# Islands and movement

## 1 Islands

As the examples in the textbook on pages 161-162 show, movement cannot freely happen between any two positions. Wh-expressions, for example, cannot move to the beginning of the sentence (Spec,CP) from any position. Compare the following pair of sentences (where coindexing identifies the moved element and the position it was moved from):

- (1) a. What<sub>i</sub> does Hortense believe that Herb saw  $t_i$ ?
  - b. \*What<sub>i</sub> does Hortense believe that who saw  $t_i$ ?

While what can move out from the embedded clause  $[_{CP}$  that Herb saw what], it is trapped inside  $[_{CP}$  that who saw what]. Domains that trap an element are called *islands* (from which there is no escape)<sup>1</sup>.

There are various types of islands, illustrated below.

### 1.1 Adjunct islands

Wh-expressions cannot move out of an adjunct (the island is indicated by square brackets):

- (2) a. Herb started to play [only after he drank his usual Ghoul Aid]
  b. \*What<sub>i</sub> did Herb start to play [only after he drank t<sub>i</sub>] ?
- (3) a. Hortense is sure that Herb lost [because he drank too much Ghoul Aid]
  b. \*What<sub>i</sub> is Hortense sure that Herb lost [because he drank t<sub>i</sub>] ?

### 1.2 Wh-islands

A wh-expression cannot be moved from within a constituent that contains another c-commanding wh-expressions:

- (4) a. What did Hortense tell Herb to drink?
  - b. \*What did Hortense tell [who to drink]?
- (5) a. Herb thought that Hortense had the ace of spades
  - b. What<sub>i</sub> did Herb think that Hortense had  $t_i$ ?
  - c. \*What<sub>i</sub> did Herb think that [who had  $t_i$ ]?

#### 1.3 Complex NP islands

The wh-expression cannot be moved from within an NP or DP, either:

- (6) a. Hortense believed [the claim that Herb cheated]
  - b. \*Who<sub>i</sub> did Hortense believe [the claim that  $t_i$  cheated]?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The islands discussed here are *strong* islands. There are also *weak* islands, where movement can happen from out of the clause, but yield a marginal sentence.

#### 1.4 Coordinate structure constraint

A moved wh-expression cannot be a part of a conjoined structure:

- (7) a. Herb liked [fruit punch and Ghoul Aid]
  b. \*What did Herb like [fruit punch and t<sub>i</sub>] ?
- (8) a. Hortense tasted the Ghoul Aid [slowly and carefully]
  - b. \*How<sub>i</sub> did Hortense taste the Ghould Aid [slowly and  $t_i$ ] ?

# 2 Subjacency

Wh-expressions cannot escape from islands. Is there some generalization behind the islandhood, or is it just an accidental fact? In fact, several cases of islandhood can be accounted for by assuming that the movement of wh-expressions must be local. Consider the following sentences (where square brackets indicate CP boundaries, not islands):

- (9) a. Hortense believes [Herb to suspect [that Harv poisoned the Ghoul Aid]]
  - b. What<sub>i</sub> does Hortense believe [Herb to suspect [that Harv poisoned  $t_i$  ]]?

How does *what* move from its base position to Spec, CP of the matrix clause? If it moves in one fell swoop, then why is movement in the following example bad?

- (10) a. Hortense wonders [who suspects [that Harv poisoned the Ghoul Aid]]
  - b. \*What<sub>i</sub> does Hortense wonder [who suspects [that Harv poisoned  $t_i$ ]?

Let us assume that *what* does not move to its surface position in (9b) in one step, but in three (always moving to Spec,CP):

(11) (= (9b))

What<sub>i</sub> does Hortense believe  $[t_i \text{ Herb to suspect } [t_i \text{ that Harv poisoned } t_i]]$ ?

The intermediate step is also shown by the following example, where what stays in that position:

(12) Hortense wonders [what<sub>i</sub> Herb suspects  $[t_i$  that Harv poisoned  $t_i$ ]]

(10b) is ungrammatical because what cannot move to its surface position. The ultimate landing site of what is empty, so this cannot be a problem. Notice, however, that the intermediate position of what would be the same as the surface position of who; at the left edge (Spec, CP) of the intermediate clause. (10b) is ungrammatical then because the second step of what (to the intermediate clause) is impossible; that position is occupied by who.

