THE GRAMMAR OF PREDICATE COMPLEMENT CONSTRUCTIONS IN EARLY MIDDLE ENGLISH PROSE

A Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree Master of Arts

by

Lee Charles Overholser, B.A.

The Ohio State University
1967

Approved by

Francis Lee Utley
Adviser
Department of English

Acknowlodgment

I wish to extend special thanks to D. Terrence Langendosn of the Linguistics Department, who has given me valuable help in the solution of the many technical grammatical problems connected with this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Since this paper concerns the problem of trying to write a transformational-generative grammar of E. M. E., there are certain questions about method that must be answered before presenting the grammar. The first question relates to the dependence of generative grammar upon the quality of the source of information. How is it possible to give a grammar of this type when ono has no informant to judge the grammaticality of possible sentences? Generative grammar makes the claim that it can account for all the possible sentences in a language and only the possible sentences. It would seem absolutely nesessary that one have at least one living informant if he is to approach anything like completeness; yet the only material we have for E. M. E. is a finite set of texts. Noam Chomsky has commented on this problem in his book, Syntactic Structures.[1]

> Questions have frequently been raised concerning the feasibility of using this notion of grammar in historical analysis, in particular concerning the appeal to intuition. A linguist theorizing about a living language ideally has as a control his own native intuition and that of the speakers around him, or at worst the native intuition of speakers of a language foreign to him. Against such intuition he can test, among other things, degrees of grammaticality and types of ambiguity. With dead languages, however, the linguist can rely only on the limited data available to him, and at best on a secondary 'native intuition' which can arise only after several years of close association with the language. He can find very few, if any, syntactically minimal pairs from which to set up paradigms of grammatical versus ungrammatical sentences. Deviation and ambiguity are even more elusive. If we take in its strongest terms the requirement placed on linguistic theory that it should characterize and predict all and only the sentences of the language and also account for the

> native speaker's competence in producing and understanding utterances of the language, we might utimately conclude that a grammar can be written only by a native speaker, not a foreigner, and that grammars of dead languages cannot be written at all. The degree of accuracy will naturally vary according to the degree of acquaintance with the language. But this does not mean that all investigation of language not native to the linguist must be de facto be abandoned, any more than any theory of history, whether cultural of geological, must be rejected because we cannot recapture all and only the characteristics of previous eras. We may quite legitimately put forward a theory of a dead language, in terms of a grammar which fulfills the requirements of descriptive adequacy and explanatory power. This theory will be based on all observable data, and also on unobservable data when necessary, i.e. when the logical consequences of the model would not match the observable data without this hypothesis. As in analysis of a living language, that model will be the simplest which will characterize the sentences of the corpus, and so the infinite set of unobserved sentences which pattern with them. Within such a framework, deviance as well as grammaticality can tentatively be made explicit.

Obviously I must forgo the claim for completeness since it is improbable that all the possible sentence combinations could have found their way into the limited number of texts remaining, or even into all the texts that are now lost. In fact, all the possible sentence combinations of E. M. E. have probably never been uttered. What claims, then, can be made for producing such a grammar of a language no longer spoken?

As Chomsky points out, generative grammar deals with the intuitive knowledge of grammar that every native speaker possesses of his language and attempts to make the structure behind this language explicit. In these terms, generative grammar is dealing with something essential to language; something, in fact, that is essential to translating a language and understanding any utterance in a language. Thus anyone who claims to understand the utterances of any language, even a dead language, is claiming to understand, intuitively at least, the

grammatical relationships within that language which generative grammar deals with. The difference between this intuitive approach and a generative approach is that generative grammar makes these relationships explicit; indeed, it must make these relationships explicit, whereas the intuitive approach can ignore them as long as the 'sense' of the text is preserved.

If we examine the scholarship of M. E. up to the present time, we see tremendous concern with textual accuracy, spelling and meaning of individual words, translation of specific sentences that present special difficulties, and the inflectional system. The concern with textual accuracy can be traced to the classical studies of the 18th century, when the methods of the new physical and biological sciences were applied to literary studies. (This is the approach to scholarship which Pope so deplors in The Battle of the Books.) Then the 19th century's great advances in linguistics, and especially the discovery of the kinship of the Indo-European languages, found specific application in the study of Medieval texts. The discovery, for instance, of Grimm's law led to exhaustive study of the pronunciation of M. E.; and the concern with the history of inflection has led to such works as Professor Kittredge's work on Chaucer's Troilus, which tabulates every word form in the book and gives an exhaustive list of the occurences of words used less than twenty times. Yet,other than concern for unusual idioms, there is little thorough work with units of the language larger than one or two words. The scarcity of careful work in the syntax of M. E. seems surprising at first when we see the enormous work done in textual criticism. It is also unfortunate that most of

the best work in M.E. syntax has been done in Germany for doctoral dissertations and that most of this work remains buried and untranslated in German libraries.

On further examination, what seems to be surprising neglect of perhaps the most important aspect of language is only a manifestation of the lack of the proper tools for dealing with problems of syntax. Where men had the necessary framework for study, they worked diligently; where they lacked the proper framework, it is to be expected that they would make little progress. Today we can expect the long-delayed study of the syntax of M.E., and in fact of all languages, since generative grammar presents us with the necessary framework for dealing with syntax profitably.

Since this analysis of syntax is now possible, what can we expect of it when applied to dead languages? As we have seen, the basic problem is that in historical grammar one cannot consult native speakers of the language. One is strictly limited to a finite body of material. This limitation, however, does not prevent one from constructing a grammar of the language in transformational-generative terms as long as one understands the syntactic relations between the sentence elements. In much the same way a lexicographer constructs a dictionary of a language, even though he does not know all the words nor all the meanings of those words. The historical grammarian accepts the hypothesis that all the structures of the language have not found their way into print. Thus the generative grammarian can make meaningful statements about dead languages without feeling the necessity of fulfilling the demand of completeness.

A more interesting problem is how far the historical grammarian may depend oh the structures of the existing languages as a guide to those of the historical language from which they are drawn. If the structures are identical, then the transformations may be assumed to be identical, since transformational grammar is concerned with the production in theory of actual constructions and not with the psychological processes of actually forming a sentence. This is not to say that there is no relation between the psychological process of sentence production and transformations, but this relationship is not direct and is not yet clearly understood. Thus, in cases where the structures of a living language and a dead language are recognisably similar, it may be assumed that the transformations of the living language may be used as a preliminary guide to understanding those of the dead language. This is one important way of overcoming the difficulty Chomsky mentions when he speaks of the scarcity of "syntactically minimal pairs." A thorough study of living languages can supply the missing pairs which are necessary for deciding the important question of the order of the transformational rules. It may be noted that in the process of translation much the same process is followed. Commentary is made on unusual and different structures and similar structures are passed over without comment.

Transformational grammar, then, gives us a method of studying the historical changes in a language, since similar structures will have similar sets of transformational rules. As Morris Halle says in Word 18.66; Structure 346, as quoted by Elizabeth Gloss in "Diachronic Syntax and Generative Grammar,"[2]

> Linguistic change is normally subject to the constraint that it must not result in the destruction of mutual intelligibility between the innovators -- i.e. the carriers of the change -- and the rest of the speech community....This restriction clearly affects the content of the rules to be added....The number of rules to be added must also be restricted, for very serious effects on intelligibility can result from the simultaneous addition of even two or three otherwise innocuous rules.
>
> It may be somewhat less obvious that the requirement to preserve intelligibility also restricts the place in the order where rules may be added. All other things being equal, a rule will affect intelligibility less if it is added at a lower point in the order than if it is added higher up.

In her study of the auxiliary in English from Old English to Modern English, Closs concludes that:[3]

> In view of the factors discussed above it appears that any theory of language change must include the proposals that language changes by means of the addition of single innovations to an adult's grammar, by transmission of these innovations to new generations, and by the reinterpretations of grammars such that mutations occur. Restriction of innovations to points of break i.e. to the points where a different syntactic process is in effect seems not to be viable as a generalization for language change, nor does the statement that mutations are rare. Both these proposals must be limited to the area of phonological change.

this leaves us with the conclusion that in a study of clause patterns we may expect to find few changes in basic clause structures, but several changes of a lower order. Of course, clause patterns are dependent on the patterns of basic sentence construction, sometimes called kernel patterns. This means that low level changes in the grammar of kernel structures such as the grammar of the auxiliary will be reflected to some extent in the structure of embedded clauses.

