

## A Study of *That*-Clause\*

Yoko ICHIMURA

(Received September 23, 1983)

I. The aim of this paper is to examine the tense in *that* clause. Verbs which occur before *that*-clauses are classified here into two types: Verbs (+ Utterance) like *say, declare, announce* and Verbs (- Utterance) like *think, guess, believe*. Subordinate clauses are less frequent in English than in many other European languages, owing to a number of constructions with infinitive and *ing*-form, which English has.

First of all, let us review briefly some proposals concerning a *that*-clause. To the best of my knowledge the tense of *that*-clause has been rather neglected in grammar books. Jespersen (1933) designates *that*-clause as "content-clause", which is "a clause containing a statement which is not a sentence by itself but is made part of a sentence."<sup>(1)</sup> Rosenbaum (1967), as a result of his intensive research on traditional grammars, maintains that their assumption that a *that*-clause may be an object of a verb is correct, but that since a noun phrase can be the object of a verb and noun phrases may dominate *that*-clauses, such finite clauses may be regarded as "verbal objects". Lester (1971) argues that a noun clause sentence, preceded by optional *that* functions as a noun clause sentence complement. He gives the following phrase structure rule:

(1) Noun Clause Sentence → (that) S (p. 190)

He postulates that all main verbs are followed by a complement. Thus, the complement which a transitive verb requires is a noun phrase, whereas the complement

which an intransitive verb requires is "the null set  $\phi$ ." His assumption seems to me to be oversimplified. It is not by verbs classified as transitive and intransitive, but individual verbs that tells us which kind of noun phrase is used. The verb is the core of a sentence. Some noun phrases may serve as the object of a verb, while others as the complement. The kind of complementizer which may appear in an embedded sentence also depends largely on the main verb of the matrix sentence. For example:

- (2) a. I believe that God exists.  
b. \*I believe for God to exist.  
c. \*I believe God's existing.

According to Sandra Thompson (class discussion—LSA Summer Institute, 1976), the finite clause *that Gary left* in *I said that Gary left*, indicates a statement of fact, while the non-finite, *for Gary to leave* in *I said for Gary to leave*, gives a sort of order. Thus, the meaning of a sentence depends on the complementizer, though the complementizer carries no meaning by itself.

However, Nakajima (1980) claims that the following pair of sentences (pp. 80-81)

- (3) a. John told Mary *that she should telephone Bill immediately*.  
b. John told Mary *to telephone Bill immediately*.

mean the same, whereas Yasui (1980) disagrees, answering that the meaning of the sentence varies depending on the kind of complementizer and that as to the verb

---

\* I would like to acknowledge with gratitude the very valuable advice of Professor Akiko Ueda of Tsuda College. I am also grateful to William Mitsuru Sone, English Lecturer at Toyo University Junior College, for his very helpful suggestions and for checking this paper.

*tell*, *that*-clause may refer to a sentential assertion, while to-infinitive may refer to ordering. Nakajima analyzes *Mary* in (3a) as an indirect object, and *Mary* in (3b) as a direct object. Accordingly, the sentences (3a) and (3b) are derived from different structures. Why does his analysis lead him to claim that the pair of examples shown above share common interpretation?

Incidentally, in Spanish, the distinction between direct and indirect objects is easier, since Spanish possesses different forms for direct and indirect objects of verbs and all personal pronoun objects stand regularly directly before the verb. For example:

(4) No *la* veo ahora, pero *le* hablé hace media hora.

"I don't see *her* now, but I spoke *to her* half an hour ago."

*La* is a direct object and *le* an indirect object.

In Japanese the particle "o" is attached to a noun to signal a direct object and "ni" in the case of indirect object, which is the case with *Mary's* in both (3a) and (3b), where only the particle "ni" may be applicable to make sense. Therefore, the examples (3a) and (3b) may be expressed in Japanese, as follows:

(5) a. John wa Mary *ni* suguni denwa o  
immediately telephone  
kakeru-yooni to hanashi-ta.

told

b. John wa Mary *ni* Bill *ni* suguni  
immediately

denwa o kakenasai to it-ta.

telephone told

Note that the particle "o" is not used in either case. The particle "o" can not stand in the same relation with the verb *tell* as the particle "ni" stands with respect to the verb.

