



On Infinitival Relative Clauses Containing Prepositions : Centering on the Works of Elizabethan Writers Other than Shakespeare

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 公開日: 2009-03-28 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 水野, 政勝 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.32150/00005797

On Infinitival Relative Clauses Containing Prepositions:

Centering on the Works of Elizabethan Writers Other than Shakespeare

MIZUNO Masakatsu

Department of English, Sapporo Campus, Hokkaido University of Education, 002-8501

前置詞を含む不定詞関係詞節について

— シェイクスピアを除く若干のエリザベス朝作家の作品を中心に —

水野政勝

北海道教育大学札幌校英語学研究室

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the works of a number of Elizabethan writers other than Shakespeare with the aim of classifying and describing the following forms of infinitival relative clause containing a preposition (hereafter, IRCCP): (I) Antecedents: preposition + relative word + *to*-infinitival (*in which to*, etc.), (II) Antecedents: *to*-infinitival...preposition (*to...in*, etc.), and (III) Antecedents: *where*-compound + *to*-infinitival (*wherein to...*, etc.). The types of preposition considered are divided into two: (A) prepositional objects, and (B) adverbial adjuncts, such as time, place, or means (process). The following syntactic points are considered: (1) antecedent types (nouns or pronouns), (2) whether the antecedent noun is modified by an adjective, (3) whether the *for*-noun phrase (NP) is used with a *to*-infinitival (to express an overt subject) and (4) syntactic functions (such as S, O, SC, OC, PO, NS) of antecedents in the main clause. We argue that among the three forms, Form II is the most common, whereas Form I seems to have been avoided in Elizabethan times. The most common syntactic function of antecedents in the main clause is O (object) in both A (prepositional objects) and B (adverbials), especially in the case of Form II without a *for*-subject, which is exclusively restricted to Form II. The stylistic difference of Deloney's novels was taken into consideration between DIS and NAR, but this study found no noteworthy difference between them.

1. Introduction

In present-day English (PE), infinitival clauses as postmodifiers in noun phrases allow correspond-

ence with relative clauses where the relative pronoun can be an object of a preposition.

In (1) and (2), we can see a correspondence with finite relative clauses (3) and (4).

- (1) (PE) the place [on which to sit]
- (2) (PE) a refrigerator [in which to put beer]
- (3) (PE) the place [on which we should sit]
- (4) (PE) a refrigerator [in which we put beer]

Bound relatives¹ of a further kind are based on infinitival relative structures rather than finite structures. Two of these types are shown in (5) and (6).

- (5) (PE) the place [for us to sit on]
- (6) (PE) a refrigerator [to put beer in]

The relative in (5) is based on a full infinitival clause with a *for*-subject; that in (6) is built on an infinitival clause that consists of an infinitival phrase alone.

In contrast with the above construction (5), (1) and (2) are impossible with a full infinitival clause.²

- (7) (PE)*a bench [on which for Jerry to sit]
- (8) (PE)*a refrigerator [in which for you to put beer]

Here we can see an ungrammaticality in (7) and (8) stemming from the two different subordinators in a single clause.³

The type of expression given in (9) and (10) is also improper, since the preposition cannot be deferred⁴ with a *wh*-relativizer in the infinitival clauses as shown below:

- (9) (PE) the place **which to stay at*
- (10) (PE) the way **which to do it in*

From the above argument, we can conclude that in PE, as far as infinitival relative constructions containing a preposition (IRCP) are concerned, the two possible types are cases such as (1) and (2) with an overt relativizer preceded by a preposition (*on which*, etc.), and cases such as (5) and (6) with a post-posed preposition after the *to*-infinitive (ignoring more or less archaic relative *where*-compounds⁵ such as *wherein*).

The aim of this paper is to investigate what forms are possible as variants in prepositional relative clauses with infinitives, drawing examples from the works of a number of Elizabethan writers other than Shakespeare.⁶

2. History of Infinitival Relative Clauses with a Preposition

First of all, let us survey the history of the types of infinitival clause discussed above. How have infinitival relative clauses, especially those containing a preposition, developed into PE usage?

