Linguistics 610 Fall 2010
Problem Set #2 **22 points**

Due Tuesday 9/28

[All questions pertain to the analyses and discussions in *Syntactic Structures* (*SS*), with the rules as corrected and extended in class where necessary.**]**

1. In tree form, present a PM (or derived PM) to which the Auxiliary Transformation T20 ('Affix Hopping') could apply, and present one to which T20 could not apply. For the PM that "fits" the rule, display a member of the set-theoretic PM which establishes the PM's eligibility to undergo the rule. **3 points**

2. Present an argument that *be* must never be a V. That is, show that something would go empirically wrong if *be* were introduced by a rule such as V → *be*. (Is the problem *overgeneration*, *undergeneration*, or *both*? Discuss.) [Note that I am not asking whether the *Syntactic Structures* rules as they're stated introduce *be* under V. I know that you know that they don't. Rather, I am asking why the rules couldn't be changed so as to (sometimes) make *be* a V, ***especially when it seems to be the "main verb" of the sentence.***] If be is not introduced under V, how might it be introduced? And what is wrong with the way Chomsky suggests on p. 67 of *Syntactic Structures*? **3 points**

3. Show precisely why Negation T16 is ordered before Affix Hopping T20. What would go wrong if Affix Hopping (as stated in *Syntactic Structures*) were ordered before Negation (as stated in *Syntactic Structures*)? What would go wrong if these two rules were unordered (i.e., freely ordered) with respect to each other? Be explicit. Would there be *overgeneration*, *undergeneration*, or *both*? **3 points**

4. The present plural morpheme for regular verbs (in fact all verbs and 'verb-like things' except be) is phonetically null. Demonstrate empirically that there really is a morpheme introduced under C in these cases, rather than nothing at all. That is, show some incorrect prediction that would be made otherwise. (Would there be *overgeneration*, *undergeneration*, or *both*?) **3 points**

5. Show precisely how each of the following ungrammatical examples is ruled out. Or, to put the same question another way, for each example, state the minimal change in the grammar that would allow it to be generated, and show how the example can be generated with that change. What are some other consequences of the suggested change? Illustrate and discuss these consequences. **6 points**

   a. *Does John be leaving [cf. Is John leaving]
   b. *John past win the race [cf. John won the race]
   c. *Solved Susan the problem [cf. Did Susan solve the problem]
   d. *Mary likesn't Bill [cf. Mary doesn't like Bill]

6. [In this exercise, do not use any examples you've discussed in other exercises in this group. Come up with new examples. In fact, try hard to come up with some new types of examples.] [[Basically, what I want you to see and show is that this is a very limited fragment of the grammar of English. Much more needs to be added for it to approach descriptive adequacy.]] **4 points**
   a. Present an unacceptable sentence that can be generated by the rules in *Syntactic Structures* as modified in Chapter 2 of SSR, and show how the sentence is generated. [You don't have to give a complete derivation - just enough to make it clear what's going on.] Briefly discuss what the deficiency in the system seems to be.
   b. Present an acceptable sentence that can't be generated by the rules in *Syntactic Structures* as modified in Chapter 2 of SSR, and show why it can't be generated. Briefly discuss what the deficiency in the system seems to be.