Returning to the examples Nakajima presents, they may be alternatively expressed in direct speech, as in (6):

(6) a. John said to Mary, "You should telephone Bill immediately."

b. John said to Mary, "Telephone Bill immediately."

Thus, *that*-clause in (3a) may be construed as *John's* statement announced to *Mary*, whereas the to-infinitive in (3b) as *John's* order given to *Mary*.

Our main concern is not to determine which part of

the sentence the *that*-clause is, yet we are interested in what *that*-clause implies as a subordinate clause. Taking account of the property of Verbs (+ Utterance), we may predict that this type of *that*-clause is a statement clause, because it refers to the statement being reported. Likewise, in the case of Verbs (- Utterance), a *that*-clause is a "content clause", because it indicates the content of the emotion, mentality, perception, and so on. Elizabeth Riddle (1975), in discussing several distinctions in meaning between infinitival and *that* complements, concludes that "all *that* complements describe situations which are more objectively true and where there is a greater psychological distance between the subject or speaker and the object."<sup>(2)</sup> Presumably, a *that*-clause may be called a sentential assertion which cannot yield much influence over the subject or the indirect object in the main clause.

With regard to the conjunction *that*, it is frequently left out, especially in spoken English. Bolinger (1972) considers it "safe to say that the omission of *that* characterizes relaxed speech to some extent regardless of the verb."<sup>(3)</sup> Nonetheless, the deletion of the conjunction *that* is inapplicable in such verbs as *assert*, *command*, and *urge*, due to the property of each verb.

Yasui (1980) categorizes verbs like *warn*, *inform*, *require* as action verbs which require an indirect object to undergo the action. However, consider the following pair of sentences:

(7) He *warned* that there was a dangerous place ahead.

(8) The old Italian proverb *warns* that oranges are gold in the morning, silver in the afternoon and lead at night.

Despite the absence of indirect object, each sentence seems understandable. Presumably, unspecified indirect objects denote people in general. We may insert such words as *people*, *us*, *them* before *that*-clause safely, without changing the meaning.

On the other hand, verbs like *explain*, *confess*, *suggest*, are followed only by a prepositional object, though optionally. For example:

(9) She explained *to him* that she was there on business connected with the hospital.

(10) \*She explained him that she was there on business connected with the hospital.

(11) He confessed *to me* that he had stolen a watch.

(12) \*He confessed me that he had stolen a watch.

Concerning the verb *tell*, it requires a (pro)noun as an indirect object. For example:

(13) He told *me* that he would go home.

(14) \*He told to me that he would go home.

(15) \*He told that he would go home.

That being the case, the structure in (3b) may be analyzed in the following manner:

(16) John told *Mary for Mary* to telephone Bill immediately.

where the subject of to-infinitive is not *Mary* but *for Mary*, which does not appear on the surface. Therefore, it seems plausible that both *Mary's* in (3a) and (3b) function as indirect object.

II. Now let us go into the main topic of this paper, the tense of *that*-clause. To begin with, English grammatical terminology TENSE is a means of verbal expression indicating the time when an action takes place. English has only two tenses: Present and Past. Two verbal groups Perfect and Future may be incorporated in Present, and Pluperfect and Past Future in Past. English tense forms are signaled by the conjugation of verbs, by the use of the auxiliary, and the combination of both. All the finite verbs refer to time-relation.

Contrastively, according to Kunihiro (lecture given at the Second Applied Linguistics Meeting, Sophia University, 1982), Japanese is a language which has aspect but no tense. Since Japanese is rather a tenseless language, the past tense, for example, is used with an adverb expressing the future or present time. He gives the following examples:

(17) Asu wa tanjyobi de *at-ta*.  
tomorrow birthday was  
"Tomorrow *is* my birthday."