Historically, in Middle English (ME), a new type of expression appeared, as shown in (11):

- (11) She has no wight to whom to make hir mone. ‘She has no one to whom she can complain.’ (late ME Chaucer (*Man of Law* 656), qtd. in Fischer 2000: 94)

Although this type appeared in the late ME period, no examples from before the fourteenth century are evident. According to Fischer, this new construction presumably developed from questioned infinitives, which made their first significant appearance earlier in ME. This type is found with examples of

bare infinitives as in (12) :

- (12) And nuste hwet seggen. ‘and did not know what to say.’ (Early ME (*St. Kath. (1)* (Bod) 563), qtd. in Fischer 2000: 94–95)

The construction shown in (11) was new in ME, as it consisted of an infinitival clause with a *wh*-form. However, in Old English (OE), it was not possible to use a relative pronoun in this place.⁷ That is, the *to*-infinitive was used by itself, as in the following:

- (13) Gif *ðær ðonne sie gierd mid to ðreageanne, si ðær eac stæf mid to wreðianne* ‘whether there be a rod to strike with, be there also a staff to support’ (OE (*CP* 17. 127. 1), qtd. Fischer 2000: 66)

Here we must note that OE had only preposed prepositions without an overt pronoun (cf. Geisler 1995: 22). On the other hand, types with a preposition in the clause-final position are first found in early ME, as in the following:

- (14) Me lihtede candles to æten *bi* ‘they lit candles to eat by’ (Early ME (*Peterborough Chronicle*), f. 94–95^v (Mitchell 1985: 390), qtd. in Geisler 1995: 22–23)

In the course of ME, many modern features developed; these included passive infinitives early in the period, *for*-subjects, the perfective infinitive, and overt *wh*-elements in the clause initial position, as in (11). An example of a relative infinitive with a *for*-subject is illustrated in (15).

- (15) She was a prymerole, *a piggesnye / For any lord to leggen in his bedde / Or yet for any good yeman to wedde.* (*The Miller’s Tale* 3268 (Kenyon 1909: 27), qtd. Geisler 1995: 24)

By using the chart of Kjellmer (1988: 564), we can survey the occurrence of infinitival relative clause types with prepositions graphically, as shown in Figure 1 (although this is a little simplistic, as he notes). The period of New English (which in this regard is probably the same as that for Early Modern English), saw the appearance of three possible types of IRCCP. Here, it must be noted that when the *a celer in at ete* type disappeared, i.e., the type with an initial or medial preposition and a deleted pronoun, a substitute arose, apparently at about the same time (cf. Kjellmer 1988: 563–64). However, the final-prepositional type, such as (14), has remained from throughout the ME period to the present day (cf. *op. cit.* 563).

Figure 1 Occurrence of Infinitival Relative Clause Types with Prepositions

	<i>Old English</i>	<i>Middle English</i>	<i>New English</i>
Initial / medial prep.: no <i>for</i> -subject (a celer in at [=‘to’] ete) (no wight to whom to make hier mone)	_____		_____
Medial prep.: <i>for</i> -subject (mansions for lordis yn to reste)		_____	
Final prep.: no <i>for</i> -subject (candles to æten bi)		_____	
Final prep.: <i>for</i> -subject (a hors for poul to ride on)		_____	

3. Data and method of classifying infinitival constructions

The works examined to find infinitival relative clauses with a preposition are the following:

Authors

(Dramas)

- C. Marlowe⁸, *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus (F)*
 _____, *The Jew of Malta (J)*
 _____, *The First Part of Tamburlaine the Great (T1)*
 _____, *The Second Part of Tamburlaine the Great (T2)*
 _____, *Edward the Second (E)*
 _____, *The Tragedy of Dido, Queen of Carthage (D)*
 _____, *The Massacre at Paris (M)*
 T. Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy (ST)*⁹
 G. Peele, *The Old Wives' Tale (OWT)*¹⁰
 R. Greene, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay (FB)*¹¹
 T. Dekker, *The Shoemakers' Holiday (SH)*¹²
 Anonymous, *Arden of Feversham (AF)*¹³

(Novels)¹⁴

- T. Deloney,¹⁵ *Iacke of Newberie (JN)*
 _____, *Thomas of Reading (TR)*
 _____, *The Gentle Craft (The First Part) (GCI)*
 _____, *The Gentle Craft (The Second Part) (GC2)*

This study is based on an analysis of infinitival relative clauses where the relativized NP (noun phrase) is an object of a preposition, particularly with non-personal antecedents¹⁶ such as those denoting place, means or manner, and time. In this paper, infinitival relative constructions (such as (1) and (2)), and their equivalent expressions (such as (5) and (6)) are classified as follows:

Form I : Antecedent ... preposition + *which* ... *to* + VP (verb phrase) E.g. (1), (2)

Form II : Noun (or antecedent) ... (*for* + NP) *to* + VP ... preposition E.g. (5), (6)

Form III : Antecedent ... *where*-compound (*wherewith*, etc.) ... *to* + VP E.g. (69)

Infinitival relative clauses with a *where*-compound (Form III) are also dealt with here, although they are said to be rather rare in PE (cf. Geisler 1995: 47ff). According to Traugott (1972: 155), *where*-compounds were particularly common in the sixteenth century. Particularly, Rydén states that there is an alternation of Form III with non-relative constructions [i.e., Form II in our paper]. Concerning relative pronouns in general, Görlach (1991: 124) states:

“The most frequent EmodE relative pronouns were: (*the*) *which*, *that*, *who(m)* and zero [i.e. contact clause]; rarer alternatives: *as* (almost exclusively after *such*); *but* (following negation, ...); and—in avoidance of clumsy combinations of preposition + *which*,¹⁷ or post-posed prepositions—*where*-combinations [i.e. *where*-compounds]”.

