

# 中英語関係節の分析に関する諸問題

岸 田 直 子

## Problems on the Analysis of ME Relatives

Naoko Kishida

1. Movement vs. Deletion Analysis of Relatives. In a movement analysis of relatives, relative pronouns are first generated within the relative clause, and later moved into the front position of the clause. 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).

In some cases of relativization, however, there is no evidence that anything has been moved from its original position within the relative clause. See (1) below.

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

These are the kind of relatives which Jespersen calls contact-clauses (Jespersen *MEG* III : 132-3). He even doubts that any relative pronouns have been omitted in these kinds of sentences. In fact, the oldest shape of the relative clause is said to be that of two sentences put together without any outward mark of connection (Kellner 1892 : 54).

Grimshaw (1975) first noted a curious fact concerning the stranded prepositions of relatives in Chaucer. In *wh*-relatives prepositions are always moved together with *wh*pronouns. In *that*-relatives, on the other hand, prepositions are always stranded at the end of the relative clause. See the sentences below.

(2) \*This bok which I make menciou of...

(3) This bok of which I make menciou...

(4) \*This bok of that I make menciou...

(5) This bok that I make menciou of...

Grimshaw proposes a "movement or deletion" analysis of relatives, based on this fact. According to her theory, movement occurs in *wh*-relatives, and deletion occurs in *that*-relatives. Since pied-piping<sup>1</sup>(fronting of prepositions) is applicable to movement rules only, her hypothesis correctly predicts that prepositions can be stranded in *that*-relatives where no movement has occurred (Grimshaw 1975 : 40). If there is no evidence that anything has

been moved from relative clauses, the movement analysis will not be justified.

What theoretical consequence will the difference of analyses entail? See the sentences (6) and (7) below.

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

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

Suppose we adopt the movement analysis. In (6), the NP *a man* is extracted out of a tensed sentence. In (7), the NP *a girl* is extracted out of a tensed sentence with a subject. Chomsky (1977) asserts that the rule of *wh*-movement observes the Propositional-island condition and the Specified subject<sup>2</sup> condition. He has to resort to a very artificial device of COMP to COMP movement in order not to violate PIC and SSC. PIC and SSC do not apply to deletion rules.

The second problem is whether we should admit "deletion over variable." See the sentence below.

(8) The boy Tom thinks everyone hopes you know is honest comes from Germany.

Suppose we adopt the deletion analysis. The subject of the relative clause *is honest* is deleted by the subject of the main clause *the boy* over a variable which includes indefinitely many sentence boundaries. In the movement analysis we can avoid this result by COMP to COMP movement. Chomsky tries to dispense with unbounded transformational processes in order to reduce the category of permissible rules. His subjacency condition is an attempt to prohibit this unbounded process.

Let us examine how *that*-relatives work in Middle English in more detail when they are accompanied by prepositions. Nakao (1972 : 192) says that prepositions can be fronted in *that*-relatives though it is very exceptional. See the sentence below.

(9) Godd off thatt itt wass bigunenn<sup>3</sup>  
(Orm D 87, Nakao 1972 : 193)

See also (10), and (11).

(10) Lo heere youre ende of that I shal devyse.  
(Chaucer, Knight's Tale 1844)

(11) But Resoun coneyveth, of a sight,  
Shame, of that I speak afor.  
(Chaucer, The Romaunt of the Rose 3040-1)

The sentences (10) and (11) are especially interesting because they are taken from Chaucer's works where Grimshaw asserts that prepositions are never fronted in *that*-relatives.

In doing this it is necessary to point out some marginal cases. See the sentences below.

(12) 'Wherof, lat see?'  
'Of that he seyde I shulde be glad to have  
sich lord as he,  
(Chaucer, The Romaunt of the Rose 4660-3)

- (13) Lat se which is the proudeste of hem alle,  
 That wereth on a coverchief or a calle,  
 That dar seye nay of that I shal thee teche.  
 (Chaucer, The Wife of Bath's Tale 1017-9)
- (14) Now have I thee declared al-out,  
 Of that thou were in drede and dout ;  
 (Chaucer, The Romaunt of the Rose 2935-6)

The sentences(12), (13)and(14) all contain the sequence *of that*. But it is not the case that the preposition *of* in these sentences are derived from the embedded sentences. See also the sentences below.

- (15) Swa-summ itt wære off moderr,  
 Thurrh thatt tatt hise thewwess thær  
 Withth spell off Godess lare  
 Don læwedd folc to sen summ del  
 (Orm 3655-8)
- (16) Lucifer thurh that he seh and biheold on him-seolf his ahne feiernesse leap  
 into prude,...  
 (Ancrene Wisse 4-5)

Mossé(1952) says in his glossary that *throughh that* means *because*. If we adopt his interpretation, the preposition *through* in(15)and(16) can be regarded as taking a clause as its object. This analysis is possible with *of* in(12),(13), and(14).

