Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

SKU: 9780521669702-SOLUTIONS

2. Key to exercises in chapter 2

2.1.1a-h Overview

These sentences are about whether the items in question have the categorial status of auxiliaries or (non-auxiliary/lexical/main) verbs. Properties differentiating auxiliaries from verbs include:

- Auxiliaries undergo Inversion in questions, verbs require *do*-support
- Auxiliaries can be used in tags, verbs require *do*-support
- Auxiliaries can be negated by a following *not* in a finite clause, verbs require *do*-support
- Only auxiliaries have contracted negative forms, not verbs
- Only (modal) auxiliaries have a third person singular present tense form not ending in *-s*
- Only verbs allow a complement introduced by infinitival *to*, not auxiliaries
- Auxiliaries allow ellipsis/deletion of their complement, verbs do not

2.1.1a Nobody *need/dare* say anything

A model answer is provided in the book

2.1.1b Nobody *needs/dares* to ask questions

There are several reasons for taking *needs/dares* to have the categorial status of main verbs in the use illustrated here, not modal auxiliaries. For one thing, they behave like typical verbs (and unlike modal auxiliaries such as *will/shall/can/may/must*) in carrying the third person singular present tense *-s* inflection. Moreover, they resemble a typical verb like *want* in taking an infinitive complement introduced by the infinitive particle *to* (cf. *He wants to leave*), whereas modal auxiliaries like *may* take a bare (i.e. *to*-less) infinitive complement (cf. *He may leave*). Furthermore, unlike typical modals, *needs/dares* cannot undergo Inversion in questions, cannot appear in tags, and cannot be negated by *n't*:

(i)(a) **Needs/Dares* anyone to say anything*?*
(b) *Nodody needs/dares to say anything, *needs/dares he?*
(c) *He *needsn't/daresn't* to say anything

On the contrary (like a verb such as *want*) they require the use of DO-support in questions, tags and negatives:

(ii)(a) *Does* anyone need/dare/want to say anything*?*
(b) Nodody needs/dares/wants to say anything, *does he/do they?*
(c) He *doesn't* need/dare/want to say anything

Moreover, *needs/dares* do not allow ellipsis/deletion of their complement, whereas (as noted in §2.8) auxiliaries and infinitival *to* both allow complement ellipsis:

(iii) *It would be nice for him to give his opinion, but I don't think he needs/dares ~~to give his opinion~~

2.1.1c John *is* working hard

There are a number of reasons to categorise the verb *is* (as used here) as an Auxiliary (one which marks progressive aspect and indicates an ongoing activity). For one thing, it can undergo Inversion in questions, can appear in tags, and can be negated by *not/n't*, and does not allow *do*-support in such structures: cf.

(i)(a) *Is* John working hard?/**Does* John be working hard?
(b) John is working hard, *is/*does* he?
(c) John *is not/isn't* working as hard as he should/*John *doesn't* be working as hard as he should

In addition, *is* behaves like a typical auxiliary in allowing ellipsis of its complement (marked by ~~strikethrough~~ below):

(ii) If anyone is working hard, John is ~~working hard~~

By contrast (as noted in §2.8), a typical main verb like *deserve* does not allow ellipsis of its complement

(iii) *If anyone deserves to be promoted, John deserves ~~to be promoted~~

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

2.1.1d John *may* stay at home

The word *may* here behaves like a typical modal auxiliary (like *will/would/shall/should/can/could/might*) etc. in certain respects. For example, like a typical modal auxiliary, it has no *-s* ending when used with a third person singular subject like *John* (**John mays stay at home*). In addition, it takes a bare (i.e. *to*-less) infinitive complement:

(i) He may (***to**) *leave early*

Moreover, like a typical auxiliary, it allows ellipsis of its complement:

(ii) I won't go to the office today, but I may ~~go to the office~~ tomorrow

Furthermore, it can undergo (Subject-Auxiliary) Inversion and is incompatible with *do*-support:

(iii)(a) Ladies and gentlemen, *may I* have your attention, please?
(b) *Ladies and gentlemen, *do I* may have your attention, please?

However, Inversion seems to be restricted to formal styles: e.g. a speech at a wedding could be introduced by a sentence like (i)(a). Moreover, Inversion only seems possible when *may* is used to express permission rather than possibility – hence the ungrammaticality of *may* in (iv)(b):

(iv)(a) Our oil supplies could/may run dry one day
(b) Could/*May our oil supplies run dry one day?

Another auxiliary property which *may* has is that it can be negated by *not* – although for most speakers it doesn't have the obsolete contracted negative form *mayn't*:

(v) He may come home early, but then again he may not/*mayn't.

Because of the awkwardness of *mayn't* we sometimes find *mightn't* used as a negative tag for a *may*-sentence:

(vi) The flight [$_T$ *may*] be delayed, [$_T$ **mightn't**] it? (wiktionary.org)

While it is clear that *may* is an auxiliary (since it is never used with *do*-support), simply categorising it as a (modal) auxiliary will not account for why (in its possibility use) it does not undergo Inversion, and why (in any use) it doesn't allow the clitic *n't* to attach to it. What this suggests is that a detailed account of the syntax of *may* requires a finer-grained analysis of categories in terms of features: thus, we need to suppose that *may* lacks whatever feature allows auxiliaries to serve as a host for a negative clitic, and (in its POSSIBILITY use) lacks whatever feature allows auxiliaries to undergo Inversion. If each of the defining properties of an auxiliary is characterised by a separate grammatical feature, (regular) auxiliaries can be defined as the set of items possessing all the relevant features. However, irregular auxiliaries (like *may*) will possess only *some* of those features, not all of them – and (as we have seen), the features they carry may depend on their meaning (e.g. *may* carries whatever feature allows it to undergo Inversion in questions when used to denote permission, but not when used to denote possibility).

2.1.1e John *has* done it

The word *has* here shows a number of characteristics which suggest it is an auxiliary (one which marks perfect aspect and indicates a completed activity). Thus, it can undergo Inversion in questions, can appear in tags, can be negated by *not/n't*, and allows ellipsis of its complement (but does not allow *do*-support in such structures):

(i)(a) *Has* John done it?/**Does* John have done it?
(b) John has done it, *has/*does* he?
(c) John *has not/hasn't* done it/*John *doesn't* have done it
(d) Mary hasn't finished the crossword, but John *has/*does*

2.1.1f John *has* to go there

In a sentence like this, *has* can behave like a typical main verb. For example (like *want*) it takes an infinitive complement introduced by the infinitive particle *to*, and it allows the use of *do*-support in questions, negatives and tags:

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

(i)(a) *Does* John have to go there?
(b) John *doesn't* have to go there
(c) John has to go there, *does*(*n't*) he?

Moreover, like a typical main verb (e.g. *deserve*), it does not allow ellipsis of its complement:

(ii) *John doesn't want to go there, but he knows he has ~~to go there~~

However, some speakers allow it to be be used as an auxiliary as well, as the following internet-sourced examples illustrate:

(iii)(a) *Have I* to be persecuted for the rest of my life? (heraldscotland)
(b) You really *haven't* to love yourself (Twitter@FamousWomen)
(c) So The Master has to go, *has he*? (*The Day Book*, Illinois, 4 February 1913)

However, its auxiliary use has a decidedly obsolescent feel to me. What is potentially anomalous about its auxiliary use is that generally only verbs take a complement introduced by infinitival *to* in present-day English (though see the discussion of *used* in 2.1.1g and *ought* in 2.1.1h).

2.1.1g John *used* to go there quite often

For speakers like me, *used* functions as a main verb in present-day English, and hence requires *do*-support in questions, negatives and tags:

(i)(a) *Did* John use to go there quite often? (b) **Used* John to go there quite often?
(ii)(a) John *didn't* use to go there very often (b) *John *usedn't* to go there very often
(iii)(a) John used to go there quite often, *did* he? (b) *John used to go there quite often, *used* he?

(I note in passing that there are heated debates on the internet about whether the form *use* or *used* should be used in sentences like (i)(a): since *did* takes an infinitive complement, in principle the infinitive form *use* would be expected.) Note, however, that *used* can be followed by *not* in sentences like that below, and in this respect might seem to function as an auxiliary:

(iv) He used not to care about such things

However, it may be that *not* negates the following infinitive *to care about such things* in a sentence like (iv) rather than *used* – as it does in a negative infinitive like that italicised in:

(v) Not to sing the national anthem before an international match is unpatriotic

I note, however, that Attarde's *Encyclopedic Graded Grammar vol.1*, p.223 cites the following examples of *used* being used as an auxiliary – though for me they are archaic to the point of being ungrammatical:

(vi)(a) Used you to work in a bank? (b) He usedn't to do it
(c) You used to smoke a pipe, usedn't you?

