

**Generative Grammar MGU/RGGU**  
**Fall, 2002: J. Bailyn Spec-Kurs**  
**Continuing with movement:**  
**How far can you move?**  
**"Subjacency"**

November 22, 2002

**Summary of Movement:**

**All movement:**

- leaves a **trace**
- is either **substitution** or **adjunction**.

1) **Head movement**

- Leaves a trace
- Moves a **head** into the next higher head position
- $V^0 \rightarrow T^0$

(English aux; French, German, Welsh, Irish lexical verbs)

- $T^0 \rightarrow C^0$  (English, French questions, German main clauses).

In English, if there is nothing in  $T^0$ , then we insert **do** whenever we need it (for movement and before Neg)

2) **NP-movement**

- Leaves a trace
- Moves an NP that has no source of case, into a case position. The NP usually has no case because either (a) it is the object of a passive verb or (b) the subject of an infinitive.
- Is movement from a theta-position (close relation to a verb, adjective, or other theta-role assignor) to a non-theta position (from object to subject position in passives; raising into the highest subject position of "raising verbs" like **seems** or other "raising predicates" such as **is likely**.)

NPs cannot have 2 theta-roles, so NP movement must be into a **non-theta position**, but into a potential **argument position** (such as subject). This is why NP movement is often called **A Movement**

3) **WH-Movement**

- Leaves a trace
- Moves a WH-word (or null element) into SpecCP. Here, the movement is from a case-marked position (if NP) into SpecCP, which is a **non-argument position**. Therefore, WH-movement is called **A-bar Movement (A'-Movement)**.
- Because the WH word (if an NP) already has **case**, it must be true that no case is assigned in SpecCP because NPs cannot have 2 cases at once.

Summarizing evidence for **traces**:

A. **Have**-contraction

- 1) a. We have called the police three times this week.  
b. **We've** called the police three times this week.
- 2) a. [We **should** have called the Police. ]  
b. **Should** [we t have called the Police? ] ( $T^0 \rightarrow C^0$  movement leaves a **trace**)  
\*c. Should [**we've** called the Police? ] (Contraction impossible over **t**)



**Possible conclusions to be drawn from (12-13):**

- i) The rule restricting movement **does not** apply to WH-movement (testable)
- ii) The rule restricting movement **does** apply to WH-movement. If true, then despite appearances, WH-movement gets around the rule by making small stops along the way

Evidence that WH-movement is **in fact restricted by our rule restricting movement**:

- 14) a. **Who<sub>i</sub>** do you think [**t<sub>i</sub>** left ] ?
- \*b. **Who<sub>i</sub>** do you wonder [ whether [**t<sub>i</sub>** left ] ] ?
- 15) a. Yeltsin thinks that Gorby fell [because of political pressures].
- b. **Why<sub>i</sub>** does Yeltsin think that Gorby fell **t<sub>i</sub>** ?
- 16) a. Yeltsin wonders whether Gorby fell [because of political pressures].
- \*b. **Why<sub>i</sub>** does Yeltsin wonder whether Gorby fell **t<sub>i</sub>** ?

- Comparing (15b) and (16b) shows that the nature of the element(s) in CP affects movement!
- Let us then **hypothesize** that whenever a middle SpecCP is open (12b, 13b), then WH movement makes a stop on its way up. This is reasonable because SpecCP is the normal stopping place for WH movement anyway and because it is empty when we use the Complementizer **that**.
- This allows us to understand why (14b, 16b) are ungrammatical. **whether** fills SpecCP, so no intermediate stopping place is available. Movement must happen in one jump, and then our **rule on restricting movement** is violated
- We can now maintain our rule and still account for cases of long movement which are possible.

How do we **test** this hypothesis? We check its **predictions!**

Our hypothesis predicts that whenever WH-movement crosses an embedded clause, SpecCP of the embedded clause should be open for a stopping place. If SpecCP is already filled, we have an **island** and movement violates our **rule on restriction of movement**.

--We have seen that if SpecCP is filled with a WH word like **whether** this rules out (14b),(16b).

--In relative clauses SpecCP is also filled by the **relative pronoun** ("which")

- 17) a. Yeltsin said [ \_\_\_ that [ Gorby hurt Lebed ] ]
- b. **Who<sub>i</sub>** did<sub>k</sub> Yeltsin **t<sub>k</sub>** say [ **t<sub>i</sub>** that [ Gorby hurt **t<sub>i</sub>** ] ] (movement is OK)

**BUT:**

- 18) a. Yeltsin is proposing a law [ **which<sub>i</sub>** will<sub>j</sub> [ **t<sub>i</sub>** **t<sub>j</sub>** hurt Lebed ] ]
- \*b. **Who<sub>i</sub>** is<sub>k</sub> Yeltsin **t<sub>k</sub>** proposing a law [ which<sub>i</sub> will<sub>j</sub> [ **t<sub>i</sub>** **t<sub>j</sub>** hurt **t<sub>i</sub>** ? ] ]

In (18b) the intermediate SpecCP is filled and Movement fails. We need to change our rule:

**Our rule restricting movement: Nothing can move over 2 TP/NPs in a single jump**

- 19) a. **Who<sub>i</sub>** did Yeltsin claim [ \_\_\_ that he saw **t<sub>i</sub>** last week ]? (is grammatical)
- \*b. **Who<sub>i</sub>** did Yeltsin make the claim [  $\emptyset$ <sub>i</sub> that he saw **t<sub>i</sub>** last week? (is ungrammatical)
- 20) a. Yeltsin thinks that Lebed is **very intelligent**.
- b. [**How intelligent**]<sub>i</sub> does Yeltsin think that Lebed is **t<sub>i</sub>** ?
- 21) a. Yeltsin is looking for a minister who is **very intelligent**.
- \*b. [**How intelligent**]<sub>i</sub> is Yeltsin looking for a minister who is **t<sub>i</sub>** ?

HOMEWORK #9: (due Friday, November 29)

- i) Draw trees of the following cases of WH-movement given in this handout:  
(11b, 12b, 13b, 14a, \*14b, 15b, \*16b, 17b, \*18b, 19a, \*19b, 20b, \*21b)
- ii) Show traces of the original spot and every stopping point with a little **t** co-indexed with the moved element.
- iii) Make sure your trees or discussions explicitly show why the ungrammatical questions are ungrammatical according to our Rule of Restrictions on Movement given in its second version on p. 3