Title	A RESEARCH ON NOMINALIZATIONS IN CHAUCER
Author(s)	Ueno, Yoshikazu
Citation	大阪外大英米研究. 1971, 7, p. 61-91
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/98987
rights	
Note	

A RESEARCH ON NOMINALIZATIONS IN CHAUCER

By Yoshikazu Ueno

It is only a short time since transformational grammar came into existence. During the short period, however, it has brought an epock-making reform to the study of language. Some linguists have applied the theory to actual languages to account for its adequacy. One of the most systematic and minute works is Robert B. Lees' *The Grammar of English Nominalizations*, first published in 1960. He has made an extensive investigation of nouns, substantives and nominalizations and has reported the results in the monograph. Hundreds of examples of many kinds of nominalizations are given, each of which is a transformation that rearranges a word or a group of words so that they can perform the function of a noun phrase in a sentence. It consists of four chapters in all. In Chapter III, he gives a grammatical analysis of various nominalizations which are generated through transformations on underlying structures. In the last chapter he applies transformational rules to a large and varied class of nominal expressions, many of which have traditionally been called "compounds". He classifies them into the following eight categories:

(I)   Subject-Predicate
(II)   Subject-"Middle Object"
(III)   Subject-Verb
(IV)   Subject-Object

(V)   Verb-Object

(VI)   Subject-Prepositional Object

(VII)   Verb-Prepositional Object

(VIII)   Object-Prepositional Object

and in most cases there are various subclassifications. He asserts that the "compounds" we use today are the results of various transformations on underlying sentences belonging to the above-mentioned categories. We shall observe some compounds whose second constituent is the word "dog":

puppydog (=dog which is a puppy): I

Jack's dog (= dog which Jack has): II

watchdog (= dog which watches something): III

praric dog (= dog which inhabits the prarie): IV

hangdog (= one who hangs a dog): V

bulldog (= dog which is like a bull): VI

hunting dog (= dog with which one hunts): VII

fogdog (= dog seen in the fog): VIII

Those which are similar at first glance have different underlying grammatical structures as the Roman numerals on the right show.

Now we are going to analayze nominal compounds in Geoffrey Chaucer by means of a transformational analysis. It is quite necessary to apply transformational theory to Presebnt-day English, as Lees has tried, in order to specify the adequacy of the theory: it must be applied also to Middle English. Transformational grammar must be that kind of thing, and Middle English was, on second thought, Modern English at that time. It may be safe to assume that the application of the new theory to nominal compounds in Chaucer won't be so neat as Lees' practical observation partly because we have a great trouble in the native speakers' intuitive knowledge of English of those days, and partly because it is with difficulty that we are able to choose the primary linguistic data. It is probably quite difficult to find out underlying structures for all the nominal compounds in Chaucer.

There remains one more thing to say. The grammar of verse is somewhat different from that of prose. As to verse, its word order is often wry and the poet's intentional distortion from grammar is usually found. So we have to straighten up the distorted parts.

Chapter I
General Remarks

English, like some other Germanic languages, has a great many examples of words which, though felt and used as single words, are made up of two or more elements each of which may also be used as a separate word. Such words are generally called "compounds", while doctors disagree concerning the definition of them.[1] Below are some of them.

1. A compound may perhaps be provisionally defined as a combination of two or more words so as to function as one word, as a unit. — 0. Jespersen[2]

2. A **Compound Noun** consists of two Nouns (or of a Noun and a Verb-noun) the first of which is an Attribute of the second. The two nouns may ne written either as two distinct words, or as two words joined by a hyphen, or as a single word. — C. T. Onions[3]

3. Compounds words are words composed of setparable root morphemes. — A. C. Gimson[4]

4. Compound words have two (or more) free morphemes among their immediate constituents (door-nob).—L. Bloomfield[5]

5. Some stems or words contain two or more roots, and are said to be **compound.** Blackbird /blækbərd/ is a compound word, containing two roots, /blæk/ and /bərd/. Blackbird contains a compound stem and an affix. — H. A. Gleason[6]

6. A one-morpheme element that can function as a word is called a **base**;... A compound word is one with more than one base. — B. M. H. Strang[7]

Though it seems that the native speakers of English intuitively know what the compound is, it is quite difficult to draw a satisfactoⅰy line to separate compound function words from completely free expressions in the same pattern. Many scholars have claimed that the comppound word should be determined by stress, some have adovocated the underlying structure and others have even sought the solution of this problem in spelling or orthography. First of all, spelling or orthography does not help solve the problem. Alice M. Ball's work may be painstaking investigation into the spelling variants of dictionaries and newspapers, but a perusal of it shows the complete lack of uniformity. [8] That orthography is also of no use, though it may be easily imagined, will be added only for the sake of completeness. [9] Stress also has been greatly adovocated as a criterion of the compound especially by structural linguists. L. Bloomfield remarks "whenever we hear lesser or least stress upon a word which would always show high stress in a phrase, we describe it as a compound number: ice-cream /ˈajs ˌkrijm/ is a compound, but ice cream /ˈajs ˈkrijm/ is a phrase, although there is no denotative difference of meaning." [10] E. Kruisinga, on the other hand, makes no difference between the compound word and the syntactic phrase, while, at the same time feeling the need to maintain the traditional concept of the compound. He defines it as "a combination of two words forming a unit which is not identical with the combined forms or meanings of its elements." [11] Bloomfield's remark is rejected by Jespersen, who says, "If ... we stuck to the criterion of stress, we should have to refuse the name of compound to a large group of two-linked phrases that are generally called so, such as *headmaster* or *stone wall*." [12] This is crertainly no argument nor is the objection that words such as *sub-committee*, *non-conductor* have forestress according to D. Jones, but level stress according to H. Sweet. In any case the first elements of these two phrases are bound morphemes. For this reason it would be inadequate to argue that "the prefixes *un-* (negative) and *mis-* are often as strongly

stressed as the following elements; are they, then independent words?"
[13]. If it rains, for instance, the ground will generally become wet.
Even if the ground is wet, however, we are not entitled to the conclusion
that it has rained. As for the criterion of stress, we shall see that it
holds for certain types only.

