Introduction

This course is an introduction to English grammar that tries to make the topic intelligible. English grammars have been plagiarizing each other’s inaccurate analyses and repeating each other’s confused nonsense for more than 200 years. The tradition should have been radically revised long ago, but unfortunately grammar seems to have proved most attractive to people who were conformist and authoritarian by nature, or lacking in intellectual curiosity, or both. Instead of progress we got just reverent repetitions of familiar dogma.

This course does not follow the tradition. It tries to provide the subject with a much-needed conceptual shake-up.

This iconoclastic aspect will make it easier for students in some ways and harder in others. It will be fairly easy for those who attend every class, because the subject will emerge as refreshingly straightforward and plausible compared with traditional grammar. It will make descriptive sense, and the way that evidence bears on it will become clear. There will be some new terminology and definitions to take in, but not a large amount.

On the other hand, the course will be tough or impossible for students who skip classes and then try to catch up by putting half-remembered previous recollections together with misunderstandings picked up from skimming someone else’s notes. Repeating the familiar 200-year-old confused blah-blah on the final exam is one way to guarantee a fail.

There is an ulterior motive to this course: to teach you to think syntactically. That is, to teach you to reason using evidence drawn from facts about the structure of sentences rather than their meanings. How to do this will become clearer as the course proceeds. It is fundamental to having any grasp of modern linguistics.
Underlying this is a requirement to think **scientifically** about the subject. Many people seem to treat grammar more like a body of religious doctrine, as if the rules come to us with an authority stemming from somewhere outside of our world. This religious view seems to assume that it is our duty to obey the rules, rather than to discover or analyse or question or test them.

Linguists, by contrast, assume that the task is to find out **what the right rules are**. Grammar is taken to be a subject for **investigation**, not obedience. We discover the rules, bit by bit, through studying the facts of how the language is used by the real experts: the people who speak the language natively. We who are native speakers of English are the ultimate experts.

Of course, it is always possible for anyone using their language (or doing anything else) to make unintended mistakes. We are not infallible. Nonetheless, the structure of English depends ultimately on the way we, the speakers, naturally use it (at least on those occasions when we were sober, and said what we intended to say, and phrased it the way we intended to phrase it). (There is a lesson here about what philosophers call **normativity**, and about why research in any cognitive, linguistic, or psychological science is difficult.)

**Overview**

The first few weeks of the course will look intensively at the very basic matter of how we assign words to syntactic categories (“parts of speech” as they used to be called): Verb, Noun, Determinative, Adjective, Adverb, Preposition, Subordinator, Coordinator, Interjection. We also distinguish various elementary grammatical functions: Head, Dependent, Subject, Object, Complement, Determiner, Adjunct, Modifier, and others. Most of these can be illustrated from the structure of very simple positive active declarative clauses, and we will begin that way. But as we move on we consider more complicated and interesting ways of putting sentences together: negation, non-declarative clauses, subordinate clauses, coordination (chaining phrases or clauses together with words like *and*), special stylistic effects, and so on.

The exposition follows the structure and assumptions of *CGEL* closely. *CGEL* is not being presupposed as necessarily always correct, of course. But it makes a real effort to be consistent and fairly clear, so where it is wrong we should be able to identify exactly which wrong turn it took. That is important: in an empirical discipline (any subject where factual evidence matters), it is much better to be wrong with clarity than to be fuzzily and evasively maybe-sort-of right.

**Schedule**

We will try to follow something like the following schedule (no guarantees about the exact timing, because this course has not previously been taught as a 15-week semester course):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Verbs and their inflection</strong>: Finiteness, auxiliaries, tense, aspect, modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reading from <em>SIEG</em>: Chapters 1 and 2, pp. vii–28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nouns</strong>: Their definition and their main properties — the features <em>count</em>, <em>number</em>, <em>gender</em>, <em>person</em>, and <em>pronoun</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td><strong>Canonical clause structure</strong>: simple active positive non-coordinate main clauses with no special style features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reading from <em>SIEG</em>: Ch 4, §§1–3, pp. 63–81. More detailed background: <em>CGEL</em> Ch 4 on complements and canonical clauses, and Ch 8 on adjuncts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Week 3  Determinatives and the Determiner function: Building noun phrases (NPs)
  • Reading from SIEG: Ch 5, §§1–3, pp. 82–93. More detailed background: CGEL Ch 5.

NPs: complements, modifiers, fused heads, and pronouns
  • Reading from SIEG: Ch 5, §§4–6, pp. 93–97.

Week 4  Adjectives and Adverbs
  • Reading from SIEG: Ch 6, pp. 112–126. More detailed background: CGEL Ch 6, §§1–4, pp. 525–562.

Prepositions and Preposition Phrases: classifying words as prepositions.
  • Reading from SIEG: Ch 7, pp. 127–137. More detailed background: CGEL Ch 7.

