SOME ASPECTS OF TYPOLOGY OF RELATIVE CLAUSES IN ENGLISH AND POLISH

ELŻBIETA MUSKAT-TABAKOWSKA

The Jagellonian University of Cracow

1.1. English relative clauses are traditionally divided into two categories: restrictive and non-restrictive, or appositive. Depending on their functions, members of the latter group are further subdivided into noun and sentence modifiers. Criteria of the above division, as well as mutual relationship between members of both categories and restrictions conditioning their occurrence, have been recently frequently discussed by numerous linguists. The moot point of the discussion is the problem of the origin of relatives.

According to the first of the two generally accepted explanations, restrictive relatives result from embedding of a clause under a coreferential NP by a rule of the base, while non-restrictive relatives come as the output of the operation of a transformational rule on the second of two sentences conjoined by the conjunction *and*. (For discussion, see eg. Aissen 1972). On the other hand, some linguists believe that, in view of syntactic and functional similarities between both types of relative clauses, conjunction should be considered as their common underlying representation (cf. eg. Thompson 1971). The evidence presented further in this paper provides some arguments for the second of those hypotheses, thus following the observations made in one of my earlier papers (Muskat-Tabakowska, forthcoming).

1.2. A comparison of formal properties of relative clauses in English and Polish shows certain basic similarities between the two languages: both in English and in Polish the head noun precedes the relative clause, the basic type of relative involving movement of an interrogative word.[1] Functionally,

---

[1] The other two types which occur as superficial structures of English, i.e., deletion of the coreferential NP and deletion and insertion of the invariant marker *that*, are considered as forms derived from the basic structure. Such treatment was first proposed by Arthur Schwartz; for a discussion see Morgan (1972).

they are also analogous: in both languages they serve as modifiers of the head NP, or, in case of sentence modification, of the entire main clause. Yet the typology offered in traditional Polish textbook grammars does not in general correspond to the restrictive vs. non-restrictive dichotomy. To the best of my knowledge, the only exception in this respect is the classification offered by Zawadowski (1952), who supplies both semantic and syntactic evidence to motivate a clearcut division of Polish relatives into two categories: *dystynkcyjne* (distinctive), which serve as attributes of main clause head NP's, constitute an element of the NP and cannot be either parenthesised or omitted, and *narracyjne* (narrative), which do not function as attributes, do not constitute an element of the NP and do not provide a 'necessary complement' of the semantic import of the main clause. Thus Zawadowski's treatment of relative clauses in Polish corresponds to the typology presented in most traditional textbook grammars of English.

A more refined classification was offered by Klemensiewicz (1963) His division of relative clauses (i.e., clauses 'introduced by junction pronouns' — 'zaimki zespolenia') comprises three categories:

1. *przydawkowe wyszczególniające* (specifying attributive clauses), which 'specify the content introduced in a general way by a demonstrative pronoun *ten, ów, taki* which is under logical stress' (Klemensiewicz 1963 : 86). In other words, this group includes restrictive relative clauses with definite head NP's. But, like in English, rules of relative clause formation in Polish allow also for restrictive modification of non-definite NP's, cf. eg.,

(1) Brat mój ... wstąpił w związek małżeński z *dziewczyną, z którą* łączyły mnie wcześniejsze kontakty. ('Prawo i Życie', 33 (1976)) (My brother married *a girl with whom* I had previously kept in touch)

Moreover, the demonstrative pronoun may not be overtly present, and its absence does not necessarily mark the noun as non-definite:

(2) Popatrzyłam na *mężczyznę, który* miał na głowie czerwoną przepaskę.

(2a) I looked at $\begin{Bmatrix} a \\ the \end{Bmatrix}$ man who was wearing a red bandana.

Klemensiewicz's typology does not make it possible to clasify sentences like (1) and (2) in a satisfactory way: both of them would have to be listed as members of the second category, i.e.,

2. *przydawkowe znamionujące* (distinguishing attributive clauses), which serve as attributes of 'one of the nominal constituents of the main clause', the second clause including a coreferential NP (Klemensiewicz 1963 : 86). Although rather vague, this definition must be taken to cover those relative clauses which English grammars describe as non-restrictives. As I attempted to show

elsewhere (Muskat-Tabakowska, forthcoming), formal and semantic criteria offered by Klemensiewicz to serve as means of differentiating between categories 1. and 2. cannot be considered satisfactory. Consequently, no clearcut division between the two types of relatives is possible.

Following some earlier typologies, Klemensiewicz describes a third category of relative clauses, i.e.

3. *rozwijające* (developing clauses). Although their surface structure is identical to that of *specifying* and *distinguishing* clauses, their semantic import and communicational function is different: they provide a 'non-necessary development' of the semantic content of the main clause. In respect of their structure, they can be included into one of two subcategories:

a. those in which 'the entire content of the main clause is introduced through relativization into the subordinate clause by means of the pronoun *co*, which becomes its subject' (Klemensiewicz 1963 : 100), i.e., non-restrictive sentence modifiers, and

b. those which 'develop and continue the action of the main clause and organize their content by relating it in a purely external way to one of the constituents of the main clause' (Klemensiewicz 1963 : 101).

