

## **ON THE (POSSIBLE) ELIMINATION OF PROBE-GOAL** AGREE AND FEATURE INHERITANCE

講師: Prof. T. Daniel Seely (Eastern Michigan University) 日時:2016年11月11日(金)15:00-18:00 会場:慶應義塾大学三田キャンパス南校舎1階 412 教室 参加費無料 申込不要(使用言語:英語:セミナー形式)

This exploratory talk considers a recent Epstein, Kitahara, Seely (EKS) proposal that both Agree (as valuation under probe-goal) and Feature Inheritance (as transmission of phi features from C/v\* to T/R)--both operations distinct from Simplest merge--might be eliminated from the narrow syntax, their effects deduced from: (i) independently motivated properties of PoP+'s labeling algorithm, (ii) automatic consequences of freely applied Merge, and (iii) the null hypothesis regarding the nature of functional categories.

As for Feature Inheritance (FI), we (tentatively) pursue the null hypothesis that unvalued phi features are freely assigned to functional categories and thus that T, R can bear phi from the 'start' of a derivation. Assuming further (see PoP/PoP+) that Merge applies freely, we note that the following derivations are generable (in fact such derivations can't be prohibited without stipulation):

- (1) a. {C, Т*рн*}
  - b.
    - $\{ \{C, T_{PHI}\}, \{EA, ...\} \} \\ \{EA, \{\{C, T_{PHI}\}, \{EA, ...\}\} \}$ c.
    - d. {C, {EA, {{C, T<sub>PHI</sub>}, {EA, ...}}}}

(External) Merge of C, T establishing a C-T relation via merge (External) Merge of {C, T} and {EA, ...} (= 'vP') Cyclic 'raising' of EA (via Internal Merge) Internal Merge of C with {EA, {{C, T}, {EA, ...}}

Each derivational point in (1) is motivated by labeling. There is no unique 'label' for {C, T<sub>PHI</sub>} in (1a), nor is there a label for {{C, T<sub>PHI</sub>}, {EA, ...}} in (1b), nor for {EA, {{C, T<sub>PHI</sub>}, {EA, ...}} in (1c). Furthermore, each application of Merge represented by (1) is allowed (given free Merge). Only at derivational point (1d) are unique labels determinable (through PoP+'s labeling under minimal search) for all syntactic objects represented. Assuming that T bears phi, for example, {C, T<sub>PHI</sub>} will be labeled by (the phi features of) T (just as in PoP+) given that C (in {C, T<sub>PHI</sub>}) is invisible; further, (given that EA bears phi) {{C, T<sub>PHI</sub>}, {EA, ...}} is labeled phi through the shared prominent feature option of PoP+'s labeling algorithm (minimal search finds phi of the heads of XP (D of EA), YP (T<sub>PHI</sub>) in {{C, T<sub>PHI</sub>}, {EA, ...}}, again as in EKS 2014/PoP+). In effect, then, the 'surface effects' (see (1d)) of PoP+ feature inheritance establishing a C-T relation are obtainable via (i) free assignment of phi to T, and (ii) cyclic Merge (external set merge of {C, T} as in (1a) and subsequent Internal set merge of C as in (1d) with no appeal to a (problematic countercyclic non-Merge) C-to-T feature inheritance operation (cf. Gallego 2016). We thus seek to eliminate (see EKS 2014, Sugimoto 2016) such word-internal morphological operations as FI from the syntax, and derive their effects from merge of lexical items (cf Marantz 1997).

The talk also explores recent developments in the work of EKS on the (possible) elimination of Agree (as valuation of phi features in a probe-goal relation), seeking to reduce such Agree to independently motivated properties of PoP+'s labeling system; basically suggesting that Agree reduces to minimal search locating X and Y in {XP, YP}, and hence that probe-goal is eliminable (a desirable result as probe-goal is potentially problematic in ways we will detail).

This research is part of the larger goal of maximizing the explanatory effects of simplest Merge, combined with 3<sup>rd</sup> factor considerations (see e.g. EKS 2015). The research goal is to posit internal to the NS as little as possible beyond simplest Merge, striving ultimately for the thesis "Interfaces + Recursion = Language," articulated and put forwarded in Chomsky 2007.

