



Non-Personal Whose and the Genitive Equivalents with Of in Shakespeare's Tragedies

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 北海道教育大学 公開日: 2012-11-07 キーワード: 作成者: 水野, 政勝 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.32150/00003972

Non-Personal *Whose* and the Genitive Equivalents with *Of* in Shakespeare's Tragedies*

Masakatsu Mizuno

1. Introduction

According to M. Rydén, "As with *whom*, the use of *whose* as an anaphoric relative dates from the late 12th century" (47). They are objective and genitive (or possessive)¹ forms of *who*, and discussing their use with inanimate antecedents, E. C. Traugott writes:

They [nonnominative forms *whose* and *whom*] are used mainly with animate antecedents until the later sixteenth century when we also find them with inanimate antecedents (usually suggesting personification) (155).

Besides the genitive form *whose*², we also find *of which*³ as a genitive equivalent in English. For the non-personal *of which*, E. Hansen *et al.* note:

of which is a construction that tallies with the development from synthesis to analysis and the two variants have been differentiated functionally so that *of which* is restricted to be used in connection with non-persons, and the main function of *whose* is still to refer to persons... (148-49)

Also, according to A. C. Partridge in his *Tudor to Augustan English*, "*whose* is still much used for things in situations where *of which* would be syntactically clumsy" (161)⁴.

"In the pronouns, the uses of the genitive parallel those of the nouns in most respects" according to C. C. Fries (82). Like the genitive form of nouns, therefore, the notional relation between *whose* and its headword varies greatly.

For the relations that may be expressed by the genitive form of nouns, R. Berndt writes:

The new 'analytic construction with *of*', which occurred more and more frequently later in the Middle English period, could be used for the expression of almost all the relations also expressible by means of the synthetic genitival construction (125)⁵.

He notes relations such as "possessive relationship", "underlying 'subject-verb relation'", and "'verb-object relation'" (125). He also writes that "one of its [the old genitive's]

major uses had been in ‘partitive expressions’” (126). The relations between *whose* (or its equivalents)⁶ and its headword, therefore, may be chiefly of the following kinds: possessive (*abbr.* P), subjective (S), objective (O), and partitive (PT)⁷. Quirk *et al.* also remark, “In many cases there is a regular correspondence between an *of*-phrase and the genitive” (1275–76)⁸.

The aim of this study is, therefore, to investigate how and to what extent the genitival relations (P, O, S, and PT) were expressed by *whose* and the genitive equivalent with *of* (*of which*, etc.) in the Early Modern English period, to observe the development of genitive relative constructions with personal and non-personal antecedents.

The study in this paper is based on an analysis of the genitive relative with non-personal antecedents especially in Shakespeare’s tragedies⁹. We will examine the types of relative constructions listed below (i.e. *whose* and its genitival equivalents with *of*), where an example is shown for each with the kind of genitival relation. The genitive and its headword (sometimes modified by an adjective, etc.) are indicated by italics (italics in the examples are mine). The slash separates verse lines.

Type (I): *Whose* + *headword*

MAC 3. 1. 104, / And I will put that Businesse in your Bosomes, / *Whose execution*
takes your Enemie off, / (Objective relation.)

Type (II a): *Headword* + *of (the) which*

COR 1. 9. 60, Caius Martius / Weares this Warres Garland: in *token of the which*, /
My Noble Steed, knowne to the Campe, I giue him, / (Possessive relation.)

Type (II b): *(The) which ... headword* + *of*

No examples can be found of this type in the material¹⁰.

Type (III): *That ... headword* + *of*

CYM 1. 1. 43, The King ... / Puts him all the Learnings *that* his time / Could
make him *the receiuer of*, (Objective relation.)

Type (IV a): *Headword* + *whereof*

TRO 5. 1. 83, I cannot Lord, I haue important businesse, / *The tide whereof* is now,
goodnight great Hector. (Possessive relation.)

Type (IV b): *Whereof... headword*

OTH 1. 3. 154, That I would all my Pilgrimage dilate, / *Whereof* by parcels she had
something heard, / But not instinctively: (Partitive relation.)

2. Method of Classifying the Relative Constructions

The following sections will consider the incidence of one or the other relative constructions. The discussion of each type of construction will use the method used for examining the non-personal *whose* and its genitive equivalents with *of* in Shakespeare's comedies. Each type of the relative construction is illustrated separately. The discussion will consider (1) various genitival relations (i.e. P, O, S, and PT) between each relative and its headword; (2) the type of non-personal antecedents of each relative, classified as nouns, pronouns (PR), and clauses (CL), here noun antecedents are subclassified into animal nouns 'nouns denoting animals' (AN), geographical names (GN), and other nouns (N); and (3) the functions of the headword in the relative clause: subject (*abbr.* s), object (o), object complement (oc), nominal part of the predicate (np), and object of the preposition (op).