Week 5  Stranding of Prepositions: clauses with gaps, where those gaps can be, and how prepositions can accompany gaps.
  • Reading from SIEG: Ch 7, pp. 137–148.

Negation: the grammar of saying no — modifying a clause to reverse its truth conditions.
  • Reading from SIEG: Ch 8.

Week 6  Prepositions vs. Subordinators and Coordinators: Introduction to content clauses
  • Reading from SIEG: Ch 10, §3.1, pp. 175–176 and §4.1, p. 178; Ch 14, pp. 225–227.

  • Reading from SIEG: Ch 11, §§1–3, pp. 183-191; Ch 12.

[Round about here we may have a little midterm assignment. Details to be announced.]
Week 13 **It-Clefts**: Sentences formed with a dummy *it*, copular verb, focused constituent, and relative clause (compare *The dog gives her companionship* with (i) *It’s the dog that gives her companionship* and (ii) *It’s companionship that the dog gives her*).

**Wh-Clefts**: Sentences formed with a *wh*-phrase, a clause with a gap, a copular verb, and a focused constituent (compare *I’ll give you one more chance* with *What I’ll do is give you one more chance*).

- Reading from SIEG: Ch 15, §§5–6, pp. 251–254.

Week 14 **Dislocation and preposing** Sentences like *He’s a nice guy, my brother* (subject kicked to the end); *This, nobody ever imagined they would see___ in their lifetime* (object kicked to the beginning); *He had ___ with a live alligator* (object kicked to the end); *Only later did I realize* (subject shifted to after the auxiliary); *On the top was a maraschino cherry* (adjunct before verb, subject after).

- Reading from SIEG: Ch 15, §8, pp. 255–258.

**Reduction and ellipsis** Grammatical ways of making sentences shorter by leaving stuff out.

- Reading from SIEG: Ch 15, §9, pp. 259–263.

Week 15 **Reading and review week**

Requirements

Attendance at class is **required**. Be there every time. Homework exercises, roughly once a week, will be turned in at class. So that they can be difficult and provoke discussion, they will not be a major factor in computing your final grade (at most 20%) — but not doing them could lead to a fail. Their main function is to force you to confront the issue of whether you are developing a command of the material. The homeworks must be done and turned in for inspection. Late submission = no submission. Your worst single homework will be ignored. Thus **one** failure to hand work in will disappear from the record (no performance = worst possible performance). But otherwise any missing homework will have to be justified in writing by a note from a doctor or a dean. The final grade will be based mostly (80%) on a **final exam scheduled for December 20**, which will have several components, including elementary right-or-wrong questions, open-ended analysis tasks, and short-essay questions.

**Further reading**

There is much more to be studied in the vast literature on English. What follows is a few suggestions for independent study and research by those who want to pursue things further. Many of the items call for a certain amount of background in linguistics.

**General introduction and overview** Read *CGEL* Chs 1 & 2. Study Huddleston (1988), a detailed critical review of the grammar by Quirk et al. (1985): the shortcomings that Huddleston highlights led him to propose *CGEL*. Culicover (2004) gives a detailed review of *CGEL* that relates it to current issues in syntax, particular his own approach as detailed in Culicover (1999). While you are familiarizing yourself with important reference sources, you should look (if you haven’t so far) at the magnificent *Oxford English Dictionary* in its latest edition, and also at *Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage* (or *Merriam-Webster’s Concise Dictionary of English Usage*, which is just as good, and more recent). This superb reference work on controversial points of modern English usage is one that every linguist should become familiar with. (It is often referred to on Language Log simply as *MWDEU*.)

**Verbs** *CGEL*: Ch 3. The ‘dependent auxiliary’ analysis stems from Fries (1952) and later Chomsky (1957). Many have argued against it, and it is rejected in *CGEL*. Huddleston (1976) offers a detailed defense of the catenative complement analysis of auxiliaries, in the process of criticizing Frank Palmer’s book *The English Verb*. For detailed arguments that the ‘auxiliaries’ of English are full verbs taking clausal complements, see *CGEL* pp. 1209–1220; Pullum & Wilson (1977); Huddleston (1974); Huddleston (1976); McCawley (1975); Gazdar, Pullum & Sag (1982).
Clauses *CGEL*: Ch 4. Beth Levin’s book *English Verb Classes and Alternations* (1993) is a very useful reference work on subcategorization — the details of the complements that go with particular lexical heads. Keenan (1976) is an interesting attempt to provide a working definition of the Subject function on a cross-linguistic basis.

**Nouns and noun phrases *CGEL*:** Ch 5. For a detailed conceptual overview and defense of the fused Determiner-Head and Modifier-Head analyses that are introduced here, see Payne, Huddleston & Pullum (2007), where it is argued that all the dictionaries are wrong about *once*: it is not an adverb, it is actually a determinative, somewhat comparable to a word like *everyone* in that it has the special property of being required (not just permitted) to appear in fused Determiner–Head function. It has been claimed (by Abney 1987, unfortunately a never-published PhD dissertation) that the head of a phrase like *the police* is the determinative *the* and the label of the whole phrase should be DP. This analysis has been very widely adopted, without much real defense. Radford (1993) departs from it by arguing that both *the* and *police* are heads. Payne (1993), however, gives some simple arguments that the best analysis has just the noun as head, and *CGEL* endorses that view (pp. 357–358).

