

Syntax 380L  
September 18, 2001

## Assignment 3

due in class on September 27

1: Assuming the judgements given, given an account of the given pattern of grammaticality in terms of the argument-adjunct distinction. In particular determine which PPs are complements and which are adjuncts.

- a. i. Fathers of which children had fun?
- ii. I met some children the fathers of whom like to drink.
- iii. Fathers of few children have any fun.
- b. i. \*Fathers with which children had fun?
- ii. \*I met some children the fathers with whom like to drink.
- iii. \*Fathers with few children have any fun.

2: A Noun Phrase such as *the English king* might be argued to have the following two distinct interpretations:

- a. the king who is English
- b. the king of England

We can provide two accounts for this dual interpretation:

- a. STRUCTURAL AMBIGUITY: in the (a) reading, *English* is an adjunct, but in the (b) reading, *English* is a complement.
- b. PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS: *English* is an adjunct on both interpretations. The relationship between *English* and *king* is left vague - something like 'king connected in some unspecified way with England'.

What predictions would each of the two accounts make about possible and impossible interpretations of *English* in the bracketed phrases below? Which set of predictions is correct, and what is the implication of this for each of the analyses proposed?

- a. Why do philosophers always use examples involving a bald French king, rather than [a bald English one]?
- b. There's not much to choose between the present English and French kings, except that the French king is less bald than [the English one].
- c. Henry VIII is [the best known English Protestant king].
- d. We've had relatively few [English septuagenarian kings].
- e. Boadicea was [the most famous English pagan queen].
- f. Henry IV was the last English French king.

3. Using the tests discussed in class (inversion, placement with respect to negation, compatibility with non-finite environments) determine what category (modal, auxiliary, main verb) the following verbs should be put into.

- a. Roland *is* to leave tomorrow. (*is to*)
- b. Roland *has* to leave tomorrow. (*have to*)
- c. Roland *has* a friend in Austin. (possessive *have*)
- d. Roland *had* his car stolen. (causative/experiencer *have*)
- e. Roland *is* a friend.