Notes on sources and further reading

These notes are intended to supplement the second edition of *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar* by Rodney Huddleston, Geoffrey K. Pullum, and Brett Reynolds (Cambridge University Press, 2022), which we refer to as '*SIEG*2'. We will also refer to *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (Rodney Huddleston, Geoffrey K. Pullum, and others, Cambridge University Press, 2002), calling it '*CGEL*'.

Space limitations made it quite impossible for us to provide in print the kind of full bibliographical referencing that our book would have in an ideal world, and the sheer bulk of the enormous linguistics literature pertaining to English makes it impossible for us to be complete here either. What we present in this document is a miscellaneous assembly of things:

- sources for a few specific examples;
- references to easily accessible general works in which an interested student could find more about particular topics, some of them filling in a bit of the 400-year history of English grammatical scholarship;
- pointers to much more technical works that an advanced linguistics student could consult to compare the analysis presented in this book with treatments in the literature on generative grammar.

We cite online works here and there, but of course the problem of dead links is always with us. Our hyperlinks were valid as of November 2021; apologies for any that may have broken since then.

Chapter 1 Introduction

The worldwide distribution and status of the English language is discussed in the following works:

- *English as a Global Language* by David Crystal (Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed. 2012). An easy and interesting popular survey of the world role of English.
- *Globish: How English Became the World's Language* by Robert McCrum (W. W. Norton, 2010). A historical survey of the way in which English ascended to its dominant position.
- *The Rise of English: Global Politics and the Power of Language* by Rosemary Salomone (Oxford University Press, 2022). This is a deeply researched recent study of the way English has begun to dominate the world politically and economically in recent years, with an emphasis on the role of language in geopolitics and international law.
- *The Last Lingua Franca: English Until the Return of Babel* by Nicholas Ostler (Allen Lane, 2010). Ostler makes an interesting and surprising prediction that the dominance of English as a lingua franca will only last a few more decades before ending.

The sociolinguistic concept of style or register, to which we refer now and then, is the main topic of *The Five Clocks* by Martin Joos (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World; 1961). It is still interesting, though because it is now six decades old, you may well notice that some of what he says about natural English in different styles has already ceased to be true in the third decade of the 21st century.

Two particular useful books on style in the other sense – the property that makes effective and beautiful writing different from weak or incompetent writing – are the following:

- *The Sound on the Page* by Ben Yagoda (HarperResource, 2004).
- *The Sense of Style* by Steven Pinker (Viking, 2014).

On matters of grammar Pinker largely follows *CGEL*, and thus is mostly compatible with *SIEG*2 as well. (However, Pinker makes a slip when he refers to *because* as a 'conjunction' at one point; it is a preposition – see Ch. 7 of *SIEG*2.)

The dictionary that first began to establish a standard spelling for BrE was *A Dictionary of the English Language* by Samuel Johnson (W. Strahan, London, 1755), and the one that started to do something similar for AmE was *An American Dictionary of the English Language* by Noah Webster (S. Converse, New York, 1828).

We know of only one dictionary that follows *CGEL* and *SIEG*2 in its categorization of lexemes: the *Simple English Wiktionary* (https://simple.wiktionary.org/). For example, all printed dictionaries we know of list *before* as a preposition (in *It happened before their marriage*), a 'subordinating conjunction' (in *It happened before they married*), and an adverb (in *It has happened before*). We claim this is hopelessly wrong as an analysis of English (see Chapter 7 for our arguments). The *Simple English Wiktionary* lists *before* simply as a preposition which sometimes takes an NP complement, sometimes takes a content clause complement, and sometimes doesn't need a complement. However, it is a wiki resource editable by a large community, and thus an entry could change without warning (that's the security that printed books offer!).

Phonology is not covered in *SIEG*2, but details of how words are pronounced occasionally become relevant. If you need a dictionary that gives a deeply researched and reliable guide to the pronunciation of words in BrE and AmE, the one to look for is *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary* by J. C. Wells (Longman, 2000). It uses the International Phonetic Alphabet, and gives first the normal BrE pronunciation in southern England and then a standard AmE pronunciation.

The usage reference book that we would recommend as the best on the market for historical information about usage is *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage* (edited by E. Ward Gilman and others; Merriam-Webster, Springfield, Connecticut; 1994). A slightly shorter more version is entitled *Merriam-Webster's Concise Dictionary of English Usage* (2002).