American structural linguists have been accustomed to marking stress
with a set of four marks. In English there are a great many sequences
of two morphemes of the type of *round* plus *house*, *black* plus *bird*, or
less often, *goose* plus *egg*. When those marks are used, nominal
phrases will be either *rôund hóuse*, *blâckbìrd*, and *goôse égg*, or *róund
hôuse*, *bláckbìrd*, and *góose êgg*. On the contrary, the compounds are
usually *róundhoùse*, *bláckbìrd*, and *góose ègg*. They respectively stand
for 'a structure for sheltering railroad engines', 'a specific kind of bird',
and 'zero', and their meanings are unpredictable. Then we could ab-
stract the compound stress pattern: $/ \nearrow + \searrow /$. Note, however, that the
stress difference does not signal the meaning directly. The stress merely
marks the rough contrast between the nominal phrase and the com-
pound. Moreover we have no precise dictionary with such four stresses.
The basic purpose of the compound is to express an idea that is en-
tirely different from that expressed by unconnected component words.
Sheep's eyes are not the eyes of one particular sheep, but the way of
looking at things. The principle of combining two words might be
sought in the natural human tendency to see a thing identical with
another one already existing and at the same time different from it.
The identity of the word rainbow, for instance, is expresseed by the
basic word bow; the phenomenon of a rainbow is fundamentally a
bow. It is, however, a bow connected with the phenomenon rain: then
the differentiating part rain. Here we might conclude that the compo-
und is a combination of two or more free forms, each meaning of
which does not signal the total meaning. That is, nominal phrases
have predictable meanings while the compound does not. Lees has
his own idea of it. [14] But our aim is to apply transformational rules

to Chaucer's nominals rather than to examine whether or not his examples are "compounds".

Now we are going to compare Lees' transformational analysis of English nominals with Jespersen's compounds with emphasis upon the so-called "ad hoc" character of linguistic description.[15]

	Jespersen	Lees

I. Final-determinative compounds

(1) subject+action- (or agent-) noun:

daybreak	III.C.1.b.
earthquake	III.C.1.b.
nightfall	III.C.1.b.
landslide	III.C.1.b.

(2) object+action- (or agent-) noun:

childbirth	V.C.2.a.
nutcracker	V.C.3.
handshake	V.C.2.b.
manslaughter	V.C.2.a.
life-insurance	V.C.2.b.
body-guard	V.D.
shoe-maker	V.C.3.

(3) The first element indicates the place in which the second is (takes place, etc.):

air-mail	IV.A.1.b.
garden-party	IV.A.1.b.
grasshopper	VII.A.1.b.

(4) a large residue of compound which do not fit in anywhere:

sunflower	IV.B.
life-boat	IV.B.
fountain-pen	VI.A.2.a.

II. Copulative compounds

(1) The element denoting sex is put last:

66

	servant-girl	I.A.1.
	washerwoman	I.A.2.
III.	adjective+substantive:	
	greenhouse	VI.A.1.a.
	madhouse	IV.A.1.a.
	sweet-shop	VII.A.1.
IV.	verb+substantive	

(1) The substantive is the instrument by
means of which the action is carried out:

	go-cart	III.B.
	bakehouse	VII.A.1.
	grindstone	VII.A.1.
	wash-basin	VII.A.1.

By comparing them it will be made clear that the former is often different from the latter and at the same time rather rough, although it seems that Jespersen takes some notice of the underlying grammatical relations mirrored in them.

Chapter II
Subject-Middle object

We are going to consider the several types of nominals in which the grammatical relation between the two constituents is that of the subject and the object of a "middle verb".[16]

The possessive transformation is probably more complicated than the transformations that are going to be dealt with in the following chapters, and it is generally assumed that we are not yet ready to cope with all its details. We might, however, observe something of its general nature.

The general possessive transformation is of a type called a double-base transformation. That is, instead of having a single base string, as do T-yes/no, T-af, T-do, etc., it has two base strings. One string supplies the structure to be used, and the other string uses it. The first

string is called the "constituent sentence (or sometimes "insert string")
while the latter the "matrix sentence".[17] The constituent sentence is
then embedded into the matrix sentence usually along with a subordi-
nating morpheme. Thus we have such relationship as follows:

constituent: Mary has an umbrella.

matrix: The umbrella is under the desk.

result: Mary's umbrella is under the desk.

If we want to know about the meaning of the possessive morpheme,
we look at the constituent sentence from which it derives. That is, all
meaning relationships in the language are contained in the kernel
sentence, and it is often only by going back to the kernel that the
meanings in transforms can be clearly understood. So far as the
possessive goes, its most common meaning is having or possessing.
Such NP's below can be generated from the kernels containing the
the verb have.

