# Limitations

## Over-generalization

The most notable over-generalization appears with subject-auxiliary agreements, more specifically with “have” and “be” and their variations, i.e. “\*He have eaten”, “\*I is eating”.

## Under-generalization

In terms of under generalizations the grammar currently cannot parse present tense at all. A simple example would be “I eat”. The grammar can do very simple future tense in the sense that it can parse “I will eat” and “I will be eating”, however, it cannot parse any sentences when you try to add objects or prepositions to the verb. Example being “I will bring Ross” and “I will be jumping on the cat” respectively. This is due to the fact that the specified grammar is only set up to take S -> NP Aux V.

Another limitation is the inability to attach adjectives to proper nouns (i.e. Soft Nadia ate).

# Testing Strategy

## 3.1

Testing was focused on determiner subject agreement (i.e. the cat fondled vs these cat fondled), ensuring valid sentence structuring (i.e. She fondled, \*her fondled, Nadia ate, Nadia with the soft fur ate, \*slowly she ate), and that all verbs used were past tense intransitive. (i.e. She arrived, \*She eats)

## 3.2

Testing for 3.2’s main focus was made on the order of auxiliaries (i.e. I had been eating, \*I been had eating) and auxiliary agreement (I had been eating, \*I had be eating). It was made sure that auxiliaries followed the order of Modal > Perfect > Progressive > Passive. Also tested certain intransitive verbs so that they were in past passive (i.e. I have eaten, \*I have ate).

## 3.3

Testing for 3.3 was primarily about sentence structure. Specifically, when VP could be followed by NP, S, or a preposition. Special care was given to the case where VP would be followed by the relative subject “that” as not every term can be followed by that (i.e. she believed that the cat ate, \*she fondled that the cat).