Syntax II – Class #22
Weak Islands and Intervention Effects

1. Barriers: Head-Movement and A-Movement

(1) * Have you could t done that?

V \rightarrow C movement blocked because it would cross VP & IP barriers
V \rightarrow I \rightarrow C assumed to be ok:
I \rightarrow C crosses no barriers (I is only inheritance barrier)
V \rightarrow I, special provision needed, [V+I] L-marks VP

If we assumed that I L-marked V, then V \rightarrow C would be fine

• Incorporation: N \rightarrow V predicted to be ok
• Incorporation: N \rightarrow V (crossing intervening P) predicted to be ok!

• A-Movement: see Roberts

2. Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990)

• Head movement blocked by heads

(1) a. You can do that.
    b. Can you do that?
    c. * Do you can that?

• A-movement blocked by A-specifiers

(2) a. Wallace seems __ to be happy.
    b. Wallace was hit __ by a bowlful of porridge.
    c. Gromit is likely __ to be arrested.
    d. * Wallace seems that it is likely __ to be arrested.
    e. * The students seem that it was told __ that there would be extra reading.

• A-bar movement blocked by A-bar specifiers

Wh-islands

(4) * How do you wonder what Wallace fixed __?

Negative islands

(5) a. * How didn’t he fix your car __?
    b. * How don’t you think he fixed your car __?
French bien (‘Pseudo-opacity’ Obenauer 1984)

(6) a. Jean a consulté beaucoup de livres. [beaucoup extraction]  
John has consulted many of books

b. Jean a beaucoup consulté de livres.

(7) a. Combien a-t-il consulté de livres? [limited LB extractions]  
How many has he consulted of books

b. Combien de livres a-t-il beaucoup consultés?

(8) a. Combien de livres a-t-il beaucoup consultés? [2 extractions  
incompatible]  
How many of books has he much consulted

b. * Combien a-t-il beaucoup consulté de livres?

• Relativized Minimality Effects

(9) a. A’ movement may not cross a filled A’ specifier

b. A movement may not cross a filled A-specifier

c. Head movement may not cross a filled head position

• What can be simplified once Relativized Minimality is assumed

  i. Wh-islands for adjuncts – intervention effects
  ii. Negative islands – intervention effects
  iii. VP needn’t be a barrier for purposes of capturing head movement constraint effects
  iv. Relative clauses are intervention islands for adjuncts

• What remains to be captured in (more or less) standard fashion

  i. CED islands: subject islands, adjunct islands
  ii. CNPC effects

3. Weak Islands & Referentiality

• Effects of D-linking object NPs: escape from wh-islands, and superiority violations (Pesetsky 1987)

(10) a. Mary asked who read what.

b. ??Mary asked what who read.
(11)  a. Mary asked which man read which book.
    b. Mary asked which book which man read.

(12)  a. Who did you persuade to read what?
    b. * What did you persuade who to read?

(13)  a. Which man did you persuade to read which book?
    b. Which book did you persuade which man to read?

(14)  a. ?? What do you wonder whether Gromit read __?
    b. Which of those books do you wonder whether Gromit read __?

Which-phrases are proposed to have special status by virtue of being \textit{D\(\text{iscourse}\)-linked}.

- Non-referential theta-roles: failure to escape wh-islands (Rizzi 1990)

\textit{Obligatory Adverbials}

(15)  a. * John worded the letter.
    b. John worded the letter carefully.

(16)  a. How carefully do you believe he worded the letter __?
    b. * How carefully do you wonder who worded the letter __?
    c. ?? How carefully did you persuade which man to word the letter __?

\textit{Idiom Chunks}

(17)  a. What headway do you believe he made __?
    b. * What headway do you wonder who made __?
    c. ?? What headway did you persuade which man to make __?

\textit{Measure Phrases}

(18)  a. How many pounds do you believe he weighs __?
    b. * How many pounds do you wonder who weighs __?
    c. ?? How many pounds did you persuade which boxer to weigh __?

- Quantificational (non-referential) NPs: failure to escape wh-islands, even in Italian (Cinque 1991)

(19)  a. Qualche ragazza, dice che troverà __.
    Some girl, he says that he will find.
• D-linking in Italian

(20) a. Ogni dichiarazione, dice di aver ritrattato __.
    Every statement, he says he has retracted.

b. * Ogni dichiarazione, mi chiedo perché abbia ritrattalo __ __.
    Every statement, I wonder why he has retracted.

• D-linking in Polish

(23) a. Zastanawiam sie [kto co przyniesie]
    I-wonder who what will-bring
    ‘I wonder who will bring what.’

b.(* ) Zastanawiam sie [kto przyniesie co]

    finally who does what

‘[Such] questions are somewhat different from echo questions. We can call them clarifying questions. The speaker could ask [6] in the following situation. There are various tasks, and several people to be assigned to them. Proposals have been made how to pair up people and tasks, but no fixed plan has been set up yet. The speaker of [6] is confused by the proposals, and wants to have a fixed plan.’ [Wachowicz 1974, noted in Pesetsky 1987]

(25) a. Kogo diedy Maria zabila?
    Whom where M. killed
    ‘Who killed Mary where?’

b. Kogo Maria zabila kiedy?
• Loss of ambiguity of *how many* phrases in wh-island contexts (Dobrovie-Sorin 1990, Longobardi 1990)

(a) Questions about a *number* or quantity, with no specific individuals in mind
(b) Questions about *individuals*, but asking about how many individuals have a certain property

(26) How many books does Wallace want to read this weekend?

a. – Five books, because that’s what he has to do every weekend
i.e. what is the number of books such that Wallace wants to read that many books

b. – Five books: *Barriers, War and Peace, The Road Less Traveled, Don Quixote* and *The Cheese-Lover’s Almanac.*
i.e. how many books are such that Wallace wants to read them

(27) How many books do you wonder whether Wallace wants to read ___?