Formal and semantic status of some members of this category of relatives in Polish is the subject-matter of a series of articles by Twardzikowa (1969, 1970a, 1970b), to which I will repeatedly refer further in this paper.

1.3. The discussion presented in the following sections of this paper is based on the assumption that, in view of formal and functional similarities between relative clauses in English and Polish, some typological principles can be established which will provide an adequate means of classification, applicable to both these languages. An analysis of linguistic data could perhaps lead to the formulation of a set of criteria of such a classification, thus providing a contribution towards a theory of relatives. It is my purpose to propose such a typology, to present some evidence by which it is motivated and to show its bearing upon some other related aspects of English and Polish grammars.

1.4. The assumption that an appropriate underlying representation for relative clauses of all types is some sort of conjunction obviously renders the criterion of derivational distinction useless as a basis for their classification. I believe that it is precisely the type of conjunction involved in their formation that can serve as a principle of taxonomic classification. Accordingly, I will postulate, both for English and for Polish, the existence of three categories of relatives, which I shall discuss in the following sections of this paper.

2.1. In her discussion of relative clauses Smith (1969) points to the obvious

relation between selectional restrictions concerning relatives and the degree of definiteness of the head NP. Having suggested a threefold classification of English determiners as to their definiteness — i.e., Unspecified, Specified and Unique — she claims that restrictive relative clauses can only occur with the first two groups. Indeed, proper nouns can function as head NP's of restrictives, but only if preceded by a determiner, which implies the loss of their property of establishing unique designation, e.g.,

(3)   Mosby had evoked ... a Lustgarten whose doom was this gaping comedy.
      (Saul Bellow, 'Mosby's Memoirs')
(3a) Mosby powołał do życia *takiego* Lustgartena, którego przeznaczeniem była ta rozłażąca się w szwach komedia.
(4)   The Lustgarten whom Mosby had evoked never really existed.
(4a) *Ten* Lustgarten, którego Mosby powołał do życia, nigdy nie istniał naprawdę.

As shown in sentences (3)—(4a), the restriction is identical for English and Polish, which requires superficial occurrence of a deictic pronoun that serves as a [-Def] or [+Def] specified determiner. Thus it seems justified to restrict further discussion to specified and unspecified designation only.

2.2. Let us consider the following sentence:

(5)   The Texas sheriff who hates his deputy is tracking down a bankrobber.
      (From a 'Time' film review)

The underlying representation of (5) is

(6)   (Texas sheriff is tracking down a bank-robber) (Texas sheriff hates his deputy)

As the determiner of the head NP in the main clause is [+Def], it can be legitimately assumed that it is the relative clause that satisfies the generally acknowledged requirement of 'previous mention'. Then underlying (5) is

(7)   1. A Texas sheriff hates his deputy
      2. The Texas sheriff is tracking down a bank-robber
Granted the coreferentiality of NP's in (7) 1 and (7) 2, the constituent that appears as the embedded clause in (5) is a means of establishing the designation of the NP in the main clause, i.e., it performs the 'restricting' function. On the other hand, it will be noticed that the underlying representation of

(8)   The Texas sheriff who is tracking down a bank-robber hates his deputy is
(9)   1. A Texas sheriff is tracking down a bank-robber
      2. The Texas sheriff hates his deputy,

where (9) 1 restricts the designation of the head NP in (9) 2. The choice between (5) and (8) seems to depend on the language user's presuppositions concerning the extent of the recipient's knowledge: (5) presupposes something like

(10) There is a Texas sheriff who hates his deputy,

while the presupposition that conditions the choice of (8) is

(11) There is a Texas sheriff who is tracking down a bank-robber.[2]

Thus it can be stated that although the constituent sentences of (5) are mutually dependant in respect of their function of establishing the degree of specification of the determiner of the coreferential NP, the embedding is superficial, in the sense that the choice of the embedded simplex depends solely on the presupposition made by the user of language. However, the underlying conjunction is asymmetrical, as the presupposition conditions the ordering of the underlying constituents.

2.3. It has been frequently noticed that 'relative clauses with indefinite nouns do not 'restrict' these nouns in the way that relative clauses with definite nouns seem to' (Thompson 1971 : 82), and it seems that structures underlying embedding provide some evidence for this difference. Consider e.g.,

(12) A Texas sheriff who hates his deputy is tracking down a bank-robber.

Underlying (12) is (6); however, specification of determiners of the coreferential NP's in both constituents entails

(13) 1. Some (or at least one) Texas sheriffs hate their deputies[3]
      2. One of those Texas sheriffs is tracking down a bank-robber,

as the restriction in (12) is the restriction to a certain set of entities (Such Texas sheriffs that hate their deputies) rather than to a single object. Contrary to (5), establishing coreference in (12) does not entail establishing unique designation. Consequently, underlying

(14) A Texas sheriff who is tracking down a bank-robber hates his deputy. is
(15) 1. Some (or at least one) Texas sheriffs are tracking down bankrobbers
      2. One of those Texas sheriffs hates his deputy.

