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(1) Minimalist Program (and related framework):

Single cycle theories – “single engine” theories = no recycling through a structure for semantic or phonological interpretation

At the Merge of each phase head, its complement domain is sent for both phonological and semantic interpretation.

Contrast with “Y” model, where whole sentence is built prior to interpretation at LF, requiring “recycling” (perhaps with additional covert movement) at LF to enable recursive semantic structure building and at PF (perhaps with additional semantically uninterpreted movement) to enable possibly recursive phonological phrase building.

(2) Contextual allomorphy:

=The choice of a form of morpheme during vocabulary insertion within a local environment (or, morphologically triggered phonological rules/phonological constraints indexed to specific morphemes)

Within DM, to be distinguished from “impoverishment,” the deletion of features within a syntactic environment, governed by syntactic locality conditions, prior to Vocabulary Insertion and thus prior to contextual allomorphy

Contextual allomorphy yields a marked allomorph of a morpheme within a marked, local phonological environment whereas impoverishment yields a relative default allomorph within a marked, local syntactic environment. From the point of view of phonology, the context for impoverishment is less local than that of contextual allomorphy (so, morpheme positions influencing each other are potentially non-adjacent phonologically – see the discussion in Halle & Marantz (1993) on Potawatomi).

(3) Context for contextual allomorphy/vocabulary insertion (see Embick 2010):

The context for vocabulary insertion at position M is material within the same spell-out domain as M and phonologically adjacent to M (combines phonologically with M).
(4) Further refinement possible – see Bobaljik (2000):

The context of contextual allomorphy “upward” in a tree is syntactic features, “downward” in the tree is phonological properties, including vocabulary/lexical item identity and morphophonological diacritics associated with items. [NOTE: some conceivable implementations of the “root-out” Bobaljik system would involve recycling and probably should be avoided.]

(5) General agreement these days, across DM, OT (see, e.g., Wolf 2008) (and all rational theories):

Vocabulary Insertion (picking the morphophonological realization of a feature bundle from the syntax) and idiosyncratic (morpheme specific) allomorphy is part of the phonology.

(6) Famous cases:

a. Kihehe reduplication (Odden & Odden 1985)

b. Haitian and Korean determiner/case allomorphy

- i /C pap-i ‘cooked rice’
- ka /V ai-ka ‘child’
(7) English past tense; contextually allomorphy across a phase head:

   a. Past tense separated by little v (a phase head) from the verbal root, but
      in a T node, which is not a phase head. Is in the same spell-out domain as the
      verb root, since the spell-out of the little v head is triggered by the C phase head,
      which sends its complement domain for spell-out.

   b. Past tense may serve as context for contextual allomorphy of the root
      if little v is phonologically null and thus T is phonologically adjacent to the root.
      Note of course that contextual allomorphy of past tense is conditioned by the
      identity of the root over the null little v, while contextual allomorphy of the root
      is conditioned by the past tense features, over this null little v:

      √TEACH + ø + Pst = taught  (irregular /t/ or null allomorph of Pst)

   c. Overt little v head would block contextual allomorphy of the root:

      √QUANTUM + ize + Pst = quantized, *quintized, *quantumized, etc.

