Homework #5 20 points
Due Friday, 12/9 6:00 pm

3 points
(1) Present two arguments, backed up by evidence, for the idea, brand new in Chomsky (1973), that A\textsuperscript{-}movement is not in one fell swoop, but rather is ‘successive cyclic’ (step-by-step).

BE EXPPLICIT

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 (= S-bar), instead of IP, were a bounding node. 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 EXPPLICIT 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, in particular, Subjacency and the ECP. 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\textsubscript{2} did you see [NP a car [CP which\textsubscript{1} [IP John gave t\textsubscript{1} to t\textsubscript{2}]]]

(c) ??Which car\textsubscript{1} do [you wonder [who\textsubscript{2} [t\textsubscript{2} said [[John fixed t\textsubscript{1} ]]]]]

vs.(d) *How\textsubscript{1} do [you wonder [who\textsubscript{2} [t\textsubscript{2} said [[John fixed the car t\textsubscript{1}]]]] [i.e., extraction of the object what is bad, but extraction of the adjunct how is even worse]

<<<I’m showing only initial traces in these 2 ex’s. There might be intermediate traces as well.>>>