The choice between (12) and (14) depends on presuppositions made by the user, as (12) presupposes the recipient's knowledge of

---

[2] For a discussion see Thompson (1971 : 80ff).
[3] The number of entities in a given set in structure like (12) remains undetermined; cf. ex. (39) below.

(16) There is at least one Texas sheriff who hates his deputy,

while (14) presupposes

(17) There is at least one Texas sheriff who tracks down bank-robbers.[4]

2.4. So called predicate sentences, i.e., those with *is* as the main verb, which usually require special treatment because of their specific properties, yield to the above interpretation. Thus, underlying

(18) My sister is the doctor who cured Allan[5]

is

(19) 1. A doctor cured Allan

    2. My sister is the doctor.

2.5. As was pointed out in Stockwell et al. (1973 : 428ff), the only correct paraphrase of relatives with generic NP's (i.e., with generic *a*, *the* and the unspecified determiners) is a conditional of the type 'if,... then', i.e., sentences like

(20) Every sheriff who hates his deputy tracks down bank-robbers single-handed

are equivalent to

(21) If a sheriff hates his deputy, he tracks down bank-robbers single-handed.

The 'restrictive' character of sentences like (20) and (21) comes clearly from their common underlying representation:

(22) 1. Some (or at least one) sheriff hate their deputies

    2. Every one of those sheriffs tracks down bank-robbers single-handed,

which postulates two sentences that are ordered, in the sense that the second one performs the function of restricting the designation of the coreferential NP, as it occurs in the first one. Thus (20) is analogous to (12): the designation is narrowed down to a set of entities.

2.6. Consider in turn the Polish equivalents of (5)—(22), the full list of which is given below.

---

[4] I am well aware of the fact (pointed out by Schachter (1973 : 43)) that there exist such relatives which do not contain 'refering' NP's and which, consequently, do not express existential presuppositions of this type. However, the 'non-refering' NP's are generic, and relatives in which they occur involve the aspect of conditionality, thus constituting a specific subclass which will be discussed in the following section of this paper.

[5] Example quoted by Smith (1969 : 257).

(5a) Szeryf z Teksasu, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywacza

(5b) Włamywacza tropi ten szeryf z Teksasu, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(7a) 1. $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu nienawidzi swego zastępcy[6]

    2. Ten szeryf z Teksasu tropi włamywacza

(8a) Szeryf z Teksasu, który tropi włamywacza, nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(8b) Swego zastępcy nienawidzi ten szeryf z Teksasu, który tropi włamywacza

(9a) 1. $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu tropi włamywacza

    2. Ten szeryf z Teksasu nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(10a) Istnieje $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{jakiś} \\ \text{pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(11a) Istnieje $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{jakiś} \\ \text{pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który tropi włamywacza

(12a) Włamywacza tropi $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{jakiś} \\ \text{pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(12b) $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywacza

(13a) 1. Niektórzy (lub przynajmniej jeden) szeryfowie z Teksasu nienawidzą swoich zastępców

    2. Jeden z takich szeryfów z Teksasu tropi włamywacza

(14a) Swego zastępcy nienawidzi $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{jakiś} \\ \text{pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który tropi włamywacza

(15a) 1. Niektórzy (lub przynajmniej jeden) szeryfowie z Teksasu tropią włamywaczy

    2. Jeden z takich szeryfów z Teksasu nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(16a) Istnieje przynajmniej jeden szeryf z Teksasu, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(17a) Istnieje przynajmniej jeden szeryf z Teksasu, który tropi włamywacza

As can be seen from the above examples, in spite of the fact that the lack of article in Polish has made linguists look for other criteria of classification of relatives than the restrictive function of the embedded clause in respect of designation of the coreferential NP, relevant grammatical rules for Polish require that analogous semantic distinctions are made. The difference between

---

[6] The exact meaning and the difference between undefinite pronouns *jakiś* and *pewien* requires a detailed discussion, which would go beyond the scope of this paper.

restriction to a definite specific designation as different from restriction to a certain set of entities is achieved either by word order or by overt presence of indefinite or definite pronouns. In (5a) the definiteness of the head NP is marked by its sentence-initial position, while the indefinite NP in (12a) occurs in the clause-final position. Thus examples (5a) and (12a) confirm observations concerning word order in Polish which were made by Szwedek (1976 : : 26ff), as well as his hypothesis that 'the lack of the pronoun does not mark the noun as indefinite'(Szwedek 1976 : 266). On the other hand, as seen from (5b) and (8b), the presence of definite pronouns in the surface structure clearly marks it for contrast; using this marker (called in Klemensiewicz 'zapowiednik zespolenia' — 'augury of junction') as the principle of classification entails restricting this group of relatives to a set of specifically marked sentences and thus overlooking the relevance of their semantic function: the underlying representation of surface structures both marked and unmarked for contrast is the same ((7a) for (5a) and (5b), (9a) for (8a) and (8b)).

The same observations hold true for predicate sentences and sentences with generic NP's, cf.