The present paper will not treat the selection of relatives which may also depend on the metre or rhythm of verses. The influence of metre or rhythm is not neglected, especially in dealing with the verses of poets like Shakespeare. Regarding this, however, W. Franz, among others, refers to the use of the relative "*the which*" or "*that*" for rhythmical reasons (1030-32). In this relation A. C. Partridge notes that "From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, prepositional infinitive, with the form-word *to*, provided useful rhythmic alternatives, not now available" (214). This remark has relevance in the matter of selection of relative forms.

3. Type (I)

In the present material there are sixty seven examples of Type (I). The non-personal *whose* is of frequent occurrence with (N) (57 exs.) and less frequently with (GN) (4 exs.) or (AN) (4 exs.). There are two cases of (PR) antecedent. The headword preceded by *whose* may have the function of subject, object, or the object of a preposition in the relative clause. As surveyed in the comedies, it shows a possessive relation in the majority of cases. There are also seven cases of an objective relation, and three of a subjective relation. Partitive *whose*, however, was not found in the material. The headword preceded by *whose* is sometimes expanded by a modifier such as an adjective or a participle, in 21 out of 57 examples with (N), and 2 out of 4 with (GN) antecedents.

3. 1. Possessive Relation (P)

The headword is more often a subject in the clause, but there are also cases where it is an object or where it depends on a preposition.

3. 1. 1. Headword as Subject : (Ps: 41exs.; (N) 36 (AN) 2 (GN) 2 (PR) 1):

(a) (N) antecedents (36 exs.)

- (1) CYM 4. 2. 5. / But Clay and Clay, differs in dignitie, / *Whose dust* is both alike. I am very sicke, /

Other examples: MAC 1. 3. 139, ROM 1. 1. 171, CYM 3. 3. 61, Ib. 3. 4. 34, 35, Ib. 5. 5. 95, 430, OTH 1. 3. 141, TIT 1. 1. 145, Ib. 2. 3. 199, HAM 1. 5. 64, Ib. 3. 2. 21p, 134p, ANT 2. 2. 203, TRO 1. 2. 3, Ib. 2. 2. 82, COR 1. 1. 69, Ib. 5. 3. 145.

Headword expanded by modifiers such as an adjective or a participle (15 exs.):

- (2) HAM 1. 5. 15, / I could a Tale vnfold, *whose lightest word* / Would harrow vp thy soule, freeze thy young blood, /

- (3) LR 4. 1. 73, / There is a Cliffe, *whose high and bending head* / Lookes fearfully in the confined Deepe: /

Further examples: MAC 1. 3. 135, HAM 1. 2. 103, Ib. 2. 1. 100, Ib. 5.1. 248, ANT 3. 13. 5, TRO 1. 3. 43, Ib. 4. 5. 220, TIM 4. 3. 178, 179, 228, 229, 439, Ib. 5. 4. 68.

(b) (AN) antecedents (2 exs.):

- (4) MAC 2. 1. 54, / Alarum'd by his Centinell, the Wolfe, / *Whose howle's* his Watch, thus with his stealthy pace, / ... / Moues like a Ghost.

Similarly: ROM 3. 5. 21.

(c) (GN) antecedents (2 exs.):

- (5) COR 3. 1. 289, / Now the good Gods forbid, / That our renowned Rome, *whose gratitude* / Towards her deserued Children, is enroll'd / In Ioues owne Booke,

Headword modified by an adjective:

- (6) OTH 3. 3. 454, Like to the Ponticke Sea, / *Whose Icie Current, and compulsiue course* , / Neu'r keepes retyring ebbe,

(d) (PR) antecedent (1 ex.):

- (7) CYM 3. 3. 2, / A goodly day, not to keepe house with such, / *Whose Roofe's* as lowe as ours:

3. 1. 2. Headword as Object (Po: 5 exs.; (N) 3 (AN) 2):

There are five examples of this, two of (AN) antecedents.

(a) (N) antecedents (3 exs.):

- (8) CYM 3. 3. 47, the Art o'th'Court, / As hard to leaue, as keepe: / *whose top* to climbe / Is certain falling:

Other examples: TRO 1. 3. 325, TIM 4. 3. 125.

