変形文法の観点から見た中世英語の統語構造

岸 田 直 子

Syntactic Structures of Middle English Seen from the Viewpoint of Transformational Grammar

Naoko Kishida

Word order problems in ME are discussed, paying attention to the relation to the word order of OE. Emonds' Structure-Preserving Contraint is shown to have some defects. The universal filter formulated by Chomsky and Lasnik does not operate in ME, if *that* belongs to the category Comp in ME.

1. Introduction. Within the framework of transformational grammar the syntactic structures of Middle English can be studied in the following two aspects : One is whether the proposed conditions on the form and function of rules (J. R. Ross 1967, J. Emonds 1976) are adequate or not. The other aspect is pointed out in D. Lightfoot (1976). He notes that syntactic changes can take place in certain surface structure filters or in deep structure category memberships. Specifically he argues for a certain cases of a deep structure change. According to him, the deep structure category Modal was first introduced in 16th century. The *to* infinitives were NPs in their earliest days, being free, therefore, to occur after the preposition *for*, and were later reanalyzed as VPs, losing their NP status and thus their ability to occur directly after *for*. He maintains that *for* is still a deep structure preposition and not a COMP.

Lightfoot further speculates on the cause of syntactic change. According to his 'opacity principle'[1], deep structure reanalyses take place when existing analyses become more opaque to the language learner, harder to figure out. His goal is to characterize the tolerance level for deep structure opacity, the point at which radical restructurings take place.

2. Word Order. J. R. Ross (1970) is an attempt to determine the basic word order of languages in deep structure. A transformational rule called Gapping deletes indefinitely many occurrences of a repeated main verb in a conjoined structure. According to his hypothesis, the order in which Gapping operates depends on the order of elements at the time when the rule applies; if the identical elements are on left branches, Gapping operates forward; if they are on right branches, it operates backward. Ross posits the following principle which should be added to the theory of grammar.

If a language has SOV order in deep structure, it is a VERB-FINAL LANGUAGE : its grammar can contain no rule which moves verbs to the left, nor any rule of the form

$$\cdots\cdots A \cdots\cdots X$$
$$1 \quad 2 \Rightarrow 0 \quad 2+1$$

If this principle is correct, German, which exhibits SVO order in main clauses, but SOV order in subordinate clauses, cannot be an SOV language. German contains the rule of Extraposition from NP, and Gapping can operate in either direction in subordinate clauses.

Middle English contains the cases of forward Gapping.

(1) I dar wel seyn, if she hadde been a mous[2], And he a cat, he wolde hire hente anon.

    (Chaucer, "The Miller's Tale" 3346—7)

(2) His rode was reed, his eyen greye as goos.

    (Chaucer, "The Miller's Tale" 3317)

(3) For som folk wol ben wonnen for richesse, And somme for strokes, and some for gentilesse.

    (Chaucer, "The Miller's Tale" 3381—2)

In (1) Gapping operates in a subordinate clause, and (2) and (3) are independent clauses. T. Nakao (1972 : 378—404) discusses word order in ME. In 13th century the positions of the subject and the verb began to be fixed. The subject was placed before the verb. Since the Early Middle English period SVO order is normal in main clauses as well as in subordinate clauses. SOV order had often occurred in subordinate clauses when the object was a pronoun until 13th century. Nakao concerns only with surface structure, but the underlying SVO order is consistent with the fact that Gapping operates forward in ME.

In N. Kishida (1977) I formulated the rule Pronoun Object Preposing which can account for cases of SOV order.

Pronoun Object Preposing :

    X - V - PRO - Y

    1   2   3   4 $\Rightarrow$ 1 - 3 + 2 - ϕ - 4

This rule may have to be revised. See (4), where the pronoun *hire* is moved leftward over the phrase *in his armes*.

(4) whan she hym felte hire in his armes folde

    (Chaucer, *Troilus and Criseyde* 1. 1201)

The modified rule will have the following form.

(5) Pronoun Object Preposing (revised) :

    X - V - PRO - Y

    1   2   3   4 $\Rightarrow$ 3 - 1 - 2 - ϕ - 4

The rule (5) poses some problems concerning Emonds' Structure-Preserving Constraint. This rule can operate in subordinate clauses. Therefore, it should be either structure-preserving or local. But this rule cannot be structure-preserving because the pronoun object does not move to an NP position, and it cannot be a local rule because the pronoun object moves over a variable.

Charles Jones (1972 : 98) notes Subject-Verb Inversion in a subordinate clause which begins with *tha* (=when).

