

# **Linguistic Parallelism between English, Galician and Spanish Defining Relative Clauses and other Related Structures: Surface and Deep Structure Interrelations**

José Oro  
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela  
Campus de Lugo

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Very often labels are assigned to linguistic areas of study to delimit special interactive aspects of the behaviour of different structures in any concrete manifestation of language. Scholars do normally realise that this can be done following two main opposite but complementary lines: going down to the nitty-gritty or going up to a wider scope. Of these, the second is more diagrammatic and complex than the first. Both aspects will be analysed following the identity condition of behaviour.

To apply the identity condition to any structure of different realizations of language implies that most items of L1 should be represented in L2/L3 and that not so many should require word-order change, assuring, whenever it is possible, both a near morphological and a syntactic identity in order to preserve specific meaning. This allows us to settle morphological and syntactic differences and similarities between the two or three languages in question and to establish homogeneous or non-homogeneous rules of behaviour. Needless to say that not all languages, present, as a matter of fact, the same patterns although the differences are specially due to the behaviour of grammatical items and not to those considered to be lexical as such. Furthermore, concrete manifestations of language have their own way of acting which can sometimes be considered rather capricious and arbitrary and this entails that a true identity condition does not happen in most occasions.

There is no discussion about any of the correct meaningful interpretations of utterances with a varied thematic meaning. However, if we accept any variant due to the interpretability condition of certain elements in L2 or L3, when there is no need for that, we are not considering morphological and syntactic arrangement interrelations. Besides, the same number of possibilities from a syntactic point of view can be

uttered in these concrete realizations of language in spite of the preferences in use of certain grammatical items of each language.

## 2. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSES

This brief study will be semantic oriented from the interpretive point of view and morphologic and syntactic in relation to contrastive analysis. A contrastive analysis, as interpreted here, shows similarities and differences of linguistic behaviour and also the preferences in use of certain structures in order to achieve an effective communicative message in the structures of the concrete manifestations of language analysed in this short paper. It will also be shown that syntactic variation is mainly due to proper preferences for both the arrangement and the order of certain grammatical items, especially pronominal and adverbial forms. This will also explain that not following the identity condition among these three different concrete realizations of language where possible is very often capricious or due to the lack of linguistic ability or to subjective interpretability and other matters.

### 2.1. Restrictive relative clauses

In spite of the different linguistic variables which may condition the specificity of restrictive relative clauses (such as personal and non-personal reference, the function of the relative form, the choice of one specific relative nexus present or absent in surface structure, the influence of determiners on the controller, etc.) RRC are conditioned by a special behaviour which implies that this type of clauses are conjoined to the antecedent. The meaning of the relative nucleus controller is certainly restricted by the relative clause more or less in the same degree in the three languages. It also seems apparent that all 3 languages behave, in spite of formal differences, in a very approximate way, both in proper RRC (i.e. those represented as such in surface structure) or in RRC equivalents (i.e. those that in spite of surface structure morphological or syntactic deviations can also be interpreted with a restricted relative meaning).

Let us illustrate the behaviour of the examples 1a and 2a in order to see their implicature nature in all 3 languages;

- 1a. The battery in the next garden woke me in the morning.
- 1b. [ the battery in the next garden) (woke) (me) (in the morning)]
- 1c. [(the battery) ( $\emptyset$ ) (in the next garden) (woke) (me) (in the morning)]
- 2a. The battery that was in the next garden woke me in the morning
- 2b. [(the battery that was in the next garden) (woke) (me) (in the morning)]
- 2c. [(the battery) (that was in the next garden) (woke) (me) (in the morning)].