The Problem of the Gerund

During the period of E.M.E. that this thesis considers, 1150-1250, the gerund was coming into existence or, perhaps more accurately, it came into existence shortly after this period in the 14th century. What exactly led to the formation of the structure still puzzels linguists. This problem is related to this thesis because in the modern set of predicate complement clauses there are the noun clause, the infinitive, and the gerund; yet the latter is missing from Old English and E.M.E.

The best treatment that I have been able to find has been On The Origin of the Gerund in English, by George van Langenhove,[4] who has made a nearly exhaustive study of the thought on the subject up to his time. His study includes all the positions still being debated today. There are those who contend that the present participle, "having the same form, and exercising important functions of the verb, undoubtedly had much to do in developing a Gerund out of a verbal noun." Some contend that the gerund developed out of the inflected infinitive, "the original suffix in -enne, -anne having very early become -end(e, -ind(e, -and(e, not only in l. O. E. and e. Mid. E. but also in the other Germanic languages. Already in e. Mid. E. this ending developed into -ing(e...." G. O. Curme "explains the gerund as having developed out of the verbal noun, which, thanks to the collapse of inflectional endings in l. O. E. and e. Mid. E. as well as to change in the word-order stress, frequently appeared to have verbal instead of nominal rection." E. Einenkel "thinks that although the gerund draws on the infinitive and verbal noun as native elements, it originated through

Anglo-Norman influence on the present participle, whose original suffix in -end(e was changed into -ing(e first of all in some Southern dialects...and then from there gradually spread over the Midlands to the North."[5]

Langenhove himself contends that the gerund is merely the infinitive in -ing. "It is obvious that when in the 12th-13th c. the infinitive in -ing gained ground in the spoken language, it not only set the prepositional infinitive free to assume greater verbal power, but by being confounded with the verbal noun, it also adopted some of the constructions peculiar to the latter, such as its uses with possessive adjectives, and thus seemed to give birth to a new form of expression, viz. the gerund."[6] The issue is at this point far from being decided. So far most of the studies have concentrated on the change of the endings of the infinitive, participle, and verbal noun into a common -ing form. It seems that the phonological evidence is important, even crucial, to the origin of the gerund; but, on the other hand, the importance of syntactic evidence has been largely ignored. Indeed Langenhove seems to dismiss the importance of such evidence when he assumes that the infinitive in -ing merely took on the possessive marker through confusion with the participle without offering any reasons for the probability of this confusion. This is but another example of the attempt of past studies to solve syntactic problems on the basis of phonology, an attempt that is patently inadequate. Moreover it is a strange assumption that on the basis of manuscript evidence one can deduce the -ing form was gaining in common speech. Such an assumption erases the crucial difference between written and spoken

language, each of which has its own conventions and each of which differs in the frequency with which certain constructions are used. What is more important is the basic understanding of the relations between words in clauses, relationships which hold for both the spoken and the written language. The point being, of course, that what a man writes he can understand, even if he is not likely to utter what he has written.

In any case I can avoid becoming embroiled in this thicket since the gerund was not in use until after 1250. The solution of this problem lies in a much broader study of the history of the language and is not at all appropriate to this more restricted study.

Symbols

V	Verb
N	Noun
Pro	Pronoun
Adj	Adjective
Adv	Adverb
Det	Determinant
VP	Verb Phrase
NP	Noun Phrase
S	Sentence
P	Passive
Af	Affix
$\emptyset$	Null, also used as the symbol for deletion
-D	That-complementizer
+D	For-to-complementizer
O	Complementizer, either that or for-to
W,X,Y,Z	Symbols used to indicate any sentence constituents that may preceed or follow a specified element
T_{CP}	Complementizer Placement Transformation
T_{IE}	Identity Erasure Transformation
T_{P}	Passive Transformation
T_{E}	Extraposition Transformation
T_{OCD}	Optional Complementizer Deletion Transformation
T_{AUX}	Auxiliary Transformation
T_{PD}	Pronoun Deletion Transformation
T_{PPD}	Preposition Deletion Transformation
T_{PR}	Pronoun Replacement Transformation
T_{DIS}	NP or Adj Displacement Transformation
T_{ORG}	Sentence Organization Transformation

Abbreviations of Frequently Used Texts

AR	The Ancren Riwle. ed. Morton, James. London, 1853.
OEH	Old English Homilies
SO	A-Saxon Chronicle. both found in Specimens of Early English. ed. Morris, Richard. Oxford, 1898.
SW	Sawles Warde. ed. Wilson, R. M. Leeds, 1938.

Chapter II

The Phrase Structure and Transformational Rules

The framework for this investigation is drawn from The Grammar of English Predicate Comolement Constructions by Peter Steven Rosenbaum.[7] As this thesis will show, these rules apply to E.M.E. in the same order as in Modern English except that rule three, Subject-Object Inversion, is not applied and rule eight, Pronoun Replacement, is altered in form and range. In addition to a few rules that apply to E.M.E. but not to Modern English, the meaning of -D and D have been changed since the gerund does not occur at this period in the history of English. Thus -D refers to the "that" construction and D refers to the "for-to" construction alone, instead of both the "for-to" and the "Poss-ing" constructions.

The phrase structure rules for generating the base are the same for both E.M.E. and Modern English:

PS Rule 1 $\quad VP \longrightarrow V \quad (NP) \quad (PP) \quad \left\{ \begin{matrix} S \\ PP \end{matrix} \right\}$

PS Rule 2 $\quad NP \longrightarrow DET \quad N \quad (S)$

These rules generate the same set of structures that Rosenbaum found, as will be seen in the examples of the rules which will be examined shortly.

In the following transformational rules the original numbering has been retained:

1. Complementizer Placement Transformation -- T_{CP}

A. $\underset{1}{X}\ \underset{[-D]}{\ }\ \underset{2}{N}\ \underset{3}{[NP + Y]_S}\ \underset{4}{Z}$ ----> 1,2, -D 3,4

B. $\underset{1}{X}\ \underset{[+D]}{\ }\ \underset{2}{N}\ \underset{3}{NP + PDP}\ \underset{4}{Z}$ ----> 1,2,[+D] + 3,4

C. $\underset{1}{X}\ \underset{[+D]}{V}\ \underset{3}{(NP)}\ \underset{4}{NP\ PDP}\ \underset{5}{Z}$ ----> 1,2,3,[+D] + 4,5

D. $\underset{1}{X}\ \underset{2}{[+D]}\ \underset{3}{NP}\ \underset{4}{\left\{\begin{matrix} V \\ have \\ be \end{matrix}\right\} + Y}$ ----> 1,2,3,2+4

2. Identity Erasure Transformation -- T_{IE}

W	(NP)	X	+D	NP	Y	(NP)	Z	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	---->

(i) 5 is erased by 2

(ii) 5 is erased by 7

The following conditions govern the application of the identity erasure transformation.

A NP_j is erased by an identical NP_i if and only if there is a S_a such that --

(i) NP_j is dominated by S_a

(ii) NP_i neither dominates nor is dominated by S_a

(iii) for all NP_k neither dominating nor dominated by S_a the distance between NP_j and NP_k is greater than the distance between NP_j and NP_i where the distance between two nodes is defined in terms of the number of branches in the path connecting them.

3. The Subject-Object Inversion Transformation is not applied.

4. Passive Transformation -- T_P

X	NP	AUX	V	(Prep)	NP	BY	P	Y	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	---->

1,6,3,4,5,Ø,7,2,9

5. Extraposition Transformation -- T_E (Usually Optional)

X	N [+Pro]	S	Y		
1	2	3	4	---->	1,2,Ø,4+3

6. Optional Complementizer Deletion Transformation -- T_{OCD}

X	$\begin{Bmatrix} V \\ ADJ \end{Bmatrix}$	(NP)	[-D]	NP	Y		
1	2	3	4	5	6	---->	1,2,3,Ø,5,6

7. Auxiliary Transformation -- T_{AUX}

X	Af	v	Y		
1	2	3	4	---->	1,Ø,3+2,4

8. Pronoun Replacement Transformation -- T_{PR}

X	$\underline{\text{N}}_{\text{NP}}$ [+Pro]	(AUX	$\underline{\begin{Bmatrix} V \\ \text{be ADJ} \\ [+PR] \end{Bmatrix}}$	$\underline{\text{(MAN))}}$	[+D]	NP	Y	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	---->

1,7,3,4,5,6,Ø,8

9. Pronoun Deletion Transformation -- T_{PD}

X	N	$\begin{Bmatrix} a.\ Ø \\ b.\ ADV \end{Bmatrix}$	S	Y		
1	2	3	4	5	---->	1,Ø,3,4,5

10. Preposition Deletion Transformation -- T_{PPD}

X	PREP	$\begin{bmatrix} Pro \\ -D \end{bmatrix}$ N	Y		
1	2	3	4	---->	1,Ø,3,4

11. Obligatory Complementizer Deletion Transformation -- T_{CD}

X	C	VP	Y		
1	2	3	4	----›	1,Ø,3,4

Although this last transformation is obligatory in modern English, it is optional in E.M.E. so that we can generate the frequent infinitive marked by "forto" which is regarded as ungrammatical today.