(8) English past tense (assume root adjoined to little v, or raised from the complement
    of little v to the edge of vP):

```
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The interaction of head movement with cyclic spell-out is an important area for further
research. In general, standard head to head movement, however implemented (e.g., a la
Matushanky), cannot be used as an escape hatch to avoid phase by phase phonological
interpretation (that is, there are spell-out domains within words built via standard head to
head movement). If the root raises from within the vP, however, it must escape spell out
in the complement domain of little v and be spelled out with little v.
Phase boundary blocks contextual allomorphy, when the context is another phase head:

a. E.g., compare lexical and syntactic causatives in Japanese:

   lexical: \( \sqrt{\text{root}} + v + \text{voice} \)
   
   syntactic: \( \sqrt{\text{root}} + v + (\text{voice}) + v \)

   Even when causative suffix is phonologically adjacent to root or stem, in the case of the syntactic causative, there is no triggered contextual allomorph of the root, nor does the root influence the choice of vocabulary item for the causative little \( v \), which takes the default –sase form.

   In contrast to the case of the English past tense, where the contextual trigger and potential locus of a contextually triggered choice, \( T \), is not a phase head, for the Japanese causatives, the potential trigger/undergoer is \( v \), a phase head. When the higher \( v \) in a syntactic causative sends its complement domain for interpretation, it is not part of the context for this interpretation.

b. See also the larger literature on “inner” (root-attaching) vs. “outer” (lexically typed stem-attaching) morphology, e.g., in the context of blocking in Embick & Marantz (2008).

   “inner” –er (donate/donor) vs. “outer” –er (donater)
   “inner” –ity (curiosity) vs. “outer” –ness (gloriousness)

   “outer” morphology may be phonologically adjacent to a root but never serves as context for contextual allomorphy of the root, nor does the root act as context for contextual allomorphy on the “outer” affix.

Big question: is the domain of contextual allosemy (“special meaning”) the same as the domain of contextual allomorphy?

a. What exactly is contextual allosemy? In particular, what kinds of meaning choice falls under the constraints of a theory of locality of meaning determination?

b. Does anything at LF correspond to the additional constraint on contextual allomorphy we see at PF, namely phonological adjacency? Is there a corresponding notion of semantic adjacency regulating the context for contextual allosemy?

\[ n \text{ awase} \ 'a \ lined \ kimono' \]

\[ n \ (1^{st} \ phase) \]

\[ \sqrt{\text{aw}} \ [\text{CAUSE}] \ -\text{ase} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Verb\text{_INTRANS}</th>
<th>Verb\text{_TRANS}</th>
<th>Nominalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sqrt{ko(y)}$</td>
<td>$ko\text{-}(ru\text{-NON-PAST})$</td>
<td>$ko\text{-as-(u-NON-PAST)}$</td>
<td>$ko\text{-e} \ 'manure'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sqrt{nag}$</td>
<td>$nag\text{-e}(ru) \ 'to \ flow'$</td>
<td>$nag\text{-as-(u)} \ 'to \ make \ flow'$</td>
<td>$nag\text{-ashi} \ 'a \ sink'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sqrt{d}$</td>
<td>$d\text{-e}(ru) \ 'to \ exit'$</td>
<td>$d\text{-as-(u)} \ 'to \ expel'$</td>
<td>$d\text{-ashi} \ 'soup \ stock'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sqrt{sag}$</td>
<td>$sag\text{-ar-(u)} \ 'to \ be \ lowered'$</td>
<td>$sag\text{-e}(ru) \ 'to \ lower'$</td>
<td>$(o)sag\text{-ari} \ 'hand\-me\-downs'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sqrt{mag}$</td>
<td>$mag\text{-ar(-u)} \ 'to \ bend'$</td>
<td>$mag\text{-e}(ru) \ 'to \ bend'$</td>
<td>$mag\text{-e} \ 'a \ topknot, \ chignon'$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12) [Japanese examples and argument from Harley ms., after Miyagawa] Some V+sase forms show properties of lexical causatives, e.g., form idioms:

a. tikara-o aw-ase
   power together-sase-
   ‘pull together’

b. mimi-o sum-ase
   ear-A clear-sase
   ‘listen carefully’

c. hana-ga saku- hana-o sak-ase
   flower-N bloom flower-A bloom-sase
   ‘be done heatedly’ ‘engage in heatedly’

d. hara-ga her- hara-o her-ase
   stomach-N lessen stomach-A lessen-sase
   ‘get hungry’ ‘fast/wait for a meal’
V+sase forms in adversity causatives (examples from Miyagawa 1989:129) – only simple transitives and lexical causatives, not productive causatives, yield adversity causatives

a. Taroo-ga yasai-o kusar-ase-ta
   Taroo-N vegetable-A rot-sase-PST
   “Taroo spoiled the vegetables.”
   “The vegetables rotted, and Taro was adversely affected.”

b. Taroo-ga kaisya-o toosans-ase-ta
   Taroo-N company-A bankrupt-sase-PST
   “Taro bankrupted the company.”
   “The company went bankrupt, and Taro was adversely affected.”

Contrast between lexical and syntactic causatives for adversity reading:

a. Boku-wa kodomo-o gake kara oti-sase-ta
   I-T child-A cliff from drop-sase-PST
   ‘I caused the child to drop from the cliff.’
   Impossible: “The child dropped from the cliff, and I was adversely affected.”