Thus, example 1 representing a RRC in deep structure at least from a semantic point of view and 2 containing a RRC proper functioning as subject and identifiable in surface structure would give us in Galician and Spanish the following parallel sentences following the identity condition rule with the assumption of certain minimal changes and taking into account both surface appearance and deep structure interpretive realizations:

3. ? A batería do xardín veciño espertoume pola mañá.
- 3a. [(a batería do xardín veciño) (despertou) (me) (pola mañá)]
- 3b. [(a batería) (ø=que estaba) (no=-en+o- xardín veciño) (espertou) (me) (pola mañá)]
4. ? La batería del jardín vecino me despertó por la mañana.
- 4a. [(la batería) (del jardín vecino) (me) (despertó) (por la mañana)]
- 4b. [(la batería) (ø) (del=-de+el- jardín vecino) (me) (despertó) (por la mañana)]
5. A batería que estaba no xardín veciño espertoume pola mañá.
- 5a. [(a batería que estaba no -en+el- xardín veciño) (espertou) (me) (pola mañá)]
- 5b. [(a batería) (que estaba no xardín veciño) (espertou) (me) (pola mañá)]
6. La batería que estaba en el jardín vecino me despertó por la mañana.
- 6a. [(la batería que estaba en el jardín vecino) (me) (despertó) (por la mañana)]
- 6b. [(la batería) (que estaba en el jardín vecino) (me) (despertó) (por la mañana)].

However, in spite of their grammaticality 3 would be rather strange in Galician use as it is semantically restricted. Nevertheless, there would not be clear arguments in order to discuss the correct meaningful interpretation of the first PP (*in the next garden*) as a relative clause as far as use is concerned because, as it is well known, this could practically be considered the result of an ellipsis procedure due to economy of speech but no clear-cut arguments have been presented in linguistic literature up to the moment to demonstrate the authentic original structure. However, if we accept this I2/I3 interpretation we are not considering formal arrangement, mainly due to the absence of interpretable elements in L1. Besides, it seems to be clear that the same number of structures can be uttered in most manifestations of language usage of the IDE family in spite of use preferences. Thus, we can say:

- 7a. The battery in the next garden (...)
- 7b. The battery that was in the next garden (...)
- 7c. The battery of my neighbour('s) (...)
- 7d. La batería del jardín (contiguo) vecino (próximo) (...)
- 7e. La batería que estaba en el jardín (contiguo) vecino (...)
- 7f. La batería de mi vecino (...)
- 7g. A batería do xardín (contiguo) veciño (próximo) (...)
- 7h. A batería que estaba no xardín (contiguo) veciño (próximo) (...)
- 7i. A batería do meu veciño (...)

It seems evident that in situations of this kind one should maintain near structural elements in all three languages in spite of the preferences in current use of more personalised modifiers in Spanish and specially in Galician far from the conceptual meaning of surface structure representations and despite deep structure implications as the double stylistic phenomenon present in L1 (i.e., the use of metonymy and the reduced relative clause) must be considered to be a natural consequence of semantic evolution through reduction of grammatical and lexical units in *constructio justa*.

As it can be observed the formal (morphological and syntactic) appearance is more similar between Galician and English than between English and Spanish. Formal interrelations also vary from one language to another. Whereas Galician and English show a very approximate identity of their syntactic arrangement as far as both types of items is concerned with the exception of head and modifiers syntactic disposition in nominal, prepositional and adverbial phrases, Spanish would show mobility of grammatical items of pronominal nature. Morphological changes would affect only surface structure representations with loss of one item both in Galician and Spanish languages but not deep structure parallel interpretation. Thus, one could interpret that, with the exception of minimal formal differences affecting both morphology and syntax of all three languages, they follow the identity condition principle specially, when representing the most common utterances of this relative type represented in *constructio justa* as proper or as relative equivalents *inconstructio figurata*. This entails that the identity representations in all three languages should be acceptable in usage, as far as their formal identity is concerned, because no dubious grammaticality is produced in any of the concrete realizations, but in use, other elements may affect the choice of one or other structure, depending mainly on a certain number of factors which have certainly to do with linguistic features but also with individuals mental inference and pragmatic recognition for an effective communicative message. Besides, functional representations are identical in all three languages despite their minimal morphological and syntactic preferences.

