

Name of the Student: \_\_\_\_\_

### Question 1

Please read Tallerman (2015), Ch. 5. Constituency tests are crucial in grammar-building. Section 5.3.4 is a gentle introduction to X-bar theory, and will help us further clarify the four way distinction: head, complement, modifier (adjunct), specifier.

### Question 2

Please read Sag et al. (2003), Ch. 4 up to section 4.5. This will partly be a revision of what we already discussed. We will discuss more complicated examples this week in class.

### Question 3

Here is a somewhat open-ended question – so “I have no idea” counts as an answer. A couple of pages past the end of this week’s reading, Sag et al. take the bracketed expressions below to be head-specifier constructions, where the head is italicized:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. They want/preferred [them *arrested*].
- b. We want/preferred [them *on* our team].
- c. With [them *on* our team], we’ll be sure to win.
- d. With [my parents as *supportive* as they are], I’ll be in fine shape.

It might look curious why they do so. For instance, (1a,b) seem quite parallel to *John put the frog on the table*, where the direct object and the following PP are complements of the head *put*, rather than the former being the specifier of the latter. Can you see their motivation? Can we make use of constituency tests like *wh*-questions and/or *it*-clefts from Tallerman? Or some other piece of evidence. Or any counter-arguments to taking these as head-specifier constructions?

---

<sup>1</sup>The bracketed constructions in (1)a,b are called “small clauses”, a form of sentence; those in the last two are “absolutes”, again some creature resembling a sentence.