b. Kotosi-wa dekinai gakusei-o hue-sase-ta
   This.year-T poor students-o increase-sase-PST
   “This year, we caused (the number of) poor students to increase.”
   Impossible: “This year, the number of poor students increased, and we were adversely affected.”

c. Taroo-wa niku-o koge-sase-ta
   Taroo-T meat-A scorch-sase-PST
   “Taro caused the meat to scorch” Pylkkanen 2002
   Impossible: “The meat scorched, and Taro was adversely affected.”

Claim (Big claim):

a. It’s the structure of the grammar itself that determines the domain of contextual allomorphy: derivation by phase. So the domain of contextual allomorphy should also be the phase.

b. The additional constraint on contextual allomorphy of phonological adjacency follows if contextual allomorphy is sensitive to a phonological notion of “combines with” – adjacent items combine with each other (directly) phonologically. If we apply this idea to the semantic domain, we predict that contextual allomorphy should be restricted to semantic adjacency, i.e., to elements that combine (directly) semantically.
Possible case of contextual allosemy over a phonologically overt but semantically null (phasal) head:

\[
\text{root + x + non-phase head}
\]

the little x phase/category head could be phonologically overt but semantically null, allowing the non-phase head to combine semantically directly with the root, allowing it to serve as context for contextual allosemy of the root (and to have its own meaning fixed in the context of the root).

Take home message:

Apparent counter-examples to the claim that the domains of contextual allomorphy and contextual allosemy are identical, in particular, counter-examples to the claim that little x category heads serve as barriers to contextual allosemy, have the structure in (16).

Marantz 1997: Domain of idiom formation

Idioms, whether lexical or phrasal, can not consist of elements that cross the boundary of a voice head that introduces an agentive external argument

Evidence:

Distinction between

a. lexical vs. syntactic causatives (e.g., Japanese)

b. stative vs. verbal passives (e.g., English, Chichewa)  
   (the hung jury/*the jury was being hung)

c. nominalizations at the root (e.g., -ee nominalizations) vs.  
   nominalizations above voice (e.g., -er nominalizations)  
   (amputee vs. amputater)
Marantz 2000: Domain of “special meanings”:

All little x heads are boundaries for special meaning, and this might/should follow from their status as phase heads

NOTE: This claim is not that same as that of Marantz 1997, and much of the literature seems to support the weaker claim about idioms and contest the stronger claim about category heads.

Evidence:

General property of category changing derivational morphology cross-linguistically: once a root/stem has been “typed” as an noun, verb or adjective, further category-changing derivational morphology preserved the meaning of the typed stem (and didn’t cause contextually allomorphy on the embedded root, and didn’t have the embedded root serve as context for its own contextual allomorphy)

Literature arose (continuation of the literature from lexical phonology and morphology days) contrasting “inner” (root-attaching) and “outer” (word-attaching) morphology, e.g., Arad, Alexiadou, Harley, etc.

Consider the verb “to hou[z]e” from the root, “house,” which shows contextual allomorphy (special voicing of the final fricative in the environment of the little v head) and contextual allosem (no literal “house” nor even a literal “container” is implied by the verb). One can also make a verb from the noun “house,” with a meaning “do something with houses,” as in “He took a bunch of plastic models and housed the room in revenge.” Here, the little n head blocks contextual allomorphy and contextual allosem.

In light of the Marantz 1997 vs. 2000 conflict, we face these issues:

a. Is “inner” vs. “outer” derivation defined in terms of the boundary of agentive voice or in terms of the boundary of a little x category head?

b. Are the domains of “inner” vs. “outer” the same for contextual allomorphy and “special meanings” – contextual allosem?
We must separate the discussion of idioms from the issue of contextual allomsemy. At the very least, it’s clear that literal/idiomatic meaning resolution does not have the same time frame as homophony resolution. So, when you hear that “John kicked the bucket,” or that “A little birdie told me that you have a birthday coming up,” you don’t have to suppress the “pail” or “parakeet” associations immediately, the way you suppress “spiders” within a half second or so of hearing “The spy searched the room for any hidden bugs.”

The literature on idioms does seem to suggest that agents do not in general form parts of idioms, and there are other interesting speculations on possible additional constraints on the domains of idioms, but here we want to separate idioms from allomsemy, with an attempt to characterize allomsemy in sufficient detail to give claims about restrictions on contextual allomsemy some bite:

choice of (related) meanings of a polysemous morpheme is made as soon as the morpheme is interpreted, i.e., within its spell-out domain