As for the importance given to the use of connectors the same vacillation and formal diversity appears in all three languages with the exception of  $\emptyset$  relative which is a distinguished feature of English in this worldly interactive process.

In relation to interactive transformational possibilities, as for example the case of adverbial mobility, the relationship is of identity and uniformity concerning both formal and functional operations as well as communicative interaction. As it is well known, keeping word-order as far as adjunct mobility is concerned implies maintaining the meaning as such in spite of the pragmatic deviations carried out by the addition or lack of emphasis or contrast as numbers 8, 9 and 10 show.

8. In the morning the battery (that was) in the next garden woke me
9. Por la mañana la batería (que estaba en el) del jardín vecino me despertó.
10. Pola mañá a batería (que estaba no) do xardín veciño espertoume.

## 2.2. Focus constructions

It is well known that focus constructions in most languages contain a clause which is designed with RR properties and a constituent which deserves an specific treatment and which is not all linguistically equivalent in most languages. The interrelations between the focused nearly always introductory element and the topicalized constituent introduced by the relative nexus establish a very particular pragmatic interrelation and imply a semantic deviation and thus, the communicative nature as such, involved in the RR itself, loses its primary semantic force, acquiring thus a new one which would almost depend on the interactive process.

The fact that they could be derived from underlying clauses as Jespersen (1909-1949 = Jespersen, Otto: *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. London: George Allen and Unwin) states does not seem to be clearly justified. On the contrary, they appear to be the result of complex syntactic combinatory possibilities that most concrete manifestations of language have from the extension of smaller significative units to larger ones. As examples 11, 12 and 13 will show the limitation of the controller of the relative clause is being emphasised and the message divided into two different parts, specially interacted by pragmatic and phonological links having into account their communicative essence.

11. It was you who did it
  - 11a. It was you (you were)
  - 11b. (Who=you) you did it
12. Fuches ti quen (o que) o fixo ( o fixeches)
  - 12a. Ti fuches
  - 12b. Ti fixéchelo (quen= ti)
13. Fuiste tú quien (el que)lo hizo (lo hiciste)
  - 13a. Tú fuiste
  - 13b. Tú lo hiciste

Whereas English uses a different verbal form from *construtio justa* to *construtio figurata* in the focus constituent, Spanish and Galician change the verbal form of the relative constituent in the primary surface representation, due to the effect of the pronoun but they maintain the secondary surface formal appearance in deep structure representations. Besides, the mobility of both parts of the message in Galician and

Spanish does not alterate the meaning pretended, and in English, this mobility although grammatical is not acceptable in use.

14. \*Who did it (it) was you

15. Quen o fixo (fixeches) fuches ti

16. Quien lo hizo (hiciste) fuiste tú.

Once more the similarity among the concrete realizations of language analysed according to morphological and syntactic behaviour can be stated as well as the differences, which both in Galician and Spanish reinforce the idea of the relative nexus as the most relevant focused constituent whereas in English the introductory elements plus the relative nexus constitute the focus. As a matter of fact the interpretation of a double message becomes diffuse in use and is becoming more and more a rather emphatic alternative to the simple variant in 11b, 12b, and 13b deep structure representations. Thus, it seems to be the case that emphatic alternatives need to be contextualised in order to be justified and are normally used to economise time and linguistic effort in certain contexts where argumentative explanations are useless. As far as syntactic arrangement is concerned the insertion of English *it + be + wh* does not have a formal correspondence in Galician and in Spanish, but it has a semantic correspondence in which phonological features also play a very important role. Both these languages reverse the order of the subject and the verbal form without the addition of the extra constituent *it* that English uses in surface structure.

