This problem set is due on Wednesday, November 14 (by dawn on the following day).

**Problem One**
I've mentioned a couple of times in class the question of how sentences like (1) are formed:

(1) Mary seems to be believed to be smart.

We know that *Mary* begins its life in the most deeply embedded clause, as the subject of *be smart*. And we know that it ends up in the matrix clause. The question is whether, in the process of getting from the most deeply embedded clause to the matrix clause, *Mary* stops in the specifier of the TP (that is, whether movement of *Mary* is 'successive cyclic'). I've already shown some evidence that the answer to this is 'yes'; this problem is meant to help you discover another kind of evidence for this conclusion.

As a preliminary, let me show you something mysterious about binding. You don't need to develop a theory of why binding works this way (though if you have one, feel free to tell us about it). This is just something you need to accept for the rest of this problem.

The mysterious fact is in (2):

(2) It seems to John, [that pictures of himself, will sell well].

Mysteriously, (2) seems to be well-formed, with *himself* referring to *John*. That's odd, because a reasonable tree for (2) would have *John* inside a PP, from which it wouldn't c-command *himself*. Nevertheless, Condition A is satisfied. Let's just accept that this is how the world works, and move on.

Now consider contrasts like the one in (3-4):

(3) John, seems to Mary to appear to himself, to be smart
(4) *John seems to Mary, to appear to herself, to be smart

Suppress any desire you might have to explain the contrast in (3-4) via something like semantics, or pragmatics; the problem with (4) is not that it's hard to imagine a situation where you'd want to say this. Also, assume that the judgments given here are the correct ones; if you have different judgments, feel free to tell us about them, but please do the problem set as though the contrast in (3-4) was real (it is, for many people, including me).

What does the contrast in (3-4) tell us about whether movement is successive-cyclic? Why?
**Problem Two**

In Choctaw, transitive verbs agree with both the subject and the object:

(5) Chi- bashli -li -tok
    2sgOBJ  cut  1sgSUBJ PAST
'I cut you'

(6) Is- sa- sso -tok
    2sgSUBJ 1sgOBJ hit  PAST
'You hit me'

(here the numbers stand for persons, "sg" means "singular", and "SUBJ" and "OBJ" stand for "subject" and "object"—so chi-, for instance, means "second person singular object").

Intransitive verbs split into two types. In one type, the verb agrees with its subject using the same morphology as that used by transitive verbs to agree with their subjects. In the second type, the agreement morphology is the same as that used by transitive verbs to agree with their objects:

(7) a. Hilha -li -tok
    dance 1sgSUBJ PAST
'I danced'
b. Ish- ipah õ?
    2sgSUBJ eat  Q
'Have you eaten?'
c. I:- bali:li-tok
    1plSUBJ run  PAST
'We ran'

(8) a. Sa- hohchafoh
    1sgOBJ be-hungry
'I am hungry'
b. Chi- cha:hah
    2sgOBJ be-tall
'You are tall'
c. Pi- hohfaya -tok
    1plOBJ be-ashamed PAST
'We were ashamed'

First question: what do you think is going on here?

Choctaw exhibits a phenomenon known as "switch-reference marking". Under certain circumstances, the verb in the first of two clauses may bear a morpheme indicating, roughly, whether the subjects of the two clauses refer to the same person or not (SS stands for "same subject", DS for "different subject"): 
In (9a), the "same subject" suffix -cha indicates that the subjects of the two clauses refer to the same person; in (9b), where the two clauses have different subjects, you get the "different subject" suffix -na. These suffixes are obligatory in these examples; using -na in (9a), or -cha in (9b), would yield an ill-formed sentence.

Consider the following examples of sentences involving switch reference markers. The sentence marked with % is one on which Choctaw speakers disagree; in some dialects of Choctaw (call them Choctaw A), this sentence is well-formed, while in other dialects (Choctaw B), it is ill-formed.

Second question: give a description of the rules for the use of same-subject and different-subject markers in Choctaw A and Choctaw B.