

# 「中英語統語論における空範疇」

岸田直子

## Empty Category in Middle English Syntax

Naoko Kishida

### § 1. Introduction.

This paper is an attempt to characterize the notion 'empty category', introduced in Chomsky 1981 and to discuss its theoretical problems in Middle English. In § 2, the empty category PRO is discussed in relation to Equi NP Deletion. In § 3, Subject Raising is discussed in terms of another empty category "trace". § 4, deals with the problems of Middle English syntax raised by Government and Binding Theory.

### § 2. Equi NP Deletion and Pronominalization.

P. M. Postal (1970: 443) asserts that the process of pronominalization plays a fundamental role in processes of nominal deletion under coreference conditions. He assumes the existence of a pronoun with the null phonological shape, which he calls Doom. He tries to show that Doom and the ordinary coreferential pronouns share the same distribution, opposed to lexical NPs. Thus the backwards pronominalization is blocked for indefinite NP. He observes EQUI is also blocked in such cases. Compare (1) a, b, and c. (2) is another case which shows similarity between Doom and pronouns.

- (1) a. \*His<sub>i</sub> finding out Greta was a vampire worried somebody<sub>i</sub>.  
b. \*Doom<sub>i</sub> finding out Greta was a vampire worried somebody<sub>i</sub>.  
c. Bill's finding out Greta was a vampire worried somebody.
- (2) a. \*Lucille<sub>i</sub> shouted for her<sub>i</sub> to stop.  
b. \*Lucilleshouted to stop.  
c. Lucille shouted for the thief to stop.

(Postal 1970: 471)

Both Doom and the pronouns are interpreted in the same way in (3) and (4).

- (3) a. Harry<sub>i</sub> promised Bill that he<sub>i</sub> would visit Greta.  
b. Harry<sub>i</sub> promised Bill Doom<sub>i</sub> to visit Greta.

(Ibid. 475)

- (4) a. Mary<sub>i</sub> and John<sub>j</sub> argued about their<sub>i,j</sub> getting married.
- b. Mary<sub>i</sub> and John<sub>j</sub> argued about Doom<sub>i,j</sub> getting married.

(Ibid. 477)

In cases such as (5), however, there are no underlying coreferential pronominals, which should be deleted later by EQUI. That is, the one who kisses Betty is different from the one who condemns the act of kissing in (5).

- (5) Kissing Betty in public was condemned.

(Ibid. 478)

Postal (1970) thinks the sentence (5) does not involve EQUI, but the rule which deletes unspecified subjects.

Chomsky (1981) adopts Postal's idea of a phonologically null pronoun, which he calls PRO. Notice there are places where only pronouns can appear, and only PRO can appear. See (6) and (7).

- (6) a. John<sub>i</sub> thinks he<sub>i</sub> is a genius.
- b. \*John<sub>i</sub> thinks PRO<sub>i</sub> is a genius.
- (7) a. \*Tom<sub>i</sub> does not know what he<sub>i</sub> to do.
- b. Tom<sub>i</sub> does not know what PRO<sub>i</sub> to do.

Chomsky tries to explain this fact in terms of government theory. PRO must be ungoverned; that is, PRO cannot appear in the constructions which has a head (a governor) such as prepositions or verb inflections. Both pronouns and PRO are opposed to anaphors such as reflexives and reciprocal in that the former must be free in their binding category. The latter must be bound by an antecedent in their binding category; that is, they must have an antecedent within the same sentence which has a lexical subject. See (8).

- (8) a. John<sub>i</sub> thinks Tom knows Mary saw him<sub>i</sub>.
- b. \*John<sub>i</sub> thinks (Tom knows) Mary saw himself<sub>i</sub>.
- c. John<sub>i</sub> thinks that it will be difficult PRO<sub>i</sub> to feed himself.

(Chomsky 1981: 57)

According to Chomsky (1981: 61), both overt pronouns and PRO may have an antecedent or be arbitrary in reference. The sentence (5) is a case of arbitrary reference. PRO must be ungoverned, while overt pronouns must be governed so that the latter can receive case from their governor. Every noun with a phonetic matrix must have case (Chomsky 1981: 49).

### § 3. Trace and Movement.

It was first pointed out by Rosenbaum (1967) that the pairs such as (1) can be related by the rule of Subject Raising, which moves the complement subject NP into the position of the superordinate clause subject.

- (1) a. It seems that John is a genius.

b. John seems to be a genius.

Postal (1974: 369–374) offers a lot of arguments, which support the view that (1) b. is derived by Raising, and not by EQUI. The arguments run roughly as follows; that is, if (2) a. is grammatical, then (2) b. is also grammatical, and if (2) a. is ungrammatical, then (2) b. is not grammatical, either. This fact does not follow from an EQUI analysis. Thus see the examples (3) and (4) below.

(2) a. NP VP

b. NP seem to VP

(3) a. There is a man in your bed.

b. \*There groans a man in your bed.

(4) a. There seems to be a man in your bed.

b. \*There seems to groan a man in your bed.

(Postal 1974: 369)

Chomsky (1981) assumes that every movement rule leaves a trace (= an indexed empty category) after the rule applies in the original position. Since Subject Raising is a kind of movement, the sentence (1) would be analyzed as follows according to his analysis.