### 2.3. Stacked constructions

This type of constructions also referred to as fused consist of two RR clauses apparently controlled by the same NP, as in

17. You're the first girl  $\emptyset$  I've met who really didn't care

18. Ti e-la primeira rapaza que encontrei que verdadeiramente non te preocupabas (se preocupaba).

19. Tú eres la primera muchacha que encontré que verdaderamente no te preocupabas (se preocupaba).

As far as deep structure levels are concerned the different constituents in 17, 18 and 19 are all simple active statements linked by alternative pronominal forms or the same forms at the same level. Different linking pronominal forms would simply change the function of the clause but not the fact that they would be linked to the same controller in spite of personal or non-personal reference. The transformations which take place in examples 17, 18 and 19 are the following:

20. You're the first girl
21. I've met the first girl
22. The girl didn't really care
  
23. Ti e-la primeira rapaza
24. Encontrei a primeira rapaza
25. A rapaza verdadeiramente non se preocupaba
  
26. Tú eres la primera muchacha
27. Encontré a la primera muchacha
28. La muchacha verdaderamente no se preocupaba.

The functional dissimilarities between 22 and 25/28 if we take a different lexical item such as 'importar' for 'care' would imply that this type of grouped constructions are, no doubt, a dialectal and non-canonical constituent resulting from arbitrary syntactic arrangement as it can be seen in,

29. You're the first girl I've met
30. You're the first girl who really didn't care
  
31. Ti e-la primeira rapaza que encontrei
32. Ti e-la primeira rapaza que (a quen) verdadeiramente non te / lle / che preocupaba(s) (que / a quen non lle importaba)
  
33. Tú eres la primera muchacha que encontré
34. Tú eres la primera muchacha que (a quien) verdaderamente no te / le preocupaba(s) (que / a quien no le importaba),

where, the choice of the relative pronominal form would depend on the meaning pretended and the choice of the relative pronominal form as subject would lead to meaning ambiguity in Galician and Spanish whereas in English would not. Nevertheless, the first conceptual meaning adjusts both communicative and formal behaviour in all three languages and this entails a standardized universal syntactic arrangement, in which dialectal characteristics can not be accepted as they would be apart from the canonical behaviour at least in relation to usage representations.

This implies that of the varied lexical choice that L2 or L3 may offer as the interrelated meaningful items for any L1 item in surface structure, not all antonyms would fulfill deep structure requirements as items have their own behaviour and are restricted from a collocative point of view. Furthermore deep structure correspondence might be necessary in order to select the appropriate word needed to follow the identity condition governing rule, providing thus, not only a semantic identity but also nearness on formal appearance should be analysed.

### 3 CONCLUSION

On the basis of contrastive descriptive linguistic studies, the identity condition in surface or underlying representations is assumed to be a necessary instrument in order to achieve a more effective understanding of meaning transposition among different concrete realizations of language. Transformational contrastive operations taking in different options help to decide the more equivalent formal and meaningful representations, as well as the characteristics of the behaviour of the 3 languages analysed in this area of study. Deep and surface structure contrast becomes essential to make more precise the complicated items in order to transpose their meaning. Besides, the choice of a RRC equivalent in deep structure instead of a RRC surface structure proper and double ellipsis makes the communicative message rather imprecise out of context, and this appears to be rather contradictory after being the result of a series of factors which are specially controlled by an ultimate communicative end: the economy of communicative interaction, mainly attributed to nearness between the speaker and addressee and the worldly concept to be expressed; it might also be due to the behaviour of personal and non-personal controlled elements, to specificity and inherent contrast and to individual's mental inference as a formal and semantic linguistic complement.

As far as this type of structures is concerned they are translatable in all three languages and behave naturally within the frame of a functional similarity and a near formal identity. However, formal differences can be easily recognised in surface structure despite their deep structure identity. The recognition of differences and similarities show different aspects of their specific behaviour proper which is controlled by the internal and external world of the speakers of each community and is developed according to linguistic needs and specific behaviour. Thus, for example, although Galician and Spanish grammatical items are almost graphologically identical and some of the lexical items are very similar, English seems to follow the Galician syntactic arrangement as far as some related pronominal and verbal forms are concerned and they are far distant from Spanish collocation.