For this reason, in addition to Forms I and II (as illustrated in Figure 1), Form III is also surveyed in our analysis of infinitival relative clauses with a preposition (IRCCP). In treating such relative clauses,¹⁸ the following semantic and syntactic points were considered (with a representative example in each case) :

i) Type of antecedent: noun (N) or pronoun (PR)

(Noun antecedent)

(16) (*GCI* 87.19–20 (DIS)) nothing is left but onely *my bones to pleasure you withal*;

In (16), the noun antecedent of the infinitival relative clause is *my bones*.

(Pronoun antecedent)

(17) (*GCI* 113.24–26 (DIS)) And, I promise you, to pay a thousand pounds a week is a pretty round payment, and, I may say to you, not *much to be misliked of*.

In (17), the indefinite pronoun *much* is used.

ii) Whether the preposition *for* is used to express the subject of the infinitival clause.¹⁹ (However, this construction is exclusively concerned with Form II for the reasons considered above in (1) Introduction.) In (18), the *for*-subject is to express the notional subject of the verb *to march*.

(18) (*TI* 3.3.145–147) Thou know'st not, foolish hardy Tamburlaine, What 'tis to meet me in the open field, That leave *no ground for thee to march upon*.

iii) Whether an antecedent noun may be used with a preceding adjective or with an adjective used predicatively²⁰

(Adjective precedent)

(19) (*AF* 9.114) I have *divers matters to talk with you about*.

In (19), the adjective *diverse* modifies the noun antecedent *matters*.

iv) The functional dimension, which is important in explaining the relative clause, is defined as subject (S), object (O), subjective complement (SC), objective complement (OC) and prepositional object (PO) in the main clause: in (20) below, the italicized structure is a relative complex (i.e., a noun phrase consisting of an antecedent and its infinitival post-modifier)²¹ headed by the noun *ten pound*; the relative complex functions as a subject in the main clause. In (21), the antecedent noun *honey* with a relative complex functions as an object; in (22), the antecedent *fair marks*²² with a relative complex functions as a subject complement; in (23), the antecedent *a dreadful thing* functions as an object complement; and in (24), the antecedent *that privilege* with a relative complex functions as an object of the preposition *by*.

(20) (*AF* 1.523) And here's *ten pound to wager them withal*; (S)

(21) (*D* 4.2.54) For I have *honey to present thee with*. (O)

(22) (*JN*: 7.44–45 (DIS)) Womens beauties are *fayre markes for wandring eyes to shoote at*: (SC)

(23) (*AF* 4.68–72) That grim-fac'd fellow, pitiless Black Will, And Shakebag, [...] have sworn my death, if I infringe my vow, *a dreadful thing to be consider'd of*. (OC)

(24) (*MP* 121) And by *that privilege to work upon*, (PO)

(25) (*MP* 1122–1123) Sweet Duke of Guise, *our prop to lean upon*, now thou art dead, here is no stay for us. (NS)

In the last example (25), the relative complex *our prop to lean upon* has no function in the main clause, but instead forms an incomplete clause or sentence fragment. This type is termed a ‘non-sentence’ (NS) (cf. Geisler 1995: 66). Relative complexes as sentence fragments are uncommon in the present material.

v) The syntactic functions of the relative pronoun (e.g., *with which*) or corresponding *where*-compound (e.g., *wherewith*) in the relative clause are defined as (A) prepositional objects and (B) adverbials as adjuncts (*adverbials* for short). This analysis may also be applied to the infinitival relative of Form II, i.e., the type where the preposition comes after the infinitive.

For type A, we further subcategorize the cases into subtypes (A-1) and (A-2).²³ A representative example in each case is shown as:

(26) (*E* 811) You have *matters* of more weight *to think upon*; (A-1)

(27) (*SH* 2.3.58–59) I pray God I may be turned to a Turk, and set in Finsbury for boys *to shoot at*. (A-1)

(28) (*D* 4.2.54) For I have *honey* *to present thee with*, (A-2)

For the subclassification of type B, we will adopt Jackson’s (1990: 46–71) classification of circumstantial meanings expressed by the prepositional relative pronoun (or corresponding *where*-compound) and its equivalent expression (Form II) as adverbials by noting several relations roughly as TEMPORAL (B-TEM), LOCATIVE (B-LOC), and PROCESS (B-PRC) (the classification here is slightly modified). Adverbial infinitival relatives have an antecedent that functions as an adverbial in the infinitival clause: in (29), the antecedent *no other time* functions as a temporal adverbial in the infinitive; in (30) and (31), the noun antecedents *many heavens* and *no ground* function as locative adverbials; and in (32), the antecedent *a good stock* functions as a process adverbial (denoting *means*):

