Contents

| | ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | | х | | |
|---|--|---|----|--|--|
| | LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS Introduction: On the Quest for Explanation | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Sai | muel David Epstein and T. Daniel Seely | 1 | | |
| | 1 | Explanation through minimization | 4 | | |
| | 2 | Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program | 5 | | |
| | | 2.1 The computational process | 6 | | |
| | | 2.2 Was GB nonderivational? | 7 | | |
| | | 2.3 Which type of derivational theory is preferable? | 8 | | |
| | | 2.4 Explanation through representational minimization | 9 | | |
| | | 2.5 Summary | 10 | | |
| | 3 | The articles | 10 | | |
| 1 | Oī | N THE STATUS OF REPRESENTATIONS AND | | | |
| • | | ERIVATIONS | 19 | | |
| | Michael Brody | | | | |
| | 1 | Representations and derivations – the status of the mixed | | | |
| | • | theory | 19 | | |
| | | 1.1 Restrictiveness and duplication | 19 | | |
| | | 1.2 Principles of I-language | 20 | | |
| | 2 | Representations or derivations | 22 | | |
| | | 2.1 Derivational theories and weak representationality | 22 | | |
| | | 2.2 Restrictiveness again | 25 | | |
| | 3 | C-command | 27 | | |
| | Ü | 3.1 Derivational definition | 27 | | |
| | | 3.2 Derivational explanation? | 29 | | |
| | | 3.3 Domination | 32 | | |
| | 4 | Summary | 33 | | |
| 2 | 101 | LIMINATING LABELS | 42 | | |
| _ | | hris Collins | | | |
| | _ | Basic properties of X'-Theory | 44 | | |
| | 1 2 | Selection | 49 | | |
| | 2 | Delection | | | |

| | 2 | 2.1 Subcategorization and Merge | 54 |
|---|-------------------------------|--|------------|
| | 2 | 2.2 Accessibility | 55 |
| | 3 | The Minimal Link Condition | 57 |
| | 4 1 | Labels at the PF interface | 59 |
| | 5 (| Conclusion | 61 |
| 3 | | LE APPLICATIONS AS CYCLES IN A LEVEL-FREE SYNTAX uel David Epstein and T. Daniel Seely | 65 |
| | | Introduction: the role of Minimalist method | 65 |
| | | DBP's general argument for cyclic Spell Out | 67 |
| | | 2.1 Background: the DBP feature system | 67 |
| | 2 | 2.2 The general DBP argument that Spell Out must be | |
| | | strongly cyclic | 69 |
| | 3 | The problem with the general argument that Spell Out must | |
| | | be strongly cyclic | 71 |
| | | A derivational approach to the problem of cyclic Spell Out | 74 |
| | 4 | 4.1 A single representation? | 76 |
| | 5 | Phasal Spell Out | 77 |
| | Į | 5.1 Why vP and CP? | 78 |
| | į | 5.2 Global lookback? | <i>7</i> 9 |
| | Į | 5.3 Simultaneity? | 82 |
| | 6 | Summary | 84 |
| 4 | CR | ASH-PROOF SYNTAX | 90 |
| | John Frampton and Sam Gutmann | | |
| | | Filters versus constrained operations | 90 |
| | | Crash-proof syntax and computational efficiency | 94 |
| | | Redundancy | 94 |
| | | Optimal design | 95 |
| | | Crash-proof selection | 96 |
| | | The Case Filter | 97 |
| | 7 | The Chain Condition | 101 |
| | 8 | Conclusion | 103 |
| 5 | REI | PROJECTIONS | 106 |
| | | bert Hornstein and Juan Uriagereka | |
| | 1 | Introduction | 106 |
| | 2 | Basic mechanics | 107 |
| | 3 | An important prediction | 109 |
| | 4 | QI island inducers | 111 |
| | 5 | LF islands without binary quantification? | 113 |
| | 6 | Binary quantifiers with no associated LF islands? | 116 |
| | 7 | A "definiteness effect" in nonexistential contexts | 118 |
| | 8 | Neg-Raising | 120 |
| | 9 | The interpretation of weak determiners | 124 |
| | 10 | A binary treatment for negation | 125 |
| | 11 | Conclusions and further questions | 128 |