Moreover, *used* does not allow ellipsis of its complement:

(vii) *He began to cough more than he used ~~to cough~~

(Note that it is OK to have *John began to cough more often than he used to ~~cough~~*, but then what is undergoing ellipsis is the complement of infinitival *to*, not the complement of *used*). In addition, *used* behaves like a verb (e.g. *want/try*) in taking a *to*-infinitive complement.

The verb *used* mainly occurs in past tense contexts – e.g. in the past tense form *used* or after the past tense auxiliary *did(n't)*. For spme speakers, it can also be used as a perfect participle after the perfect aspect auxiliary *have*:

(viii)(a) The old, discredited leaders of the party **had** *used* to gather there before they were finally purged (George Orwell, *1984*)
(b) It looks like there might **have** *used* to be a sign there, but it has long since blown away (erinhikes.blogspot.com)

In addition, there are speakers who also use the infinitive form *use* after *would*:

(ix) I remember how I **would** *use* to go there to ogle at cookware and beautiful things (instagram.com)

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

2.1.1h John *ought* to apologise

For some speakers, *ought* behaves like a typical auxiliary, in that it has a contracted negative form, allows ellipsis of its complement, and can undergo Inversion in questions:

(i)(a) It oughtn't to be allowed. It really oughtn't (Aldous Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 2009: 127)
(b) What are quantum logics and what *ought they* to be? (Title of article in *Current Issues in Quantum Logic* 1981: 35-52)
(c) That's reassuring, but *oughtn't it* to go without saying? (Tripadvisor)
(d) Don't see things as if they are odd. You might see things you *oughtn't* (geo.coop)

However, other speakers find forms like *oughn't* awkward, and so tag *ought* sentences with *shouldn't*:

(ii) If you wish to be so insufferable about me finally attempting something mutual towards you, then I ought to leave, *shouldn't* I? (ask-thresh,tumblir.com)

In some (non-standard) varieties, *ought* is treated like a main verb, and hence shows *do*-support in sentences such as:

(iii) They ought to be punished them men, and Mrs Hedges and Mr Johnson, they ought to, *didn't* they, Mum? (Hilary Bailey, *In Search of Love, money and Revenge*, Google Books)

In other (non-standard) varieties, the auxiliary *had* is used with *ought* (suggesting that *ought* functions as a perfect participle for such speakers):

(iv) I am not afraid he was anywhere he *hadn't* ought to be, nor doin' anything he *hadn't* ought to (Mary Eleanor Wilkins Freeman 2012, *Pembroke A Novel*, Google Books)

2.1.2a-g Overview

This exercise is about whether a given occurrence of *to* functions as a preposition/P or as an infinitival tense particle/T. Four key differences between the two are the following:

- An infinitive particle has a complement with a verb in the infinitive form; a preposition allows a complement with a verb in the gerund form
- An infinitive particle allows ellipsis of its complement, a preposition does not
- A preposition allows its complement to be substituted by a pronoun like *it*, whereas an infinitive particle does not
- Only a preposition can be modified by *straight/right*, not an infinitive particle

Note the claim that *only* a preposition can be modified by *right/straight* does not entail that all prepositions can be so modified; rather, it means that if a given occurrence of *to* can be modified by *right/straight* it is a preposition, whereas if it cannot, it may or may not be a preposition.

2.1.2a Executives like *to* drive *to* work

A model answer is provided in the book.

2.1.2b I look forward *to* learning *to* drive

As shown in (i) below, the first *to* is a preposition, and the second *to* is an infinitive particle – or more precisely, an infinitival tense particle (belonging to the category T, in terms of the analysis in §2.8):

(i) I look forward [$_P$ **to**] learning [$_T$ *to*] drive

One piece of evidence in support of this claim comes from the *selectional* properties of the two words: prepositions select (i.e. 'take') a complement with the verb in the gerund (*-ing*) form, whereas infinitival *to* selects a complement with the verb in the infinitive form: hence the fact that *learning* is a gerund suggests that the first *to* is a preposition, and conversely the fact that *drive* is an infinitive suggests that the second *to* is an infinitive particle.

A second piece of evidence in support of the analysis in (i) comes from *substitution*. (Transitive) prepositions allow a clausal complement to be substituted by *it*, but infinitival *to* does not. In the light of this, consider:

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

(ii) Some people don't look forward to learning to drive, but
(a) I'm looking forward to *it*
(b) *I'm looking forward to learning to *it*.

The fact that the complement of the first (but not the second) *to* can be substituted by *it* provides additional support for the claim that the first *to* is a preposition and the second an infinitive particle.

A third piece of evidence in support of the analysis in (i) comes from *ellipsis*. The infinitve particle *to* allows its complement to undergo ellipsis, but prepositions do not. (Transitive) prepositions allow a clausal complement to be substituted by *it*, but infinitival *to* does not. In the light of this, consider the following dialogues

(iii)(a) Can you *drive*? – No, but I'm learning to
(b) Are you *learning to drive*? *No, but I'm looking forward to

The fact that the second *to* allows ellipsis of its complement but the first *to* does not is consistent with the second *to* being an infinitive particle and the first a preposition.

If the first *to* is a preposition and the second an infinitive particle – as claimed in (i) – we might expect the first (but not the second) to be modifiable by *right/straight*. However, in the event, neither can be modified in this way:

(iv) I look forward (*straight/*right) **to** learning (*straight/*right) *to* drive

However, since we saw in §2.2 that only *some* uses of *some* prepositions can be modified by *straight/right*, the data in (iv) do not undermine the analysis in (i).

2.1.2c It's difficult *to* get him *to* work

As shown in (i) below, the first *to* here is a preposition, but the second *to* is ambiguous between being an infinitival tense particle/T or a preposition:

(i) It's difficult [$_{T}$ **to**] get him [$_{T/P}$ *to*] work

Evidence that the first *to* is an infinitive particle rather than a preposition comes from selectional considerations: the verb in its complement is the infinitive form *get* found after infinitival *to* and not the gerund form *getting* found after prepositions. Moreover, like an infinitive particle (and unlike a preposition), the first *to* allows ellipsis of its complement, but can't be modified by *right/straight*, and doesn't allow its complement to be replaced by *it*:

(ii)(a) I try and get him to work, but sometimes it's difficult to
(b) It's difficult (**straight/*right*) to get him to work
(c) *I try and get him to work, but sometimes it's difficult to *it*

Now consider the second occurrence of *to*. This has one use on which it is an infinitive particle and *to work* can be substituted by an infinitival clause like *to do any work*. However, it also has a second use on which it is a (transitive) preposition, and *to work* can be substituted by *to the place where he works*.

In its use as a preposition, *to* allows its complement *work* to be substituted by a noun like *London*, it can be modified by *straight*, it *but* it doesn't allow ellipsis of its complement:

(iii)(a) It's difficult to get him to *London*
(b) It's difficult to get him *straight* to work
(c) *I drive him to work, but sometimes road closures mean it is difficult to get him straight to

Moreover, in its use as a preposition, the phrase *to work* can be replaced by the pronoun *there*:

(iv) I try and get him to work, but sometimes it's difficult to get him *there*

By contrast, in its use as an infinitive particle, the second *to* allows its complement to be substituted by a verb like *apologise*:

(v) It's difficult to get him to *apologise*

Moreover, when used as an infinitive particle, the second *to* allows ellipsis of its complement:

(vi) I try and persuade him to work, but sometimes it's difficult to get him *to*

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

Overall, then, the data outlined above support the *ambiguity* analysis in (i).

