

**24.902: Problem Set #3**  
due Wednesday, October 31

**Problem One**

Consider the following beautifully poetic sentence.

(1) In order to convince myself to respect myself, I reminded myself that pictures of myself were selling like hot cakes.

Consider all four of the instances of *myself* in (1). For each *myself*, explain how it is satisfying the Binding Theory; in particular, tell us which DP is the antecedent that is sufficiently close to *myself* to bind it and satisfy Condition A. There may be cases in which more than one such DP could be the antecedent; in that kind of case, you should list all the potential binders. You can refer to the instances of *myself* as *myself* (1), *myself* (2), etc. (where *myself* (1) is the first instance of *myself*, the one after *convince*). So your answer should look something like:

*myself* (1)'s binder is *hot cakes*.  
*myself* (2)'s binders are *pictures* and *respect*.

...etc.

**Problem Two**

When we were talking about PRO, I mentioned that there were a couple of proposed theories about how to account for the facts in sentences like (2):

(2) John tried to paint himself blue.

In one theory, the subject of *paint* is a null DP, PRO, which is required (for reasons we haven't tried to figure out) to refer to *John*; this requirement is referred to as 'control' (we say that *John* controls PRO). In another theory, the subject of *paint* is the DP *John*, which raises out of the embedded clause to become the subject of *tried* as well (thereby getting two theta-roles).

In the second theory, we have to relax the theta-criterion so that *John* can get two theta-roles. The first theory allows us to maintain the theta-criterion as it is, requiring DPs to have only one theta-role, but then must posit more DPs than we can actually see, so that *paint* can assign its Agent theta-role (or rather, so that the *v* that takes the VP headed by *paint* as its complement can assign its Agent theta-role). Let's look at some facts that might help us choose between theories.

A while ago we talked about the existence of "floating quantifiers", which are things like the *all* in (3):

(3) The boys have **all** left.

Here *all* somehow manages to be taken as modifying *the boys*, even though it's not anywhere near that DP. We're not going to worry, for this problem set, about how floating quantifiers do this; we'll just exploit some useful properties of them in Icelandic.

Icelandic floating quantifiers agree in case, number, and gender with the DPs that they modify. Also, Icelandic verbs may assign any of a number of different cases to their subjects; some verbs simply idiosyncratically require dative subjects, for instance. These two facts combine to yield paradigms like the one in (5):

- (4) a. Strakarnir komust **allir** í skóla  
boys-NOM got all-NOM.PL.M to school  
'The boys all got to school'
- b. Strakana vantaði **alla** í skólann  
boys-ACC lacked all-ACC.PL.M in school-the  
'The boys were all absent from school'
- c. Strakunum vantaði **öllum** í skóla  
boys-DAT bored all-DAT.PL.M in school  
'The boys were all bored in school'
- d. Strakanna var **allra** getið i ræðunni  
boys-GEN was all-GEN.PL.M mentioned in speech-the  
'The boys were all mentioned in the speech'

Now consider the sentences in (5):

- (5) a. Strákarnir vonast til að komast **allir** í skóla  
boys-NOM hope to get all-NOM.PL.M to school  
'The boys hope to all get to school'
- b. Strákarnir vonast til að vanta ekki **alla**  
boys-NOM hope to lack not all-ACC.PL.M  
í skólann  
in school-the  
'The boys hope to not all be absent from school'
- c. Strákarnir vonast til að leiðast ekki **öllum**  
boys-NOM hope to bore not all-DAT.PL.M  
í skóla  
in school  
'The boys hope to not all be bored in school'
- d. Strákarnir vonast til að verða **allra** getið  
boys-NOM hope to be all-GEN.PL.M mentioned  
í ræðunni  
in speech  
'The boys hope to all be mentioned in the speech'

How do these facts bear on the two theories of control that we discussed?