In addition the following rules seem necessary to account for peculiarities of E.M.E. The first is a modification of rule 8, the Pronoun Replacement Transformation, which applies only to the infinitive in Modern English. However, in E.M.E. it seems as if the complementizer "that" can function as a pronoun, or rather, that the underlying pronominal character of "that" is brought out in certain contexts.

8.a. Pronoun Replacement -- T_{PR}

X	NP [-D, +Pro]	Y	hit	be	Z		
1	2	3	4	5	6	----›	1,Ø,3,2,5,6

This transformation seems to indicate that at this time the language still retained the pronominal sense of "that", especially in light of the rules that will be developed for witen and the special use of bat in connection with that verb.

The next rule covers a sentence rearrangement that might occur in modern poetry, but not in modern prose.

12. NP or ADJ Displacement Transformation -- T_{DIS}

X	[-D]	Y	V	NP		
1	2	3	4	5	----›	5,1,2,3,4,Pro

X	[-D]	be	ADJ		
1	2	3	4	----›	4,1,2,3

The problem of placing this transformation in its proper order

will be considered later.

There are also certain modifications in the use of the rules for Modern English. The T_P does not apply to the infinitive which is unmarked in the passive. In E.M.E. the infinitive can still be indicated by the inflectional ending -en, which has been lost for only a few verbs by 1250. This means that the Complementizer Placement Transformation must insert both the "for-to" complementizer and the "-en" complementizer. Also, since the infinitive can be adequately indicated by the ending "-en", the Complementizer Deletion Transformation has the power to delete both the "for" and the "to" of the infinitive. In contrast to modern rules, it seems that in E.M.E. some verbs required the unmarked infinitive and some the marked.

There also seems to be some justification for a "floating" transformational rule for rearranging the sentence elements. Mossé notes the freedom with which the subject, verb, and object could be arranged in M.E. He gives the following examples of the six possible combinations:[8]

he takez hys leve 'he takes his leave'
I hym folwed 'I followed him'
gaf ye the chyld any thing? 'did you give the child anything?'
Thus thaught me my dame 'Thus my mother taught me'
al þou most sugge 'you must tell everything'
but hood wered he noon 'but he wore no hood'

It seems that this transformational rule, which can be called the T_{ORG}, can be applied any time after the T_{CP}, though it is normally applied after all operations on the embedded sentence and can apply to both the kernel sentence and the embedded sentence. Some examples seem to show

that the time of application of the T_{ORG} can block certain of the other transformational rules.

In the application of the rules to particular sentences, the first occurrence of each rule will be mapped out in detail. Any unusual or especially difficult applications of the rules will also be fully mapped out.

Chapter III

The Þat Clause

Following the work done by Rosenbaum, research into the clause patterns of E.M.E. does not require determining the order and form of the rules if the clauses are similar. This is because transformational grammar is an abstract system which purports only to generate clauses, not to account for the process of actual speech. What the investigator has to do, then, is to see if the rules apply in the same order and form as they do in Modern English. Consider an example from the Peterborough Chronicle (SC, p.12, l.61), "hi saeden openliche ⁊ Christ slep." Which can be generated by the rules as follows:

BASE

hi saeden ((hit) (Christ slepen)) (openliche)
N S NP ADV

The base is the string generated by the phrase structure rules. The PS rules would have generated the string, hi saeden NP, to which PS rule 2 would apply, giving us the string, hi saeden DET N (S). Further application of the PS rules would substitute hit for the symbol N and Christ slepen for the symbol S. For the sake of clarity the words in the base are marked by the symbols which they replaced. The combinatioh of N and S is marked NP to record the fact that this combination is a substitute for the object of the verb and has as a whole many of the properties of a noun phrase.

For the sake of consistency, the infinitive in -en will be used throughout the derivations. Also, although the various abbreviations for bat which the scribes used will be recorded in the quotations, the form bat will be used uniformly in the derivations for the -D complementizer.

After the PS rules have generated the base, the transformational rules have to change the underlying structure into the form that is written or spoken. The first rule to be applied is the Complementizer Placement Transformation. This rule will fill the slot marked DET.

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} X & N & NP & Y & {}_{S} & Z \\ & [-D] & & & & \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & & 4 & \longrightarrow\ 1,2,[-D]+3,4 \end{array}$$

This rule has the effect of taking the feature -D, which is associated with the N, in most cases hit, and attaching it to the sentence, Christ sleœn. Next the Extraposition Transformation is applied. In the object complementation situation, the T_E only has the effect of preparing the pronoun hit for the Pronoun Deletion Transformation. The T_E takes the sentence, Christ sleœn, and moves it to the end of the sentence proper. In this case this has the effect of inverting the embedded sentence and the adverb, œnliche, which is associated with the main verb, saeden. Since the embedded sentence is removed, the feature NP is assigned to hit alone. Thus after the first two transformational rules are applied we have the result:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{hi saeden ((hit) (þat Christ sleþen)) (œnliche)} & & T_{CP} \\ \quad\ \ N \qquad\qquad\qquad\quad S\ NP \qquad\quad ADV & & \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{hi saeden ((hit)) (œnliche) (þat Christ sleþen)} & & T_{E} \\ \quad\ \ N\ NP \qquad\quad ADV \qquad\qquad\quad S & & \end{array}$$

The final transformation to be applied to this sentence is the Pronoun

Deletion Transformation.

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} X & N & \left\{\begin{array}{l}\text{a. } \emptyset \\ \text{b. ADV}\end{array}\right\} & S & Y & \\ & [+\text{Pro}] & & & & \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & \longrightarrow 1,\emptyset,3,4,5 \end{array}$$

This rule stipulates that if the word filling the N-slot is a pronoun and if there is either nothing or only an adverb between the pronoun and the embedded sentence, then the pronoun is usually deleted. Thus we have the result:

hi saeden (openliche) (þat Christ slepen) T_{PD}
ADV S

In order to produce the final written form we still have to apply the morphemic and graphemic rules. The morphemic rules will put the verbs in the proper form and the graphemic rules will substitute the scribe's symbol for þat. These operations are labeled the post cycle.

POST CYCLE

hi saeden (openliche) (ð Christ slep) M&G
ADV S

For a similar operation to generate the subjunctive in the embedded clause, it appears necessary to have certain verbs marked for the subjunctive, such as wilnen and hopen. Mosse lists two groups of verbs that require the subjunctive, verbs of wishing (commanding and compelling) and asking and verbs of doubting, uncertainty, or estimation.[9] We see an example of this from the AR, p.52, "Nullich þ no mon iseo ou bute he habbe leave." Simplifying this by dropping the final clause, "bute he habbe leave," we have the following derivation.

BASE

ich ne wilnen ((hit) (no mon i-seon ou))
N S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

ich ne willnen ((hit) (þat no mon i-seon ou)) T_{CP}
N S NP

ich ne willnen ((hit)) (þat no mon i-seon ou) T_{E}
N NP S

ich ne willnen (þat no mon i-seon ou) T_{PD}
S

POST CYCLE

nullich (þ no mon iseo ou) M&G
S

In this example we see the application of the rule that requires that the verb in an embedded clause following wilnen be in the subjunctive. Besides it is interesting to note the operation of the Extraposition Transformation when there is nothing following the embedded clause. It appears that the embedded sentence does not move in position, but actually it is moved to the right of the feature NP. This changes the surface structure of the sentence proper radically. Thus the embedded sentence is no longer clearly marked as the direct object, but appears on the surface to stand on its own as a clause.

