

A Generative Analysis of “Yes, indeed” Or, not seeing the wood for the trees

The Problem

- **Yes, indeed** is a legitimate English utterance, so must be analysable.
- The semantics of the utterance indicate that **yes** is a sentence substitute, and dictionaries describe it so (e.g. *Collin’s English Dictionary, Complete & Unabridged 2012 Digital Edition*).
- **Yes, indeed** must therefore be analysable generatively as a sentence.

An Interpretation

- **Yes indeed** could be seen as a form of generative sluicing, where a short noun phrase acts as an elided version of an implied verb phrase or clause. **Yes, indeed** does imply an elided version of a clause; but sluicing is seen as applying to questions, not answers, and **yes, indeed** is not a noun phrase.
- What **Yes, indeed** implies is agreement, it establishes consensus.
- The agreement must be between parties, so the first and second persons (speaker and listener) are also implied.
- The agreement must be about something, so a third person topic is implied.
- **Indeed** acts as an emphatic intensifier, so all the other semiotic components must be within the word **yes**. (Although **indeed** can be offered as a single word marker of agreement, which may mean that even the **yes** can be implied rather than stated.)
- **Indeed** creates the context of **yes**, excluding other contextual meanings (*I will do it, I can do it, I allow you to do it, let it be so, etc.*).

Into the Trees

This gives us the following generative tree structure:

| Yes | | Indeed | | Yes | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|-------|--|--|
| 1 st Person | Intensifier | Consensus | | Topic | | 2 nd Person | | | |
| [I] | [emphatically] | [establish] | [consensus] | [about] | [X] | [with] | [you] | | |
| S | | | | | | | | | |
| NP | VP | | | | | | | | |
| | Int | VP | | | | | | | |
| | | V | NP | | | | | | |
| | | | N | PP | | PP | | | |
| | P | NP | | P | NP | | | | |
| [t] | indeed | [t] | [t] | [t] | [t] | [t] | [t] | | |

Which leaves us with a few problems:

- Where did all those trace elements come from?
- Are they really there?
- Is **Yes** simultaneously a Noun Phrase and a Verb Phrase, and what does that tell us about tree structure syntactic rules?
- If the utterance had been just **Yes**, which of the traces is the sound-syntax correspondence, or is there no correspondence between sound and structure?