(b) (AN) antecedents (2 exs.):

- (9) COR 3. 3. 120, / You common cry of Curs, *whose breath* I hate, / As reeke a'th'rotten Fennes:

Similarly: COR 3. 3. 121.

3. 1. 3. Headword as Object of a Preposition (Pop: 10 exs.; (N) 9 (GN) 1):

The headword may be an object of a preposition. The preposition precedes the relative group *whose* + *headword* in most cases. In one rare case, however, the preposition is placed after the relative group. As O. Jespersen wrote, "*whose* however is preferable after the preposition *of*: ..." (MEG, III, 129)¹¹. Instances below, illustrate the prepositions used. There are nine examples of (N) antecedent type, five are the cases where the headword is modified by an adjective or a participle. In one instance of a (GN) antecedent, the headword is modified by an adjective.

(a) (N) antecedents (9 exs.):

- (10) *from*: HAM 3. 1. 78, / The vndiscovered Countrey, from *whose Borne* / No Traueller returns, Puzels the will, /

- (11) *on*: LR 2. 4. 34, / Deliuier'd Letters spight of intermission, / Which presently they read; on *whose contents* / They summon'd vp their meiney, straight tooke Horse, / (*whose* Q.; *those* F1)

- (12) *upon*: TIT 2. 3. 200, / What subtile Hole is this, / Whose mouth is couered with Rude growing Briers, / Vpon *whose leaues* are drops of new-shed-blood, / (Similarly: HAM 1. 1. 119.)

The type with the modifiers (5 exs.):

- (13) *between*: TRO 1. 3. 117, / Force should be right, or rather, right and wrong, / (Bet-

weene *whose endlesse iarre*, Iustice recides) / Should loose her names, and so should Iustice too. /

(14) *of*: JC 3. 1. 61, / But I am constant as the Northerne Starre, / *Of whose true fixt, and resting quality*, / There is no fellow in the Firmament. /

(15) *to*: ROM 4. 3. 34, / Shall I not then be stifled in the Vault? / *To whose foule mouth* no healthsome ayre breaths in, / (Similarly: HAM 3. 3. 19.)

The preposition after the relative group:

(16) *in*: TIT 2. 4. 19, / Speake gentle Neece, what sterne vngentle hands, / Hath lopt, and hew'd, and made thy body bare, / Of her two branches, those sweet Ornaments / *Whose circling shadowes*, Kings haue sought to sleepe in / And might not gaine so great a hap-pines /

(b) (GN) antecedent (1 ex.):

(17) *within*: TRO The Prologue 9 (in F1), and their vow is made / *To ransacke Troy*, within *whose strong emures* / The rauish'd Helen, Menelaus Queene, / With wanton Paris sleepes, and that's the Quarrell. /

3. 2. Objective Relation (O)

Whose is occasionally used to express an objective relation¹². *Whose* as "objective genitive" is, according to *OED* (s.v. *whose* 4), "Now rare: commonly replaced by *of whom* or *of which*."¹³ In the material here, the headword more often has the function of subject in the clause. In most cases the headword is what Quirk *et al.* call "a deverbal noun."¹⁴

3. 2. 1. Headword as Subject (Os: 5 exs.; (N) 5):

All the examples are the (N) antecedent type.

(18) MAC 3. 1. 104, / And I will put that Businesse in your Bosomes, / *Whose execution* takes your Enemie off, / (Also quoted in the Introduction.)

Other examples: ROM 5. 1. 51, OTH 4. 1. 105, CYM 3. 1. 56, COR 5. 3. 144.

3. 2. 2. Headword as Object (1 ex.; (N) 1):

One case of the headword as object was found with the (N) antecedent type.

- (19) CYM 3. 1. 55 / Our Ancestor was that Mulmutius, which / Ordain'd our Lawes, *whose*
use the Sword of Caesar / Hath too much mangled;

3. 2. 3. Headword as Object of a Preposition (Oop: 1 ex.; (N) 1):

There was one case of the headword as object of a preposition with the antecedent of (N):

- (20) *in*: TRO 1. 1. 56, O that her Hand / (In *whose comparison* all whites are Inke) /
Writing their owne reproach;

3. 3. Subjective Relation (S)

There were also cases where the non-personal *whose* expresses a subjective relation; the headword as subject (3 exs.) and as the object of a preposition (1 ex.).

