I. Explain the following pattern of grammaticality by making reference to the case properties of NPs and CPs. (1 page, single spaced)

(1)  a.  i. The hosts anticipated \[CP\] that Mary would arrive late.
    ii. The hosts anticipated \[NP\] Mary’s late arrival.
   b.  i. It was anticipated (by the hosts) \[CP\] that Mary would arrive late.
    ii. *It was anticipated (by the hosts) \[NP\] Mary’s late arrival.
   c.  i. \[CP\] That Mary would arrive late] was anticipated by the hosts.
    ii. \[NP\] Mary’s late arrival] was anticipated by the hosts.
   d.  i. We counted on \[NP\] Mary’s late arrival.
    ii. *We counted on \[CP\] that Mary would arrive late.

Is the above data compatible with the view that finite T in English has an uninterpretable [nom] feature that must be checked with a phrase that comes to have nominative case for the sentence to be grammatical? Explain your answer. (half a page, single spaced)

Further does the above data provide additional support for the claim that it is a strong uninterpretable [uN*], and not the [nom] feature, that triggers movement of the subject to [Spec,TP]? Explain your answer. (half a page, single spaced)

Does your analysis extend to the following cases? If it does, show how it does, and if it does not, extend it appropriately. (half a page, single spaced)

(2)  a.  i. [The question *(of) \[NP\] the time when Mary should leave]] remains unresolved.
    ii. [The question (of) \[CP\] when Mary should leave]] remains unresolved.
   b.  i. I wonder *(about) \[NP\] Mary’s wellbeing.
    ii. I wonder (about) \[CP\] how well Mary is doing.

II.1. Consider the following facts from German and English.

(3)  a.  German
    i. *(Es) wurde getanzt
       it  was  danced
       ‘There was dancing.’
    ii. *(Es) wurde bis spät in die Nacht getrunken
       it  was  till late  in  the  night  drunk
       ‘There was drinking till late in the night.’
iii. *Es wurde diesen Roman von vielen Studenten gelesen
   it was this-Acc novel by many students read
iv. *(Es) wurde dieser Roman von vielen Studenten gelesen
   it was this-Nom novel by many students read
   ‘This novel was read by many students.’
v. Dieser Roman wurde (*es) von vielen Studenten gelesen
   this-Nom novel was it by many students read
   ‘This novel was read by many students.’

b. English
i. * was arrested John.
ii. *It was arrested John.
iii. There were several men arrested yesterday.
iv. */???[That the conclusion was false] was believed.
v. It was believed [that the conclusion was false].
vi. *There was believed [that the conclusion was false].

Provide an explanation for the above pattern of grammaticality. You explanation should extend
to a hypothesis about differences between English and German from which the above differences
between English and German would follow. (one page, single spaced)

II.2. Next consider the following Hindi-Urdu data. Note that the passive auxiliary in Hindi-Urdu
is jaa/ga ‘go’ and not ho ‘be’.

(4) a. dekh ‘see’
   i. Active:
      Vijay Dawood-ko bazaar-me dekh-egaa
      Vijay-Nom Dawood-Acc market-in see-will
      ‘Vijay will see Dawood in the market.’
   ii. Passive 1:
      Dawood-ko (Vijaya-dwaaraa) bazaar-me dekhaa gayaa
      Dawood-Acc Vijaya-by market-in seen was
      ‘Dawood was seen by Vijaya in the market.’
   iii. Passive 2:
      Dawood (Vijaya-dwaaraa) bazaar-me dekhaa gayaa
      Dawood-Nom Vijaya-by market-in seen was
      ‘Dawood was seen by Vijaya in the market.’
b. ʰaːs ‘laugh’
   i. Active:
      Yunus zor-se ʰaːs-egaa
      Yunus loudly laugh-will
      ‘Yunus will laugh loudly.’
   ii. Passive 1:
      *Yunus-ko ʰaːsaa gayaa
      Yunus-Acc laughed was
   iii. Passive 2:
      *Yunus ʰaːsaa gayaa
      Yunus-Nom laughed was
   iv. Passive 3:
      Yunus-dwaaraa zor-se ʰaːsaa gayaa
      Yunus-by loudly laughed was
      ‘It was laughed loudly by Yunus.’

