**Arthur Stepanov (2007): The end of CED? Minimalism and extraction domains**

*Syntax* 10:1, 80-126

**Main claim:** Unifying subject islands and adjunct islands under CED is a spurious generalization. Instead, subject islands are accounted for by Chain Uniformity and adjunct islands by late adjunction.

0. Background

CED: Can extract out of XP only when XP is properly governed.

 “properly governed” = in a local relationship to a lexical head

 CED gives us subject and adjunct island facts.

1. Preminimalist formulations

**Chomsky 1986 (*Barriers*)**

Subjects and adjuncts are not L-marked (theta-marked by lexical head), and thus become barriers to extraction.

 Stepanov: Not clear why lexical licensing and extractability should be linked.

2. Minimalist formulations

**External constraints on movement: Takahashi 1994**

 Chain Uniformity: (5) (See also (7) Uniformity Corollary on Adjunction.)

 Shortest Move: (6)

 Result: No extraction out of previously moved element.

 Subject island: Follows from above, assuming VPISH.

Adjunct island: Assume adjuncts are conjoined, plus UCA (7), which prohibits adjunction to a conjunct.

**Structure-building: Nunes & Uriagereka 2000**

If phrase markers X and Y are assembled in parallel (but they will merge and Y will project), can’t extract from X into Y.

This prohibits extraction from subjects and adjuncts, but allows it from complements.

N&U derive this from multiple spell-out and Kayne’s LCA: Anything that is not in an asymmetric c-command relation with rest of tree must be linearized (in effect, frozen).

3. Evidence that CED generalization is not correct

Some languages allow extraction from subjects, but prohibit it from adjuncts: Japanese, Navajo, Turkish, Palauan, Hungarian, Russian (19)-(30)

English allows extraction from postverbal subjects: (31) *Who is there [a picture of \_ ] on the wall?*

4. How could previous accounts handle this?

**Chomsky 1986:** Could say:

 - I is lexical in these languages

 - directionality of government matters, and these languages govern to the left

 - subject remains within VP in these languages (more promising)

**Nunes & Uriagereka 2000:** Seem forced to say that subjects are merged as sisters of V (very unattractive for several reasons). Also can’t account for English fact.

**Takahashi 1994:** Could say that subject can remain within VP in these languages. In fact, this has been claimed for exactly this set of languages. English also falls into place in this view.

5. Proposed analysis: “Eclectic approach”

**Subject islands**

Chain Uniformity à la Takahashi (but enforced at PF). This also accounts for:

Other types of “freezing” effects: (41)

English fact: possibility of extraction depends on position of subject (31)

German: similar facts (42)-(44)

Degraded extraction out of presupposed DPs (45)-(46)

Possible extraction out of presupposed DPs in Hindi (48)-(52)

Similar facts in German (53)

**Adjunct islands**

Late Adjunction Hypothesis: Adjunction takes place after all substitution (“postcyclically”).

Movement out of adjuncts not possible, because adjuncts are not present at that point in derivation.

LAH follows from economy condition of Least Tampering.

Only elements without any uninterpretable feature are subject to LAH (so adjunct *wh*-phrases are immune).

Extension: Inherently case-marked DPs are either transparent (no minimality effect) and inert (no movement), or not. No mixed cases. This follows from LAH: DPs with no uninterpretable features are merged postcyclically, so they are transparent and inert. Extraction out of inherently case-marked DP is predicted to be bad (Russian (74)).

Further evidence for eclectic approach:

-Subject Condition violations are worse than Adjunct Condition violations.

-Subject Condition violations show satiation; Adjunct Condition violations don’t.

6. Questions and observations

Analysis predicts correlation between ability to stay in SPEC of VP and ability to extract from subjects. Is this really found?

Evidence for late adjunction is alluded to (binding theory, weak crossover, adjacency). How strong is this evidence? Are there other ways to implement the core idea?

Gaps within both subjects and adjuncts license parasitic gaps:

 Which paper did [the author of \_\_] publish \_\_ without a permit?

 Which paper did you file \_\_ [without reading \_\_]?

This goes against the spirit of the eclectic approach.