

中英語統語論の諸問題

岸田直子

The Syntax of Middle English Complementation

Naoko Kishida

O. **Introduction.** This paper is an attempt to characterize some syntactic properties of ME complementation, and to discuss their theoretical importance in the framework of generative grammar. In section 1, I show that OE and ME allow the kind of complement structure with the extracted subject which Modern English does not allow. In section 2, I discuss the theoretical problems that this structure poses.

It has been observed by several linguists including Langendoen (1970), Perlmutter (1971), and Bresnan (1979), that the subject cannot be extracted from the complement structure with a *that* complementizer. Thus see the sentences below. In (1) and (2) the extracted subject is relativized, while (3), (4) and (5) are the questions. It is generally agreed that the same rule, wh movement, operates to extract the complement subject in both relatives and questions.

- (1) The committee which I understand investigated the accident has not yet made its report public.
- (2) *The committee which I understand *that* investigated the accident has not yet made its report public.
- (3) *Who do you believe *that* _____ fired on you?
- (4) Who do you believe fired on you?
- (5) What does he believe (that) you did?

(Langendoen 1970 : 102-3)

(Bresnan 1979 : 97)

1. **The OE and ME Facts.** Now I try to show that in OE and ME the complement subject does appear in front in the context of (2). Unfortunately, I have not been able to find any examples of questions so far such as (3). I am not sure whether this gap is accidental or systematic.

First I present some OE examples. I owe (6), (7) and (8) to C. Allen (1980). The

translation is her own. The part '(that) _____' in her translation indicates the complement structure in question. The sentence (9) is taken from Kellner (1956) together with his own translation. Notice that the complementizer *ðæt* in the original is omitted in his translation. The structure in question is indicated in italics by Kellner.

(6) Ac is wolde witan hu ðe ðuhte be
 but I would know how thee-dat. seemed about
ðæm monnum ðe wit ær cwædon ðæt unc
 the men that we earlier said that us
ðuhte ðæt wæron wildiorun gelicran ðone
 seemed that were wild-beasts like-er than
 monnu.
 men

'But I would like to know how it seemed to you
 about the men that we said earlier (that) _____
 were more like wild beasts than men.'

(Boeth. XXVIII. 5 p. 122. 13)

(C. Allen 1980 : 264)

(7) And he ahefð hine sylfne ofer ealle ða
 and he raises him self over all those
 ðe hæðene men cwædon ðæt godas beon
 that heathen men said that gods be
 sceoldon.
 should

'And he raises himself over all those that
 heathen men said (that) _____ were gods.'

(Wulf. N. p. 197. 16)

(C. Allen 1980 : 278)

(8) Forðæm sceal ðæs modes læce ær
 therefore shall the spirit's physician first
 tilian ðæs ðe he wenð ðæt ðone
 tend that-gen. that he thinks that the
 mon ær mæge gebrengan on færwyrd.
 man-acc, first may bring into perdition
 'Therefore shall the physician of the spirit
 first tend that which he think (that) _____
 may first bring the man into perdition.'

(CP Sweet p. 457. 10)

(C. Allen 1980 : 278)

(9) Eac wæs gesewen on ðæm wage atifred..., & eac sio gidsung *þe Sanctus Paulus*
cwæð ðæt wære hearga & idelnesse gefera (There were also seen painted on the

wall..., and also the cupidity *which St. Paul said was* the companion of idols and vanity).

(*Pastoral Care* 156/5 Cotton MS.)

(Kellner 1956 : 62)

Notice that the above sentences (6), (7), (8), and (9) are the cases of *that* relatives, and not *wh* relatives. This fact casts some doubt on the validity of these examples. If *that* relatives of ME are derived by deletion, as is claimed by Grimshaw (1975) and Allen (1980), then it will follow that the complement subject has been deleted instead of being extracted. But see the ME examples below, where the example of *wh* relatives is presented.

