Assignment 2

1: Give an account of the pattern of grammaticality.

   a. i. *The discussion of the match was more animated than the one of the riots.

   ii. The discussion at the match was more animated than the one in the bar.

   b. i. The discussion of the riots and their implications was full and frank.

   ii. The discussion at the match and in the bar was full and frank.

   iii. *The discussion of the riots and in the bar was full and frank.

   c. i. The discussion of the riots in the bar was full and frank.¹

   ii. *The discussion in the bar of the riots was full an frank.

2. The following DPs raise questions about the argument/adjunct distinction and where modifiers attach respectively. Examine the data and draw conclusions about the structures of these DPs, providing the arguments behind your conclusions.

   a. [The journey from Dusseldorf to Paris on All Saints Day] was tiring.

   b. [The DJ at the club last week] rang Olafur up yesterday.

I said in class that CPs could function both as complements and adjuncts. It is generally assumed that the CP in (1a) is a complement of the noun and that the CP in (1b) is an adjunct on the NP.

(1) a. The rumor \[CP \text{ that Markus is a werewolf}\]

   b. The rumor \[CP \text{ that Markus spread}\]

Can you find any empirical evidence to support this claim?

3. For this question, assume the grammaticality judgements given. You have to provide an explanation for the pattern of grammaticality seen in the following examples.

   a. i. [No king of any country] abdicated.

   ii. [No king of any importance] abdicated.

   iii. [No king of any country of any importance] abdicated.

   b. i. [The lack of any discipline in some schools] worried them.

   ii. *[The lack of discipline in any schools] worried them.

   iii. [The lack of teachers with any qualifications] worried them.

Think of c-command.

¹This sentence is ambiguous. Consider both structures.