(29) (*AF* 10.75–76) Have you *no other time to brabble* [i.e., quarrel about trifles]²⁴ *in* But now when serious matters are in hand? (B-TEM)

(30) (*ST* 4.180–181) Had I as many lives as there be stars, as *many heavens to go to*, as thou lives. (B-LOC)

(31) (=18) (*TI* 3.3.145–147) Thou know’st not, foolish hardy Tamburlaine, What ‘tis to meet me in the open field, That leave *no ground for thee to march upon*. (B-LOC)

(32) (*GCI* 131.28 (NAR)) Giuing them *a good stock to begin the world withall*; (B-PRC)

4. Antecedent types according to the kind of relative clause

Below, we discuss each form according to antecedent types. In the examples given, the functions of the antecedent in the main clause are indicated first, and a division is made between prepositional objects (A-1 or A-2) and types of adverbial in the infinitival clause (B-TEM, -LOC, and -PRC). For example:

(33) (*JN*: 7.44–45 (DIS)) Womens beauties are *fayre markes for wandring eyes to shoote at*: (SC) (A-1)

4.1 Nouns (34 exs.)

4.1.1 Form I (No ex.)

With noun antecedents, no example of Form I was found in the materials examined. This form seems to have been avoided, at least in infinitival relative constructions where the relative *which* is used as the object of a preposition. Here, Görlach's remarks (1991: 124) are to be noted. Rather than infinitival relative constructions, cases of fully expressed finite relative clauses are usually found. For comparative purposes, examples of such cases are quoted below.

(34) Cf. (*D* 2.1.263–264) So, leaning on his sword, he stood stone still, Viewing *the fire wherewith rich Ilion burnt*.

(35) Cf. (*F* 230–232) Nay, then, I fear he has fallen into *that damned art for which* they two are infamous through the world. (Here the antecedent *that damned art* functions as a prepositional complement of the adjective *infamous*. In my material, such types with infinitival relatives are not found. Note, however, the interesting examples given by Geisler (1995: 34) : *a thing to be thankful for, nothing for you to be anxious about, a thing of which to be proud*.)

4.1.2 Form II (33 exs.)

This form can be introduced by the preposition *for* expressing the subject of an infinitive. Without such a subject, the notional subject of the infinitive can be understood according to the context, or the reference is general or indefinite.

4.1.2.1 The infinitive with *to* preceded by its subject with *for* (4 exs.)

(O: 1 ex.; B-LOC (1 ex.) ; PO: 1 ex.; A-1 (1) ; SC: 1 ex.; A-1 (1) ; NS: 1 ex.; A-1 (1))

The type expressed by *for...to* is found in both A and B. The antecedent followed by an infinitival relative clause has various functions, such as O (object), subject complement (SC), PO (prepositional object), and non-sentence (NS). No particular preference of function according to prepositional type (A and B) was detected here.

(36) (=18, 31) (*TI* 3.3.145–147) Thou know'st not, foolish hardy Tamburlaine, What 'tis to meet me in the open field, That leave *no ground for thee to march upon*. (B-LOC) (O)

(37) (=27) (*SH* 2.3.58–59) I pray God I may be turned to *a Turk*, and set in Finsbury *for boys to shoot at*. (A-1) (PO)

(*With adjectives*)

The noun may be preceded by a modifying adjective, as in (38). The adjective is used predicatively in (39), where the predicative adjective is modified by the adverb *too*.

(38) (=22, 33) (*JN* 7.44–45 (DIS)) Womens beauties are *fayre markes for wandring eyes to shoote at*. (A-1) (SC)

In (38), the adjective *fair* is used to modify the antecedent.

(39) (*TI* 1.2.120–122) You must be forced from me ere you go. A thousand horsemen? We five hundred foot? *An odds too great for us to stand against*. (A-1) (NS)

4.1.2.2 The infinitive without *for* (29 exs.)

(O: 22 exs.; A-1 (4 exs.), A-2 (4), B-LOC (3), B-TEM (1), B-PRC (10) ; PO: 3 exs.; B-PRC (2), B-LOC (1) ; SC: 1 ex.; B-LOC (1) ; S: 1 ex.; B-PRC (1) ; OC: 1 ex.; A-1 (1) ; NS: 1 ex.; A-1 (1))

The type without *for* to express the subject of the infinitive occurs quite frequently with both A

(prepositional object) and B (adverbial) types. It should be noted that the most common function of the relative complex (antecedent noun plus infinitival relative clause) is as an object (O) in the main clause. In the case of A (prepositional object), 8 out of 10 examples (80%)²⁵ have an object function (O) in the main clause. In B cases (adverbials), 14 out of 19 examples (about 74%) are of this case (O). According to Geisler (1995: 243), the most common function of the adverbial relative complex is O (object).²⁶ In some cases with an antecedent as a prepositional object in the infinitival relative clause, the prepositional verb is in the passive voice (cf. (63) below).

