

Syntax Midterm Answers

Jean Mark Gawron

Introduction to Syntax

San Diego State University


gawron@mail.sdsu.edu

<http://www.rohan.sdsu.edu/~gawron>

2007 Oct 17


1 Trees (15pts)

Using the X-bar theory of Chapter 7, draw trees for the following sentences. Remember a point emphasized in class: despite the shrill, lowbrow protestations of your textbook, it is possible for a head to have more than one complement.









- (1.1) For a member *of Congress* to appear on *Dancing with the Stars* is unseemly.
- (1.2) All junior syntacticians must report *to the syntax office* immediately.
- (1.3) John resigned himself *to a very long speech*.
- (1.4) Max's *tax* attorney served *three years in San Quentin*.

2 Parts of speech (15 pts)

- (2.1) What is/are the part(s) of speech of *junior*? Give 3 arguments for one of the parts of speech you claim it has. Be sure that your answer covers the use of *junior* illustrated in example 1.2 as well as any other uses you can think of.
- (2.2) What is/are the part(s) of speech of *north*? Give 2 arguments for each of the parts of speech you claim it has.
- (2.3) What is/are the part(s) of speech of *record*? Give 1 argument for each of the parts of speech you claim it has.

(2.1) *junior*

(a) Adjective

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| He is junior only to the vice president. | Predicative position |
| He is a very junior associate | Follows <i>very</i> |
| He is the most junior of the three associates. | Superlative form |

(b) Noun

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| He is a junior. | Follows determiner |
| They are juniors. | Takes plural -s |
| Only a junior can attend the junior prom. | Subject of sentence |

(2.2) *North*

(a) Adjective

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| San Diego is north of the border. | Predicative position |
| San Diego is north of the border and very crowded. | Conjoins with adjective |

(b) Noun

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| He headed to the north. | Follows determiner |
| North is my favorite direction | Subject of sentence |

(2.3) *Record*

(a) Noun

- | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| She broke two records. | takes plural -s |
| A record is made of vinyl. | Follows determiner and subject |

(b) Verb

- | | |
|---|---|
| He recorded two hits songs. | Takes past tense ending |
| She recorded <i>Misty</i> before he did so. | First word in phrase replaced by <i>do so</i> |

3 Complements vs. Adjuncts (25pts)

Part A: In drawing trees for Section 1 you had to make a number of decisions about what strings of words were constituents and a number of decisions about whether particular constituents were complements or adjuncts. Defend your decisions for 4 of the italicized strings in Section 1. If they are constituents, give one argument that they are; if not give an argument that they are not.

1. *of congress* is a constituent:
 Only members *of congress* and *of the senate* may dine here Only constituents conjoin
2. *to the syntax office* is a constituent
 It was to the syntax office that all the syntacticians reported. Only constituents move.
3. *to a very long speech* is a constituent
 John resigned himself to a very long speech and to an even longer recital. Only constituents conjoin.
4. *three years in San Quentin* is a constituent.
 How many years in San Quentin did she serve? Only constituents move.

Part B: Next, defend your decision that the string is a complement or adjunct of whatever head it modifies. Obviously, being a complement or an adjunct presupposes being a constituent, so if you argued that the string was *not* a constituent, answer this question for the first complete constituent in the string. In each case, defending your decision means using at least 2 of the tests we have discussed for distinguishing complements from adjuncts. Remember that complement and adjunct are relational notions. A complement is a complement *of* some lexical head. An adjunct is an adjunct of some lexical head. Be sure that you make it clear what lexical head you are talking about, and be sure that your examples are the right examples for that head. [For example, one-replacement works as a test **only** when the head you are testing is a noun, *do so* only works when the head is a verb, and so on.]

1. *of congress* is a complement:
 * The member *of congress* was significantly smarter than the one of the Senate. *One* anaphora can only replace $\overline{\text{N}}$ s, which means *member* must be an N here, which means *of congress* must be a complement.
 The only member of congress with a red Porsche is Orin Hatch. Setup sentence
 * The only member with a red Porsche of congress is Orin Hatch. Reordering of complements away from their head is not possible.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 2. <i>to the syntax office</i> is a complement | |
| * Fred reported to the syntax office and Sue did so to the phonology wing. | <i>Do so</i> anaphora can only replace \bar{V} s, which means <i>re-report</i> must be an V here, which means <i>to the syntax office</i> must be a complement. |
| Fred reported to the syntax office on Tuesday. | setup sentence |
| * Fred reported on Tuesday to the syntax office. | Reordering not possible with complements |
| 3. <i>three years in San Quentin</i> is a complement. | |
| * Fred served three years in San Quentin and Sue did so ten years in Folsom. | <i>Do so</i> anaphora can only replace \bar{V} s, which means <i>serve</i> must be an V here, which means <i>three years in san Quentin</i> must be a complement. |
| Fred served three years in Folsom without a single complaint. | setup sentence |
| * Fred served without a single complaint three years in Folsom. | Reordering not possible with complements |

4 Binding Theory (25 pts)

Each of the following sentences has a pair of coindexed NPs and is either starred or unstarred. Accept the indicated grammaticality judgment as valid data.