A larger and much more prescriptive guide to usage is *Garner's Modern English Usage* by Bryan A. Garner (Oxford University Press, 5th edition 2022), which gives clear advice about what expressions are fully approved of in Standard English and what are deprecated. It shares with *Merriam-Webster* the great merit of basing its advice on evidence from corpora and surveys of user opinion, not just on the author's whims or preferences.

We have resisted the temptation to name and shame a few examples of the really bad books on usage that are available. That temptation is not resisted at all in the following works:

- 'Fear of writing' by James Lindgren (*California Law Review* 78, No. 6 [Dec., 1990], pp. 1677–1702).
- 'Frankenstrunk: Birth of a monster' by Jan Freeman (*The Boston Globe*, 23 October 2005, reproduced on her blog *Throw Grammar From the Train*, 4 July 2016)

- *Ambrose Bierce's* Write It Right*: The Celebrated Cynic's Language Peeves Deciphered, Appraised, and Annotated for 21st-Century Readers*, by Jan Freeman (New York, Walker Books, 2009).
- 'The land of the free and *The Elements of Style*' by Geoff Pullum (*English Today* 102 [26.2], 34–44; June 2010). Browsable HTML version here.
- 'These rules are already broken' by Geoff Pullum (*Times Higher Education* 1,973, [11 November 2010], p. 56; PDF with page references here; browsable HTML version here).

Chapter 2 Overview

CGEL has a survey of the entire work as its second chapter (Chapter 2, 'Syntactic overview', 43–69), and the present chapter has the same purpose: to permit a quick look at the whole framework, and to give a first introduction to some of its technical terminology before delving into the details. Significant review articles on *CGEL* that set it in context, and thus provide useful background for *SIEG*2 as well, include

- Chris Brew's review in *Computational Linguistics* 29(1), 144–147, March 2003 (https://doi.org/10.1162/);
- Peter Culicover's review in *Language* 80, 127–141, March 2004;
- Bas Aarts's review article 'Grammatici certant' in *Journal of Linguistics* 40, 365–382; 2004;
- Geoffrey Leech's review article 'A new Gray's anatomy of English grammar' in *English Language and Linguistics* 8(1), 121–147, 2004.

CGEL was developed in the period from 1988 to 2000, as Rodney Huddleston began to realize that existing major reference grammars retained faults and incorrect assumptions inherited from earlier traditional grammars. In particular, after Huddleston studied the major work entitled *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* by Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (Longman, 1985) he realized that in many ways its theoretical framework was sometimes vague or inconsistent. He wrote an detailed review of it (in *Language* 64 [1988], 345–354), and began planning a project to produce a more theoretically coherent grammar with similar coverage of the facts.

One grammar that emerged from the program of Quirk et al. is a very useful reference work despite the fact that it follows Quirk and his colleagues in theoretical outlook and terminology: the *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* by Douglas Biber, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan (Longman, 1999) provides a considerable amount of quantitative information about how frequent certain constructions in English syntax are, and how they are distributed in different genres like conversational speech, informal writing, fiction, journalism, and so on.

Chapter 3 Verbs

Rodney Huddleston's review article 'Some theoretical issues in the description of the English verb' (*Lingua* 40, 331–383, 1976), about F. R. Palmer's book *The English Verb* (London: Longman, 1974; 2nd edition 1987), makes a very clear case for an important claim not

accepted by Palmer. It is defended in *CGEL* and *SIEG*2. It is the claim that the English auxiliaries are all simply verbs (albeit with special properties), and heads of their own verb phrases and clauses; they are not minor members of some distinct category that co-occur with verbs.

The view that auxiliaries are verbs was clearly held by the great Danish grammatican Otto Jespersen (see the discussions of auxiliaries in his seven-volume *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*; George Allen & Unwin, 1909–1949). But many traditional grammars have unfortunately muddied the picture over several centuries by referring to groups of words like *has been walking* as verbs or compound verbs, which really confuses the issue of what words are and when we have more than one of them. Our analysis is clear: *has been walking* is a sequence of verb forms, each taking a complement headed by the next in the sequence.

Examples of the opposing view – that auxiliaries are non-verbal elements that occur alongside verbs as modifying particles of some sort – is the one presented in Charles C. Fries, *The Structure of English* (Harcourt Brace, New York, 1952). The analysis in Noam Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures* (Mouton, The Hague, 1957) takes a very similar view.