2.1.2d I've never felt tempted *to* turn *to* taking drugs

As shown in (i) below, the first *to* is an infinitival tense particle/T, and the second *to* is a (transitive) preposition:

(i) I've never felt tempted [$_T$ to] turn [$_P$ to] taking drugs

Evidence that the first *to* is an infinitive particle and the second *to* a preposition comes from selectional considerations: the first *to* is followed by a verb in the infinitive form (*take*), whereas the second *to* is followed by a verb in the gerund form (*getting*). Moreover, the first *to* (like an infinitive particle) allows ellipsis of its complement, whereas the second *to* (like a typical preposition) does not:

(ii)(a) I know some people do turn to taking drugs when they get syntactophobia, but I've never really felt tempted *to*
(b) *I know some people turn to taking drugs to help them overcome syntactophobia, but I'd never turn to

Conversely, the second *to* (like a typical transitive preposition) allows its complement to be substituted by a pronoun like *them*, but the first *to* (like an infinitive particle) does not:

(iii)(a) I know some people do turn to taking drugs when they get syntactophobia, but I've never felt tempted to turn to *them*
(b) *I know some people do turn to taking drugs when they get syntactophobia, but I've never felt tempted to *them*

Similarly, like a preposition and unlike an infinitive particle, the second *to* (but not the first) can be modified by *straight*:

(iv)(a) I've never felt tempted to turn *straight* to taking drugs
(b) *I've never felt tempted to *straight* turn to taking drugs

2.1.2e Better *to* yield *to* temptation than *to* submit *to* deprivation!

As shown in (i) below, the first and third occurrences of *to* are infinitival tense particles/T, and the second and fourth occurrences are (transitive) prepositions:

(i) Better [$_T$ *to*] yield [$_P$ *to*] temptation than [$_T$ *to*] submit [$_P$ *to*] deprivation!

Evidence that the *to* immediately following *better* is an infinitive particle comes from selectional considerations, since the verb immediately following it is the infinitive form *yield*, not the gerund form *yielding* which we would find after a preposition. Moreover, like a typical infinitive particle, the *to* immediately after *better* allows its complement to undergo ellipsis – as in the dialogue below:

(ii) Do you think I should resign? – Yes, I certainly think it would be better *to*

Similarly, the *to* following *better* behaves like an infinitive particle and unlike a preposition in not allowing a pronominal complement (**better to it*), and in not being modifiable by *straight/right* (though this latter test is inconclusive, because there are some uses of prepositions which are not modifiable in this way).

By contrast, the *to* following *yield* is a preposition – as we see from the fact that it has the noun *temptation* as its complement, and can also have a pronoun as its complement – as in:

(iii) The best thing to do in the face of temptation is to yield to *it*

Moreover, like a typical preposition (but unlike an infinitive particle), the *to* after *yield* does not allow ellipsis of its complement: cf.

(iv) *Lots of people yield to temptation, but I would never yield to

Furthermore, the *to* following *yield* can (like a typical preposition) be followed by a verb in the gerund from:

(v) Better to yield **to** *taking* advantage of temptation than to submit deprivation!

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

Although the *to* after *yield* cannot be modified by *straight/right*, this does not undermine analysing it as a preposition because there are many uses of prepositions which are not modifiable in this way.

Now consider the status of the *to* immediately following *than.* Selectional considerations suggest that it is an infinitive particle because (like an infinitive particle) it is followed by a verb in the infinitive form (*submit*) and not (like a preposition) by a verb in the gerund form (*submitting*). Moreover, like a typical infinitive particle, it allows ellipsis of its complement:

(vi) Better to yield to temptation than not to!

In addition, it behaves like an infinitive particle in not allowing a pronominal complement (**Better to yield to temptation than not to it*) and in not being modifiable by *straight/right* (although, as we have seen, this is not conclusive, since there are some prepositions not modifiable by *straight/right*).

Finally, consider the *to* immediately following *submit*. The claim in (i) that it is a preposition is supported by the observation that it has the noun *temptation* as its complement, and can also have a pronoun as its complement – as in:

(vii) Better to stand up to temptation than to submit *to it*!

Moreover, like a typical preposition, it can be followed by a verb in the gerund form:

(viii) Better to yield to temptation than to submit **to** *putting* up with deprivation!

Furthermore, like a typical preposition (but unlike an infinitive particle), the *to* after *submit* does not allow ellipsis of its complement: cf.

(iv) *Lots of people yield to temptation, but I would never yield to

Although the *to* after *yield* cannot be modified by *straight/right*, this does not undermine analysing it as a preposition because there are many uses of prepositions which are not modifiable in this way.

2.1.2f Failure *to* achieve sometimes drives people *to* drink

As shown in (i) below, the first *to* here is a preposition, but the second *to* is ambiguous between being an infinitival tense particle/T or a preposition:

(i) Failure [$_{T}$ to] achieve sometimes drives people [$_{T/P}$ *to*] drink

The word *drink* here is ambiguous between being a noun meaning 'alcohol' (in which case the *to* immediately preceding it is an infinitive particle), or a verb in the infinitive form meaning 'imbibe alcohol' (in which case the *to* immediately preceding it is a preposition).

Let's consider first what evidence there is that the *to* immediately following *failure* is an infinitive particle. For one thing, the verb immediately following it is in the infinitive form *achieve* found after an infinitive particle, not in the gerund form *achieving* found after a preposition. Moreover (like an infinitive particle and unlike a preposition) it allows complement ellipsis:

(ii) Everyone wants to achieve things, but failure to ~~achieve things~~ sometimes drives people to drink

Similarly, it does not allow a pronoun as is complement (**failure to* **it**), and it is not modifiable by *straight/right*.

Now consider the nature of the *to* immediately preceding *drink*. As shown in (i), this is ambiguous between being a preposition or infinitive particle. On its use as a preposition, *to* allows its complement *drink* to be substituted by an item which is clearly a noun (like *alcohol*), and can be modified by *straight*, but doesn't allow ellipsis of its complement:

(iii)(a) Failure to achieve can sometimes drive people **to** *alcohol*
(b) Failure *to* achieve sometimes drives people *straight* **to** drink
(c) *People can turn to drink under stress, and failure can drive them straight to

By contrast, on its use as an infinitive particle, the second *to* allows its complement to be substituted by a verb in the infinitive form like like *get*:

(iv) Failure to achieve can sometimes drive people **to** *get* drunk

Moreover, when used as an infinitive particle, the second *to* allows ellipsis of its complement:

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

(v) Psychologists claim that more and more people are starting to drink to excess, and that stress is one of the main factors that drives them to

2.1.2g Try *to* go *to* sleep

As shown in (i) below, the first *to* here is a preposition, and the second *to* is a preposition:

(i) Try [$_T$ to] go [$_P$ *to*] sleep

Consider first the evidence that the *to* immediately following *try* is an infinitive particle. One piece of evidence in support of this is that (like an infinitive particle) it is followed by a verb in the infinitive form *go* and not (like a preposition) by a verb in the gerund form *going*:

(ii) Try to go/*going to sleep!

Moreover, like an infinitive particle but unlike a preposition, it allows ellipsis of its complement:

(iii) I know it's hard to go to sleep, but really you must try to

Furthermore, like an infinitive particle (but unlike many prepositions), it cannot be modified by *straight*:

(iv) Try (**straight*) **to** go to sleep!

Now consider evidence that the second occurrence of *to* (before *sleep*) is a preposition. For one thing, its complement *sleep* can be substituted by a noun like *bed*:

(v) Try to go **to** *bed*

Since a noun can occur as the complement of a preposition but not of an infinitive particle, this provides evidence that the *to* immediately following *go* is a preposition. Moreover, like a preposition, it can be modified by *straight*:

(v) Try to go *straight* **to** sleep

And, again like a preposition (but unlike an infinitive particle) it does not allow ellipsis of its complement;

(vi) *I know it's hard to go to sleep, but really you must try to go to

2.1.3a-g Overview

This exercise is about whether a particular instance of *for* is a C/complementiser introducing an infinitival clause, or a P/preposition introducing a prepositional phrase. There are a number of tests we can use in order to differentiate between the two:

- **Modification**: Only a preposition can be modified by *straight/right*, not a complementiser
- **Substitution**: Only a preposition can be substituted by another preposition; only a complementiser can be substituted by another complementiser
- **Subjecthood**: Only a clause introduced by a complementiser can serve as the subject of another clause, not a prepositional phrase introduced by a preposition
- **Complementation**: The complementiser *for* requires a complement containing infinitival *to*; a transitive preposition like *for* requires a nominal, pronominal or gerund complement
- **Preposing**: A nominal expression following *for* can be preposed (with or without *for*) if *for* is a preposition, but not if *for* is a complementiser

