Answers

Chapter 1

2. Here are the alternative grammatical sentences for most speakers:
   a. He will clean it up
      The pronoun it must precede the particle up.
   b. Who do you think saw what?
      Only the first wh-word can be displaced.
   c. She will put the baby to sleep
      Sleep is an intransitive verb, and therefore cannot have an object.
   d. I have not had breakfast
      The auxiliary verb have must precede the negation not.
   e. He ate cornflakes with a silver spoon this morning
      Other words cannot intervene between a verb and its object.
   f. She may walk to the shops
      A modal verb such as may and the third person singular present inflection -s cannot occur together.
   g. Did you make pancakes this morning?
      This question requires an auxiliary do verb.
   h. I {am/was} walking quickly
      This sentence requires an auxiliary be verb.
   i. He sang the tune to his friends OR He sang his friends the tune
      For the direct object the tune to precede the indirect object his friends there must be a to preposition before the latter. Alternatively, the indirect object may precede the direct object without a preposition.
   j. He offered pudding to her OR She offered pudding to him
      The subject pronoun must have Nominative Case, and the object of the preposition Accusative Case. The sentence should have Subject-Verb-Object word order.
Chapter 2

1. a. Not a constituent.
   b. Constituent: NP, head *park*.
   c. Could be a constituent, but probably not in this context: if it is a constituent it means that the man has Billy’s hand, or Billy smacked the man with the man’s own hand.
   d. Constituent: VP, head *smacked* (also inside a larger VP [smacked the man with his hand]).
   e. Not a constituent.
   f. Constituent: AP, head *confusing*.
   g. Constituent: PP, head *on*.
   h. Not a constituent: in contrast to the previous sentence, the second PP is not nested in the first.
   i. Constituent: VP, head *ate*.
   j. Not a constituent.
   k. Not a constituent.
   l. Constituent: PP, head *of*.

3. c.

   ![Diagram](image)

   i.

   ![Diagram](image)
4. Many of the other sentences have multiple verbs or more than one object. We have not yet seen a way to represent these structures without violating our binary branching requirement.

Chapter 3

1. a. 

```
NP      vP
  D    N     v
     the  boy  handed

AgrOP
  NP
    him

AgrOP
  AgrO
    handed

VP
  NP
    the
  VP
    book

handed
  VP
    him
```

b. 

```
NP      vP
  I     v
     gave

VP
  NP
    the
  VP
    AP  N
      other  book
  V
    gave
  PP
    P
      to
    NP
      the
      AP  N
        other  boy
```

2. a. Whether our account in this chapter is sufficient for full NPs in relation to particle verbs depends on the acceptability of sentences such as (i).

(i) ??He gave back the boy the book

If (i) is grammatical then our model must allow the indirect object (here the boy) to Merge in the VP after Merge of the direct object (here the book) so that they may both follow the particle in AgrO.
b. Remerge of objects in AgrOP appears to be sufficient, as long as it is an option for all objects, and a requirement for pronouns. It is possible that the particle may also be realised (pronounced) in the V position, but this does not add anything to our analysis for the data we have here.

c. This alternative structure (pictured below) eliminates Merge of more than one object in a single AgrOP in instances where both objects appear to precede a particle. At the same time, the introduction of an additional head means that we are further decomposing a single lexical item syntactically, and possibly duplicating information in separate phrases. In other respects, however, there is little difference between what we have proposed in this chapter and a structure with two AgrOPs, and we could argue that in terms of the data we have seen these two representations are functionally equivalent.
Chapter 4

1. a.  ```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AuxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spilled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

b.  ```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the butter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

c.  ```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the pancakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

2. a. ‘True’ modals select for bare infinitives, lack regular overt tense morphology and precede the negation *not.*
   
   (i) I may (*to) leave now
   
   (ii) *I mays leave now
   
   (iii) I may not leave now
Have (to), dare and ought can select for a to-infinitive.

(iv) I have *(to) leave now
(v) He wouldn’t dare %%(to) leave now
(vi) He ought %%(to) leave now

Have to and dare have overt tense morphology; ought does not.

(vii) He has to leave
(viii) He dares to leave early
(ix) *He oughts to leave early

Use of have (to) and dare preceding negation is variable.

