

**Homework #5** 22 points

Due Tuesday, 12/9

5 points (3+1+1)

- (1)a. Within the "classic" theory of Subjacency (Chomsky (1973, as modified in 1977), present an argument that IP (= S) is one of the bounding nodes for Subjacency in English.
- b. Suppose CP (=  $\bar{S}$ ), instead of IP, were a bounding node. Give and discuss two differences in the resulting language.
- c. Suppose both IP and CP were bounding nodes. Discuss the difference in the language.
- d. Finally, present an argument that IP is **not** a bounding node in English (that is, an argument that Chomsky 1973 actually had a reason for making it CP rather than IP).

**BE EXPLICIT IN ALL OF THE ABOVE**

3 points

- (2)a. Present an argument for WH-Movement in an 'in situ' language like Chinese or Japanese or Korean. **Be explicit!**
- b. If your argument has any limitations in its force, discuss that fact as well.

5 points (3+2)

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 Discuss and illustrate how this exemption must be withdrawn under certain circumstances.

9 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 in the Barriers framework. **Show the relevant portions of the structures, and compute the relevant barriers.**
- (a) \*Who did a picture of fall on the floor
- (b) \*Where<sub>2</sub> did you see [<sub>NP</sub> a book [<sub>CP</sub> which<sub>1</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> John put *t*<sub>1</sub> *t*<sub>2</sub> ]]]
- (c) Who do you think (\*that) won the race
- vs.(d) Who do you think (that) John said won the race [i.e., this one, unlike (a), is good with or without *that*]
- (e) ??Which car do you wonder who fixed
- vs.(f) \*How do you wonder who fixed the car [i.e., extraction of the adjunct is much worse than extraction of the object]