c. ubal ‘boil’
   i. Active:
      paanii ubal rahaay hai
      water boil -ing is
      ‘The water is boiling.’
   ii. Passive 1:
      *paanii-ko ubal-aa gayaa
      water-Acc boiled was
   iii. Passive 2:
      *paanii ubal-aa gayaa
      water-Nom boiled was
   iv. Passive 3:
      *paanii-dwaaraa ubal-aa gayaa
      water-by boiled was

Provide a theoretical characterization of the differences between passives in Hinhi-Urdu and English. Further provide a characterization of why the passive behaves differently with the three classes of predicates shown above. For simplicity, you can assume that the Hindi-Urdu predicates in question have the same syntactic properties as the corresponding English predicates. (one page, single spaced)
III. By determining the co-reference possibilities for pronouns, determine where the following clauses occur in the structure:

(5) a. *if* clauses that follow the main clause:
   I would be very happy [*if Hikyoung joined us*].

   b. *if* clauses that precede the main clause:
   [*If Hikyoung joined us*], I would be very happy.

   c. *because* clauses that follow the main clause:
   Faye left [*because Tim was singing*].

   d. *because* clauses that precede the main clause:
   [*Because Tim was singing*], Faye left.

The internal structure of the bracketed constituent is not of interest here. What you need to find out is where the bracketed constituent, which you can assume is an adjunct, is/can be attached. You should use Condition C of the Binding Theory according to which a pronoun cannot refer to a name that it c-commands. (two pages, single spaced)

IV.1. Some constituents seem to be discontinuous i.e. different parts of the constituent do not form a continuous string. By using constituency tests and coreference possibilities for the emphasized pronoun and name determine possible structural locations for the bracketed constituent.

(6) a. Extraposed Relative Clause
   i. *She* told many people about the concert [*who Mary made nervous*].

   ii. I told *her* that many people attended last year’s concert [*who made Mary nervous*].

   iii. I told *her* that the concert was attended by many people last year [*who made Mary nervous*].

   b. Result Clause
   i. *She* told so many people about the concert [*that Mary made Bill nervous*].

   ii. I told *her* that that so many people attended last year’s concert [*that I made Mary nervous*].

   iii. I told *her* that that the concert was attended by so many people last year [*that I made Mary nervous*].

As in problem III, the internal structure of the bracketed constituent is not of interest here. What you need to find out is where the bracketed constituent, which you can assume is an adjunct, is/can be attached. You should use Condition C of the Binding Theory according to which a pronoun cannot refer to a name that it c-commands. (two pages, single spaced)
IV.2. The following sentences are ambiguous in the manner indicated below.

(7)  a. Mary claimed that Bill was so weird that he ate ants.
    i. Reading 1: Mary’s claim: Bill is weird to such an extent that he even eats ants.
    ii. Reading 2: Mary’s claim: Bill is weird to a very high degree. The result of Mary’s claim: Bill ate ants.
        (plausible scenario: Bill is so frustrated that Mary keeps telling people what a weirdo he is that he says to himself ‘what have I got to lose now. Everyone thinks I am a weirdo anyway. I might as well eat ants to confirm their worst beliefs about me.’ Then he goes and eats ants.)

    b. Mary claimed that Bill was so weird that we didn’t invite him to dinner.
    i. Reading 1: Mary’s claim: Bill is weird to an extent that we didn’t invite him for dinner.
        (plausible scenario: Mary thinks that we’ll invite just anyone for dinner. But Bill is too weird even for us to invite for dinner. Hence she makes her claim.)
    ii. Reading 2: Mary’s claim: Bill is weird to a high degree. The result of Mary’s claim: we don’t invite him for dinner.

Extend/modify the structure you have developed for result clauses in the previous problem and use it to provide a structural account for the ambiguity of the above sentences. Any hypothesis you present should be supported by empirical argumentation. Your answer should have the following parts: first you need to say which structure goes with which reading, and then you need to provide evidence for the connection between the structure and the reading that you are proposing. In this second part, it might be useful to use pronominal coreference possibilities as a diagnostic for structure.

The judgements involved in IV are subtle and involved. For this reason, all judgements must be confirmed with three native speakers of English (who should be named). This requirement applies to native speakers of English also. (two pages, single spaced)