(40) (=16) (*GCI* 87.19–20 (DIS)) Nothing is left but onely *my bones to pleasure you withall*; (B-PRC) (PO)

(41) (*GCI* 89.23–24 (in a song)) Our Apron is the Shrine, to wrap these bones in: (B-LOC) (SC)

(42) (*GCI* 92.17–18 (DIS)) What, haue you *no friends or acquaintance in these parts to go to*²⁷ (A-1) (O)

In (42), the antecedents are coordinated by the coordinator *or*, and are followed by the post-modifying prepositional phrase *in these parts*. The antecedents belong to personal cases.

(43) (*GC2*: 144.21–22 (DIS)) but it is happy that I haue *a maidenhead left to sweare by*. (B-PRC) (O)

(44) (*GC2*: 180.30–32 (DIS)) I haue made a man a paire of shooes that hath lasted him a twelue month *to toyle in* euery day. (B-PRC) (O)

In (44), a quantifying expression of the *of*-phrase *a pair of* is used.

(45) (*J* 1.1.388) And yet have kept *enough to live upon*; (B-PRC) (O)

(46) (=26) (*E* 811) You haue *matters of more weight to think upon*; (A-1) (O)

In (46), we have a post-modifying prepositional *of*-phrase with the antecedent *matters*.

(47) (=24) (*MP* 121) And by *that privilege to work upon*, (B-PRC) (PO)

(48) (=25) (*MP* 1122–1123) Sweet Duke of Guise, *our prop to lean upon*, Now thou art dead, here is no stay for us. (A-1) (NS)

(49) (*D* 1.1.166–167) Gentle Achates, reach the tinder box, That we may make *a fire to warm us with*, (B-PRC) (O)

(50) (=30) (*ST* 4.4.180–181) Had I as many lives as there be stars, As *many heavens to go to*, as thou lives, (B-LOC) (PO)

(51) (=20) (*AF* 1.523) And here's *ten pound to wager them withal*; (B-PRC) (S)

(52) (*AF* 1.583–584) who threats his enemy, Lends him *a sword to guard himself withal*. (B-PRC) (O)

(53) (*AF* 2.109–110) I'll give thee *a gallon of sack to handsel the match withal*. (A-2) (O)

In (53), the quantifying expression *a gallon of* modifies the antecedent *sack*.

(54) (*OWT* 46–47) although we haue *no bedding to put you in*. (B-LOC) (O)

(55) (*SH* 4.4.110–111) they shall be married together, by this rush, or else turn Firk to *a firkin of butter to tan leather withal*. (B-PRC) (O)

In (55), the quantifying phrase *a firkin of* is used with the antecedent noun *butter*.

(56) (*GC2* 177.11–12 (DIS)) The happier thou art (quoth Harrie) that thou hast *a trade to liue by*, (B-PRC) (O)

(57) (=21, 28) (*D* 4.2.54) For I haue *honey to present thee with*. (A-2) (O)

(With adjectives)

In most cases with adjectives, the antecedent noun is modified by the preceding adjective, but in the case of (68) the adjective *enough* modifies the preceding antecedent *leaves and windfall boughs*.

- (58) (=32) (*GCI* 131.28 (NAR)) giuing them *a good stock to begin the world withal*: (B-PRC) (O)
 (59) (=29) (*AF* 10.75-76) Have you *no other time to brabble in* / But now when serious matters are in hand? (B-TEM) (O)
 (60) (*T2* 1.1.14-15) We all are gluttred with the Christians' blood, And have *a greater foe to fight against*, (A-1) (O)
 (61) (*E* 796) For I have *joyful news to tell thee of*; (A-2) (O)
 (62) (*AF* 1.495-496) When he is at home, then have I forward [i.e., stubborn]²⁸ looks, *Hard words and blows to mend the match withal*; (B-PRC) (O)

We have the case of coordination in (62) by the coordinator *and* for two noun phrases, *words* and *blows*.

- (63) (=23) (*AF* 4.68-72) That grim-fac'd fellow, pitiless Black Will, And Shakebag, [...] Have sworn my death, if I infringe my vow, *A dreadful thing to be consider'd of*. (A-1) (OC)

In (63), the prepositional verb *to consider of* is in the passive voice.