The morphemic rules not only account for the presence of the subjunctive and the proper agreement between subject and verb, but they also take care of the combinations that can occur in M.E. between the subject and the verb. In the case of nullich, the T_{ORG} has placed the subject ich after the verb willnen, and then the morphemic rules have combined ne with will and null with ich.

Certain verbs can also take the that-complementizer which cannot take it in Modern English. For example, the verb will has generally lost the capacity to take this construction. Yet we have in Ancren

Riwle, "... ȝe al þisses weis punded ower wordes, 7 forstopped ouwer þouhtes, ase ȝe wulled þ heo climben 7 hien touward heouene, 7 nout ne uallen aduneward, 7 to uleoten ȝeond the world...." (AR, p.72) "In these ways ye all must check your words, and restrain your thoughts, as you wish that they may climb and mount up toward heaven and not fall downward and flit over the world...." In Modern English this function of willnen has been taken over by the verb wish. Note also that the clause introduced by þ is in parallel construction with two infinitives, uallen and to uleoten. This parallelism indicates the functional similarity between the two types of clauses and indicates a kind of parallelism that is frowned upon in Modern English.

Although much less common and restricted, the Optional Complementizer Deletion Transformation still applies occasionally. From Ancren Riwle, "al ich am wel ipaied euerichon sigge þet hire best bered on heorte." (AR, p.44) "I am well satisfied that everyone should say that which she best carries in her heart."

BASE

((hit) (euerichon siggen NP)) paien mc wel (by + P)
N S NP MAN

The NP which is the object of siggen stands for the clause, "þet hire best bered on heort."

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

((hit) (þat euerichon siggen NP)) paien me wel (by + P) T_{CP}
N S NP MAN

The next transformation which applies is the Passive Transformation. This transformation replaces the subject with the object and puts the

subject in place of the P following the preposition by. The auxiliary has be -ed added to it, but this change does not directly affect the form of the embedded clause and so is not spelled out in the rule here. I have substituted -ed for -en, which is usually the symbol for the past tense, because of the possible confusion with the ending of the infinitive.

ich be+ -ed paien wel (by ((hit) (bat euerichon
N siggen NP))) T_P
S NP MAN

ich be+ -ed paien wel (by ((hit)) (bat euerichon
N NP siggen NP)) T_E
S MAN

Although the Optional Complementizer Deletion Transformation applies here, it is necessary to make a slight change in its form for both the Modern and the E.M.E. cases. The rule as Rosenbaum gives it is:

$$X \quad \begin{Bmatrix} V \\ ADJ \end{Bmatrix} \quad \begin{Bmatrix} a. & N & [+D] \\ & [+Pro] & \\ b. & (NP) & [-D] \end{Bmatrix} \quad NP \quad Y$$

$$1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \text{---} \quad 1,2,3,\emptyset,5,6$$

However, this does not account for the present case where the preposition intervenes between the second and the third element of the rule. The same problem is found in the modern sentence, "I am pleased you did it." This difficulty can be resolved by reformulating the rule.

$$X \quad \begin{Bmatrix} V \\ ADJ \end{Bmatrix} \quad (Prep) \quad \begin{Bmatrix} a. & N & [+D] \\ & [+Pro] & \\ b. & (NP) & [-D] \end{Bmatrix} \quad NP \quad Y$$

$$1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \quad \text{---}\rightarrow$$

$$1,2,3,4,\emptyset,6,7$$

Using the second formulation of the rule, we produce the following change in the sentence:

ich be+-sd þaien wel (by ((hit)) (euerichon
N NP siggen NP)) T_{OCD}
S MAN

Next the Auxiliary Transformation applies, which takes the affix, -ed, and attaches it to the verb.

ich be paien+ -ed wel (by ((hit)) (euerichon
N NP siggen NP)) T_{AUX}
S MAN

ich be paien+ -ed wel (by (euerichon siggen NP)) T_{PD}
S MAN

The final rule to apply is the Preposition Deletion Transformation, which merely strikes out the preposition by.

ich bo paien+ -ed wel (euerichon siggen NP) T_{PPD}
S

POST CYCLE

ich am wel ipaied (euerichon siggen NP) M
S

In general it appears that the Optional Complementizer Deletion Transformation does not apply in E.M.E. to the bat-clause. Examples of its application are very scarce.

One peculiarity of the E.M.E. system of generating the bat-clause is that the hit, either as the subject of the embedded clause or as the noun of the complement phrase, is deleted, but only before the verb beon. Since this can apply to the beon derived from the passive transformation, the rule must follow the T_P. First there is an example of hit (also rendered as it) not deleted before a verb other than beon.
" e Judeus of Noruuic) on lang fridaei him (an Christen cild) on rode henged for ure Drihtines luue, 7 sythen byrieden him. Wenden d it sculde ben for-holen." (SC, p.12, l.8S) "(The Jews of Norwich) on Good Friday hung him (a Christian child) on a cross for our Lord's love, and

then buried him, thinking that it should be hidden." Thus the hit normally occurs in this position. However, it is deleted, or more properly, replaced, in this example from In Diebus Dominicis, "ic eow segge. þet wes sancte paul þe apostle and mihhal þe archangel heo twein eoden et sume time into helle." (OEH, p.17,1.8) "I say to you that it was Saint Paul the Apostle and Michael the Archangel, those two, who went at some time into hell." Note that the relative pronoun is also deleted or replaced in this passage. After simplifying this to, "ic, eow segge. þet wes paul and mihhal," we have the following derivation:

BASE

ic seggen eow ((hit) ((hit) beon paul and mihhal))
N [+Pro] S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

ic seggen eow ((hit) (þat (hit) beon þaul and mihhal)) T_{CP}
N [+Pro] S NP

ic seggen eow ((hit)) (þat (hit) beon paul and mihhal) T_{E}
N NP [+Pro] S

ic seggen eow (þat (hit) beon þaul and mihhal) T_{PD}
[+Pro] S

The next rule to be applied is thr Pronoun Replacement Transformation, which was tentatively labeled 8a. This rule is distinguished from the modern one by the fact that it applies to the þat-clause instead of to the infinitive. Moreover it is the subject of the infinitive which does the replacing in the modern rule, while it is the complementizer that does the replacing in the þat-clause. The replacement seems to take place by virtue of the underlying pronominal character of þat, which is brought out in this context. Thus we have:

ic seggen eow((þat) beon paul and mihhal) T_{PR}
[+Pro] S

POST CYCLE

ic eow segge (þet wes paul and mihhal) $T_{ORG,M}$
S

This interesting construction underscores the possibility that the clause marker þat was originally a pronoun since it takes on the properties of a noun in this kind of construction. To test this hypothesis it might be necessary to trace it back to the earliest Germanic records we have, or even earlier.

On the other hand there is some evidence that the hit is deleted. From An Bispel, "Þa sende se king his aerndraches of fif ceđen to alle his underþeoden. to ȝeladie þis folc. hwet bute [fece] icome sume cofer sum later sum frend sum fend. and was idon bi ham al swa aer cweđe [we] þat isette was."(OEH, p.2, 1.21) "Then the king sent his messengers from five regions to all his subjects to invite his people, without more delay to come sooner or later, friend or foe; and it was done by them as we previously said was appointed (settled)." It would seem that the pronoun hit is deleted from the subject in the passive construction, "and was idon bi ham." However, there is the possibility that the real subject of the clause is al in the phrase, al swa, which is usually translated, "just as." But if al is the subject, then a closer translation would be, "and all was done by them as we previously said was appointed." The þat presents no problem as it follows the pattern of the previous example.

It also seems that a prepositional phrase can function as a noun and replace hit. This could serve as confirmation of current speculation that the prepositional phrase does have noun phrase status. Thus

we have, "... of Eue vre alre modre is iwriten on aire erest in hire neowe inʒong of hire eie sihde."(AR, p.52) "... of Eve, our first mother, it is written that sin went into her in the first through her eyesight." The prepositional phrase, "of Eue," functions as a noun phrase and replaces the pronoun hit in this sentence. The following is a possible derivation of this construction:

BASE

me writen of Eue ((hit) (neowe inʒon into her of hire eie sihde)) (by + P)
N S NP MAN

The E.M.E. pronoun me, meaning "men," here functions in the same capacity as the modern "one" or "someone."

