

- Is it the argument/adjunct asymmetry that argues for covert movement?
- With CP instead of IP as bounding node, SOME extraction out of embedded questions is allowed, not all. This was one of Rizzi's main points.
- There are lexical requirements on complement clauses ('subcategorization', and 'selection', in the terms of Chomsky 1965):
 - *Mary thinks [where John put the book t] *Mary thinks the book
 - *Mary wonders [that J. put the book on the table]
- Subjacency is not about the total number of BNs crossed in the derivation. It is evaluated for each individual step of the derivation.
- Subjacency is not about linear crossing. It is about starting inside something and moving outside that thing.
- Can intermediate traces be lexically governed?
- A 'sentential subject' is a sentence that is itself the subject of a sentence. The term was coined by Ross, who used it in his Sentential Subject Constraint.
- A 'complex NP' is an NP with a sentence inside it. Another term of Ross's, who used it in his Complex NP Constraint
- Extracting XP is not the same as extracting out of XP
- What is an embedded question? (Hint: The embedded clause in 'What do you think Mary bought' is **not** one.)
- Does movement occur **at** SS, or **at** LF. No. these are **levels of representation** single points in derivations. (So for the former, much better to say 'between DS and SS' or maybe 'in the overt component'; for the latter, 'between SS and LF', or 'in the covert component', or 'in the LF **component**'.)
- Do traces move? Conceivably, but none of the material in this module of the course relies on such movement.
- What is the Strict Cycle Condition? Is it that once you have finished a cycle, nothing in that completed cycle can be accessed? That's too strong. Can you see why?
- In 'the car which I gave to Mary' 'which' has undergone A'-movement to CP,Spec, rather than, say, head movement to C. Note that the direct object of 'give' must be an NP, not a mere N.

- CNPC reduction to Subjacency is tricky (for noun complement constructions) for Chomsky 1986, and probably even for Chomsky 1973/1977:
 - Who do [_{IP} you believe [_{NP} the claim [_{CP} that [_{IP} Mary likes t]
- The problem for 1986 is that the CP is L-marked by 'claim', and, as usual, the whole big NP is L-marked by 'believe'.
- The problem for 1973-1977 is that the lower CP,Spec should be available. Then we just need to get out of the object NP and the matrix IP in one step. But we know that is generally possible:
 - ✓ Who did [_{IP} you see [_{NP} a picture of t]
- Is VP a barrier? For Chomsky 1986 **all** XPs are, but there are a bunch of ways to de-barrierize them. VP always gets de-barrierized by adjoining to it. (So how are there **any** island effects at all? Because Chomsky had several constraints on adjunction, ultimately entailing that VP is the only XP that can get de-barrierized that way. Lasnik&Saito took another tack, simply asserting that VP is never a barrier. L&S then didn't need the adjunction de-barrierization technology.)

-Point of presentation: Avoid presupposing what you are trying to prove. (e.g., when arguing that wh-movement is successive cyclic, don't begin by saying, for instance, that in Irish, intermediate wh-traces cause a change in the complementizer. That should be presented as the ultimate **conclusion**, rather than as the initial data.

Similarly for arguing for covert movement. You don't want to begin by saying that in Chinese, traces of (covert) movement of adjuncts obey the ECP. Again, this presupposes what you are trying to prove - that there **is** covert movement.

[This faulty kind of argument has a name in classical theory of rhetoric: question begging.]