

Single Cycle Syntax Meets GoN: Abstract

Błaszczak (2001) observes that Long GoN (Genitive of Negation) in Polish, holding between Neg and DP_{OB} in (1) below is an insurmountable challenge to Chomsky's (1998, 1999, 2001) view of phase-based derivation:

(1)

- a. Maria nie chce wypić kawy.
Maria not wants (to) drink coffee-GEN
- b. ... [_{NegP} Neg [_{+case}]_{VP} ... [_{CP} [_{TP} PRO_[+φ] [_{VP} t_{PRO} ... V_[+φ] ... DP_{OB[+φ]}]]]]]]

Any relation between matrix Neg and the embedded object is precluded under Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC, Chomsky 1999:10) if CP and vP in (1b) constitute strong phases.

This paper is an attempt at reintroducing Long GoN into a minimalist theory preserving as much of a derivationally conceived Single Cycle Syntax as possible. In particular, we step away from the (mini)phase-based view of the derivation only as much as it is necessary to accommodate the empirical facts connected with GoN. The central ideas of our account involve:

(2)

- a. The relation of Agree involving a probe and a goal may also hold of 'split' probes and goals; i.e. probes which are incomplete (defective) when considered separately (Neg_[+case], V_[+φ]) but form one complete probe, including features [+case, +φ], in an appropriate configuration.
- b. Both the components of the 'split' probe and the goal must be in the same derivational phase.
- c. Only CP is a phase and this level is projected only when confirmed by independent evidence, chiefly bare infinitives are TPs both in raising configurations and in control configurations (c.f. Hornstein 1999, 2000 and Bošković 1997).
- d. GoN is the result of a case-agreement relation holding of a 'split' probe (Neg_[+case]/V_[+φ]) and a goal DP_{OB[+φ]} within one derivational phase (CP): for instance a simple clause (3) or a subject control construction (4).

(3)

- a. Jan nie pije kawy.
Jan not drinks coffee-GEN
- b. [_{TP} Jan T_[+φ, +case] [_{NegP} Neg_[+case] [_{vP} t_{Jan} V_[+φ] [_{VP} V DP_{OB[+φ]}]]]]]]

(4)

- a. Maria nie chce wypić kawy.
Maria not wants (to) drink coffee-GEN
- b. [_{TP} Maria T_[+φ, +case] [_{NegP} Neg_[+case] [_{vP} t_{Maria} chce [_{TP} t_{Maria} T_[+φ] [_{vP} t_{Maria} V_[+φ] DP_{OB[+φ]}]]]]]]].

In the implementation of our account, we face the following three-prong challenge:

(5)

- a. We explore empirical and conceptual difficulties faced by Chomsky's concept of the vP strong phase (presence of [+EPP] feature, reconstruction facts and PF independence, unexpected difference in transparency to external 'deep' probing between the vP and the CP phases, the former may be transparent while the latter never is);
- b. We explore problems connected with distinguishing between control and raising infinitives (temporal and eventive interpretation, extraposition and topicalization and problems with PRO/Null Case) and show that both types of infinitives can be TPs;

- c. We deal with the issue of Defective Intervention Constraint (DIC) in Long GoN. Once the environment of Long GoN is taken to be a single phase and PIC is rendered null and void, the problem of defective intervention appears: i.e., in (4b) above, PRO should block the matching and checking of features between Neg and DP_{OB} . We show that this problem can be best solved through Hornstein's approach to Obligatory Control PRO as NP-trace, as traces do not induce DIC effects. For object control constructions, also treated as a consequence of movement, we assume that DIC is avoided because inherent case-marked DPs are invisible to matching and structural case relations in Polish.

Ultimately, we refer to previous accounts of GoN, chiefly Przepiórkowski (1999), who finds three problems with an Attract-F analysis of GoN in Witkoś (1998), and show that the current analysis, based on valuing the case of DP_{OB} in situ is not only free from these problems but also has an empirical and conceptual edge over the argument-raising analysis of GoN:

(6)

- a. Long GoN constructions with *nauczyć/teach* receive a straightforward account when no (feature) raising of the embedded verb is postulated;
- b. Optional Long GoN is accounted for through optional placement of head $Pos_{[+case]}$ in the embedded infinitive;
- c. Multiple GoN is a result of operation Multiple Agree;
- d. Clitic climbing from negative infinitives is not a threat to our account:
 - (i) ?Na dodatek [$_{VP}$ nie przeszkadzać t_{mu}] kapitan kazał mu t_{VP} już do końca inspekcji.
in addition not (to) disturb captain told him until end of inspection