2.1.3a It is important *for* parents to spend time with their children

A model answer is provided in the book

2.1.3b It would be disastrous *for* me *for* my driving-licence to be withdrawn

As shown in (i) below, the first *for* here is a preposition, and the second *for* is a complementiser:

(i) It would be disastrous [$_P$ for] me [$_C$ *for*] my driving-licence to be withdrawn

The substitution test supports the analysis in (i) since the first occurrence of *for* can be substituted by the preposition *to*, and the second by the complementiser *if*:

(ii) It would be disastrous [$_P$ to] me [$_C$ *if*] my driving-licence were withdrawn

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

Likewise, the subjecthood test supports the analysis in (i), since the clause *for my driving license to be withdrawn* can serve as a subject, but not the prepositional phrase *for me*:

(iii)(a) *For my driving license to be withdrawn* would be disastrous for me
(b) **For me* would be disastrous for my driving-licence to be withdrawn

Similarly, the complementation test supports (i), because the complement of the first *for* is an accusative pronoun (*me*), whereas the complement of the second *for* is the infinitive clause *my driving licence to be withdrawn*. In addition, the preposing test also supports (i), because if we replace *me* by *who*(*m*), the pronoun *who(m)* can be preposed with or without the preposition *for*:

(iv)(a) *For whom* would it be disastrous for my driving-licence to be withdrawn?
(b) ??*Who* would it be disastrous *for*, for my driving-licence to be withdrawn?

(The awkwardness of the second example can be attributed to the stylistic inelegance of *for for*: this is alleviated if there is a pause between the two occurrences of *for*, marked above by the comma.) By contrast, if we replace *my driving-licence* by *what*, the pronoun *what* cannot be preposed with or without the complementiser *for*:

(v)(a) **For what* would it be disastrous for me to be withdrawn?
(b) **What* would it be disastrous for me *for* to be withdrawn?

Unlike other criteria, the modification test here proves inconclusive, because neither occurrence of *for* can be modified by *straight/right*: this is inconclusive because although complementisers can't be modified by *straight/right*, neither can some uses of some prepositions. Thus, 4 of the 5 criteria support the analysis in (i), and the fifth is inconclusive.

2.1.3c He was arrested *for* being drunk

As shown in (i) below, the word *for* functions as a preposition here:

(i) He was arrested [$_P$ for] being drunk

Is we use the modification test, we find that *for* can't be modified by *straight/right* in this sentence:

(ii) *He was arrested *straight/right* **for** being drunk

However, this is inconclusive because there are some prepositions which can't be modified in this way. The substitution test is more conclusive and supports the analysis of *for* as a preposition, since *for* can be substituted by other prepositions like *after/through*, but not by a complementiser like *that*:

(iii)(a) He was arrested *after/through* being drunk (b) *He was arrested *that* he was drunk

Likewise, the complementation test supports the preposition analysis, since *for* behaves like a typical preposition in having a gerund complement containing the gerund *being*: by contrast, *for* cannot have an infinitive complement in this use:

(iv) *He was arrested **for** *him to be drunk*

Further support for the preposition analysis comes from the subjecthood test, since the prepositional phrase *for being drunk* cannot function as a subject:

(v) **For being drunk* got him arrested

Yet more support for the preposition analysis comes from the preposing test, since the complement of *for* can be preposed, with or without *for*:

(vi)(a) *For being drunk*, they arrested him (and sentenced him to five years hard labour in a Guinness brewery)
(b) *Being drunk* you can get arrested *for*

Thus, 4 of the 5 criteria support the analysis in (i), and the fifth is inconclusive.

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

2.1.3d We are hoping *for* a peace agreement to be signed

As shown in (i) below, the word *for* functions as a complementiser here:

(i) We are hoping [$_C$ for] a peace agreement to be signed

The modification test yield results which are consistent with (i) since (like a typical complementiser), *for* cannot be modified by *straight/right*:

(ii) *We are hoping *straight* **for** a peace treaty to be signed

However, this is inconclusive, since there are some prepositions which likewise cannot be modified by *straight/right*. More conclusive support for the complementiser analysis comes from the substitution test, since *for* can be substituted by a complementiser like *that* here, but not by a preposition like *against*:

(iii)(a) We are hoping *that* a peace agreement will be signed
(b) *We are hoping *against* a peace agreement to be signed

Additional support comes from the complementation criterion, since *for* here behaves like an infinitival complementiser in selecting an infinitive complement containing *to* (*for a peace agreement* **to** *be signed*). Furthermore, the subjecthood criterion also supports the complementiser analysis, since the infinitive clause *for a peace agreement to be signed* can serve as the subject of another clause:

(iv) *For a peace agreement to be signed* would be wonderful

Moreover, the preposing test also suggests that *for* is a complementiser here, since if we replace *a peace agreement* by *what*, the wh-pronoun cannot be preposed, with or without *for*:

(v)(a) **For what* are you hoping to be signed? (b) **What* are you hoping *for* to be signed?

Thus, in all 5 respects, *for* behaves like an infinitival complementiser here.

However, a complication noted in the helpful hints in the book is that *hope* is a verb which can take a complement introduced by the preposition *for*:

(vi) We are hoping **for** *a fresh start*

This raises the possibility that there may be a silent counterpart of the preposition *for* preceding the complementiser *for* in this sentence, as shown below:

(vii) We are hoping [$_P$ ~~*for*~~] [$_C$ **for**] a peace agreement to be signed

The first *for* might then be deleted by a phonological operation which deletes one of a string of two immediately adjacent identical words (a phenomenon traditionally termed Haplology). Some evidence for positing a 'latent' preposition in a structure like (vii) comes from the fact that it is overtly spelled out in pseudo-cleft sentences like:

(viii) What we are hoping [$_P$ *for*] is [$_C$ **for**] a peace agreement to be signed

2.1.3e Ships head *for* the nearest port in a storm

As shown in (i) below, the word *for* functions as a preposition here:

(i) Ships head [$_P$ for] the nearest port in a storm

Evidence in support of this claim comes from the modification test, since *for* can be modified by *straight*:

(ii) Ships head *straight* **for** the nearest port in a storm

Further evidence comes from the substitution test, since *for* can be substituted by the preposition *towards*:

(iii) Ships head *towards* the nearest port in a storm

Yet more evidence in support of analysing *for* as a preposition comes from the complementation test, since (like a typical preposition) *for* has a nominal complement (*the nearest port in a storm*) and can alternatively have a gerund complement (containing the gerund *going*):

(iv) At the rate we're spending we're heading for *going bankrupt by Xmas*

Further evidence that *for* is a preposition comes from the subjecthood test, since the *for*-phrase *for the*

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

nearest port cannot serve as the subject of a clause:

(v) **For the nearest port* is a good place to head in a storm

Finally, the preposing test also supports the preposition analysis, since if we replace *the nearest port* by the interrogative wh-phrase *which port*, the wh-phrase can be preposed with or without *for*:

(vi)(a) *For which port* were they heading? (b) *Which port* were they heading *for*?

Thus, in all 5 respects, *for* behaves like a preposition.

2.1.3f Congress voted *for* the treaty to be ratified

As shown in (i) below, the word *for* functions as a complementiser here:

(i) Congress voted [$_C$ for] the treaty to be ratified

The modification test yield results which are consistent with (i) since (like a typical complementiser), *for* cannot be modified by *straight/right*:

(ii) *Congress voted *straight* **for** the treaty to be ratified

However, this is inconclusive, since there are some prepositions which likewise cannot be modified by *straight/right*. More conclusive support for the complementiser analysis comes from the substitution test, since *for* can be substituted by a complementiser like *that* here, but not by a preposition like *against*:

(iii)(a) Congress voted *that* the treaty should be ratified
(b) *Congress voted *against* the treaty to be ratified

Additional support comes from the complementation criterion, since *for* here behaves like an infinitival complementiser in selecting an infinitive complement containing *to* (*for the treaty* to *be ratified*). Furthermore, the subjecthood criterion also supports the complementiser analysis, since the infinitive clause *for the treaty to be ratified* can serve as the subject of another clause:

(iv) *For the treaty to be ratified* would be a great achievement

Moreover, the preposing test also suggests that *for* is a complementiser here, since if we replace *the treaty* by *what*, the wh-pronoun cannot be preposed, with or without *for*:

(v)(a) **For what* did Congress vote to be ratified? (b) **What* did Congress vote *for* to be ratified?

