

On the phasehood of CP and other projections

This workshop aims to consider the clausal architecture against the background of phase theory proposed in Chomsky (2000 et seq.), addressing the questions of, among others, which head hosts essential clausal features (such as tense and ϕ -features) or how they are shared by hierarchically adjacent heads. In the feature inheritance approach (Chomsky (2008), Richards (2007)), the features at stake originate in C and are handed ‘downward’ to T, while they are extended ‘upward’ from T/V to C in the theories of extended projection (Grimshaw 1997 and Broekhuis 2013), phase extension (den Dikken 2006) and phase-sliding (Gallego & Uriagereka 2006). The former takes the rigid definition of phases (CP and ν P), while the latter assumes them to be defined dynamically. The downward sharing of clausal features or barrierhood is proposed in Chomsky (1986), while the upward one is more widely assumed, for example, by Jackendoff (1977) and Marantz (1980), who claim that S is the maximal c-projection of V. This idea can be traced back to Chomsky’s (1957) phrase structure rules. The structure of S-bar as COMP plus S assumed in the seventies can be restated as CP as a c-projection of S/TP. Though the hierarchical sequence of CP-TP- ν P-VP has been generally accepted as independent c-projections in the minimalist tradition, it remains controversial where the loci of clausal features are and which projections in the sequence function as phases.

Specifically, if the downward view of clausal feature sharing is adopted, A-movement of a subject to TP-Spec in (1a) would be countercyclic because the movement takes place phase internally after C is Merged and the features are inherited by T.

- (1) a. ... John came to the party.
- b. ... [CP C [TP T [ν P John [came to the party]]]]
- c. ... [CP C [TP John_i [T [ν P t_i [came to the party]]]]]]

Epstein, Kitahara and Seely (2012), and (Narita 2011, forthcoming, *inter alia*) have proposed two-peaked/doubly rooted structures to overcome this difficulty. This workshop will pursue other possibilities based on cyclic applications of Transfer at phases as well as under the assumption of upward clausal feature sharing, discussing which derivational option can provide a more theoretically coherent and empirically adequate account for subject movement in clausal syntax.

Furthermore, if the moved subject is a *wh*-phrase, it raises the question of whether it involves simultaneous movement to the CP- and TP-Specs (Chomsky 2008) as in (2) or the subject moves only to TP-Spec as in (3) (George 1980; Chomsky 1986, 2013), or to CP-spec via TP-spec as in (4).

- (2) a. [CP C [TP T [ν P who [came to the party]]]]
- b. [CP who_i [C [TP who_j [T [ν P t_{i,j} [came to the party]]]]]]]
- (3) [CP C [TP who_i [T [ν P t_i [came to the party]]]]]
- (4) [CP who_i C [TP who_i [T [ν P t_i [came to the party]]]]]

The number and type of chains formed differ depending on how the *wh*-subject moves. A related issue is the size of a declarative root clause and a case of subject *wh*-movement, which typically disallow an overt complementizer and an inverted finite auxiliary, as exemplified in (5) and (6), respectively.

- (5) a. (*That) John is honest.
- b. I think (that) John is honest.
- (6) a. Who bought this book?
- b. *Who did buy this book? (*did* unstressed)
- c. *Did who buy this book?
- d. *Has who bought this book?

Locative inversion in (7a) appears to show similar behaviors, being generally restricted in the root context without a finite auxiliary (Emonds 1970).

- (7) a. In came John.
- b. *I noticed that in came John.
- c. *In did/has come John.

(5a), (6a), and (7a) can be analyzed as CPs on a par with cases of non-subject *wh*-movement and

embedded clauses or as TPs without CP layers. The choice has a direct bearing on the question of which assumption is correct: the downward or upward sharing of clausal features between C and T/V.

This workshop will also be concerned with a more general issue of the definition of phase. Given the traditional assumption that NPs count as cyclic nodes along with S's, it is natural to decompose them into the D and N layers as proposed by Abney (1987) and to analyze them in parallel with the C and T layers as explored by Bošković (2012). Besides CP (and possibly DP), *v*P has been generally assumed to constitute a phase in the minimalist tradition. If traditional verbs are decomposed into *v* and acategorial roots and the former is a phase head, one can argue for the decomposition of N, A, and P into the category-deciding heads and acategorial roots in the spirit of Distributive Morphology, and for the phasehood of the former, as proposed by Bošković (2014). Once the set of (potential) phase heads is defined, individual languages are assumed to choose some of them since functional categories are loci of syntactic variation (Borer 1984, Fukui 1986 *inter alia*).

References

- Abney, Steven (1987) *The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect*. MIT dissertation.
- Borer, Hagit (1984) *Parametric syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Bošković Željko (2012). On NPs and Clauses. In *Discourse and grammar: From sentence types to lexical categories*, eds. G. Grewendorf and T. E. Zimmermann, pp.179-242. Mouton De Gruyter.
- _____ (2014). Now I'm a phase, now I'm not a phase: On the variability of phases with extraction and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(1), 27-89.
- Broekhuis, Hans (2013) Feature inheritance versus extended projections. Ms.
- Chomsky, Noam (1957) *Syntactic Structures*. Mouton.
- _____ (1986) *Barriers*. MIT Press.
- _____ (2000) Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels & Juan Uriagereka, eds, *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. pp.89-115. MIT Press.
- _____ (2008) On phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, eds. Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero & Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, pp.133-166. Cambridge, MA/Oxford: MIT Press.
- _____ (2013) Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130.
- den Dikken, Marcel (2006) *Relators and linkers: The syntax of predication, Predicate Inversion, and copulas*. MIT Press.
- Emonds, Joseph (1970) *Root and structure-preserving transformation*. MIT dissertation.
- Epstein, Samuel David, Hisatsugu Kitahara, and T. Daniel Seely (2012) Structure building that can't be. In *Ways of structure building*, eds. Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria and Vidal Valmala, pp.253–270. Oxford University Press.
- Fukui, Naoki (1988) Deriving the differences between English and Japanese. *English Linguistics* 5.
- Gallego, Ángel & Juan Uriagereka. 2006. Sub-extraction from subjects. Paper presented at WCCFL 25 and LSRL 36.
- George, L. (1980) *Analogical Generalization in Natural Language*. MIT dissertation.
- Grimshaw, Jane (1997) Projection, heads and optimality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:373-422.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1977) *X-bar Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Marantz, Alec (1981) *On the nature of grammatical relations*. MIT dissertation.
- Narita, Hiroki (2011) *Phasing in Full Interpretation*. Harvard University dissertation.

- ____ (forthcoming) Endocentric Structuring of Projection-free Syntax. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Richards, Marc D. (2007) On feature Inheritance: an argument from the Phase Impenetrability Condition. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38:563-572.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1996. Residual Verb Second and the wh Criterion. In *Parameters and functional heads. Essays in comparative syntax*, eds. Adriana Belletti & Luigi Rizzi, pp.63-90. Oxford University Press.