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

me writen (of Eue) ((hit) (þat neowe inʒon into her of hire eie sihde)) (by + P) T_{CP}
NP N S NP MAN

((hit) (þat neowe inʒon into her of hire eie sihde)) be + -ed
N S NP
writen (of Eue) (by + me) T_P
NP MAN

((hit)) be + -ed writen (of Eue) (by + me) (þat neowe inʒon
N NP NP MAN
into her of hire eie sihde) T_E
S

((hit)) bo + -ed writen (of Eue) (by + me) (neowe inʒon into
N NP NP MAN
her of hire eie sihde) T_{OCD}
S

((hit)) be writen + -ed (of Eue) (by + me) (neowe inʒon into
N NP NP MAN
her of hire eie sihde) T_{PR}
S

(of Eus) be writen + -ed (by + me) (neowe inȝon into her of hire eie sihđe)
NP MAN S T_{PR}

This particular application of the Pronoun Replacement Transformation is slightly different from the one involving bat and might be written as follows:

8.b. X hit be Y (NP) Z ----> 1,5,3,4,Ø,6
1 2 3 4 5 6

This is quite similar to the modern Pronoun Replacement Transformation involving the subject of the infinitive, of which we shall see an example later.

(of Eue) be writen + -ed (neowe inȝon into her of hire eie sihđe) T_{PASD}
NP S

The Passive Prepositional Phrase Deletion Transformation, T_{PASD}, is the standard transformation by which the prepositional phrase formed of the preposition by and the subject of the sentence is deleted if the subject is an indeterminate pronoun, which is me in E.M.E.

POST CYCLE

(of Eue) is iwriten (in her seowe ingong of hire eie sihđe) M
NP S

In this example it definitely seems that the phrase "of Eue" functions as a noun phrase and replaces the subject. In addition it seems that in cases such as this where the Optional Complementizer Transformation operates, the main clause is in the passive. This may indicate a restriction on its operation in E.M.E.

In this example from Ancren Riwle, we see the infinitive acting as a noun phrase as it replaces hit, "Þis forte bitocnen was ihoten i þen olde lawe þet no men ne scholde twinen þe two grindstones."(AR,

p.332) "To forshadow this it was commanded in the old law that no man should separate the two grindstones." The base would be:

(me hat in þen olde lawe ((hit) (no men ne scholde twinen þe two
N
grindstones)) ((hit) (S_1 bitocen þis)) (by + P)
NP S_1 N SNP MAN

In this sentence the infinitive of purpose is a complement to the whole first sentence and the first sentence serves as the subject of the infinitive since it is the action of the main sentence that foreshadows. Thus the sentence subject of the infinitive will be deleted by the Identity Erasure Transformation and the infinitive will then replace hit as the subject of the sentence after the Passive Transformation has applied. It would seem that this is a case of replacement and not of deletion and application of the Organization Transformation since the infinitive is not a main sentence constituent and would not be affected by the Organization Transformation.

The most unusual constructions are found with the verb, witen, which gives considerable support to the contention that the complementizer þat still retains some of the properties of a pronoun. First there are some examples of the ordinary use of the complementizer:

"7 wuteð to soðe þet euer so þe wittes beoð more ispreinde utwardes, so heo lesse wendet inwardes."(AR, p.92)

"and know for truth that as the wits are more dispersed outwards, so they tend less inwards;"

"Euchan haueð of oðres god ase muche murðe as of his ahne. bi þis ye mahen seon ant witen. þat euchan haue sunderlepes ase feole gleadschipes...." (SW, p.34, l.329)

"He wat wel þat manizе men bied sa ful of ȝescung mihti efre isi Na ȝewold ham selfe. to bigeten w[u]rldlic echte." (OEH, p.3, l.62)

"Ho knows well that many men are so full of
covetousness, were they ever able to see,
they still would not control themselves from
getting worldly goods."

This establishes that <u>witen</u> is capable of taking a predicate complement in the ordinary manner. We have in <u>Ancren Riwle</u>, "Þet, wot Christ, þis is a sori tale. þet ancre hus, þet schulde beon onlukest stude of alle, schal beon iueied to þeo ilke þreo studen...."(<u>AR</u>, p.90) "That, Christ knows, this is a sorry tale that a house for anchoresses, which should be the most solitary place, shall be evened to those same three places...." "Þ et" can only function as the complementizer in this context, and yet it is treated as a pronoun and put at the head of the sentence by the Organization Transformation.

BASE

Christ witen ((hit) (þis is a sori tale))
N S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

Christ witen ((hit) (þat þis is a sori tale)) T_{CP}
N S NP

Christ witen ((hit)) (þat þis is a sori tale) T_{E}
N NP S

Christ witen (þat þis is a sori tale) T_{PD}
S

At this point a transformation is necessary which will bring out the underlying pronominal character of the complementizer <u>þat</u>. It may be that this transformation is involved in the replacement of <u>hit</u> as in the examples we have already seen. The transformation would be of the following form and applies only to the case of <u>witen</u> being the main verb and possibly in the context of "þat hit be."

13. Pronoun Feature Transformation -- T_{PRO}

X	witen [+Pro]	Y	(þat	Z) S	W		
1	2	3	4	5	6	----	1,2,3, 4 [+Pro] ,5,6

When this rule is applied to the example, we have:

Christ witen (þat) [+Pro] (þis is a sori tale) S	T_{PRO}
(þat) [+Pro] witen Christ (þis is a sori tale) S	T_{ORG}

POST CYCLE

(þet) [+Pro] wot Christ(þis is a sori tale) S	M

A similar derivation would hold for, "and þan lat me þa sawle to merchestowe. þat is se moreymete si blisse þe he haƀ an þar sawle. þat wits ȝe weł. nan halege naƀ his fulle blisse er ho underfo adomes deie his licame."(OEH, p.6, l.145) "... and then they take the soul to the place of separation, that is the first meal, the happiness which he has in his soul there. This you know well, that no holy man has his full bliss before he receives his body on doomsday." In Modern English we have replaced the bat with the demonstrative pronoun "this" and retain the complementizer at the beginning of the noun clause.

Witen is also one of the few verbs that regularly uses the Optional Complementizer Deletion Transformation, perhaps the only verb to use it regularly without being involved in the Passive Transformation in E.M.E. In the example, "Wat christ hit is god riht þet us scheome biuoren men."(AR, p.330) "Christ knows that it is very just that we be ashamed before men," we see an example of the T_{OCD} used without the T_{P}.

BASE

Christ witen ((hit) ((hit) (we scheomen us biuoren men))
N N S NP
beon god riht))
S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

Christ witen ((hit) (þat((hit) (þat we scheomen us biuoren men))
N N S NP
beon god riht)) T_{CP}
S NP

Christ witen ((hit)) (þat ((hit)) beon god riht (þat we
N NP N NP scheomen us biuoren men))T_E
S S

Christ witen ((hit))(((hit)) beon god riht (þat we scheomen
N NP N NP us biuoren men)) T_{OOD}
S S

Christ witen(((hit)) beon god riht (þat we scheomen us
N NP biuoren men)) T_{PD}
S S

witen Christ (((hit)) beon god riht (þat we scheomen us
N NP biuoren men)) T_{ORG}
S S

POST CYCLE

wot Christ (((hit)) is god riht (þat us scheome biuoren men)) M
N NP S S

The post cycle also requires a transformation that will replace the subject of scheomen with the object, or perhaps to erase it through some form of identity erasure. Since this double embedding is a little complicated, it might be useful to examine which structures are deleted and why. The Complementizer Placement Transformation Transformation presents no difficulty since the two sentences are marked by bat. The Extraposition Transformation operates on the first hit by moving all that follows it to the left of the final NP-marker. This gives

us the following structure:

((hit)) (þat (hit) (þat we scheomen us biuoren men)) is god riht)
N NP N S NP S

Then in the same operation the second embedded sentence is moved to the left of the VP, "is god riht." Thus we have:

((hit)) (þat (hit)) is god riht (þat we scheomen us biuoren men))
N NP N NP S S

Then the Optional Complementizer Deletion Transformation only applies to the first þat since the second follows an adjective phrase instead of a NP. In the Pronoun Deletion Transformation only the first hit preceedes a complete sentence as in required by the rule, and so only the first hit is deleted.