- (64) (=19) (*AF* 9.114) I have *divers matters to talk with you about* (A-1) (O)
 (65) (*OWT* 45-46) You shall have house-room and *a good fire to sit by*, (B-LOC) (O)
 (66) (*FB* 500) Sirrah Ned, I'll have no *more post-horse to ride on*: (B-LOC) (O)
 (67) (*SH* 1.1.36-37) Then seek, my Lord, *some honest citizen / To wed your daughter to* (A-2) (O)

This is one of the rare cases of personal antecedent (cf. the case in (42)).

- (68) (*D* 1.1.172-173) You shall have *leaves and windfall boughs enow*, Near to these woods, *to roast your meat withal*. (B-PRC) (O)

In (68), two noun phrases, *leaves* and *windfall boughs*, are coordinated by the coordinator *and*.

4.1.3 Form III (*Where-compound*) (1 ex.) (O: 1 ex.; B-PRC (1))

Form III, i.e., the *where*-compound opening the infinitival relative clause, occurs with a noun antecedent. Quite a rare case can be found with type B (B-PRC). One rare case here (69) has the antecedent functioning as O (object) in the main clause. No example can be found of the case where the antecedent functions as A (prepositional object). For comparative purposes, cases of fully expressed finite relative clauses are also quoted.²⁹

- (69) (*D* 1.1.34-35) From Juno's bird I'll pluck her spotted pride, To make thee *fans wherewith to cool thy face*; (B-PRC) (O)
 (70) Cf. (*D* 2.1.263-264) So, leaning on his sword, he stood stone still, Viewing *the fire wherewith rich Ilion burnt*. (B-PRC)
 (71) Cf. (*GCI* 87.5-6 (DIS)) far doth it surpasse *that Nectar wherewith the gods were nourished*. (B-PRC)
 (72) Cf. (*T2* 1.4.13-14) And when *the ground, whereon my soldiers march*, Shall rise aloft and touch the horned moon, (B-LOC)
 (73) Cf. (*J* 4.166) This is *the hour wherein I shall proceed*; (B-TEM)
 (74) Cf. (*TR* 227.1-2 (NAR)) The third was a grieffe, *whereof* Hodgekins of Halifax complained, (A-1)

4.2 Pronouns (1 ex.)

4.2.1 Form I (No ex.)

In the case of pronouns, Form I was not found in this study. This form seems to be uncommon

with a pronoun antecedent in infinitival relative clauses, as well as with a noun antecedent. Cases of finite relative clauses with this antecedent are quite common (although they are relatively few compared with noun antecedents). For comparative purposes, we quote such an example (75) below. In (75), we have the prepositional verb *long for*.

(75) Cf. (*J* 2.450) Now have I *that for which my soul hath long'd*.

4.2.2 Form II (1 ex.) (SC: 1 ex.; A-1 (1))

A rare example is found here. The indefinite pronoun *much* is an antecedent of the infinitival relative clause in which the passive is used for the prepositional verb *mislike of*. The antecedent here is type A (the object of a prepositional verb).

(76) (=17) (*GCI* 113.25-26 (DIS)) I promise you, to pay a thousand pounds a week is a pretty round payment, and, I may say to you, not *much to be misliked of*. (A-1) (SC)

4.2.3 Form III (No ex.)

No example was found in our material. For comparative purposes, a rare example with the interrogative pronoun *what* is quoted as a case with a finite clause in (77).

(77) Cf. (*ST* 3.4.41-42) he breaks the worthless twigs, And sees not *what wherewith the bird was lim'd* [i.e., what it is wherewith the bird was limed].

4.3. Infinitival relative clauses

The following table shows the distribution of each form (I to III) according the preposition pattern (A or B).

Table 1 Distribution of Forms I to III with Noun and Pronoun Antecedents

	Form I	Form II		Form III
		With <i>for</i>	Without <i>for</i>	
A-1	0	1 [1] [1**] 1 ⁺	3 [3] <1> 1 ⁺ 1 ⁺	0
A-2	0		2 [2]	0
B-TEM	0		[1]	0
B-LOC	0	1	3 [2] (1)	0
B-PRC	0		10 [2] [1*] 4 ⁺ <i>I</i>	1
TOTAL	0	2 [2]	18 [11] <1>	1
	0%	11.4%	85.7%	2.9%

Notes on Table 1:

1. Italic figures indicate NAR (narrative style), and are included in the total.
2. Figures with a ⁺ symbol indicate DIS (discourse style), and are also included in the total.
3. The figure in () is a song (cf. 4.1.2.2 (41)).
4. The figure in < > shows a pronoun antecedent.
5. Figures in [] denote cases used with adjectives.
6. The figure with * shows a noun + *enough* (cf. 4.1.2 (68)).
7. The figure with ** indicates an antecedent with an adjective modified by the adverb *too* (cf. 4.1.2.1 (39)).