KERNEL	TRANSFORM
Mary has a book.	Mary's book
Mary has an idea.	Mary's idea
Mary has a father.	Mary's father

(A): Possessive genitive:

Many compounds in this group have many kernel-sentences enough
to justify their origins. See below:

KERNEL	TRANSFORM
man hath ... the wit (Anel.164)	mannes wit (C.Pard.559)
I have wit (TC.3.997)	my wit (D.WB.426)
Examples	
every wightes wit (TC.5.757)	lordes wit (E.Mch.1504)
KERNEL	TRANSFORM
God ... have mercy (B.Mel. 3050-60)	Goddes mercy (E.Mch.2419)
Crist have mercy (I.Pars.1080 -50)	Cristes mercy (I.Pars.1065- 70)

KERNEL	TRANSFORM
A doghter hadde this worthy kyng (F.Sq.32)	kynges doghter (F.Sq.465)
A dogthter hadde he (E.CI.209)	his doghter (A.Rv.4136)

Examples

lordes doghters (C.Phy.76)	Emperoures doghter (E.CI.168)
Demociones doghter (F.Fk1. 1426)	Ligruges doughter (LGW.2425)
Nysus doughter (LW.1908)	Agonores doghtre (LGW.114)
milleris doghter (A.Rv.4204)	Calkas doughter (TC.4.663)
bisshoppes doghter (I.Pars. 835-40)	Penneus doghter (A.Kn.2064)

KERNEL	TRANSFORM
hadde ... Phebus ... a wyf (H.Mcp.	Phebus wyf (H.Mcp.238)

Examples

brotheres wyf (G.SN.296)	Menelaus wyf (Bo.4.m.7)
falkes wyves (I.Pars.900-5)	neighebores wyf (I.Pars.840-5)
Hasdrubales wyf (B.NP.455f)	Nicerates wyf (F.Fk1.1437)
lordes wyf (E.CI.839)	carpenteris wyf (A.Mil.3343)

Concerning the last example "carpenteris wyf". there is a sentence which seems to be another kernel-sentence. See below:

This carpenter hadde wedded a ... wyf (A.Mil.3221)

Although this sentence has not the verb have as a main verb, the grammatical relation between the "carpenter" and the "wyf" mirrors that of the subject and the object of the middle verb "wed".

KERNEL	TRANSFORM
the kyng hath sones (TC.2.170)	kynges sone (TC.3.1715)

Examples

lordes sone (D.WB.1151)	preestes sone (B.NP.4504)3)
wydwes sone (B.Pri.1692)	brother sone (B.MK.3593)[18]
Philippes sone (B.MK.3846)	Goddessone (G.SN.330)
Fades Sone (G.SN.326)	Venus sone (LGW.1086)

foxes sone (LGW.2448)   sonnes sone (TC.5.664)

Tideus sone (TC.5.1514)

   KERNEL   TRANSFORM

the cok hath crowe (A.Mil.3687)   cokkes crowe (A.Mil.3675)

In addition to the examples so far given, there are some which have no direct source-sentence but a few similar expressions which might have undergone some transformsation.

There was a kyng ... / That hadde   kyngs brother (A.Kn.3084)

a brother (LGW.1397-8)

  Examples

  fadres brother (LGW.2608)   otheres brother (C.Pard.698)

For completeness' sake one more example will be added.

I have a brother (G.SN.235)   my brother (TC.2.16320)

the joye that a man seketh to have mannes joie (TC.3.820)

(B.Mel.2695-700)

  Example

  worldes joye (Bal.Co.12)

 In the following examples there is no kernel-sentence.

To take "Goddes governaunca (TC.2.467)" as an example, it has no such kernel-sentence as 'God hath governaunce'. But it may be safe to imagine that the former might have been generated as a transform from the latter because we can find a source-sentence "He hadde ... the governaunce (B.Mk.3250)" and its derivation" his governaunce (A.Prol.281)".

  Examples

 markys governaunce (E.Cl.994) mannes governance (B.ML.287)

 senatoures governance (B.ML. frendes governaunce (TC.2.

 987)   1442)

  I may have ... shame (RR.6086) → my shame (B.Mel.2630-40)

  Example

   Example

   fadres shame (TC.1.107)

he have harm (B.Mel.2730-40) →his harm (A.Mil.3842)

I may have harm (RR.6086)   →Myn harm (RR.2595)

Examples

mannes harm (I.Pars.490-5)   haukes harm (F.Sq.632)

he hath a ... wownde (TC.2.156) →his wownde (TC.1.858)

Examples

Habradates woundes (F.Fkl.   hertes wounde (Merc.B.5)
1416)

balkes wond (LGW.2253)   dethis wownde (TC.3.1697)

thou wolt have conseil (B.Mel. →thy conseil (B.Mel.2345-50)
2390-5)

Examples

Cristes conseil (A.Mil.3504)   wommennes conseils (B.NP.
4445)

wommannes conseil (B.NP.4446)

as have I blisse (B.Sh.1541)[19)] →my blesse (BD.1039)

Example

worldes blis (B.NP.4390)

wordes hadde she (E.CI.438)   →hir word (G.SN.404)

Examples

mannes word (L.St. 2)   Loves wordes (LGW.280)

Goddes word (D.Sum. 1937)   Grisildis wordes (LGW.280)

cokkes wordes (B.NP.4455)   Petres wordes (D.Sum.1819)

I have kyn (TC.4.1521)   →my kyn (TC.4.625)

Examples

fader kyn (H.Mcp. 37)   Alexandres kyn (RR.1152)