(5) a. [<sub>s1</sub>NP\* INFL [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>V</sub> seem] [<sub>s2</sub> John INFL be a genius]]]

(D-structure)

b. [<sub>s1</sub>John<sub>i</sub> INFL [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>V</sub> seem] [<sub>s2</sub> trace<sub>i</sub> INFL be a genius]]]

NP\* in (5) a. is an empty category, which will be ultimately filled by expletive *it*, *there*, or the subject of the embedded clause. Both trace and PRO belong to an empty category, which is phonologically null. But there are a number of distinctions we can make between them.

(6) Trace is indexed by a movement rule, while PRO is indexed by control theory.

(7) NP Trace is a kind of anaphor, while PRO is a kind of pronoun.

(8) An anaphor must be governed and bound, while PRO is ungoverned and free.

There are semantic roles such as "agent-of-action," "goal-of-action," which referential NPs play. The subject raised from the embedded clause typically has no semantic roles, while PRO has its own semantic role.

#### § 4. Parameter in Middle English.

There are syntactic differences between Middle English and presentday English, which poses some problems concerning PRO and Trace. First, many linguists note that Middle English uses *for to* instead of *to* as an infinitival marker. See the sentences below.

(1) But he semede for to be/A man of greet auctoritee...

(Chaucer, The House of Fame Bk. III 1067–8)

- (2) But swich a nede was to preye him thenne,  
As for to bidde a wood man for to renne.  
(Chaucer, Troilus and Criseyde Bk. II  
1553-4)

- (3) It were my wrecched clothes, nothyng faire,  
The whiche to me were hard now for to fynde.  
(Chaucer, The Clerk's Tale 850-1)

- (4) His berd was wel bigonne for to sprynge;  
(Chaucer, The knight's Tale 2173)

If we adopt the framework of Chomsky 1981, these sentences will be analyzed as follows.

- (5)  $he_i$  INFL [<sub>VP</sub>[<sub>V</sub> seem] [ $\alpha$  for [ $\beta$   $t_i$  to be a man...]]]

The subject of the verb *seem* has no semantic roles in ME as well. See (6).

- (6) It semed that the lystes sholde falle.  
(Chaucer, The Knight's Tale 2662)

Therefore, we can assume that the embedded subject was raised in ME as well. The object of the verb *bid* has an independent semantic role. See (7).

- (7) I bidde god so yeve yow bothe sorwe !  
(Chaucer, Troilus and Criseyde Bk. III  
1470)

The sentence (2) will be analyzed as follows.

- (8) [<sub>VP</sub>bid [<sub>NPA</sub> wood man]<sub>i</sub>] [ $\alpha$  for [ $\beta$  PRO<sub>i</sub> to renne]]

We have to use PRO in the sentences (3) and (4) as well.

Secondly, there are NPs in Middle English which apparently lack case assigners. See the sentences below.

- (9) Men to seye of wommen wel, it is best, And nor for to despise  
hem ne depraue.  
(Occleve, Letter of Cupid 188)  
(Visser II, p. 956)
- (10) I to make me blith or glad...that nu (=na) mai be.  
(Cursor M. 10459) (Visser II p. 956)
- (12) That it were inpossible me to wryte.  
(Chaucer, Franklin's Tale 1549)
- (13) it is vncuth and vnwon the fader to be-cum the sun.  
(Curs. M. 10139) (Visser II, p. 963)
- (14) yif it seme a fair thyng a man to han  
(Chaucer, Boethius Bk. III p. 6 745-50)

According to Chomsky (1981: 49), every noun with a phonetic matrix must have Case and only verbs and prepositions can assign Case.

Thirdly, as is pointed out by Moulton (1985: 683), The North Sea Ger-

manic languages (including English) at one time had no reflexive pronouns at all. English later developed—*self* in all persons and numbers. The simple pronoun served as a reflexive in Old and Middle English. See the following.

(15) That in that grove he wolde hym hyde all day,  
(Chaucer, *The Knight's Tale* 1481)

(16) How that we bore us... (Chaucer, *CT. Prologue* 721)

(17) Ye shapen yow to talen and to pleye; (Chaucer, *CT. Prologue* 772)

In presentday English both overt pronouns and PRO must be free in their binding category; that is, they must not refer to the same person within the same sentence.

UG (= the correct theory of universal grammar) is equipped with certain parameters that permit a range of variation in the proposed principles (Chomsky 1981: 6). According to his theory, those parameters should take care of the difference between Middle English and Modern English.

#### REFERENCES

- Chomsky Noam. *Lectures on Government and Binding* 1981 Dordrecht-Holland: Foris
- Moulton, W. G. "Review: Rauch & Carr (eds.) : *Language Change*" *Language* Vol. 61 No. 3 1985
- Postal, Paul M. "On Coreferential Complement Subject Deletion" *Linguistic Inquiry* Vol. 1, No. 4 pp. 439–500 1970
- Postal, Paul M. *On Raising* 1974 Cambridge, MA: MIT
- Rosenbaum, Peter S. *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions* 1967 Cambridge, MA: MIT
- Visser, F. Th. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language* 1963 Leiden: E. J. Brill