The most detailed descriptions of the English auxiliary verb system in the generative grammar literature have shared the auxiliaries-as-verbs view: 'Autonomous syntax and the analysis of auxiliaries' by Geoffrey Pullum and Deirdre Wilson (*Language* 53, 741–788; 1977); 'Auxiliaries and related phenomena in a restrictive theory of grammar' by Gerald Gazdar, Geoffrey K. Pullum, and Ivan A. Sag (*Language* 58, 591–638; 1982); and 'Lessons from the English auxiliary system' by Ivan A. Sag et al. (*Journal of Linguistics* 56, 87–155; 2020).

Huddleston's arguments against the idea that *will go* is the future tense of *go* are spelled out in detail in 'The case against a future tense in English' (*Studies in Language* 19, 399–446; 1995).

Chapter 4 Complements

We should stress here that our term 'canonical clause' is defined solely as a presentational convenience we adopt (and you won't find the term in other grammar books). It is not, for example, a DISCOVERY that canonical clauses are always positive: we simply stipulate that we will count a clause as canonical if and only if it is a main clause that is (i) positive, (ii) declarative, (iii) active, (iv) non-coordinate, and (v) not illustrative of any of the stylistic reorderings or other devices that are described in Ch. 16.

The order of constituents in English canonical clauses – subject followed by verb followed by other complements such as objects – is generally abbreviated by linguists as SVO, and is widely believed to be so natural as to scarcely need notice. The French 18th-century encyclopedist Denis Diderot thought that SVO was so natural that it presented the ideas in a sentence in exactly the way the mind would be forced to consider them in any language. Even today, one grammar site on the web states confidently that 'Every human language starts an active sentence with the subject'. This is patently untrue.

The truth is that while widespread among the world's languages, SVO order is by no means universal. Huge numbers of languages (possibly a majority) prefer the verb to be at the end of the predicate part of the clause (SOV, as in Hindi, Japanese, or Turkish). Some languages order the verb first in the clause, then the subject, and then other complements (VSO, as in Irish, Tahitian, or Classical Arabic). A smaller number have the verb first, its

internal complements after that, and the subject at the end (VOS, as in Malagasy, Toba Batak, or Tzotzil). A few languages prefer to have the object before the verb and the subject after it (OVS, as in Hixkaryána, Barasana, or Urarina, or OSV as in Warao or Xavante), and a further possibility is to show very little sign of favouring any particular order for constituents in the clause (Dyirbal or Classical Sanskrit). There is certainly no possibility of defining the subject in general cross-linguistic terms as the NP that comes earliest in the clause; that's a generalization that applies to some extent within English, but not always, and not universally.

A very useful book for studying the kinds of internal complements that different English verbs take – a far more extensive survey than we have been able to give in this book – is Beth Levin, *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation,* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1993).

Chapter 5 Nouns

Among the works using the term 'determinative' as we do here, as a category name for words like *the* and *every*, are these two pedagogical works:

- *A Grammar of Spoken English on a Strictly Phonetic Basis* by Harold E. Palmer (W. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge, 1924).
- *A Comprehensive English Grammar for Foreign Students* by C. E. and J. M. Eckersley (Longmans, London, 1960).

There is a particularly unfortunate terminological clash between these books and the 1985 book *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* by Quirk et al., mentioned above. Quirk and his colleagues use 'determiner' for the lexical category (our **determinative**) and 'determinative' for the grammatical function (our **determiner**).

Additionally confusing is the fact that the words 'determiner' and 'specifier' have been used in the generative grammar literature in a way that doesn't even make it clear whether they denote a lexical category or a grammatical function.

There is nothing we can do about these terminological differences between grammars of English other than to be fully clear and explicit ourselves: following Palmer and Eckersley (and of course *CGEL*) we use the *-ive* words **adjective** and **determinative** for lexical categories and the *-er* words **modifier** and **determiner** for grammatical functions.

We mention that %*between you and I* occurs in books 18 times less frequently than the usual *between you and me*. That fact is cited by Bryan Garner in *The Chicago Guide to Grammar, Usage, and Punctuation* (University of Chicago Press, 2016), pp. 244–245. Nonetheless, for a simple rule about case assignment to be accidentally broken five or six percent of the time is significant. It's not as if we find people say **Me would prefer a beer* or **Listen to I*: you never hear such slips, let alone hear them five or six percent of the time. The anomalous use of the nominative is associated very specifically with following a coordinator, and it's largely restricted to the pronoun ***I***. Numerous speakers are quite consistently drawn to using the form *I* after the word *and* (and to some extent after *or*: the expression %*to you or I* is surprisingly common as a rival to the Standard English *to you or me*).

