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General topic

- Postsyntactic syntax?
- Narrow syntax
  - Winfried Lechner 2007-2017: Is "head movement" in the syntax or in PF?
    ..can be answered if "head movement" can be shown to have semantic effects..
  - further question Are some phrasal movements postsyntactic?
Head movement in PF?

Expectation of PF account: no interaction with (narrow) syntax (regardless of scope).

- "Head "movement extends domain.
  Head Constraint of van Riemsdijk (1978), and the Government Transparency Corollary of Baker (1988)
  ... enables certain phrases to reach higher scope position\(^1\)
- Romance clitics, Verb Movement and PRO (Kayne, 1991)...

Romance clitics, Verb Movement and PRO (Kayne, 1991)

(1)  
   a. de le faire serait une bonne idée
       it do-inf
   b. Farlo sarebbe una buon idea
       do.inf.it

   [To do/doing it ] would be a good idea

- Romance Clitics are in a fixed position in the clause;
- Height of Movement-parameter:
  \( \rightarrow \) (further) leftward movement of the infinitive past the clitic in Italian.

(2)  
\[ v\text{-}\text{inf}_{It} \quad \text{Cl} \quad v\text{-}\text{inf}_{Fr} \]
Correlation with other known differences?

- pro-drop (French no, Italian yes)
- different Romance varieties also differ w.r.t. the following:

(3)   a. *Marie ne sait pas si PRO aller au cinéma
      Marie neg knows pas si PRO go.inf to movies
   b. Gianni non sa se PRO andara al cinema
      Gianni neg knows si PRO go.inf to movies

(4)   a. ... se farlo It: yes-PRO
   b. *.... si le faire Fr: no -*PRO
Table based on Kayne (1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.inf-Cl</th>
<th>pro drop</th>
<th>si PRO</th>
<th>attested?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Italian, Spanish,..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Occitan, Sardinian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>French, Gardenese,..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Piedmontese, Milanese,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"whether an infinitive precedes the clitic or follows it has consequences for whether a Romance language allows infinitival complements headed by si with a PRO subject."

→ head movement in syntax. \(^2\)

how high a head moves in a given language may be arbitrary, but it may feed syntactic and (?) interpretative processes.

\(^2\)Koopman (2012), Campbell (1991),..
Can "head movement" have semantic effects? Split scope

not > can > every

not every professor can have a workshop for his birthday

...accept semantics, but evaluate/reanalyze the syntax.

1 background assumptions: spell out where I am coming from.
2 "head movement" or variation of E merge of MOD?
3 reanalyze syntax: → a much more transparent interface
4 support: distributional properties of the construction (English), further questions
Questions of Architecture and Division of Labor

- from shallow structures, to highly decompositional structures...
- from Levels of representations: D-structure, S structure with (traces) Riemsdijk and Williams (1986), and QR in LF
- to MP: a single syntax (derivational syntax (cyclic interpretation, cyclic late spell-out)), with Merge, and Move(I-merge) as copy and delete, and QR as low spell out..
- to narrow syntax, and post-narrow syntax (=PF syntax)?
Assume: Overt Scope Principle

- Kayne (1998): "cases of covert phrasal movement can be advantageously rethought in terms of overt movement"
  \[ \rightarrow \text{LF and PF Interpretation are informative about the sequence of Merge} \]

- Overt Scope Principle
  A syntactic object cannot be interpreted higher than where it is pronounced in the syntax.
  \[ \rightarrow \text{reconstruction (cyclic interpretation) is OK, but no QR (or spell out of low copy)} \]
with this in mind..

Syntactic derivation (Winnie Lechner -without labels) step 1

```
not every boy

  take

  the exam
```
Syntax– Step 2: Merge *can*, "move" (I-merge) *not every boy*
Syntax–step 3: Merge ? I-merge can:

- Can
  - Not every boy
    - Can
      - Not every boy
        - Take
          - The exam
Syntax–step 4 Merge abstract NOT, move *not every boy* –PF (delete..)

1. labels?
2. ... redundancy in the syntactic representation?
not every boy must be interpreted above the base position of the modal (*nice evidence!*).

