

## Italian vs. English in the BARRIERS Framework

We have seen in the Subjacency Revised handout how we can describe the fact that movement must be successive cyclic and certain configurations constitute movement islands and others do not. Now the question arises whether we can accommodate the Italian/English difference pointed out by Rizzi. Recall that in English, movement out of even a single embedded question is degraded, while, according to Rizzi, movement is fine in that situation, but bad if the movement is out of a stacked sequence of embedded questions.

It seems clear that under the framework under discussion, IP must not be even a potential BARRIER. This gives the basic case just as under Rizzi's footnote proposal that IP is not a bounding node in Italian.

- (1) Tuo fratello,  
your brother,  
[CP a cui [IP mi domando [CP [che storie] [IP abbiamo raccontato \_\_ ]]]],...  
to whom me demand what stories have.they-SUBJ told  
"Your brother, to whom I wonder which stories they told,..."

Ruling out the stacked embedded question case is trickier. Here, essentially following Rizzi, we want to say that CP is a BARRIER. But since the relevant CPs here are L-marked, we will have to stipulate that in Italian, CP cannot be deBARRIERized. <Chomsky 1986 ran into a similar problem. When we just have lists, it's very easy to describe differences between languages. The Barriers, and BARRIERS, frameworks are more principled, making it harder to describe such differences.>

- (2) \*Questo argomento,  
[NP di cui [IP mi sto domandando [CP a chi [IP potrei chiedere \_\_  
[CP quando [IP dovrò parlare \_\_ ]]]]] mi sembra sempre piu complicato.  
"This topic, of which I am wondering whom I could ask when  
I will have to talk, seems to me more and more complicated."