(18a) Lekarką, która wyleczyła Allana jest moja siostra
(18b) Tą lekarką, która wyleczyła Allana jest moja siostra

with the underlying

(19a) 1. $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakaś} \\ \text{Pewna} \end{Bmatrix}$ lekarka wyleczyła Allana
      2. Tą lekarką jest moja siostra

and

(20a) Każdy szeryf, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywaczy sam

paraphrased as

(21a) Jeśli jakiś szeryf nienawidzi swego zastępcy, to tropi włamywaczy sam,

with the underlying

(22a) 1. Niektórzy (lub przynajmniej jeden) szeryfowie nienawidzą swoich zastępców
      2. Wszyscy ci szeryfowie tropią włamywaczy sami.

In (21a) the indefinite pronoun is obligatory in sentence-initial position (cf. Szwedek 1976 : 267).

2.7. To conclude, it could be stated that for both English and Polish a class of relatives can be established for which
1. designations of the coreferential NP's in constituent simplexes are different,

the scope of designation of the head NP being restricted to a definite entity (with specified [+Def] NP determination) or to a set of entities (with specified [—Def] or unspecified determination),
2. although the underlying constituent simplexes are joined by simultaneous (as different from entailing) conjunction, the conjunction is asymmetrical, i.e., the order of constituents cannot be changed without affecting the meaning.

3.1. The second category traditionally established for English relatives includes those relative clauses that come as the result of embedding through a transformation operating on the second of the two conjoined sentences. According to Smith (1969), the transformation applies when the coreferential NP in the main clause is Unique or Specified in respect of definiteness. There is some evidence to claim that, both in English and in Polish, the ordering of simplex sentences from which this class of relatives is derived is optional, thus pointing to the symmetrical character of conjunction.

3.2. Consider the following set of sentences:

(23) Sheriff Jackie Gleason, who hates his deputy, is tracking down a bank-robber
(24) Sheriff Jackie Gleason, who is tracking down a bank-robber, hates his deputy.

Underlying both (22) and (23) is

(25) Sheriff Jackie Gleason hates his deputy
     Sheriff Jackie Gleason is tracking down a bank-robber.
(26) The Texas sheriff, who hates his deputy, is tracking down a bank-robber
(27) The Texas sheriff, who is tracking down a bank-robber, hates his deputy.

Underlying both (26) and (27) is

(28) The Texas sheriff hates his deputy
     The Texas sheriff is tracking down a bank-robber.
And finally
(29) A Texas sheriff, who hates his deputy, is tracking down a bank-robber
(30) A Texas sheriff, who is tracking down a bank-robber, hates his deputy,

with the underlying representation

(31) A Texas sheriff hates his deputy
     The same Texas sheriff is tracking down a bank-robber.

As can be seen from these examples, irrespective of the degree of definiteness of the coreferential NP (Unique in (23)—(25), Specified [+Def] in (26)—(28), Specified [—Def]in (29)—(31)), its designation is identical for both constituent sentences, i.e., neither one performs the restrictive function in respect of the other. Hence, the ordering of constituents (that is, the choice between the main and the subordinate clause) is optional, in the sense that it depends entirely upon the user's preference as to which out of the two pieces of information should be given more prominence. This conforms to the intuitive feeling that the function of a 'non-restrictive' relative is to give an additional fact about an entity already identified: in (23) and (24) identification is achieved by the use of a proper noun, in (26) and (27) the designation of the coreferential NP is established by context, consituation or some sort of presupposition (in this case, inherent presupposition introduced by the definite article). However, the designation of the coreferential NP can also remain unidentified, either because it is not known to the language user, or else because he chooses not to make it known (cf. (29)—(31)).

3.3. Consider in turn the Polish equivalents of (23)—(31):

(23a) Szeryf Jackie Gleason, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywacza

(23b) Szeryf Jackie Gleason, który to szeryf nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywacza

(23c) Szeryf Jackie Gleason, który $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{nawiasem mówiąc} \\ \text{nota bene} \\ \text{zresztą} \\ \text{etc.} \end{Bmatrix}$ nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywacza

(24a) Szeryf Jackie Gleason, który tropi włamywacza, nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(24b) Szeryf Jackie Gleason, który to szeryf tropi włamywacza, nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(24c) Szeryf Jackie Gleason, który $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{nawiasem mówiąc} \\ \text{nota bene} \\ \text{zresztą} \\ \text{etc.} \end{Bmatrix}$ tropi włamywacza, nienawidzi swego zastępcy

The underlying representation of (23a)—(24c) is

(25a) Szeryf Jackie Gleason nienawidzi swego zastępcy
Szeryf Jackie Gleason tropi włamywacza.

(26a) Szeryf z Teksasu, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywacza

(26b) Włamywacza tropi ten szeryf z Teksasu, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(26c) Szeryf z Teksasu, który to szeryf nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywacza

(26d) Szeryf z Teksasu, który $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{nawiasem mówiąc} \\ \text{nota bene} \\ \text{zresztą} \\ \text{etc.} \end{Bmatrix}$ nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywacza

(27a) Szeryf z Teksasu, który tropi włamywacza, nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(27b) Swego zastępcy nienawidzi ten szeryf z Teksasu, który tropi włamywacza

(27c) Swego zastępcy nienawidzi szeryf z Teksasu, który to szeryf tropi włamywacza

(27d) Swego zastępcy nienawidzi szeryf z Teksasu, który $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{nawiasem mówiąc} \\ \text{nota bene} \\ \text{zresztą} \\ \text{etc.} \end{Bmatrix}$ tropi włamywacza

The underlying representation of (25a)—(27d) is

(28a) Szeryf z Teksasu nienawidzi swego zastępcy
Ten szeryf z Teksasu tropi włamywacza.