5. Summary

In the above, we have surveyed infinitival relative clauses containing prepositions (IRCCP). On the whole, the complete absence of Form I suggests that the structure was avoided. Form III (*where*-compounds) does not seem infrequent (although few cases were found in this study), and the most frequent type is Form II. The following points can be drawn from this study:

- (a) Form I seems to be uncommon. It can be assumed that in works written in a colloquial style (such as plays or novels), Form I was not favored (or was avoided, as Görlach (1991: 124) remarks) as far as infinitival relative constructions with a preposition are concerned.
- (b) Compared with Form I above, Form II is favored predominantly in the present material. The percentage of Form II within overall usage is about 86%.
- (c) Contrary to the uncommon Form I, the corresponding Form III seems to have been common in those days, although its frequency is rather low (with one case of B-PRC). The percentage of Form III within overall usage is about 3%.
- (d) Nouns and pronouns can become antecedents of an infinitival relative with a preposition, although cases with pronouns are relatively few compared to those with nouns.
- (e) *For*-subjects are exclusively found with Form II. The usage of *for*-subjects is restricted to Form II in the case of infinitival relatives. This restriction seems to have been valid in those days as well as in PE (as stated in (1) Introduction).
- (f) The case of antecedents modified by an adjective is found in both A (prepositional verbs) and B (adverbials).
- (g) Antecedents followed by infinitival relative clauses mostly function as O (object) in the main clause, especially in the case of Form II without the *for*-subject. In the case of A (prepositional object), 8 out of 10 examples (80%)³⁰ have an object function (O) in the main clause. In B cases (adverbials), 14 out of 19 examples (about 74%) are of this case (O).
- (h) The distribution of DIS and NAR, although exclusively in the works of Thomas Deloney, seems to be nearly the same as in other works, although the number of examples is insufficient to identify a definite tendency regarding any difference between them. However, it can safely be said that both styles (DIS and NAR) are not unlike the colloquial style of works such as plays as far as the infinitival relative construction in question is concerned.

6. Notes

1 Cf. Baker (1995: 297) for the terminology.

2 Cf. Baker (1995: 298).

3 On the ungrammaticality of (7) and (8), Huddleston (1971: 256) states that here the subject is preceded by the complementizer [i.e., preposition] *for*, so the ungrammaticality of the two sentences is due to the presence of two different complementizers in one clause. For this, cf. also Radford (1981: 295-296).

4 Quirk et al. (1985: 1266) use the term 'deferred' instead of 'stranded'. Cf. also Baker (1995: 299) for the ungrammaticality of these. As for infinitival relatives for most speakers, McCawley (1998: 440) explains that they allow an overt relative expression only in the form of a prepositional phrase. He quotes examples such as *a shovel with which to dig the*

