A. Irish

Some dialects of English allow a kind of Wh-construction, where the base position of the wh-word is filled with what is called a "resumptive pronoun":

This is the book$_i$ that the police are arresting everyone who reads it$_i$

In Modern Irish, this kind of construction is very common. Modern Irish has two different wh-complementizers (notice that these are NOT wh-words, which go in spec,CP, these are C°):

a^L, a^N. The complementizer a^L is found in sentences like (1). Sentence (a) shows a simple sentence without wh-movement, sentences (b) and (c) show two possible forms of the question (b) has the question moved only to an intermediate CP specifier (declarative sentence containing an embedded question). (c) has the wh-word moved to the topmost specifier (this is a direct question).

1) a) Bíonn fios   agat i gconaí   go   bhuailfidh an píobaire an t-amhrán]
   be.HAB know at.2.s always   that   play.FUT   the piper   the song
   'You always know that the bagpiper will play the song'

   a) Bíonn fios   agat i gconaí [$_{CP}$ caidé$_i$ a^L bhuailfidh   an píobaire t$_i$]
      be.HAB know at.2.s always   what$_i$ COMP play.FUT   the piper   t$_i$
      'You always know what the bagpiper will play.'

 b) [$_{CP}$ Cáidé$_i$ [$_{IP}$ a^L bhíonn   fios   agat i gconaí [$_{CP}$ t$_i$ a^L bhuailfidh an píobaire t$_i$]]
        What   comp be.hab   know at.2.s always   comp play.fut   the piper   t$_i$
          'What do you always know the piper will play?'

The distribution of the complementizer a^N seems to be linked to the presence of a resumptive pronoun. Consider the following sentences (2b) and (3b) both show resumptive pronouns and the complementizer a^N:

2) a) Bíonn   fios   agat   i gconaí [$_{CP}$ caidé$_i$ a^L bhuailfidh   an píobaire t$_i$]
      be.HAB   know at.2.s   always   what$_i$ COMP   play.FUT   the piper   t$_i$
      'You always know what the bagpiper will play'

b) [$_{CP}$ Cén Píobaire$_j$ **a^N** [$_{IP}$ mbíonn fios   agat   i gconaí [$_{CP}$ caidé$_i$ a^L bhuailfidh **sé$_j$** t$_i$]]
        Which piper COMP be.HAB know at.2.s   always   what$_i$ COMP play.FUT he
        'Which bagpiper do you always know what (he) will play'?

3) a) Tá   máthair   an fhir   san otharlann
      Be.PRES mother   the man.GEN   in.the hospital
      'The man's mother is in the hospital'

   b) Cé   **a^N**   bhfuil   **a¡** mháthair   san   otharlann
      who   COMP   be.PRES   his mother   in.the hospital
         'Who is (his) mother in the hospital'

The a^N complementizer and the resumptive pronouns are boldfaced in the above examples.

Where precisely does the a^N-resumptive strategy appear in each case? In what environment do you get this construction? (This does not require a long answer!)

B.   Malay

Read the paper which I emailed to you all as a .pdf file, *The typology of Wh-movement: Wh-questions in Malay*, by Peter Cole and Gabriella Herman and answer the following questions *briefly* (read the questions before you read the paper, so that you can be alert for the relevant parts!):

1.   Describe the environments in which the *meng-* verbal prefix is omitted in Malay. What do Cole and Herman say that the interaction of *meng-* with wh-in-situ shows?

2.   Does partial wh-movement behave more like overt movement or more like wh-in-situ with respect to island violations? Does partial partial wh-movement behave more like overt movement or more like wh-in-situ with respect to *meng-*prefixation?

C.   Factive and Negative Islands

Cole and Herman discuss two kinds of islands which we haven't discussed in class: 'factive' islands and 'negative' islands.

→ *Factive* clauses are clauses that occur as the complement of a predicate which entails that the proposition described by the complement clause is true, as in *I regretted that Bill went*. (You can test whether or not a predicate entails the truth of its complement clause by adding a phrase which negates the complement clause and seeing if the resulting sentence makes sense. Contrast *regret* with, e.g., *believe*:

I believed that Bill went, but he didn't

vs.　*#I regretted that Bill went, but he didn't*.　　(#means 'semantically nonsensical')

Some other factive predicates include *be happy that* and *wonder* (*#I was happy that Bill went, but he didn't*, and *#I wondered why Bill went, but he didn't*).

→ 'Negative islands' occur when the matrix clause is negated, as in *I didn't believe Bill went*.

Do the following:

a) In some language, either your own or one for which you have a reliable and willing consultant[1], construct three declarative sentences with embedded clauses in them.
　　(i)　　The first sentence should contain a factive matrix verb like *regret that* or *be happy that* (don't use any equivalents of *wonder!*);
　　(ii)　　The second should contain a non-factive matrix verb like *believe that* or *think that*.
　　(iii)　　The third should be the negation of the second (i.e. it should say something like *I don't believe that…*).

→ Use the same embedded clause in all three sentences.
→ The embedded clause should contain a subject with a possessor in it (like *Bill's mother*),
→ The embedded clause should contain a direct object
→ The embedded clause should contain a reason-clause adjunct like *because he left*. (Note that the adjunct should modify the *embedded* clause, not the matrix clause — it should give the reason for the action in the embedded clause, not the reason for the belief or regret of the matrix clause).
→ Note: if you're not using English, use the standard method of interlinear glossing: first a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss, and then an idiomatic translation.

→ If the language you're using is not English, show that the factive verb in the first sentence is indeed factive, using the negation-conjunction test on the embedded clause shown above.

→ If the language you're using is not English, show the usual method of question-formation in your language by translating the following English question into its most natural counterpart in your language: What did John read?

---

[1] English speakers may use English if they want, *or* they may find a willing consultant who is a native speaker of another language, and treat this as a fieldwork exercise (in fact, *any* of you may do this if you don't want to use your native language). If you adopt the latter course, then follow the instructions that begin "if your native language is not English".

b)   Using your three declarative sentences from (a) as models, and using the usual means of question-formation in your language, construct questions which ask about the object of the embedded clause, and evaluate them for grammaticality. Does your language seem to show factive island effects? Does it show negative island effects?

c)   Using your three declarative clauses from (a) as models, and using the usual means of question-formation in your language, construct questions which ask about the *adjunct* of the embedded clause (these should be the equivalent of "why" questions), and evaluate them for grammaticality. Is there any difference between these sentences and the questions you constructed in (b)?

d)   Using only the *non*-factive declarative sentence from (a) as a model, and using the usual means of question-formation in your language,

    (i) construct a question which asks about the possessor contained in the subject of the embedded clause, and evaluate it for grammaticality.

    (ii) Construct a variant of the non-factive declarative sentence from (a) in which the *object* DP contains a possessor (the subject doesn't have to contain a possessor in this sentence).

    (iii) Now construct a question which asks about the possessor contained in the object of the embedded clause and evaluate it for grammaticality.

    (iv)   Is there any difference between the grammaticality judgements in (i) and (iii)? If so, discuss.