And finally

(29a) $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywacza

(29b) $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który to szeryf nienawidzi swego zastępcy tropi włamywacza

(29c) $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{nawiasem mówiąc} \\ \text{nota bene} \\ \text{zresztą} \\ \text{etc.} \end{Bmatrix}$ nienawidzi swego zastępcy, tropi włamywacza

(29d) Włamywacza tropi $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{(jakiś)} \\ \text{(pewien)} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(30a) $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który tropi włamywacza, nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(30b) $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który to szeryf tropi włamywacza, nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(30c) $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{nawiasem mówiąc} \\ \text{nota bene} \\ \text{zresztą} \\ \text{etc.} \end{Bmatrix}$ tropi włamywacza, nienawidzi swego zastępcy

(30d) Swego zastępcy nienawidzi $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{(jakiś)} \\ \text{(pewien)} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu, który tropi włamywacza.

The underlying representation of (29a)—(30d) is

(31a) $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ szeryf z Teksasu nienawidzi swego zastępcy

Ten sam szeryf z Teksasu tropi włamywacza

Examples (23a)—(31a) show that there exists a category of relatives in Polish whose semantic function, as well as formal properties, correspond closely to non-restrictive relative clauses in English. The absence of determiners, as well as lack of a differentiating intonation marker in the written medium (commas are used, in a purely conventional way, in all types of relatives) is compensated by two kinds of surface markers: 1. repetition of the coreferential NP followed by the demonstrative pronoun *to*, whose function is merely to emphasise the fact that the noun had already been identified in respect of its designation (Skorupka 1959 : 65), ex. sentences (23b), (24b), (26c), (27c), (29b), 30b), and 2. presence in the subordinate clause of certain adverbials ('wskaźniki zespolenia' — 'markers of conjunction'), (cf. Muskat-Tabakowska, forthcoming, Twardzikowa 1969), which can also occur in coordinate clauses and whose function is to imply the 'additive' character of information contained in the relative clause, e.g. sentences (23c), (24c), (26d), (27d), (29c), (30c).

As was the case with restrictive modifiers, the overt presence of the demonstrative definite pronoun *ten* (with the necessary shift of word order) marks the sentence for contrast ((26b), (27b)).

3.4. It is interesting to mention in this connection the type of relative construction exemplified by

(32) Marvin Grosswirth is a freelance wirter who never leaves the house without his rubbers (From Introduction to an article about weather forecasts, 'Science Digest')

Like for predicate sentences with a [+Def] NP in object position (cf. ex. (18)

above), sentences of this type do not allow for non-restrictive relativization:

(33) *Marvin Grosswirth is a freelance writer, who never leaves the house without his rubbers,

(cf. Smith 1969 : 257—58).

The interpretation of (32) as a restrictive relative would require an underlying representation

(34) 1. Some (or at least one) freelance writers never leave their houses without their rubbers
2. Marvin Grosswirth is one of those freelance writers.

However, the interpretation which seems more in agreement with common intuition is rather

(35) Marvin Grosswirth is a freelance writer

Marvin Grosswirth never leaves the house without his rubbers,
thus suggesting non-restrictive modification. Indeed, (32) can be paraphrased as

(36) Marvin Grosswirth, who is a freelance writer, never leaves the house without his rubbers.

In Polish, the translation equivalent of (32) gives an ungrammatical sentence:

(32a) *Marvin Grosswirth jest współpracującym z redakcją pisarzem, który nigdy nie wychodzi z domu bez kaloszy,

which can be paraphrased as a plausible coordinate conjunction

(37) Marvin Grosswirth jest współpracującym z redakcją pisarzem *i nigdy* nie wychodzi z domu bez kaloszy

or a non-restrictive relative

(36a) Marvin Grosswirth, który jest współpracującym z redakcją pisarzem, nigdy nie wychodzi z domu bez kaloszy.

3.5. Sentence-modifying relative clauses will not be discussed in this place. In view of considerable similarities of their semantic function and syntactic properties in the two languages considered it seems possible to find common criteria of their typological classification. However, the problem requires further research and a detailed discussion which would go beyond the scope of this paper.

3.6. In view of the above discussion, it can be stated that for both English and Polish it is possible to establish a class of relatives for which

1. designations of coreferential NP's in constituent simplexes are the same, 'coreferentiality' not being tantamount to 'definiteness',
2. the underlying constituent simplexes are joined by a symmetrical conjunction, i.e., the order of constituents can be changed without changing the meaning, the choice being conditioned only by the user's judgement concerning relative importance of information that he wants to express.