Thus, in all 5 respects, *for* behaves like an infinitival complementiser here.

However, a complication noted in the helpful hints in the book is that *vote* is a verb which can take a complement introduced by the preposition *for*:

(vi) Congress have voted **for** *ratification of the treaty*

This raises the possibility that there may be a silent counterpart of the preposition *for* preceding the complementiser *for* in this sentence, as shown below:

(vii) Congress have voted [$_P$ ~~*for*~~] [$_C$ **for**] the treaty to be ratified

The first *for* might then be deleted by a phonological operation which deletes one of a string of two immediately adjacent identical words (a phenomenon traditionally termed Haplology). Some evidence for positing a 'latent' preposition in a structure like (vii) comes from the fact that it is overtly spelled out in pseudo-cleft sentences like:

(viii) What Congress voted [$_P$ *for*] is [$_C$ **for**] the treaty to be ratified

2.1.3g It was disappointing *for* the students to fail their exams

The word *for* here is ambiguous between being a preposition and a complementiser, as shown below:

(i) It was disappointing [$_{P/C}$ for] the students to fail their exams

When *for* functions as a preposition, the sentence can be paraphrased as in (ii)(a) below; by contrast, when *for* is a complementiser, the sentence can be paraphrased as in (ii)(b):

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

(ii)(a) It was disappointing for the students when they failed their exams
(b) It was disappointing when the students failed their exams

Evidence that *for* can function as a preposition comes from the fact that *for the students* can be preposed, like a typical a prepositional phrase:

(iii) *For the students*, it was disappointing to fail their exams

And, like a typical preposition, it has a nominal complement (*the students*) in (iii). Evidence that *for* can also serve as a complementiser comes from the fact that the clause *for the students to fail their exams* can serve as the subject of another clause:

(iv) *For the students to fail their exams* was disappointing

And like an infinitival complementiser, *for* has a *to*-infinitive complement (*the students to fail their exams*). Moreover, *for* in (i) can be substituted either by a preposition like *to*, or by a complementiser like *that*:

(v)(a) It was disappointing *to* the students to fail their exams
(b) It was disappointing *that* the students failed their exams

Neither in its use as a complementiser nor in its use as a preposition can *for* be modified by *straight/right*, but this is inconclusive since there are many prepositions which cannot be modified by *straight/right*. Overall, then, there seems to be a reasonable amount of evidence in support of the ambiguity analysis in (i).

2.1.4a-g Overview
This exercise is about whether the items *how*, *as* and *how come* (as used in the relevant sentences) have the status of complementisers, or have some other status (e.g. whether *how* is a manner adverb).

2.1.4a-g *If* you wouldn't mind passing the salt
A model answer is provided in the book

2.1.4b I was struck (by) *how* the winter was so much colder in New York than London
There is some evidence to suggest that *how* functions as a factive complementiser here rather than as a manner adverb, as shown below:

(i) I was struck (by) [$_C$ **how**] the winter was so much colder in New York than London

For one thing, a factive complementiser analysis provides a more accurate characterisation of the semantics/meaning of the complementiser, since *how* in (i) has the factive paraphrase 'the fact that' and not the manner paraphrase 'the manner in which' (albeit the differences between the two paraphrases are slight). Moreover, a manner adverb analysis is implausible for sentences like (ii) below, because the bracketed complement clause already contains the manner adverb *badly*:

(ii) I was struck by [**how** he behaved *badly* whenever we had visitors]

Moreover, like a typical complementiser such as *that*, factive *how* cannot introduce a main clause:

(iii) **How*/**That* the winter was so much colder in New York than in London

In addition, whereas the manner adverb *how* (meaning 'in what manner') in a clause like that bracketed (iv)(a) below can be qualified by a counterfactive phrase like 'if at all', this is not the case with the complementiser *how*:

(iv)(a) I'm not sure [**how**, *if at all*, he'll ever be able to walk again after the accident]
(b) *I was struck (by) [**how**, *if at all*, the winter was so much colder in New York than London]

The use of *if at all* in possible in (iv)(a) because the bracketed clause containing manner *how* is non-factive and so we can add a phrase like *if at all* which suggests that the relevant situation may not arise, By contrast, the complementiser *how* in (iv)(b) is factive, and so we cannot question the potential truth of the proposition it introduces by adding *if at all*. A further property of *how* in (i) which is consistent with it being a complementiser is that (like othe complementisers) it does not allow Sluicing of its complement:

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

(v) *It was colder in New York than London, and you couldn't fail to be struck by **how**

Moreover (like the complementiser *that*), factive *how* is restricted to use in finite clauses, and (unlike the infinitival complementiser *for*) cannot occur in infinitive clauses like that bracketed below:

(vi) *I was struck by [**how** the winter to be so much colder in New York than London]

In addition, factive *how* is restricted to occurring as the complement of a factive predicate like *realise*, and cannot occur as the complement of a non-factive predicate like *think*:

(vii) I eventually came to *realise*/**think* **how** the winter was so much colder in New York than London

In addition, *how* behaves like the complementiser *whether* in that just as *how* is optionally preceded by the preposition *by* in (i), so too *whether* is optionally preceded by the preposition *by* in a sentence like:

(viii) She was intrigued (**by**) *whether* he would ask her out

Overall, then, we see that there are numerous reasons for taking *how* to be a factive complementiser in (i).

2.1.4c As the heir to the throne, one has to learn *how* to conduct oneself in a manner befitting one's status

As shown in (i) below, the word *how* functions as an adverbial relative pronoun meaning 'the way in which' here, and not as a factive complementiser:

(i) As the heir to the throne, one has to learn [$_{ADV}$ *how*] to conduct oneself in a manner befitting one's status

One reason for not treating *how* as a complementiser here is that the factive complementiser *how* only introduces finite clauses, whereas here *how* occurs in an infinitive clause. Another reason is that *how* is not factive in this kind of use, as we see from the possibility of qualifying it by counter-factive *if at all*:

(ii) One has to learn **how** (*if at all*) to respond to criticism of one's comportment

Rather than being a factive complementiser, it seems more likely that *how* is an adverb here. One reason for thinking this is that it can be co-ordinated with other adverbs:

(iii) One has to learn **how**, *when* and *where* to respond to criticism of one's conduct

Moreover, like other wh-pronouns (but unlike complementisers), *how* allows Sluicing of its complement:

(iv) One is not born knowing how to conduct oneself in public, one has to learn **how**

In addition (like other wh-pronouns) it can occur not only in infinitival clauses but also in finite clauses like that bracketed in (v)(a) below, and also in main clauses like that in (v)(b):

(v)(a) As the heir to the throne, one has to learn [*how* one should conduct oneself in a manner befitting one's status]

(b) How should one conduct oneself when one is heckled by ranting republicans who want one to pay for the upkeep of one's palaces?

Overall, then, it seems plausible to treat *how* as an adverbial pronoun in (i).

2.1.4d One little boy told me *how* that he had "done three months at Maidstone"

At first sight, *how* would seem to function as a factive complementiser rather than an adverbial relative pronoun here. One reason is that it can be paraphrased by 'the fact that':

(i) One little boy told me about *the fact that* he had "done three months at Maidstone"

Another is that it cannot be modified by counterfactive *if at all*:

(ii) One little boy told me how (**if at all*) that he had "done three months at Maidstone"

But if we treat *how* as a factive complementiser here, and if we treat the *that* following *how* as a complementiser, we end up with the double complementiser structure below:

(iii) One little boy told me [$_{C}$ how] [$_{C}$ that] he had "done three months at Maidstone"

At first sight, this might suggest that we should analyse *how* as an adverbial pronoun instead, since there

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

are (nonstandard) varieties of English where we find adverbial pronouns like *why* or *how* followed by *that* – as illustrated by the examples below which I recorded from live, unscripted broadcasts:

(iv)(a) This is *why* **that** we'll be offering so much coverage here on 5 Live over the next few days Jonathan Overend, BBC Radio 5)
(b) It's difficult to see *how* **that** we can keep these players (Alan Smith, Sky Sports TV)

However, this is not a compelling argument, since I have also recorded examples (like those below) of the complementisers *whether/if* being followed by *that*:

(v)(a) I'm not sure *whether* **that** Spurs fans will accept him (John Cross, Talk Sport Radio)
(b) It's not clear, though, *if* **that** they're just infecting the microbes that make us sick (Carl Zimmer, BBC Radio 5)

Analysing *how* in 2.1.4d as a factive complementiser would bring structures like 2.1.4d in line with those in (v). It could be that the first of the two complementisers in such cases (= *how/whether/if*) marks the clause as interrogative or factive in type, and the second (= *that*) marks it as finite.