The features of person, number, gender, and case that apply to noun phrases are important enough that whole monographs have been devoted to studying how comparable features work in different languages:

- *Person*, by Anna Siewierska (Cambridge University Press, 2004).

- *Number*, by Greville G. Corbett (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- *Gender*, by Greville G. Corbett (Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- *Case*, by Barry J. Blake (Cambridge University Press, 1994; second edition 2001); see also *Theories of Case* by Miriam Butt (Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Chapter 6 Adjectives and adverbs

The category distinction between adjectives and adverbs, and the difference between their functions, is defended by John Payne, Rodney Huddleston, and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2010), 'The distribution and category status of adjectives and adverbs' (*Word Structure* 3, 31–81).

The opposite position (that adverbs are just a special subcategory of adjectives) is argued by Heinz Giegerich in 'The morphology of *-ly* and the categorial status of "adverbs" in English' (*English Language and Linguistics* 16, 341–359, 2012). His arguments turn mainly on phonological and morphological generalizations.

It is a remarkable fact that the existence of a distinction in category between adjectives and adverbs could still be disputed in such detail after 400 years of the study of English grammar, but fact it is.

Chapter 7 Prepositions

In this chapter we briefly mention John Hunter's 18th-century paper arguing that 'subordinating conjunctions' like *after* should be recognized as prepositions. The paper was 'A grammatical essay in the nature, import, and effect of certain conjunctions' (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 1, 113–134, 1784). Otto Jespersen's argument for the same point was in *The Philosophy of Grammar* (Holt, New York, 1924; reprinted by University of Chicago Press, 1992), 87–90. Joseph E. Emonds' article 'Evidence that indirect object movement is a structure-preserving rule' (*Foundations of Language* 8 [1972], 546–561) supplies several tests for showing that intransitive prepositions are prepositions, not adverbs, and his case is further strengthened by Ray S. Jackendoff in 'The base rules for prepositional phrases' (in *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, edited by Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 345–356, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1973).

The prejudice against stranding prepositions was instigated by John Dryden, in an essay called 'Defense of the Epilogue; or, An Essay of the Dramatique Poetry of the last Age', which he published as a polemical addendum to the script of a play, *Almanzor and Almahide, or the Conquest of Granada* (Henry Herringman, London, 1672).

Robert Lowth discussed the topic 90 years later in *A Short Introduction to English Grammar* (1762). Lowth explicitly noted the connection to style (stranding being somewhat more informal), and never suggested stranding was a grammatical error. Generations of English teachers unfortunately taught generations of children otherwise.

The prejudice against stranding was further fuelled in the chapter that E. B. White added to a 1959 revision of William Strunk's *The Elements of Style* (W. F. Humphrey, Geneva, New York, 1919). The additional chapter is called 'An Approach to Style' (Chapter 5 of *The Elements of Style* by William Strunk and E. B. White, 4th edition, Allyn and Bacon, 2000, later printings distributed by Longman, New York). In a section oddly called 'Avoid fancy words', White implies that stranding is 'bad grammar' (pp. 77–78).

The idea that *ago* is an intransitive preposition that demands a measure phrase as pre-head modifier is defended by Elizabeth Coppock (2007) in 'Toward a true theory of the periphery: Why Culicover's "odd prepositions" aren't that odd' (*BLS 33: General Session and Parasession on Multilingualism and Fieldwork*, 71–82; Berkeley Linguistics Society, Berkeley CA), and the way meaning can make some adjuncts apparently obligatory, which is what we suggest happens with *ago*, is discussed in 'The pragmatics of obligatory adjuncts' by Adele E. Goldberg and Farrell Ackerman (*Language* 77 [1997], 798–814).