We have demonstrated above that prepositions can be fronted in *that*-relatives in Middle English. Another problem is whether prepositions are always moved forward in *wh*-relatives. Nakao(1972) says that the construction *whom. . .prep* is rare in Early Middle English, and that only a few examples can be found in Orm / Gen & Ex. See the sentences below.

- (17) Out of that place which that I was inne.  
 (Chaucer, F. Sq. 578)
- (18) His lady, certes, and his wyf also,  
 The which that lawe of love acordeth to.  
 (Chaucer, The Franklin's Tale 797-8)
- (19) As of this thinge the whiche ye ben aboute,  
 (Chaucer, LGW. 1612)

Again, it is rare but not impossible in Chaucer that prepositions are stranded in *wh*-relatives. Nakao(1972 : 195) notes that *the which* tends not to be chosen after prepositions.

In view of the facts above, Grimshaw's observation seems to be at most the tendency, and not the absolute truth. As for the movement vs. deletion issue, there is no factual basis on which to settle this issue at present. The overall organization of grammar has much to do with this decision.

2. Movement vs. Interpretation Analysis of Relatives. Chomsky (1977 : 80) says

that in Hebrew there are two processes of relativization, one involving a movement rule and the other involving just interpretation of a base-generated pronoun in the relative clause. The movement rule observes the constraints mentioned in section 1 such as PIC and SSC ; the interpretive rule violates them fairly freely. In section 1 we observed that *that*-relatives in ME show a quite odd behavior; the fronting of prepositions. In this section I suggest that at least some cases of ME relatives might be regarded as interpretive rules.

First, it is obvious that the relative clause construction apparently violates PIC, SSC, and the subjacency condition in the same way as in Modern English. See the sentences below,

- (20) Of whom it nedeth nat for to declare  
(Chaucer, E.Mch. 2437)
- (21) The knyght cam which men wenden had be deed.  
(Chaucer, D.Sum. 2029)

The sentence (20) violates the subjacency, and the sentence (21) violates the subjacency, PIC, and SSC. But as was mentioned above in section 1, a COMP to COMP movement analysis will allow (20) and (21) to be generated without offending the conditions on movement.

ME has a so-called copying structure of relatives, in which pronouns are redundantly left behind after the relativized NP moves leftward. See below.

- (22) ...to a woman whome hee suspected that she hadde falsified hir fayth(OED)  
(1567 Pinter Pal. Pleas. II,92)

Nakao (1972 :198-9) says that this copying structure (that/which--he/his/hire/it/him/their) often occurs in Late ME. See also the sentence below.

- (23) Til that the knyght of which I speke of thus  
(Chaucer, F.Fkl. 807)

In (23), the preposition *of* is left behind.

Chomsky (1973 : 244) says that *wh*-Movement can be applied only once to a constituent of the form S. We cannot, for example, question (or relativize) an item that is within an indirect question to derive (24) from (25).

- (24) \*What did he wonder where John put  
(25) COMP he wondered [sCOMP John put what where]

To derive (24) from (25), we must first place *where* in the COMP position of the embedded sentence. But in that case, *what* cannot enter the COMP position which is filled by *where*, and thus cannot be extracted on the next cycle. See the sentence below.

- (26) That in his gardyn growed swich a tree  
On which he seyde how that his wyves thre  
hanged himself for herte despitus.

(Chaucer, The Wife of Bath's Tale 757-761)

Notice that in (26) *on which* is extracted from the relative clause even though the COMP position of the embedded relative is already filled by *how that*. See also (27) below, which is

taken from Presentday English.

- (27) We encourage whichever pupil it is who is to speak first to say what he was to say...

(A.W.Frisby 1957 : 197)

Notes :

1

See J.R.Ross (1967 : 110) for further detail of the pied piping convention.

2

See Chomsky(1977) for further detail of the various conditions on movement.

3

Spelling is modernized for the printer's convenience.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, Cynthia. "Movement and Deletion in Old English" *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol. II, No.2 pp. 261-323 1980
- Anderson, S.R. & P. Kiparsky. (ed.) *Festschrift for Morris Hale* New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston 1973
- Chomsky, Noam. "Conditions on Transformations" in S.R. Anderson & P. Kiparsky (ed.) 1973 pp. 232-286
- Chomsky, Noam. "On Wh-Movement" in Culicover, Wasow, and Akmajian (ed.) 1977 pp. 71-132
- Culicover, Wasow, and Akmajian. (ed.) *Formal Syntax*. New York : Academic Press 1977
- 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
- Jespersen, Otto. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* Vol.3 London : Allen & Unwin 1961
- Kellner, L. *Historical Outlines of English Syntax* Tokyo : Kenkyu-sha 1892
- Kishida, Naoko. "Some Theoretical Problems of the Relative Clause in Middle English" *Annual Report of the Faculty of Education* Bunkyo University, No.15 1981 pp. 104-8
- Mossé, Fernand. *A Handbook of Middle English* Baltimore, Md. : Johns Hopkins 1952
- Nakao, Toshio. *History of English II (Middle English)* Tokyo : Taishukan 1972