- (10) Ða namen hi pa men pe hi wenden
when caught they the men that they thought
pat ani god hefden,
that any good had

'When they caught the men that they thought (that) _____ had any good'

(*The Peterborough Chronicle* 1137)

- (11) And if this knight wol sweren how that she
and if this knight will swear that she
This womman slow, yet wole we us avyse
this woman slew, yet will we us advise
Whom that we wole that shal ben our justyse.
whom that we will that shall be our judge

'And if this knight will swear that she, this womman slew, yet will we advise ourselves whoever that we wish (that) _____ shall be our judge.'

(Chaucer, *The Tale of the Man of Law* 663-5)

- (12) I am he that thou knowe *that dyd doo destroye* (whom thou knowest did cause to be destroyed) rome your cyte, and slewe the Pope and many other,...

(*Charles the Grete*, 52/30)

(Kellner 1956 : 62)

The translation of (10) and (11) is mine, while (12) is translated by Kellner. In (12) the complementizer *that* is omitted in his translation. In (10) and (11) the structure in question is indicated by '(that) _____' in my translation. The sentence (11) is a case of *wh* relatives, as is shown by the occurrence of *whom*.

One may still wonder if (11) may be a case of double restriction such as (13). This interpretation seems to me a little unnatural. The verb *wole* can take a *that* clause as its object. See (14). Another possibility is that *that* is inserted after *we wish* for some metrical purpose.

- (13) There are few people that we meet that are really happy.

- (14) And therefore if ye *wole that* men do you obeisance, ye moste demen more curteisly ;

(Chaucer, *The Tale of Melibeus* 3040-5)

(22) What sleighte is it, thogh it be long and hoot,
 what sleight is it, though it be long and hot,
 That love nyl fynde it out in som manere?
 That love will not find it out in some manner

‘What trick is it, however long and hot it may be, that love will not find?’

(Chaucer, *The Merchant's Tale* 2126–7)

Notes :

1

See N. Chomsky (1977) for further information.

2

The Fixed Subject Constraint : No NP can be crossed over an adjacent complementizer. (Bresnan 1979 : 97)

3

See Chomsky and Lasnik (1977 : 451).

4

Right Node Raising : ..., given certain paired sequences of identical constituents in disjoint clauses, RNR places a double of the sequence on the right, by Chomsky adjunction, and deletes all original occurrences. (Postal 1974 : 126)

References

- Allen, Cynthia, "Movement and Deletion in Old English" *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol. 11, No.2 pp. 261–323 1980.
- Bresnan, J. W. "The Position of Certain Clause-Particles in Phrase Structure" *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol. V., No. 4 pp. 614–619 1974.
- Bresnan, J. W. *Theory of Complementation in English Syntax* New York : Garland 1979.
- Chomsky, Noam. "On Wh-Movement" in Culicover, Wasow, and Akmajian (ed.) 1977. pp. 71–132.
- Chomsky, Noam. and Howard Lasnik. "Filters and Control" *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol. 8 No. 3 pp. 425–504 1977.
- Culicover, P. W., T. Wasow, and A. Akamajian. (ed.) *Formal Syntax* New York : Academic Press, 1977.
- Grimshaw, J. B. "Evidence for Relativization by Deletion in Chaucerian Middle English" in J. B. Grimshaw (ed.) 1975. pp. 35–43
- Grimshaw, J. B. (ed.) *Papers in the History and Structure of English* The University of Massachusetts at Amherst Occasional Papers in Linguistics, No. 1 1975.
- Jacobs, R. A. and P. S. Rosenbaum. (ed.) *Readings in English Transformational Grammar* Waltham, Mass. : Ginn, 1970.
- Kellner, L. *Historical Outlines of English Syntax* Tokyo : Kenkyu-sha 1956.
- Langendoen, D. T. "The Accessibility of Deep Structures" in Jacobs and Rosenbaum (ed.) 1970. pp. 99–104

- Maling, J. and A. Zaenen. "The Nonuniversality of a Surface Filter" *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol. 9 No. 3 pp. 475-497 1978.
- Perlmutter, D. M. *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax* New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.
- Postal, P. M. *On Raising* Cambridge, Mass. : MIT, 1974.
- Visser, F.Th. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language* Leiden : E. J. Brill, 1963.