

Relatively the Same: Relative Constructions in Intermediate-level English Language Textbooks

Stephen DRAGE

スティーブン ドレイジ. 中級レベル英語教科書における関係節について *Studies in International Relations* Vol. 39, No. 2, February 2019, pp. 17-36.

本論文では、15冊の英語教科書の中で、関係節がどのように扱われているかにつき言及した。本研究にて取り扱った教科書は、CEFRのB1からB2レベルを対象にした、Cambridge University PressとMacmillan Publishersの2社から発行されているものを選んだ。そのうちの6冊は執筆者自身が教育現場で使用し、その他の内の少なくとも6冊に関してはその他の教員が本学において使用したものである。こうした教科書の中で、①関係詞がどのように学習者向けに示されているか、②関係詞の十分な説明がなされているか、③その他、説明として含まれるべき事項は何か、の3つの研究課題に着目した。これらの課題に対する回答として、関係詞の説明に要する文法用語および裸関係詞 (bare relatives) といった構造 (構文) がどのように学習者に示されているかにつき考察を行った。

The textbook is central to the pedagogical economy of language teaching. Teachers of all kinds in all sorts of institutional contexts habitually depend on it for the structure, content and goals of their classes. Curriculum scholars have noted that it frequently becomes the de facto syllabus. It has a similarly determining role for learners: it gives them a map of their course, structures each of their classes and is a primary source for the language they are learning. Learners set great store in their textbooks, which means that those who write, publish and assign them have a responsibility to put high quality texts into their hands.

In this article, with the crucial role of the textbook in mind, I look critically at the presentation of relative constructions in fifteen mainstream intermediate-level EFL texts, ten of which have been used in classes at Nihon University College of International Relations (six of these in my own classes). After close analysis of the texts, I summarise certain aspects of the presentation of relatives in a table. This table serves as a balance sheet or snapshot of the fifteen texts: it shows ten relative-connected items ranging from features of relative constructions to the terminology the texts use to some of the types of relatives that are, or perhaps should be, presented to learners. I discuss each item from the table in the sections below.

My focus here is rather specialised. After all, relatives are only one aspect of English grammar, albeit an important one, that learners (and teachers) have to come to terms with. I am, however, taking up a suggestion made by Jackie F. K. Lee and Peter Collins. In their 'holistic' survey of ESL textbooks used in Hong Kong, they suggest that future studies assess textbooks on grammatical features such as passive voice and present tenses (2009: 65). I hope what follows on relative constructions is in keeping with their idea.

Now, for reasons of space and since I am looking at intermediate-level texts, my account of relatives is not comprehensive. For one thing, it would be absurd to expect texts for intermediate-level learners to include all or even most of the relative words and phrases. For another thing, I include just enough grammatical analysis to explain certain elementary points about relatives as demanded by the items in my table. This is not to say, however, that my criticisms apply only to the

fifteen texts considered here, or even that they should be confined to those at intermediate-level; some apply, as should become obvious, to EFL texts in general.

The sections that follow are ordered according to the headings of the columns in the table on page nineteen: my balance sheet for relative constructions. For ease of reading, the table appears in two parts: Table 1A and Table 1B. At this point, I should say that I could not have written this article without *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* to guide me (Huddleston and Pullum et al. 2002).¹ My analysis of the texts here goes by its modern, relatively informal and remarkably consistent description of English grammar.² Since there are a number of references to it below, I will henceforth refer to it as *The Cambridge Grammar*.

Yet for all its merits, *The Cambridge Grammar* seems to be out of favour in ELT circles. In a blistering conclusion to his *TESL Canada Journal* article, Brett Reynolds remarks:

Why ... are we so uninformed about linguistics? Why are major linguistics journals like *English Language and Linguistics* and comprehensive grammars such as *CGEL* [*The Cambridge Grammar*] (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002) almost never cited in the ELT literature these days? This blindness to advances in grammatical description is not new. Cook made similar observations in 1989, and Halliday, McIntosh, and Stevens (1964) were arguing for better descriptions of language two decades earlier (2013: 12–13).

After the communicative turn in language teaching, many believed grammar had no place in ELT pedagogy. The tide has turned against such views: grammar today has a rightful place.³ Indeed, Richard Hudson and John Walmsley (2005: 594) say that we are undergoing a ‘rebirth of grammar teaching’. If my article has any use, I hope it serves as a further reminder of the relevance of modern and authoritative grammars like *The Cambridge Grammar* for ELT.

2. Textbooks

The fifteen texts used for this article are listed in the references. While there are only fifteen, they are a fair cross-section of the texts used to teach English to second language learners at intermediate levels—approximately B1–B2 on the CEFR scale—in tertiary education (naturally, I ruled out texts without explicit sections on relatives). Indeed, two-thirds of the texts have been in recent use in the English language program at the College of International Relations. The level was also an important consideration. Intermediate level is one with which I am familiar—I write this article as an English language teacher—and, as Rod Ellis (2006: 103) says, ‘Grammar is best taught to learners who have already acquired some ability to use the language (i.e., intermediate level) rather than to complete beginners.’

All the texts are recent ones from established international publishers such as Cambridge University Press, Macmillan and National Geographic Learning, and are written in American or British English. Going by their pages of acknowledgments, the texts have all received serious scrutiny from numerous reviewers and consultants around the world. In this article, I do not pass judgment on the overall quality of any of these fifteen texts.

I have included three specialized grammar texts, *Fundamentals of English Grammar* (Azar and Hagen 2011), *Grammar and Beyond 3* (Blass et al. 2012) and *Grammar Dimensions 3* (Thewlis 2007), and one for TOEFL-iBT preparation, *The Complete Guide to the TOEFL Test* (Rogers 2007). I have included four pairs of texts, for example, *Perspectives 1* (Lansford, Barber, and Jeffries 2018) and *Perspectives 2* (Barber, Lansford, and Jeffries 2018). So it is possible to compare how texts from one series present material

TABLE 1A. Features and Types of Relatives in Intermediate-level Textbooks

TEXTBOOK	TERMINOLOGY	PAGES	WHOSE POSSESSION	WHOSE NON-PERS.
<i>Complete Guide to the TOEFL</i>	Adjective clauses/relative clauses	5	x	✓
<i>Fundamentals of English Grammar</i>	Adjective Clauses/relative clauses (TG/index)	21	x	✓ x
<i>Global Intermediate</i>	Defining and non-defining relative clauses	3	x	✓
<i>Global Upper Intermediate</i>	Defining and non-defining relative clauses	3	x	✓
<i>Grammar and Beyond 3</i>	Relative Clauses/adjective clauses	34	x	✓
<i>Grammar Dimensions 3</i>	Relative Clauses/adjective clauses	16	✓	✓ x
<i>Great Writing 2</i>	Adjective clauses	3	N/A	N/A
<i>Great Writing 3</i>	Adjective clauses	2	N/A	N/A
<i>Longman Academic Writing Series 3</i>	Adjective clauses/relative clauses	11	N/A	N/A
<i>Longman Academic Writing Series 4</i>	Adjective clauses/relative clauses (index only)	21	✓	✓ (but)
<i>North Star: Listening & Speaking 4</i>	Adjective clauses/relative clauses	4	X	x
<i>North Star: Reading & Writing 4</i>	Identifying adjective clauses/restrictive relative cls.	4	x	x
<i>Oxford EAP Pre-Intermediate</i>	Relative clauses	4	N/A	N/A
<i>Perspectives 1</i>	Defining relative clauses	3	N/A	N/A
<i>Perspectives 2</i>	Defining and non-defining relative clauses	8	N/A	N/A

