

Discussion questions: Noguchi (1997)

Alternative for Assignment #4-5 • Due Tuesday, October 18

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you are a linguistics graduate student in your second year or higher, you must complete this alternative to Assignment #4–5. |
|---|

Background information and terminology

In GB syntax (1980s-1990s), the difference between *A-movement* (A-positions, A-binding) and *A'-movement* (A'-positions, A'-binding; pronounced “A-bar”) was important.

- A-movement is movement to an argument position (hence “A”), as in NP-movement (like Passive or Raising), and usually involves moving to get Case. A-binding is the binding relationship between a phrase that has undergone A-movement and its trace.
- A'-movement is movement to a *non*-argument position, like an adjunction site or Spec of CP; examples are WH-movement and operator movement (e.g., quantifier raising). A'-binding is the binding relationship between a phrase that has undergone A'-movement and its trace.

Null pronominals: Many languages, including Japanese, have null (empty, non-overt) subject and/or object pronouns. These are represented in example sentences as pro, sometimes called “little pro” to distinguish it from “big PRO” (the null subject of an infinitive clause).

Answer the following questions completely but concisely, based on the information in the reading (and any other relevant knowledge you might have). Please avoid using direct quotations unless absolutely necessary; instead, try to restate the points made in the reading using your own words.

- (1) What is it that personal pronouns like *he, she* can do in English, but personal pronouns like *kare, kanozoyo* can't do in Japanese? Try to explain the difference; go beyond simply repeating terminology from the article.
 - Hint: The presence of the index *i* on certain words in examples (1a-b) is crucial.
- (2) Choose *one* of the two previous approaches to the problem that Noguchi reviews in section 2 (i.e., sec 2.1 or sec 2.2). Summarize the main point of the proposal as well as Noguchi's grounds for rejecting that proposal.
- (3) English personal pronouns
 - (a) What lexical category does Noguchi propose that English personal pronouns belong to?
 - (b) Note that as part of his discussion, Noguchi reviews earlier, related claims by various researchers, but he finds fault with certain aspects of their proposals. Summarize what Noguchi, himself, proposes to be true about the syntactic structure of English personal pronouns (in section 3.1).
 - (c) Draw the structures in (25) and (27a) as trees.

- (4) Japanese personal pronouns
- What lexical category does Noguchi propose that Japanese personal pronouns belong to?
 - What *distributional* evidence does he present for this claim? What additional evidence does he also present? Do you have any comment on these arguments?
 - Draw the structures in (32) (pick one pronoun) and (33a) as trees.
- (5) Does Noguchi's proposal about the syntactic-category difference between Japanese and English personal pronouns explain why only the Japanese ones can occur with adjectives (setting aside the special English pattern in §4.1)? If so, how?
- (6) Choose *one* of the two potential problems for Noguchi's analysis that he raises and dismisses in §4.1 and §4.2. Summarize the problem and Noguchi's reason for dismissing it. Are you convinced?
- (7) The "meat" of Noguchi's proposal is summarized in §5. Explain how the proposal in Noguchi's (51) leads to the difference between personal pronouns in English and Japanese that you discussed in reading guide question (1).
- (8) (*Background to the question:*) One of the points discussed in §6 is this: At LF, the English determiners *a, the* can optionally be represented by a variable (which gets bound by a quantifier such as the universal quantifier introduced by an expression like *always*). Noguchi's rule of **variable substitution** (VS) is a formalization of this effect. Then, §6 explains that most researchers analyze the LF representation of an English personal pronoun that is used as a bound variable (in a construction like [*Every woman*]_i *painted her_i own car*) as a variable as well; this time, it gets bound by the overt quantifier in the sentence.
- (*The question:*) What does Noguchi see as the generalization that underlies VS (57) and the LF pronoun rule (58)? In other words, would he predict that Japanese *kare* would be subject to a rule similar to the one in (58)? Why or why not?
- (9) Does the Japanese form *sore* pattern like *kare*? What syntactic category does Noguchi propose that *sore* belongs to? Does he have any corroborating evidence for this claim?
- (10) Now let us return to Noguchi's example (13b) with *pro*, repeated here:

Daremo_i-ga [pro_i atama-ga ii to] omotte-iru
everyone-NOM pro head-NOM good COMP think-PRES
 'Everyone_i thinks that he_i is intelligent.'

What would Noguchi say is the syntactic category of *pro* in this example? On what basis?