This class has not in general been defined in a consistent way in traditional taxonomies of Polish relatives, as the surface structure alone cannot provide satisfactory classificatory criteria, for two main reasons: 1. deictic pronouns are overtly present only in some sentences of this type, i.e., the relatives marked for contrast (cf. (5b), (8b), (26b), (27b)), and 2. some Polish relatives (in their written form) are ambiguous in respect of designation of the coreferential NP (the surface structure of (5a) is identical to that of (26a), although the underlying representations of these two sentences differ). The resulting problem of interpretive differentiation between restrictive and non-restrictive modification in Polish remains to be investigated.

4.1. In addition to the above mentioned categories, there is another class of relative clauses that can be differentiated in both English and Polish. In traditional taxonomies they are considered as non-restrictive modifying relatives in English, and *zdania pozornie przydawkowe*, or *rozwijające*, in Polish, i.e., they are not differentiated as constituting a separate sub-class of relatives. The only exception that I am aware of is Twardzikowa's treatment of Polish subordinate clauses introduced by *gdy*, *jeśli* and *kto*, which she considers as different from 'regular' relatives and conditionals (Twardzikowa 1969, 1970a, 1970b). In both languages this third class of relatives is formally unspecified: there are no specific surface markers by which they might be distinguished from non-restrictive (rozwijające) clauses. They allow for the use of all relative pronouns, except *that* in English. A coreferential NP must occur in their underlying representation, whose designation, like in non-restrictives, is identical in both constituent simplexes. However, the semantic relationship between the constituents is different, which provides the basis for making the distinction. The specific property of those structures is that, in logical sense, no modification is involved, the mutual relation between the constituents being of some other semantic character.

Consequently, contrary to the other two categories, restrictions on the degree of definiteness of the coreferential NP seem to be less strict. Consider the following examples:

(38)   John, who was the only boy in the group, paid the bill[7]
(38a) Jan, który był jedynym chłopcem w grupie, zapłacił rachunek

---

[7] The example taken from Aissen (1972), who discusses the occurrence of a similar class of relatives in Attic Greek.

(39)   On his way to Blackpool John met a friend, who gave him a lift in his car
(39a) Po drodze do Blackpool Jan spotkał pewnego znajomego, który go podwiózł swoim samochodem
(40)   He waited in the anteroom, where the rabbi's bearded followers went in and out in long coats (Saul Bellow, 'The Old System')
(40a) Czekał w przedpokoju, gdzie wchodzili i wychodzili brodaci uczniowie rabiego ubrani w długie płaszcze.

In (38 - 40a) the determination of the coreferential NP is, respectively, Unique, Specified [+Def], and Specified [—Def]. This type of relative clause can also occur, at least in Polish, with certain Unspecified determiners of the coreferential NP, cf.

(41)   Najbardziej go zmartwiło, że nie mógł tam hodować żadnego zwierzęcia, którego przecież nie mógłby codziennie sprowadzać z dziesiątego piętra (from a daily newspaper)
(41a) ?What worried him most was that he could keep no pet there, which he would not be able take down from the 10th floor every day.

Underlying each of (38) - (41a) is a set of two sentences, but — contrary to the first two categories of relatives — the semantic import of the conjunction is not the symmetrical non-entailing *and*. This can be clearly seen if we consider that (38) - (41a) allow for paraphrases in which the coreferential NP in the second simplex is replaced by an appropriate anaphoric pronoun (which can be subsequently deleted) and the two constituents are joined by a copulative conjunction which expresses the semantic relation that holds between them:[8]

(42)   John was the only boy in the group and (therefore) he paid the bill
(42a) Jan był jedynym chłopcem w grupie, więc zapłacił rachunek
(43)   On his way to Blackpool John met a friend and (then) the friend gave him a lift in his car
(43a) Po drodze do Blackpool Jan spotkał pewnego znajomego, a następnie ów znajomy podwiózł go swoim samochodem
(44)   He waited in the anteroom, and (there) the rabbi's bearded followers went in and out in long coats
(44a) Czekał w przedpokoju, tam zaś wchodzili i wychodzili brodaci uczniowie rabiego ubrani w długie płaszcze
(45)   Najbardziej go zmartwiło, że nie mógł tam hodować żadnego zwierzęcia, bo przecież nie mógłby go codziennie sprowadzać z dziesiątego piętra

---

[8] For a discussion of Polish material, see Twardzikowa (1969 : 118).

(45a) What worried him most was that he could keep no pet there, as he would not be able to take it down from the 10th floor every day.

As seen from (42) - (45a), the semantic function of the conjunction is to express one of the following types of priority of the first sentence in respect of the second:

1. causal ((42), (42a), (45), 45a)),
2. temporal ((43), (43a)),
3. locational ((44), (44a)),

which are also the three basic semantic functions of asymmetrical *and*, as defined by Robin Lakoff (1972).

