

4 points

- 1.a With reference to specific examples, discuss some specific formal property of a rule (or set of rules) that would require negative evidence (i.e., the information that a particular example is ill-formed) in order to be learned. Be as explicit as possible, and show precisely why negative evidence is needed in the case you discuss.
- b Show how the property in (a) could be eliminated in favor of a device (or devices) not requiring negative evidence, **such that the new device still handles the original facts**. Be explicit.

6 points

- 2.a. Give 2 Syntactic Structures transformations that would not be possible within the 'wish list' theory of possible transformations, and show precisely all the ways in which they fail to qualify. The theory, essentially the one we have been working toward in class, is summarized on p.131 of Chapter 5 of Essays on Restrictiveness and Learnability, "Restricting the Theory of Transformations" (Lasnik (1981)). [This is not a question about the specific T's proposed in Lasnik (1981), but rather, about the theory of transformations permitting those T's, and excluding others. Thus, the following would not be an answer: "T12 is not listed in Lasnik's article; therefore it is not a possible rule of the system."]
- b. For the ways in which your rules in (a) failed to qualify, show in detail whether the failures could have been rectified internal to the Syntactic Structures theory, **so that everything still works**. (For example, T21b stipulates 3 instances of adjacency, but clearly adjacency to the left and right edge of the sentence is not a crucial requirement of the rule. In fact, it is not even correct.)
- c. Parts (a) and (b) were about ways that the SS/LSLT theory evolved into a more restrictive one. But it was already rather restrictive. Make up and discuss some formal operation that apparently does not occur in human language and show how the SS/LSLT theory of possible transformations correctly predicts its impossibility.

4 points

- 3.a Present an argument for the Case Filter. That is, show in detail how the Case Filter helps provide an explanation for some fact or facts that cannot be explained (or at least not easily) otherwise.
- b Show that the Case Filter applies at S-structure rather than D-structure.

6 points

4. For each of the following examples, discuss in detail what the structure of the VP is. Some potentially relevant possibilities to consider are [\_ NP CP], [\_NP IP], [\_IP], [\_CP]. In answering this question, you will be providing some of the subcategorization information about the verb.
  - a. Mary told John to leave
  - b. Susan attempted to solve the problem
  - c. John declared Mary to be a genius

[Even if you are not a native speaker of English, you should know just what information you need to answer this question, and hence, should be able to collect the data from a native speaker. Relevant evidence involves distribution of expletives, of PRO, of lexical NP, of NP trace, of 'idiom chunks'.]

**[Here is a sample answer (an excellent one) from Beth Rabbín, who took this course a few years ago:**

John considers Mary to be a genius.  
The structure of this VP is [ \_\_\_ IP]. "Consider" is an ECM verb, and it assigns Accusative Case to the subject of the embedded clause ("Mary"). We can see that "considers" is not a ditransitive verb because we cannot do the same thing to this sentence as we could with "Mary told John to leave":

\*John considers Mary that she is a genius.

However, we can make the embedded clause an idiom and still preserve the idiomatic meaning:

John considers the cat to be out of the bag.

These facts suggest that "Mary to be a genius" is a clause. Since the non-finite Infl is not a Case assigner, "Mary" must be getting Case from "considers". Thus, the embedded clause must be an IP, not a CP, because in order to assign Case, the assigner must govern the NP. A CP would prevent the verb from governing the NP, but since IP does not seem to be a barrier for government, the verb can assign Case to the NP.]

6 points

5. Explain the ungrammaticality of each of the following examples in terms of principles of linguistic theory or properties of the grammar of English. (Or, if in some instance, the ungrammaticality cannot be explained, show why.) Use the GB framework for your answers.
- \*It was chosen John
  - \*It was slept by Bill
  - \*George appears to be likely that it is raining