We see the same operation of the T_{OCD} in the following sentences:

God hit wute -- 7 he hit wot -- ma were
leouere þet 3e weren alle oðe spitel
uuel þen 3e weren ontfule,... (AR, p.250)

May God know it -- and he does know it --
I would prefer that you were all leprous
than you were envious.

God hit wot, leoue sustren, more wunder ilomp. (AR, p.54)

God knows it, beloved sisters, a greater wonder
has happened.

In the first sentence, besides the deletion of þat, there is also a replacement of hit as the subject of were leouere, which is an example of the substitution of hit beforo an active verb. In the second sentence, as in the first, there is a phrase between the verb and the deleted þat-clause, which may indicate that the interruptor has some influence on the use of the T_{OCD}, as in the following sentence:

> Elewsius wite tu hit wel ireadi, wraþþi so þu wraþþi, no lengre nullich hit heolon þe.[8]
>
> Elewsius, may you know full surely, be as wroth as you may, I will no longer conceal it from you.

The question is whether or not the application of the T_{ORG} separates the clause sufficiently from the verb so that it can be considered to stand by itself without a clause marker. Moreover, does the application of the T_{ORG} prevent the application of the Pronoun Deletion Transformation so that hit is not deleted in these sentences? These examples serve as the best support for the contention that the T_{ORG} has the power to operate any time after the application of the T_{CP} or the T_P, if there is one involved.

The final object noun clause to be considered is the type in which an element in the noun clause is transferred to the front of the sentence, as in "Þes put, he hat þ heo beo euer ilided 7 iwrien." (AR, p.58) "He ordered that this pit be ever covered and hidden." This is either an example of verb complementation, the only one for a noun clause, or an example of transferral. There is a parallel example for an adjective, "Vuel me seiþ þ hit is."(AR, p.88) "Men say that it is evil." Even if these are examples of verb complementation, they would still be exceptional, but considering the example of the adjective, the construction

me seiþ (vuel) ((hit) (is vuel))
NP N VP S

is most unusual, especially since vuel is first a noun and then an adjective. Assuming, then, that we are dealing with a case of noun complementation, the derivation of the sentence is as follows:

BASE

he haten ((hit) (me liden euer (þis put) (by+ P)))
N NP MAN S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

he haten ((hit) (þat me liden (þis put) euer (by+ P))) T_{CP}
N NP MAN S NP

The Displacement Trnasformation has to apply before the Passive Transformation or the environment will be disturbed. This transformation has the effect of taking the noun or adjective at the end of the embedded sentence and placing it at the beginning of the main sentence. In case a noun is displaced, a pronoun will be put in its place. Thus we have:

(þis put) he haten ((hit) (þat me liden(heo)euer (by+ P))) T_{DIS}
NP N [+Pro] MAN S NP

(þis put) he haten ((hit) (þat (heo) be+ -ed liden euer
NP N Pro (by+ me))) T_P
MAN S NP

(þis put) he haten ((hit)) (þat (heo) be+ -ed lided euer
NP N NP Pro (by+ mo)) T_E
MAN S

(þis put) he haten ((hit)) (þat(heo) be liden+ -ed euer
NP N NP Pro (by+ me)) T_{AUX}
MAN S

(þis put) he haten (þat (heo) be liden+ -ed euer
NP Pro (by+ me)) T_{PD}
MAN S

(þis put) he haten (þat (heo) be liden+ -ed euer) T_{PASD}
NP Pro S

POST CYCLE

(þes put) he hat (þat (heo) beo euer ilided) M
NP Pro S

It seems important that the NP, <u>þis put</u>, be transferred to the front of

the sentence, otherwise it might be confused with the object of the verb, hat. The derivation of "Vuel me seid þ hit is," is obvious enough not to require explicit derivation.

It is interesting to note that the first sentence can be understood if it is translated literally into Modern English, but not the second, "This pit, he ordered that it be covered." *"Evil men say it is." the second would be completely misunderstood. The presence of the pronoun in the first sentence may make it understandable.

Subject Complementation of the þat-clause

Subject complementation for the noun clause seems to be limited to fixed impersonal constructions of the type, "it happened that..." and subjects of copulative verbs followed by an adjective or preposition. Thus we have, "Hit ȝelamp þat an rice king. wes strang and mihti."(CEH, p.1,1.1) "It happened that a rich king was strong and mighty." This would be derived as follows:

BASE

((hit) (an rice king beon strang)) ȝelamp
N S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

((hit) (þat an rice king beon strang)) ȝelamp T_{CP}
N S NP

((hit)) ȝelamp (þat an rice king beon strang) T_{E}
N NP S

POST CYCLE

((hit)) ȝelamp (þat an rice king wes strang) M
N NP S

The sentence, "Vor so hit biualled ofte. ⁊ hit is riht Godes dom, þet

hwo ne ded hwon he msi, he ne schal nout hwon ho wold."(AR, p.296) "For so it happens often and it is God's proper decree, that who does not act when he may, he shall not when he wishes to," would be structured similarly.

There is an example of the replacement of hit in the following sentence, which is also an example of a noun clause as the subject of a copulative verb. "Vorþi is þet we ȝeieđ upon him ofte,7 he fursed him awei urommard ure stefne."(AR, p.76) "For this reason it is that we call upon him often, and he withdraws from our voice;..."

BASE

((hit) (we ȝeien upon him ofte)) is vor þi
N S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

((hit) (þat we ȝeien upon him ofte)) is vor þi T_{CP}
N S NP

((hit)) is vor þi (þat we ȝeien upon him ofte) T_{E}
N NP S

(vor þi) is (þat we ȝeien upon him ofte) T_{PR}
NP S

POST CYCLE

(vorþi) is (þet we ȝeied upon him ofte) M
NP S

This example shows the property of the prepositional phrase of functioning as a noun phrase. The prepositional phrase does not function in the same way in the following sentence:

> Ich write muchel uor ođre, ƿ nođing ne etrine ou, mine leoue sustren; vor nabbe ȝe nout þene nome, na ne schulen habben, þurh þe grace of Gode, of totinde ancres, ne of tollinde lokunges , ne lates, ƿ summe, ođer hwules, weilawei! unkundeliche makie; vor ayein kunde hit is, 7 unmeđ swuc wunder, ƿ te deade totie, 7 mid cwike worldes

men wede wiþ sunne. (AR, p.50)

> I write much more for others, for nothing (here said) applies to you, dear sisters, for ye have not the name, nor shall ye have, through the grace of God, of staring anchorites, nor of enticing looks and manners, which some, at times, alas! contrary to the nature of their profession, practice; for against kind it is, and a singularly strange prodegy, that the dead should look out, and among living men of the world, consort with sin.

Perhaps some appeal to the difference between the function of the two prepositional phra ses can account for the application to one and not to the other of the Pronoun Replacement Transformation, more probably, the T_{PR} is simple optional.

There is no difficulty in accounting for the structure of the sentences which take a noun clause as a subject and an adjective as a complement, as in, "Bettre hit is þet mon ne iknawe noht þe wei to godalmihtin þe he hine icnawe and seoddþe hine for-hoyie."(OEH, p.22, 1.25) "Better it is that a man does not know the way to Godalmighty, than that he know it and afterwards neglect it." In sentences of this type, the hit is not replaced by the adjective, as would be expected if the adjective were in the embedded clause.

Prepositional Þat-clause Complementation and Other Patterns

Noun complementation in the prepositional phrase is distinguished only by the regular presence of the demonstrative pronoun as the object of the preposition. Note that the pronoun is still declined at this period, "for þenne þe mon wule tilden his musestoch he binde uppon þa swike chese and bret hine for þon þet he scolde swote smelle."(OEH, p.25, 1.120) "For then the man will set his mousetrap, he ties the mouse-

trap cheese upon it and roasts it so that it should smell sweetly." In modern usage the phrase, "for this that," is, at best, awkward.