(6) tha com se kyng to Englaland innon heruest,

    (Peterborough Chronicle : Annal 1129)

Subject-Verb Inversion is a root transformation which can operate only in root S's. We can get out of this difficulty if the notion Root S can be defined to include the clause in (6). This inversion seems to be optional. See (7) and (8).

(7) tha the King Stephne to Englalande com,

    (Peterborough Chronicle, 1137)

(8) tha hit eall com forth,

    (Peterborough Chronicle : Annal 1129)

In N. Kishida (1977) I noted another instance which does not obey Emonds' constraint. The subject NP is often postposed to final position in subordinate clauses as well. This rule cannot be structure preserving because the postposed NP's do not dominate an S or a PP. Unless the stylistic transformations which Banfield (1973) suggests can account for these cases, they will pose serious problems to the Structure-Preserving Constraint.

According to E. C. Traugott (1965), word order in Old English has the following patterns :

In coordinate *and* clauses and in subordinate clauses, the finite verb often occurs at the end.

In independent clauses, the finite verb occurs after the subject.

Traugott postulates the underlying SOV order for OE. J. C. McLaughlin (1970 : 184) also assumes SOV order in deep structure.

Categorial Subcomponent :

$$S \rightarrow (Q) \quad (Neg) \begin{Bmatrix} NP \\ \phi \end{Bmatrix} VP \ Aux$$

$$VP \rightarrow (Adv) \ MV$$

$$MV \rightarrow (PP) \left(\begin{Bmatrix} Pred \\ NP \ (NP) \end{Bmatrix} \right) \quad V$$

Lawrence Mitchell (1972) is an attempt to demonstrate that Old English is an SVO language. Mitchell notes that OE shows Gapping.

(9) ······tha gefeaht se cyning Aethered wip
     thara cyninga getruman ········and Aelfred
     his brothur thara eorla getruman
     (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 871)

Emonds' Structure-Preserving Constraint is inconsistent with SVO order. because it requires a rule that moves the verb to final position in subordinate clauses.

J. M. Maling refutes Ross's principle in her paper (1972). She contends that no claim about base order can be made on the basis of Gapping, since it is only the input order of constituents after the application of reordering rules, and not the deep structure order, that is relevant. According to her proposal, only languages without SOV inputs can exhibit no Gapping whatsoever. If we assume SOV order for OE, word order change SOV→SVO should have occurred in ME period. Lightfoot (1976) argues that the development of a rule of Extraposition in late ME is a consequence of the earlier SOV→SVO word order change.

Quirk and Wrenn (1955: 88—9) says that modifiers in general (especially adjectives, and especially in poetic usage) often follow their nouns in Old English, while in Early Middle English modifiers already occupy the front position according to Nakao (1972: 390). Lightfoot (1976: 22) makes interesting remarks in this connection. He says that $\overline{X}$ conventions have two interesting consequences for diachronic syntacticians: they provide a restrictive theory of a possible phrase structure rule, thus constraining possible innovations, and they yield a descriptive mechanism for cross-category generalizations. If a language has a convention $\overline{\overline{X}} \rightarrow$ (Spec $\overline{X}$) $\overline{X}$ where X may be N, V, Adj, etc.,

then (assuming Aux, Det and Degree Adverbs to be 'specifiers' of major categories) it will follow that one will find in that language Aux-V order, Det-N and Degree Adv-Adj. Given conventions of this type, one would not expect to find a language with Aux-V order and N-Det. Diachronically one would expect that if a language changes from V-Aux to Aux-V order, then it will also change from N-Det to Det-N. One would not expect a crosscategory rule to be introduced which affected different bar levels, e.g., N, V and Adj. In other words, word order change in modification is related to the change SOV→SVO.

3. The Status of Comp *that*. D. T. Langendoen (1970) notes the fact that when the relative pronoun stands for the subject of a subordinate clause inside the relative clause, the subordinating conjunction *that* introducing that subordinate clause must be deleted. Thus the following sentence is grammatical :

(10) The committee which I understand investigated the accident has not yet made its report public.

but not :

(11) * The committee which I understand that investigated the accident has not yet made its report public.

Chomsky and Lasnik (1977) tries to develop some notion of well-formedness for surface structure, which they call a "surface filter". These filters will have to bear the burden of accounting for constraints which, in the earlier and far richer theory, were expressed in statements of ordering and obligatoriness, as well as all contextual dependencies that cannot be formulated in the narrower framework of core grammar. They claim that the properties of the complementizer system can be captured in a direct and natural way by resorting to the device of a surface filter. They suggest the following filter in order to account for the ungrammaticality of (11).

