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Extraction from NP

1. Background

(1) A taxonomy of Cut operations:

a. phrases:
   (i) specifiers: [-D-]
       Müller (2014), Murphy (2014) on standard and stacked passives, respectively
   (ii) complements: [-V-] [-T-]
       possibly an option that might be pursued for VP ellipsis and slicing (TP deletion)

b. heads: [-D[–]
       see the previous handouts on Circassian DP shell removal (the lower part of the complement remains intact); on that removal (Chomsky’s recent lectures); and on verb projection raising and restructuring infinitives

c. features: [-f–]
       possibly a way to make sense of impoverishment in the syntax, as in Keine (2010), Doliana (2013)

Assumption:
Cut obeys exactly the same constraints as Merge (PIC, Strict Cycle Condition).

2. Extraction from NP

(2) a. [*pp Über wen l] hat [NP ein Buch t1] den Wolfgang beeindruckt? about whom has a bookacc ART Wolfgangacc impressed
b. [*pp Über wen l] hat den Wolfgang [NP ein Buch t1] beeindruckt? about whom has ART Wolfgangacc a bookacc impressed
c. [*pp Über wen l] hat der Wolfgang [NP ein Buch t1] geschrieben? about whom has ART Wolfgangacc a bookacc written

d. [*pp Über wen l] hat der Wolfgang [NP ein Buch t1] geklaut?
   about whom has ART Wolfgangnom a bookacc stolen

(3) a. [*pp Über wen l] hat der Verleger [NP einem Buch t1] keine Chance about whom has the publishernom a bookdat no chanceacc given?
   b. *Worüberl hat man neulich [NP einem Buch t1] einen Preis
      about-what has oneonem recently a bookdat an awardacc
geschenkt/verliehen?

(4) a. [*pp Über wen l] hat keiner einer Frau [NP ein Buch t1]
       about whom has no oneonem a womandat a bookacc
geschenkt?
   b. Worüberl hat man dir [NP ein Buch t1] geschenkt?
      about-what has oneonem youdat a bookacc
donated

Analysis in Müller (1995):
Barriers are to some extent determined by lexical factors.

(5) Barrier:
For every α included in XP, XP is a barrier iff (a) and (b) hold:
   a. α does not occupy an escape hatch in XP.
   b. X is distinct from Y, where Y is the head of YP, and YP’s is the minimal
       maximal projection which does not exclude XP.

(6) Three ways of removing distinctness of heads:
   a. overt incorporation (Baker (1988))
   b. empty identification [cf. complementizer-trace effects]
   c. abstract incorporation: co-indexing at S-structure followed by movement at LF.

An alternative via reanalysis:
Bach & Horn (1976), Chomsky (1977)

3. Extraction from Clauses

(7) a. Wie l denkst du [CP dass das passiert ist t1]?
   b. *Wie l bedauern du [CP dass das passiert ist t1]?
   c. *Wie l ärgert (es) [CP dass das passiert ist t1]?

(i) All (finite) clausal complements are embedded in NP shells.
(ii) Bridge verbs differ from other clause-embedding predicates in permitting abstract incorporation of N, the head of the NP-shell.
A reanalysis approach:
Bridge verbs have a Cut feature that removes the NP shell: \([-N_A-]\)

Extension to (real) NPs:
This is actually not trivial. A naïve approach:
(i) \([-N_a-]\) on V. (This is possible only if V and N qualify as a “natural predicate”).
(ii) Movement of PP since there is no NP that would block it.
(iii) Remerge of NP via \([\bullet N]\) on V.

Note:
This is problematic because (a) determiners (DP in NP) are ignored, and (b) V actually has two separate subcategorization features for NP.
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