

Assignment 5

I: Assuming the judgements given, provide a generalization that explains the following pattern of grammaticality. (Suggested length: less than 2 pages single spaced 11 pt. text, can be done in much less than that though.)

- (1) a. [Fathers of few children] have any fun.
b. *[Fathers with few children] have any fun.
- (2) a. i. [Fathers of which children] had fun?
ii. I met some children [[the fathers of whom] like to drink].
b. i. *[Fathers with which children] had fun?
ii. *I met some children [[the fathers with whom] like to drink].

II: Assuming the generalization you have developed in I, explain the following contrast. (Suggested length: less than 2 pages single spaced 11 pt. text, can be done in much less than that though.)

- (3) a. i. Arguments with few people yield any satisfaction.
ii. Arguments with which people satisfy you?
iii. He is a person [[arguments with whom] are fruitless].
b. i. ?*Arguments with few premises yield any satisfaction.
ii. ?*Arguments with which premises satisfy you?
iii. ?*This is a premise [[arguments with which] are useless].

Your explanation should be able to handle the observation that the examples in (3b) are acceptable if *arguments with few premises* is interpreted as *arguments against which premises*, but unacceptable if interpreted as *arguments employing which premises*.

III: Several distinct structures can be postulated for ditransitive verbs. Some possibilities are indicated below.

- (4) Mary showed Chloe a picture.
 - a. Flat Structure: Mary [_{VP} showed [Chloe] [a picture]].
 - b. Binary Branching 1: Mary [_{VP} [_{VP} showed [Chloe]] [a picture]]
 - c. Binary Branching 2: Mary [_{VP} showed [_{XP} [Chloe] [_{X'} X⁰ [a picture]]]](Focus on the VP, what the label of the XP is is not relevant here.)

Now consider the following sets of data and evaluate which of the structures are compatible with them and why.

(5) Dataset 1

- a. i. I showed John himself (in the mirror).
- ii. *I showed himself John (in the mirror).
- b. i. I showed the professor each other's students.
- ii. *I showed each other's students the professors.
- c. i. I gave no one anything.
- ii. *I gave anyone nothing.

Background: an NP must c-command a reflexive/reciprocal pronoun that it binds. A NPI must be c-commanded by a negative phrase.

(6) Datapoint 2:

Benjamin gave Lee the cloak and Nathan the chalice.

(7) Dataset 3:

- a. *Benjamin thought that he would give Lee the cloak and [Lee the cloak] he gave.
- b. *They said that Bill would give Mary something, and give Mary, he did a magazine.

(If you disagree with the judgement indicated for (7b), insert your own judgement and evaluate the three structures with your own judgement in mind. Adger assigns a similar sentence *, but another author assigns it just a ?.)

Does the evidence from the different datasets converge to a structure? If so, which one? If not, indicate which structures we seem to need to explain the entire set of facts reported in this problem. (Suggested length: Less than two single-spaced 11pt pages).