TABLE 1B. Features and Types of Relatives in Intermediate-level Textbooks

TEXTBOOK	BARE RELATIVES	SUPPLEMENTARY	CLAUSE AS ANTECEDENT	PROPER NAMES	WHEN WHERE	IT-CLEFTS
<i>Complete Guide to the TOEFL</i>	x	✓	x	x	✓	x
<i>Fundamentals of English Grammar</i>	✓	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Global Intermediate</i>	✓	✓	x	x	✓	x
<i>Global Upper Intermediate</i>	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓
<i>Grammar and Beyond 3</i>	✓	✓	x	x	✓	x
<i>Grammar Dimensions 3</i>	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
<i>Great Writing 2</i>	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Great Writing 3</i>	x	✓	x	x	x	x
<i>Longman Academic Writing Series 3</i>	✓	✓	x	x	✓	x
<i>Longman Academic Writing Series 4</i>	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	x
<i>North Star: Listening & Speaking 4</i>	✓	✓	x	x	✓	x
<i>North Star: Reading & Writing 4</i>	x	x	x	x	✓	x
<i>Oxford EAP Pre-Intermediate</i>	x	x	x	x	✓	x
<i>Perspectives 1</i>	✓	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Perspectives 2</i>	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

on relatives from one level to the next. The two *NorthStar* texts (English and Monahan English 2015; Ferree and Sanabria 2015) are at the same level in their series, but one is for reading and writing and the other listening and speaking. I have also looked at the teaching guides for the texts, if they were available. I take a guide to be an extension of the textbook: quotations from ‘the texts’ could be from a text itself or its accompanying guide. Finally, there are a few references to higher-level texts: sequels to my fifteen at intermediate level. All these texts and guides are listed together in the references under ‘Textbooks and Teaching Guides’.

In the table, the ‘Pages’ column gives an approximate guide to how many pages each text devotes to relatives. Some texts have as few as two or three pages. With thirty-four pages, *Grammar and Beyond 3* (Blass et al. 2012) has the most.

3. Terminology

In the table under ‘Terminology’, I note the basic designations the texts use for relative constructions—a term I have taken from *The Cambridge Grammar* (1033). This requires a brief word before I turn to the terminology in the texts themselves. Relative construction is a more general term than that of relative clause. It covers both of the constructions underlined in (1):

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--|-------------------|
| (1) | i | <i>I've eaten most of the food <u>that you left in the refrigerator.</u></i> | [relative clause] |
| | ii | <i>I've eaten most of <u>what you left in the refrigerator.</u></i> | [noun phrase] |

The two sentences have virtually the same sense. But there are differences between the underlined parts. While *that you left in the refrigerator* is uncontroversially a relative clause, *The Cambridge Grammar* takes *what you left in the refrigerator* to be better understood as a noun phrase (for the detailed arguments see 1068–70). That is because the latter equates not to the underlined clause in (i) but to the longer noun phrase containing the relative: *the food that you left in the refrigerator*. Relative clause, then, is the more specific term. It is used in traditional grammar and retained in most modern grammars. But it cannot be used to cover constructions like the underlined part of (ii). Finally, just as I have above, I use the word ‘relative’ as a useful shorthand for both ‘relative clause’ and ‘relative construction’.

The texts in their section or chapter headings designate relative constructions as either adjective clauses or relative clauses. Frequently, though, a text refers to both terms. *Longman Academic Writing Series 3*, for example, has ‘Adjective Clause’ as section heading, and in the text itself ‘adjective clauses are sometimes called *relative clauses*’ (Oshima and Hogue 2014a: 131). *Grammar and Beyond 3* has it the other way around: in two section headings on relatives, the first term is relative clause (to be exact, ‘Subject Relative Clauses’ and ‘Object Relative Clauses’), and adjective clause (to be exact again, ‘Adjective Clauses with Subject Relative Pronouns’ and ‘Adjective Clauses with Object Relative Pronouns’) is in parentheses (Blass et al. 2012: 282; 296). In the table, I show when a textbook uses two terms like this with a virgule. Also shown in the table is the fact that two texts use relative clause just in their indexes; though one of these, *Fundamentals of English Grammar* (Azar and Hagen 2011), uses relative clause in its teacher’s guide as well (Hall and Azar 2011). In my sample, two-thirds (ten) of the texts use adjective clause: just over half (eight) of the texts use it as their primary term; another two use it as an alternative term.

Given that adjective clause has been the term preferred in traditional grammar for over one hundred and fifty years, this is not really surprising. According to Ian Michael, it became firmly ensconced in English grammar writing by the late 1850s and 1860s, alongside the related terms of noun clause and adverb clause (1991: 22). In traditional grammar, these three clause types are the

three basic classifications for finite subordinate clauses in English. They are so named because noun, adjective, and adverb clauses (or nominal, adjectival, and adverbial clauses) are reckoned to have functional analogies with three major word categories or ‘parts of speech’, namely noun, adjective and adverb. Many modern theoretical grammars, however, like *The Cambridge Grammar* and *Oxford Modern English Grammar* (Aarts 2011), have discarded the traditional analysis principally because functional analogies between word categories and subordinate clauses do not bear examination. As Huddleston and Pullum say, with characteristic directness, ‘the classification just doesn’t work. Noun clauses aren’t like nouns, adjective clauses have almost nothing in common with adjectives, and most adverb clauses turn out not to be clauses at all’ (2003: B20).

I will make two brief comments on this traditional classification. First, it is not writ large in any of the texts I examine here. When the terms are used, they are presented ad hoc, not systematically as the basic classification of finite subordinate clauses. Because the texts are intermediate level, there is (perhaps) a pedagogical reason for an expedient, relatively unsystematic presentation. But even so, only one of the accompanying teacher’s guides mentions the classification as such: *Fundamentals of English Grammar, Teacher’s Guide* (Hall and Azar 2011: 116). This is slightly puzzling, given the tripartite classification’s salience in traditional grammar and the adoption of the terms in many of these (and other EFL) texts. Perhaps, though, this absence can be put down to the haphazard way traditional grammar has been absorbed by many if not most EFL textbook writers.

Secondly, Huddleston and Pullum in *The Cambridge Grammar* and Aarts in his *Oxford Modern English Grammar* (2011) replace the traditional classification of finite subordinate clauses with three major categories of their own: content clauses, relative clauses and comparative clauses.⁴ These new categories are based on the syntax of the clauses themselves, and thus not subsumed into analogies with word types. The arguments that led Huddleston and Pullum to dispense with the traditional classification are set out in *The Cambridge Grammar* (1014–17) and expanded, helpfully, in their article ‘The Classification of Finite Subordinate Clauses’ (2004). I draw upon this article in the remainder of this section.

Why is the term adjective clause such a misnomer? Why, as the *Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar* says, is it to be avoided? (Aarts, Chalker, and Weiner 2014: 11). In the first place, although adjective clauses are often identified with relative clauses, as many of the texts I have examined here claim, they are not coextensive. Adjective clauses, as Huddleston and Pullum (2004: 110) say, are only ‘a subset of traditional relative clauses’. In other words, adjective clauses are not as basic as traditional grammar makes them out to be.

Now, a relative clause often provides further information about a noun to which it is linked:

(2) i *We’ve been talking to [the people who work with her].*

Here the underlined relative functions as modifier of the noun *people*, marked by double underlining. The relative pronoun *who* relates the subordinate clause to the antecedent noun *people*. The fundamental feature of all relative clauses is the relation of an anaphoric element in the construction—expressed overtly in (i) by the pronoun *who*—to an antecedent.⁵ In this case, there is a veneer of plausibility in thinking that the relative clause is functioning like an adjective, for the most basic noun modifier is an adjective: for example, the noun phrase *a generous person* has the adjective *generous* in attributive position modifying the noun *person*.