4.2. The examples discussed in section 4.1. provide some evidence which justifies the assumption that the third class of relatives comprises complex sentences which are in fact pseudo-relative, in the sense that relativization as applied to these sentences is merely a surface phenomenon, a kind of stylistic device of syntactic connection. In fact, the semantic relationship between constituent simplexes is that of coordination, which is proved by the existence of synonymous coordinate sentences, cf. (42) - (45a). While the connectedness of sentences underlying the other two types of relatives is achieved mainly by the presence of a coreferential NP, in the third type additional linkage is provided by temporal, locational and causal relations, i.e., all basic types of intersentential linkage within a discourse. Consequently, the conjunction underlying sentences like (38) - (41a) does not serve any of the two purposes generally considered as basic functions of coordinating conjunctions, i.e., indicating contrast or reducing repetition (cf. Gleitman 1969 : 88). In fact, all Polish coordinate structures (i.e., (42a), (43a), (44a), (45)) require conjunction other than *i*, which seems to prove that the 'unmarked' (cf. Aissen 1972 : 197) conjunction *and* in English is inherently ambiguous, the extent of the ambiguity exceeding that of its Polish counterpart *i*. However, any systematic discussion of conditions restricting the use of *and/i* when joining sentences underlying the type of relatives under discussion would require further research. At the present moment I do not find it possible to state any rules, however tentative.

4.3. In connection with the above analysis it obviously becomes necessary to consider the problem of recoverability of the conjunction deleted during relativization of the type discussed in 4.1. and 4.2. It seems that the explanation offered by Aissen (1972 : 196ff), who claims that, at least for English, the only conjunction that can be deleted (prior to relativization) is *and*, cannot be considered satisfactory in view of the ambiguity of *and*. Moreover, in Polish the range of conjunctions that allow this type of deletion is considerably larger, the list including, in addition to *i*, at least such conjunctions

as *więc, a, zaś* and *bo*. As neither English or Polish seems to utilize any syntactical means that might secure the recoverability of the deleted conjunction, there obviously exists a possibility of producing potentially ambiguous outputs.

Indeed, in Polish sentences like (39a) are systematically ambiguous, as underlying (39a) is

(46) 1. $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{Jakiś} \\ \text{Pewien} \end{Bmatrix}$ znajomy podwiózł kiedyś Jana swoim samochodem
2. Po drodze do Blackpool Jan spotkał tego samego znajomego
(1) A friend once gave John a lift in his car
2. John met the same friend on his way to Blackpool)

or

(47) 1. Po drodze do Blackpool Jan spotkał $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{jakiegoś} \\ \text{pewnego} \end{Bmatrix}$ znajomego
2. Następnie ten sam znajomy podwiózł go swoim samochodem
1. On his way to Blackpool John met a friend
2. Then the same friend gave him a lift in his car)[9]

4.4. An ad hoc list of factors which, both in English and in Polish, serve the purpose of disambiguating relative structures in terms of the relationship between the two constituent clauses comprises the following elements:
1. *Tense/mood/aspect* of the verb in the second constituent,[10] cf.

(48) On his way to Blackpool John met a friend (,) who could have given him a lift in his car

(48a) Po drodze do Blackpool Jan spotkał pewnego znajomego, który mógł był go podwieźć swoim samochodem.

(restrictive or non-restrictive modification, cf. also (39) and (39a))
2. *Surface structure markers*: adverbials overtly present in the surface structure, cf.

(49) On his way to Blackpool John met a friend (,) who once gave him a lift in his car

(49a) Po drodze do Blackpool John spotkał pewnego znajomego, który go kiedyś podwiózł swoim samochodem

---

[9] For a discussion, see Tabakowska 1966. In English, the ambiguity is often resolved by the use of a grammatical tense, cf.

(39) On his way to Blackpool, John met a friend, who gave him a lift in his car (pseudo-relative).

(39b) On his way to Blackpool John met a friend, who had given him a lift in his car (non-restrictive modification).

[10] The relevance of the time sequence in some pseudo-relatives in Polish is discussed in detail in Twardzikowa (1969).

(restrictive or non-restrictive modification, cf. also (39) and (39a))
(50) My brother, who, after all, is a heart surgeon, smokes three packs a day
(cf. Although my brother is a heart surgeon...)
(50a) Mój brat, który przecież jest kardiologiem, pali trzy paczki papierosów
dziennie.[11]

(relationship of causality, a pseudo-relative construction)
Cf. also

(51) Po drodze do Blackpool John spotkał tego znajomego, który go pod-
wiózł swoim samochodem

(restrictive modification marked for contrast, or non-restrictive modification
of the previously determined NP; a pseudo-relative is ruled out due to the
presence of the demonstrative pronoun)

3. *Context*, cf.

(52) John missed the last train, but fortunately he met a friend, who gave
him a lift in his car
(52a) John spóźnił się na ostatni pociąg, ale na szczęście spotkał pewnego
znajomego, który go podwiózł swoim samochodem.

4. *Presuppositions*, cf. the pragmatic presupposition 'It is boys, and not
girls, who usually pay bills' underlying sentences (42) and (42a).

5. *Intonation*, which is the chief factor resolving the ambiguity between
restrictive and non-restrictive relatives. It is intuitively felt that, in the absence
of other markers, it is possible to use intonation to distinguish also between
relative and pseudo-relative structures (cf. e.g., the discussion in Twardzi-
kowa 1970b). However, any attempt at a systematic treatment of this problem
would by far exceed the scope of this paper.

