},\ \sout{u\varphi},\ \sout{EPP}]}$… [$_\alpha$ t$_{XP}$ [T$_{def[\sout{EPP}]}$ [$_{YP}$ …]]] –if T$_\beta$ = T$_{def}$, XP must raise further

h. Quirky Case/agreement (Icelish)[130f.]

(3) a. me$_{[\sout{CASE}:DAT]}$ T-thought$_{[\sout{u\varphi}:PL]}$ [t$_{me}$ [they$_{[\sout{CASE}:NOM,\ \varphi:PL]}$ be industrious]] – t$_{me}$ doesn't intervene as it's no chain head (trace invisibility, only A-chains themselves = sets of Occ intervene[131]) [cf. OE *methinks*; *mich dünkt*]

b. *me$_{[\sout{CASE}:DAT]}$ T-seem$_{[\sout{u\varphi}:\mathbf{default}]}$ [t$_{me}$ [John$_{[\sout{CASE}:DAT,\ \varphi:SG]}$ to like horses$_{[\varphi:PL,\ \sout{CASE}:NOM]}$]]

c. *John T-seems$_{[\sout{u\varphi}:SG]}$ me$_{[\sout{CASE}:DAT]}$ [t$_{John}$ to like horses]] [cf. *seems to me to…*; *scheint mir*]

i. **Multiple Spell-Out** (also cf. Bresnan 1971; Uriagereka 1996, 1999b; Epstein *et al.* 1998[n. 99]): deleted F LF-invisible & C$_{HL}$-inaccessible (i.e. [-active]), but PF-visible → single Spell-Out (MP) problem: probes must delete pre-Spell-Out, yet *remain* until Spell-Out → Spell-Out associated with agreement [*?*] → deleted Fs are erased after **Spell-Out at the phase level** [131]
➲ "Spell-Out […] applies cyclically in the course of the (narrow syntactic) derivation."[131]

j. **Single cycle syntax**: MP's single Spell-Out (EST-style) yields two cycles – overt (pre-Spell-Out) and covert (post-Spell-Out) (or *three* if 'phonological' [= *morphological*] component is cyclic [= *computational?*])[131]
➲ "With cyclic Spell-Out, contingent on feature-checking operations, these distinctions collapse. **There is a single cycle; all operations are cyclic**."[131] → "Within narrow syntax, operations that have or lack a phonetic effect are interspersed."[131]
➲ "There is **no distinct LF component** within narrow syntax […]."[131]
➲ "Agree alone […] can precede overt operations […]."[132] → LDA, *wh*-in-situ,…
➲ No more Procrastinate, Strength[132]

k. Spartan C_{HL}: indispensable operations (Pure) Merge & Agree, which must meet the following conditions:
1. Find syntactic objects to which they apply & Find feature F that drives the operation [i.e. (52a+b)] → optimal satisfaction means that C_{HL} must operate cyclically[132]

(4) Properties of the probe/selector α must be satisfied before new elements of the lexical subarray are accessed to drive further operations.[132] [cf. *Pesetsky's Earliness Ptinciple*]

2. Perform the operation, constructing a new object K.[133]
Merge(α,β) → K = {α, β}; label/category: label(α) = α, α an LI (the projecting head) [following Collins 1997[n. 101]]

l. **Pair-Merge** (formerly, Adjunction) *vs.* **Set-Merge** (formerly, Substitution): {γ, <α, β> } *vs.* {γ, {α, β} }, γ = label[133]

"Are labels predictable?": Set-Merge inherently asymmetrical → satisfaction of selectional requirements of the uniquely det. selector[133] – shares properties with Agree: the label of the selector F ∋ α projects [F θ-related F[134]? [*u*F] *vs.* [*i*F][n. 104]?] ➲ asymmetrical Pair-Merge: no selector and optional *vs.* symmetrical Set-Merge: selector and obligatory ➲ **label redundant** (det. by operations)[134]

m. Re: Move
a. A probe P in the label L of α locates the closes matching G in its domain.
b. A feature G' of the label containing G selects a phrase β as a candidate for 'pied-piping'.
c. β is merged to a category K.[134]

n. **Extension condition** (structure preservation)[136]

(5) Given a choice of operations applying to α and projecting its label L, select one that preserves R(L, γ).[137] [R = basic relation]

➲ **Head adjunction**: local Merge (in K = {α, {α, β} }, β is as close to L as possible) outdoes Extension Condition[137]; same holds for **tucking-in**, i.e. Merge in inner Spec (cf. Richards 1997)

o. **Merge-over-Move** "is a simple matter of more versus less"[138]