2.1.4e I reckon *as* he's still carryin' a torch for you, I do

This is a non-standard structure, as is shown by the non-standard use of *reckon* in a context where standard English would use *think*. Since *as* can be substituted by *that* here, a plausible assumption is that *as* has the status of a complementiser, as in (i) below:

(i) I reckon [$_C$ as] he's still carryin' a torch for you, I do

Indeed, there are other contexts in which *as* can be substituted by *that* in standard varieties of English, e.g.

(ii) I watched the same game *as*/**that** you did

Edwards (1993: 229)[2] reports that in some varieties of Southern British English, *as* can be used to introduce relative clauses with both animate and inanimate antecedents

(iii)(a) the boy *as* I asked (b) the food *as* I bought

In this respect, *as* functions in much the same way as *that* in standard English, so strengthening the case for taking *as* to be a (non-standard) complementiser.

2.1.4f Reckon *as how* I love you

In the discussion of 2.1.4e immediately above, it was suggested that *as* has the status of a complementiser in some non-standard varieties of English. However, we have also seen that *how* can also serve as a complementiser. This raises the possibility that this sentence has the double-complementiser structure below (with the main clause subject *I* subsequently undergoing Truncation and thereby being given a silent pronunciation in the phonology):

(i) I reckon [$_C$ as] [$_C$ how] I love you

This would be puzzling, because *how* (when occurring on its own as a complementiser) is factive, whereas *as how* here is non-factive, as we see from:

(ii) I reckon as how he's lyin', but I could be wrong

One plausible way of getting round this problem would be to suppose that *as how* has fused into a single-word complementiser (*ashow*), in the same way as *howcome* has done for many speakers. Some support for treating *ashow* as a single word comes from the observation that *as* cannot be separated from *how* by intervening material like e.g. the vocative *darling(g)* underlined below:

(iii) *I reckon **as**, darlin', *how* I love you

Evidence for taking *ashow* to be a complementiser includes the fact that (like standard English *that*) it is restricted to use in finite clauses, and cannot introduce a main/root clause:

[2] Edwards, V. (1993) 'The grammar of southern British English', in J. and L. Milroy (eds) Real English, Longman, London, pp. 214–42.

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

(iv) **As how* I love you

As noted ain relation to (ii) above, an interesting difference between *ashow* and the complementiser *how* (in sentences like *I told him* **how** *I had come across some old photos in the attic*) is that *how* is factive, whereas *ashow* is non-factive.

2.1.4g *How in the world come* you treat me this-a-way?

In the main text, I reported the claim made by Collins (1991) that *how come* functions as a single-word (factive) complementiser in present-day English. However, both the claim that *how come* is a single word and the claim that it is a complementiser are potentially problematic. For example, unlike other complementisers (including factive *how*), *how come* can appear in main clauses:

(i) *How come* you treat me this way?

Although it could be argued that English has other structures in which a complementiser occurs in a main clause (e.g. **If** *you wouldn't mind passing the salt* or **That** *he should have said such a thing!*), the model answer in the book argues that these are not clearcut cases of main-clause complementisers. Furthermore, *how come* allows Sluicing/ellipsis of its complement:

(ii) They got out of Syria, though God knows *how come* ~~they got out of Syria~~

By contrast, typical complementisers like *whether/if* do not allow Sluicing of their complement:

(iii) **I think he loves me, but sometimes I wonder *whether/if* ~~he loves me~~

Moreover, the fact that (for speakers who accept/produce sentences like 2.1.4g) a phrase like *in the world* can intervene between *how* and *come* casts doubt on the claim that *how come* is a single word, since compound words generally don't allow phrases to be positioned internally within them. For example, the compound *wherever* does not allow this kind of intervention in a sentence like (ii) below:

(iv)(a) *Wher***ever** have you been? (b) ***Where** in the world *ever* have you been?

So, it would seem that the existence of structures like *how in the world come* leads us to the conclusion that *how come* can function as an interrogative *phrase* of some kind for some speakers. But then the question which arises is this: if *how come* is an interrogative phrase, why (unlike other interrogative phrases) is it restricted to use in finite clauses, and why (unike other interrogative phrases) doesn't it trigger Inversion – i.e. why don't most speakers accept sentences like:

(v) **How (in the world) come *do you* treat me this-a-way?

One way of accounting for this is to suppose that speakers who accept sentences like 2.1.4g treat them as reduced forms of (vi), where *come* has the sense of 'happen' (or 'come about') and the material marked by strikethrough is deleted in the phonology:

(vi) How (in the world) ~~does it~~ come (that) you treat me this way

We can then say that Inversion is not allowed after *come* in (v) because what follows *come* is a complement clause, and Interrogative Inversion generally only takes place in main clauses. This is essentially the analysis of *how come* questions proposed by Zwicky and Zwicky (1971): but see Radford (2015) for a review of a wide range of analyses of *how come* in present-day English.

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

Exercise 2.2

Use the labelled bracketing technique to assign each word in each of the sentences below to a grammatical category which represents how it is being used in the position in which it occurs in the sentence concerned. Give reasons in support of your proposed categorisation, highlight any analytic problems which arise, and comment on any interesting properties of the relevant words.

2.2.1 He was feeling disappointed at only obtaining average grades in the morphology exercises

A model answer is provided in the book

2.2.2 Student counsellors know that money troubles can cause considerable stress

As used here, the words in this sentence have the categorial status indicated below:

(i) [$_N$ Student] [$_N$ counsellors] [$_V$ know] [$_C$ that] [$_N$ money] [$_N$ troubles] [$_T$ can] [$_V$ cause] [$_A$ considerable] [$_N$ stress]

The words *student* and *counsellors* are both (count) nouns, since each has a plural form ending in *-s* (e.g. *two students*; *several counsellors*). However, even though the expression *student counsellors* means 'people who counsel *students*', only the rightmost noun in a nominal (expression) containing more than one noun can be pluralised, and hence only *counsellors* carries plural *-s* here. *Know* is a (third person plural present tense) verb here, as we see from the fact that if we change the plural subject *student counsellors* into the singular subject *every student counsellor*, we have to use the third person singular present tense form *knows*. *That* is a (finite, declarative) complementiser here, and as such can be substituted by another finite complementiser like factive *how*. *Money* is a (noncount/mass) noun/N here, as we see from the fact that it can be quantified by *much* (which is the type of quantifier that can only quantify mass nouns: cf. *He doesn't have much furniture/*chair/*chairs*). *Troubles* is a (plural, count) noun, as we see from the fact that it carries the plural ending *-s*. *Can* is a (present tense) modal auxiliary (hence a T constituent in contemporary terms), as we see from the fact it does not take the ending *-s* when used with a third person singular subject like *money* (as in *money can cause trouble*): like a typical auxiliary, *can* undergoes Inversion in main clause questions (*Can money troubles cause considerable stress?*). *Cause* is a verb (in the infinitive form), as we see from the fact that it can carry the regular verb endings *-ing/-s/-d* (as in *causing/causes/caused*). *Considerable* is an adjective, as we see from the fact that it can occur as the complement of *be* in a sentence like *The damage may be considerable*, it can be modified by *very*, and it has the *-ly* adverb counterpart *considerably*. *Stress* is a noun, as we see from the fact that it can be pluralised (as in *the stresses and strains of student life*).

