In the next session we'll look at two classes of verbs (or roots) and examine how their semantics influences their syntactic behavior, i.e. argument structure. Let's see what that looks like.

One class of verbs doesn't require an internal argument, or object. Here are a few examples where we can leave out the object:

(1) a. Chris **swept** the floor.
    b. All last night, Chris **swept**.

(2) a. Chris **scrubbed** the floor.
    b. All last night, Chris **scrubbed**.

In the other class of verbs, we cannot omit the object:

(3) a. Chris **broke** the vase.
    b. *All last night, Chris **broke**.

(4) a. Chris **dimmed** the lights.
    b. *All last night, Chris **dimmed**.

Q1 Why might this be the case? In other words, what is it about *sweeping* and *scrubbing* that should allow us to drop the object, and what is it about *breaking* and *dimming* that requires one?

Here's an additional challenge. The list in (5) contains a number of verbs like *sweep* and *scrub*. The list in (6) contains verbs like *break* and *dim*.

(5) *eat, bash, bellow, dance, flutter, hit, jog, jump, laugh, murmur, nibble, pour, roll, rub, run, scour, scream, scribble, scrub, shout, spin, sweep, swim, walk, whisper, wipe, yell*

(6) *admit, approach, arrive, break, clean, clear, come, cover, declare, destroy, devour, die, empty, enter, faint, fall, fill, freeze, go, increase, kill, melt, near, open, proclaim, propose, remove, rise, say*

Q2 Can you propose a generalization for what the semantic difference between (5) and (6) amounts to?

Q3 Can you divide the second list, (6), into two or three semantic sub-classifications?