

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

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

(2) *Background assumptions:*

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

(3) *Claims:*

- Widely perceived problems with multidominance are mainly typographical in nature.
- 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:*

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

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

- 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
- 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:

- The MLC (F-over-F condition part) demands that the higher wh-phrase (DP) moves first.
 - After that, the lower wh-phrase (PP) moves; it can in principle do so by tucking in (unproblematic?).
 - Such movement also presupposes that a moved wh-phrase does not count as an intervener anymore (unproblematic?).
 - 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.
 - 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):
- [_{DP} whose friend] [_{PP} about what] talked
 - *[_{PP} about what] [_{DP} whose friend] talked
 - [_{DP} whose book] [_{PP} about what] Bill read
 - [_{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:

- 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?)
- 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:

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