A voys he hadde (A.Prol.688) →His vois (B.NP.4041)

Examples

pilates voys (A.Mil.3124)   Gabrielles vois (ABC.115)

turtles voys (E.Mch,2139)   Pandarus vois (TC.I.725)

mannes vois (HF.2.556)

I have suffisaunce (Ven.70)   →My suffisaunce (Fort.15)

Example

hertes suffisaunce (B.NP.4029)

he have care (A.Kn.1321)　　　　→his care (TC. 5.54)

Example

every wightes care (TC.1.660)

he ... hath ... wratthe (B.Mel.　→his wratthe (RR.3439)

2310-20)

Examples

goddes wrathe (TC.1.940)　　Cristis warth (RR. 7225)

he hadde a ... note (A.Prol.235) →his note (A.Rv.4068)

Example

Kynges Noote (A.Mil.3217)

I have wille (Comp.L.74)　　　→my wyl (F.Sq.569)

Examples

Goddes wille (C.Pard.726)　　quenes wille (LGW.1490)

hertes wil (Comp.L.77)

he hath an hous (A.Kn.1262)　　→his hous (G.SN.374)

Examples

kinges hous (Bo.1.p.4.59-60)　carpentrees hous (A.Mil.3356)

neighebores hous (D.WB.239)　Arthures hous (D.WB.1089)

fadres hous (E.Cl.809)　　　　menneshous (I.Pars.960-5)

Criseydes hous (TC.5.528)　　Deiphebus hous (TC.2.1540)

neces hous (TC.2.1461)　　　Goddes hous (E.Mch.2293)

Gristes hous (E.Mch.2282)

thou hast power (B.Mel.2400-10) →thy power (B.Mel.2570-80)

Examples

mannes power (G.SN.438)　　　lordes power (Bo.3.p.57)

prynces power (RR.6632)

had I ... lust (RR.1653)　　　　→my lust (RR.4600)

Examples

hertes lust (TC.2.830)　　　lordeslust (B.Mel.2340-50)

worldes lust (D.Sum.1876)

thou have corage (B.NP.4642)   →thy corage (H.Mcp.164)
    Example
    mannes corage (I.Pars.460-5)
so have I reste (BD.1080)   my reste (BD.603)
    Example
    peples reste (E.CI.741)

The remaining possessive genitive constructions that are going to be dealt with differ from those already given in the fact that they have no direct kernel-sentences though having those with the same grammatical structures.

every thyng hath ende (LGW.651)

my wo shold han an ende (TC.5.1273)

hath htis pitous day a blisful ende (E.Cl.1121)

Whan shal youre curesede pletyng have an ende? (PF.495)
    Examples
    staves ende (Anel.184)   yeres ende (D.WB.916)
    lyves ende (TC.5.1554)   worldes endse (D.Fri.1455)
foules ... / That ... han fethefres (PF.365-6)
    Example
    aungels fetheres (PF.356)
I ... have the ... sheep (RR.6462)
        Examples
        lordes sheep (A.Prol.597)   Jewes sheep (C.Pard.351)
the someressonne ... hath ... lyght (BD.821-2)
        Examples
        Phebus lyght (Mars.114)   sterres lyght (E.CI.1124)
        dayes lyght (B.Pri.1778)
        dayes lyght (B.Pri.1778)
Ye ... han a ... conscience (D.WB.434-5)
        Example
        mannes conscience (B.Mel.2820-30)
man hath sapiences (G.SN.338)

73

Example

Fadres sapience (B.Pri.1662)

His doghter hadde a bed (A.Rv.4142)

Examples

mannes bed (1.Pars.870-5)   clerkes bed (A.Rv.4219)

brotheres bed (F.Fkl. 1166)

Astrolabie hath a ring (Astr.Part 1.1)

Example

Canacees ryng (F.Sq.247)

hadde this Phebus ... a crowe (H.Mcp.130)

The devel have ... hors (D.Fri.1547)

Examples

develes apes (I.Pars.650-5)   Goddes apes (TC.1.913)

develes fourneys (I.Pars545-50)   develes child (I.Pars.625-30)

develes wolves (I.Pars.765-70)   develes knyf (D.Sum.2091)

swa have I seel (A.Rv.4239)

Examples

lordes seel (C.Pard.337)   Venus seel (D.WB.604)

the moone hath comaundement (Bo.2.m.8.6-7)

Example

Goddes comaundement (I.Pars.835-40)

god wolde ... han some pitee (B.Mk.3231)

his herte kan have pitee (BD.575)

hire herte hath pite (LGW.1078)

myn herte hath ... pite (LGW.2184)

Example

fadres pitee (C.Phy.211)

There remain a large number of genitive consturctions which can be
interpreted as containing the underlying grammatical relation of the
subject-middle object as is found in the compounds so far given.

We shall list some examples but give no kernel-sentences from
which they are derived.