| 6 PRONOUNS AND THEIR ANTECEDENTS | 133 |
|--|------------|
| Richard S. Kayne | 122 |
| 1 Introduction | 133 134 |
| 2 Clitic doubling | 135 |
| 3 Antecedent and pronoun | 135 |
| 4 Control | 136 |
| 5 Merge and Move | 137 |
| 6 Condition C | |
| 7 More on Condition C and on apparently antecedent-le | 138 |
| pronouns | 141 |
| 8 Strong crossover | 143 |
| 9 Condition B | 147 |
| 10 Why are there reflexives?11 English-type reflexives | 147 |
| 11 English-type reflexives | 148 |
| 12 zich-type reflexives13 Backwards pronominalization | 150 |
| 14 Epithets again | 152 |
| 15 Condition C reconstruction effects | 153 |
| 16 Further Condition <i>C</i> reconstruction effects | 155 |
| 17 Sideward movement | 156 |
| 18 Circularity | 156 |
| 19 "Transitivity of coreference" | 157 |
| 20 Split antecedents and overlapping reference | 158 |
| 21 Conclusion | 158 |
| | 167 |
| 7 SCRAMBLING, CASE, AND INTERPRETABILITY | 107 |
| Hisatsugu Kitahara | 167 |
| 1 Scrambling and binding relations | 171 |
| 2 Specifying the mechanisms of scrambling | 173 |
| 3 A strongly derivational model of syntax | 175 |
| 4 A derivational analysis of binding relations | 178 |
| 5 Long-distance scrambling | 179 |
| 6 Summary | |
| 8 RESUMPTION, SUCCESSIVE CYCLICITY, AND THE | |
| 8 RESUMPTION, SUCCESSIVE CICLICITY, AND THE LOCALITY OF OPERATIONS | 184 |
| | |
| James McCloskey | 184 |
| 1 Background2 The core pattern and some initial issues | 185 |
| The core pattern and some initial issuesThe form of complementizers | 188 |
| | 191 |
| 4 An earlier analysis5 Mixed chains – movement and binding | 193 |
| 5.1 Pattern 1 | 194 |
| 5.2 Pattern 2 | 197 |
| 5.3 Pattern 3 | 199 |
| 5.4 Implications | 201 |
| 6 Analysis | 202 |
| / | |

| | 6.1 Two features | 203 |
|----|---|------------|
| | 6.2 Successive cyclic effects | 204 |
| | 6.3 Implications | 205 |
| | 7 Adjunct extraction | 206 |
| | 8 A final challenge | 213 |
| | 9 Summary and conclusion | 218 |
| 9 | VERY LOCAL A' MOVEMENT IN A ROOT-FIRST DERIVATION Norvin Richards | 227 |
| | 1 Expletive–associate relations | 229 |
| | 2 Sinking and non-Sinking | 231 |
| | 3 Very local A' movement | 236 |
| | 3.1 Inner tough-movement | 236 |
| | 3.2 Vacuous movement | 237 |
| | 3.3 Contained relative clauses in Japanese | 238 |
| | 3.4 Tense islands | 240 |
| | 3.5 Persian scrambling | 241 |
| | 3.6 Tagalog extraction | 243 |
| | 4 Conclusion | 245 |
| 10 | A D CV II A D TO | |
| 10 | ARGUMENTS FOR A DERIVATIONAL APPROACH | 240 |
| | TO SYNTACTIC RELATIONS BASED ON CLITICS | 249 |
| | Esther Torrego | 240 |
| | 1 Introduction | 249 250 |
| | 1.1 Background | |
| | 1.2 Background assumptions | 251 252 |
| | 1.3 English | 252 252 |
| | 2 Strict derivationality: the first two arguments from Romance | 252 253 |
| | 2.1 The first argument: French and Italian | 254 |
| | 2.2 The second argument: Spanish versus French/Italian 3 The third argument | 260 |
| | and an Surrent | 260 |
| | 3.1 Raising-to-object or control? 4 Conclusion | 264 |
| | | |
| 11 | ISSUES RELATING TO A DERIVATIONAL THEORY | |
| | OF BINDING | 269 |
| | Jan-Wouter Zwart | |
| | 1 Introduction | 269 |
| | 2 Anaphoricity as acquired information | 272 |
| | 3 Consequences | 275 |
| | 3.1 Asymmetry | 275 |
| | 3.2 Obviation (Principle C) | 276 |
| | 3.3 Obligatoriness | 277 |
| | 3.4 Uniqueness | 278 |
| | 3.5 C-command | 278 |
| | 3.6 Locality | 279 |
| | 3.7 Binding restricted to A-positions | 280 |

| | 3.8 Local obviation (Principle B)3.9 Absence of nominative anaphors3.10 Conclusion | 282 283 284 |
|--------|--|--------------------------|
| 5 6 | Other types of anaphora Reconstruction A few words on remaining problems Conclusion | 285 290 293 294 |
| IN | NDEX | 305 |