Broadly speaking, irrespective of whether the term relative clause or adjective clause is used, the texts construe relative constructions in this way, as adjective-like modifiers of nouns: ‘A relative clause is essentially a sentence embedded in a noun phrase and used to modify the noun’ (Mitri 2009: 202); ‘Relative clauses are like adjectives: they modify nouns’ (Douglas and Morgan 2018: 98a). Quite a few,

though, say or go on to say that adjective or relative clauses ‘describe’ nouns. The idea is pervasive: ‘The purpose of adjective clauses is to describe nouns and pronouns’ (Oshima and Hogue 2014a: 131); ‘An adjective clause is a clause (subject + verb) that acts as an adjective (describes a noun)’ (Folse, Muchmore-Vokoun, and Vestri Solomon 2014b: 52); ‘Relative clauses modify – define, describe, identify, or give more information about – nouns’ (Blass et al. 2012: 283); ‘Identifying adjective clauses, sometimes called restrictive relative clauses are groups of words (phrases) that act as adjectives to describe or identify a noun’ (English and Monahan English 2015: 110).

Such explanations are anathema to many contemporary linguists. That is because they confuse relations between linguistic expressions (relative clauses modify nouns, say, or adjectives modify nouns), which are internal to the language system, with the power of language to describe things in the world out there. In other words, description applies not between words or expressions but to referents: an entity or collection of entities in the real world (or an imaginary world), understood tangibly as that person, my shoes, the weather and so on.

But to return to my main argument, there are anyway a number of relative constructions that do not fit the adjective-like comparison. Huddleston and Pullum provide seven examples in their 2004 article (110); I give alternative versions of these below and add one more for good measure. Traditional grammar recognises all of these as relative clauses:

- (3)
- i *Was that the best you could do?*
 - ii *I ran the fastest I have ever run that night.*
 - iii *Where can we go that is dog friendly?*
 - iv *It was Hannah Arendt who had seen this most clearly.*
 - v *It was at that point that she decided to change the course of her studies.*
 - vi *They stayed married for twenty years, which struck me as remarkable given his lifestyle.*
 - vii *America’s system of nuclear decision-making was set up by Truman, who was determined to keep the bomb out of the hands of the military.*
 - viii *I asked the people next door to help, which they did without hesitation.*

The antecedents for the relative clauses in (3) are again marked by double underlining. In (i–ii) the antecedents are an adjective and an adverb respectively. In traditional grammar, adjectives do not modify adjectives (contemporary linguistics sometimes notes exceptions for collocations like *dark green* or *cold sober*)⁶ and adjectives do not modify adverbs. It is misleading, then, to label the relatives in (i–ii) as adjective clauses. The same goes for (iii). The antecedent is *where*, a fronted locative complement in an open interrogative. Traditional grammar has *where* as an adverb. *The Cambridge Grammar* reanalyses it as an interrogative preposition. But either way the word is in a category that ‘again does not take adjectives as modifier’ (Huddleston and Pullum 2004: 111).

Both constructions in (iv–v) are *it*-cleft sentences. They are syntactically more complicated versions of *Hannah Arendt had seen this most clearly* and *She decided to change the course of her studies at that point*. I look at *it*-clefts in a little more detail in section 11 below. For now, it is enough to say that relative clauses in *it*-clefts are not comparable to adjectives. Although the antecedent in (iv) is a noun (proper name to be exact), the relative clause does not modify it, and the relative clause and antecedent do not combine to form a syntactic constituent. *It*-clefts permit a fairly wide range of antecedent types functioning as complements of the verb *be* in its specifying function: noun antecedents are the most common and prepositional phrases, like the one shown in (v), are the second most common type.

The antecedent for the relative clause in (vi) is the preceding double-underlined clause. An adjective cannot be taken as the standard modifier to a clause. Note that it is the clause-modifying

adverb *remarkably*, not the adjective *remarkable*, that is required in a shorter version of the sentence in (vi): *Remarkably, they stayed married for twenty years*. In (vii), the noun or, more precisely, proper name *Truman* is the antecedent for the relative clause, but once again the relative does not modify the noun and does not combine with it to form a syntactic constituent. The relative clause, then, is not adjective-like at all. Finally, in (viii) the relative clause draws its interpretation from the verb *help*. It is not modifying the verb (in any case, adverbs not adjectives modify verbs). Instead, the relative clause has a continuative effect, one that develops the narrative.

To end this section, here is one more difference between supposedly adjective-like relative clauses and prototypical adjectives. A relative clause is typically placed immediately after its antecedent, as in *the people who work with her*. But comparatively few adjectives appear immediately after the noun they modify; prototypical adjectives appear attributively (*cold hands*) and as predicative complement (*My hands are cold*). I said earlier that there was a degree of plausibility in thinking that a relative clause could be seen to be like an adjective. Yet the closer one looks at the analogy, the more fanciful it appears.

As Huddleston and Pullum note, relative clause is a ‘valid’ and ‘even indispensable’ category (2004: 111). It has salience in both traditional and modern grammar. But to identify relative clauses as adjective clauses, or what amounts to the same thing, to identify relative clauses as simply adjective-like modifiers of nouns leads learners—and a few teachers too, no doubt—up the garden path.

4. Relative *Whose* (Possession)

In this section, I am interested in whether the texts reduce the semantics of relative *whose* to possession. Six texts do not mention *whose* at all: I have marked these ‘N/A’ in the table. Regrettably, seven of the other nine do identify it solely with the idea of possession. The exceptions are *Grammar Dimensions 3* (Thewlis 2007) and *Longman Academic Writing Series 4* (Oshima and Hogue 2014b). I have therefore given these seven texts a cross in the table. Here are three glosses about *whose* from the texts: ‘*whose* (belonging to a person or a thing)’ (Clandfield and Robb Benne 2011a: 144); ‘*whose* or *in whose* = possession’ (English and Monahan English 2015: 110); and ‘*whose* shows possession or, in a more general sense, belonging’ (Hall and Azar 2011: 121). On one page *NorthStar: Listening & Speaking 4* states that ‘*whose* refers to people’s possessions’, apparently unaware that on the previous page it has an example sentence which contradicts its own explanation: ‘With the support of his wife and a native leader, Sting established the Rainforest Foundation, an organization whose goal is to help save the world’s rainforests’ (Ferree and Sanabria 2015: 146–47). The main point, however, is that relative *whose* is certainly not limited to the semantic notion of possession in either personal or non-personal domains.

Like many modern grammars, *The Cambridge Grammar* uses the term genitive rather than possessive, the now traditional term. Some of the texts use possessive, but others, as we have seen, omit the term and give semantic explanations. One advantage of the genitive as a term is that it helps to disabuse us of the idea that possession is the sole semantic relation involved. Possession is of course the most salient one, but the range of interpretations is very wide. I am not going to attempt even a partial list of those here.⁷ Instead, I will present two examples that show relative *whose* in contexts that clearly cannot be squared with any idea of possessing. The first has a personal antecedent and the second a non-personal one:

- (4) i *Where Brazil had Mario Zagallo shuttling deep from a high position, Ipswich had Leadbetter, whose lack of pace meant he sat deep naturally.*

- ii *The city of Ai, whose destruction is celebrated in Joshua 8, was also found to have been abandoned.*

In the texts, many examples using *whose* do straightforwardly signify possession, such as ‘Mr. Collins is the man *whose* house I rented’ (Rogers 2007: 709), and ‘The citizens whose property the government had seized protested’ (Oshima and Hogue 2014b: 253). But there are others where any idea of possession is missing or much attenuated: ‘There are even some businesses whose employees are paid partly in Ithaca Hours’ (Clandfield and Robb Benne 2011a: 78); ‘Charlie’s new girlfriend would like to go to the lecture by the mountain climber whose latest climb she read about in *Adventure Magazine*’ (Mitri 2009: 213); ‘New video cameras can automatically identify a face whose image police have on film’ (Blass et al. 2012: 296); and ‘I know a girl whose brother is a movie star’ (Azar and Hagen 2011: 336). By recognising only the semantic notion of possession, many of the texts unfortunately elide such distinctions.