Cristes mooder (B.Pri.1696)	Goddes mooder (D.Sum.2202)
wyves syster (LGW.2274)	Phoebus suster (TC.4.1591)
Jobes pacience (D.WB.436)	wyves patience (E.Cl.1181)
Palladiones feste (TC.1.161)	kynges feste (F.Sq.299)
Joves feste (TC.3.150)	someres gamse (D.WB.648)
mannes game (TC.3.1126)	ladies game (Comp.A.61)
Loves name (HF.3.1489)[20]	Goddes name (A.Prol.854)
Apostles name (D.WB.341)	lordes name (E.Cl.77)
doghter name (E.Cl.608)	maydens name (G.SN.102)
Kynges name (Bo.2.p.18)	fadir name (RR.3033)
Joves name (TC.1.878)	sterres names (HF.2.997)
arowis name (RR.1774)	Venus companye (Mars.104)
wyves fader (E.Cl.1133)	philosophres fader (G.CY.1434)
Melibees freendes (B.Mel. 2970-80)	Dianes temple (F.Fkl.1390)

Bacus temple (LGW.2376)	moones mansioun (F.Fkl.1289)
develes temple (C.Pard.470)	Goddes place (I.Pars.985-90)
fadres place (E.Cl.862)	neces paleis (TC.2.1094)
Theseus paleys (A.Kn.2199)	Cilenios tour (Mars. 113)
Kynges court (A.Kn.1181)	waspes nest (B.Pri.1749)
emperoures halle (E.Cl.399)
houndes nest (RR.6504)
Lordes body (C.Pard.474)	mannes body (Bo.2.p.6.42)
mannes ye (E.Cl.944)	folkes shuldris (RR.6903)
wyves tonge (E.Mch.1377)	Joves face (TC.4.1337)
bestes throte (LGW.2005)	angels face (G.SN.301)
cherubynnes face (A.Prol. 624)	bukkes horn (A.Mil.3387)
	wyves cheere (E.Cl.599)
briddes clawes (B.Mk.3366)	foxes bak (B.NP.4595)
monstres hed (BD.628)	bores heed (B.Th.2060)
pigges heed (D.Sum.1841)	Goddes fynger (D.Sum.1890)
fadres barm (B.Mk.3630)	Canacees barme (F.Sq.631)

sowes nose (D.WB.785)	coltes tooth(D.WB.602))
Goddes armes (C.Pard.654)	kynges eyr (LGW.1819)
peples eres (E.CI.941)	develes ers (D.Sum.1694)
Goddes eres (D.Sum.1941)	asses erys (D.WB. 976)
Goddes bones (B.Mk.3087)	cokkes bones (H.Mcp.9)
develes bely (I.Pars.350-5)	crowes feet (TC.2.403)

(B): Of-periphrasis:

In English one of the most productive transformations in the generation of the nominal compound is one which converts "Noun+ Prepositional Noun" into "Noun + Noun" compound.
Below is one example:

(1): The bed has a side.

(2): the bed's side

(3): the side of the bed

(4): the bedside

The prepositional phrase can give rise to nominal compounds and such a periphrastic genitive compound will also embody the same underlying grammatical relation in the above-mentioned transformational way as is found in the genitive group just studied.

It might be easily imagined, however, that in Chaucer it may be impossible to find out a complete set of derivational lines of a nominal. We must, therefore, introduce "generalization". For instance,

(1)	the ... sonne ... hath ... lyght (BD.821-2)			
(2)		dayes lyght (B.Pri.1778)	someres sonne (BD.821)	aspes leef (TC.3.1200)
(3)	the light of the sonne (Astr.II. 2.3.)	light of day (Astr.II.34. 19)		the lef of aspe (LGW. 2648)

(4)	daylyght (G.	somer sonne
	CY.881)	(PF.299)

Taking the nominal "daylyght" as an example, we can probably say as follows: though it has no source-sentence, judging from the derivation (the ... sonne ... hath ... lyght → the light of the sonne), the nominal must have come from a putative kernel-sentence 'day hath lyght'. Thus, from 'day hath lyght' we might derive "dayes lyght", then "light of day", and from this, by NPN-transformation, finally "daylyght".

Examples

rose-leef (RR.905)	ivy lef (TC.5.1433)
fige leves (I.Pars.325-30)	clote-leef (G.CY.577)
howethorn-leves (A.Kn.1508)	harpe-strynges (HF.2.777)
bugle horn (F.Fkl.1253)	wombe syde (Astr. 1.6)
bak side (Astr.II.3)	watir-syde (RR.129)
forest syde (BD.372)	ryver-syde (RR.134)
haven-syde (B.NP.4261)	

There are some genitive structures similar to the second lines of the derivation above.

beddes syde (TC.3.236)	wodes syde (B.NP.4601)
mones syde (Astr.II.34)	

Other Examples

nekke-boon (D.WB.906)	rake-stele (D.WB.949)
sholder-boon (C.Pard.350)	canel-boon (BD.943)
brest boon (A.Kn.2710)	haunche-bon (A.Mil.3803)
corpus bones (B.MK.3096)	marybones (A.Prol.380)
cartwheel (D.Sum.2257)[21]	herte-roote (D.WB.471)
lopwebbe (Astr.I.21)	chambre dore (TC.4.352)
temple-dore (PF.239)	halle dore (F.Sq.80)
chirchehawe (I.Pars.960-5)	chirche dore (D.WB.6)
closet dore (TC.3.684)	trappe -dore (TC.3.759)

chambre roof (BD.299)	paleys-yates (Mars.82)
castel-yate (HF.3.1294)	paleis-gardyn (TC.2.508)
paleis-chaumbres (Form.A.41)[22]	
chambre wal (TC.2.919)[23]	castel wal (B.NP.4050)
gardyn wal (A.Kn.1060)	

Chapter III
Verb-Object

Lees divides this category into four major subcategories and then classifies each of them into some minor ones. The compound embodying the relation of 'Verb + Object' is one of the most productive compound types in Present-day English. In Chaucer, however, the number of the nominal belonging to this category is not so large as it seems to be. Among them the compound with Ing seems to be somewhat productive. Lees gives such an example as follows:

John rears the child.