(28) a. How many books do you regret that Wallace read ___?
b. How many diamonds are you happy that Knuckles stole ___?

(29) a. How many sheep do you think that Preston captured ___?
b. How many sheep don’t you think that Preston captured ___?

• Austronesian: evidence for and against successive-cyclic wh-movement (Chung 1982, 1994; Georgopoulos 1985, 1991)

**Chamorro Verbs:**

Sensitive to Case of *wh*-traces; always in lowest clause, generally successive cyclic.

(30) a. Nominative replace ergative AGR with *-um-* = transitive infinitive
b. Objective (Optionally) nominalize: insert *-in-* if transitive
c. Oblique Nominalize: insert *-in-* if unaccusative

**Palauan Verbs**

Sensitive to Case of *wh*-traces; always in lowest clause, successive cyclic.

(31) a. Nominative realis mood; delete subject agr
b. Objective irrealis mood
Wh-agreement affects each clause in path of extraction

(32) a. Haya umistotba si Juan [t ni minahalang i asagua-na t]? who? wh[NOM].disturb Juan COMP wh[OBL].lonely the spouse-AGR 'Who does it disturb Juan that his wife is lonely for?' [Or: 'Who does [that his wife is lonely for t] disturb Juan?']

b. Hayi minalagu'-niha [t para u-maigu' t gespaingi]? who? wh[OBL].want-AGR FUT wh[NOM].AGR-sleep late 'Who do they want to sleep late?'

Wh-agreement varies with the case of the trace, or of the argument containing the trace.

- Long-distance movement doesn't always require successive-cyclic wh-agreement

(33) a. Hafa malago'-mu [t u-mafa'maolik t ]? what? wh[OBL].want-AGR wh[NOM].AGR-be.fixed 'What do you want to be fixed?'

b. * Hafa malagu' hao [u-mafa'maolik t ]? what? AGR-want you wh[NOM].AGR-be.fixed ('What do you want to be fixed?')

(34) a. Hayi na palao'an ma'a'nao-mu [t na para u-kahat t esti na dangkulu-n kahun]? who? L woman wh[OBL].afraid-AGR COMP FUT wh[NOM].AGR-lift this L big-L box 'Which woman are you afraid will pick up this big box.'

b. Hayi na palao'an ma'a'nao hao [na para u-kahat t esti na dangkulu-n kahun]? who? L woman AGR-afraid you COMP FUT wh[NOM].AGR-lift this L big-L box 'Which woman are you afraid will pick up this big box?'

Wh-expressions showing long-movement effects in Italian and Chamorro?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Non-referential” Short Movers</th>
<th>“Referential” Long Movers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian: chi, ‘who’</td>
<td>Italian: definite DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro: hayi ‘who’</td>
<td>Chamorro: definite DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro: hafa, ‘what’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian: ogni NP, ‘every NP’</td>
<td>Italian: quale, ‘what’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian: qualcosa, ‘something’; qualcuno, ‘someone’</td>
<td>Chamorro: which NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian: nessun NP, ‘no NP’; niente, ‘nothing’</td>
<td>Italian: tutti DP, ‘all DP’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro: no one; nothing</td>
<td>Chamorro: all DP, each NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian: qualche NP, ‘some NP’; alcuni NP, ‘some NP’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamorro: many NP, much NP, some NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamorro: no NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(35) *Condition on Long Movement*

The trace of long movement must range over a sufficiently restricted set.

The ability of just a subset of NPs to escape, say, wh-islands, shouldn’t be attributed to properties of the wh-island, because the same classification of NPs that do and don’t allow long movement is found in the absence of wh-islands.

- *Weak Islands* are affected by these semantic manipulations, other islands probably are not

**Weak Islands:** wh-islands, factive islands, negative islands, pseudo-opacity

[Note that weak islands may be characterized in terms of *intervention* effects]

**Strong Islands:** subject islands, adjunct islands, relative clause islands, CNPC effects

(36) a. How many pounds do you think Wallace weighs __?
b. How many pounds is it surprising that Wallace weighs __?

(37) a. How many books do you think John will put __ in this box?
b. How many books is it surprising that John will put __ in this box?

### 4. Locality (Manzini 1992) …to be continued

(38) Typology of Dependencies

a. ‘Categorial’ dependencies (more local)
b. ‘Address-based’ dependencies (less local)

(39) Typology of Islands

a. Weak Islands

Includes: wh-islands (2-whs), factive islands, negative islands, pseudo-opacity

Properties:

i. intervention due to A’ specifier
ii. escaped by address-based (referential) dependencies
iii. no crossing of non-complement node

b. Strong Islands I

Includes: subject islands, adjunct islands, relative clause islands

Properties:

i. problem due to crossing non-complement node
ii. address-based dependency impossible
c. Strong Islands II
   Includes: Complex NP Constraint, Wh-islands (multiple wh-blockers), LBC (?)
   Properties:
      i. problem due to extraction out of addressed-category
      ii. address-based dependency impossible

What it attempts to unify, what it does not change.

- Weak Islands are those islands that involve crossing neither an independent address nor a non-complement. These islands can be escaped when an address-based dependency is formed.

- Address-based dependencies can cross barriers, but cannot cross non-complement nodes, and cannot cross other addressed categories.

- A-movement is movement in search of case, so by assumption is inherently unable to form an address-based dependency.

- Head-movement also does not involve movement of case-marked elements, so it is also confined to forming categorial dependencies.