Word-order variation

The following sentences all have approximately the same meaning. That is, technically speaking, their *truth conditions* are the same, but they emphasize different aspects of that meaning.

(Data adapted from Nemoto 1999)

(1)	Taroo-ga <i>Taroo-NOM</i> 'Taroo bo		o-mise <i>ноn-store</i>) book at (t	de <i>at</i> he) stoi	hon-o book-ACC ce.'		kat-ta buy-PAST
(2)	hon-o		Taroo-ga <i>Taroo-NOM</i>		o-mise HON-store	de at	kat-ta buy-PAST
(3)	o-mise HON-store	de at	Taroo-ga <i>Taroo-NOM</i>		hon-o book-ACC		kat-ta buy-PAST
(4)	hon-o		o-mise HON-store	de at	Taroo-ga <i>Taroo-NOM</i>		kat-ta buy-PAST
(5)	Taroo-ga <i>Taroo-</i> NOM		hon-o book-ACC		o-mise HON-store	de at	kat-ta buy-PAST
(6)	o-mise HON-store	de at	hon-o book-ACC		Taroo-ga <i>Taroo-NOM</i>		kat-ta buy-PAST

[•] Which one of these Japanese sentences is compatible with our X-bar model?

A clue to the solution may come from considering the following English sentences:

- (7) Pat has devoured the burrito.
- (8) * Pat has devoured. (ungrammatical)
- (9) What has Pat devoured?
- Is there anything that sentence (9) might have in common with the Japanese examples above? (Linguistics majors should be able to come up with a proposal. If this is your first exposure to syntax, give it some thought and see what you can think of.)

[→] How can we explain the others?