

A possible hybrid theory of bounding nodes/barriers

We have seen that none of the theories we have looked at handle even the relatively small range of facts we have considered.

- (1) Chomsky 1973: Movement can cross one but not two bounding nodes. Bounding nodes were NP and CP. Subjacency then did little work, NOT subsuming the islandhood of subjects or embedded questions. On the positive side, it did allow extraction out of objects.
- (2) Chomsky 1976/77: Movement can cross one but not two bounding nodes. Bounding nodes were NP and IP. Pretty much the reverse empirical pluses and minuses of 1973.
- (3) Rizzi 1980: A parameter. Clausal bounding node CP for Italian, IP for English. Rizzi claimed that while extraction out of subjects and embedded questions is bad in English, it is OK in Italian. (But, recall, he claimed that extraction out of stacked embedded questions is bad in Italian, as is extraction out of an embedded declarative inside and embedded question. As he showed, this all follows with CP.) Unless more is said, it runs into problems for English extraction out of objects.
- (4) Chomsky 1986 was an attempt at a much more principled theory. Basically **all** XPs are potential barriers, but almost all of them get de-barrierized (in a variety of ways; and with stipulations preventing too much de-barrierization). One of the major de-barrierization strategies was L-marking - an XP that is complement to a lexical head is de-barrierized. He got the theory to work, but the English/Italian contrast was problematic.
- (5) A hybrid theory that is not particularly principled, and that nobody has ever proposed, but that seems to get the facts we have looked at right:
- (6) As in Rizzi's proposal, CP, NP for Italian, IP, NP for English are the barriers.
- (7) BUT we add the stipulation that L-marked DP is de-barrierized. (We can't say that any L-marked XP is de-barrierized or we lose the wh-island effects in Italian that do exist.)
- (8) I guess we also want to add that L-marked PP is also de-barrierized, to allow "What did she talk about?"

Addendum:

- (9) I have now remembered that IP also can be de-barrierized when it is the complement of a lexical head. We need this for WH-extraction out of an ECM or raising complement (both of which, you will recall, must be 'bare' IPs).
- (10) Who do [_{IP} you believe [_{IP} Mary to admire *t*]]
- (11) Who_j is [_{IP} Susan_i likely [_{IP} *t*_i to hire *t*_j]]
- (12) (8) presupposed that PP can be a barrier, so this should be made explicit. This is then used to account for the fact that adjuncts are islands, as in
- (13) *Which lecture did you go home [_{PP} after *t*]