The linguistic, psycholinguistic, and neurolinguistic literatures make a strong distinction between homophony – two different meanings associated with the same phonological form, represented in distinct lexical entries – and polysemy – two related meanings represented in the same lexical entry.

However, just as homophony resolution is immediate and local, so polysemy resolution is immediate and local, at least in the canonical cases, and homophony resolution serves as a good model for polysemy resolution.

Semantics of roots

Roots arguably have different classes/types of meanings. All may be treated as modifiers (see Harley, Levinson, etc.)

a. “nominal” roots, modify entities/stuff (little n introduces an entity stuff variable to be modified by the root, e.g.)

b. “verbal” roots, modify events (canonically little introduces an event variable modified by the root)

c. “adjectival” roots, modify properties
Possible systematic ambiguity in root meanings

a. For example, consider systematic polesemy between abstract and concrete meanings of “book” and “magazine”

b. Possibly certain verbal roots are systematically ambiguous between an entity modifier (“a jump”) and an event modifier (“to jump”)

c. Possibly certain nominal roots are systematically ambiguous between an entity modifier
   a braid, to braid the hair tight
   and an event modifier reading (Levinson 2010)
      to braid the bread, to braid Mary a necklace

Semantics of category heads

a. Simple category heads, the ones likely to be phonologically null in English, introduce entities/stuff, events, or properties, which are modified by roots.

b. Derivational heads that change category, like “-ize” or “-ity,” are more complex: they are functions from input entities/stuff, events or properties to output entities/stuff, events or properties and their outputs are semantically more specific than the semantics of simple category heads

c. So, -able attaches to verbs and names a function from events to properties, where the property is, “able to be verbed.”

The literature on inner (root attaching) vs. outer (word/stem attaching) derivational morphology suggests there are affixes that can serve in either capacity.

a. atrocity, curiosity
b. analyzability, nationality
So, “outer” semantic categories that seem to be functions on (n, v. a) categories can also attach to roots—the semantics of output may be the same, but special input/output relations are required, verging on type shifting of roots (if a morpheme is a function from properties to entities, for example, it would need to shift a property-modifying root meaning to the meaning of a property in order to apply to this input). It should be noted for the present examples that a primary interpretation of the root-attaching –ity is of a “thing” associated with the related adjectival meaning (atrocity = atrocious thing, curiosity = curious thing), while the outer –ity (potentiated by –al and –able) yields a property reading (analyzability = property of being analyzable). Thus it may not be generally the case that the semantic function of these structurally ambiguous derivational heads is the same in their inner and outer uses.

(31) On this view of root and derivational morpheme meanings, it should follow from the very nature of semantic composition that the grammar must choose an alloseme of any polysemous element by or at point of semantic composition.

(Or choose either, that is, be the source of ambiguous outputs, such that only one choice is made in any particular derivation but both meanings survive in some derivation of the complex form.)

(32) Derivation by phase lets the grammar wait a bit for making alloseme choices, at least with respect to the syntactic derivation. Choices can be contextually triggered within the local spell out domain by constituents that are not syntactic sisters to the elements whose meaning is being fixed. However, derivation by phase forces “full interpretation” i.e., some choice of alloseme, within the spell-out domain, and the choice must be made by the first semantic combination of a polysemous element.

(33) Various linguists (Borer, Goldberg, Harley) have suggested counter-examples to the claim that the first category-determining node above the root fixes the meaning of the root in a way that cannot be undone by further derivation. Their examples are not finely analyzed, but they have the property that the primary use of a derived word is not entirely predictable from its parts. Under theories that do not separate idiomatic interpretations from contextual allosemy, some of these are counterexamples to the locality claims. However, once we have introduced the more refined theory of what root allosemy amounts to, we find not only that the particular counterexamples do not sink the locality claims but more importantly that theories that might allow contextual allosemy at the word level predict types of meaning shifts in derivation that never occur.
(34) “globalization” – a potential counterexample from the literature – well illustrates
the claims of the local alloposy account

a. globe = sphere or earth
b. global = sphere-like or of or pertaining to the earth or general
