

Ling 406/802
Spring 2005 (Pelletier)
Assignment #2

This assignment is due in class on Wednesday March 16th. Please type or neatly write as much of this assignment as you can. (I realize that diagrams and funny logic symbols might prove challenging for typing.) This is the second of three Assignments. As a whole, they are worth 25% of your grade. As before, they will be graded on a 3-2-1-0 basis. Since these are longer “thought questions”, you can work in groups of two, if you wish. When you turn in your assignments, please put both your names and IDs on the assignment. You should ensure that you both do half the work and both end up understanding everything you turn in.

1. Suppose the grammar of Chapter 7.2 (pp. 399-401) had *teacher* and *student* added to N_c (rule (19k)) and *pass* added to V_t (rule (19m)). Give the translations (into Intensional Logic) of the various LF structures that are associated with *Every teacher will not pass a student*.
2. On pp. 404-407 of our text, the authors give a number of reasons in favour of a “two stage” semantics. What is a two stage semantics? State three of the reasons they give, and critically discuss one of these three. You should focus on whether you think that their reason is correct or not; and whether you think that, even if it is correct, maybe it does not favour the two-stage view any more than another view.
3. **Background:** There is an intuitive difference between *events* (occurrences that involve a change of some sort that happens in time) and *states* (situations in which something just is, with no essential change going on). *To go on a hike*, for example, one has to move and create changes. So this is an event. *Having measles* is not like this, because once you get the disease, continuing to have measles amounts to there *not* being any changes, and hence this is a state. (Our book discusses this in Chapter 8, but we are not going to cover that chapter.)
Question: In the Reichenbach theory of tense, the difference between the perfect and the non-perfect tenses amounted to saying that E was before R in the perfect, but was at the same time in the non-perfect. In any present tense we have the speech time S be the same as R, while in any past tense we have R before S.. So in the present perfect we have E before S and R, which are at the same time; in the past perfect we have E before R before S. Consider
Mary has been sick for two days and *Mary had been sick for two days*
What is the normal understanding of these sentences? What would these sentences mean if E was really before R? (Can you put them into a context where that would be salient?) It doesn't always seem right to say that E is before R, because sometimes, although the E time *starts* before R, it continues up to and *includes* R. What is a reasonable generalization here? (Hint: it has something to do with events and states.)
4. Our authors did not explicitly discuss *unless* being used as a VP-conjunction. Nonetheless, their discussion of *and* and *or* as VP-conjunctions, and as giving rise to VP-ellipsis (pp. 420-425), seems similar to *unless*. A typical sentence that gives rise to VP-ellipsis might be *George will kiss Alice unless Sam does*. The book's discussion of the details of how VP-ellipsis works is pretty sketchy (mostly Sections 7.5.1 and 7.5.2), but nonetheless: How would their discussion apply to this example? The sentence *George will kiss his wife unless Sam does* is ambiguous. Explain what the ambiguity is. Can the authors' informal method be used to account for this ambiguity? (Why or why not?)