

**Homework #5**

Due Tuesday 12/6

5 points (3+1+1)

- (1)a. Within the "classic" theory of Subjacency (Chomsky (1973,1977)), present an argument that IP (= S) is a bounding node for Subjacency in English.
- b. Suppose CP (=  $\bar{S}$ ), instead of IP, were a bounding node. What would be the difference in the language?
- c. Suppose both IP and CP were bounding nodes. What would be the difference in the language?

3 points

- (2) Present an argument for WH-Movement in an 'in situ' language like Chinese or Japanese or Korean. Be explicit! [If your argument has any limitations in its force, discuss that too.]

5 points (3+2)

- (3)a. The leading idea of Chomsky's Barriers is that every maximal projection is potentially a barrier (thus eliminating the stipulated list in "Conditions on Transformations"). Given this, illustrate and discuss the "exemptions" that are granted to permit fully acceptable instances of WH-Movement.
- b. One of the exemptions concerns escape from an XP via adjunction to it. Discuss how this exemption must be withdrawn under certain circumstances.

8 points

- (4) Discuss each of the following examples, explaining as explicitly as possible their status in terms of rules, principles, constraints, etc., that we have discussed. Show the relevant portions of the structures.
- (a) Who do you think (\*that) won the race
- (b) ??Which car do you wonder who fixed
- vs. (c) \*How do you wonder who fixed the car
- (d) Who do you think that John said won the race

4 points

- (5) In a very influential 1970 paper, C. L. Baker observed that the following sentence is exactly 2-ways ambiguous:  
Who wonders where we bought what  
-Reading 1: Matrix single question (about who) and embedded double question (about where and what), anticipating answers like "John does" or "John wonders

where we bought what"

-Reading 2: Matrix double question (about who and what) and embedded single question (about where), anticipating answers like "J. wonders where we bought groceries and M. wonders where we bought beer, etc."

- (a) Discuss the theoretical implications of Reading 2.
- (b) Given that there are 3 WH-expressions in the sentence, and 2 +WH Comps, mathematically speaking one might expect far more readings. Discuss these 'missing' readings, and, for each, how it is ruled out (if, indeed, it is).

3 points

- (6) In recent years, Relativized Minimality has sometimes been appealed to to explain wh-island effects and Superiority effects. [The attempt to relate these two phenomena has a long tradition, beginning in the early 1960's (Chomsky, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory); and hinted at again in "Conditions on Transformations (1973).] -Comment on how RM and the associated Ts ought to be stated if the two effects are to be combined.