(13) (= (10b))

\*What<sub>i</sub> does Hortense wonder  $[who/*t_i \text{ knows } [t_i \text{ that Harv poisoned } t_i]]?$ 

#### 2.1 The Subjacency Condition

The distance that a wh-expression can cover in a single step is regulated by the Subjacency Condition:

(14) Subjacency Condition(Wh)-movement cannot cross more than one bounding node, where bounding nodes are TP and DP

The Subjacency Condition requires *what* to make a stop in the intermediate clause. If it does not, then *what* crosses three TP boundaries:

(15) a. What<sub>i</sub> does [ $_{TP}$  Hortense believe t<sub>i</sub> [ $_{TP}$  Herb to suspect t<sub>i</sub> that [ $_{TP}$  Harv poisoned t<sub>i</sub> ]]]? b. \*What<sub>i</sub> does [ $_{TP}$  Hortense believe [ $_{TP}$  Herb to suspect that [ $_{TP}$  Harv posioned t<sub>i</sub> ]]]? The ungrammatical sentence involves movement across two TP nodes in the following sentence:

(16) a. What<sub>i</sub> does [<sub>TP</sub> Hortense wonder t<sub>i</sub> if [<sub>TP</sub> Herb noticed t<sub>i</sub> ]]?
b. \*What<sub>i</sub> does [<sub>TP</sub> Hortense wonder who [<sub>TP</sub> noticed t<sub>i</sub> ]]?

The same condition also rules out complex NP violations, where the wh-expression also crosses more than one bounding node, a DP and a TP node:

(17) \*Who<sub>i</sub> did [ $_{TP}$  Hortense believe [ $_{DP}$  the claim t<sub>i</sub> that [ $_{TP}$  t<sub>i</sub> cheated ]]?

How does the subjacency condition account for the following examples?

- (18) a. Hortense was wondering how to fix a Ghoul Aidb. \*What was Hortense wondering how to fix t?
- (19) a. Herb drank Harv's Ghoul Aidb. \*Whose did Herb drink Ghoul Aid?

#### 2.2 Relative clauses

With wh-expressions as relative pronouns, the Subjacency Condition also comes into play. A complex NP violation is illustrated below.

(20) a. this is the man whom<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> Herb claims t<sub>i</sub> that [<sub>TP</sub> he will beat t<sub>i</sub> ]]
b. \*this is the man whom<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> Herb made [<sub>DP</sub> the claim t<sub>i</sub> that [<sub>TP</sub> he will beat t<sub>i</sub> ]]]

How does the Subjacency Condition account for the ungrammaticality of the following sentence?

(21) \*the man who<sub>i</sub> [ they think that when [ Herb beats t]] then everyone will be happy

#### 2.3 Crosslinguistic variation

Compare the Italian and English relative clauses below:

- (22) a. tuo fratello, a cui mi domando che storie abbiano raccontato your brother, to whom myself ask-I which stories have-they told 'your brother, to whom I wonder which stories they told'
  - b. \*your brother, to whom<sub>i</sub> [ $_{TP}$  I wonder which stories [ $_{TP}$  they told t<sub>i</sub> ]] (Haegeman 1994)
- (23) a. la nuova idea di Giorgio, di cui immagino che cosa pensi the new idea of G, of which imagine-I what think-you
  'Giorgio's new idea, of which I imagine what you think'
  - b. \*George's new idea, of which<sub>i</sub> [ $_{TP}$  I can imagine what [ $_{TP}$  you think t<sub>i</sub> ]] (Haegeman 1994)

Do the data above indicate that Subjacency is not operative in Italian? The following example makes it clear that movement possibilities are also restricted there:

(24) \*tuo fratello, [ $_{CP}$  a cui<sub>i</sub> [ $_{TP}$  temo [ $_{DP}$  la possibilità [ $_{CP}$  t<sub>i</sub> che [ $_{TP}$  abbiano raccontato your brother . to whom . fear-I . the possibility . . that . have-they told tutto t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]] everything

'Your brother, to whom I fear the possibility that they have told everything'

Italian differs from English in the nature of the bounding nodes:

(25) Subjacency Condition (Italian)

(Wh)-movement cannot cross more than one bounding node, where bounding nodes are CP and DP

In (25) below, movement of *a cui* crosses only one CP node (even though it crosses two TP nodes) – thus it does not violate Subjacency. In (26), however, it crosses both a DP and a CP node in the same step, violating the Subjacency Condition.

(26) (= (21a))

tuo fratello, a cui<sub>i</sub> mi domando [ $_{CP}$  che storie abbiano raccontato t<sub>i</sub>] your brother, to whom myself ask-I . which stories have-they told

'your brother, to whom I wonder which stories they told'

(27) (= (23))

\*tuo fratello, a cui<sub>i</sub> temo [ $_{DP}$  la possibilità [ $_{CP}$  t<sub>i</sub> che abbiano raccontato tutto t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]] your brother to whom fear-I. the possibility . . that have-they told everything

'Your brother, to whom I fear the possibility that they have told everything'

The Subjacency Condition is not constant across languages; it is subject to parametric variation. We have seen that DP is a bounding node for both Italian and English. TP is a bounding node only for English; and CP is a bounding node only for Italian.