

動的文法理論とその展開—語法文法研究から理論へ
Grammatical Dynamism and Its Development:
In Search for a Theory through the Studies of Grammar and Usage
中澤和夫 (青山学院大学)
Kazuo NAKAZAWA (Aoyama Gakuin University)

1. Case Studies

1.1 The English head-internal relative clauses: (Nakazawa 2018a, 中澤 2018b)

Peculiarity of the construction: the head inside the relative clause

- (1) This fish is [the biggest I ever caught ____].
- (2) It is our impression that there are very few *pure syntactic constructions*, that is, constructions which have *no* specific semantic or pragmatic functions associated with them and which mention no specific lexical items. [The closest we can come ____ to that] is the *subject-predicate* construction of English. [italics original authors'] (Fillmore and Kay 1987: 13)
- (3) a. [The nearest any western fighting technique has come ____ to the eastern martial arts], is in the French art of “la Savate.” (BNC)
b. [The nearest **any western fighting technique** has come ____ to the eastern martial arts], is in the French art of “la Savate.” (BNC)
- (4) a. A friend of mine once passed out from heat on a downtown street, falling into the gutter. [The closest **anyone** came ____ to him] was the man who leaned over, just as my friend was coming to, and said: “Hey, you’re blocking my car.” (Royko (1987a); Royko (1987b))

Examples	Functions [the +Superlative] and its trace assume			Head of the entire NP
	[the +Superlative]	Its trace in the relative		
	Clause Introducer	Argument in the relative	~Argument (Degree Modifier / Predicative) in the relative	
(1)	√	√	--	[the +Superlative]
(2)	√	--	√	[the +Superlative]
(3a)	√	--	√	[the +Superlative]
(3b)	√	--	√	bold face NP
(4)	√	--	√	bold face NP

1.2 The *Dungeon* construction: A syntactic hapax legomenon: (Nakazawa 2018a)

Peculiarity of the construction: *with* followed by theme/subject/agent

The *Dungeon* construction:

- (5) a. Into the dungeon with the traitors! (Jackendoff 1973: 347)
b. Down with the traitors!
c. Away with you!
d. Off with {you/your hat/his head}!
- (6) a. “Traitors shall go down into the dungeon!”
b. “Traitors shall be down!”
c. “You should be away from me!”
d. “{You/Your hat/His head} should be off of {me/you/his body}!”
- (7) a. We stepped into the dungeon with the tourists.
b. Mary walked down the street with her friends.
c. John will be away from Tokyo in Hawaii with his wife.
d. The thief ran off with the money.
e. John sliced cheese with a knife.

- (8) a. ...into the dungeon with NP.
 b. ...down...with NP.
 c. ...away...with NP.
 d. ...off with NP.
- (9) After Bill left, Trina cranked up the stereo and continued wallowing in Sondheim albums. She'd never play musicals that loud when Bill was home, nor would he play his jazz albums at a volume that disturbed her. But **[with him away]**... She washed dishes to the thundering Dies Irae chords from Sweeney Todd. (COCA) [Three dots original–K.N.]
- (10) [with him away] → Adverbial Preposing → (11)
- (11) Away with you! (= The *Dungeon* construction)
 Further extension of the construction:
- (12) a. Get along with you, and go to bed. (OED) (cf. *with you get along)
 b. Get along with you, vagrant! (COCA)
 c. Go along with you. (OED) (cf. *with you go along)
 d. Now go along with you. Try to come back with a smile on your face. It troubles me to see you looking so lost. (2009) (COHA)
 e. Get away with you, young Tamborel! (COCA) (cf. *with you get away)
- (13) Base: Away with you! →
 Reinterpreted template: [DIRECTIONAL PHRASE XP][with NP_{THEME/SUBJECT/AGENT}]! →
 Derived form: [DIRECTIONAL PHRASE [V_{Nonfinite} get along]][with NP_{THEME/SUBJECT/AGENT}]!
- Peculiar features of the *Dungeon* construction:
- (14) a. It is a nonfinite clause.
 b. It has a directional phrase followed by [PP with NP].
 c. NP in the PP [PP with NP] is a definite NP.
 d. NP in the PP [PP with NP] is the agent/actor or theme of the event, or put into syntactic terms, the subject NP in the paraphrase for the construction: *the traitors*, for example, in “Into the dungeon with the traitors!” is the agent/actor or theme, or the subject NP in the paraphrase “The traitors shall go down into the dungeon!”
 e. Though the preposition *with* is used to express a whole variety of meanings and relations such as ‘contact,’ ‘accompaniment,’ ‘possession,’ ‘instrumental,’ ‘circumstantial condition,’ and many others, it is never followed by an agent/actor or theme, or a subject NP. But, note well, so it is only when in the *Dungeon* construction.
 f. The discourse function is “order/command.”