For each sentence, indicate whether the binding theory given in our book rules out or does not rule out the sentence with the given indexing. Then indicate whether this agrees or disagrees with the indicated grammaticality judgment. That is, tell me if this data is a problem for the binding theory or not. **Draw a tree for example j.**

If a sentence is ruled out, say which principle (or principles!) rule(s) it out. Whether or not the sentence is ruled out, *describe the binding relationships between the co-indexed NPs*. If there are no binding relationships between the coindexed NPs, say so. Describing the binding relationships for an example

like *Wilma told Fred Flintstone_i that he_i dressed well* will require writing a sentence like this:

The NP *Fred Flintstone* binds the NP *he* because it C-commands and is coindexed with it; the NP *he* does not bind the NP *Fred Flintstone* because it does not C-command it.

If you are in doubt about a binding relationship, draw the tree you are assuming and show it to me. You will get credit if you are correctly applying the definitions of binding, if the tree is not too incredibly silly.

Note: For verbs like *envy* and *lend*, assume that both NPs that follow it are complements. For example, in

(1) Mary lent John the flowers.

both *John* and *flowers* are complements of *threw*. Also assume that the PP *to John* is a complement in examples like:

(2) Mary lent flowers to John.


. For possessives and verbs like *want*, assume the analysis of Chapter 7.

NOTE: Now that we have switched from NPs to DPs, we are no longer coindexing NPs in the binding theory. We are coindexing DPs. In

$$[_{CP}[_{DP}\text{The }[_{NP}\text{ man }]]_i\text{ shaved }[_{DP}\text{ himself }]]_i$$

man is an NP and *the man* is a DP, so the question relevant to applying Principle A is not whether the NP *man* C-commands the NP *himself*; the question is whether the DP *the man* C-commands the DP *himself*.

- (4.1) John_i sent that article about himself_i to the coach.
John binds *himself* since it is both coindexed with it and C-commands it. *Himself* does not C-command *John* and therefore does not bind it.
 No violations.
- (4.2) Mary lent John_i that silly picture of him_i.



John asymmetrically C-commands the pronoun *him* and is coindexed with it. Therefore *John* binds *him*, and since they are clausemates, this is a principle B violation. So the theory disagrees with the indicated grammaticality judgment.

- (4.3) Mary lent $John_i$'s syntax professor that silly picture of him_i .
There is no C-command relation between *John* and *him* in either direction and therefore there are no binding relations. No violations.
- (4.4) Mary sent $John_i$'s mother that silly picture of $himself_i$.
There is no C-command relation between *John* and *himself* in either direction and therefore there are no binding relations. This leads to a Principle A violation since the anaphor *himself* is unbound, so the theory disagrees with the indicated grammaticality judgment.
- (4.5) * $Himself_i$ flaunts $John_i$.
Himself C-commands *John* and is co-indexed with it, but *John* does not C-command *himself*. Therefore, *John* is bound and *himself* is not, leading to both a Principle A violation (*himself* is not bound) and a Principle C violation (the R-expression *John* is).
- (4.6) ? Mary lent a picture of $himself_i$ to $John_i$.


There is no C-command relation between *John* and *himself* in either direction and therefore there are no binding relations. This leads to Principle A violation since the anaphor *himself* is unbound.

- (4.7) * Mary lent that picture of John_i to him_i.

There is no C-command relation between *John* and *him* in either direction and therefore there are no binding relations. No violations, so the theory does not predict the indicated judgment.

- (4.8) John likes Mary_i's picture of herself_i.

Our text assigns this sort of sentence the following structure:




As can be seen the R-expression *Mary* is coindexed with and asymmetrically C-commands the anaphor *herself*, so there are no violations.

- (4.9) The colonel's mention of him_i excited John_i.

There is no C-command relation between *John* and *him* in either direction and therefore there are no binding relations. There are no violations.

- (4.10) John_i gave Mary_j a picture of herself_j.



Mary C-commands *herself* and is coindexed with it; *Mary* therefore binds *herself*. No violations.

5 Hungarian (20 pts)


Consider the Hungarian data we saw on the homework assignment for Chapter 7.

- (3) a. az en kalapom
the I hat
“my hat”
- b. a te kalapod
the you hat
“your hat”
- c. a Mari kalapja
the Mary hat
“mary’s hat”

- d. Marinak a kalapja
 Mary-Genitive the hat
 “mary’s hat”

In this problem you will draw the trees for some analyses of (3c). Assume the DP analysis of Chapter 7 and the Xbar theory of Chapter 7. **Assume each of the examples in (3) is a DP.**

- (5.1) Draw a tree for the DP in (3a) in which *en* is the specifier of *kalapom*. Does the same kind of tree work for (b) and (c)?



Yes, the same kind of tree will handle (b) and (c).

- (5.2) Will it work to say that *en* is the specifier of the DP *az en kalapom* in (3a)? If so draw the tree for that analysis. If not, say why not.

It will not work to say *en* is the specifier of the DP, because it comes in between the head *az* and its complement *kalapom*. The situation is similar to that of subjects in VSO languages like Irish. The thing we’d like to call the specifier comes between the head and the complement. Therefore there is no way to draw the tree to meet the definition of specifier without crossing lines.

- (5.3) Why is the form of the word for *hat* changing in examples (a), (b), and (c)? If you don’t know, speculate. Be aware that I have asked Professor Csomay not to tell you the answer. Our DP analysis of possessives has made DPs look more like TPs (clauses); does this change in form resemble anything that happens in TPs? Don’t just say “yes”. Tell me what it resembles.

The head noun is agreeing with its possessor the way verbs agree with subjects. This suggests we might want to redraw our tree for (a) a little and hypothesize some kind of affix lowering from D to implement the agreement:

