

Assignment 4: Cumulative Readings According to Scha and Krifka

Recall that the sentence in (1a) is true in the situation in (1b).

- (1) a. Two boys lifted two pianos.
b. Dave lifted piano-1. Tom lifted piano-2.

The ability for (1a) to be true in situation (1b) exceeded the abilities of our earlier semantics for plurals.

(2) **Question 1:**

Please show how the system proposed by Scha (1984), as characterized in our class notes, would capture the ability of (1a) to be true in (1b).

- Provide the ‘LF’ that Scha (1984) [transposed into a GB syntax] would assign to (1a). *Don’t worry about how the structure is derived, only the structure that would be assigned.*
- Explain, step-by-step, how Scha (1984) interprets the LF assigned to (1a).
- Explain how the predicted T-conditions hold in a situation like (1b).

(3) **Question 2:**

Please show how the system proposed by Krifka (1999), as characterized in our class notes, would capture the ability of (1a) to be true in (1b).

- Provide the ‘LF’ that Krifka (1999) would assign to (1a).
- Compute the T-conditions that would be assigned to this LF.
- Explain how the predicted T-conditions hold in a situation like (1b).

(4) **Question 3:**

Consider the fact that sentence (4a) is also true in situation (1b). What analysis could Scha (1984) offer of this fact? How would it differ from the analysis offered by Krifka (1999)?

- a. Dave and Tom lifted piano-1 and piano-2.

(5) **Question 4:**

Does our Krifka-based system still predict that (1a) is true in situation (5a) below? What about situation (5b)?

- a. Dave and Tom (together) lifted piano-1 and piano-2 (together).
b. Dave lifted piano-1 and piano-2. Tom lifted piano-3 and piano-4.