3. 3. 1 Headword as Subject (Ss: 3 exs.; (N) 1 (GN) 1 (PR) 1):

(a) (N) antecedent (1 ex.):

- (21) JC 1. 2. 123, / And that same Eye, *whose bend* doth awe the World, / Did loose his
Lustre: I did heare him grone: /

(b) (GN) antecedent (1 ex.):

- (22) TIM 5. 3. 10, / Before proud Athens hee's set downe by this, / *Whose fall* the marke
of his Ambition is. /

(c) (PR) antecedent (1 ex.):

- (23) JC 2. 2. 27, / What can be auoyded / *Whose end* purpos'd by the mighty Gods? /

3. 3. 2. Headword as Object of a Preposition (Sop: 1 ex.; (N) 1):

- (24) TRO 1. 1. 57, O that her Hand / (In whose comparison, all whites are Inke) / Writing
their owne reproach; to *whose soft seizure*, / The Cignets Downe is harsh,

In this example the headword is modified by an adjective.

4. Genitive Equivalents with *Of*

4. 1. Type (II a)

There are no examples of the type where *of which*¹⁵ is used to express a genitival relation. For the group *of which*, H. Poutsma has noted that *of which* "is placed either after or before its headword"¹⁶ (2:1:B, 1005). The former is the usual one. As with *which*, the relative *the which*¹⁷ can be used to express a genitival relation. M. Rydén notes that "*the which* is not infrequently used in *genitival of*-constructions (partitive, possessive, and objective)" (138). In the material *of the which* stands after the headword, which is the object of a preposition. A possessive relation may be seen between *of the which* and the headword. The antecedent type is (N).

- (25) COR 1. 1. 60, Caius Martius / Weares this Warres Garland: in *token of the which*, /
My Noble Steed, knowne to the Campe, I giue him, / (Also quoted in the Introduction.)

In the example above, *of* forms the last element of the phrase 'in token of'. Concerning this type of phrase, C. M. Millward writes:

On the other hand, a number of new preposititons entered the language during the same period [ME and EMnE]. For the most part, these were not entirely new words, but compounds consisting of existing prepositions plus nouns. Some examples of these new phrasal prepositions are *by means of*, *in spite of*, *because of*, *with regard to*, and *in accordance with*. (235)

4. 2. Type (II b)

No examples can be found in the material of the case where the relative *which* stands as the object of the preposition *of* placed at the end of clause¹⁸. As regards the post-position of the preposition *of* in the case of a partitive relation, O. Jespersen wrote, "Partitive *of* is generally placed first" (*MEG*, III, 188).

4. 3. Type (III)

The *genitival of* - construction may also be found with the relative pronoun *that*¹⁹. In the material there is one instance of this type. Unlike *which*, that may be preceded by a preposition, the relative *that* must come first. According to *OED* (s. v. *that* 1), "*That* can be an object of a preposition, which in this case stands at the end of the relative clause (in OE and ME sometimes immediately before the verb)." An objective relation can be found between the post-posed preposition *of* and the headword. The headword functions as an object complement. The antecedent is a noun:

- (26) CYM 1. 1. 43, The King ... / Puts to him all the Learnings *that* his time / Could make him *the receiver of*,

4. 4. Type (IV)

Genitival relations can also be expressed by the relative use of the compound *where-* + the preposition *of*. E. Traugott finds that "Expressions of this type [the form *where-* + *Preposition*] are particularly common in the sixteenth century" (155). Also, according to B. M. H. Strang, "During the 18 c (as earlier) the non-human term had compound formations, *whereof*, *whereby*, etc. which, though still known, are no longer in daily use" (144). In the material, type (IV) is found rather frequently, though less than type (I). It is used to express most of the genitival relations (P, O, and PT). No examples were found of a subjective relation. In two cases the headword is expanded by its modifiers (an adjective and a participle). The headword may be a subject, an object, a nominal part of the predicate, or it may be dependent on a preposition (only with post-position of the relative, i.e. the type (IV a)). Type (IV b) seems to be the rule when the headword functions as the nominal part of the predicate.

4. 4. 1. Possessive Relation (P)

The headword functions as a subject, a nominal part of the predicate, or a prepositional object. The relative *whereof* in this relation has (N), (AN), and (CL) as its antecedent.

4. 4. 1. 1. Headword as Subject (Ps: 2 exs.; (N) 1 (CL) 1):

There are two cases where the headword functions as a subject. The relative stands after its headword (the type (IV a)).