2.2.3 Opposition politicians are pressing for election debates to receive better television coverage

As used here, the words in this sentence have the categorial status indicated below:

(i) [$_N$ Opposition] [$_N$ politicians] [$_T$ are] [$_V$ pressing] [$_C$ for] [$_N$ election] [$_N$ debates] [$_T$ to] [$_V$ receive] [$_A$ better] [$_N$ television] [$_N$ coverage]

The words *opposition/politicians/election/debates/television/coverage* are all nouns, as we see from the fact that they can all have a plural form in *-s* (even the noun *coverage*, as we see from the following heading in an online article: *Defensive Football Coverages*), and from the fact that all can end a sentence like *I'm not happy with the ---*. *Are* is a (third person plural, progressive aspect) auxiliary marking (present) Tense (hence assigned to the category T), as we see from its ability to undergo Inversion (*Are opposition politicians pressing for this?*). *Pressing* is a (progressive participle form of a) non-auxilary verb – as we see from the fact that if we replace progressive *is* by perfect *have*, we'd need to use the perfect participle form of the verb (= *pressed*). *For* is an infinitival complementiser, as we see from the fact that it has a complement containing infinitival *to* (= *election debates* **to** *receive better television coverage*). *To* is an infinitival tense particle (not a preposition), as we see from the fact that it is followed by a verb in the infinitive form (*receive*), not by a verb in the gerund form (*receiving*) required after a preposition: *to* is used here with future time reference, as we see from the fact that we could add *in future* to the end of the sentence. *Receive* is a verb used in the infinitive form required after infinitival *to*, and hence can be substituted by another infinitive form like *be* (*They are pressing for debates to* **be** *given better coverage*). The word *better* could in principle either be an adjective or an adverb, but since it can be

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

substituted by an adjectival phrase like *more substantial* in this particular sentence (but not by an adverbial phrase like *more substantially*), it is clearly a (comparative) adjective here.

2.2.4 Seasoned press commentators doubt if the workers will ever fully accept that substantial pay rises lead to runaway inflation

As used here, the words in this sentence have the categorial status indicated below:

(i) [$_{A}$ Seasoned] [$_{N}$ press] [$_{N}$ commentators] [$_{V}$ doubt] [$_{C}$ if] [$_{D}$ the] [$_{N}$ workers] [$_{T}$ will] [$_{ADV}$ ever] [$_{ADV}$ fully] [$_{V}$ accept] [$_{C}$ that] [$_{A}$ substantial] [$_{N}$ pay] [$_{N}$ rises] [$_{V}$ lead] [$_{P}$ to] [$_{A}$ runaway] [$_{N}$ inflation]

Seasoned here function as an adjective since it has the negative counterpart *unseasoned* and in this respect resembles an adjective like *happy*. *Press* can in principle serve as a noun or verb, but is clearly a noun here since it is substitutable by another noun like *newspaper*. *Commentators* is clearly a count noun, since it carries plural *-s*. *Doubt* is a (nonauxiliary) verb, since it can carry the endings *-ing/-s/-d* like a regular verb. *If* is a complementiser, and as such can be substituted by the complementiser *that*. *The* is a determiner, and can be substituted by another determiner like *these*. *Workers* is a noun, as we see from its plural *-s* ending. *Will* is a T constituent (Tense auxiliary), and like other auxiliaries can undergo Inversion in main clause questions (*Will the workers ever accept this?*); it is a modal auxiliary, and as such lacks the third person singular *-s* ending. *Ever* is an adverb (albeit an irregular one not ending in *-ly*), as we see from the fact that it can be substituted by another adverb like *eventually*. *Fully* is a regular adverb ending in *-ly*, as we see from the fact that removing *-ly* derives the adjective *full*. *Accept* is a (third person plural) present tense (non-auxiliary) verb here, as we see from the fact that we require the third person singular form *accepts* is we use a singular subject like *the workforce*. *That* is a complementiser, as we can see from it being substitutable by the factive complementiser *how*. *Substantial* is an adjective, as we see from the fact that it has the adverb derivative *substantially*. Although *pay* could in principle be either a noun or a verb, here is a noun since it is substitutable by another noun like *salary*. *Rises* could in principle be either a (plural) noun or a (third person singular present tense) verb; here it is a plural noun, as we see from the fact that it can be modified by a plural quantifier by *many*. *Lead* is a (third person plural) present tense (non-auxiliary) verb here, as we see from the fact that we require the third person singular form *leads* is we use a singular subject like *a substantial pay increase*. *To* is a preposition here, since it can be modified rather unidiomatically by *straight*, or more idiomatically by *directly*. The status of *runaway* is far from clear. It certainly has a use as a noun (*The guard recaptured the runaways*); however, I have categorised it as an adjective in this use, since it can be modified by an adverb like *increasingly* (*Regular increases in pay lead to increasingly runaway inflation*). It seems to be restricted to use as an attributive adjective (i.e. one preceding a noun), because it cannot occur predicatively in sentences like **Inflation is runaway*. Finally, *inflation* is a (noncount/mass) noun, and hence can be modified by the kind of quantifier (like *much*) which modifies a mass noun (as in *I don't think there will be* **much** *inflation next year*).

2.2.5 Students often complain to their high school teachers that the state education system promotes universal mediocrity

As used here, the words in this sentence have the categorial status indicated below:

(i) [$_{N}$ Students] [$_{ADV}$ often] [$_{V}$ complain] [$_{P}$ to] [$_{PRN}$ their] [$_{A}$ high] [$_{N}$ school] [$_{N}$ teachers] [$_{C}$ that] [$_{D}$ the] [$_{N}$ state] [$_{N}$ education] [$_{N}$ system] [$_{V}$ promotes] [$_{A}$ universal] [$_{N}$ mediocrity]

Students here is a noun, as we see from its plural ending *-s*. *Often* is an adverb (albeit an irregular one not ending in *-ly*), as we see from it being substitutable by a regular adverb like *frequently*. *Complain* is a (third person plural) present tense (non-auxiliary) verb here, as we see from the fact that we require the third person singular form *complains* if we use a singular subject like *a student*. *To* is a preposition, as we see from it being able to be modified (rather unidiomatically) by *straight* or (more idiomatically) by *directly*. *Their* is a (third person plural genitive) pronoun/PRN, as we see from the fact that it has three distinct case forms (*they*$_{\text{NOMINATIVE}}$/*them*$_{\text{ACCUSATIVE}}$/*their(s)*$_{\text{GENITIVE}}$). *High* is an adjective, and as such has the comparative form *higher,* the superlative form *highest* and the adverb derivative *highly*. *School* is a noun, and hence has a plural *s*-form (*schools*): the plural form cannot be used here, because an expression like *(high) school teacher* is a compound noun, and only the rightmost noun in such a compound can be pluralised. *Teachers* is a plural (count) noun, as we see from its plural ending *-s*. *That* is a complementiser,

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

as we see from is being substitutable by the factive complementiser *how*. *The* is a determiner, as we see from it being substitutable by another determiner like *this*. *State*, *education* and *system* are all nouns, as we see from the fact that (in relevant uses) they can have a plural form in *–s*. If *state education system* is a compound noun, only the rightmost noun will be pluralisable in a phrase like *state education systems*. *Promotes* is a (third person singular present tense non-auxiliary) verb, as we see from the fact that we require the third person plural form *promote* if we have a singular subject like *state education systems*. *Universal* is an adjective, as we see from the fact that it is modifiable by an adverb like *unquestionably*, and has the adverb derivative *universally*. *Mediocrity* is a noun, as we see from the fact that it can be modified by an adjective like *severe* and can be used to end a sentence like *What I don't like about the state education system is its* ---.

2.2.6 Most scientists believe that climatic changes result from ozone depletion due to excessive carbon dioxide emission

As used here, the words in this sentence have the categorial status indicated below:

(i) [$_{Q}$ Most] [$_{N}$ scientists] [$_{V}$ believe] [$_{C}$ that] [$_{A}$ climatic] [$_{N}$ changes] [$_{V}$ result] [$_{P}$ from] [$_{N}$ ozone] [$_{N}$ depletion] [$_{A}$ due] [$_{P}$ to] [$_{A}$ excessive] [$_{N}$ carbon] [$_{N}$ dioxide] [$_{N}$ emission]