1.3 The post-nominal modifier *combined*: (中澤 2017)

Peculiarity of the construction: all basic features missing

- (15) a. More particles are contained in the first receptacle than in [all the others combined]. (Bolinger 1975: 79)
 b. China is larger than [Japan and Korea combined].
 a'. More particles are contained in the first receptacle than in [all the others that are combined].
 b'. *China is larger than [Japan and Korea that are combined].
- (16) Stage 1: [(all) NP_{pl} that are combined] (Base: (15a'))
 Stage 2: [(all) NP_{pl} combined] (Derived through WHIZ-Deletion: (15a))
 Stage 3: [(all) NP_{pl} combined] (Reinterpreted template as a model)
 Stage 4: [[NP A and B]_{pl} combined] (Derivatively derived based on the Stage 3 model: (15b))

Grammatical features observed/reserved at Stage 3:

- (17) a. NP is post-modified by *combined*.
 b. The grammatical number of NP is plural.
 c. No reference to the internal structure of the NP: it does not matter whether the head(s) of NP is/are pronominal or nouns, or in the latter case, whether the nouns are coordinated or not.

More peculiar instances:

- (18) a. “What about violence?” I inquired, beginning to feel ready for some.

“Sex is a special kind of violence - and money is an abstraction of both,” she answered. “[Sex and money combined] is the basis for almost all violence in the sense that you mean. ...” (Kris Saknussem. 2009. *Private Midnight*. The Overlook Press.) [due to Masaaki Fuji]

- b. “I just thought it would be something dope. Social networking is important,” Wale said recently to Wired.com. “Anything that’s [social and music combined] is something I want to be a part of. ...” (*Billboard*, 12/3/11, p.15) [due to Masaaki Fuji]

Peculiar features observed/acquired in the examples of (18a) and (18b):

(19) a. In (18a), “[Sex and money combined]” is not plural, but singular. (Re: number)

b. In (18b), in “[social and music combined],” items modified by *combined* are not the ‘referential’ NPs as they were as in (15), but they are ‘predicative’ NPs. (Re: referentiality)

c. Interestingly enough, in (18b), the coordinated items are not of the same syntactic category, but they are different: *social* is an adjective and *music* a noun. (Re: category and coordination)

d. We do not normally coordinate different categories, but in (18b) the items of the same syntactic-functional category labeled ‘predicative’ are coordinated (cf. (b)). (Re: ‘predicative’)

e. Though normal syntactic rules cannot coordinate different categories (cf. (c) above), the two items combined in (18b) are of the same type called ‘predicative’ and they are actually coordinated (cf. (d) above). But we cannot modify this by a relative clause like “*Anything that’s [social and music that are combined]...” But once “that are” is absent, it becomes fine. (Re: evidence that (18b) is obtained through the derivative-dynamic process)

Back to the original ‘basic’ features of (15a, b):

(20) a. the syntactic structure of the modified phrase: NP

b. the grammatical number of it: plural

c. the internal structure of it: [N_{pl}] or [N and N]

d. referentiality of the internal constituents: referential

Analysis of (18b):

(21) (continued from (16))

Stage 4: [[NP A and B]_{pl} *combined*] (Derivatively derived based on the Stage 3 model: (15b))

Stage 5: [[X and Y] *combined*] (Reinterpreted template as a model)

Stage 6: [[[x social] and [y music]] *combined*] (Derivatively derived based on the Stage 5 model: (18b))

NB: All the ‘basic’ features of the original structures (15a, b), i.e. (20), are totally lost. It is as if all the scaffolding was taken away after the construction is finished.