(a) (N) antecedent (1 ex.):

- (27) TRO 5. 1. 83, / I cannot Lord, I haue important busnesse, / *The tide whereof* is now, goodnight great Hector. / (Quoted in the Introduction.)

(b) (CL) antecedent (1 ex.):

- (28) TRO 1. 2. 35p, They say he yesterday cop'd Hector in the bat-tell and stroke him downe, *the disdain & shame where-of* hath euer since kept Hector fasting and waking. (*disdaine* Q.; *disdaind* F1)

4. 4. 1. 2. Headword as Nominal Predicate (Pnp: 2 exs.; (N) 2):

There are two examples of the relative *whereof* with its headword functioning as a nominal part of the predicate. The relative is placed first (the type (IV b)) in both examples. The antecedent is a noun.

- (29) HAM 1. 3. 24, / And therefore must his choyce be circumscrib'd / Vnto the voyce and yeelding of that Body, / *Whereof* he is *the head*. Then if he sayes he loues you, / (Similarly: LR 3. 1. 28.)

4. 4. 1. 3. Headword as Object of a Preposition (Pop: 3 exs.; (N) 1 (CL) 2):

When the headword is the object of a preposition, the relative *whereof* is in the postposition (i.e. the type (IV a)). This is also the case with the corresponding relative group *of the which* postmodifying the prepositional object. There are three instances of type (IV a) with the headword as prepositional object.

(a) (N) antecedent (1 ex.):

- (30) *from*: LR 4. 6. 267p, If hee returne the Conqueror, then am I the Prisoner, and his bed, my Gaole, *from the loathed warmth whereof*, deliuer me, and sup - ply the place for your Labour. (The headword is modified by a participle.)

(b) (CL) antecedents (2 exs.):

- (31) *by*: JC 1. 2. 49, / Then Brutus, I haue much mistook your passion, / *By meanes whereof*, this Brest of mine hath buried / Thoughts of great value, worthy Cogitations. /
- (32) *in*: HAM 1. 2. 124, / This gentle and vnforc'd accord of Hamlet / Sits smiling to my heart; *in grace whereof*, / No iocond health that Denmarke drinks to day, / But the great Cannon to the Clouds shall tell, /

4. 4. 2. Objective Relation (O)

Whereof seems to commonly indicate an objective relation with (N) or (CL) antecedents.

4. 4. 2. 1. Headword as Subject (Os: 3 exs.; (N) 1 (CL) 2):

There are three examples. The antecedent is a noun in one case, and a clause in the other two with type (IV a) among these.

(a) (N) antecedent (1 ex.):

- ③③ TIM 4. 3. 92, / I haue but little Gold of late, braue Timon, / *The want whereof*, doth dayly make reuolt / In my penurious Band.

(b) (CL) antecedents (2 exs.):

- ③④ CYM 3. 4. 22p, Thy Mistris (Pisanio) hath plaide the Strumpet in my Bed: *the Testimonies whereof*, lyes bleeding in me.

- ③⑤ OTH 2. 1. 296, For that I do suspect the lustie Moore / Hath leap'd into my Seate. *The thought whereof*, / Doth (like a poysounous Minerall) gnaw my Inwardes :

4. 4. 2. 2. Headword as Object (Oo : 2 exs.; (N) 1 (CL) 1):

There are two examples. The antecedent as noun in one and as a clause in the other. Type (IV b) occurs in the former of these two.

(a) (N) antecedent (1 ex.):

- ③⑥ TRO 1. 3. 14, / Sith eury action that hath gone before, / *Whereof* we haue *Record*, Triall did draw, / Bias and thwart, not answering the ayme: /

(b) (CL) antecedent (1 ex.):

- ③⑦ CYM 3. 5. 37, Since the exile of Posthumus, most retyr'd / Hath her life bin: *the Cure whereof*, my Lord, / 'Tis time must do.

4. 4. 2. 3. Headword as Object of a Preposition (Oop : 3 exs.; (N) 1 (CL) 2):

Type (IV a) is used with the headword as a prepositional object.

(a) (N) antecedent (1 ex.):

- ③⑧ *in*: TRO 4. 5. 84, / And that which looks like pride, is curtesie: / This Ajax is halfe made of Hectors bloud; / *In loue wherof*, halfe Hector staies at home: / Halfe heart, halfe hand, halfe Hector, comes to seeke / This blended Knight,

(b) (CL) antecedents (2 exs.):

(39) *for*: CYM 3. 1. 29, and his Shipping / (Poore ignorant Baubles) on our terrible Seas / Like Egge-shels mou'd vpon their Surges, crack'd / As easily 'gainst our Rockes. For *ioy whereof*, / The fam'd Cassibulan, who was once at point / ... / Made Luds-Towne with reioycing-Fires bright,

(40) *in*: TRO 3. 2. 58p, Words pay no debts; giue her deedes: but sheele bereaue you 'oth' deeds too, if shee call your actiuity in question: what billing againe? here'e in *witnesse where-of* the Parties interchangeably.

