## Class discussion notes | Baker (1985), day 3 / wrap-up

M Feb 13
I. Review: The basic proposal in sec 1-2
(Minimal class discussion; you should be able to answer these questions on your own at this point)
(1) What does the Mirror Principle state?
(2) Implications and assumptions concerning the basic architecture of the grammar
(a) What is Baker's view of the morphological component?
(b) What is Baker's view of the syntactic component?
(c) What is it about morphology and syntax that the Mirror Principle states is to be "the same"?

## II. Review: Language data and argumentation in sec 3-4

(Brief class discussion here; make sure you are clear on these ideas)
(3) What must be addressed in an argument about data from a language if that argument is intended to support the Mirror Principle? [...see (2c) above!...]
(4) For cases where it looks like a language is some kind of exception to the Mirror Principle, Baker often appeals to evidence that some other factor is involved to cause the apparent exception. What is the value of this kind of argumentation?
III. New discussion: More about the coverage of the Mirror Principle (sec 5) and implications for the architecture of the grammar (sec 6)
(5) Is the Mirror Principle relevant to clitics? Why or why not?
(6) How strongly does Baker assert that the Mirror Principle is relevant to languages with morphological types other than agglutinative? How might we be able to tell if it is relevant?
(7) On Baker's view, what does the architecture of the grammar need to be like in order to have the Mirror Principle follow automatically from more basic assumptions, rather than being an arbitrary stipulation?
(8) What does it mean to contrast a "lexicalist" versus a "syntactic" view of the kind of grammar that Baker wants to propose in the context of the Mirror Principle?
(a) How are these different, and why is this an important question for Baker?
(b) Which of these two views does Baker support?
(c) What different empirical predictions do the two models make?

