Assignment 4 (due Thursday, April 5 in class)

I. Another Job for *DO* SUPPORT

The following examples illustrate another grammatical context in which the English "dummy" auxiliary verb *do* appears:

(1) He said that he would [$_{VP}$ finish the project], ...
  a. and [$_{VP}$ finish the project] he did.
  b. *and [$_{VP}$ finished the project] he.

Do our current assumptions regarding TENSE LOWERING and *DO* SUPPORT account for the contrast between (1a) and (1b)? If so, then explain how they do. If your explanation requires any additional assumptions regarding the way in which (1a) is syntactically derived, then be sure to state these assumptions explicitly.

II. *Why* vs. *How Come*

Based on the following contrasts, formulate a hypothesis concerning the syntactic differences between English *why*- and *how come*-questions. Your hypothesis should include a precise statement of the syntactic positions occupied by *why*, *how come*, and *are* in (1b) and (2a).

(1) a. Why are they making such a fuss?
  b. *Why they are making such a fuss?

(2) a. *How come are they making such a fuss?
  b. How come they are making such a fuss?

III. V2 Word Order in Modern German

In this problem, you will consider the implications of the following two sets of facts for our understanding of V2 word order in Modern German.

A. German has a large class of verbs which are similar to *understand* or *withstand* in English, in that they seem to consist of a prepositional prefix in combination with a verbal stem. The verbs *anrufen* (*an-*+*rufen* 'call on the phone') and *ausziehen* (*aus-*+*ziehen* 'pull out') are typical members of this class. Consider the following examples:

(1) a. Jetzt zieht er den Nagel aus.
now STEM he the nail PREF
'Now he is pulling out the nail.'
b. Mein Vater ruft mich von Zeit zu Zeit an.
my father STEM me from time to time PREF
'My father calls me on the phone every so often.'

(2) a. *Jetzt auszieht er den Nagel.
now PREF+STEM he the nail
b. *Mein Vater anruft mich von Zeit zu Zeit.
my father PREF+STEM me from time to time

(3) a. Jetzt hat er den Nagel ausgezogen.
now has he the nail pulled-out
'Now he has pulled out the nail.'
b. Mein Vater hat mich gestern Abend angerufen.
my father has me yesterday evening called-up
'My father called me on the phone yesterday evening.'

(4) a. Jetzt kann sie den Nagel ausziehen.
now can she the nail pull-out
'Now she can pull out the nail.'
b. Am abend kann er mich anrufen.
in-the evening can he me call-up
'He can call me on the phone in the evening.'

(5) a. weil Marga Johann selten anruft […]
because Marga Johann seldom calls-up
'Because Marga seldom calls Johann on the phone […]'
b. Ich denke dass sie den Nagel auszieht.
I think that she the nail pulls-out
'I think that she is pulling out the nail.'

Do these facts support our syntactic analysis of V2 word order in Modern German? If so, then explain how they do. Your explanation should include an informal, but precise description of how our analysis derives the different word orders seen in (1) and (5). In addition, you should briefly discuss the constraint on such verbs that is illustrated by the contrast between (1) and (2).

III. V2 Word Order in Modern German (continued)

B. German also has a class of so-called "weak" pronouns, such as *es* 'it' and *ihm* '(to) him'. These pronouns are restricted to appear in only certain positions in the clause. The following examples illustrate the positions in which *es* and *ihm* characteristically appear:

(6) […] dass es ihm der Johann gestern gegeben hat
that it him the Johann yesterday given has
'[…] that Johann gave it to him yesterday.'

(7) Gestern hat es ihm der Johann gegeben.
yesterday has it him the Johann given
'Johann gave it to him yesterday.'

How does the word order in (6) differ from the standard word order seen in German subordinate clauses? Does the distribution of the weak pronouns *es* and *ihm* support our understanding of the syntactic differences between main and subordinate clauses? If so, then explain how it does.

Interlude: The Syntactic Derivation of Negative Modal & Auxiliary Verbs (A bit of background discussion for Part IV…)

Recall that one of the distinctie properties of those elements that occupy the T position in English is their ability to host the bound negative morpheme *–n't*. Recall also that *–n't* is best classified as an inflectional suffix (not a true "contracted" clitic), on par with the present and past tense suffixes *–s* and *–ed*. These two observations suggest that our treatment of *–n't* should parallel our treatment of tense marking. In particular, we can assume that just like the abstract tense specifications PRES and PAST, the abstract specification NEG may also appear under T. This abstract NEG, when joined by a modal or auxiliary verb, will eventually be realized as *–n't*, just as PAST is eventually realized as *–ed*:

T	T	T
|	|	|
can+NEG	*have*+PAST+NEG	*do*+PAST+NEG
⇓	(via AUX RAISING)	(via *DO* SUPPORT)
can't	⇓	⇓
	hadn't	*didn't*

Note that in many non-standard varieties of English, the combinations of *have*+PRES+NEG and *be*+PRES+NEG may alternatively be realized as *ain't*:

Baby, you ain't seen nothin' yet!
I ain't gonna work on Maggie's Farm no more.
It ain't me, babe.

IV. Negative Modal & Auxiliary Verbs in African American English

In this problem, you will consider so-called "emphatic negative" constructions like those in (1), produced by speakers of African American English:

(1) a. Ain't nothin' happenin'.
b. Can't nobody tag you.
c. Didn't nobody see it.
d. Ain't nobody never told me what to do.

These sentences are uttered with falling intonation and have the meanings of declaratives (not questions). They correspond to the following sentences of Standard English:

(2) a. Nothing is happening.
b. Nobody can tag you.
c. Nobody saw it.
d. Nobody ever told me what to do.

A. Based on our recent class discussions about the structure of the English clause, you should be able to develop **two** initially plausible hypotheses concerning the syntactic derivation of emphatic negatives in African American English. These hypotheses **should start with the same underlying structure**, and arrive at the surface word order seen in (1) via different sets of syntactic operations (rules). For each hypothesis:

(i) Describe in prose the syntactic operations that would need to apply. In particular, what happens to the subject NP? What happens to the negative modal/auxiliary verb?

(ii) Illustrate the derivation of (1a).

(iii) Say how the proposed derivation differs from what happens in Standard English.

B. Linguists who have studied African American English have reported two different patterns concerning the possibility of emphatic negatives in subordinate clauses:

Dialect A	Dialect B
(3) a. I know that ain't nobody leavin'.	(4) a. *I know that ain't nobody leavin'.
b. I know ain't nobody leavin'.	b. I know ain't nobody leavin'.

What conclusions can you draw concerning the correctness of your previous two hypotheses, given the data presented in this section?