→ In fact above T. *show further support below, and ask why: syntax!*

2. *can* takes scope from a position above *every boy* (=head movement).
Distributional properties (Collins (2017) for refs to previous literature)

Preverbal vs postverbal asymmetries

(5) Negated Quantifier Phrase Constraint (NQPC)
If X is an overt occurrence of [not DP], then X ccommands a clause-mate T.  
Collins 2017

• Good cases
  1 not QP subject: A-movement.
     (6) not every boy, not even Bill, but not: *not Bill left
  2 Negative Inversion (with movement to Spec, Focus)
     (7) Not every boy can she have danced with
  3 appositive relatives (his guitars, not many of which)
     (8) There are umpteen Hendrix discographies and a thriving literature on his guitars (not many of which
Bad cases

1. *Not QP cannot be postverbal\(^3\). → not QR-able.

   (9)  
   a. *John saw not every slide  
   b. *John spoke to not every student  
   c. *he liked not every present  
   d. *NOT he like not every present

2. *not QP cannot be DP internal, unless not is DP initial.

   (10) *His refusal of not every bribe was exactly what we expected.

   (11) Not everyone’s family could be here today

---

\(^3\)Scandinavian negative indefinites cannot be postverbal
The view from the syntax:– problems

1. labeling– can is taking scope from the moved position or the T position.. → Reflects two possible E-merge positions of possibility MOD w.r.t every.

2. PF/LF redundancy (u, and i features). Only one scope position for not and why cannot (not) every boy reconstruct below T?
Assume WL is completely right—does it follow that head movement has semantic effects?
If head movement in the syntax: headedness/labeling

(a) \[ * \begin{array}{c} T \\ \text{can} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} T \\ \text{can} \end{array} \]

(b) \[ * \begin{array}{c} \text{Neg?} \\ \text{can} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{MOD} \\ \text{can} \end{array} \]

(12) In a: T must project, as other properties of the projection depend on T
In b: can cannot project Neg in b (and neg is indeed not PF interpreted on can).
where is Mod w.r.t. to T?

(13) \[ \text{Mod} > [_{TP} \text{not every boy }] \text{ T or } [_{TP} \text{not every boy }] \text{ T} > \text{Mod} \]

---

\[ ^4 \text{Williams (1981), Chomsky (2013)} \]
2 External merge orders: not head movement has semantic effects

(14) Distribution of can: V, T_{present}, Mod_{possibility}
read: "can" is a piece of phonological structure which must be 
"associated" with V, T_{present}, Mod_{possibility}
T, V and Mod are silent–only scope tells us how they are ordered

I assume both hierarchies are possible (i.e. two different merge structures).

(15) two (?independent) possibilities of E-merge of:
Mod_{possibility} > T or T > Mod_{possibility}

(16) a. can moves until all properties are satisfied; Mod_{possibility} can enter into two different configurations.

b. It is not head movement that carries up MOD, and allows projecting MOD in a position above TP. excluding this possibility is theoretically desirable
Interpretability of *not* and *(not) every N*

- Redundancy in the syntactic representation—why are not all the *not's* interpretable?
- why cannot *every boy* be interpreted *below* the base position of *can* (= T)? *how many subject positions are there?*
Redundancy: *Not* and the Overt Scope Principle

- *Not* is (only) interpretable in the position in which it is pronounced.
- The sentence is negative: *Not every professor can ... , can he?*
- *not* is E-merged where it is pronounced \(^5\), Williams (2003), Sportiche (2005).
- Constituency? (a (Lasnik, 1976, Kayne 1998)) \(^6\)

\[\text{a. yes} \quad \text{not b.}\]

- Why are all these *not*’s uninterpretable? They are not structurally present. *not* occurs once (as in a) \(\checkmark\) Overt scope principle. Not does not reconstruct (since it did not move).

\(^5\)Kayne (1998); ?
\(^6\)More needs to be said about coordinatability of not ever DP
every boy must be interpretable below can, but above T/Mod:

→ cannot reconstruct below the modal, regardless of the number of subject positions.