4. 4. 3. Partitive Relation (PT)

There are three instances of *whereof* to indicate a partitive relation in the material. The antecedent is (N) or (AN). The headword in this relation functions as an object and a nominal part of the predicate.

4. 4. 3. 1. Headword as Object (PT_o: 2 exs.; (N) 1 (AN) 1):

There are two instances of this. *Whereof* precedes the headword (type (IV b)).

(a) (N) antecedent (1 ex.):

(41) OTH 1. 3. 154, That I would all my Pilgrimage dilate, / *Whereof* by parcels she had *something* heard, / But not instinctiuelly:

(b) (AN) antecedent (1 ex.):

(42) COR 1. 9. 32, of all the Horses, / *Whereof* we haue ta'ne *good*, and *good store* of all, / The Treasure in this field atchieued, and Citie, / We render you the Tenth,

4. 4. 3. 2. Headword as Nominal Predicate (PT_{np}: 1 ex.; (N) 1):

There is one example here. *Whereof* precedes the headword (type (IV b)).

(43) OTH 1. 3. 331p, But we haue Reason to coole our raging Motions, our carnall Stings, or vnbitted Lusts: *whereof* I take this, that you call Loue, to be a *sect*, or *Seyen*.

5. Summary

We surveyed the use of *whose* and its genitive equivalents with *of* with non-personal antecedents especially in Shakespeare's tragedies. On the whole the former construction seems to be preferred²⁰, but there are some differences in the use. The distribution of types from (I) to (IV b) are shown in the following tables according to genitival rela-

Non-Personal *Whose* and the Genitive Equivalents with *Of*

tions (possessive, objective, etc.) and the functions of the headword (subject, object, etc.) with the kind of antecedents: (a) nouns, (b) clauses, and (c) pronouns.

(a) Noun Antecedents :

Table 1

	P				O				S				PT				TOT	
	s	o	np	op	s	o	np	op	s	o	np	op	s	o	np	op		
I	21	3		4	5	1		1	1									65
	⑮		0	⑤			0			0	0	①	0	0	0	0		
	(2)	(2)							{1}									
	{1}																	
	{①}			{①}														
IIa	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
III	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
IVa	0	0	0	①	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
IVb	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	7
														①				

- N. B. 1. Numbers in () show cases of (AN) and in { } (GN) antecedents.
 2. The circled numbers indicate cases where the headword has a modifier, e. g. adjective or participle.
 3. The number in < > shows a headword functioning as an object complement.
 4. The percentage of (I) to the total (I-IV) is about 84%.

Table 1 shows some general trends :

(Possessive relation)

- 1) Type (I) is most often used in this relation, type (IV) is sometimes used. There is one rare case of the group *of the which* (the type (IIa)) in the material.
- 2) There are various functions of the headword in Type (I), as it can be a subject, an object, or a prepositional object. The headword in Type (IV) also has various functions (i. e. subject, nominal predicate, and prepositional object). When it becomes the nominal predicate, *whereof* always has a front position (the type (IVb)).
- 3) Types (I) and (IVa) include examples of the headword with modifier (e.g. adjectives).

(Objective relation)

The relative *whose* (I) and the genitive equivalent with *of* (III and IV) occur in an

objective relation in the material. There are, however, variations in their frequencies and distributions. The headword in type (I) most often functions as subject. The rather frequent occurrence of Type (I) must be especially noted considering that such use is now rare.

(Subjective relation)

There are three examples of type (I) in a subjective relation. The headword functions as a subject and prepositional object.

(Partitive relation)

In this relation, only the genitive equivalent with *of* (the type (IVb)) is used. The type (IVb) occurs with the headword functioning as a nominal predicate. There are no examples in the present material of type (I) in a partitive relation.

(b) Clause Antecedents :

Table 2

	P				O				TOT
	s	o	np	op	s	o	np	op	
IVa	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	2	8

Table 2 shows the distribution of *whereof* according to genitival relation and function of the headword in the clause. There are no examples of other types (I to III) in the material²¹. From Table 2 we can detect that *whereof* is in all cases in the post-position (headword subject, object, or prepositional object). *Whereof* seems to be very common with a clause antecedent, especially in the prepositional expressions such as 'by means of' (a possessive relation) and 'in witness of' (an objective relation).

