

Question 5, Homework 2: Synthesis

What students need to do:

Compare two Danish data sets, consisting of simple sentences with negation and sentences with an embedded clause with negation. The present perfect auxiliary HAR is in one position in the embedded clause and in another place in a simple clause

1) Initial observations

2) Use evidence from negation to describe a pattern

- Which sentences are grammatical and which ones aren't?
- Which rules can we draw from this?

3) Application of the models learned from readings and reviewed in class

- Where would HAR raise in a simple clause, according to the Pollockian model?
- Where would it appear to raise in the embedded clause, according to the Pollockian model?

******Use of appropriate terminology is crucial.** For instance, the question of the Pollockian model requires reference to the TP, AgrP, NegP and vP/VP levels of projection

4) Process of elimination

- HAR is not in the position it would be in a simple clause (TP).
- HAR is beneath NegP, so it would be in AgrP or in vP/VP
- Are we missing any evidence to finalize the place of HAR in the embedded clause?

5) Continuing application of in-class learning

- What is this piece of evidence/test? How would we use this test?

Sample Feedback:

Good start, but please be sure to explicitly note the following:

- *har* is not raising as high as TP; it must follow NEG in the embedded clause
- We can't tell if *har* stays in situ or moves just to Agr
- To determine whether it was in Agr we would need to see adverb position
- Missing discussion of data points

Overall impressions of what students should be looking to improve upon in future homework:

- Appropriate/accurate use of technical terms
- Providing enough prose, including stating basic observations
- Connecting reasoning to the given data in a clear way