

## On Islands, wh-Movement, Scrambling and the Problem of Labels within a Radical Minimalist Approach (in Slavic and other languages)

### *Abstract*

Recall that in standard Mainstream Generative Grammar (MGG), wh-movement is derived by a [+wh-feature] in an Operator position which attracts the *wh*-word to Spec-CP via cyclic movement. So the equivalent of the example (1) as wh-movement derivation would yield (2). In cases of short scrambling in Czech, the internal Merge is derived by the need to check and value  $\varphi$ /Case until the edge of the first Phase  $v^*$ , cf. (3)-(4). The only difference to wh-Movement (apart of the fact that wh-movement is A-bar and NP-movement should be A-movement), is, that in (2) there is a need to check a +wh feature in the Operator position of a Force Phrase (in the sense of Rizzi 1997), whereas in (3) the feature is associated with a Topic feature of the NP/DP. How can we derive or even justify the need or possibility to move to a left-most position if not for Case or Agree necessities? Let us consider the following scenario in Czech of Scrambling of Arguments in (3). We can derive scrambling of NPs in Czech because the case feature and the Agreement phi-features of the NP [ *knihu* ] is at the edge of a phase [DP], given (4).

If the interface systems can read the Edges they can also interpret them and only after this the features  $\varphi$ /Case can be deleted at PF. The Phase is at this stage done but it can serve as input for further computation if there is another parallel working space (e.g. IS) to check different features (e.g., Top or Foc). After valuation, the Case and phi-features are deleted in syntax (S-structure) and not available for further computation at LF. Instead, the trigger for movement is the wh-feature in Spec-CP, while the expletive *do* is a last resort operation to spell-out the phi-feature (Tense and Agree). The following subject inversion in wh-questions in Italian can be explained à la Rizzi (1997 and passim). The Spec position as landing site for the wh-word engages only for wh-features and stands in a A-bar (non-Theta) position. The reason for the ungrammatical outcome is, however, the fact that the subject (you) bleeds the PPP in (7). In Slavic languages, Wh-movement is a classical problem in generative framework. Unlike English, the Slavic languages exhibit a peculiar behavior with respect to multiple fronting of wh-words. Some simple examples from Bg, SC, Pol and Czech follow, respectively.

(9) (a.-c.) in Czech are out because wh-movement should be preferred over an adverb if both are in the lexical array. The temporal adverb is not visible for any kind of features except for EPP-features in this position. The sentences are ungrammatical because the wh-feature constraint (and maybe also focus feature constraint) are violated. If there is a *wh*-word in the lexical array, it must be first attracted by a strong *wh*-feature, which is visible on the left, while the EPP features of the adverb are weak and thus ranked lower as candidates. In (12), the *wh*-words are all in the appropriate Edge positions (A-bar), visible to the LF interface for the scope and wh-feature.

### **Examples**

(1) what did you lose?

(2) [ Spec-CP\_OP+wh *what* C did  $\varphi$   $\varphi$ /Case you [  $\varphi$ /Case wh-  $v^*$  [V loose DP [NP [wh- ]]]]

(3) a. Pavel1 tu knihu [vP odpoledne t1 koupil t2].  
PavelNom the book\_Acc in the afternoon bought  
“Pavel bought the book in the afternoon”

b. Pavel1 koupil3 tu knihu2 [vP odpoledne t1 t2 t3].  
PavelNom bought the book\_Acc in the afternoon  
“Pavel bought the book in the afternoon”

(4) [ C Spec T .....[  $\varphi$ /Case DP **tu** [NP knihu [..... ]]]]

(5) \* what you did lose?

(6) \* [ Spec *what you* C did  $\varphi$  [  $\varphi$ /Case wh-  $v^*$  [V loose DP [NP [wh- ]]]]

(7) Principle of Phase Interpretability (PPI)

- The formal features ( $\varphi$ /EPP/wh-) of an element  $\alpha$  of a phase  $\pi$  are interpretable at LF, iff they are ‘visible’ for the interfaces PF (cf. also Kosta, in progress)
- (8) a. Koj kogo vižda? Bg  
Who whom sees  
b. Ko koga vidi? SC  
Who whom sees (Examples from Rudin 1988)  
c. Kto kogo widzi? Pl  
Who whom sees  
d. Kdo koho vidi? Cz  
Who whom sees  
(Examples from Franks 2005: 394)
- (9) a. \*Včera koho kdo viděl?  
b. \* Včera viděl kdo koho? (not as echo-question)  
c. \* Viděl včera koho kdo?
- (10) a. Koho včera kdo viděl? ✓  
whom yesterday who saw  
b. Kdo včera koho viděl? ✓  
who yesterday whom saw  
c. Kdo viděl včera koho? ✓  
who saw yesterday who  
d. Koho viděl včera kdo? ✓  
whom saw yesterday who (Examples from Kosta in prep. 2016)
- (9') \*[ Spec-EPP Včera [ Spec-CPOP +wh koho [ Spec-CPOP +wh kdo C  $\varphi$   $\varphi$ /Case [  $\varphi$ /Case wh- v\* kdo [V viděl DP [NP [wh- koho ]]]]]]
- (10') [ Spec-CPOP +wh Koho [ Spec-vP +TNS  $\varphi$  včera [  $\varphi$ /Case wh- v\* kdo [V viděl DP [NP [wh- koho ]]]]]]

LF	PF	S-Structure
[+wh-feature]	EPP-features	$\varphi$ -features
Wh-movement	Adverbs left edge COMP that	NP-movement
☞	***!	***

Table 3: Ranking of Candidates for long distance wh-movement (Kosta, 2016, in prep.)

