

**Homework #5** 22 points  
Due Tuesday, 12/6

5 points (3+1+1) <<For this exercise, assume that NP is a bounding node.>>

- (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 the best argument you can for WH-Movement in an 'in situ' language like Chinese or Japanese or Korean. **Be explicit!** Spell out your reasoning.
- 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 Discuss and illustrate how this exemption must be withdrawn under certain circumstances.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) \*Who<sub>2</sub> did you see [<sub>NP</sub> a book [<sub>CP</sub> which<sub>1</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> John gave  $t_1$  to  $t_2$  ]]]

(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<sub>1</sub> do [you wonder [who<sub>2</sub> [ $t_2$  said [[John fixed  $t_1$  ]]]]]

vs.(f) \*How<sub>1</sub> do [you wonder [who<sub>2</sub> [ $t_2$  said [[John fixed the car  $t_1$  ]]]]] [i.e., extraction of the adjunct is much worse than extraction of the object]