... John's rearing of the child ...

... John's child rearing ...

The same derivation sequence can not be found in Chaucer, but we can generalize a derivation by gathering a few examples which bear witness to each derivational stage.

blood she shedde (B.MK.3447)	she stale ... roses (RR.3049-50)
	for stelyng of the Rose (RR.4229)
blod-shedynge (HF.3.1241)	

From these examples it might be reasonable to assume that perhaps the two transforms (i.e., 'the shedynge of blode':'rose-stelynge') must have existed at that time. On second thought, however, the second line of the derivation sequence (for instance, "John's rearing of the child" in Lees) does not seem to be indispensable to the explanation of the

78

"Verb + Object" relation of the compound child rearing, for the kernel-sentence itself mirrors the underlaying grammatical relation of it. In order to appreciate better how difficult it will be to find out the complete derivation sequence, we might note the following illustration given by Lees:

John distills aniline with steam.

... John's distillation of aniline with steam ...

... distillation of aniline with steam by John ...

... distillation of aniline with steam ...

... steam distillation of aniline ...

... aniline steam distillation ...

... steam distillation ...

Between the phrase *steam distillation* and its kernel-sentence *John distills aniline with steam* there are, indeed, five transformational processes. We are not able to find them out even in Present-day English, however grammatical they may be, much less in Chaucer. Therefore it follows that it is not a very important matter whether or not there are transforms between the compound and its kernel-sentence.

KERNEL	TRANSFORM
he do harm (B.Mel.2770-80)	harm doynge (B.Mel.2770-80)
This ... marchaunt heeld a ... hous (B.Sh.1210)	housholding (RR.1132) houshold (B.Sh.1436)
ye wol ... take vengeance (B. Mel.2630-40)	vengeance-takynge (B.Mel. 2680-90)
Examples	
love-likynge (B.Th.2040)	love huntynge (A.Kn.2308)
hert-huntyng (BD.1313)	love-longynge (B.Th.1962)
clooth-makyng (A.Prol.447)	wyn-yevyng (C.Pard.587)
manslaughtre (I.Pars.560-5)	housholdere (A.Prol.339)
pykepurs (A.Kn.1998)	warde-cors (D.WB.359)

Chapter IV
Subject-Prepositional Object

Among the compounding devices which isolate two nouns in a sentence there is a group which pick out the subject of the sentence and a noun which appears as object of a post-verbal prepositional phrase. The most productive types are all of the copulative-sentence kind. According to Lees the kernel-sentence "The club is in the country" produces the prepositional phrase "the club in the country", and then this resulting construction can undergo the NPN-transformation to yield a very common type of compound. Namely,

The club is in the country.

... the club in the country ...

... country club ...

There are following evidences in Chaucer:

the goddes ... in havene dwelle (TC.3.590)

God in hevene (LGW.2329)

hevene goddis (Bo.3.m.12)

Examples

heven kyng (HF.2.1084)	hevene queenee (ABC.24)
herte blod (LGW.2105)	oxe-stalle (E.CI.398)
contre-houses (Anel.25)	contre-folk (LGW.2161)
shipmen (Astr.Part 2.31.8)	court-man (E.Mch.1492)
parisshe preest (D.WB.532)	paroch-prest (RR.6384)
parissh clerk (A.Mil.3312)	abbey orlogge (B.NP.4044)
chapel belle (A.Prol.171)	paryssh chirche (A.Mil.3307)
candle-stikke (I.Pars.1035-40)	gowne-clooth (D.Sum.2252)
bordel wommen (I.Pars.975-80)	wood leon (A.Kn.1656)
wodedowve (B.Th.1960)	not heed (A.Prol.109)
schelle-fyssch (Bo.5.p.5.30)	

There remain some others which can be interpreted as containing the grammatical relation of "subject-prepositional object" but for which the expected underlying prepositional phrase seems more or

less unnatural in any kind copula sentence.

    foul ... lyveth by sed (PF.328)

    sed-foul (PF.576)

    Examples

worm-foul (PF.505)   water foul (PF.327)

spryng flood (F.Fkl.1070)

Chapter V
Object-Prepositional Object

    The nomiual in this chapter is of the type whose underlying grammatical structure is "object-prepositional object". This type of nominal compounds arise directly from prepositional phrases just as, in Present-day English, we derive *wood alcohol* from *alcohol from wood* or *alcohol made from wood*, and *rattlesnake* from *snake with a rattle*, and so on. Below are some instances from Chaucer:

    thy gerland wroght with rose (G.SN.27)

    rose gerlond (A.Kn.1961)

    a thred of gold (TC.5.812)

    gold threed (B.MK.3665)

    a ryng of gold (I.Pars.155-60)

    a gold ryng (D.WB.785)

    Examples

whete-seed (D.WB.143)   barly breed (RR.2757)

gingebreed (B.Th.2044)   silver teyne (G.CY.1318)

gold broche (RR.1193)   ston-wal (LGW.713)

fether-bed (BD.251)   water pot (E.CI.290)

water-vessel (G.CY.1234)   nyght-cappe (E.Mch.1853)

Chapter VI
Subject-Object

    We are going to analyze the nominals in which the underlying grammatical relation between the two constituents is that of the subject

and the object of a transitive-verb sentence. We find only one sentence which seems to serve as kernel.