Of course, there is a balance to be struck between accuracy and presenting a grammatical point in a way learners can grasp. But at intermediate levels, some nuances can be introduced. As it is, from many of these texts learners are likely to pick up a misguided idea about the application of relative *whose* that they will have to unlearn later. This point about relative *whose* is mirrored in the presentation of dependent and independent genitives (possessive adjectives and pronouns in traditional grammar): texts often present these too as though possession is the sole meaning.

5. Relative *Whose* (Non-personal Antecedent)

The question here is whether the texts acknowledge that relative *whose* can have a non-personal antecedent. The idea that it should always be personal seems to have originated in the writings of a number of eighteenth-century grammarians, most notably Bishop Lowth and Joseph Priestley (Gilman 1994: 959–60). The idea still crops up today. In a sense, we have already seen it in *NorthStar: Listening & Speaking 4*, and *NorthStar: Reading & Writing 4* seems to follow suit because none of its uses of *whose* has a non-personal antecedent (Ferree and Sanabria 2015; English and Monahon English 2015). *Longman Academic Writing Series 4*, doing its bit to keep the superstition alive, has a note saying that some writers feel *of which* and not *whose* should be used when referring to ‘animals and things’ (Oshima and Hogue 2014b: 252). Two texts postpone non-personal *whose* to a higher level, which is why I have given both a tick and a cross in the table to *Fundamentals of English Grammar* and *Grammar Dimensions 3*.⁸ It is worth pointing out that neither of the *NorthStar* texts do likewise.

For the most part, though, the texts allow *whose* to have a non-personal antecedent. There are only two outright crosses in the table, one for each *NorthStar* text, and I have given a tick to *Longman Academic Writing Series 4* (Oshima and Hogue 2014b) despite the unhelpful note (which is why there is a parenthetical ‘but’ alongside its tick in the table). As before, six texts do not mention *whose* and these again are marked ‘N/A’ in the table.

6. Bare Relatives

Relative clauses that are marked by one of the relative words (*which, who, whom, whose*, etc.) are called *wh* relatives in *The Cambridge Grammar*. There are two other formal types: *that* relatives and bare relatives (sometimes called zero relatives or contact clauses), known collectively as non-*wh* relatives. Bare relatives lack the clause subordinator *that*.

- (5) i I copied the notes which I needed from a classmate. [wh relative]
 ii I copied the notes that I needed from a classmate. [non-wh: that relative]
 iii I copied the notes I needed from a classmate. [non-wh: bare relative]

In traditional grammar (some modern grammars too) and in the texts, *that* is a relative pronoun like *who* and *which*. *The Cambridge Grammar*, however, categorises ‘relative’ *that* as a clause subordinator rather than a pronoun (the arguments for this analysis are given on 1056–57). Both *that* relatives and bare relatives, therefore, have a covert anaphoric relation to an antecedent. In *wh* relatives the anaphora is overt as it is marked by a *wh* word.

The difference in categorisation is important for the descriptive grammar advanced in *The Cambridge Grammar*, and it accounts for the division of relative clauses in (5), but it does not really matter to the discussion here. For what I am interested in here is whether the texts feature bare relative clauses like the one in (iii). What is relativised in this case is the object, and where the object is relativised *that* or a *wh* counterpart is almost always optional. In fact, *that* or a *wh* counterpart is usually optional in any relative clause where any non-subject element is relativised. For example, in *Those no-hopers (that) you’re referring to are friends of mine*, the complement of a preposition is relativised, and so a bare relative is permissible; hence the parentheses around *that*. But in *Those students that do not pass may resubmit their work*, it is the subject that is relativised, and so it is not possible to drop *that* without loss of grammaticality (it could of course be replaced by *who*).

In the table, we can see that two-thirds (ten) of the texts introduce learners to bare relative clauses. Unsurprisingly, the term is not used. This is not a failing. Yet there is no equivalent term in the texts for this feature. Instead, the texts generally talk about deleting, omitting or leaving out the relative pronoun when it is object in the clause: ‘If the relative pronoun is the object of the verb ... the relative pronoun can be left out’ (Lansford, Barber, and Jeffries 2018: 142); ‘In clauses where the pronoun is the object, the pronoun can be left out’ (Clandfield and Robb Benne 2011a: 78); and ‘You can delete relative pronouns that function as objects in restrictive relative clauses’ (Thewlis 2007: 210). In addition, Azar and Hagen (2011) and Oshima and Hogue (2014a; 2014b) use \emptyset , the empty set sign, for bare relatives.

In my experience, such minimal explanations are often obfuscating. That is because intermediate texts tend to shy away from explaining even basic grammatical functions like that of object to learners, or they provide unsatisfactory accounts (typically word categories and grammatical functions are confused). In Clandfield and Robb Benne (2011a), Lansford, Barber, and Jeffries (2018), Oshima and Hogue (2014a) and Thewlis (2007) no account of the object function is given. Teacher’s guides do not offer much in the way help either. The guide for Oshima and Hogue (2014a) has virtually the same minimal direction: ‘Point out that the relative pronouns function as objects in the dependent adjective clauses’ (Curtis 2014: 33).⁹ And the guide for Clandfield and Robb Benne (2011a) has nothing on the object function apart from an incorrect piece of analysis of an example sentence: ‘Point out that *each swap (that) they organise* is the object of the third example sentence’ (Clandfield and Robb Benne 2011b: 88). The sentence in the text reads ‘*They charge a fee for each swap (that) they organise*’ (2011a: 78). But ‘each swap (that) they organise’ is not object in the sentence: it is complement of the preposition *for*. That said, the annotated example sentences and diagrams in Azar and Hagen (2011: 322; 324; 327) and Oshima and Hogue (2014b: 250; 252–53) are helpful.

Finally, I was a little surprised by the fact that as many as five texts disregard bare relatives. These five include both *Great Writing 2* (Folse, Muchmore-Vokoun, and Vestri Solomon 2014a) and *Great Writing 3* (Folse, Clabeaux, and Vestri Solomon 2015a); one might have expected some kind of introduction to the feature in the more advanced text.¹⁰ Better still, introduce bare relatives at the same time as *wh* and *that* relatives. After all, bare relatives are common enough in English, especially

in informal registers, and, as J. Dean Mellow (2006: 652) notes, their component parts (or grammatical properties) appear in other types of constructions.

7. Supplementary Relatives

Another important distinction in types of relative construction is that between supplementary and integrated relatives. Both of these terms are from *The Cambridge Grammar*. The distinction is illustrated below:

- (6) i *The scarf which Grandma bought for you is on the sofa.* [integrated]
 ii *The scarf, which Grandma bought for you, is on the sofa.* [supplementary]

The terms themselves are to the point: an integrated relative is an integral part of a larger sequence, whereas a supplementary relative is pendant, or merely attached, to the surrounding construction. *The Cambridge Grammar* goes on to describe in detail the differences between these relatives with reference to three areas: prosody and punctuation, syntax, and meaning (1058–65). I outline the most significant differences in the next three paragraphs.