(x) %He does not have to leave early
   %He has not to leave early
(xi) %He dares not leave early
    %He does not dare leave early
(xii) He ought not (to) leave early
    *He does not ought (to) leave early

b. This single head analysis works well only if it is not possible to have intervening material between the two modal heads. If only one modal moves to C in questions (as in examples (59) and (60)) we must assume a sort of partial Head Movement. An example such as (61), in which negation appears between the two modals, is particularly problematic under this approach.

An analysis in which modals are in two separate heads cannot account particularly well for (i), as it would require one head to first move into the other before moving to C, or for them to each move to C independently. An analysis in which the first modal might is actually an adverb can account for (i), inasmuch as it is possible to have an adverb preceding an auxiliary verb in a question (e.g. Maybe could be do that?).
Chapter 5

1. a.

```
CP
  NP  CP
     who
  C   TP
    [+Q]
     NP  TP
     who
   T   AuxP
     has
    Aux
     has
      NP  vP
     who
      v
     VP
    spilled
  NP  V
     spilled
 D  N
the  milk
```

b.

```
CP
  C   TP
  should
  NP  Billy
 T   ModP
  should
 Mod  rP
  should
 NP  vP
Billy
 v
 clean
 AgrOP
 AgrO  VP
 clean up
 NP  V
 D  N
 clean up
 the  mess
```
2. The data here indicate that, unlike NP objects, clausal objects cannot precede particles in particle verb configurations. This evidence is consistent with the proposal that CPs are Merged as VP complements.

Alternatively, we could argue that the CP is Merged as a specifier of the VP, in the same position as an NP object, but cannot Remerge in the specifier of AgrOP. Under this analysis we would have to argue that AgrO is the only head position in which the particle may be realised (which is what we have said already), as otherwise it would be possible for a CP to precede it.

In short, both of these approaches are possible given the data that we have, but we will see in Chapter 7 that in some instances it is possible to have both a clausal and an NP object, suggesting that the clausal object is in a VP complement position.
Chapter 6

1. a.

   NP
   Maisie

   T
   hasn’t

   Neg
   hasn’t

   Aux
   has

   vP
   NP
   Maisie

   v
   VP
   NP
   Martha

   met

b.

   NP
   Lucy

   T
   does

   Neg
   not

   vP
   NP
   Lucy

   v
   VP
   NP
   any pancakes

   want
2. We could analyse these negative inversion constructions as involving T-to-C Movement similar to that which we see for questions. According to this approach these negative elements in C must have some sort of uninterpretable Tense (sub)feature when they occur in C.

Chapter 7

1. a. Subject Control.
   b. Object Control.
   c. Subject Raising.
   d. None of the above: no non-finite complement.
   e. Raising-to-Object.
   f. Object Control.
   g. Subject Control.
   h. Subject Control.
   i. Subject Raising.
   j. Raising-to-Object.
2. a. TP
   NP
   Billy
   T [-PAST]
   vP
   NP
   Billy
   v
   asked
   VP
   V asked
   CP
   C TP
   V asked
   NP
   PRO
   TP
   T
   VP
   NP
   PRO
   leave

b. TP
   NP
   Billy
   T [+PAST]
   vP
   NP
   Billy
   v
   asked
   VP
   NP
   Martha
   V asked
   CP
   C TP
   V asked
   NP
   PRO
   TP
   T
   VP
   NP
   PRO
   leave
c. 

```
  TP
  /|
 TP  VP
  /|
 NP  T  V
    /  
   [−PAST] happens
      /  
     NP  TP
        /  
       Oscar  V
          /  
         to  vP
           /  
          NP  vP
            /  
           Oscar  like
              /  
             NP  VP
               /  
               like
```

Chapter 8

1. a. 

```
  TP
  /|
 DP  TP
   /|
 DP  T  NegP
  /|
 me  is  not
 / |
 D  NP  NegP
  / |
 's  sister  Neg
 / |
 NP  VP
  / |
 V  AP
  / |
 my-sister  AP
   / |
   very  A
   happy
```
b. TP
   NP I
   T [+PAST] vP
   NP 4 vP
       v observed
       VP observed
       DP DP
       D the NP statue' s NP DP N
       destruction
   
   c. TP
   DP NP T AuxP
   D the N PP were Aux
   P pieces were
   of DP Aux eaten
   D NP by her
Chapter 9

1. These postnominal attributive APs can be accounted for using right-adjunction.

If right-adjunction is disallowed because of the LCA, they can potentially be accounted for by Head Movement of the noun into a position above the adjective.