(18) Kyo *kita* to ittei-ta.  
today came said  
"He said that he *would come* today."

As illustrated above, the tense in Japanese is not in accordance with the flow of time. This constitutes a considerable problem for the Japanese in understanding the notion of tense in English. Therefore, the contrastive analysis based on the grammar of individual languages will be of great value for Japanese learners of English. Let us consider how the tense forms in subordinate clauses differ between English and Japanese:

(19) She *told* me that she would wait till I *returned*.

Watashi ga *modoru* made kanojyo wa *matteiru* to  
I return till she wait  
watashi ni *ittei-ta*.  
me told

(20) Carol *said* that she *lived* alone with her mother.

Carol wa hahaoya to futaridake de *Kurashite-iru* to  
mother alone live  
*ittei-ta*.  
said.

(21) She *knew* what *was* in the box.

Kanojyo wa sono hako ni *haitte-iru* mono o  
she the box in is  
*shhitei-ta*.  
knew

(22) Henry *fixed* almost anything that *needed* repairing.

Henry wa shuuri o *yosuru* mono wa taitei  
repairing need thing almost  
*naoshiteshimma-ta*.  
fixed

The morpheme *ta* attached to the verb indicates the past tense, while *ru* indicates the future or present tense. Thus, in Japanese the tenses in the subordinate or relative clauses are expressed in the present, which may tell you that in Japanese the tense of the subordinate clause seems irrelevant at least on the surface to that of the main clause.

In English, however, the tense of verbs is determined according to the sequence of tenses. The past tense in the main clause, for instance, requires its corresponding tense in *that*-clause. Yasui (1980) points out that English carries the structural frame where every element subordinating the main clause is conditioned to observe from a fixed point indicated by the tense of the main clause.

In Japanese, determination of tense forms is dependent on the relativity or the order of occurrence not upon the sequence of time. The so-called subordinate clause is not subordinated to the main clause. Instead, it occurs before the main verb and is independent of the tense of the main verb. If a subordinate clause takes place before the action of the main clause, the tense in the subordinate clause is regularly in the past, disregarding the tense in the main clause. For example:

(23) Ookiku *nattara*, kangofu ni *narimasu*.

older grew nurse become

"I shall be a nurse when I grow up."

As Anzai (1983) proposes, in Japanese the verbs in the subordinate clauses are usually expressed in the present or future tense when the final verbs in the main clause are in the past. For example:

(24) *Watashi wa kare ga sensei de aru koto o shhitei-ta.*

I he teacher is knew

"I knew that he was a teacher."

Consequently, Japanese learners of English often misuse the tense forms in *that*-clause when the main verb is in the past. For instance, a sentence like

(25) He admitted *that he was a spy*.

should be expressed in Japanese, as in (26):

(26) *Kare wa jibun ga supai de aru koto o mitome-ta.*

he he spy is admitted

Instead, they tend to literally translate the verb *was* in (25) into *at-ta* (had been), thus, changing the meaning completely, as shown below:

(27) *Kare wa jibun ga supai de at-ta koto o mitome-ta.*

He admitted *that he had been a spy*.

The misuse of such tense form in *that*-clause reflects transfer of the Japanese tense concept, namely, in Japanese the main verb does not restrict the tense of the subodinate clause, as the counterpart verb in English does.

At this stage of discussion, we must consider indirect speech in which "the words of the speaker are subordinated in the form of a *that*-clause within the reporting sentence."<sup>(4)</sup> English has two ways of stating what someone says or has said (or thinks or has thought) i.e. direct speech and indirect speech, whereas Japanese has only one way, i.e. direct speech. Yasui (1980) maintains that it is a matter of choice on the part of speakers of English which way to use in their actual discourse. Nevertheless, the use of indirect speech as well as the sequence of tenses belongs to the new concept for Japanese learners of English. They must learn that the tense of *that*-clause either after Verbs (+ Utterance) or Verbs (- Utterance) is in accordance with the sequence of time, and that when an introducing verb is in the past, the tenses of indirect speech are back-shifted. Here are some contrastive examples where back-shifting does not take place in the subordinate clauses in Japanese. The first four examples may explain that in Japanese

such tense forms in the subordinate clauses are expressed in the present and in the cases of the last two, the past tense is used, while in English the tenses in *that*-clauses are all back-shifted.