A supplementary relative is set apart from other material prosodically. Most distinctively, there is usually a slight pause before the relative is spoken, and if the relative does not terminate the sentence, a similar pause will follow at its end. An integrated relative, however, is prosodically a part of the larger construction: it lacks distinctive pauses. In writing there is a corresponding difference between the two types of relative: supplementary relatives are marked off by commas (dashes and parentheses are also possible), while integrated relatives lack commas or other punctuation.

Turning to syntax, three things stand out. First, supplementary relatives are to all intents and purposes only ever of the *wh* type. Bare relatives are not permitted at all, and supplementary *that* relatives are hardly ever found and only acceptable to some speakers in standard English. *The Cambridge Grammar* provides a handful of attested examples of written supplementary *that* relatives (1058), but I have never come across one myself in a regular publication.¹¹ Secondly, supplementary relatives allow a greater range of antecedents than integrated ones. We have seen this already in the supplementary relatives in (3vi–viii): the antecedents there were respectively a clause, a proper name and a verb. Disregarding an *it*-cleft with a proper name, which is a special kind of integrated construction, none of these antecedents are normally permitted with integrated relatives. The same can be said about adjectives as antecedents for relative clauses, supplementary only: *I am aware of the problem, which I am sure they are too.* Thirdly, *which* as a determinative is only permitted in supplementary relatives:

- (7) i *The repairs should be completed before October, [by which time the path will be open to the public].*

The relative phrase in (i) is underlined. The noun phrase *which time* is a complement of the preposition *by*, and the antecedent for *which time* is *October*. Of course, when *which* is a pronoun, it can occur in supplementary and integrated relatives. It is worth mentioning in passing that determinative *which* in relatives does not feature in any of my fifteen texts.

The informational content of an integrated relative is presented as essential to the meaning of the sentence in which it is embedded. On the other hand, informational content in a supplementary relative is presented as a supplementation, a non-essential addition or a parenthetical interposition, to whatever meaning is conveyed by the rest of the sentence. Although the two sentences in (6) are

lexically identical, removing the relative clause from (i) is quite different to removing it from (ii). In (ii) the scarf would still be identifiable in the context without the supplementary relative: the noun phrase alone, *the scarf*, is sufficient in the context for you to know which scarf I am referring to. In (i), however, removing the relative would mean that the scarf is not identifiable: the relative is an essential part of the information presented in the sentence; there is a strong presupposition that there is more than one scarf, and the integrated relative is necessary for you to understand which scarf I mean ('the one Grandma bought for you').

In the texts, we find three pairs of traditional terms that can be correlated with the two from *The Cambridge Grammar*: restrictive, defining and identifying (integrated), and non-restrictive, non-defining and non-identifying (supplementary). They are not strictly interchangeable, however, but I will not go into that here (for why they are not, please see 1064–65 in *The Cambridge Grammar*). For now, I want to point out that two-thirds (ten) of the texts have some sort of coverage of supplementary relatives. Using traditional terms (restrictive, non-restrictive etc.), the texts typically say that supplementary relatives add 'extra information' to a sentence while integrated relatives contain 'necessary information' (Oshima and Hogue 2014a: 139). All ten say that in writing supplementary relatives are set off by commas, but only four mention analogous pauses in speech: *Global Intermediate, Grammar and Beyond 3; NorthStar: Listening & Speaking 4; Perspectives 2*. Here is the explanation from *Perspectives 2*: 'In written English, non-defining relative clauses are separated from main clauses by commas. In spoken English, the speaker usually pauses before and after the relative clause' (Barber, Lansford, and Jeffries 2018: 144).

The texts, however, are sometimes confusing when trying to explain certain aspects of integrated and supplementary relatives, though of course they use different terms. This from *Perspectives 2* must be baffling to learners: 'The following sentence is not clear without the relative clause, because it is not known which movie it is talking about. *The movie I'm going to see is called the Bachelors*' (Barber, Lansford, and Jeffries 2018: 144). Without the bare relative the sentence reads: 'The movie is called *the Bachelors*.' Needless to say, we still understand which movie is specified. *Grammar Dimensions 3*, laying down rules, follows 'Do not use *that* as a relative pronoun in nonrestrictive relative clauses', which is unobjectionable (the other nine texts have a similar instruction), with the misleading 'Use only *who*, *whom*, and *which*' (Thewlis 2007: 207). *NorthStar: Listening & Speaking 4* confuses its explanation of identifying relative clauses: 'In writing, commas surround the identifying adjective clause' (Ferree and Sanabria 2015: 146). It is obviously a typo.¹² Fortunately, neither of the example sentences the text gives at this point have commas, but I wonder how the typo was missed—over sixty reviewers are listed in the acknowledgments, and this is the fourth edition of the text! Finally, I did not expect to see a prescriptive prohibition on *which* in integrated relatives in any of these texts. But one appears in *Longman Academic Writing Series 4*: '*Which* is used in nonrestrictive clauses only' (Oshima and Hogue 2014b: 246). There is no prohibition in *Longman Academic Writing Series 3*, written by the same authors, no less: '*That, which, who, and whom* can begin a necessary adjective clause' (Oshima and Hogue 2014a: 132). The less advanced text is of course right. Integrated relatives with *which* are perfectly grammatical in English. They have been for over four hundred years.¹³

As these examples suggest, when it comes to the presentation and grammatical explanation of integrated and supplementary relatives, EFL texts need to be viewed with some circumspection.

8. Supplementary Relatives: Clause as Antecedent

The next two sections look briefly at two different types of supplementary relatives. Both have been mentioned already. The first one is a supplementary relative that has a clause as antecedent:

- (8) i *The paper said Nissan would not base a car plant in Britain if Labour won the election, which was a lie.*

The antecedent for *which* is the clause *Nissan would not base a car plant in Britain if Labour won the election*. Turning to the table, we can see that only *Global Upper Intermediate* and *Longman Academic Writing Series 4* mention this type of relative (Clandfield and Robb Benne 2011c: 115; 144; Oshima and Hogue 2014b: 245). Relatives with clausal antecedents do not occur in any of the three specialised grammar texts, even though they devote a significant number of pages to relatives. Presumably, omission from the other texts is due to the construction being thought too difficult for learners at this level. On the face of it, this might be pedagogically justifiable. All the same, it is possible to make supplementary relatives understandable to intermediate-level learners. Concise, straightforward examples may be used. *He said he loved her, which was true*, for instance, appears simple enough. Oshima and Hogue's example (2014b: 245) is similarly uncomplicated: 'The team won the championship, which shocked the opponents.' (Although they say the relative clause modifies the entire sentence rather the antecedent clause, and that the relative pronoun must always be *which*—other *wh* words are possible.) In my experience, supplementary relatives with clausal antecedents are teachable. Indeed, they can sometimes be found in texts at intermediate level even when this construction is not an explicit topic. 'Often two or three DJs work at the same time, which means that dancers can choose the type of music they want to dance to' turns up without warning, so to speak, in the grammar reference section on relative clauses in *Perspectives 2* (Barber 2018: 234). Another turns up unannounced, again in the section on relatives, in *Grammar Dimensions 3*: 'She has a wonderful sense of humor, which makes their times together relaxing and enjoyable' (Mitri 2009: 208). Some of these texts give learners much harder material to work on than my *which was true* example. For instance, *Oxford EAP Pre-Intermediate* wants learners to come up with extended definitions that 'use a number of relative clauses and prepositional phrases combined' (Storton 2015: 25). The text is CEFR B1, apparently.

Not introducing this construction at intermediate level may be a missed opportunity. Moreover, its inclusion would also show learners in a straightforward way that relative constructions sometimes have antecedents other than nouns.

