HOME EXAM (HJEMMEEKSAMEN) FOR LING2104 IN HØST 2017

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)!

> Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
> Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. Issues in adverbial syntax. *Lingua* 114, 683-710.

[b] Please outline Cinque'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.)

> Rizzi, Luigi, and Guglielmo Cinque. 2016. Functional Categories and Syntactic Theory. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 2, 139-163. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011415-040827

[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).[1] 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.

---

[1] Åfarli, Tor A., and Kristin M. Eide. 2003. *Norsk generativ syntaks*. Oslo: Novus forlag.

(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)!

Bobaljik, Jonathan D. 2008. Where's Phi Agreement as a Postsyntactic Operation'. In D. Harbour, D. Adger and S. Béjar (eds.): *Phi Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 295-328.

Marantz, Alec. 1991. Case and licensing. In G. F. Westphal, B. Ao and H.-R. Chae (eds.): *ESCOL 91: Proceedings of the Eighth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*. 234-253.

[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.)

Baker, M. C., and J. D. Bobaljik. 2017. On Inherent and Dependent Theories of Ergative Case. In J. Coon, D. Massam, and L. D. Travis (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Ergativity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Final preprint version available for download at: http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003107/

[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. šilaa   kaagaL   lakh-t-i   *Standard Gujarati*
         Sheela.F.SG   letter.M.SG   write-IPFV-F.SG
         'Sheela used to write a letter.'

   b. hũ   rəm-t-o   hə-t-o
       I   play-IPFV-M.SG   AUX-PROG-M.SG
       'I was playing.' *(male speaker)*

(2) a. šilaa-e   kaagaL   lakh-y-o
         Sheela.F.SG-ERG letter.M.SG write-PFV-M.SG
         'Sheela wrote a letter.'

   b. hũ   rəm-y-o
       I   play-PFV-M.SG
       'I played.' *(male speaker)*

---

[2] Mistry, P. J. 2004. Subjecthood of non-nominatives in Gujarati. In P. Bhaskararao and K. V. Subbarao (eds.): *Non-nominative Subjects, Volume 2*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1-32.
Suthar, Babubhai Kohyabhai. 2006. Agreement in Gujarati. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

[d] 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, <u>weigh up the costs and benefits</u> (the *pros and cons*) of adopting the approach of Bobaljik (and Marantz).

(3) a.   šilaa-e   Raaj-ne   pajav-y-o   *Standard Gujarati*
                Sheela.F.SG-ERG Raaj.M.SG-ACC harass-PFV-M.SG   (adapted from Mistry 1997)[3]
                'Sheela harassed Raj.'

      b.   kišor-e   mag-ne   bharad-y-a
                Kishor.M.SG-ERG mung.beans.M.PL-ACC grind-PFV-M.PL
                '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.F.SG dog.M.SG hit-PFV-M.SG
                'Reena hit a dog.'

(5) a.   raaj-e   aa varše vahelaa keri   aaN-i   *S.Gujarati*
                Raaj.M.SG-ERG this year   early   mango.F.SG bring-PFV-F.SG   (Mistry 1997)
                'Raj brought mangoes early this year.'

      b.   raaj-e   aa varše vahelo keri   laav-y-o
                Raaj.M.SG-INCL this year   early   mango.F.SG bring-PFV-M.SG
                'Raj also brought mangoes early this year.'

---

[3] Mistry, P. J. 1997. Objecthood and specificity in Gujarati. In J. Hill, P. J. Mistry, and L. Campbell (eds.): *The life of language: Papers in linguistics in honor of William Bright.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 425-442.