

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 \bar{A} -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.>>
- 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.
 - 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.)
 - Suppose both IP and CP were bounding nodes. Discuss with examples the difference in the language.
 - 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, 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.**)
- *Who did a picture of fall on the floor
 - *Who₂ did you see [_{NP} a car [_{CP} which₁ [_{IP} John gave t_1 to t_2]]]]
 - ??Which car₁ do [you wonder [who₂ [t_2 said [[John fixed t_1]]]]]]
- vs. (d) *How₁ do [you wonder [who₂ [t_2 said [[John fixed the car t_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.>>>