Midterm FRI MAR 2

1. [4] Fill in the missing labels for the nodes in the tree below. Use the standard "X-bar" notation (e.g., NP, v', etc.).



2. [4] Yes or No. In the sentence for which the structure is given in (1)...

- (a) Is *One* an Experiencer?
 (b) Is *every feature* a complement?
 (c) Is *not* an adjunct?
 (d) Is *One* occupying a specifier?
 3. [1] Circle one. The verb shown in (1) above is...
 ditransitive / transitive / unergative / unaccusative
- **4.** [1] θ -role. Name the θ -role that *every feature* has in (1).

5. Suppose we start building a structure for a sentence, and at a certain stage we wind up with a *v*P as shown (abstractly) below in (2). *Note:* The superscripts are just for identification purposes—they aren't there in the structure, I just need to be able to refer to the individual nodes.



- (a) [1] Name the θ -role that the DP¹ will have.
- (b) [1] Name the operation (Merge, Adjoin, Move) that incorporated PP² into the structure.
- (c) [1] How many $[uP^*]$ features were there—total—in these lexical items initially?
- (d) [1] Which of the following three sentences might plausibly include the vP in (2)?
 - 1. Aliens in movies shoot at people.
 - 2. Water on mountains boils with vigor.
 - 3. People under stress drive in circles.
- 6. [1] Circle one. The verb shown in the structure in (2) is...

ditransitive / transitive / unergative / unaccusative

7. Suppose you had a sentence with the abstract structure given below in (3). I have provided the pronunciation of four syntactic objects: the DPs (*Tracy* and *barns*), and the bare (uninflected) form of the verb (*paint*).



(a) [1] The verb shown in the structure in (3) (above) is...

ditransitive / transitive / unergative / unaccusative

- (b) [1] Draw arrows in the tree that show, for things that moved, where they moved from and to.
- (c) [1] Write the sentence that this would be the structure for.
- (d) [1] What was the motivation to Merge Prog and vP?
- (e) [1] What was the motivation to Merge T' and DP (*Tracy*)?

9. [4] Binding Theory. One question, about the sentences in (4) and (5) below. The question (as you will explore in the real questions a–d below) is this: Why does (5b) have only one of the two interpretations you might expect? The background is this: There are two kinds of *give* sentences, the kind with the prepositional goal (4a), and the "double object construction" (4b). Both sentences in (4) seem to mean basically the same thing, and have the same options. Some male won a prize and Bill received the prize from Sue. The prizewinner can be Bill, or somebody else.

The similar-looking pair of sentences in (5) don't have as many meaning possibilities. Bill won a prize, and some male received it from Sue. However, the one who receives the prize can be Bill or somebody else in (5a), but it *cannot* be Bill in (5b). The question here is asking you to explain why Bill can't be the one who receives the prize from Mary in (5b). *Hint:* The title of this question is "Binding Theory"—expect to find yourself using the word "Principle" and one of the capital letters "A," "B," or "C."

- (4) a. Sue gave the prize that he won to Bill.
 - b. Sue gave Bill the prize that he won.
- (5) a. Sue gave the prize that Bill won to him.
 b. Sue gave him the prize that Bill won. ← him cannot be Bill.

(a) [1] In (4a), does *he* bind *Bill* if they have the same index?

(b) [1] In (4b), does *Bill* bind *he* if they have the same index?

- (c) [1] Why doesn't (4b) violate Principle B even when *he* and *Bill* have the same index?
- (d) [1] Why can't *him* be *Bill* in (5b)?

10. [2] It seems to me (right now, at least) that the two sentences together in (6) can in fact relate to two books written about Björk, one by John and the other by Björk herself. Notice that the second sentence is incomplete—the vP is left unpronounced, and is understood to mean the same thing as the vP in the preceding sentence (this kind of omission of the verb phrase is called "VP ellipsis"). Another example of VP ellipsis can be seen in (7). When (7b) follows (7a), it is understood as communicating (7c).

Here's the question: Given what (6b) means, explain why it is surprising that it is grammatical. (You can ignore *too*, but it is assumed to be adjoined to TP, very high in the tree.)

- (6) a. John could write a *book* about $Björk_i$.
 - b. She_i could too.
- (7) a. John has ordered a pizza.
 - b. Mary has too.
 - c. Mary has ordered a pizza too.