

# 中英語關係節の理論的諸問題

岸田直子

## Some Theoretical Problems of the Relative Clause in Middle English

Naoko Kishida

0. Introduction. Within the framework of generative transformational grammar, various attempts have been made to restrict the class of possible grammars. The base should satisfy the principles of the X-bar theory. The number of transformational rules is severely restricted, and general principles govern their forms and manners of application. Surface filters are newly devised to capture the consequences of ordering, obligatoriness, and contextual dependency. Transformational rules used to serve that purpose. Chomsky proposes his core grammar as follows:

1. Base
  2. Transformations (movement, adjunction, substitution)
- 
- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| 3 a. Deletion        | 3 b. Construal                          |
| 4 a. Filters         | 4 b. Quantifier interpretation,<br>etc. |
| 5 a. Phonology       |   |
| 6 a. Stylistic rules |   |

in Chomsky and Lasnik (1977 : 431)

Chomsky (1977) proposes a transformational rule of *wh*-movement, which has the following general characteristics:

- (1) a. it leaves a gap
- b. where there is a bridge, there is an apparent violation of subjacency, PIC, and SSC
- c. it observes CNPC
- d. it observes *wh*-island constraints<sup>1</sup>

He asserts that this *wh*-movement rule underlies relatives, questions, comparatives, topicalization, cleft sentences, and *easy to please* constructions. The problem is whether the configuration ( 1 ) serves as a kind of " diagnostic " for *wh*-movement (Chomsky 1977:86) ; that is, are there any movement rules which do not show this configuration, or are there other kind of rules which do show this configuration. We must await further investigation of linguistic facts.

Let us take a concrete example. See the sentence below.

( 2 ) The railing on which the sightseers were leaning broke.

In a movement analysis of relatives, *on which* would be first generated within the relative clause, and later moved into the front position of the clause. There is an argument which supports this analysis. The movement analysis explains the fact that relative pronouns follow prepositions only when a preposition could be generated in the lower clause (C. Allen 1980 : 272). But the problem is whether this movement analysis is valid for all cases of relativization. In ( 3 ) below, there is no evidence that anything has been moved from its original position within the relative clause.

( 3 ) This is the man I have been looking for.

If there is no evidence of movement, the movement rule would only serve to justify a theory. In fact, Bresnan holds a position different from Chomsky. She asserts that a deletion analysis should be admitted in some cases of relativization. What will happen if we accept Bresnan's deletion analysis? First, it will be the case that some deletion rules have the properties ( 1 ). See the sentences ( 4 ) and ( 5 ) below.

( 4 ) This is a man I know is honest.

( 5 ) I love a girl I know you don't like.

The sentence ( 4 ) violates the propositional island condition. The sentence ( 5 ) is an apparent violation of the specified subject condition. Second, we must admit the existence of unbounded transformational processes, which Chomsky tries to dispense with. As is pointed out in Bresnan (1975 : 81), the essence of Chomsky's subjacency condition seems to be that transformations cannot have unbounded domains of applications. Which theory—Chomsky's or Bresnan's—will lead to the simplification of grammar?

1. The Relative Clause in ME. The oldest shape of the adjective clause (= the relative clause) is said to be that of two sentences put together without any outward mark of connection (Kellner 1892 : 54). Let us briefly examine the relative clauses in ME. T. Nakao (1972) deals with ME relatives in detail. He classifies the relative pronouns into the *th* set and the *wh* set. In the former set *that* is the commonest after *pe* disappears. This pronoun can take both animate and inanimate antecedents, and can be used in nonrestrictive relatives. *Which* begins to be used as a relative pronoun in EME, and becomes common in the 15th century. This pronoun can take both animate and inanimate antecedents during the ME period. The word *that* often follows the pronouns of the *wh* set.

( 6 ) And to my nece, *which that* I loved weel, (Chaucer, D. WB. 537)

The form *the which* is often used in the same way as *which*.

(7) *The whiche thynges troublen al this erthe*, (Chaucer, D. WB. 363)

*Whom* begins to be used in EME, and cooccurs only with animate nouns in LME. *Whose* is rare in EME, and cooccurs with inanimate nouns after the latter half of the 14th century. *Who* did not function as a relative pronoun independently until the end of ME. *What* was also used as a compound relative. It was possible to omit the relative pronouns in nominative cases as well as in objective cases. The copying structure of relatives often occurs in LME. See (8)<sup>2</sup>.

(8) a daughter *that* with *hire* was hire moder ded

(*Gregorius* 32 a., Kellner 1892 : 59)

2. Analysis. Some theoretical problems arise as to the analysis of the relative clauses. First, it is obvious that the relative clause construction apparently violates subjacency, PIC, and SSC. See the sentences below.

(9) The knyght cam which men wenden had be deed.