1.4 The verb *allege* as a semi-auxiliary verb: (中澤 2020)

Peculiarity of the construction: emergence of the semi-auxiliary use of *allege*

(22) a. *I alleged John to be a fool.

b. John, I alleged to be a fool.

c. John is alleged to be a fool. (中澤 2015: 274)

d. Our present arrangement is alleged to reduce the need for saving. (OED Online: 1987)

No reference to semi-auxiliary *allege* in *OED Online* (as of August 3, 2020)

(23) a. So far it alleges to protect the agriculturist, yet it outs the duty on sugar, which is a blow at the planter. (COHA: 1890)

b. ...; and our assiduous patronage rumour alleges to have been the death of it--... (COHA: 1895)

c. These pictures inside a local hospital allege to show children who've been injured in airborne chemical attacks. (COCA: 1991) (中澤 2015 : 276)

d. OK, now let's go to these pictures that CNN has obtained. They allege to show you and Reverend Swaggart leaving a motel in New Orleans. (COCA: 1991)

e. The young women who allege to have been involved with Willie Smith say that they didn't come forward before because of the prominence of his family. (COCA: 1991) (中澤 2015 : 276)

f. Which Hollywood actress had alleged to have had sex with an entire football team which included John Wayne? (BNC: 1992) (中澤 2015 : 275-276)

Analysis:

Examples of “allege NP to VP”

- (24) a. As a result, the plaintiffs “failed to allege facts to support their legal conclusion of injustice or unfairness.” (“Christianity Today,” USA) (WBO: N/A)
- b. It will appear, when we come to the subject of the specification, that the patentee must be entitled to a patent for all that he alleges himself to have invented, or his patent will be void. (COHA: 1837)
- c. “Wherefore? -- You cannot believe that I am, indeed, what they allege me to be -- the chief of the Black Riders -- that dreaded monster -- half man, half dragon -- who slays the men, swallows the children, and flies off with the damsels. Ha! ha! ha! Really, Clarence, I am afraid you are as credulous now at twenty-five as you were at five.” (COHA: 1841)
- d. He thought that all that was needed upon the subject of fugitive slaves, was to amend the existing act of Congress, so as to confine the exercise of [sic] the powers conferred to the judges of courts of the United States, and to secure to those who allege themselves to be free, the advantage of an impartial jury to aid the courts in the ascertainment of facts. (COHA: 1850)
- e. A protest was made, alleging the dun gelding G.T. Pilot to be ineligible. (OED Online: 1877)
- f. If we expand S’s second statement into the perceptual claim “I can see that the captain is a very young man” we might want to ask whether this statement is true or false. In one respect it is clearly false; the captain is not (let us say) a very young man, and so S could scarcely be right in saying that he sees that he is very young. Still, the fact remains that the increment in knowledge which S alleges himself to have acquired by visual means is an increment which he can easily bridge and, in the present case, is actually bridging with respect to that fellow over there (the porter). (COHA: 1967)
- g. The markets have exposed the fatal flaw of Margaret Thatcher’s government. This is not the fallacy (although some allege it to be so) of Nigel Lawson’s exchange rate policy, nor the fallacy (which others allege) of the money supply policy which Mrs Thatcher would prefer, but the fallacy of supposing government can be conducted successfully on the basis of ambiguous vacillation. (BNC: 1989)

(25) Dynamic analysis of the semi-auxiliary *allege* (I)

a. Bases

Syntactic Base: NP₁ allege NP₂ to VP (cf. (24))

Semantic Base: “NP₁ claims the proposition ‘[NP₂ VP]’ without proof”

b. Flat structure models: ‘NP allege to VP’ (WH- and NP-movement of NP_{ACC})

c. Derived structure: NP allege to VP

(26) Dynamic analysis of the semi-auxiliary *allege* (II)

a. Bases

Syntactic Base: NP₁ allege NP₂ to VP (cf. (24))