BASE

þe moh bret hine for ((þon) (he scolde swote smelle))
N S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

þe mon bret hine for ((þon) (þat he scolde swote smelle)) T_{CP}
N S NP

POST CYCLE

þe mon bret hino for ((þon) (þat he scolde swote smelle)) M
N S NP

The same construction holds for the following examples:

> la lief mayie wiman forȝeten his oge cild. þat hi ne milsi. hire barn of hire ogen innid. and ȝief hi forȝiet þah-hweder nell ic forȝete þe cwed drihten. be þam þe he fader is and laford he him self owed þe þe witie. (OEH, p.4, l.71)
>
> O friend, may a woman forget her own child, so that she will not be kind to it, her child of her own womb; and nevertheless if she forgets, I will not, this the Lord says, by the fact that he is father and lord, he himself says it, by this shall you know.
>
> 7 nim þer of ȝeme þ bis vuel þ com of Dina ne com nout of þ þet heo liseih Sichem Emores sune, þ heo sunebede mide,... (AR, p.54)
>
> And take note that this evil which came of Dinah, came not from her seeing Sichem, the son of Hamor, with whom she sinned,...
>
> Ac þanne hit þer-to cumþ þat se hlaford a þe muchele deie cumþ forte isi and frend and fend. (OEH, p.6, l.158)
>
> But then it comes to the time that the Lord on that great day comes to see both friend and foe.

In the next-to-last example, the symbol þ could stand for þat or þon. In either case it parallels the two previous examples. The last

example substitutes ber for the demonstrative pronoun, but it still parallels the other two examples.

The next example seems to show deletion of the preposition, but may represent another pattern of which I have no other examples:

> Ac we [habbeð ȝe-] sed ȝiu litl her þat hi sceolden [h]abben god brad and win.... (OEH, p.7,l.185)
>
> But we havo said little to you about the fact that they shall have good bread and wine....

Another pattern that is occasionally encountered is the noun complement pattern pased on a noun instead of the more usual hit.

> Non ancre by mine read schal makien professiun, þet is, bihoten ase hest, bute þreo þinges, þet is obedience, chastete, studestaþeluestnesse; þet heo ne schal þene stude neuer more chaungen:...(AR, p.6)
>
> No anchorite, by my advice, shall make profession, that is, vow to keep any thing as a command, except three things, that is, obedience, chastity, and studestathelfastness, that she shall never more change her convent;...

BASE

heo schal bihoten ase hest ((studestaþeluestnesse) (heo ne schal
N
þene stude chaungen))
S NP

All that is required is the application of the T_{CP} to complete the form of the sentence as given in the text. In some cases the complement can be considerably removed from the noun it modifies.

> 7 hwat mihte wenest tu was icud ine þeos wordes? Hwat? Þet a child bigon vor to pleien to ȝeienes ham. (AR, p.76)
>
> And what might, do you think, was manifested in those words? What? That a child began to play against them.

Here the complement clause is considerably removed from its noun,

mihte.

There are also rare examples of adjective complementation, as "þenne we beoð sari in ure heorte þet we isuneged habbed."(OEH, p.23, l.60) "Then we are sorry in our hearts that we have sinned." In Modern English this is interpereted as a prepositional phrase modifying the adjective. The adjective "about" could fit into this context, but more evidence is necessary to arrive at a conclusion.

The practice of repeating the clause-marker after an interrupter is occasionally encountered. In modern style this is rarely tolerated, even though it is fairly common in speech. Thus, "vor hwsoe is muche stille ⁊ halt lengre silence, heo mei hopien sikerliche ⁊ hwon heo spoked touward God, ⁊ he hire wule iheren."(AR, p.78) "For whoso is very quiet and holds long silence, she may hope truely that when she speaks to God, he will hear her." This problem is still far from being solved for modern languages, because it is difficult to introduce questions of clarity of meaning into a grammar without invoking ad hoc rules, which seem rather to defeat the stated purpose of generative grammar.

Chapter III

The Infinitive

The rules applying to the generation of infinitive phrases are the same as those applying to the noun clause, except that the Pronoun Replacement Transformation operates as it does in Modern English, that the passive infinitive does not apply to the infinitive by adding to the auxiliary, and that the Complementizer Deletion Transformation is not required as in modern usage, and can delete both the _for_ and the _to_. This power of the T_{CD} to delete the _for_ and the _to_ is related to the presence of an inflected infinitive ending _-en_, which can serve as sufficient indication of the infinitive. Thus the Complementizer Placement Transformation must place both the _for-to_ marker and the _-en_ marker on the infinitive. It appears that some verbs are marked so that their object infinitives take only the _-en_ marker, verbs like _leten_ and _schould_.

In situations where we would expect a gerund in Modern English, the infinitive regularly appears. "Warschipe... seiđ ich iseo a sonde cumen swiđe gledd icheret."(SW, p.24, l.223) "Worship... says, 'I see a messenger coming, looking very happy.'" "Ne beo in hire naþing iwraht bute chirche bisocnie and beode to christ and eoten and drinken mid griđ and mid gledscipe."(OEH, p.20, l.90) "Nor be on that day nothing done except going to church and praying to Christ, and eating and drinking with peace and joy." Clearly the infinitive is used in

these sentences in place of the modern gerund. In the second sentence bisoonie is part of a fixed phrase and may have noun status at this time; beode is one of the few unmarked infinitives used in E.M.E. -- it is necessary to remember that the infinitive is in transition at this time and that there will be a certain mixture of forms -- eoten and drinken are both simple infinitives. These two examples, which seem to require the infinitive marked only with -en, give some indication of the possibility that the infinitive can be confused with forms in -ing such as the verbal noun.

The first sentence is an example of verb complementation.

BASE

ich seon ((a sonde) (cumen))
[+en] NP VP S

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

ich soon ((a sonde) (cumen + -en)) T_{CP}
NP VP S

The second sentence is an examplo of oblique noun phrase complementation, that is, the complementation of a noun phrase which is the object of a preposition. Here, bute functions as a preposition in the sense of "except for."

BASE

ye ne wirchen noþing bute ((hit) (ye eoten mid gledscipe))
[+en] N S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

ye ne wirchen noþing bute ((hit) (ye eoten + -en mid gledscipe)) T_{CP}
N S NP

ye ne wirchen noþing bute ((hit) (eoten + -en mid gledscipe)) T_{IE}
N S NP

ye ne wirchen nobing bute ((hit)) (eoten + -en mid gledscipe)) T_E
N NP S NP

ye ne wirchen nobing bute (eoten + -en mid gledscipe) T_{PD}
S

Probably more specification of the environment in which only the suffix -en is used is required, but this is the only example I have found of oblique noun phrase complementation for the infinitive. Further searching might turn up enough examples for one to be able to make further generalizations.

Let us now turn to some examples of ordinary object noun phrase complementation.. "Hit is hore meister, þ beoð ouer oðer iset, 7 habbeð ham to witene." (AR, pp.70-72) "It is their business who are set over the rest and have to take charge of them."

BASE

heo habben ((hit) (heo witen ham))
N S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

heo habben ((hit) (for (heo) (to witen + -en ham))) T_{CP}
N NP VP S NP

heo habben ((hit) (for (to witen + -en ham))) T_{IE}
N VP S NP

heo habben ((hit)) (for (to witen + -en ham)) T_E
N NP VP S

Heo habben ((hit)) ((to witen + -en ham)) T_{OCD}
N NP VP S

heo habben ((to witen + -en ham)) T_{PR}
VP S

It seems to be the best procedure to have the Optional Complementizer Deletion Transformation apply to the for alone and to have the Complementizer Deletion Transformation apply optionally to the combination for-to

only. This way all the E.M.E. infinitive markers can be generated, the infinitive in forto, the infinitive in to, and the unprefixed infinitive. In any case all infinitives will be marked by -en, except the very few that have lost that ending. In the above example it seems possible for the T_{ORO} to apply any time after the T_P. If the marker for is not deleted, then the object pronoun ham has to be moved to the front of the marker for, since it would be definitely confused with the subject if it followed the for. Thus if the T_{OOD} were not applied, we would generate the structure,

heo habben (ham for (to witen)).
VP S

One of the striking peculiarities of the infinitive in E.M.E. is that the auxiliary is not changed for the passive. Thus, "God hat writen o lives boc al þet heo sei."(AR, p.246) "God ordered all that she says to be written in life's book."

BASE

God haten ((hit) (me writen al o lives boc (by+P)))
N MAN S NP

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

God haten ((hit) (for(me) (to writen al o lives boc (by+P))))
N NP MAN VP S NP
T_{CP}

God haten ((hit) (for)(al) (to writen o lives boc
N NP (by+me)))) T_P
MAN VP S NP

God haten ((hit)) (for (al) (to writen o lives boc
N NP NP (by+me))) T_E
MAN VP S

God haten (for (al) (to writen o lives boc (by+me))) T_{PD}
NP MAN VP S

God haten ((al) (writen o lives boo (by + me))) T_{CD}
NP MAN VP S

God haten (writen (al) o lives boc (by + me))) T_{ORG}
NP MAN VP S

The inversion of subject-object order and the placing of the subject after the pronoun by take place, but the auxiliary is not altered. To arrive at this result it is necessary to mark the auxiliary as ∅, thus making the T_{AUX} unnecessary.

