Please answer **only one** of the two exam questions given below. You must answer all parts of each question. Please write 5-7 pages (not counting structure diagrams).

**Question 1: Cinque 2004 (and Cinque 1999)**

[a] In your own words, please explain the core claims put forward by Cinque 1999/2004. What is the core research question/puzzle that Cinque addresses? Be explicit (throughout!)


[b] Please outline Cinqué’s core argumentation in favor of his cross-linguistic claim(s). Please provide supporting data from Cinque’s writings to support your prose. (Feel free to optionally consult Rizzi & Cinque 2016 for additional data, but you are not required to do so.)


[c] Please state the core patterns and observations in the Norwegian data (1)-(3) (from Cinque 1999:34, judgments due to Øystein Nilsen). Show how Cinque’s analysis explains the data. Please provide illustrations (e.g. structure diagrams) of the analysis, as applied to these examples. Please include additional examples of your own if you feel that they make a better point than (1)-(3), but bear in mind that you must also discuss (1)-(3).

(1) a. **OK** Per forlater ærlig talt heldigvis nå selskapet.
   ‘Peter leaves honestly spoken fortunately now the party.’

   b. * Per forlater heldigvis ærlig talt nå selskapet.
   ‘Peter leaves fortunately honestly spoken now the party.’

(2) a. **OK** Per har heldigvis tydeligvis gått.
   ‘Peter has fortunately evidently left.’

   b. ?? Per har tydeligvis heldigvis gått.
   ‘Peter has evidently fortunately left.’

(3) a. **OK** Per skjønner tydeligvis sannsynligvis problemet godt.
   ‘Peter understands evidently probably the problem well.’

   b. * Per skjønner sannsynligvis tydeligvis problemet godt.
   ‘Peter understands probably evidently the problem well.’

[d] Please apply Cinque’s proposal to the Norwegian data in (4) (from Åfarli & Eide 2003:87-88). Please explore options of how Cinque’s proposal could explain (4), i.e. try to “make the data work” in a Cinque approach; provide explicit illustrations (e.g. structure diagrams) of how Cinque could deal with these data. Then sketch an alternative approach (drawing on the syntactic theory that you have learned so far). Finally, weigh up the costs and benefits (the **pros and cons**) of adopting a Cinque approach.

---

(4) a. OK Jon hadde dessverre truleg også fortært ostekake på festen.
   'Jon had unfortunately probably also eaten cheese cake at the party.'

b. OK Jon hadde truleg dessverre også fortært ostekake på festen.
   'Jon had probably unfortunately also eaten cheese cake at the party.'

c. (?) Jon hadde også dessverre truleg fortært ostekake på festen.
   'Jon had also unfortunately probably eaten cheese cake at the party.'

**Question 2: Bobaljik 2008 (and Marantz 1991)**

[a] In your own words, please explain the core claims put forward by Marantz 1991 and Bobaljik 2008. What is the core research question/puzzle that they address? Be explicit (throughout)!


[b] Please outline Bobaljik and Marantz’s core argumentation in favor of their cross-linguistic claim(s). Please provide supporting data from their writings to support your prose. (Feel free to optionally consult Baker & Bobaljik 2017 for additional data, but you are not required to do so.)


[c] Please state the core patterns and observations in the Standard Gujarati data (1)-(2) (from Mistry 2004:3-4 and Suthar 2006:36).\(^2\) Show how Marantz’s analysis explains the case pattern and how Bobaljik’s analysis explains the agreement pattern. Please provide illustrations (e.g. structure diagrams) of the analysis, as applied to these examples. Please include additional examples of your own if you feel that they make a better point than (1)-(2), but bear in mind that you must also discuss (1) and (2).

(1) a. ʂɪlāa  kaagaL  lakh-t-i
   Sheela.F.SG  letter.M.SG  write-IPFV-F.SG
   ‘Sheela used to write a letter.’

b. hʊ  ṛam-t-o  ḡə-t-o
   I  play-IPFV-M.SG  AUX-PROG-M.SG
   ‘I was playing.’ *(male speaker)*

(2) a. ʂɪlāa-e  kaagaL  lakh-y-o
   ‘Sheela wrote a letter.’

b. hʊ  ṛam-y-o
   I  play-PFV-M.SG
   ‘I played.’ *(male speaker)*

---


Please apply Bobaljik’s (2008) proposal to the data in (3)-(5). Please explore options of how Bobaljik’s proposal could explain (3)-(5), i.e. try to “make the data work” in the approach of Bobaljik (and Marantz); provide explicit illustrations (e.g. structure diagrams) of how Bobaljik (and Marantz) could deal with these data. Then sketch an alternative approach (drawing on the syntactic theory that you have learned so far). Finally, weigh up the costs and benefits (the pros and cons) of adopting the approach of Bobaljik (and Marantz).

(3) a. šilaa-e Raaj-ne pajav-y-o Standard Gujarati
   ‘Sheela harassed Raj.’
   ‘Kishor ground mung beans.’

(4) a. Reena kutro mar-th-i Kutchi Gujarati
   Reena.F.SG dog.M.SG hit-IPFV-F.SG
   ‘Reena used to hit a dog.’
   b. Reena kutro mar-y-o
   ‘Reena hit a dog.’

(5) a. raaj-e aa varše vahelaa keri aaN-i S.Gujarati
   ‘Raj brought mangoes early this year.’
   b. raaj-e aa varše vahelo keri laav-y-o
   ‘Raj also brought mangoes early this year.’

---