Problem Set 8 **Linguistics 101**
Due Monday, 4/28/08

Part I: Constituency Tests

A. Apply at least 2 of the constituency tests discussed in class to determine whether the italicized/underlined strings in sentences (1a–c) below are constituents. (I.e., for each different underlined string of words in (1a–c), apply **two** different constituency tests to see if the string is a constituent. By "different," I mean "belonging to different test classes." We discussed three different classes during lecture.)

Reminder: When looking at the results of a constituency test, you can only make inferences based on **positive results**. A negative result by itself is inconclusive (especially if you are looking at the results of only a single test).

(1) a. Jack *looked under the table*.
b. Jack *looked under* the table.
c. Jack looked *under the table*.

NOTE: DO NOT use the Coordination Test on (1b). In general, the Coordination Test is not quite as reliable as other constituency tests; under certain circumstances, the Coordination Test can produce a false positive result.

B. Based on the results of the constituency tests for (1a–c), draw a tree structure for the italicized string in (1a). Your tree structure should be in the X-bar format discussed in class.

Part II: Structural Ambiguity + Constituency Tests

The sentence in (1) is ambiguous between the two interpretations paraphrased in (2).

(1) The student looked over her homework.

(2) a. Interpretation A: The student proofread her homework.
b. Interpretation B: The student engaged in the action of looking and the direction of her looking was over the piece of paper that her homework was typed on.

It is claimed that this ambiguity is structural in nature, i.e., that each one of the interpretations corresponds to a different hierarchical grouping of the constituents in (1). (In other words, the sentence in (1) is associated with two different syntactic structures, each one corresponding to a different interpretation (2a versus 2b).)

A. Draw the two tree structures for (1). **Be sure to label your trees, indicating which interpretation is associated with eac tree.**

B. Justify the difference between the two tree structures (i.e., *provide evidence for the two different tree structures*) by making use of appropriate syntactic constituency tests.

NOTE: By "appropriate syntactic constituency tests," I am referring not only to the particular test you use, but also to what constituents you are trying to test for. For example, applying a constituency test to show me that "the student" is a constituent will not be very useful or enlightening, since "the student" should be an NP constituent in both of the trees. The point of your answer to B is to provide evidence in favor of **the difference** between the two tree structures. (Think very carefully about how you should be applying your test(s) to show how the two structures differ.)

Part III: Syntactic Trees

Using the X-bar format discussed in class, draw tree structures for the following four sentences from problem #5 in your textbook, p. 195–196: **c, d, i,** and **j**. Also provide tree structures for the following two sentences:

(1) The officer said that the accident injured that woman.

(2) Scientists will never accept the claim that the earth is flat.