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 needn’t/daren’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
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:
(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 didn’t. For some 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)
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 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 *oughtn’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,tumblr.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:
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 infinitive 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 looking to learn to drive
(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 to get him 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
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 \([_T \text{to}]\) turn \([_P \text{to}]\) 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

(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 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 \([_T \text{to}]\) yield \([_P \text{to}]\) temptation than \([_T \text{to}]\) submit \([_P \text{to}]\) 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 form:

(v) Better to yield *to taking* advantage of temptation than to submit deprivation!
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:
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
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 me 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 [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.
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 \[C \text{for}\] 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 \[P \text{for} C \text{for}\] 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 \[P \text{for} C \text{for}\] is \[C \text{for}\] 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 \[P \text{for}\] 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
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 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):
(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 counterfactual 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* is 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 other complementisers) it does not allow Sluicing of its complement:
(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
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) 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, darling*, 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:

---

(iv) *As how I love you

As noted in 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) Wherever 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 (unlike 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.
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 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 that 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/televison/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-auxiliary 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
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)  

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

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/math) 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)  

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

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 (theyNOMINATIVE/theirACCUSATIVE/their(s)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,
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 adverb 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 ozone bas 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 that 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 carbon 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
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 behaviours 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 ---. Children 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] [IN takeover] [IN 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 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. *offer/*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
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 unsuccessful); if takeover bid is a compound noun, it follows that only the rightmost noun in the compound will be pluralisable (takeover bids/*takeovers bid).