(Chaucer, D. Sum. 2029)

(10) Of whom it nedeth nat for to declare

(Chaucer, E. Mch. 2437)

(11) I am he that thou knowe that dyd doo destroye rome your cyte, and slewe that Pope and many. . .

(*Charles the Grete*, 52/30, Kellner 1892 : 62)

As was mentioned above in section O, we will have to take a COMP to COMP movement analysis of the relative pronouns if we want to preserve the subjacency condition.

Visser (1963 : 495-6) makes an interesting remark in connection with the case of the relative pronouns in such constructions. See the sentences below.

(12) Whom that we wole that shal been our justise.

(Chaucer, B. ML. 665)

(13) they doo not accompany wyth those whom they know are not secret (OED, Visser 1963 : 495)

The form *whom* frequently occurs instead of *who* because the relative pronoun is realized as the object of the immediately following 'they know', etc. This tendency is seen even today.

(14) . . . journalists, whom they say continue to view

(*New York Times* August 8, 1980)

The second problem which confronts us is the pied piping of prepositions in relative clauses. The pied piping convention specifies that any reordering transformation which operates on some NP may instead operate on any higher NP (or PP) (Ross 1967 : 110). See (15) below.

(15) Reports the height of the lettering on the covers of which the government prescribes should be abolished. (Ross 1967 : 108-9)

Grimshaw (1975) first noted a curious fact concerning the stranded prepositions of relatives in Chaucer. Pied piping never occurs in *that*-relatives; that is, prepositions are always stranded at the end of the relative clause if one is present. In *wh*-relatives pied-piping is obligatory. The

distribution of prepositions would be as follows in Chaucer.

- (16) \*This bok which I make menciou of . . .
- (17) This bok of which I make menciou . . .
- (18) \*This bok of that I make menciou . . .
- (19) This bok that I make menciou of . . .

Grimshaw uses pied piping as a kind of "diagnostic" for movement. When prepositions are pied piped, some item has always been moved. On the other hand, stranded prepositions show that there is no movement.

Let us examine how prepositions work in more detail. See the sentences below.

- (20) Godd off thatt itt wass bigunnenn  
(Orm D 87, Nakao 1972 : 193)
- (21) Out of that place which that I was inne.  
(Chaucer, F. Sq. 578)
- (22) As of this thinge the whiche ye ben aboute,  
(Chaucer, LGW. 1612)
- (23) the letter that he shuld a wretyn whych ye sente me word of  
(PL 291, 20, Nakao 1972 : 199)

Nakao (1972 : 192) says that prepositions can be pied piped very exceptionally in *that* relatives, as is shown by (20). According to him, the construction *whom. . . prep* is rare in EME, and only a few examples can be found in Orm/Gen & Ex. Grimshaw notices that only the preposition *in* can be stranded in *wh* relatives. Grimshaw's observation seems to apply to the whole ME period with few exceptions. The example (22) is the only exception I find in Chaucer. See (23), where the preposition *of* is stranded in a *wh* relative. *Paston letters* was written in the 15th century. It seems that the English language is approaching the present state.

Notes :

- <sup>1</sup> See Chomsky (1970), (1977), and Chomsky and Lasnik (1977) for further detail.
- <sup>2</sup> Emonds' relativization rule consists of two steps, and the first step is pronominalization (Emonds 1976 : 142). This copying structure may support his analysis.

#### REFERENCES

- Allen, Cynthia. "Movement and Deletion in Old English" *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol.11, No.2 pp. 261-323 1980
- Bresnan, J.W. "Comparative Deletion and Constraints on Transformations" in Grimshaw (ed.) 1975 pp.45-87
- Chomsky, Noam. "Remarks on Nominalization" in Jacobs and Rosenbaum (ed.) 1970 pp.184-221
- Chomsky, Noam. "On Wh-Movement" in Culicover, et al. (ed.) 1977 pp.71-132
- Chomsky, Noam. and H. Lasnik. "Filters and Control" *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol.8, No.3 pp. 425-504

- Culicover, Wasow, and Akmajian. (ed.) *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press 1977
- Emonds, Joseph. *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax*. New York: Academic Press 1976
- Grimshaw, J. (ed.) *Papers in the History and Structure of English*. The University of Massachusetts at Amherst Occasional Papers in Linguistics, No.1 1975
- Grimshaw, J. "Evidence for Relativization by Deletion in Chaucerian Middle English" in J. Grimshaw (ed.) 1975 pp.35-43
- Jacobs and Rosenbaum (ed.) *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*. Waltham, Mass.: Ginn 1970
- Kellner, L. *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*. Tokyo: Kenkyu-sha 1892
- Nakao, Toshio. *History of English II (Middle English)*. Tokyo: Taishukan 1972
- Ross, J.R. Constraints on Variables in Syntax. Indiana University Linguistic Club 1967
- Visser, F. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden: E.J.Brill 1963