9. Supplementary Relatives: Proper Names

As I have already mentioned, proper names are normally only permitted as antecedent of a supplementary relative:

- (9) i *The story is narrated by Marian Leatherby, who is 92 and has no teeth left.*

In (i) the antecedent of *who* is Marian Leatherby. It is not possible for the relative clause here to be of the integrated type, hence the comma. But if a proper name is preceded by a determiner, an integrated relative is acceptable, as in *He was not the Bill Smith I met previously*.

In the table, I have marked each text with a cross. That is because all the texts fail to mention that proper names normally occur as antecedents to supplementary relatives. In fact, I cannot think of a textbook at intermediate level that does mention this (it is rare in advanced texts too). Of course, this is where the teacher can step in. Even so, it would be useful for the texts to make the point about proper names and supplementary relatives on the page. At this level, it is feasible for learners to grasp the essentials, and the benefit to them seems obvious. As it is, learners are often faced with similar-

looking example sentences in their texts and accompanying explanations that withhold the key detail. Compare, for instance, ‘The professor who teaches my biology class won a Nobel Prize two years ago,’ which is labelled as ‘restrictive’ and ‘necessary’, with ‘Professor Jones, who teaches my biology class, won a Nobel Prize two years ago,’ contrastingly labelled as ‘nonrestrictive’ and ‘unnecessary’ (Oshima and Hogue 2014b: 246). The terms may or may not be helpful to learners. Yet surely it would be far better for learners to understand the crucial distinction, that in each case here the antecedents require different types of relative: the ordinary noun (or nominal) ‘professor’ requires an integrated relative and the (proper) name ‘Professor Jones’ a supplementary one.

10. Relatives with *When* and *Where*

Two other important *wh* relative words are *when* and *where*. Typical uses are illustrated in:

- (10) i *The fears are driven by memories of the not so distant time [when kidnapping was a major criminal industry in Baghdad].*
 ii *We walked a few blocks to the hotel [where the others were staying].*

The antecedents for the relatives clauses in (10) are double underlined. A temporal expression is invariably the antecedent for *when*. In contrast, *where* almost always takes a locative expression as antecedent. *The Cambridge Grammar* treats *when* and *where* as prepositions. In traditional grammar they are treated as adverbs.

Because *when* and *where* are not categorised as relative pronouns, there is a danger that textbook writers overlook relatives that use these words.¹⁴ My concern therefore in this section is whether or not the texts include *when* and *where* clauses in their sections on relatives. Up to a point, my concern is warranted: only nine out of the fifteen texts feature these kinds of relatives. Out of the three grammar texts, *Grammar and Beyond 3* (Blass et al. 2012) is the only one that covers them.

There are a number of other relative words that are often grouped with *where* and *when*. *The Cambridge Grammar* lists *while*, *why*, *whence* and various compounds of *where* plus another preposition (*whereupon*, *whereby*, for instance). None of these feature in my sample of texts. This is not a criticism: it would be ridiculous to expect the texts to have comprehensive coverage of relatives at intermediate level. Nevertheless, it does show a certain rigidity to the coverage of relatives. Not one text gives us a relative with, for example, *why*, as in *There is no simple reason why this has happened*.¹⁵

11. *It*-clefts

It-clefts are among a number of clause constructions that are collectively known as information-packaging constructions or discourse and information presentation. Some others are existentials, preposing, postposing and passives (*The Cambridge Grammar* devotes a whole chapter to the topic). As with many (but not all) information-packaging constructions, an *it*-cleft has a more basic counterpart:

- (11) i *Ann made the salad today.*
 ii *It was Ann who made the salad today.*
 iii *It was the salad that Ann made today.*
 iv *It was today that Ann made the salad.*

The three *it*-clefts in (ii–iv) are formed by taking one element from the basic, non-cleft sentence in (i) and foregrounding it by making it into a complement of a clause with *It* as subject and a form of *be*. Other elements from the non-cleft are backgrounded by being placed into a special kind of relative clause. Foregrounded in (ii–iv) are respectively subject (*Ann*), object (*salad*) and adjunct (*today*) from the non-cleft. Conversely, these elements are antecedents for subject, object and adjunct in the respective relative clauses. The *it*-cleft gets its name from the idea that the more basic clause is divided into two: one part foregrounded and the other backgrounded. The information that is backgrounded in the relative is taken as presupposed or not at issue. For example, (ii) presupposes that someone made the salad today and highlights or foregrounds this someone as *Ann*.

The foregrounded elements in the three *it*-clefts in (11) are all nouns. As we have already seen, other elements may be foregrounded. Example (3v) foregrounds a prepositional phrase, as does *It was on the metro that she lost her bag*. An adverb phrase is foregrounded in *It's not often that she's late*.

Turning to the table, we can see that only *Global Upper Intermediate* (Clandfield and Robb Benne 2011c) covers the *it*-cleft. Commendably, it covers the related pseudo-cleft or *wh*-cleft too, as in ‘What made me laugh was her expression’ (Clandfield and Watkins 2011: 134, the text is rated B2). There are a number of possible explanations for this almost complete neglect of the *it*-cleft by the texts. The construction may be thought too difficult for intermediate-level learners. But a moment’s reflection suggests that this cannot be right: conditionals and passives seem more or less obligatory at intermediate levels, and both of these, for learners and in general, are much more complicated constructions syntactically and otherwise. In my experience, moreover, intermediate learners grasp the *it*-cleft, especially when they are given short constructions like those in (11). In fact, its two-part structure facilitates comprehension, and also gives learners a genuine sense of control over their own language production. The reason for neglect, then, must lie elsewhere. Frequency may be an explanation, though *it*-clefts are hardly recondite—after all, they are important enough to be named as such.¹⁶ I suggest that a large part of the explanation for neglect lies with the fact that EFL textbook writers have tended to follow traditional grammarians, of whom it can be said have paid little attention to information-packaging structures apart from passives. All fifteen of my texts cover passives; only one the *it*-cleft. None of the three specialised grammar texts cover the *it*-cleft. All three have advanced-level sequels, but the *it*-cleft features in just *Grammar Dimensions 4* (Eyring and Frodesen 2007). It is not in *Grammar and Beyond 4* (Bunting and Diniz 2014) or *Understanding and Using English Grammar* (Azar and Hagen 2009), which is the sequel to *Fundamentals of English Grammar* (Azar and Hagen 2011). It is worth noting that the teacher’s guide for *Grammar Dimensions 4* expects learners to be aware of *it*-clefts: ‘Students will most likely be familiar with the form of *It*-clefts’ (Gokay 2008: 444).

That claim is not borne out by fourteen of the texts surveyed here. And *Global* series excepted, there is no coverage of *it*-clefts in any of ten more advanced texts that are sequels to those I have analysed for this article: nothing in *Great Writing 4* (Folse, Muchmore-Vokoun, and Vestri Solomon 2014c), *Great Writing 5* (Folse and Pugh 2015), *Longman Academic Writing Series 5* (Meyers 2014), *NorthStar: Listening & Speaking 5* (Preiss 2014), *NorthStar: Reading & Writing 5* (Cohen and Miller 2014), *Oxford EAP Intermediate* (de Chazal and Rogers 2013), *Oxford EAP Upper-Intermediate* (de Chazal and McCarter 2012), *Perspectives 3* (Barber, Lansford, and Jeffries 2017a) and *Perspectives 4* (Barber, Lansford, and Jeffries 2017b).

