

# Reading assignment #1

## Pied-piping

April 23, 2013

**Readings** Both readings are available for download from the course website.

- Ortiz de Urbina, Jon. 1993. Feature percolation and clausal pied-piping. In Hualde and Ortiz de Urbina (eds.) *Generative studies in Basque linguistics* 189–219. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Coon, Jessica. 2009. Interrogative possessors and the problem with pied-piping in Chol. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(1):165–175.

Send your answers by email to [vicente@uni-potsdam.de](mailto:vicente@uni-potsdam.de) no later than Monday May 6 at 23:59. Send only either .pdf or .txt files (no .doc, .docx, or .rtf). You may write your answers in either English or German.

**Background** Descriptively, *pied-piping* refers to the effect where a moving item (typically, but not always, a wh- word) drags a larger constituent with it. Here are some examples from English.

- (1) a. [Whose book] did you read?  
b. \* [Whose] did you read [book]?  
c. \* [Who] did you read [’s book]?

Properly, only the wh- word *who* needs to move to the front of the sentence. However, it cannot move on its own. If it strands either the possessee (1b) or the possessee plus the genitive marker (1c), ungrammaticality results. The only grammatical possibility is for the wh- word to drag (pied-pipe) both the genitive marker and the possessee.

**Question #1** Describe the patterns of both clausal pied-piping in Basque and possessor pied-piping in Chol, quoting data as necessary. Note that this is purely a question about data, and therefore your answer should not make reference to the technicalities of either Ortiz de Urbina or Coon’s analyses.

**Question #2** Ortiz de Urbina and Coon each propose a different technical analysis of pied-piping. Specifically, Ortiz de Urbina’s is based on feature percolation, whereas Coon’s is based on the variable placement of a Q-morpheme. Explain how these two analyses work. You may quote from either article as necessary.

**Question #3** On the basis of your answers to the previous two questions, it should be apparent that Ortiz de Urbina's and Coon's analyses of pied-piping are quite different. Is this difference motivated by the different patterns of the data each one considers? In other words, could Ortiz de Urbina's feature percolation approach be extended to Chol data? Or, alternatively, could Coon's Q-morpheme analysis be extended to Basque data?

**Further reading** This is not necessary for this assignment, but if you want to know more about pied-piping, I can recommend the following book.

- Heck, Fabian. 2008. *On pied-piping: wh- movement and beyond*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (Bereichbibliothek Golm, ET 680 HECK).