

4 points

- 1a. Present an argument for the Case Filter. That is, show in detail how the Case Filter helps provide an explanation for some fact or facts that cannot be explained (or at least not easily) otherwise. For your example, show that nothing else is violated. [Logically, if you don't do this, you haven't really presented an argument for the Case Filter.]
- b. Provide evidence that the Case Filter applies at S-structure rather than D-structure. [Note that I am specifically asking about the Case Filter, rather than the rules of Case assignment.]

3 points

2. In the early GB era, there were two major proposals for constraining the distribution of PRO:
  - a. PRO must not be governed. (Chomsky LGB)
  - b. PRO must not be Case-marked (Bouchard 1982 MIT thesis)Compare and contrast these 2 proposals, and present an argument for one over the other.

8 points

3. For each of the following examples, discuss in detail what the structure of the VP is, providing evidence and arguments. Some potentially relevant possibilities to consider are [<sub>S</sub> NP CP], [<sub>S</sub> NP IP], [<sub>S</sub> IP], [<sub>S</sub> CP]. **(Make sure to present evidence/argument bearing on IP vs. CP).** In answering this question, you will be providing some of the subcategorization information about the verb.
  - a. Mary persuaded John to leave
  - b. Susan attempted to solve the problem
  - c. John proved Mary to be the best candidate
  - d. Harriet appears to like linguistics

[Even if you are not a native speaker of English, you should know just what information you need to answer this question, and hence, should be able to collect the data from a native speaker. (Ask me if you have trouble locating another consultant.) Relevant evidence involves distribution of expletives, of PRO, of lexical NP, of NP trace, of 'idiom chunks'.]

**[Here is a sample answer (an excellent one) to a similar question from Beth Rabbin, who took this course many years ago:**

John considers Mary to be a genius.

The structure of this VP is [<sub>S</sub> IP]. "Consider" is an ECM verb, and it assigns Accusative Case to the subject of the embedded clause ("Mary"). We can see that "considers" is not a ditransitive verb because we cannot do the same thing to this sentence as we could with "Mary told John to leave":

\*John considers Mary that she is a genius.

However, we can make the embedded clause an idiom and still preserve the idiomatic meaning:

John considers the cat to be out of the bag.

These facts suggest that "Mary to be a genius" is a clause. Since the non-finite Infl is not a Case assigner, "Mary" must be getting Case from "considers". Thus, the embedded clause must be an IP, not a CP, because in order to assign

Case, the assigner must govern the NP. A CP would prevent the verb from governing the NP, but since IP does not seem to be a barrier for government, the verb can assign Case to the NP.]

6 points

4. Explain the ungrammaticality of each of the following examples in terms of principles of linguistic theory or properties of the grammar of English that we have seen. (Or, if in some instance, the ungrammaticality cannot be explained, show why.) **Use the GB framework for your answers.** *Be explicit.* <It in these examples is intended as pleonastic.>
- a. \*It was chosen John
  - b. \*It was slept by the children
  - c. \*It is likely PRO to park here
  - d. \*Mary is illegal to park in this lot