(12) * [that [$_{NP}$ e]

According to Chomsky and Lasnik, this filter

is valid for all languages that do not have a rule of Subject Pronoun Deletion, and only these.

In ME we have (13), which would be ungrammatical in presentday English.

(13) Tha namen hi tha men the hi wenden that
      ani god hefden,

        (The Peterborough Chronicle, 1137)

If the rule Subject Pronoun Deletion does not operate in ME, the filter (12) cannot be universal. Comp *that* in ME shows other peculiarities as well. It cooccurs with subordinating conjunctions, and relative wh-words.

(14) Tharfore the pope seynt Gregory
      Tellyth thys tale, resun why
      That envye ys a cursed synne,

        (Robert Mannyng of Brunne 4129—31)

(15) Loverd, we sholen the wel fede,
      Til that thu conne riden on stede,
      Til that thu conne ful wel bere

        (Havelok the Dane 621— 3)

(16) Do he to Gode thet he muye, the hwile
      thet he bo alive.

        (The "Poema Morale " 21)

(17) What wol my deere herte seyn to me,
      Which that I drede nevere mo to see ?

        (Chaucer, *Troilus and Criseyde* 4 . 858)

This difficulty may be overcome if we suppose that *that* did not belong to the category Comp in ME. Then this will constitute another case of a deep structure change, which Lightfoot suggests. E. C. Traugott (1972) notes that no complement of the form *that* + Sentence occurs in subject position not only in OE but also in ME. The question is still open where Comp *that* comes from.

Notes :

¹ The notion 'opacity of a rule' is defined in P. Kiparsky (1971 : 621— 2) as follows :
   Definition . A rule A → B / C____D is
   opaque to the extent that there are
   surface representations of the form
      (i)   A in environment C____D
   or (ii) B in environment other than
      C____D.

² Spellings are modernized for the printer's convenience.

³ The significance of this sentence was pointed out by T. Inada in class.

REFERENCES

Banfield, Ann. Stylistic transformations in "Paradise Lost." Unpublished dissertation. University of Wisconsin, 1973.

Chomsky, Noam. and Howard Lasnik. "Filters and Control" *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol . 8, No. 3 pp. 425—504

Emonds, Joseph. A Transformational Approach to English Syntax. New York : Academic Press. 1976.

Jones, Charles. An Introduction to Middle English. New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1972.

Kiparsky, Paul. "Historical Linguistics " In W. O. Dingwall (ed.), A Survey of Linguistic Science. pp. 576—649, University of Maryland. 1971.

Kishida, Naoko. "Complementation in Middle English" Annual Report of The Bunkyo University No. 10. 1977.

Langendoen, D. Terence. "The Accessibility of Deep Structures " in Jacobs and Rosenbaum (ed.), Readings in English Transformational Grammar pp. 99—104 Waltham, Mass : Ginn. 1970.

Lightfoot, David. "The Base Component as a Locus of Syntactic Change" in W. M. Christie (ed.), Current Progress in Historical Linguistics pp. 17—37 Amsterdam : North-Holland.

Maling, Joan M. "On Gapping and the Order of Constituents " Linguistic Inquiry Vol. 3, No. 1 pp. 101— 8 .

McLaughlin, John C. Aspects of the History of English New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1970.

Mitchell, Lawrence. "Old English as an SVO language : Evidence from the Auxiliary" Papers in Linguistics 5 : 2 pp. 183—201.

Nakao, Toshio. History of English II (Middle English) "Outline of English Linguistics 9 "

Tokyo : Taishukan 1972.

Quirk R. and C. L. Wrenn. An Old English
Grammar London : Methuen. 1955.

Ross, John Robert. Constraints on Variables
in Syntax Unpublished dissertation, MIT.
Reproduced by Indiana University Linguistic
Club. 1967.

Ross, John R. "Gapping and the Order of Con-
stituents" in Bierwisch and Heidolph (ed.)
Progress in Linguistics pp. 249—259. The
Hague : Mouton.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. "Diachronic Syntax
and Generative Grammar" in Reibel and Schane
(ed.) Modern Studies in English. Englewood
Cliffs, New Jersey : Prentice-Hall. 1969. pp.
395—408.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. A History of En-
glish Syntax. New York : Holt, Rinehart and
Winston. 1972.