Chapter 8 Adjuncts: modifiers and supplements

The Elements of Style by Strunk and White (referred to in the notes for Ch. 7) is an example of a book giving the strange advice that writers should avoid adjectives and adverbs (see p. 71, 'Write with nouns and verbs'). They are effectively disrecommending the use of a huge number of adjuncts. Another book saying much the same thing is *On Writing Well* by William K. Zinsser (Harper and Row, New York, 1976); Zinsser claims that 'Most adverbs are unnecessary'. The horror writer Stephen King even asserted that 'the road to hell is paved with adverbs' (in *On Writing: A Memoir of the Craft*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 2000, p. 118). What these authors are probably intending to warn you against is pointless or redundant adverbs (*he shouted loudly*, for instance; shouting is always loud!). But that is not what they say in the quotations just given.

The way adjuncts can sometimes appear obligatory for semantic reasons is insightfully discussed in the paper by Goldberg and Ackerman (1997), cited in the notes for Ch. 7.

Chapter 9 Negation

For further advanced study of the semantics of negation, which is treated only minimally in this book but covered more fully in *CGEL*, a very good source is this one:

- *The Natural History of Negation* by Laurence Horn (University of Chicago Press, 1989; reissued by CSLI Publications, Stanford CA, 2001).

The *CGEL* chapter relies extensively on this book for topics like why non-affirmative polarity-sensitive items are allowed in sentences like *I don't think* [*I've ever seen anyone so angry*] (notice that the underlined non-affirmative items are inside the bracketed part, but the negator is in the matrix clause).

One fascinating classic work on negation that may help in understanding the complexities of Chapter 9 is Otto Jespersen's *Negation in English and Other Languages* (Høst, Copenhagen, 1917; reissued by Franklin Classics, 2018), which points out a curious cycle that has emerged in the history of a number of languages, including English: first a single element before the verb is used for negation (Old English *ic ne seah* "I didn't see"), then that is treated as not strong enough so an element is added after the verb to emphasize the negation (Middle English *I ne sauȝ nauȝt*, literally "I not saw naught", rather like modern non-standard !*I didn't see nothing*), and then the preverbal element is eventually dropped leaving just the second element to convey the negation (modern Standard English non-verbal negation *I saw nothing*). The sequence has become known as Jespersen's cycle.

Chapter 10 Clause type

The topic of clause type interacts with work by philosophers of language on speech acts. The basic texts on speech acts are two philosophy books:

- *How to Do Things With Words* by J. L. Austin (Clarendon Press, 1962; second edition, Harvard University Press, 1975)
- *Speech Acts* by John Searle (Cambridge University Press, 1968).

Austin's book is a classic in philosophy (though put together after his death from lectures he gave at Harvard in 1955). It introduced the idea that by producing an utterance a person could actually DO something rather than just SAY something. The speech acts that can do something (make a promise, apologize, name a ship, or cause two people to become legally married to each other) he called **performative**; the utterances of more ordinary declarative main clauses that merely say something, he called **constative**. Searle's book developed the theory of speech acts into a major topic within the philosophy of language.

Whole monographs have been written on each of the clause types. The way in which *wh* phrases appear at the beginnings of open interrogative clauses at an indefinitely large distance away from their associated gaps has attracted much attention in theoretical syntax since the 1960s. A recent advanced survey of the topic, covering not just the syntax but also experimentation on how people understand sentences such as open interrogatives, is *Unbounded Dependency Constructions: Theoretical and Experimental Perspectives* by Rui Chaves and Michael T. Putnam (Oxford Surveys in Syntax & Morphology; Oxford University Press, 2021)

The study of the semantics of questions and imperatives has also been much studied: it is not immediately clear how truth conditions can be of use in explaining what interrogatives or imperatives mean. With both these clause types, the pragmatic consideration of politeness comes into play; see E. N. Goody (ed.), *Questions and Politeness* (Cambridge University Press, 1978).

Chapter 11 Subordination

The traditional account of subordinate clauses, in which they are classified as 'noun clauses', 'adjective clauses', and 'adverb clauses', is critically examined and rejected by Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum, 'The classification of finite subordinate clauses' (in *An International Master of Syntax and Semantics: Papers Presented to Aimo Seppänen on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday*, Gothenburg Studies in English, 88, ed. by Gunnar Bergh, Jennifer Herriman, and Mats Mobärg, 103–116; Göteborg, Sweden: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 2004; online at: http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/~gpullum/FiniteSubordinateClauses.pdf).