Most here is a (plural) quantifier, as we see from the fact that it can be substituted by another plural quantifier like *many*. *Scientists* is a noun, as we see from its plural *-s* ending. *Believe* is a (third person plural present tense non-auxiliary) verb, as we see from the fact that we require the third person singular form *believes* if we use a singular subject like *every scientist*. *That* is a complementiser, as we see from the fact that it is substitutable by the complementiser *how* in a sentence like *Some people find it hard to believe how carbon dioxide emissions cause climate change*. *Climatic* is an adjective, as we see from the fact that it can be modified by an adverb like *inherently*. *Changes* is a noun, as we see from its plural *-s* ending. *Result* is a (third person plural present tense non-auxiliary) verb, as we see from the fact that we require the third person singular form *results* if we use a singular subject like *climate change*. *From* is a preposition here, and as such is completely invariable (cf. **frommer*, **fromly*, **fromness*, *frommed*, etc.); although it can't (idiomatically) be modified by *straight*, it can be modified by *entirely*. *Ozone* is a noun, as we see from the fact that (in appropriate uses) it is pluralisable (*There are several different ozones in our atmosphere*). *Depletion* is also a noun, as we see from the fact that it can be pluralised (*Ozone depletions are thought to result from climate change*). *Due* is an adjective, as we see from the fact that it can be modified by an adverb like *partly*, can serve as the complement of *is* in a sentence like *Your rent is* ---, and has the adverb derivative *duly*. *To* is a preposition, as we see from the fact that it is invariable; and although it cannot be modified by *straight*, it can be modified by *entirely*. *Excessive* is an adjective, as we see from the fact it is modifiable by an adverb like *really*, can end a sentence like *The rent is* ---, and has the adverb derivative *excessively*. The words *carbon*, *dioxide* and *emission* are all nouns, as we see from the fact that (in appropriate uses) all are pluralisable (*Carbons are precious*. *Dioxides poison the planet*. *Regulations govern car exhaust emissions*), but if the expression *cardon dioxide emissions* is a compound noun, only the rightmost noun will be pluralisable (*carbon dioxide emissions*).

2.2.7 Linguists have long suspected that peer group pressure shapes linguistic behaviour patterns in very young children

As used here, the words in this sentence have the categorial status indicated below:

(i) [$_{N}$ Linguists] [$_{T}$ have] [$_{ADV}$ long] [$_{V}$ suspected] [$_{C}$ that] [$_{N}$ peer] [$_{N}$ group] [$_{N}$ pressure] [$_{V}$ shapes] [$_{A}$ linguistic] [$_{N}$ behaviour] [$_{N}$ patterns] [$_{P}$ in] [$_{ADV}$ very] [$_{A}$ young] [$_{N}$ children]

Linguists is a (plural count) noun, as we see from its plural *-s* inflection. *Have* is a (third person plural perfect aspect) auxiliary marking present tense (hence belonging to the category T), as we see from the fact it can undergo Inversion in a main clause question like *Have linguists long suspected this? Long* is an adverb (albeit an irregular one not ending in *-ly*), as we see from it being substitutable by a regular adverb like *periodically*. *Suspected* is a (non-auxiliary) verb, as we see from its past tense ending *-ed*. *That* is a (finite) complementiser, as we see from the fact that it cannot occur in a non-finite clause (*They have long suspected (**__that__*) peer group pressure to be a major factor in shaping linguistic behaviour patterns*). *Peer*, *group* and *pressure* are all nouns, as we see from the fact that they are pluralisable in appropriate

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

contexts (*People are influenced by the pressures placed on them by groups of their peers*). If *peer group pressure* is a compound noun, it follows that only the rightmost noun will be pluralisable (as in *Peer group pressures are sometimes difficult to resist*). *Shapes* is a (third person singular present tense non-auxiliary) verb, as we see from the fact that the third person plural form *shape* is required if it has a plural subject like *peer group pressures*. *Linguistic* is an adjective, as we see from the fact that it can be modified by an adverb like *purely* (*Agreement is a purely linguistic phenomenon*), can be used to end a sentence like *Agreement is a phenomenon which is* ---, and has the adverb derivative *linguistically*. *Behaviour* and *pattern* are both nouns, as we see from the fact that (in appropriate contexts) they are pluralisable (*Many different baheviours can be observed in mammals*); if *behaviour patterns* is a compound noun, it will follow that only the second/rightmost noun is pluralisable. *In* is a (transitive) preposition, and as such has a nominal (noun-containing) complement *very young children*; like other prepositions, it is invariable when used as such (the form *inner* can be argued not to be derive from the preposition *in*, because we cannot substitute *more in* by *inner* in a typical prepositional structure like *He is more in demand than me/*He is inner demand than me*). *Very* is an adverb (albeit not one ending in *-ly*), as we see from the fact that it is substitutable by a regular adverb like *extremely*. *Young* is an adjective, as we see from the fact that it has the comparative form *younger* and the superlative form *youngest*, can be modified by an adverb like *really*, and can end a sentence like *They are* ---. *Childen* is an (irregular plural) noun, as we see from the fact that it can be modified by a plural quantifier like *many* (*Many children fantasise about becoming pop stars or footballers*).

2.2.8 You don't seem to be too worried about the possibility that many of the shareholders may now vote against your revised takeover bid

As used here, the words in this sentence have the categorial status indicated below:

(i) [$_{PRN}$ You] [$_{T}$ don't] [$_{V}$ seem] [$_{T}$ to] [$_{V}$ be] [$_{ADV}$ too] [$_{A}$ worried] [$_{P}$ about] [$_{D}$ the] [$_{N}$ possibility] [$_{C}$ that] [$_{Q}$ many] [$_{P}$ of] [$_{D}$ the] [$_{N}$ shareholders] [$_{T}$ may] [$_{ADV}$ now] [$_{V}$ vote] [$_{P}$ against] [$_{PRN}$ your] [$_{A}$ revised] [$_{N}$ takeover] [$_{N}$ bid]

You is a (second person) pronoun, traditionally categorised as a personal pronoun, but treated in some more recent work as having the status of a pronominal D constituent. *Don't* is a negative auxiliary marking present tense, hence belonging to the category T; like a typical auxiliary, it can undergo Inversion in questions (*Don't you feel worried about it?*). *Seem* is a (non-auxiliary) verb in its infinitive form, and as such can be substituted by another verb in the infinitive form (like *appear*). *To* is an infinitival tense particle (belonging to the category T), and like other T-constituents allows ellipsis of its complement (*You don't understand, or at least you don't seem to*). *Be* here is a verb used in the infinitive form required after the infinitive particle *to* and as such can be substituted by another verb in the infinitive form like *become*. *Too* is is adverb (albeit an irregular one not ending in *-ly*), as we see from the fact that it can be substituted by a regular adverb like *excessively*. *Worried* is an adjective, as we see from the fact that it can be substituted by another adjective like *happy*, it has the negative counterpart *unworried* (*The government remains unworried about the level of inflation*), and has the adverb derivative *worriedly* (as in the following example from thefreedictionary.com: *"I wonder what to do", she said worriedly*). *The* is a determiner, and hence can be substituted by another determiner like *this*. *Possibility* is a noun, as we see from the fact that it has the plural form *possibilities*. *That* is a finite clause complementiser, as we see from the fact that the clause containing it contains the finite auxiliary *may* and not the infinitive particle *to*. *Many* is a pronominal plural quantifier (hence it could alternatively be categorised as PRN), as we see from the fact that it can be replaced by a similar quantifier like *all*. *Of* is traditionally categorised as a preposition, but in this kind of used is termed a genitive case particle by some; it has the morphological characteristics of a preposition in that it is completely invariable (cf. **ofer/*ofly/*ofed* etc.). *The* is a determiner, as we can see from the fact that it is substitutable by another determiner like *those*. *Shareholders* is a noun, as we can see from its plural *-s* ending. *May* is a (modal) auxiliary marking present tense, as we can see from the fact that (like other modal auxiliaries) its third person singular present tense form lacks *-s* (*He may/*mays vote for the Greens*); like other modals, it has an irregular past tense form (*might*). *Now* is an adverb (albeit an irregular one note ending in *-ly*), as we can see from the fact that it is substitutable by a regular adverb like *immediately*. *Vote* is a (non-auxiliary) verb in the infinitive form required after a modal like *may*, and as such can be substituted by another verb in the

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual

infinitive form like *be* (*They may now* **be** *outvoted*). *Against* is a preposition, as we see from the fact that it is invariable, and can be substituted by another preposition like *for*. *Your* is a (second person) genitive pronoun, and has the variant (nominative/accusative) case form *you*. *Revised* is an adjective, as we see from the fact that it has the negative counterpart *unrevised*, and can be substituted by another adjective like *new*. *Takeover* and *bid* are nouns, as we see from the fact that they have plural forms ending in *-s* (*The bids/takeovers were unsucessful*); if *takeover bid* is a compound noun, it follows that only the rightmost noun in the compound will be pluralisable (*takeover bids/*takeovers bid*).

_____

Analysing English Sentences 2nd edition Radford Solutions Manual