Linguistics 610 Fall 2018

Homework #5 26.5 points
Due Thursday, 11/29

3 points

(1) Present an argument for the idea, brand new in Chomsky (1973), that movement is not in one fell swoop, but rather is 'successive cyclic' (step-by-step). **BE EXPLICIT**

5 points (2+1+1+1) <<For this exercise, assume that NP is a bounding node.>>

(2)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

(3)a. Present the best argument you can for WH-Movement in an 'in situ' language like Chinese or Japanese or Korean (sometimes called 'covert movement'). **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)

(4)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 Discuss and illustrate the ways that this exemption must be withdrawn under certain circumstances.

10.5 points

(5) 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$_2$ did you see [$_{NP}$ a car [$_{CP}$ which$_1$ [$_{IP}$ John gave t_1 to t_2]]]

(c) Who do you think (*that) won the race

vs.(d) ✓Which race do you think (that) John won

vs.(e) Who do you think (that) John said won the race [i.e., this one, unlike (a), is good with or without *that*]

(f) ??Which car$_1$ do [you wonder [who$_2$ [t_2 said [[John fixed t_1]]]]]

vs.(g) *How$_1$ do [you wonder [who$_2$ [t_2 said [[John fixed the car t_1]]]]] [i.e., extraction of the adjunct is much worse than extraction of the object]