c. globalize = make global, preference for abstract sense of adjective – use is in
contrast to ‘national’ and ‘nationalize’
d. globalization = “act or process of making global”
[e. globalized solar system =/= a solar system with planets]

(35) a. nature natural naturalized
    ‘made natural’
    ‘became a citizen by residing in country’

b. naturalize ‘to make natural, most often used in the special context of
making someone as if a natural citizen or equivalent to a natural citizen’

(36) exist existence existential existentialism
    ‘belief system somehow
    related to the existential’

(37) At the stage of verbalizing “global,” the semantic properties of –ize prefer the
abstract reading of “global,” if “global” could mean “round” at all, anyway
Alloposy choice is in the local context of the category-changing stem; so,
“globalization” could not switch back to the concrete meaning of the root, globe,
since the choice of the “world” meaning was made at –al, or –ize

(38) The root “novel,” like other roots that determine reference to the result of writing,
can mean either a physical object (“the novel on my table weights 2 pounds”) or a
work of art (“the novel on my table is gripping”). The verb “novelize” seems to
resist any meaning that involves the physical object alloposy of the root:

“The magician novelized the hapless author, turning him into a two-pound volume
on the bookshelf of his office”

requires a very self-conscious, joke reading that’s hard to compute. The prediction
of the little x as phase head theory is that further derivation can’t choose the physical
object alloposy of “novel” over the verbalizing head that has chosen the abstract
reading: “novelization” can’t mean, “the creating of a physical book,” as in, “the
novelization of those particular 200 sheets of paper would serve no good purpose.”

(39) Construction grammar, Borer and Harley all “predict” (allow for) flip-flopping
sequential derivation, in which each subsequent category-changing suffix chooses
the opposite alloposy of the root (for Borer, the derivation can re-access the
Encyclopedia at each step). The phase based local resolution of alloposy approach
prohibits flip-flopping.
(40)  This account does not directly address the question of whether something like "globalization" could be a phrasal idiom; the answer to the idiom question takes one into a different range of facts and considerations.

(41)  Apparent counterexamples; choice of alloseme over an over category head:

a.  structure has the meaning of a root ("inner") derivation to category x (like root nominalization, stative passive, lexical causative)

b.  but the structure includes root, apparent category-determining y, and outer apparently category-determining x

Recall that the literature from Marantz (2000) on emphasized that “inner” and “outer” affixation should be distinguished by a correlation of properties, under the assumptions of a single cycle grammatical architecture. That is, the same inner affixes that could trigger special form could trigger special meanings.

(42)  Usual correlation of properties: English stative passives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special form</th>
<th>Special meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. the shaven man</td>
<td>a. The hung jury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The man by shaved/*shaven by John.</td>
<td>b. *the jury was being hung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(43)  Anagnostopoulou & Samioti (2009): -tos statives (or nominals) with special meanings – in fact, root-formed stative properties – over an overt verbalizing suffix

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>axn-is-tos ‘steaming hot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>axn-iz-o ‘steam’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>koudoun-is-tos ‘ringing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>koudon-iz-o ‘ring (a bell)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>magir-ef-tos ‘cooked’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>magir-ev-o ‘cook’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(44)  "Crucially, these verbalizers [in (43)] do not have the same semantic properties of the little v head identified and discussed in the literature (Alexiadou et al. 20006; Marantz 2001, 2007…), i.e., they do not contribute eventiveness, they do not license modifiers and argumental PPs."

(45)  The examples in (43) above involve roots that modifies entities, not events; they’re “nominal” roots. –tos formally will not attach directly to such roots and requires the intervening “verbalizing” morpheme.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>afr-os ‘formN’</td>
<td>afr-iz-o ‘foamV’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>axn-os ‘steamN’</td>
<td>axn-iz-o ‘steamV’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(46) Adjectival passives/Greek root-attaching –tos forms

a
   PART
      root

(47) Greek –tos on “verbalized” stems

a
   PART
      -tos
      v
      root

The v head is phonologically overt but semantically null.

