

Assignment 4

1 Do Support

1a. Explain the following patterns of grammaticality.

- (1) a. i. Chunghye is talking to Makoto.
ii. Chunghye might be talking to Makoto.
iii. *Chunghye does be talking to Makoto.
iv. Chunghye is not talking to Makoto.
v. *Chunghye not is talking to Makoto.
vi. *Chunghye did not be talking to Makoto.
- b. i. Chunghye talked to Makoto.
ii. Chunghye might talk to Makoto.
iii. Chunghye does talk to Makoto.
iv. *Chunghye talked not to Makoto.
v. *Chunghye not talked to Makoto.
vi. Chunghye did not talk to Makoto.

Your explanation should illustrate the *last resort* nature of the phenomenon at hand, explain why (1b.iii) is only a putative counterexample to giving the above phenomenon a *last resort* characterization, and address why 'emphatic' *do*-support as in (1b.iii) is not an option with auxiliaries (see 1a.iii).

1b. Consider the following minimal pairs.

- (2) a. i. Charlene is not meeting with Minjoo.
ii. Charlene isn't meeting with Minjoo.
iii. Isn't Charlene meeting with Minjoo?
- b. i. Charlene has not met with Minjoo.
ii. Charlene hasn't met with Minjoo.
iii. Hasn't Charlene met with Minjoo?

A common analysis of these facts assumes that *have/be* are generated below NegP. They pick up the head *n't* on their way to T⁰ by passing through Neg⁰. The cases in (2a/b.iii) are taken to be generated by further movement into C⁰.

Provide an explanation for the ungrammaticality of (3).

- (3) a. *Is not Charlene meeting with Minjoo?

- b. *Has not Charlene meet with Minjoo?

1c. Discuss the implications of the following facts for your analysis of the English auxiliary system, in particular where modals are generated and when/where auxiliary *do* enters into the derivations.

- (4) a. Modals:
i. Angela shouldn't invite Tom.
ii. Shouldn't Angela invite Tom?
b. *do*-support:
i. Angela didn't invite Tom.
ii. Didn't Angela invite Tom?

1d. In addition to being triggered by a ΣP that intervenes between a finite T^0 and an associated VP, *do*-support also takes place if we try to elide or topicalize a tensed VP headed by a main verb. If the VP is not tensed, we do not get *do*-support.

- (5) a. VP-ellipsis:
i. Bill [likes David]. Maria does, too.
ii. Bill should [like David]. Maria should, too.
b. VP-topicalization:
i. I was convinced that Bill [liked David], and [like David], he does.
ii. I am convinced that Bill will [like David], and [like David], he will.

Extend your proposal for *do*-support to handle the cases in (5).

1e. Based on the surface similarities between (6a) and (??), the idea that (6a) involves *do*-support seems plausible.

- (6) a. What Roumi and Dave did in the kitchen was soak their feet.
b. I thought that Roumi and Dave soaked their feet in the kitchen and [soak their feet], they did in the kitchen.

Does (6a) actually involve *do*-support?

2 Double Modals

2. Certain dialects of English allow the appearance of more than one modal in the same sentence. The following data are from Hawick (pronounced "hoik") in Scotland:

- (7) a. He will can go.
b. He might could go.

In this dialect, *can/could* is always the second of the two modals:

- (8) a. *He can will go.
b. *He could might go.
c. *He can can go.

The modals seem to agree in Tense:

- (9) a. *He will could go.
b. *He would can go.

Can/could can appear after *to* in an infinitival clause:

- (10) a. I would like to could swim.
b. I want to can do it.
c. He's bound to could do it.
d. *I would like to might do it.
e. *He's bound to should do it.

There are a number of possible analyses of this construction. Here's two competing hypotheses:

- **Hypothesis 1:** the double modal is a single word.
- **Hypothesis 2:** one of the modals is really an adverb.

Using the data provided, evaluate these two hypotheses. The two hypotheses as they stand are somewhat underspecified and you might want to make them more explicit before you start comparing them. If you end up deciding that they are both wrong, formulate your own hypothesis.

(11) Inversion:

- a. He will can do it.
b. Will he can do it?
c. *Can he will do it?
d. *Will can he do it?
e. *Can will he do it?

(12) Negation:

He might not could have done it.

(13) Tag-Questions:

- a. He'll no can do it, will he?
b. He'll no can do it, can he?
c. He might maybe do that, mightn't he?
d. *He might maybe do that, mayben't he?
e. He can't possibly do that, can he?
f. *He can't possibly do that, possibly he?

(14) Ordering

- a. All the boys should could go.
- b. The boys all should could go.
- c. The boys should all could go.
- d. The boys should could all go.

The data here might be insufficient to decide between various theories. You could explicitly indicate the kind of data that would be relevant and leave it at that. But if you would like to see additional data, you could go to the source - Brown (1991), which is in the library. The following website might also be helpful:

<http://www.abdn.ac.uk/~en1038/grammar.htm>

References

Brown, K. (1991) "Double Modals in Hawick Scots," in P. Trudgill and J. K. Chambers, eds., *Dialects of English: Studies in Grammatical Variation*, Longman, London, 74–103.