(c) Pronoun Antecedents :

There are two cases of the pronoun antecedent in type (I). Because of the few examples, we are not able to say anything definite about this antecedent, and further examination will be required.

(Assistant Professor, Sapporo Campus, Hokkaido University of Education)

NOTES

*As the second attempt to investigate the use of the genitive relative constructions

in Shakespeare's plays, I have taken up the non-personal *whose* and its genitive equivalents with *of* in Shakespeare's tragedies.

1. The name *genitive* (from Latin *genitivus*, *pertaining to generation or birth*) is used for this form, since many other functions (i. e. subjective, objective, etc.) are indicated by the genitive form. *Possessive*, however, is the usual term for this form, because possession is signalled in many cases. Cf. M. Celce-Murcia (1983: 125).
2. O. Jespersen wrote of the use of the interrogative genitive *whose*, that "While the interrogative genitive *whose* is never used of things, the relative *whose* may be used to avoid the postponed *of which*" (*Essentials*, 196).
3. *Whose* can not always be substituted for *of which*. See below:
 - (i) *The poem *whose* I am speaking ... [ungrammatical]
 - (ii) The poem *of which* I am speaking ...
(quoted from Quirk *et al.*, 367).
4. A. C. Partridge writes about the relation with French that "The use of the substitute genitive with *of* was suggested in the twelfth century by the parallel construction in French with *de*; it formed part of general transition from the synthetic to the analytic nature of the language" (78).
5. Concerning the *of*-construction, E. C. Traugott states that "In OE *of* was used mainly to signal "out of, originating from", or part-to-whole relationship" (128).
6. This does not systematically investigate cases where a noun in the genitive form is used for inanimate objects besides the genitive equivalent with *of*, but the following comment by R. W. Pence in *A Grammar of Present-day English* should be noted:

The possessive *whose* is used much oftener than a corresponding noun in the possessive case for inanimate objects. Thus we say "The door whose lock is broken" rather than "the door the lock of which is broken". But we say "The lock of the door is broken" rather than "The door's lock is broken." (226)
- For linguistic conservatives, R. Burchfield writes, "In practice linguistic conservatives tend to restrict the apostrophe to names of persons only (*the edge of the water*, not *the water's edge*) but wide variation is permissible" (184).
7. H. Poutsma noted, "the divisions of the different kinds of genitive cannot always be marked off with precision" (2: 1: A, 41).
8. They illustrate examples such as (iii) and (iv):
 - (iii) The ship's funnel is red. [genitive construction]
 - (iv) The funnel of the ship is red. [*of*-construction]
9. Unless otherwise indicated, citations are from C. Hinman (ed.), *The First Folio of Shakespeare*. Original italics are removed; italics in citations are mine, placed to call attention to particular forms. The act-scene-line numbers, unless otherwise stated, are from *The Riverside Shakespeare* edited by G. B. Evans. The abbreviations used for the twelve plays (excluding *Pericles*, which was not included in the First Folio) are from M. Spevack (ed.), *The Harvard Concordance to Shakespeare*. The letter (p) after a line-