(48) The –tos head that does the root word formation in (46) cannot attach directly to the “nominal” roots that occur in (45). The presence of the v head in (47), then, resembles do-Insertion in English, where a phonologically overt but semantically null head is used for syntactic purposes. Within the complement domain of the little a head, the PART, the v, and root are local to each other and can interact in the desired way. We don’t offer a deep explanation for the construction in (47), but the phase-based architecture precisely allows such “root formations” with phonologically overt (but semantically null) category heads.

(49) Idiomatic interpretation of root-v-tos – sometimes ONLY idiomatic interpretation is possible

a. kol-a-o       kol-i-tos       ‘close friend’
   glue-1sg      lit. glued

b. xtip-a-o     xtipl-i-tos     ‘striking’
   bang, hit-1sg lit. whipped

c. xon-ev-o     xon-ef-tos      ‘inside the wall’
   digest        no lit. meaning
Japanese nominalizations (Volpe 1995), our original counterexample to the locality of allosemy

a. chir-asu  chir-as-i
   ‘scatter’   ‘a leafet’
b. d-asu     d-as-i
   ‘expel’     ‘soup stock’
c. nag-asu   nag-as-i
   ‘wash away’ ‘a sink’

The nominalizations in (50) are exactly parallel to the Greek forms in (43) – the interpretation is of a root nominalization, but the words contain an overt little v head, followed by the “continuative,” arguably a piece of inflection.

When the non-phase head (PART) in our examples from Greek and Japanese combine semantically directly with the root (since the intervening v head is semantically null), what is the semantic type of the output? Note that we’re assuming there’s some higher phase/category head, higher than “PART,” that must send its complement domain for semantic interpretation.

From the structures displayed on the handout and from the discussion so far, one would inevitably conclude that the semantic type of the combination of the “PART” head and the root is the same semantic type as a root, such that this constituent may modify the category head with which it will combine semantically in the next spell-out domain.

While this is consistent with the general theory – the semantic type of a root is a type associated with constituents in the theory – it raises the issue of whether we really want to have the semantic output of an interpreted cycle be of the category of roots. Shouldn’t roots always be incorporated into a larger semantic unit within the first phase in which they are interpreted, and shouldn’t this principle apply to derived as well as basic roots?

A more speculative possibility is that the phase head that sends the PART+root constituent for interpretation isn’t the obvious category head (phonologically null a or n in our examples) but rather some other head associated with DPs or APs. In this case, the PART+root combinations would, first, be associated with the semantic type of a root during interpretation. Then, since the semantic type of a root is not a possible output of a phase interpretation (by the hypothesis under consideration), type-shifting would occur, and the root semantic interpretation would be combined with the necessary meaning.
associated with an unmarked category head. For example, in Japanese an entity would be introduced for the entity-modifying root meaning to modify.

(54) English shows predicted “counterexamples” with stative passives outside –ize little v on “nominal” roots

a. quantized energy
d. globalized universe
b. pulverized lime
e. nationalized island
c. atomized individual
f. fictionalized account

(the forms on the right contain an adjective in –al within the verbalization in –ize, putting a phase head between the little v and the root and preventing the PART head from serving as a context for contextual allosemy of the root)

(55) Phase based interpretation:

Each phase head sends its complement domain for interpretation. This includes previously interpreted phases, elements moved to the edges of those previous phases, and non-phase heads in the “extended projection” of a selected complement to the phase head. So, for example, the C phase head would send the as-yet-uninterpreted vP for interpretation, plus elements moved to the edge of the vP, plus modifiers of the v, like the verbal root, and the T, Neg, and aspect heads, if any, in the extended projection of v.

(50) Locality for contextual allomorphy/allosemy:

Accessible features of a constituent that combines with a head h within the spell-out phase of h may serve as context for contextual allomorphy/allosemy, where “combines with” means phonological adjacency at PF and semantic adjacency at LF. So, phonological nulls won’t get in the way of phonological adjacency (if they’re part of the same spell-out domain as the constituents on either side) and semantic nulls won’t get in the way of semantic adjacency. Since the two interfaces are connected only via the syntax, the phonological nullness of a constituent can’t be (directly) relevant to semantic interpretation, so we expect that phonologically non-null heads might be semantically null at LF and vice versa, leading to apparent exceptions to the claim that the locality domains for contextual allomorphy and contextual allosemy are the same.
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