

Multiple Spell-Out and the locality conditions on A-movement

Adolfo Ausín, University of Connecticut

Uriagereka (1999) and Chomsky (1998, 1999) have argued that the operation of Spell-out can take place more than once as the derivation proceeds. In this talk, I will argue that if we make certain assumptions about A-movement and the operation of Multiple Spell-Out (MSO), a straightforward account of the locality conditions on A-movement is available. The assumptions I make are the following:

- (1) Spell-Out is triggered by Case assignment, leaves the syntactic object intact and creates a PF representation. The different PF outcomes created by MSO have to be combined in accordance to the principle in (2).
- (2) Matching Principle: For any overlapping PF outcomes to be combined, one has to be a contiguous subpart of the other.
- (3) A-movement leaves no trace (as argued by Lasnik (1999)).

Under these assumptions, consider (4), whose derivation appears in (5). In the left-hand column I give some of the steps in the derivation. Square brackets signal Spell-out points. In the right-column, PF outcomes appear.

- (4) Guess when Mary was kissed?
(5) kissed Mary when
 was kissed Mary when
 [Mary was kissed when] → Mary was kissed when (a.)
 C Mary was kissed when
 when C Mary was kiss when
 [guess when C Mary was kiss when] → guess when Mary was kissed when (b.)

The two PF outcomes obtained after two applications of Spell-out can be combined because the outcome in (5)a is a contiguous subpart of the PF outcome in (5)b.

Now consider an instance of movement from one Case position to another Case position.

- (6) leave John
 [John past leave] → John left(a.)
 seem that John past leave
 [John pres seem that past leave] → John seems that left (b.)

The two PF outcomes that we obtain in (6) cannot be combined according to the Matching Principle in (2), since although they overlap, neither of them is a contiguous subpart of the other. In particular, (6)a is not a contiguous subpart of (6)b. Thus, my proposal, a combination of different proposals regarding MSO and the idea that A-movement leaves no traces, can easily explain why it is not possible to have A-movement from a Case position to another Case position.

The example in (7) is an instance of superraising. Its derivation appears in (8).

- (7) *John seems that it was told that Mary was sick.
(8) was told John that ...
 [it was told John that ...] → it was told John that ... (a.)
 pres seem that it was told John that ...
 [John pres seem that it was told that ...] → John seems that it was told that ... (b.)

The two PF outcomes in (8) cannot be combined because (8)a is not a contiguous subpart of (8)b. Thus the proposal in this talk exempts A-movement from the Minimal Link Condition, because the standard examples for that, such as (7), are ruled out independently. This has three positive consequences. First (7) is given a different explanation than (9), which is empirically adequate since (9) is only mildly ungrammatical. Second, nothing special needs to be said about the insertion of *it*. If the wrong choice is made, (2) is going to rule the derivation out. Lastly, the cases of a subject raising over the experiencer, much discussed recently (Chomsky (1995), Kitahara (1997)) are not problematic any more since A-movement would not be subject to the MLC.

(9) ??What do you wonder how to fix?

Other issues I will be addressing are the impossibility of A-movement out of NPs, *wanna*-contraction, and examples like (10) which are taken to be evidence that A-traces must be subject to the Proper Binding Condition (Lasnik and Saito, 1992).

- (10) a. How likely to win the race is John? b. *How likely to be a riot is there?