(28) He *predicted* that there *would be* a drought.

*Kare wa kanbatsu ga okoru to yogenshi-ta.*

he drought is predicted

(29) I *promised* him that I *would come*.

*Watashi wa kare ni kuru to yakusokushi-ta.*

I him come promised

(30) They *objected* that the new tax law *was* unfair.

*Atarashii zei ho wa fukoohei de aru to karera wa*

new tax law unfair is they

*hantaishi-ta.*

objected

(31) Iris *felt* that she *could* not desert her mother.

*Iris wa haha o misuteru koto wa deki-nai to*

mother desert can not

*omot-ta.*

felt

(32) I *informed* May that her son *had arrived*.

*Watashi wa May ni kanojyono musuko ga toochaku*

I her son arrived

*shi-ta koto o shirase-ta.*

informed

(33) Tom *confessed* that he *had stolen* a car.

*Tom wa kuruma o nusunda to hakujo shi-ta.*

car stole confessed

As stated above, the tense of the subordinate clause in Japanese is independent of the tense of the main verb. In addition, the concept of such past perfect tense in examples above is also new for learners of English.

Assuming that *that*-construction composed of Verbs (+ Utterance) or Verbs (- Utterance) is analogous to indirect speech, we may expect the following example:

(34) She insisted *that her daughter always came home early*.

has its corresponding direct speech like

(35) She insisted, "My daughter always comes home early."

and also has a cleft counterpart such as

(36) What she insisted was "My daughter always comes home early."

Quirk and Greenbaum (1972) classifies the "incorporated speech" as "notional direct object" of *insisted*.

But we shall not be concerned with this issue here. In Japanese a "content clause" is expressed in direct speech. For example:

- (37) Kare wa amerika ni iki tai to omot-ta.  
 he America go want thought  
 "He thought, 'I want to go to America.'"

The use of direct speech seems effective in reproducing the scene or the situation where the action takes place.

Anzai (1983) argues that English has also "represented speech" (Jespersen) or "free indirect speech" (Quirk) to make a vivid impression on hearers. He gives the example below: (p. 166)

- (38) She asked her next neighbor if she knew Lady Mickleham by sight. *Had she seen her lately?*

However, the frequency of "represented speech" is far less than indirect speech in English, while direct speech is more frequently used in Japanese than "represented speech". Presumably, in English, indirect speech is preferred over direct speech, especially when main verbs are of Verbs (- Utterance).

Furthermore, a *that*-construction has some parallel with indirect speech in that it can ignore the rule of sequence of tenses in the rendering of general statements, habits or historical events. For example:

- (39) He recognized *that Death doesn't die, that he continues to collect his toll.*  
 (40) The report revealed *that many teachers are alcoholic.*  
 (41) Mr. Smith explained to his students *that the First World War lasted from 1914 to 1918.*

In this way, the tense of *that*-clause is conditioned by the choice of the main verb. The tense of indirect speech also behaves in the same way. Here are some examples to clarify the time-relationship between *that*-clauses and Verbs (+ Utterance) as well as Verbs (- Utterance). In addition, *that*-clauses are subdivided into *ru*-type and *ta*-type, in accordance with the Japanese time expression. As mentioned above, the morpheme *ru* denotes the future or present tense and the morpheme *ta*, the past. The present negative morpheme *nai* and the future suffix *daroo* are included in *ru*-type:

- (42) Verbs (+ Utterance) + *That*-Clause<sup>(5)</sup>

*Ru*-type:

- a. The pontiff said *that the sovereignty of a state*

*was closely linked with the freedom of the nation.*

- b. Phillips has denied several times *that he and Ann would become engaged.*  
 c. Pope John declared Sunday *that Poland had the right to live in freedom* and he called this "one of the fundamental right in the moral order."  
 d. Rumanian officials stressed *that any such Soviet moves would be in contradiction with Moscow's current rhetoric of detente.*  
 e. Allon asserted *that Israel was ready to negotiate peace with any Arab country.*  
 f. She indicated *that she would soon resign her office.*  
 g. Mary predicted *that she would marry a doctor.*  
 h. He remarked *that she looked very pretty.*  
 i. She answered *that she would be happy to come.*  
 j. Some objected *that the new tariff would worsen diplomatic relations.*  
 k. John promised me *that he would be here at eight o'clock.*  
 l. U.S. President John Kennedy confided to close aides and friends a month before his death *that he was ready if reelected to pull American troops out of Vietnam*, a new biography says.  
 m. He announced *that he didn't like work and that he wasn't suited for marriage.*  
 n. The doctor emphasized *that the patient had only a few days to live.*  
 o. She complained to me *that she did not have enough to do.*  
 p. Douglas Liyanage, Secretary to the Ministry of State, told reporters *that there were no new reports of major violence Sunday night in Sri Lanka.*  
 q. Three members of the opposition Labour Party fired back *that the 34-year-old heir to the throne was intervening in politics and had no understanding of what life was for ordinary people.*
- Ta*-type:
- a. The government disclosed *that she had worked as a spy.*  
 b. Wafa claimed *that King Hussein had overcome opposition to his marriage from his*

mother, *Queen Zein*, and his brother *Hassan*.

- c. The Sunday Times reported *that the Ruey Pin Trading Co. here had been selling panda skins from China since last December*.
- d. He replied *that he had never been in New York*.
- e. Carol said good-bye and added *that she had a pleasant visit*.
- f. He stated *that he had done his best in that matter*.
- g. Various groups pointed out *that they had always been discriminated against in this country*.
- h. The letter arrived last week, advising Kevin Burns, born Oct. 25, 1963, *that he'd failed to register as required by law*, Burns said.
- i. An official indicated *that they had failed to reach agreement in their series of secret peace negotiations*.

(43) Verbs (- Utterance) + *That-Clause*

*Ru-type*:

- a. Americans learned *that their air, water, land, and food were being polluted*.
- b. I noticed *that if a party was amusing she could dance till five in the morning*.
- c. He discovered *that Hopi followed its own precise set of grammatical rules*.
- d. I observed *that he was a patron of the excellent Mosieur Coty*.
- e. They had expected *that the conservative Reagan would be immune from attacks from the right wing in the United States, and could thus turn the clock back to the cooperative days of de-tente*.
- f. I often thought *that you were strong enough to do the things you wanted to*.
- g. One might be tempted to conclude *that he favored the creation of a universal language*.
- h. When I looked into the mirror, I saw *that I was too old to do the foolish things, but still too young to feel grave*.
- i. I meant *that my son should become a doctor*.
- j. America's 50 state governors resolved Tuesday *that the nation owed an apology but no money to the 120,000 Japanese Americans interned in camps during World War II*.
- k. A West German court ruled Tuesday *that the*

*reporter who bought the forged Hitler diaries for Stern magazine could be released from prison while he awaits trial*.

- l. They also acknowledged *that it would be difficult for Congress to force an end to the war in the near future*.
- m. Circumstances forced George to realize *that his brother would never settle down*.

*Ta-type*:

- a. I suspected at once *that his unfortunate brother had been causing trouble*.
- b. He fancied *that he heard foot steps behind him*.
- c. Diplomats speculated *that Chernenko might have agreed to give stronger public support to Andropov's politics in return for compromises on other issues*.
- d. The Swedish Foreign Ministry confirmed *that the U.S. State Department had asked Sweden not to send a new ambassador to Washington for the moment*.