**Adjectives and adverbs *CGEL*:** Ch 6. Jackendoff (1977) offers one of the most detailed attempts at studying the internal structure of adjective phrases. He also treats adverb phrases, though (as the second half of Ch 6 of *CGEL* makes clear) he makes a major mistake (it’s not true that adverbs don’t take complements). Intensive argumentation for the distinctness of the adverb and adjective categories, and a demonstration that they cannot be collapsed or regarded as complementary in function, is presented in Payne, Huddleston & Pullum (2009).

**Prepositions *CGEL*:** Ch 7. Emonds (1972) and Jackendoff (1973) are the classic transformational readings on the diagnosis of prepositionhood and the internal structure of PPs, though they are actually only reviving ideas first urged by Otto Jespersen in his *The Philosophy of Grammar* (1924), a classic that every linguist should be aware of.

**Preposition stranding *CGEL* contrasts preposition stranding (*Who did you hand it to?*) with preposition fronting (*To whom did you hand it?*). There is a rich variety of transformationalist work on the syntax of stranding and fronting in both relative clauses and interrogatives. And just about every usage handbook (like Fowler 1926, Evans & Evans 1957, Morris & Morris 1985, Merriam-Webster 1994) has an article with a title something like ‘Preposition at end’; it is worth looking at what such handbooks say.

**Subordination and content clauses *CGEL*:** Ch 11. A classic early paper on this topic is Bresnan (1970), which introduced the term ‘complementizer’; *CGEL* uses the term *subordinator* instead (with good reason: subordinators don’t always turn clauses into complements!); and *CGEL* claims subordinators are not heads. Later work in transformational grammars claim they are, so subordinate clauses are labelled CP (‘complementizer phrase’).

**Open interrogatives *CGEL*:** Ch 11. See also Baker (1970) for an important study that opens by drawing a careful distinction between open interrogative clauses and relative clauses.

**Relatives *CGEL*:** Ch 12, especially pp. 1058–1066. The vast literature on relative includes interesting vintage transformational discussions in Ross (1967). An interesting new proposal for describing relative clauses without using transformations was proposed in Gazdar (1981). Supplementary (‘*appositive*’ or ‘non-restrictive’) relative clauses have been the subject of controversy: Emonds (1979) argues that they have no special syntactic properties’, but Arnold (2007) disagrees. Fused relatives are often known as ‘free relatives’ or ‘headless relatives’ (*CGEL* regards these as inappropriate terms). Bresnan & Grimshaw (1978) is an interesting transformationalist paper on the topic.


---

1In the transformational literature, fronting is known as ‘pied piping’. The whimsical term is due to John Robert Ross, who sees prepositions as dancing along with fronted *wh*-words the way the children of Hamelin followed the legendary Pied Piper.
Raising & control  Pollard & Sag (1991) present compelling evidence that ‘control’ (determining appropriate understood subjects for subjectless non-finite subordinate clauses) is a semantic matter, not purely syntactic. Pullum (1991) defends the view that expressions like his having won the race (‘nominal gerunds’) are noun phrases with verb-phrase heads, but CGEL adopts a different view, taking them to be gerund-participial clauses. Both these conflicting views have some solid support, yet they cannot both be right.

Coordination  CGEL: relevant part of Ch 15. The discussion of the Coordinate Structure Constraint in Ross (1967) and the reanalysis of that material in Gazdar (1981) make a very interesting study in syntactic theory.

Passives  CGEL: relevant section of Ch 16, pp. 1427–1447. Among the huge number of treatments of English passives, the relevant section of Chomsky (1957) is of course classic. Freidin (1975) argues against transformational treatment of passive clauses; Bresnan (1982) claims the right approach is lexical; Keenan (1980) disagrees, claiming that passivization maps phrases to phrases; Bach (1980) offers a rich compilation of novel facts plus some new analytical proposals. For a cross-linguistic comparative view see Keenan (2006).

Extraposition and existentials  CGEL  Ch 16. Extraposition is a term introduced by Jespersen (1909–1949). It was first treated in transformational terms by Rosenbaum (1967).

Clefts  CGEL: relevant sections of Ch 16. See Birner & Ward (1998) for a treatment of various information-packaging constructions, focusing mainly on the pragmatics. Ross (1967) is also a classic source on syntactic phenomena of this kind.

Reductions  CGEL: Ch 17. There is a huge literature on such topics as VP ellipsis (better called post-auxiliary ellipsis). Look for names like Hankamer, Merchant, Sag, and Schachter.
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