

Default Linearization Algorithm: Frampton (2004)

(1) *Default Linearization Algorithm (DLA)*:

If γ is the merger of α and β , then

$$\text{Linearization}(\gamma) = \text{Linearization}(\alpha) + \text{Linearization}(\beta)$$

if α is a specifier of β is a complement; except that

- a. if β is a C-complement, then $\text{Linearization}(\beta)$ is taken to be the result of the prior phasal linearization; and
- b. the linearization of δ (either α or β) is omitted if δ has a parent outside of γ .

(2) *Background assumptions*:

- a. Only CP is a phase.
- b. Linearization is by phase, bottom up.
- c. Once a phase is completed, the phase head's complement is linearized.
- d. At the very end of the derivation, the final root CP is linearized.

(3) *Claims*:

- a. Widely perceived problems with multidominance are mainly typographical in nature.
- b. Derivations of certain Bulgarian multiple wh-questions with apparent lowering provide an argument for multidominance because with multidominance, there is no lowering.

(4) *Bulgarian wh-in-wh multiple clause-bound questions*:

- a. Kolko studenti po kakvo vidja ?
how many students of what you saw
- b. Po kakvo kolko studenti vidja ?
of what how many students you saw

(5) *Bulgarian wh-in-wh split clause-bound/long-distance questions*:

- a. Kolko studenti se opitvaš da rezbereš ot koi strani e ubil
how many students you try to find out from which countries AUX kill
Ivan ?
Ivan
- b. Ot koi strani se optivaš da razbereš kolko studenti e ubil
from which countries you try to find out how many students AUX kill
Ivan ?
Ivan

Argument:

1. The MLC (F-over-F condition part) demands that the higher wh-phrase (DP) moves first.
 2. After that, the lower wh-phrase (PP) moves; it can in principle do so by tucking in (unproblematic?).
 3. Such movement also presupposes that a moved wh-phrase does not count as an intervener anymore (unproblematic?).
 4. However, the order-preserving PP movements in (4) and (5) must violate the ban on lowering in addition standard (copy-theory-based) approaches; and this is assumed to be problematic.
 5. Multidominance evades this problem because PP extraction takes place from the base position, to a c-commanding position.
- (6) *More data* (unrelated to the main issue):
- a. [_{DP} whose friend] [_{PP} about what] talked
 - b. * [_{PP} about what] [_{DP} whose friend] talked
 - c. [_{DP} whose book] [_{PP} about what] Bill read
 - d. [_{PP} about what] [_{DP} whose book] Bill read
- (7) *Complete dominance*:
 α completely dominates β ($\alpha \gg \beta$) if β does not have a parent outside of α and β is a daughter of α , or if $\alpha \gg \beta'$ and $\beta' \gg \beta$.
- (8) *Precedence*:
 α precedes β ($\alpha \prec \beta$) if α and β are daughters of γ which completely dominates them and either α is a specifier or β is a complement; or if $\alpha \prec \beta'$ and $\beta' \gg \beta$.

Intuition:

1. There is “a condition favoring minimal disruption of precedence” that can “choose” between two derivations. (What does this condition look like? Parallel Movement? Shape Conservation?)
2. This condition is violated in (6-b) (reversal of initial order) but not in (6-c) or (6-d) (no precedence relation in the base).

An alternative without lowering under the copy-theory-based approach:

- (i) One must permit extraction from the base copy.
- (ii) The DLA can and must be adjusted accordingly.