### Short Abstract

In the present paper I shall give some evidence that an radical interface based approach of Radical Minimalism (cf. Kosta, Krivochen 2014 and Krivochen, Kosta 2013) is preferred over an approach which stipulates data by features ad-hoc. The generalized theory of Strong Minimalism (Chomsky 2005) assumes that any derivation in syntax must follow principles of economy and parsimony. Furthermore, derivations should respect and even obey local economy (cf. Rizzi 1997). Another important observation is that a theory which is based on phase-by-phase principles of Crash-proof derivation in which each derivational step bottom-up must be done within a Phase (following Phase Inpenetrability Condition and Edge Features) seems to prove by data. Thus, any principle of UG which serves as common basis of different syntactic derivations must be applied without exception and uniquely for any given natural language. We apply this idea repeated again in Chomsky (2016, in print) and show this on cases of strong Islands, wh-Movement and Scrambling in Slavic languages (in Bulgarian, SCB, Czech, and Polish). As opposed to previous assumptions in which we reject

any feature based approach, this theoretical approach respects the need of Label driven syntax.

## References

- Petr Biskup (2011) *Adverbials and the Phase Model*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 177) 2011. ix, 235 pp.
- Hans Broekhuis & Helen Woolford (2013) *Minimalism and Optimality Theory*. In: Marcel den Dikken (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Generative Syntax*. Cambridge: CUP, 122-161.
- Chomsky, N. and H. Lasnik. 1977. Filters and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:425-504.
- Noam Chomsky (2001) *On Phases*. In: Robert Freidin, Carlos Peregrin Otero, Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.): *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*. 133-
- Noam Chomsky (2001a) *On Phases*. In: Robert Freidin, Carlos Peregrin Otero, Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.): *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*. 133-
- Steven Franks (2005) *The Slavic Languages*. In: Cinque, Guglielmo & Richard S. Kayne (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University, 373-419.
- Norbert Hornstein (2009) *A Theory of Syntax. Minimal Operations and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Peter Kosta, *TEORIE ŘÍZENÍ A VÁZÁNÍ* angl. government and binding theory, teorie G&B (Autor: PKo, LV)  
// Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny online
- Peter Kosta, *TEORIE THETA/θ teorie* (Autor: PKo, LV), Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny online  
[https://www.czechency.org/oldhtml/index.cgi/23\\_t\\_477-504.html#TEORIE%20THETA](https://www.czechency.org/oldhtml/index.cgi/23_t_477-504.html#TEORIE%20THETA)
- Peter Kosta, *Leere Kategorien in den nordslavischen Sprachen. Zur Analyse leerer Subjekte und Objekte in der Rektions-Bindungs-Theorie*, hab. spis univ. Frankfurt a.M., 1992
- Kosta, P., *Empty categories, null-subjects and null-objects and how to treat them in the minimalist program*, in: Kosta, P. (ed.), *Linguistics in Potsdam 2/3, 1995/96*, 7-38
- Kosta, P., *Syntaktische Prinzipien und Informationsstruktur in sog. „nichtkonfigurationellen“ Sprachen*, in: Kosta, P. - Mann, E. (eds.), *Slavistische Linguistik 1996, 1997*, 105-135
- Kosta, P., *Über Argumentstruktur, Fokussierung und modale Satzadverbien im Tschechischen und Russischen*, *ZfSl* 43, 1998, 140-154
- Kosta, P., *Quantoren und Satznegation im Slavischen aus typologisch-vergleichender Sicht*, in: Hansack, E. - Koschmal, W. ad. (eds.), *Festschrift für Klaus Trost zum 65. Geburtstag, 1999*, 171-187
- Kosta, P., *Negace a větná struktura v češtině*, in: *Č-US* 3, 2001, 117-138

---

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. (2003): *Prolific Domains. On the Anti-Locality of Movement Dependencies*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam [etc].

Kosta, P. (in prep., 2016), *Syntax of Meaning and Meaning of Syntax: Minimal Computations*. (accepted in Peter Lang Edition)

- Krivochen, D., P. Kosta (2013). *Eliminating Empty Categories: A Radically Minimalist View on their Ontology and Justification*. Potsdam Linguistic Investigations, Vol. 11. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Lasnik, H. 1999. *Minimalist Analysis*. Blackwell.
- Lasnik, H. (with M. Depiante and A. Stepanov) 2000. *Syntactic Structures Revisited: Contemporary Lectures on Classic Transformational Theory*. MIT Press.
- Lasnik, H. 2003. *Minimalist Investigations in Linguistic Theory*. Routledge Ltd.
- Lasnik, H. and J. Uriagereka. 2005. *A Course in Minimalist Syntax: Foundations and Prospects*. Blackwell.
- Minimalism and Beyond: Radicalizing the Interfaces* Edited by Peter Kosta, Steven L. Franks, Teodora Radeva-Bork and Lilia Schürcks. Universität Potsdam / Indiana University, Bloomington [Language Faculty and Beyond, 11]. available, 423 pp. © John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Philadelphia.
- John R. Ross (1967) *Constraints on variables in syntax*, doctoral dissertation, MIT (published as 'Infinite syntax!' Ablex, Norwood (1986)).
- Teodora Radeva-Bork (2012) *Single and Double Clitics in Adult and Child Grammar*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang (Potsdam Linguistic Investigations; 9).

- Rizzi, Luigi (1997): The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In: L. Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar. A Handbook in Generative Syntax*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, etc., pp. 281–337.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2001): On the position 'Int(errogative)' in the Left Periphery. In Cinque & Salvi (2001), pp. 286–296.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2004): On the Cartography of Syntactic Structures. In: L. Rizzi, ed., *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Vol. 2, Oxford University Press, Oxford, etc., pp. 3–15.
- Rudin, C. (1988), On Multiple Questions and Multiple Wh-Fronting. // *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 445-501.