Linguistics 610   Fall 2021

Homework #5   20 points
Due Saturday, 12/11

3 points
(1)   Present two arguments, backed up by evidence, for the idea, brand new in Chomsky (1973), that Ā-movement is not in one fell swoop, but rather is 'successive cyclic' (step-by-step). **BE EXPLICIT**

6 points
(2) <<For this exercise, assume that NP is a bounding node. Also assume, as Chomsky proposed at the time, that crossing one bounding node is fine but crossing two or more in one step is banned.>>
  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 (= S̄), instead of IP, were a bounding node. Give and discuss with examples two differences in the resulting language. (Make sure to consider whether there would be Subjacency effects at all, especially "WH-island" effects.)
  c. Suppose both IP and CP were bounding nodes. Discuss with examples the difference in the language.
  d. Finally, present an argument (based on evidence)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)   Present an argument for WH-Movement in an 'in situ' language like Chinese or Japanese or Korean (sometimes called 'covert movement'). **Be explicit!** Provide evidence and spell out your reasoning.
   < If you have any reservations about your argument, feel free to articulate them.>

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, and indicate the relevant bounding nodes or BARRIERS.** (Since we have discussed various versions of Subjacency, you can choose which to use for each example, but **be sure to state explicitly which you are using**.)

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

   vs.(d)   *How$_1$ do [you wonder [who$_2$ [t_2 said [[John fixed the car t_1]]]]]   [i.e., extraction of the object <u>what</u> is bad, but extraction of the adjunct <u>how</u> is even worse]