12 Conclusion

For this article I drew up a kind of balance sheet based on the presentation of relative constructions in fifteen intermediate-level texts. On the negative side, I found that many of the texts were cleaving to the outdated term of adjective clause—a grammatical relic if ever there was one—and that all the texts described relatives as only ever adjective-like modifiers of nouns despite syntactic evidence to the contrary. When they included it, the texts, with only two exceptions, identified relative *whose* with the sense of possession: it has a myriad of other interpretations. With two exceptions, the texts ignored relatives with clausal antecedents, and only one text included the *it*-cleft construction. Relatives with proper names could be explained better. It would make sense for texts introduce them with *it*-clefts since these constructions often use proper names as well. On the credit side, there is less to report. The texts on the whole show that relative *whose* can have a non-personal antecedent. Ten out of the fifteen texts featured bare relatives. Ten texts, but not always the same ones, covered the important difference between supplementary and integrated relatives (but with occasional confusions). Nine texts featured relatives with *when* and *where*.

Fifteen texts were included in this study. The relatively small number meant that I could look closely at each one and their teaching guides. On the other hand, this number might be seen as a limitation. Still, even if I looked at others at intermediate level, I think many of my criticisms would stand (the report might even be worse). Plenty of texts cling to the term adjective clause, and it seems that relatives are always said to be adjective-like modifiers of nouns. For a more rounded picture, it would be interesting to analyse the presentation of relative constructions in advanced EFL texts. At that level, texts should be presenting more complex constructions and a greater variety of relatives as well as a fuller account of the grammar.

My close analysis of the texts was through the lens of *The Cambridge Grammar*. Of course language teaching does not just depend on getting the grammar ‘right’. But it is a good start.

Appendix

Here are the sources for my numbered examples. Those not listed are my own creations.

- (3vi) Kleinzahler, August. 2018. ‘Remembering Anthony Bourdain’. *LRB Blog* (blog). 11 June 2018.
- (3vii) Shatz, Adam. 2017. ‘The President and the Bomb’. *London Review of Books*, 16 November 2017.
- (4i) Wilson, Jonathan. 2008. *Inverting the Pyramid: A History of Football Tactics*. London: Orion.
- (4ii) Lazare, Daniel. 2013. ‘A Diverse Collection of Peoples’. *London Review of Books*, 20 June 2013.
- (8i) Ascherson, Neal. 1985. ‘Newspapers of the Consensus’. *London Review of Books*, 21 February 1985.
- (9i) Gordon, Edmund. 2017. ‘Save the Feet for Later’. *London Review of Books*, 2 November 2017.
- (10i) Cockburn, Patrick. 2017. ‘As the Wars End’. *London Review of Books*, 14 December 2017.

Notes

¹ I follow Bas Aarts's lead and add 'et al.' to the bibliographic note because Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey Pullum wrote *The Cambridge Grammar* in collaboration with thirteen other linguists (one of whom is Collins). Aarts gives a full explanation for the 'et al.' in his review of *The Cambridge Grammar*—an 'awe-inspiring tome' (2004: 365).

² See Huddleston and Pullum's forthcoming 'Modern and Traditional Descriptive Approaches to Grammar' for an overview of *The Cambridge Grammar*. A Japanese translation of *The Cambridge Grammar* is being published in eleven parts. The introductory volume was published in 2017 by Kaitakusha.

³ Hossein Nassaji makes this claim in his 'Introduction to Teaching Grammar' for *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (2018). Unfortunately, this eight-volume encyclopedia does not mention *The Cambridge Grammar* at all.

⁴ These three types of finite subordinate clause are given a chapter each in *The Cambridge Grammar* (947–1170). For an overview, see 'Coordination and Subordination' (Huddleston and Pullum 2006, especially 210–15) in *The Handbook of English Linguistics* (Aarts and McMahon 2006).

⁵ Only *Fundamentals of English Grammar Teacher's Guide* (Hall and Azar 2011) and the two *Longman Academic Writing Series* texts (Oshima and Hogue 2014a; Oshima and Hogue 2014b) use the term 'antecedent' to explain the anaphoric relation. Because they eschew the term, other texts are forced to explain the relation in a roundabout way.

⁶ *The Cambridge Grammar* does not recognise adjectives as modifying other adjectives. This position is reconsidered in 'The Distribution and Category Status of Adjectives and Adverbs' (Payne, Huddleston, and Pullum 2010, see especially 52–55), where a number of 'Adj + Adj' collocations are given.

⁷ *The Cambridge Grammar* has a table illustrating the wide variety of semantic interpretations for subject-determiner genitives (474); all are equally applicable to genitive *whose*.

⁸ Here is the statement from the teacher's guide for *Fundamentals of English Grammar*: 'The text does not introduce the use of *whose* to modify "things" as well as "people"' (Hall and Azar 2011: 121). I do not really understand why this use of *whose* is postponed to advanced level.

⁹ Baker (2014: 36–38) has three pages of notes for five chapters from *Longman Academic Writing Series 4* (Oshima and Hogue 2014b). Unfortunately, the chapter on relatives is among these five.

¹⁰ There is no explanation for this omission in either of the teaching guides (Folse, Muchmore-Vokoun, and Vestri Solomon 2014b; Folse, Clabeaux, and Vestri Solomon 2015b).

¹¹ Bengt Jacobsson's (1994) paper on supplementary (in his terms, nonrestrictive) relative *that* clauses gives many more examples.

¹² I have not been looking to catalogue typo-like mistakes in the texts. Individually, such things are trivial matters. Still, EFL texts in general seem to have quite a lot of errors, some quite egregious: 'When World War I, which was fought in Europe from 1914 to 1917, was finally over, it was called "the war to end all wars"' (Thewlis 2007: 211).

¹³ This point is made in Huddleston and Pullum's *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*: 'Integrated *wh* relatives with non-personal heads have been occurring in impeccable English for about 400 years' (2005: 191).

¹⁴ Huddleston makes this point in *English Grammar in School Textbooks: Towards a Consistent Linguistic Alternative*. Texts may ignore relatives with *when* and *where* (and others) because sections on relatives are often organised around the word category of the relative pronoun (1989: 51).

¹⁵ *Oxford EAP Pre-Intermediate* has an example with *why* tucked away in its grammar glossary entry for relative pronouns, but there is nothing in the main text (Dummett and Hird 2015: 7).

¹⁶ *Perspectives 2*, perhaps inadvertently, or at least without explanation of the construction, includes an *it*-cleft in its section on relatives: 'It wasn't Mike Leigh who directed the movie' (Barber, Lansford, and Jeffries 2018: 144).

References

- Aarts, Bas. 2004. 'Grammatici Certant'. *Journal of Linguistics* 40 (2): 365–82. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226704002555>.
- Aarts, Bas. 2011. *Oxford Modern English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aarts, Bas, Sylvia Chalker, and E. S. C. Weiner. 2014. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aarts, Bas, and April M. S. McMahon, eds. 2006. *The Handbook of English Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cook, Vivian J. 'Grammar in the Applied Linguistics of Language Teaching'. 1989. *Trinity College Dublin Occasional Papers* (No. 22). Available: <http://www.viviancook.uk/Writings/Papers/TCD89.htm>.
- Ellis, Rod. 2006. 'Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective'. *TESOL Quarterly* 40 (1): 83–107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>.
- Gilman, E. Ward, ed. 1994. *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of English Usage*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Halliday, M.A.K., Angus McIntosh, and Peter Stevens. 1964. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*. London: Longmans.
- Huddleston, Rodney D. 1989. 'English Grammar in School Textbooks: Towards a Consistent Linguistic Alternative' (Occasional Papers Number 11). Brisbane: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia.
- Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. (in collaboration with Laurie Bauer, Betty Birner, Ted Briscoe, Peter Collins, David Denison, David Lee, Anita Mittwoch, Geoffrey Nunberg, Frank Palmer, John Payne, Peter Peterson, Lesley Stirling and Gregory Ward). 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2003. 'Of Grammatophobia'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 3 January 2003, Section 2, *The Chronicle Review*, B20.
- Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2004. '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*, edited by Gunnar Bergh, Jennifer Herriman, and Mats Möbärg, 103–16. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2005. *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2006. 'Coordination and Subordination'. In *The Handbook of English Linguistics*, edited by Bas Aarts and April M. S. McMahon, 198–219. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2017. Translation edited by 本田謙介, 深谷修代 and 長野明子. 「英文法大事典」シリーズ 0. 東京: 開拓社.
- Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. Forthcoming. 'Modern and Traditional Descriptive Approaches to Grammar'. In *The Oxford Handbook of English Grammar*, edited by Bas Aarts, Jill Bowie, and Geri Popova. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson, Richard, and John Walmsley. 2005. 'The English Patient: English Grammar and Teaching in the Twentieth Century'. *Journal of Linguistics* 41 (3): 593–622. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226705003464>.
- Jacobsson, Bengt. 1994. 'Nonrestrictive Relative *That*-Clauses Revisited'. *Studia Neophilologica* 66 (2): 181–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393279408588139>.
- Lee, Jackie F. K., and Peter Collins. 2009. 'English Grammar: An Investigation of Hong Kong ESL Books'. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11 (2): 51–70.