This final section deals with *that*-clauses containing the auxiliary *should*. This happens after verbs like *ask*, *command*, *suggest*, *regret* and after adjectives like *important*, *eager*, *necessary*, *vital*. But our discussion is restricted to verbs here. Quirk and Greenbaum (1972) designate *should* of this kind as "putative" *should*, because *should* does not express "a subordinate statement of fact", but a "putative idea." Ideas of this kind may be expressed with the subjunctive, especially in American English. Thus, the following example

(44) Americans ask that life *should* be meaningful.

can also be expressed with the subjunctive, as in (45):

(45) Americans ask that life *be* meaningful.

Incidentally, it is interesting to notice that in modern British English the subjunctive is not very common and is used chiefly in formal style, while in American English it survives at the level of colloquial expressions. The subjunctive is still flourishing in Latin, French, Spanish and other languages. For instance, in Spanish, after *dudar* (to doubt) and other verbs expressing uncertainty, the subjunctive is used. For Example:

(46) *Dudaba que lo hicieran*.

doubted that it do <subjunctive>

"I doubted that they were doing it."

In English, the form of the subjunctive is identical with

the infinitive. *Should* is used, in all persons, in clauses denoting a "putative" idea, with the main verb either in the present or in the past tense.

Consequently, learners are apt to misinterpret the "putative" *should* as the auxiliary *should* which carries the sense of obligation, i.e. "ought to". Let us consider the following italicized *should* as contrasted with those italic *yoo* or *yooni* in Japanese:

- (47) They urge that the trial *should* be held.  
 Karera wa saiban o hiraku-*yoo* shuchoshite-iru.  
 they trial hold urge
- (48) Dr. Preston decreed that his son *should* become a clergyman.  
 Preston hakase wa musuko ni bokushi ni naru-*yoo*  
 doctor son clergyman become  
 meiji-ta.  
 decreed
- (49) He requires that the students *should* present their papers.  
 Kare wa gakusei ni ronbun o happyoosuru-*yoo*  
 he student paper present  
 yokyushite-iru.  
 require
- (50) He commanded that a messenger *should* be dispatched at once.  
 Kare wa tadachini denrei o hashiraseru-*yooni*  
 he at once messenger dispatch  
 meiji-ta.  
 commanded
- (51) I recommended that he *should* think carefully.  
 Watashi wa kare ga shinchooni kangaeru-*yooni*  
 I he carefully think  
 susume-ta.  
 recommended

The morpheme *yoo* or *yooni* stands for "putative" *should* in English. In these sentences, *yoo* or *yooni* is used depending upon the final verbs, but not *neba nara nai* meaning "ought to" in English. Here are some examples of *that*-construction containing *should* or the subjunctive:

- (52) a. I command *that you should act justly.*  
 b. She proposed *that he should meet her in the second-class waiting room at Victoria Station.*  
 c. He ordered *that I should go there.*  
 d. Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Everett

Ricks recommended *that under no circumstances should he be released.*

- e. She urged *that the members should pay their dues promptly.*  
 f. The chairman directed *that she should submit the paper.*  
 g. He came to my house and demanded *that I should help him.*  
 h. Fate has decreed *that we should meet.*  
 i. We agreed *that we should take the first train.*  
 j. I advise *that you take a holiday.*  
 k. God grants *that you come home safe and sound.*  
 l. His injury requires *that he wear a neck brace.*  
 m. Some critics even suggested *that all parades be banned.*  
 n. Vance Packard urges *that efforts be made to stabilize our shifting population* so that Americans can "rediscover the natural human community."  
 o. They requested *that something be done immediately.*  
 p. He specified *that he be given a preference.*