Semantic Base: NP_i allege [NP_i (= reflexive_i) to VP] (cf. (24b, d, f))

b. Models: *want*-type verb

Syntactic Model: NP_i want Δ_i to VP

Semantic Model: NP_i want [NP_i (= Δ_i) to VP]

c. Derived structure: NP allege to VP

2. Grammatical Dynamism (aka. Dynamic Model of Grammar)

2.1.1 Kajita (1977, 2002): K-Model

(27) If the grammar of a language L at stage i, G(L,i), has property P, then the grammar of the language at the next stage, G(L,i+1), may have property P’. (Kajita 2002: 161)

(28) The Kajita Format (K-model)

If A, then B is possible (= If A, then B or ~B);

where A stands for the proposition “the grammar of a language L at stage i, G(L,i), has property P,” and B for the proposition “the grammar of the language at the next stage, G(L,i+1), has property P’.”

2.1.2 Problems with K-Model

(i) “How far it goes” and “When to stop”

(a) The English head-internal relative clauses

(a-1) Clause introducer (CI) is in the form of the superlative, but is confined to *the closest* and less frequently to *the nearest*. Why not other cases, e.g. **the shortest*, **the longest*, etc.?

(a-2) The quantifier attached to the head is invariably *any*. Why not other cases, e.g. **all*, **every*, etc.?

(b) The *Dungeon* construction

(b-1) The discourse function of “order/command” is imposed upon the *Dungeon* construction. Why not other functions, e.g. “*interrogation,” “*rejection,” etc.?

(b-2) Why is “order/command” not imposed upon other preposing constructions, e.g. VP preposing, Topicalization, etc.?

(c) The post-nominal modifier *combined*

(c-1) Why did the extension not stop at Stage 4: $[[NP\ A\ and\ B]_{pl}\ combined]$? (cf. (15b))

(c-2) Why does the extension not go with **coupled*, **coordinated*, etc.?

(d) The verb *allege* as a semi-auxiliary verb

(d-1) Why not other verbs, e.g. **doubt*, **disclaim*, etc.?

(d-2) Why is *allege* not extended to the genuine auxiliary, i.e. without infinitive marker *to*?

(e) See §3.1.

(ii) Tautology

Table 1: Truth Functional Table for (28)

A	B	~B	B or ~B	If A, then B or ~B.
T	T	F	T	T
T	F	T	T	T
F	T	F	T	T
F	F	T	T	T

2.2 Revised model: R-model

(29) The Revised Format (R-Model)

If *B*, then *A*;

where *B* stands for the proposition “the grammar of a language *L* at stage *i* ($i \neq 0$), $G(L,i)$, has property *P*,” and *A* for the proposition “the grammar of the language at the stage $i-1$, $G(L,i-1)$, has property *P*.”

(i) Accidental Gap/Accidental Hap

Cf. §2.1.2. (i).

(ii) Explanation

Table 2: Truth Functional Table for (29)

B	A	If B, then A.
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

3. Advantages of R-Model

3.1 The vowel in *money*

(30) a. As part of *P*’: The word *money* has a short stressed vowel [ʌ] for the letter -o-; the word *monetize* has a short stressed vowel [ɑ] for the letter -o-.

b. As part of P: The word *money* has a short stressed vowel [ʌ] for the letter -o-; according to the normal sound-spelling relationship in English, when the letter -o- represents a short stressed vowel, it is [ɑ].

NB: It is clear that *monetize* with a short stressed vowel [ɑ] is a normal practice. Since in P there are two descriptions such as, first, a description about *money* with a short stressed vowel [ʌ] and, second, a description about the normal practice of the letter -o- having a short stressed vowel [ɑ], we know that in the case of *money* having the vowel [ʌ], it is an exceptional feature for the word *money* to have a vowel [ʌ] in the place of the letter -o-. And we also know that in the case of *monetize* having the vowel [ɑ], it is a regular feature for the word *monetize* to have a vowel [ɑ] in the place of the letter -o-.

In K-Model, however, words like *accómpany*, *cómfortable*, *hóneymoon*, *Lóndoner*, *lóvely*, *mónkeyfy*, *wónderer*, *wónderful*, and *wónderland* with their [ʌ] cannot be accounted for. Instead, they may well be claimed to have [ɑ], contrary to what they really are. (adapted from Nakazawa 2018: 143-144)

3.2 On ‘peculiarity’: How and why the construction is peculiar

3.2.1 K-Model: $[[P]] + p = [[P']]$, where $[[P]]$ and $[[P']]$ are extensions of **P** and **P'** given in (28), respectively; *p* a specific property.