Infinitive Verb Complementation

It seems that verb complementation can occur only with the infinitive (and the gerund in Modern English.)" This construction can occur only with certain verbs and then certain transformations are limited in their operation with it. First let us look at an ordinary example. "... al swa fendes he þer ȝemet hine to underfo and to don hine into þisternesse."(OEH, p.6, l.154) "Also he shall meet fiends there to receive him and to throw him into darkness."

BASE

he meten (fendes) ((fendes) (underfon him))
NP NP VP S

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

he meten (fendes) (for(fendes) (to underfon him)) T_{CP}
NP NP VP S

he meten (fendes) (for (to underfon him)) T_{IE}
NP VP S

he meten (fendes) ((to underfon him)) T_{OCD}
NP VP S

(fendes) he meten ((to underfon him)) T_{ORG}
NP VP S

This example shows how the subject of the infinitive, fendes, is also the object of the main verb and is therefore free to be put at the front of the sentence by the T_{ORG} . The removal of the n in underfon would probably be taken care of in the morphemic rules.

In the next two examples we can see the operation of the modern Pronoun Replacement Transformation and the E.M.E. character of the Complementizer Deletion Transformation.

> Ich habbe bigunne to tellen of þing þet ich
> ne mahte nawt bringe to eni ende. (SW, p.14, 1.122)
>
> I have begun to tell of a thing that I may
> not brong to any end.
>
> Bihold mid wet eien þine scheomefule sunnen:
> dred 3st þine woke kunde þet is ed aworpen:
> and seie mid te holie monne, þet bigon uorto
> weopen 7 seide,.... (AR, p.278)
>
> Behold with wet eyes thy shameful sins; dread
> continually thy weak nature, which is easily
> overcome; and say with the holy man, who began
> to weep, and said,....

BASE

hit habben bigunne ((ich) (tellen of þing))
NP VP S

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

hit habben bigunne (for (ich) (to tellen of þing)) T_{CP}
NP VP S

hit habben bigunne ((ich) (tc tellen of þing)) T_{OCD}
NP VP S

(ich) habben bigunne ((to tellen of þing)) T_{PR}
NP VP S

In the second example the T_{OCD} is not applied, but unlike the modern case, the T_{CD} is not applied either.

BASE

hit bigon ((þe holie monne) (weoþen))
NP VP S

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

hit bigon (for (þe holie monne) (to weopen)) T_{CP}
NP VP S

(þe holie monne) bigon (for (to weopen)) T_{PR}
NP VP S

POST CYCLE

(þe holie monne) bigon (uor (to weopen)) M
NP VP S

Both of these examples demonstrate intransitive verb phrase complementation. The pattern of the second example is still retained in modern dialects of the language, although it is not accepted in written English.

Next let us look at the problem of verbs which require the unprefixed infinitive.

> Vor euerich schal holden þe uttre efter þet þe licome mei best mid hire serui þe inre. (AR, p.4)
>
> For every one ought to so observe the outward rules as that the body may therewith best serve the inward.
>
> (David) wold winnan þis lande. (SC, p.13, l.96)
>
> (David) desired to win this land.
>
> þa owed mihhal heh-engel he wes an biscop on oðre liue þe nefre nalde cristes layen lokien ne halden. (OEH, p.19, l.50)
>
> Then says Micheal, archangel, "He was a bishop in the other life who never would observe nor hold Christ's law.
>
> We eow wulled sutelice seggen.... (OEH, p.17, l.2)

We will speak to you openly.

We ayen to understonden ulcne mon sinfulle.
þet lið in heuie sunne and þurh soðe serift
his sunbendes nule slakien. (OEH, p.23, 1.70)

We ought to understand each sinful man
who lies in heavy sin and does not desire
to loosen his sin-bonds through true penance.

These examples correspond to modern usage, except that the verb following the modal has lost nearly all sense of the infinitive, except in the case of "ought." However, there is a counter example in the case of "ought," "Muye we ahct clepeien hine moder wene we, yie muye we." (OEH, p.3, 1.56) "May we feel it necessary to call him mother, suppose we, yea, may we?" Yet this construction, "ought call," is possible in Modern English, indeed it is required in some dialects with the negative, as in, "You ought not do that." There seems to be no problem in dealing with these examples except that the T_{CP} must take account of the main verb if it is marked for the infinitive in -cn only.

BASE

David wold ((David) (winnen þis land))
[+en] NP VP S

David wold ((David) (winnen + -en þis land)) T_{CP}
NP VP S

David wold ((winnen+ -sn þis land)) T_{IE}
VP S

The final verb to be considered is leten, which is another verb that is marked for -en. "Ure Loered... ne leue ou neuer stinken þene fule put."(AR, p.88) "May our Lord never let you smell that foul pit"

BASE

ure loered ne leue (ou) neuer ((cu) (stinken þene fule out))
NP NP VP S

TRANSFORMATIONAL CYCLE

ure loered ne leue (ou) neuer ((ou) (stinken + -en þene fule put
NP NP
put)) T_{CP}
VP S

ure loered ne leue (ou) neuer ((stinken + -en þene fule put)) T_{IE}
NP VP S

POST CYCLE

ure loered ne leue (ou) neuer ((stinken þene fule put)) M
NP VP S

These examples show that the major difference between the modern and M.E. derivation of the modal construction lies in the emphasis on the infinitival character of the "main verb." In Modern English the modal is treated as part of the auxiliary, while this analysis of the E.M.E. verb indicates that the modal is functioning as a main verb. This is not to say that the modern situation is the same because the character of the verb could have changed.

Chapter IV

Conclusion

The results of this investigation corroborate the argument that change is more frequent at lower levels of the grammar than at higher levels. No significant difference in the order of the application of the transformational rules has been found, the phrase structure rules are the same, and the differences in the application of the Pronoun Replacement Transformation rule can be attributed to the retention of underlying pronominal character by *bat*, a trait stronger in E.M.E. than in Modern English. However, the many variations in spelling (reflecting, of course, differences in pronunciation,) vocabulary, inflection, and word order are quite evident. Not only is there the difference between Modern and Middle English, but the dialectical variations in E.M.E. are obvious in the examples studied.

Perhaps the most significant conclusion to be drawn is that, despite wide variations in the lower level grammar of E.M.E. among the various dialects and despite the difference between these dialects and Modern English, there are no significant differences in the rules governing the generation and transformation of the underlying structures. Since this covers a period of seven hundred years of change, it would seem that major changes in the structure of a language are very slow in the making.

FOOTNOTES

Chapter I

1. As quoted in "Diachronic Syntax and Generative Grammar," by Elizabeth Closs, Language, XLI (July-September, 1965), p.403.

2. Closs, p.402.

3. Ibid., pp.414-415.

4. George van langenhove, On the Origin of the Gerund in English, (Paris: Edouard Champion, 1925.)

5. Ibid., pp.vii-xi.

6. Ibid., pp.130-131.

Chapter II

7. Peter Rosenbaum, The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions, (dissertation), (Cambridge: Massachussetts Institute of Technology, 1965), pp.9-13.

8. Fernand Mossé, A Handbook of Middle English, tran. James A. Walker, (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1952), p.122.

9. Ibid., pp.115-116.

Chapter III

10. Rev. Richard Morris, Specimens of Early English, "The Life of St. Juliana," (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), p.100, l.38.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Closs, Elizabeth. "Diachronic Syntax and Generative Grammar," Language, XLI (July-Septembsr, 1965), 402-415.

Langenhove, George Ch. van. On the Origin of the Gerund in English. Paris: Edouard Champion, 1925.

Morris, Rev. Richard, ed. Specimens of Early English. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.

Morton, James, ed. The Ancren Riwle. London: Camden Society, 1853.

Mossé, Fernand. A Handbook of Middle English, trans. James A. Walker. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1952.

Rosenbaum, Peter S. The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1965.

Wilson, R. M. Sawles Warde. Leeds: Titus Wilson, 1938.