1. **Trees.** For the sentences a–e, **draw the structure of the sentence.** Where something moves, **draw an arrow from the trace to its next position.** Mark [uclause-type:] and [uwh*] features, and show how they are checked/valued by drawing a line between the heads that have the matching features. You need not mark the other features.

**Ground rules:** Mostly as with the last homework; (implicit or explicit) triangles are ok within DP. No need to mark the case of DPs or how the case is checked. **When something moves, indicate it with an arrow from the place it moved from to the place it moved to.** You can write “V+v” or “N+n” instead of drawing the full complex head, but you still need to draw the movement arrow that ends at N or V.

(1) a. Which book did Igor read?
   b. Who was introduced to Pat?
   c. What was Pat asked to buy?
   d. Did the boat sink?
   e. When did Pat find the case of cheese?

2. **Binding theory and wh-movement.** (Inspired by a problem from Roberts 1997). Under certain circumstances, anaphors can be bound inside DPs. So, (2) is grammatical.

(2) John_i likes [DP songs about himself_i].

**Part A.** Draw a tree for (3) (same ground rules as in problem #1).

(3) Who did Mary give a song about herself to?

**Part B.** Draw a tree for (4).

(4) [DP which song about himself_i ] does John_i like?

**Part C.** (4) is grammatical, so it must satisfy Principle A. It doesn’t *look* like it does, though. Assume Principle A is correct as it is (anaphors must be bound within their binding domain). Briefly explain how (4) satisfies Principle A. *Hint:* Think about what we write as “<DP>”—that’s just a shorthand, really. “Movement” is a process of making a copy of the thing we’re moving and then Merging/Adjoining the copy at the top. You can assume that when you make a copy of an anaphor, only one of the copies needs to be bound.
Part D. Briefly explain why she in (5) cannot be Mary.

(5) * [DP which song about Mary] does she like?

Part E. What is the binding domain for Principle A? (Is it TP or CP?) We’ve not so far been very explicit about what the binding domain (for Principles A and B) is exactly—it’s just been “the clause.” That could mean either TP or CP. But, we’re in a position now to make this determination. Consider (6), where himself can refer either to David or to Nigel. This is predicted, but it also indicates that an anaphor like himself need not be bound by the closest possible binder—it just has to be something within the binding domain. Both David and Nigel are inside the binding domain.

(6) David gave Nigel a picture of himself.

Now consider (7)—in (7), himself can be Derek, but it can’t be David.

(7) David believes Derek to have taken a picture of himself.

So, here’s the question: What is the binding domain for Principle A (TP or CP)?

Part F. Go back to Part C and remind yourself about what you said. Then, consider (8). Draw a tree for (8).

(8) [DP which songs about himself] did Nigel say that Derek likes?

Part G. Explain how it is possible in (8) for himself to refer to Nigel, and how it is possible for himself to refer to Derek.

Part H. (Inspired partly by Adger 2003, ex. 9.6.). What seems to be the problem with (9)? There’s no easy solution to this problem, the traditional solution has been to slightly complicate the definition of “binding domain.” More recent solutions often involve altering the means by which accusative case is checked. For now, you just need to identify what it is about (9) that would have led us to predict that it should be ungrammatical.

(9) Derek believes himself to have the role of lukewarm water.