What has been treated in this paper is the notion that in English the verbal tense in *that*-clause is determined according to the sequence of time. Since Japanese is not so time-oriented as English, transfer of the Japanese tense concept tends to prevent learners from understanding the rule of sequence of tenses. The difficulty of learning a foreign language is assumed to depend largely on the degree of differences between the target and the native languages of learners. Grammar teaching plays a vital role even in the most up-to-date course, because each language has its own grammar. English, having lost inflection by the eleventh century, has a unique grammar mostly based on a fairly fixed word order. We cannot learn English without a deep understanding of its grammar, "a COMMON CORE which constitutes the major part of any variety of English, however specialized, and without which fluency in any variety at a higher than parrot level is impossible."<sup>(6)</sup> From a pedagogical point of view, the tense of a *that*-construction seems better accounted for if it is treated parallel to the tense of indirect speech, which is also conditioned by the introducing verb in the past tense. It is also desirable to deal with the tense forms of

English by contrasting them with those of Japanese. Hopefully the examples discussed above have elucidated the use of the tense forms in *that*-clauses and should help familiarize learners of English with a *that*-construction and indirect speech characteristic of English and other Indo-European languages.

NOTES

- (1) Jespersen, Otto. *Essentials of English Grammar*. George Allen and Unwin: London. (1933) p. 349.
- (2) Riddle, Elizabeth. "Some Pragmatic Conditions on Complementizer Choice," *Kaigai Eigo Ronso*. (English Linguistics Inquiry) 1977, ed. by Minoru Yasui, 155-66. Eichosha: Tokyo. (1975) p. 165.
- (3) Bolinger, Dwight. *That's That*. Mouton: The Hague. (1972) p. 22.
- (4) Quirk, Randolph et al. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Longman: London. (1972) p. 785.
- (5) Most examples are from *The Japan Times* and some from *Cosmopolitans* by W.S. Maugham, and so on.  
Quirk Randolph and S. Greenbaum. *A University Grammar of English*. Longman: London. (1973) p. 8.

REFERENCES

- 1) Lester, Mark. *Introductory Transformational Grammar of English*. Holt Rinehart and Winston: New York (1971).
- 2) Kiparsky, Paul and C. Kiparsky. "Fact," *Progress in Linguistics*, ed. by Manfred Bierwisch and K. Heidolph, 143-73. Mouton: The Hague. (1970).
- 3) Rosenbaum, P. S. *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*. The M.I.T. Press: Cambridge, Mass. (1967).
- 4) Nakajima, Fumio. *Eigo no Kozo (The Structure of English)* I. Iwanamishoten. Tokyo (1980).
- 5) Yasui, Minoru. *A Better Guide to English Grammar*. Kaitakusha: Tokyo. (1982).
- 6) Anzai, Tetsuo. *Eigo no Hasso (The Way in Thinking in English)*. Kodansha: Tokyo. (1983).
- 7) Sack, F. L. *The Structure of English*. Kinseido: Tokyo. (1967).
- 8) Kuno, Susumu. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. The M.I.T. Press: Cambridge, Mass. (1973).
- 9) Kimizuka, Sumako. *Teaching English to Japanese*. The Feather: Moab, Utah. (1977).
- 10) Hinds, J. and Haward Irwin ed. *Problems in Japanese Syntax and Semantics*. Kaitakusha: Tokyo. (1978).

That 節の研究

市村洋子

(昭和58年9月23日受理)

日本語には時制の一致という現象がないので、時制の一致が要求される従属節の時制は、特殊な規則という印象を与えがちである。しかし、これは、主節の動詞が過去形であるとき、従属節もふくめて、それに支配されるものすべてが、過去の枠組に入るため、自動的に過去形に変わる結果として生じるものである。一方、日本語では、日常、直接話法が多く用いられているので、間接話法は、概念的にも理解しにくい点がある。さらに、ここでも時制の一致が問題になる。本文では、*that* 節と主節の時制との関係を、日本語と英語を比較しながら、話法の面からも考察すると同時に、*that* 節が使われている例文を言語理論に基づいて分析し、その扱い方を英語教授法の立場から解明したい。