

## Homework 1: Islands, Barriers and Successive Cyclicity

1) Suppose raising and ECM complements are bare TPs, with no CP layer, as might well be the case. Are any interesting issues raised by the following examples? If so, what?

- (1) a. What did Mary seem to have written \_\_\_?  
b. What an incredible book Tom believed Sue to have written \_\_\_!

2) We saw in class that wh-islands, as in (2), can be accounted for in terms of Subjacency:

- (2) ??Which problem do you wonder how Bill solved

There is, however, an alternative derivation for (2) which would not violate Subjacency. How does this alternative derivation look like? Is there a way to exclude this derivation by a more general principle?

3) Suppose that in addition to the COMP escape hatch, wh-movement may also employ adjunction to VP as an escape hatch strategy. Does this assumption have any consequences for the account of (perhaps some of the) Islands in terms of the Subjacency Condition in (3)?

### Subjacency

- (3) No rule may move an element from the position Y to the position X  
.....X.....[ $\alpha$ .....[ $\beta$ .....Y.....].....X.....  
where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are bounding nodes

Bounding nodes in English: DP, TP.

4) It is reasonable to conjecture that the sentences in (5) show the same effect as the sentences in (4) — an effect discussed in class. They pose a particular problem, however. There is a type of derivation that must be excluded, or else the sentences in (5) should be as good as those in (6). Explain the problem, and suggest a solution.

- (4) a. \*Who did huge pictures of annoy the art critic?  
b. \*Which book by Franzen did the *Times* reviewer of accept a bribe?  
(5) a. \*Who were huge pictures of recently painted by Sue.  
b. \*Which book by Franzen did a nasty review of just appear.  
(6) a. Who did Sue recently paint huge pictures of?  
b. Which book by Franzen did the *Globe* just publish a nasty review of?

5) Rizzi (1982) proposed that the bounding nodes in Italian are DP and CP, rather than DP and TP. Describe clearly (with visual aids as appropriate) how the proposal accounts (or perhaps fails to account) for the judgments given below. These examples are from Rizzi's paper:

- (7) Tuo fratetello, a cui mi domando che storie abbiano raccontato  
 Your brother, to whom me ask-I which stories have-3p told  
 era molto preoccupato  
 was very troubled  
 ‘Your brother, to whom I wonder which stories they told was very troubled’
- (8) Il mio primo libro, *wh che* credo che tu sappia a chi ho  
 The my first book that believe-I that you know to whom have-I  
 dedicato mi è sempre stato molto caro  
 dedicated to me is always been very dear  
 ‘My first book, which I believe you know to whom I dedicated, has always been very dear to me’
- (9) \*Il mio primo libro, *wh che* so a chi credi che abbia  
 The my first book that know-I to whom believe-you that have-I  
 dedicato mi è sempre stato molto caro  
 dedicated to me is always been very dear  
 ‘My first book, which I know to whom you believe that I dedicated, has always been very dear to me’
- (10) \*Questo incarico, *wh che* non so proprio chi possa avere indovinato  
 This task that not know-I really who could have guessed  
 a chi affiderò, mi sta creando un sacco di grattacapi  
 to whom would entrust-I is getting me into trouble  
 ‘This task, that I really don’t know who could have guessed to whom they would entrust is getting me into trouble’

Are there any other islands predicted to be well-formed in Italian on this account?