→ (perhaps) every is forced to enter the derivation above T.  

---

7 Williams (2003), Sportiche (2005),..
This yields the following (simplified) syntactic representation

Not: build QPs/DPs and merge in arguments positions— but functional material enters the derivation at different levels of embedding. "scattering" ⁸

Overt scope principle: syntactic derivation constrains the interpretations. Overt scope principle reduces possible analyses, and provides hints as to where certain elements come into the derivation. (If you cannot reconstruct, the property is absent at that point in the derivation. )

⁸PPs, starting from Kayne (1994), Cinque (2006), DPs Sportiche (2005), etc., or Williams (2003 levels of embedding conjecture)
Negated Quantifier Phrase Constraint (NQPC)

If $X$ is an overt occurrence of [not DP], then $X$ c-commands a clause-mate $T$.  

\begin{equation}
\text{not } c\text{-commands } T; \text{ the NQPC must move up to not: .}
\end{equation}

- Good cases
  1. not $QP$ subject $\rightarrow$ A-movement. every must be merged in the T region
  2. Negative Inversion (with A’ movement to Spec, Focus)

\begin{equation}
\text{(18) Not every professor had he danced with }
\end{equation}
Bad cases

1. *Not QP cannot be postverbal*[^1]
   (19) is not a constituent—, and the postverbal position is not a position where neg can take sentential scope in English.

   (19) *I showed [ not every slide ] *not must take sentential scope

2. *not QP cannot be DP internal, unless not is DP initial

   (20) *His refusal of not every bribe was exactly what we expected.  not cannot be merged here
   Not [ [everyone] ’s family ] could be here today  as good as everyone’s family could be here

[^1]: Scandinavian negative indefinites cannot be postverbal
English: \textit{not \{ Vp \{ every slide \}}

(21) I didn’t show every slide

\begin{itemize}
\item vP moves around object (Kayne, 1998). Why: $(v>O)$ Koopman 2009: Minimality: so the subject can escape.
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item Merge \textit{not}, interpret \textit{every slide}, build T layer in the usual way.
\end{itemize}
Dutch: *not Vp every slide*

(22) Dutch: No problems with object NQP— but Dutch is not: Neg V O! The finite verb ends up in final position (as does the verb cluster or in V second position.

a. *Ik heb niet iedere slide laten zien*
I have not everyone slide let see
I did not show every slide

- vP moves (to let the subject escape, Koopman 2009) (v>O)

- Merge *niet*, interpret *every slide*, move vP to T layer. → linear adjacent!
Extensions—Comparative syntax—Differences between varieties of English

West Texan English\(^{10}\)

(23)  
\begin{enumerate}
  \item a. Didn’t everybody come to the workshop
  \item b. didn’t noone come to the workshop \textcolor{red}{\textit{negative concord}}
  \item c. ain’t everyone come to the workshop\(^{11}\).
\end{enumerate}

\textbullet\ choice of \textit{not} and \textit{n’t}: \textit{n’t} is bound to \textit{T}. \rightarrow do support (in West Texan), ain’t/be support,

\begin{tabular}{c}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (ai) {ai}
  \node (n't) [above right of=ai] {n’t}
  \node (QP) [below right of=n’t] {QP}
  \node (T) [below right of=QP] {T}
  \node (every boy) [below right of=T] {every boy\(_1\)}
  \draw (ai) -- (n’t)
  \draw (n’t) -- (QP)
  \draw (QP) -- (T)
  \draw (T) -- (every boy)
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{tabular}

\(^{10}\)Foreman (1999), Matyiku (2017)

\(^{11}\)following up on \textit{Can’t/(ain’t) every professor (can) get a secret workshop}

and available readings
Conclusion

- Head movement or its equivalent is in the syntax, regardless of scope
- Taking the Overt Scope Principle seriously, leads to
  - a (potentially) much cleaner syntax-semantics interface
  - a simple theory of reconstruction
  - (I further) insights in the way surface constituency is built from Merge, and the question of determining what merges where and why. This question deserves to be taken up more widely.
  - a general argument that undoing the syntactic derivations reveals the underlying hierarchy.