- hole, a person to whom to show respect* as grammatical in PE, and *a hole (*which) to fill with earth, premises (*which) to draw interesting conclusions from* as ungrammatical (shown by *).
- 5 According to Huddleston (1988: 393), this type of relative is more or less archaic in PE. Cf. Mizuno (2003b: 181).
- 6 For an analysis of infinitival relative clauses containing a preposition in Shakespeare's plays, see Mizuno (2003a) and (2003b). This paper is a continuation of my study about infinitival relatives with a preposition in the Early Modern English period.
- 7 See Geisler (1995: 23) for the properties of the infinitive in OE.
- 8 The edition I used in this study is: *The Plays of Christopher Marlowe* ("The World's Classics." London: OUP, 1969).
- 9 T. Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy* ("Minor Elizabethan Tragedies." London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1974).
- 10 G. Peele, *The Old Wives' Tale* ("The Minor Elizabethan Drama." Vol. II. London, New York: Everyman's Library, 1968).
- 11 R. Green, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* ("The Minor Elizabethan Drama." Vol. II. Everyman's Library, 1968).
- 12 T. Dekker, *The Shoemakers' Holiday* ("Early Seventeenth Century Drama." London, New York: Everyman's Library, 1970).
- 13 Anonymous, *Arden of Feversham* ("Minor Elizabethan Tragedies." London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1974).
- 14 In dealing with the novels of Thomas Deloney, the stylistic difference between discourse style (DIS) and narrative style (NAR) is also considered in this paper. One separate instance was the case found in a song. Cf. 4.1.2.1 (41).
- 15 The edition used is: *The Works of Thomas Deloney*. Edited by. F. O. Mann. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).
- 16 Most of the examples are of the non-personal antecedent type. A relatively rare example of the personal type is also found. Examples such as (42) and (67) are of this case.
- 17 Concerning type I in PE, R.A. Jacobs (1995: 312-13) states that it is grammatical if somewhat clumsy, giving examples like *a person to whom to talk*.
- 18 In discussing the syntactic or semantic characteristics of a particular word, its modernized form is used.
- 19 The question whether *for* in *for* subjects is a preposition or a subordinator is not discussed here.
- 20 The kind of adjective treated here is what Geisler (1995: 110) calls an absolute adjective. Antecedent nouns can appear with other modifiers – such as many kinds of determiners (ex. *a, the, this, my, no, some*, etc.) – or without modifiers, and also sometimes with post-modifiers like prepositional phrases.
- 21 This terminology is used here following Geisler (1995: 14).
- 22 The illustrated example in (22) has *fayre markes*. Hereafter in discussing a particular word, its modernized form as in this case (*fair marks*) is used (cf. note 18).
- 23 Prepositional verbs are divided into two types, as Huddleston (1995: 61) explains: "A considerable number of verbs take PP complements when the preposition is fully determined by the verb itself and thus does not have any identifiable independent meaning of its own..." He uses the following examples (intransitive and transitive) to explain two types:
- (i) Many people referred to her article. (A-1) [i.e., an intransitive verb type]
- (ii) They charged him with perjury. (A-2) [i.e., a transitive verb type]
- In prepositional verbs like *look at, look for*, etc., Quirk et al. (1985: 1156) state that "the verb word has a literal use, but a fixed association with the preposition," unlike *live at* ("a purely non-idiomatic free combination"). However, demarcation is not always easy between them.
- 24 Cf. *OED*² s.v. *brabble* v.
- 25 The case of a non-sentential relative complex is not included.
- 26 A hierarchy is shown for the functions of an adverbial relative complex as follows: Object > Subject complement > Subject > *There*-existential > Prepositional complement. Geisler also gives an interpretation for this hierarchical pattern: The hierarchy should be interpreted as follows: the matrix object [i.e., O (object) in the main clause] is the most common context for an adverbial relative infinitive [i.e., adverbials (B)], while the prepositional complement [i.e., prepositional object (PO)] is the least contextual.
- 27 Ask someone for help, goods, or professional services. Cf. Courtney (1990: 260).
- 28 See "Minor Elizabethan Tragedies" (1974: 282). Also cf. *OED*² s.v. *froward* adj. (not now in colloquial use.) 1. Disposed to go counter to what is demanded or what is reasonable; perverse, difficult to deal with, hard to please, refractory, ungovernable; ...

- 29 For cited examples of the *where*-compound in finite relative clauses, see Mizuno (1986).
 30 Here, the case of NS (non-sentences) is excluded.

7. References

- Baker, C.L. (1995) *English Syntax*. Cambridge (Mass.) : MIT Press.
- Courtney, R. (1990) *Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs*. Singapore: Longman.
- Fischer, O., et al. (2000) *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Geisler, C. (1995) *Relative Infinitives in English*, Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells.
- Görlach, M. (1991) *Introduction to Early Modern English*. Translated by M. Görlach. Cambridge: CUP. (Translation of *Einführung ins frühneuenglische*. Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1978).
- Huddleston, R.D. (1971) *The Sentence in Written English: A Syntactic Study Based on an Analysis of Scientific Texts*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Huddleston, R.D. (1988) *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Huddleston, R.D. (1995) *English Grammar: An Outline*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Jackson, H. (1990) *Grammar and Meaning: A Semantic Approach to English Grammar*. London: Longman.
- Jacobs, R.A. (1995) *English Syntax: A Grammar for English Language Professionals*. Oxford: OUP.
- Kjellmer, G. (1988) "‘What a Night on which to die!’ On Symmetry in English Relative Clauses," *English Studies*. 69, 559–568.
- McCawley, J.D. (1998) *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mizuno, M. (1986) "Relative Pronouns in the Late 16th Century (III) : From the Works of C. Marlowe and His Contemporaries," *Journal of Hokkaido University of Education (Humanities and Social Sciences)*. 36, 2, 1–31.
- Mizuno, M. (2003a) "A Note on Some Infinitival Relative Clauses in Shakespeare," *Journal of Hokkaido University of Education (Humanities and Social Sciences)* 53, 2, 19–31.
- Mizuno, M. (2003b) "An Analysis of Infinitival Relative Clauses Containing a Preposition in Shakespeare’s Plays." In M. Toyota (ed.) *Studies in Modern English: The Twentieth Anniversary Publication of the Modern English Association*. Tokyo: Eichosha, 177–191.
- The Oxford English Dictionary* (1989 (2nd edition)) Edited by J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner. Oxford: Clarendon Press [along with the electronic form on CD-ROM version 3.0 (*OED*²)].
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Radford, A. (1981) *Transformational Syntax: A Student’s Guide to Chomsky’s Extended Standard Theory*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rydén, M. (1966) *Relative Constructions in Early Sixteenth Century with Special Reference to Sir Thomas Elyot*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.
- Traugott, E.C. (1972) *A History of English Syntax: A Transformational Approach to the History of English Sentence Structure*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

(札幌校教授)