

## Assignment 5

I. What conclusions can you draw from the following pattern of grammaticality with regard to the case properties of NPs and CPs?

- (1) a. i. The hosts anticipated [<sub>CP</sub>that Mary would arrive late].  
ii. The hosts anticipated [<sub>NP</sub>Mary's late arrival].
- b. i. It was anticipated (by the hosts) [<sub>CP</sub>that Mary would arrive late].  
ii. \*It was anticipated (by the hosts) [<sub>NP</sub>Mary's late arrival].
- c. i. [<sub>CP</sub>That Mary would arrive late] was anticipated by the hosts.  
ii. [<sub>NP</sub>Mary's late arrival] was anticipated by the hosts.
- d. i. We counted on [<sub>NP</sub>Mary's late arrival].  
ii. \*We counted on [<sub>CP</sub>that Mary would arrive late].

Are the conclusions that you have drawn concerning the case properties of NPs and CPs based on the above data compatible with the following cases? If they are, show that they are and if they are not, modify your conclusions appropriately.

- (2) a. i. [The question \*(of) [<sub>NP</sub>the time when Mary should leave]] remains unresolved.  
ii. [The question (of) [<sub>CP</sub>when Mary should leave]] remains unresolved.
- b. i. I wonder \*(about) [<sub>NP</sub>Mary's wellbeing].  
ii. I wonder (about) [<sub>CP</sub>how well Mary is doing].

II. By determining the co-reference possibilities for pronouns, determine where the following clauses occur in the structure:

- (3) a. *if* clauses that follow the main clause:  
I would be very happy [**if Hikyoung joined us**].
- b. *if* clauses that precede the main clause:  
[**If Hikyoung joined us**], I would be very happy.
- c. *because* clauses that follow the main clause:  
Faye left [**because Tim was singing**].
- d. *because* clauses that precede the main clause:  
[**Because Tim was singing**], Faye left.

The internal structure of the bracketed constituent is not of interest here. What you need to find out is where the bracketed constituent, which you can assume is an adjunct, is/can be attached. You should use Condition C of the Binding Theory according to which a pronoun cannot refer to a name that it c-commands.

**III.1.** Some constituents seem to be **discontinuous** i.e. different parts of the constituent do not form a continuous string. By using constituency tests and coreference possibilities for the emphasized pronoun and name determine possible structural locations for the bracketed constituent.

- (4) a. Extraposed Relative Clause
  - i. *She* told many people about the concert [who *Mary* made nervous].
  - ii. I told *her* that many people attended last year's concert [who made *Mary* nervous].
  - iii. I told *her* that the concert was attended by many people last year [who made *Mary* nervous].
- b. Result Clause
  - i. *She* told so many people about the concert [that *Mary* made Bill nervous].
  - ii. I told *her* that that so many people attended last year's concert [that I made *Mary* nervous].
  - iii. I told *her* that that the concert was attend by so many people last year [that I made *Mary* nervous].

As in the previous problem, the internal structure of the bracketed constituent is not of interest here. What you need to find out is where the bracketed constituent, which you can assume is an adjunct, is/can be attached.

**III.2.** The following sentences are ambiguous in the manner indicated below.

- (5) a. Mary claimed that Bill was so weird that he ate ants.
  - i. Reading 1: Mary's claim: Bill is weird to such an extent that he even eats ants.
  - ii. Reading 2: Mary's claim: Bill is weird to a very high degree. The result of Mary's claim: Bill ate ants.  
(plausible scenario: Bill is so frustrated that Mary keeps telling people what a weirdo he is that he says to himself 'what have I got to lose now. Everyone thinks I am a weirdo anyway. I might as well eat ants to confirm their worst beliefs about me.' Then he goes and eats ants.)
- b. Mary claimed that Bill was so weird that we didn't invite him to dinner.
  - i. Reading 1: Mary's claim: Bill is weird to an extent that we didn't invite him for dinner.  
(plausible scenario: Mary thinks that we'll invite just anyone for dinner. But Bill is too weird even for us to invite for dinner. Hence she makes her claim.)
  - ii. Reading 2: Mary's claim: Bill is weird to a high degree. The result of Mary's claim: we don't invite him for dinner.

There are reasons to believe that the two readings of (5a/b) correspond to two different syntactic structures. Extend/modify the structure you have developed for result clauses in the previous problem and use it to provide a structural account for the ambiguity of the above sentences. Any hypothesis you present should be supported by empirical argumentation. Your answer should have the following parts: first you need to say which structure goes with which reading, and then

you need to provide evidence for the connection between the structure and the reading that you are proposing. In this second part, it might be useful to use pronominal coreference possibilities and VP-ellipsis/VP-topicalization as diagnostics for structure.

The judgements involved in **III** are subtle and involved. For this reason, all judgements must be confirmed with two native speakers of English (other than you, three if you are not a native speaker). For **III.2**, try to find native speakers who get the ambiguity in (5). If someone does not find (5) ambiguous, they are in a sense irrelevant for the experiment at hand - though it would still be interesting to see which of the two readings they get. Feel free to report any variation in judgements that you might find.

**IV.** Provide derivations for the following examples. For the ungrammatical examples, take the derivation to the point where it crashes. Your derivations should be explicit with respect to case, agreement, and EPP.

- (6) a. There were many people in the garden.
- b. They have been thanking him.
- c. \*Them have been thanking him.
- d. \*They have been thanking he.
- e. \*Them have been thanking he.