> The sterres ... yeten ... lyght (Bo.1.m.7.1-2)
> sterre lyght (Bo.2.m.3.5)
> *Examples*

thonder-leyt (I.Pars.835-40)	mone lyght (RR.1010)
candel-lyght (A.Mil.3634)	char-hors (TC.5.1018)
shrifte-fadir (RR.6423)	wynd-melle (HF.3.1280)
sonne-beem (D.WB.868)	goldsmyth (G.CY.1333)

Chapter VII
Subject-Verb

We may note a class of nominals which appear to have a verb as first member and which embody the relation between the subject and the finite verb of a sentence, and another class in which the first member is a subject and the second a finite verb. In Chaucer there are few examples which seem to be of this type.

> *Examples*

herde-gromes (HF.3.1225)	plowman (E.CL.799)
werkman (D.Sum.1973)	thonder-clappes (I.Pars.170-5)
toth-ake (RR.1098)	

Let us compare Lees' derivation sequence with Chaucer's to give reasons why these examples belong to this category.

Lees	Chaucer
The population grows.	oure hedes ... ake (LGW.705)
... population's growth ...	
... growth of the population...	ache of head (TC.4.728)
population growth	toth-ake (RR.1098)

The *toth-ake* is the nominal in which the nominalized verb *ake* appears as head.

Chapter VIII
Verb-Prepositional Object

The nominals which mirror the "verb-prepositional object" relation are going to be treated here. According to Lees, the whole sequence of lines in the derivation of *hunting dog* would be:

The dog is for Na.

John hunts a fox with the dog.

The dog is for John's hunting a fox with the dog.

... dog which is for John's hunting of a fox with the dog ...

... dog for John's hunting of a fox with the dog ...

... dog for John's hunting of a fox with the dog + Pron ...

... dog for John's hunting of a fox ...

... dog for the hunting of a fox by John ...

... dog for the hunting of a fox ...

... dog for a fox hunting ...

... fox hunting dog ...

... hunting dog ...

This gerundive transformation is a type called a double-base transformation which has two base strings. When we pay attention to Chaucer, we can find several examples which would belong to this category:

kervyng instrument (TC.1.631)   kervyng toils (TC.1.632)

It might be necessary to give two source-sentences in order to account for the underlying grammatical relation of the two examples above. We can find a sequence which might serve as a source-sentence:

I with this knyf my throte kerve (TC.2.325)

Examples

knedyng-tubbes (A.Mil.3594)	knedyng trogh (A.Mil.3620)
wonyng places (RR.6119)	buriyng place (G.Sn.409)
wedyng ryng (E.Cl.868)	daunsynge chaumberes (LGW. 1106)
restyng place (BD.1005)	slepyng-tyme (Comp.L.50)

fastyng tymes (I.Pars.975-80)

Chapter IX
Subject-Predicate

Certain nominals appear to embody the relation between predicate nominal or adjectival and the subject of the sentence, as first and second member respectively. To illustrate this relation of the two constituents, we derive the following Present-day English nominals from the kernel-sentences at the right:

girlfriend: The friend is a girl.

madman: The man is mad.

Below are compounds and nominal phrases found in Chaucer which appear to belong to this category.

quyksilver (G.CY.772)	holyday (LGW.35)
wis-man (TC.1.630)	gentil-man (LGW.1264)
mayde child (B.Sh.1285)	boy-knave (RR.3849)
knave child (B.ML.715)	mayster-strete (LGW.1965)
maister-tour (F.Sq.226)	mayster-hunte (BD.375)
mayster-temple (LGW.1016)	lylye flour (B.NP.4053)
date-tree (RR.1364)	fige-tree (RR.1718)
boxtree (A.Kn.1302)	whippletree (A.Kn.2923)
pyntree (RR.1314)	bremble flour (B.Th.1936)
foomen (B.MK.3255)	

We have no source-sentences which can justify the classsification of the above-listed examples. There is one sequence in which the adjective "wise" is used as predicate.

folk that weren wise (TC.5.1579)

Conclusion

We have so far applied Lees' transformational analysis of compounds to the compounds in Chaucer. From what has been mentioned it might be made clear that however superficially linguistic phenomena

have been changed (spelling, pronunciation, inflection, and so on), the linguistic intuition has not been changed so much. In dealing with transformational grammar native speakers' linguistic intuition is the most important factor. Native speakers might often say like: "We wouldn't say it that way," or "Well, I suppose you could say that." This is what is called "linguistic intuition". We'll give one example from Lees; *cave man*. The compound *cave man* is classified as belonging to Category IV (Subject-Object), for, according to Lees' intuition, its underlying grammatical sentence would be "The man *inhabits* the cave," but not "The man *lives in* the cave." If its source-sentence may be the latter, the compound must ne classified under Category VI (Subject-Prepositional Object). We can see, therefore, that it is quite difficult to determine to which category a given compound belongs.

When we study language, it goes without saying that it is very important to lay stress on linguistic intuition of native speakers. With Chaucer, however, we have no exact intuitive knowledge of English of those days. For this reason, after the study of Chaucer's compouds, some questions in the following arose.