- reference denotes a prose context (the simple reference, a verse context).
10. Cf. my paper "Non - Personal *Whose* and the Genitive Equivalents with *Of* in Shakespeare's Comedies" (*The English Literature in Hokkaido* No. 37.)
 11. Cf. also K. Brunner (1960-62 : 527-8).
 12. G. O. Curme remarks that "The prepositional genitive [e. g., *of which*] is the rule in this category [i. e., objective relation], but, ... the old simple genitive still lingers on" (82).
 13. The earliest example in *OED* (s. v. *whose* 4) is dated 1382 (Wyclif).
 14. Cf. Quirk *et al.*, 1278.
 15. According to J. M. Grainger, there is no example of the relative *of which* denoting a possessive relation in the King James Version [1611] (cf. Grainger, 32).
 16. The earliest example in *OED* (s. v. *which* 7) is dated 1423 (JAS. I *Kingis* Q. iii, A boke.. Off quhich the name Is clepit.. Boece.)
 17. The relative *the which* has almost the same grammatical function as *which* (cf. *OED* (s. v. *which* 13)). Concerning the attributive use of *the which*, E. A. Abbott wrote that "The above repetition [repetition of the antecedent] is, perhaps, more common with definite "the which": " (184). Cf. also K. Araki, *Theoretical and Practical Studies in English Grammar* (1966 : 44).
 18. R. D. Huddleston writes on the function of the headword in the type (II b) that, "In no register is type (c) [the case where the relative (*which*, etc.) stands as the object of the preposition *of* placed at the end of clause] allowable if the NP [i. e. headword] dominating the relativized NP is subject of the clause" (225). He also illustrates the following case :
 (v) *the Pope, who a biography of is appearing next year, ... [ungrammatical]
 The headword found in the material has the function of object complement. The case we found in Shakespeare's comedies functions as a direct object (cf. Mizuno, *op. cit.*, sect. 4. 2).
 19. The relative pronoun *that* cannot be used in the genitive form. It is historically interesting to note L. M. Myers's remark that "the habit of using *that* for all genders now seems convenient, but the disappearance of a genitive form for *that* is a real loss" (51).
 20. The percentage of the genitive *whose* to the total relative forms (I - IV) with noun antecedents is about 84% in the present material. The percentage of *whose* to the total relative forms (I to IV) in Shakespeare's comedies is about 81% (cf. Mizuno, *op. cit.*, sect. 5).
 21. One rare case of type (II b) is found with a clause antecedent in Shakespeare's comedies (cf. *Ib.* sect. 4. 2).

REFERENCES

Abbott, E. A. 1929. *A Shakespearian Grammar*. London: Macmillan; Tokyo: Senjo.

- Araki, K. 1966. *Theoretical and Practical Studies in English Grammar*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Berndt, R. 1989. *A History of the English Language*. Leipzig: verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Brunner, K. 1960-62. *Eigo Hattatsu - shi*. Trans. T. Matsunami et al. 1973. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Burchfield, R. 1987. *The English Language*. Oxford: Oxford U. P.
- Celce-Murcia, M. 1983. *The Grammar Book*. London: Newbury House.
- Curme, G. O. 1931. *Syntax*. Maruzen Asian Edition. Tokyo: Maruzen.
- The First Folio of Shakespeare [1623]: The Norton Facsimile*. 1968. Ed. C. J. K. Hinman. New York: Norton.
- Franz, W. 1939. *Shakespeare no Eigo : Shi to Sanbun*. Trans. S. Saito et al. 1968. Tokyo: Shinozaki Shorin.
- Fries, C. C. 1940. *American English Grammar*. Maruzen Asian Edition. Tokyo: Maruzen.
- Grainger, J. M. 1907. *The King James Version no Koubun*. Trans. M. Shimizu. 1977. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Hansen, E. et al. 1986. *Irregularities in Modern English*. Odense: Odense University Press.
- The Harvard Concordance to Shakespeare*. 1973. Ed. M. Spevack. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Huddleston, R. D. 1971. *The Sentence in Written English: A Syntactic Study Based on an Analysis of Scientific Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P.
- Jespersen, O. 1949. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles [MEG]*. 7 vols. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Jespersen, O. 1979. *Essentials of English Grammar [Essentials]* London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Millward, C. M. 1989. *A Biography of the English Language*. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Mizuno, M. 1992. "Non-Personal *Whose* and the Genitive Equivalents with *Of* in Shakespeare's Comedies," *The English Literature in Hokkaido*. 37. 107-120.
- Myers, L. M. et al. 1979. *The Roots of Modern English*. Ed. with notes by H. Iwasaki. 1985. Tokyo: Kinseido.
- The Riverside Shakespeare*. 1974. Ed. G. B. Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- The Oxford English Dictionary [OED]*. 1933. Ed. J. A. H. Murray et al. 13 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Partridge, A. C. 1969. *Tudor to Augustan English*. London: André Deutsch.
- Pence, R. W. 1953. *A Grammar of Present-day English*. New York: Macmillan.
- Poutsma, H. 1914-29. *A Grammar of Late Modern English*. 5 vols. Groningen: P. Noordhoff.
- Quirk, R. et al. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

- Rydén, M. 1966. *Relative Constructions in Early Sixteenth Century English with Special Reference to Sir Thomas Elyot*. Uppsala: University of Uppsala.
- Strang, B. M. H. 1979. *A History of English*. London: Methuen.
- Traugott, E. C. 1972. *A History of English Syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- The Works of Shakespeare: The Text of the First Folio with Quarto Variants and a Selection of Modern Readings*. 1929. Ed. H. Folger. 7 vols. (The Nonesuch Press.) New York: Random House.