6. Even a random analysis as the one given above makes it clear that the
ultimate decision concerning the recipient's interpretation of a relative struc-
ture depends on the nature of particular lexical material, cf.

(53) I came up in the lift, which had been mended (Iris Murdoch, 'A Word
Child')
(53a) Wyjechałem na górę windą, która została naprawiona.

Both (53) and (53a) are ambiguous, as they can be interpreted either as non-
restrictive relatives or as pseudo-relatives:

(54) I came up in the lift
The lift had been mended
(54a) Wyjechałem na górę windą
Winda została naprawiona

---

[11] The example taken from Aissen (1972), whose analysis, however, does not allow
for such an interpretation.

and/or

(55) I came up in the lift because it had been mended (On the previous
occasion I had to climb the stairs)
55a) Wyjechałem na górę windą, ponieważ została ona naprawiona (Po-
przednim razem musiałem wejść pieszo)

However, no causative interpretation is possible in

(56) I came up in the lift, which had been repainted
(56a) Wyjechałem na górę windą, która została odmalowana.

5.1. In the above discussion I suggested that relative constructions in
English and Polish can be divided into three categories: restrictives, non-
restrictives and pseudo-relatives. It seems that, apart from language-specific
distinctions (e.g. the absence of articles in Polish), it is possible to formulate
a set of criteria that allow a taxonomy universal in respect of the two languages
under consideration. In view of the use of formal surface markers, which in
both languages seems to be considerably non-systematic, these criteria should
be based on semantic representations that underlie the relatives.

Postulating the existence of a third category, the pseudo-relatives, makes
it possible to resolve the ambiguity inherent in certain constructions and to
provide a better understanding of the semantic nature of conjunction.

However, I am perfectly aware of the fact that, in its present form, this
paper poses a lot of questions to which it gives no answers.

REFERENCES

Aissen, J. 1972. "Where do relative clauses come from?". In Kimball, J. P. (ed.). 1972.
177—198.
Fillmore, C. J. and D. T. Langendoen. (eds). 1971. *Studies in linguistic semantics*. New
York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Gleitman, L. R. 1969. "Coordinating conjunctions in English". In Reibel, D. and S. A.
Schane. (eds). 1969. 80—112.
Gołąb, Z. 1972. "The relative clauses in Slavic. I. Common Slavic and North Slavic".
In Peranteau et al. (eds). 1972. 30—39.
Jackendoff, R. S. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.:
The MIT Press.
Jodłowski, S. 1976. *Podstawy polskiej składni*. Warszawa: PWN.
Kimball, J. P. (ed.). 1972. *Syntax and semantics*. New York and London: Seminar Press.
Klemensiewicz, Z. 1963. *Zarys składni polskiej*. Warszawa: PWN.
Lakoff, R. 1971. "If's, and's and but's about conjunctions". In Fillmore, C. J. and D. T.
Langendoen. (eds). 1971. 114—149.
Morgan, J. L. 1972. "Some aspects of relative clauses in English and Albanian". In
Peranteau, P. M. et al. (eds). 1972. 63—72.
Muskat-Tabakowska, E. 1977. "Some aspects of modification in written English and
Polish — pedagogical implications". *PSiCL* 7. 159-169.

Peranteau, P. M., J. N. Levi. and G. C. Phares. (eds). 1972. *The Chicago which hunt.* Papers from the Relative Clause Festival. Chicago: CLS.

Reibel, D. A. and S. A. Schane. (eds). 1969. *Modern studies in English. Readings in transformational grammar.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Schachter, P. 1973. "Focus and relativization". *Language 49.* 19—46.

Skorupka, S. and H. Kurkowska. 1959. *Stylistyka polska. Zarys.* Warszawa: PWN.

Smith, C. S. 1969. "Determiners and relative clauses in a generative grammar of English". In Reibel, D. A. and S. A. Schane. (eds). 1969. 247—264.

Stockwell, R. P., P. Schachter and B. H. Partee. 1973. *The major syntactic structures of English.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Szwedek, A. 1976. "Pronouns as articles?". *PSiCL 4.* 265—272.

Tabakowska, I. 1966. "O zdaniach rozwijających (pozornie przydawkowych). Uwagi dyskusyjne". *Zeszyty Naukowe WSP w Katowicach.*

Thompson, S. A. 1971. "The deep structure of relative clauses". In Fillmore, C. J. and D. T. Langendoen. (eds). 1971. 79—96.

Twardzikowa, J. 1969. "O stosunku rozwijania w zdaniu podrzędnie złożonym. 1. Następstwo czasowe zdań składowych". *Język polski XLIX.* 113—118.

Twardzikowa, J. 1970a. "O stosunku rozwijania w zdaniu podrzędnie złożonym. 2. Zdanie modalne". *Język polski L.* 131—140.

Twardzikowa, J. 1970b. "O stosunku rozwijania w zdaniu podrzędnie złożonym. 3. Intonacja". *Język polski L.* 273—281.

Zawadowski, L. 1952. *Zagadnienia teorii zdań względnych.* Wrocław: Ossolineum.