1 Constituency

1. Constituency tree

```
   John
     \   /think
   \ /     
  that  
\   /want
  /   
Suzie 
   \  /to
    \ /kill
     /him
```

2. Labeled constituency tree

```
S
  \  \ John
   \ VP
     \ V'
       \ V
         \ CP
           \ C
             \ N
               \ Suzie
                 \ V
                   \ VP
                     \ V
                       \ NP
                         \ kill
                           \ N
                             \ him
```

3. What’s the diff?
John thinks that Suzie wants to kill him

Drawing the tree the way we did first makes a **constituency claim**, a claim about what the syntactic **constituents** (= phrases) of the sentence are. In particular, the first tree says *Suzie wants to kill him* is a constituent and the second tree says it is not. The second tree says *that + Suzie* is a constituent, and the first tree says it is not.

## 2 Specifier Trees

1. **the zoo**
   
   \[ \text{Det} \rightarrow \text{the} \rightarrow \text{zoo} \]

2. **always try**
   
   \[ \text{Adv} \rightarrow \text{always} \rightarrow \text{try} \]
3. so witty
   AP
   Deg   A'
   so    A
   witty

4. quite cheap
   AP
   Deg   A'
   quite A
   cheap

5. those books
   NP
   Det   N'
   those N
   books

6. very competent
   AP
   Deg   A'
   very A
   competent
3 Specifier Complement/Trees

1. into the house

   PP
   └── P'
       └── P
          └── NP
             └── into
                   └── NP
                      └── Det
                          └── N'
                              └── N
                                  └── house

2. fixed the telephone

   VP
   └── V'
       └── V
           └── NP
               └── fixed
                   └── the telephone

3. more toward the window

   PP
   └── P'
       └── P
          └── NP
             └── Deg
                └── more
                       └── P
                          └── toward
                                 └── NP
                                    └── Det
                                        └── N'
                                            └── N
                                                └── window
4. a film about pollution

5. perhaps earn the money

6. that argument with Owen

4 Sentences

Some of the trees below are NOT on the assignment. They are merely there to provide more models to help when you use this answer sheet as a study guide.

1. Those guests should leave
1. Those guests should leave.

2. Maria never ate a brownie

3. Maria never ate a brownie
IP
 /    \
 NP   I'
 |     |    
 N'   I
 |     |    
 N    Adv 
 |     |    
 Maria never V' 
 |     |    
 VP   V
 |     |    
 a  N  brownie

IP
 /    \
 NP   I'
 |     |    
 N'   I
 |     |    
 N    Adv 
 |     |    
 Maria should V' 
 |     |    
 VP   V
 |     |    
 eat Det  brownie
 |     |    
 N   N
4. The teacher often organized a discussion

5. The manager may offer a raise
6. Marianne could become quite fond of Larry.

5  Tests

Some of the tests below were NOT on the assignment. They are merely there
to provide more models to help when you use this answer sheet as a study
guide. In particular there was no problem using the conjunction tests, but
you should know the conjunction test for the midterm.

1. The news upset the entire family.
• Substitution
   In fact, it upset the entire congregation. [= The news upset the entire congregation.]

   ProNP it can be substituted for the news, providing evidence that the news is a constituent (in fact, that it is an NP).

• Movement
   It was [the news] that upset the entire family.

   Ability to move the news as a unit in deriving It was the news that upset the entire family from the news upset the entire family provides evidence that the news IS a unit, that is, that it is a constituent.

• Coordination
   [The news] and [ the public reaction] upset the entire family.

   Conjunction of the news with a similar string of words, the public reaction, provides evidence that the news is a constituent.

2. Steve looked up the number in the book

• Substitution
   # Fred looked there in the book too. [≠ “Fred looked up the number in the book too.”]

   Failure of ProPP there to substitute for up the number provides evidence that up the number is NOT a constituent (in fact, that is is not a PP).

• Movement
   * It was [up the number] that Fred looked.

   * [Up the number] Fred looked.

   Inability to move up the number using fairly common
movement operations provides evidence that up the number is not a constituent.

- Coordination
  # Fred looked up the number and up the email address.
  Failure of up the number to conjoin with another phrase like it provides evidence that it is NOT a constituent.

3. They hid in the cave.

- Substitution
  We hid there too. [= We hid in the cave, too]
  ProPP there can be substituted for in the cave, providing evidence that in the cave is a constituent (in fact, a PP).

- Movement
  It was [in the cave] that we hid .

- Coordination
  They hid in the cave and behind the big boulder.
  Successful conjunction of in the cave with another phrase like it provides evidence that it IS a phrase (in fact, a PP).