

1. Category argumentation: Some linguists have argued that the word *of* has two different uses, illustrated in a) and b) below:

- a) items of sentimental value
- b) his criticism of the press

It has been suggested that *of* in expressions such as a) belongs to the category P of prepositions, and is hence a lexical category; it can often be paraphrased by *with* and has an antonym *without* (compare: *items with sentimental value*, which is basically synonymous with *items of sentimental value*, and *items without sentimental value*, which is basically an antonym of *items of sentimental value*).

On the other hand, the *of* in expressions like b) seems to serve a purely functional need, and apparently has no lexical content at all. It has been suggested that it is a functional item belonging to category K, for 'case particle', and that its function is to allow a noun which cannot directly take a DP argument (e.g. **criticism the press*) to take one. One reason for supposing that *of* in constructions like b) is a meaningless functor is that it does not show up in the corresponding verbal construction: *criticize the press*, not *criticize of the press*. Further, it cannot be replaced by *with*: *criticism with the press* does not mean the same thing at all as *criticism of the press*.

Contentful, lexical prepositions can be
- modified by an adverb:

- a' items *truly* of sentimental value
- b' **criticism truly* of the press

Contentful lexical propositions can be *noncontrastively* negated:

- a'' items not of sentimental value
- b'' **criticism not* of the press

(b'' is ok if it is continued... *but of the government*, where the negation is contrasting *the press* with *the government* — but it is not acceptable just as is, with neutral intonation.¹)

Using these tests (*with*-replacement, antonym *without*, adverbial modification, noncontrastive negation), decide whether the *of* in the following examples is a lexical preposition or a functional case particle.

If you are a non-native speaker of English, you will need to find an English-speaking friend who will give you his/her judgements on the test phrases.

¹ Well, ok, there is another reading of *of* that is possible in *criticism of the press*, where it is the *press* that is the agent of criticizing — the press is doing the criticizing, and that *of* can be negated, in a rather archaic-sounding way. If you don't get this reading, don't worry about it (cf. *a being not of this earth*).

- i) The Queen is the head *of* the state
- ii) It is a building *of* substantial architectural merit
- iii) He was a composer *of* classical music
- iv) This is a portrait *of* the president
- v) He is a man *of* unlimited means
- vi) I am very appreciative *of* your assistance
- vii) He is someone *of* a violent disposition
- viii) He fell out *of* the window

Sample answer to i)

Tests:

1. Adverb:
*The Queen is the head truly of the state
2. *with*-replacement synonymy
*The Queen is the head with the state. (definitely not a synonym)
3. *without*-antonym
*The Queen is the head without the state. (not an antonym of *head of state*)
4. Noncontrastive negation
*The Queen is the head not of the state (want to continue ... *but of the church*, for example)
5. Can the *of* be deleted if the first noun is used as a verb?
The Queen heads the state (fine)

Based on these tests, the *of* in *head of state* is a case particle, not a preposition.

Comment on examples that don't give the same result in each test, or cases where you think both uses of *of* are possible.

2. Right-headed tree-drawing practice

Recall that Japanese is a right-headed language. Draw trees for the following Japanese sentences. Treat *ni* as a preposition, but treat *-wa* and *-ga* as simply part of the proper name (draw a triangle under the DP). Treat the suffixes *-ta* and *-ru* as heading Infl.

- a) Taroo-wa Koobe ni it-ta
Taro-TOP Koobe to go-PAST
"Taro went to Koobe"
- b) Taroo-wa Hanako-ga Koobe ni it-ta to omotte-ru
Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM Koobe to go-PAST that think-PRES
"Taroo thinks that Hanako went to Peking"

3. Shakespearean English and parameter setting revisited

Compare once again the following Shakespearean English sentences with their Modern English counterparts:

1. SE: Speak you not for him!
ModE: Don't you speak for him!
2. SE: How came you hither?
ModE: How did you come here?
3. SE: Hast any more of this?
ModE: Do you have any more of this?
4. SE: Hath he not a son?
ModE: Doesn't he have a son?
5. SE: Friend hast thou none.
ModE: You have no friends

How can the differences in word order between the two dialects in each of these sentences be structurally characterized, i.e., what parameter change in English between then and now is illustrated in all these sentences? Draw trees for both the SE and the ModE sentences in 1, 2, and 4, showing all movement with arrows.

No need to draw non-branching nodes if you don't want to, BUT, be sure that every phrase has a head and every head has a phrase! You are still allowed (nay, requested) to draw pronouns and proper names as unanalyzed DPs with triangles under them.

Comment on sentences 3 and 5. What additional assumptions would you need to make when drawing a tree for them?