Fred Karlsson has done some interesting empirical study of how frequently (or rather, how infrequently) speakers and writers use iterated subordination, i.e., clauses embedded in clauses which are themselves embedded in clauses, and so on. Subordinate clauses are rare as the initial constituent of the matrix: see 'Constraints on multiple initial embedding of clauses' (*International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 12, 107–118; 2007); and they are extremely rare as medial constituents, with material both preceding and following them: see 'Constraints on multiple center-embedding of clauses' (*Journal of Linguistics* 43, 365–392; 2007).

Chapter 12 Relatives

The book alluded to in the Controversial Usage Note at the end of §2.2, in which the Fowler brothers proposed that *which* should not be used in integrated ('restrictive' or 'defining')

relative clauses, was *The King's English* (H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1906).

Henry Fowler wrote twenty years later that 'if writers would agree' to use *that* solely in integrated relative clauses and *which* solely in supplementary ones, 'there would be much gain both in lucidity and ease' (H. W. Fowler, *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1926). This isn't really true: he was overstating the likely benefit that might come from his proposed reform. And the reform was not successful, though American copy editors and English teachers seem to have latched on to it, and nearly always 'correct' integrated relatives with *which* to make them begin with *that* instead.

On the rarity of supplementary *that*-relatives, mentioned in §12.2.3, *CGEL* cites a few in [58] on p. 1052, and the Fowler brothers cite some older ones in *The King's English* (1906). There is little doubt that supplementary *that*-relatives should be regarded as having died out during the past century and a half.

However, the frequency of integrated relative clauses with *which* in published prose in America is depressed quite a bit by the intervention of publishers' editors. William Strunk used integrated *which* throughout his privately printed 1918 book *Elements of Style*, and did not mention any rule implying that there was anything wrong with them. But four decades later a revised version was published by Macmillan as *The Elements of Style* by William Strunk and E. B. White, and for that version White added a brief section stating that *which* should not be used in integrated ('restrictive') relative clauses; and at that point either he or his editorial assistant went through Strunk's original text and edited out all the integrated *which* relatives, changing *which* to *that*, to make it look as if Strunk had obeyed the newly added rule!

We cited an example sentence (numbered [12]) about a controlling father, illustrating the point that integrated relative clauses are not always semantically restrictive:

> *The father who had planned my life to the point of my unsought arrival in Brighton took it for granted that in the last three weeks of his legal guardianship I would still act as he directed*.

It is from the novel *10 Lb. Penalty* by Dick Francis (Penguin, 1997).

The question of how supplementary relative clauses relate to the structure of sentences has been controversial. 'Appositive relatives have no properties', by Joseph E. Emonds (*Linguistic Inquiry* 10, 211–243; 1979) argued in classical transformational grammar terms that supplementary (or 'appositive') relatives are just like parenthetically interpolated main clauses, except for beginning with a *wh* word interpreted in the same way as in integrated relatives. *CGEL* (Ch. 12, §4 and Ch. 15, §5) in effect takes a similar view. Christopher Potts, in *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures* (Oxford University Press, 2005) disagrees, as does Doug Arnold in 'Non-restrictive relatives are not orphans' (*Journal of Linguistics* 43, 271–309; 2007). Both argue that that supplementary (or 'non-restrictive') relatives fit syntactically into clause structure very much in the same way that integrated relatives do. We adopt that sort of view here when we propose the tree diagram in [17b].

The myth about *that*-relatives being barred from having human antecedents (i.e., the notion that *people that care* is incorrect) was lambasted, with plenty of documentation, in a post by Mark Liberman called 'The factual impenetrability of zombie rules' (Language Log, 9 April 2017; online at https://languagelog.ldc.upenn.edu/nll/?p=32049).

The Shakespearean character who uses a fused relative with *who* is Iago in *Othello*. Iago says: 'Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something, nothing; 'twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands.'

Chapter 13 Comparatives and superlatives

The topic of comparative constructions is one of the hardest and most complex parts of English syntax. An attempt at solving a number of its puzzles in terms of classical transformational grammar is made in Joan Bresnan's paper 'Syntax of the comparative clause construction in English' (*Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 275–343; 1973).

Gerald Gazdar presents a description in non-transformational phrase structure terms in 'A phrase structure syntax for comparative clauses' (Teun Hoekstra, Harry van der Hulst, and Michael Moortgat, eds., *Lexical Grammar*, pp. 165–179; Foris, Dordrecht, 1981). The semantics of comparatives is a hot topic of ongoing research in linguistics today.