The problem: why is it the case that this very *p* and no other is added to $[[P]]$ to derive $[[P']]$? Why not otherwise?

3.2.2 R-Model: $[[P']] - [[P]] = p$, where $[[P']]$ and $[[P]]$ are extensions of **P'** and **P** given in (29), respectively; *p* a specific property.

The peculiarity: it just happens that the difference between $[[P']]$ and $[[P]]$ is *p*.

(a) head in HIRC: how peculiar! (cf. §1.1)

(b) “command” in the *Dungeon* construction (cf. §1.2)

(c) scaffolding in *combined* construction (cf. §1.3)

(d) verb type change of *allege* from *believe*-type to *want*-type as a semi-auxiliary verb (cf. §1.4)

3.3 Multiple motivations for extension

K-Model: $[[P]] + \{p_1 \& p_2\} = [[P']]$ (Are two or more motivations possible? If so, how are they sequentially and/or functionally organized? Why and how is this very $\{p_1 \& p_2\}$ chosen?)

R-Model: $[[P']] - [[P]] = p$ ($p = \{p_1 \& p_2\}$, $\{p_1 \text{ or } p_2\}$, or whatsoever. No such ‘why’ problems arise.)

3.3.1 *allege* (cf. §1.4)

3.3.2 Nomura (2019a, b)

Inverted subjunctive conditional clause (ISCC)

(31) a. Were it not for electricity, our life wouldn’t be the same.

b. Should you have any questions, please feel free to ask.

c. Had it not been for his help, I could not have won the race.

Purported origins of ISCC: (a) Interrogative sentence (“Am I a bird? If so, I would fly to you.”)

(b) Optative sentence (“Were I a bird!”) (Examples of §3.3.2 are from Nomura (2019a, b))

NB: Nomura (2019a, b) chooses (b) above.

3.3.3 N. Nakazawa (2006)

N. Nakazawa (2006) supposes that parataxis is the source construction that ultimately becomes the relative clause construction.

Parataxis: There was a farmer. The farmer had a dog.

[A]: There was a farmer, he had a dog. (No conjunction; pronominal subject)

[B]: There was a farmer(,) and he had a dog. (Overt conjunction and pronominal subject)

[C]: There was a farmer(,) who had a dog. (‘and he’ replaced by a relative pronoun: relative clause construction)

[D]: There was a farmer had a dog. (*There* contact clause: an *apo koinou* construction) (Examples of §3.3.3 are from

N. Nakazawa (2006))

N. Nakazawa (2006) proposes that starting from parataxis, we have two ways to arrive at the relative clause construction [C].

(32) Two-way derivation hypothesis

Route 1: Parataxis → [A] → [B] → [C]

Route 2: Parataxis → [D] → [C]

4. Postscript

この障壁を打ち破るためには、「可能な文法」の限定の仕方について、発想を根本からあらためねばならない。(梶田 1984 (3))

この事態を打開する方向としては、つぎの2つの方向が考えられる。1つは、今までどおり既存の理論のどれか1つを出発点とし、これを部分的に手直してよりよい理論に変えていく方向。もう1つは、「可能な文法」をできるかぎり狭く限定するという Chomsky の基本路線には従いながらも、その限定の仕方については、発想を根本からあらため、まったく新しい可能性を探っていく方向。(梶田 1984 (4))

肝心なことは、既存の理論に共通の隠された前提を明確な形で取り出し、それが適切かどうかを検討していくことだ。そのためには、まず現在までの諸理論の共通点を—それも当事者たちが明示あるいは認識していないような基本的な共通点を—探り出すことから始めるのが得策だろう。(梶田 1984 (4))

もし規則自体のあいだに基本的なものとそうでないものとの段階的な区別があるとするれば、その区別は、上記のような漠然とした直感に反映されるというだけでなく、もっとほかにもいろいろなところでその影響が現れてくるだろう。たとえば、他の条件が同じであれば、基本的な規則ほど早く習得されるというようなことがあっても不思議ではない。習得した文法を実際に使うときにも、基本的な規則ほど優先的に適用されるというようなことがあるかもしれない。また言語類型学的にいても、基本的な規則ほど、それと同類の規則がより多くの言語に出てくるのではないか。さらに言語の歴史的な変化においても、基本的な規則ほど変化・消失しにくい、という傾向が見られるだろう。(梶田 1984 (5))

(33) Chomsky argues for the instantaneous model.