- Leitner, Gerhard, ed. 1991. *English Traditional Grammars: An International Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Liontas, John I., and Margo DelliCarpini, eds. 2018. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235>.
- Mellow, J. D. 2006. 'The Emergence of Second Language Syntax: A Case Study of the Acquisition of Relative Clauses'. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (4): 645–70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml031>.
- Michael, Ian. 1991. 'More Than Enough English Grammars'. In *English Traditional Grammars*, edited by Gerhard Leitner, 11–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nassaji, Hossein. 2018. 'Introduction to Teaching Grammar'. In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, edited by John I. Liontas and Margo DelliCarpini, 1–3. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eeltv05a>.
- Payne, John, Rodney Huddleston, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2010. 'The Distribution and Category Status of Adjectives and Adverbs'. *Word Structure* 3 (1): 31–81. <https://doi.org/10.3366/E1750124510000486>.
- Reynolds, Brett. 2013. 'Determiners, Feline Marsupials, and the Category-Function Distinction: A Critique of ELT Grammars'. *TESL Canada Journal* 30 (2): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v30i2.1138>.

Textbooks and Teaching Guides

- Azar, Betty Schramper, and Stacy A. Hagen. 2009. *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. 4th ed. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Azar, Betty Schramper, and Stacy A. Hagen. 2011. *Fundamentals of English Grammar*. 4th ed. West Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.*
- Baker, Lida. 2014. *Longman Academic Writing Series 4: Essays, 5th Ed. Teacher's Manual*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Barber, Daniel. 2018. *Perspectives Level 2 Lesson Planner*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Barber, Daniel, Lewis Lansford, and Amanda Jeffries. 2017a. *Perspectives 3*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Barber, Daniel, Lewis Lansford, and Amanda Jeffries. 2017b. *Perspectives 4*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Barber, Daniel, Lewis Lansford, and Amanda Jeffries. 2018. *Perspectives 2*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.*
- Blass, Laurie, Susan Ianuzzi, Alice Savage, and Randi Reppen. 2012. *Grammar and Beyond 3*. New York: Cambridge University Press.*
- Bunting, John D., and Luciana Diniz. 2014. *Grammar and Beyond 4*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chazal, Edward de, and Sam McCarter. 2012. *Oxford EAP Upper-Intermediate: A Course in English for Academic Purposes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chazal, Edward de, and Louis Rogers. 2013. *Oxford EAP Intermediate: A Course in English for Academic Purposes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clandfield, Lindsay, and Rebecca Robb Benne. 2011a. *Global Intermediate Coursebook*. Oxford: Macmillan.*
- Clandfield, Lindsay, and Rebecca Robb Benne. 2011b. *Global Intermediate Teacher's Book*. Oxford: Macmillan.

- Clandfield, Lindsay, and Rebecca Robb Benne. 2011c. *Global Upper Intermediate Coursebook*. Oxford: Macmillan.*
- Clandfield, Lindsay, and Francis Watkins. 2011. *Global Upper Intermediate Teacher's Book*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Cohen, Robert F., and Judy L. Miller. 2014. *NorthStar 5: Reading & Writing*. 4th ed. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Curtis, Jane. 2014. *Longman Academic Writing Series 3: Paragraphs to Essays, 4th Ed. Teacher's Manual*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.*
- Douglas, Nancy, and James R. Morgan. 2018. *Perspectives Level 1 Lesson Planner*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Dummett, Paul, and John Hird. 2015. *Oxford EAP Pre-Intermediate: A Course in English for Academic Purposes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.*
- English, Andrew K., and Laura Monahon English. 2015. *NorthStar: Reading & Writing Level 4*. 4th ed. White Plains, NY: Pearson.*
- Eyring, Janet, and Jan Frodesen. 2007. *Grammar Dimensions 4: Form, Meaning, and Use*. 4th ed. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Ferree, Tess, and Kim Sanabria. 2015. *NorthStar: Listening & Speaking Level 4*. 4th ed. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Folse, Keith S., David Clabeaux, and Elena Vestri Solomon. 2015a. *Great Writing 3: From Great Paragraphs to Great Essays*. 3rd ed. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.*
- Folse, Keith S., David Clabeaux, and Elena Vestri Solomon. 2015b. *Teacher's Notes for Great Writing 3: From Great Paragraphs to Great Essays, 3rd Edition*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Folse, Keith S., April Muchmore-Vokoun, and Elena Vestri Solomon. 2014a. *Great Writing 2: Great Paragraphs*. Fourth Edition. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.*
- Folse, Keith S., April Muchmore-Vokoun, and Elena Vestri Solomon. 2014b. *Teacher's Notes for Great Writing 2: Great Paragraphs, 4th Edition*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Folse, Keith S., April Muchmore-Vokoun, and Elena Vestri Solomon. 2014c. *Great Writing. 4: Great Essays*. 4th ed. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Folse, Keith S., and Tison Pugh. 2015. *Great Writing. 5: From Great Essays to Research*. 3rd ed. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Gokay, Janet. 2008. *Grammar Dimensions 4 Lesson Planner*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Hall, Martha, and Betty Schramper Azar. 2011. *Fundamentals of English Grammar Fourth Edition Teacher's Guide*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Lansford, Lewis, Daniel Barber, and Amanda Jeffries. 2018. *Perspectives 1*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.*
- Meyers, Alan. 2014. *Longman Academic Writing Series 5: Essays to Research Papers*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Mitri, Suzanne. 2009. *Grammar Dimensions 3 Lesson Planner*. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.
- Preiss, Sherry. 2014. *NorthStar 5: Listening & Speaking*. 4th ed. West Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Oshima, Alice, and Ann Hogue. 2014a. *Longman Academic Writing Series 3: Paragraphs to Essays*. 4th ed. White Plains, NY: Pearson.*
- Oshima, Alice, and Ann Hogue. 2014b. *Longman Academic Writing Series 4: Essays*. 5th ed. White Plains, NY: Pearson.*
- Rogers, Bruce. 2007. *The Complete Guide to the TOEFL Test, IBT Edition*. Boston, MA: Heinle.*
- Storton, Richard. 2015. *Oxford EAP Pre-Intermediate: A Course in English for Academic Purposes, Teacher's Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thewlis, Stephen H. 2007. *Grammar Dimensions 3: Form, Meaning, and Use*. 4th ed. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.*

Note: The fifteen texts that are marked with an asterisk are the ones that appear in the table.