Expletive Insertion

| Course | Fall 24 COSC 426A (NLP) |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Instructor | Forrest Davis |
| Your Name | |
| Your Teammates' Names | |
| | |

Knowing a language involves <u>implicit</u> or <u>tacit</u> knowledge of a variety of "rules". English has a particularly fun rule that you have probably never reflected on! It's called **expletive insertion**. Expletives are, generally, swear words, though only some can undergo expletive insertion. Namely, we will consider 'fucking', 'freaking', and/or 'flipping' (if you know British English, 'bloody' would also work).

You may have said the following while moving back into the area:

(1) **Hamil**-fucking-ton (or, Hamil-freaking-ton, Hamil-flipping-ton, maybe even Hamil-bloody-ton)

In your small **groups**, your <u>task</u> is to <u>characterize the rule that describes our tacit knowledge</u> of expletive insertion. This should be done with the least **stipulations** and in the form of a **general** rule which applies to the most data. Note: the most succinct rule which appears to best conform to our knowledge requires the use of some representations we will not discuss in this class (namely, prosodic structure) – just do your best \odot

But first, we need some data!²

¹ This is adapted from Problem 3 of the morphology assignment shared by the Linguistic Society of America: https://www.linguisticsocietv.org/sites/default/files/e-learning/80.%20F10_L1_M1.pdf

² An additional fun example is from the movie *Forrest Gump*: Viet-fucking-nam - Forrest Gump

Data (5 points)

For the following words, discuss in your group where you think the expletive would go. Indicate with a **consistent mark** in each word the position you determine. If there is disagreement, indicate that below the word. Note: Some words may **not** work with expletive insertion. If it sounds markedly weird to place it anywhere, just indicate that.

| Alabama | Louisiana | Nebraska |
|------------|---------------|--------------|
| Arizona | Maine | Ohio |
| California | Maryland | Oklahoma |
| Montana | Massachusetts | Pennsylvania |
| Illinois | Michigan | Tennessee |
| Iowa | Minnesota | Vermont |
| Kentucky | Mississippi | Wyoming |

Rule (5 points)

As a group, work out a rule to account for your data above. It is often helpful to do this iteratively by first grouping data together, positing a rule, looking for counter-examples, and repeating.

For the Road (no points, just fun)

Consider the following examples. Do they violate your rule?

everybody amalgamated hypocrite every-fuckin-body amalga-fuckin-mated hypo-fuckin-crite

How might you adjust your rule to accommodate these data?