Kajita argues against the instantaneous model, and proposes a dynamic model, i.e. K-Model.

Nakazawa argues against K-Model, and proposes a revised model, i.e. R-Model.

References

- Anderson, Stephen R. and Paul Kiparsky (eds.) (1973) *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Bolinger, Dwight (1975) "On the Passive in English," Adam Makkai and Valerie Becker Makkai (eds.) *The First LACUS Forum 1974*, 57-80, Hornbeam Press, SC, USA.
- Fillmore, Charles J. and Paul Kay (1987) "Construction Grammar Lecture" (A Course Textbook), LSA Summer Institute, Stanford University, CA.
- Jackendoff, Ray S (1973) "The Base Rules for Prepositional Phrases," Anderson and Kiparsky (eds.), 345-356.
- Kajita, Masaru (1968) *A Generative-Transformational Study of Semi-Auxiliaries in Present-Day American English*, Sanseido, Tokyo.
- Kajita, Masaru (1977) "Towards a Dynamic Model of Syntax," *SEL* 5, 44-76.
- 梶田優 (1984) 「英語教育と今後の生成文法 (1) - (6)」『学校新聞』(1983-1984) 文英堂. 東京) 宇賀治正 朋 (代表) 『言語普遍性と英語の統語・意味構造に関する研究』昭和 57・58 年度科学研究成果報告書.
- Kajita, Masaru (1997) "Some Foundational Postulates for the Dynamic Theories of Language," Ukaji et al. (eds.), 378-393.
- Kajita, Masaru (2002) "A Dynamic Approach to Linguistic Variations," Kato (ed.), 161-168.
- Kato, Yasuhiko (ed.) (2002) *Proceedings of the Sophia Symposium on Negation*, Sophia University, Tokyo.
- 中澤和夫 (2015) 「統語的機能構造について」江頭浩樹他編『より良き代案を絶えず求めて』開拓社, 東京, 267-278.
- 中澤和夫 (2017) 「後位修飾語 combined の語法」英語語法文法学会第 25 回大会, 専修大学.
- Nakazawa, Kazuo (2018a) *A Dynamic Study of Some Derivative Processes in English Grammar: Towards a Theory of*

Explanation, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.

中澤和夫 (2018b) 「潜伏名詞句の意味論と統語論をさぐる」日本英語学会第 36 回大会シンポジウム「名詞句をめぐる拡張の諸相」横浜国立大学.

中澤和夫 (2020) 「19 世紀における動詞 *allege* の助動詞化」近代英語協会第 37 回大会 (オンライン).

中澤紀子 (2006) 「There 接触節と関係代名詞の顕在化—ナーサリー・ライムの場合」『近代英語研究』22, 71-91.

野村忠央 (2019a) 「仮定法の倒置をめぐる」日本英文学会第 91 回大会シンポジウム「倒置現象をめぐる」安田女子大学.

野村忠央 (2019b) 「仮定法の倒置をめぐる」『日本英文学会第 91 回大会 Proceedings』.

Ukaji, Masatomo, Toshio Nakao, Masaru Kajita and Shuji Chiba (eds.) (1997) *Studies in English Linguistics: A Festschrift for Akira Ota on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, Taishukan, Tokyo.

Data

BNC: The British National Corpus (via Shogakukan Corpus Network).

COCA: Corpus of Contemporary American English.

COHA: Corpus of Historical American English.

OED: *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Second Edition) 1989, Oxford: Oxford University Press; also OED Online.

Royko, Mike (1987a) “Some Good Reasons to Keep Walking,” *Chicago Tribune* October 1, 1987.

Royko, Mike (1987b) “Woman Gives Aid and Gets AIDS?” *The Japan Times* October 30, 1987.

WBO: WordbanksOnline (via Shogakukan Corpus Network).