Chapter 14 Non-finite clauses

The view that infinitival *to* is an odd kind of subordinator for infinitivals is adopted here with no great enthusiasm. There is an alternative, but it seems rather weird: infinitival *to* seems to behave syntactically in exactly the way we would expect for a defective non-finite auxiliary verb that has no tensed forms or participles, but only a plain form. Robert D. Levine, in 'Auxiliaries: *to*'s company' (*Journal of Linguistics* 48, 187–203), makes a strong case for analyzing it that way.

Paul Postal devotes an entire monograph to arguing that there are indeed transparent verbs that take raised subjects (his 'A-raising' verbs) and verbs taking raised objects (his 'B-raising' verbs): *On Raising* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1974).

Chapter 15 Coordination

The examples of multiple coordination in [6] are all from pages 74–8 of Allan Bloom's overheated polemic against rock music in *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987).

Some modern accounts have tried to make coordinations fit in better with other kinds of constituents by analyzing coordinators as lexical heads licensing complements. These accounts face very serious problems, as is made clear by Robert D. Borsley's 'In defense of coordinate structures' (*Linguistic Analysis* 24, 218–246; 1994) and 'Against ConjP' (*Lingua* 115, 461–482; 2003).

Chapter 16 Information structure

The topic of this chapter raises a question posed by Knud Lambrecht in his book on the topic, *Information Structure and Sentence Form* (Cambridge University Press, 1994): 'the question of why grammars provide so many ways of expressing the same proposition' (p. 340). Lambrecht's book represents an attempt to answer that question by showing how the different constructions involved facilitate information flow in a discourse composed of multiple sentences with shifts in topic and attention.

On the topic of the various passive constructions in English, Geoffrey Pullum's 'Fear and loathing of the English passive' (*Language and Communication* 37, 60–74; 2014; browsable HTML reading version here) attacks the misguidedness of the 20th-century writing advisers who have made a habit of warning against the use of passive clauses; he exhibits numerous cases of such advisers being demonstrably unable to tell which clauses are passive and which aren't.

Presentational clauses are carefully distinguished from other existentials by Judith Aissen in 'Presentational *there*-insertion: a cyclic root transformation' (*Papers from the 11th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 1–14; 1975).

The term 'extraposition' was coined by Otto Jespersen in *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, Vol. III*, pp. 356–357 (Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1927), though its use to denote specifically the construction seen in *It surprises me that he's resigning* is due to researchers in transformational grammar such as Peter Rosenbaum. A useful study of extraposition, addressing the odd fact that verbs like ***seem*** occur with extraposed clauses that are not permitted as subjects (compare *It seems that he's resigning* with **That he's resigning seems*) can be found in 'Extraposed subjects vs. postverbal complements: On the so-called obligatory extraposition' by Aimo Seppänen and Jennifer Herriman (*Studia Neophilologica* 74, 30–59; 2002).

There is considerable disagreement about the structure of cleft clauses: about whether the *it* is a dummy, whether the clause after the cleft focus item is a relative clause, where that clause is attached in the tree, and so one. One careful study with copious references to the literature is 'The referential status of clefts' by Nancy Hedberg (*Language* 76, 891–920; 2000).

The classic study of the pseudo-cleft construction is *The Pseudo-Cleft Construction in English* by F. R. Higgins (Routledge, London 1979; ebook published 2015).

Appendix: Word structure

There are several excellent comprehensive textbooks that teach the International Phonetic Alphabet:

- *A Practical Introduction to Phonetics* by J. C. Catford (Oxford University Press; 2nd edition, 2002) explains general phonetics from the ground up.
- *Gimson's Pronunciation of English* by Alan Cruttenden (Routledge; 2014), a classic text on standard British English, is in its 8th edition.
- *A Course in Phonetics* by Peter Ladefoged and Keith Johnson (Cengage Learning; 2014) is a superb textbook in its 7th edition, mainly treating American English.

The definitive treatment of lexical word formation in English is *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word Formation* by Hans Marchand (Beck, Munich; 1969). Laurie Bauer gives a more recent detailed account of the lexical word formation patterns in English in his book *English Word Formation* (Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Some of our examples of ongoing word formation by conversion to a new lexical category are taken from David Denison's interesting study 'Parts of speech: solid citizens or slippery customers?' (*Journal of the British Academy* 1, 151–185; 2014).

One of the most thorough and detailed studies of the irregular inflectional morphology of English words is Chapter 18 of *CGEL*.