(1). There are some possessive-genitive compounds in Chaucer like; *Seint Velentynes day* (I.Pars.1085-90, PF.322etc.). Lees remarks that this compound is quite obviously not of the *have*-sentence form (*op. cit.*, p.132), but after all he classifies it under Category II (Subject-Middle Object 'possessive genitive'). So as Owen Thomas criticizes Lees by saying "Probably some of Lees's analysis of compounds needs to be re-evaluated in terms of recent advances in the study of English" (*Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English*, New York (Holt, Rinehart and Winston), 1966, p. 113), it seems that Lees himself is unsatisfied with some of his nominalizations. For instance, as has been mentioned in Chapter II, genitives are usually derived by nominalizing sentences with *to have* as a main verb: The boy has a hat. → The boy's hat ... This nominalization does not explain the ambiguity inherent in an expression such as *the queen's picture*

85

which would mean either "the picture that belongs to the queen" or "the artistic reproduction of the queen's likeness". Furthermore, the nominalization will not produce the so-called *genitives of measure* or all of the *genitives of origin*. The following is not acceptable:

　　　* The work has a month.

But this phrase is:

　　　The month's work ...

It is clear that the nominalization accounts for most genitives of possession, but not all. We can say:

　　　The woman's rudeness ...

But we can not ssy:

　　　* The woman has a rudeness.

Below is an example from Chaucer:

　　　Jobes patience (D.WB.436)

There are several examples of this type in Chaucer: His wyves patience (E.CI.1181), Grisildes ... patience (E.Mch.1224), etc. But which would be a source-sentence?

　　　he wolde have ... patience (RR.6429)

　　　a womman was ... patient (E.CI.1149)

Therefore it is quifficult to select "the priamry linguistic data" and that precisely when we deal with older languages.

　　(2). Transformationalists regard language as static. They never accept any historical approach to linguistic phenomena. But if we deal with compounds, we sometimes need to adopt a historical approach. For in order to account for the underlaying agrammatical relationships of compounds we have to have kernel-sentences. The compound *Seint Valentynes day*, though it is used still today, might have been produced in the Old English period or in the Middle English period.

　　We have so far analyzed nominals in Chaucer. The data were restricted. But if we cover all the linguistic facts of Middle English, the result will be superior beyond comparison.

The following are the abbreviations for the titles of Chaucer's works. The spellings are modernized.

A. Prol.	Prollog of the Canterbury Tales
A. Kn.	Knight's Tale
A. Mil.	Miller's Tale
A. Rv.	Reeve's Tale
A. Co.	Cook's Tale
B. ML.	Man of Law's Tale
B. Sh.	Shipman's Tale
B. Pri.	Prioress's Tale
B. Th.	Tale of Sir Thopas
B. Mel.	Tale of Melibeus
B. MK.	Monk's Tale
B. NP.	Nun's Priest's Tale
C. Phy.	Physician's Tale
C. Pard	Pardoner's Tale
D. WB.	Wife of Bath's Tale
D. Fri.	Friar's Tale
D. Sum.	Sumner's Tale
E. Cl.	Clerk's Tale
E. Mch.	Merchant's Tale
F. Sq.	Squire's Tale
F. Fkl.	Franklin's Tale
G. SN.	Second Nun's Tale
G. CY.	Canon's Yeoman's Tale
H. Mcp.	Manciple's Tale
I. Pars.	Parson's Tale
BD.	Book of the Duchess
Pity.	Complaint unto Pity
ABC.	Chaucer's ABC
Mars.	Complaint of Mars

Comp. L.	Complaint to his Lady
Anel.	Complaint of Fair Anelida and False Arcite
PF.	Parliament of Fowls
Bo. 1.	Boethius, nk. 1.
Bo. 2.	Boethius, bk. 2.
Bo. 3.	Boethius, bk. 3.
Bo. 4.	Boethius, bk. 4.
Bo. 5.	Boethius, bk. 5.
TC. 1.	Troilus and Criseyde, bk. 1.
TC. 2.	Troilus and Criseyde, bk. 2.
TC. 3.	Troilus and Criseyde, bk. 3.
TC. 4.	Troilus and Criseyde, bk. 4.
TC. 5.	Troilus and Criseyde, bk. 5.
Adam.	Chaucer's Words unto Adam
HF. 1.	House of Fame, bk. 1.
HF. 2.	House of Fame, bk. 2.
HF. 3.	House of Fame, bk. 3.
LGW.	Legend of Good Women
Form. A.	Former Age
Fort.	Fortune
Truth.	Truth
Gent.	Gentilesse
L. St.	Lack of Steadfastness
Ven.	Complaint of Venus
Purse.	Complaint to his Purse
Prov.	Proverbs of Chaucer
Comp. A.	Complainte d'Amour
Bal. Co.	Balade of Complaint
Astr.	Treatise on the Astr4labe
RR.	Romaunt of the Rose
m.	metrum (in the Boethius)
P.	prosa (in the Boethius)

All the examples are taken from *The Complete Works of Geofferey Chaucer*, Second Edition, ed, F. N. Robinson, London (Oxford University Press), 1957.

NOTES

1). Though Jespersen gives a definition to the compound, his defnition lacks consistency. Accoriding to his *A Modern English Grammar* (London, Allen & Unwin, 1965) *stone wall* is not a compound (Part II, §§ 13.21 13.22, 13.23), but it is regarded as belonging to the substantive-compound (Part VI, § 8.22).

2). *A Modern English Grammar*, Part VI, §8.11.

3). *An Advanced English Syntax*, London (Kegan Paul, Trench, & Trubner), 1929. § 10 (6).

4). *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English*, London (Edward Arnold), 1965, p. 224.

5). *Language*, London (Allen & Unwin), 1965, § 14. 1.

6). *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*, New York (Holt, Rinehart and Winston), 1961, § 5.20.

7). *Modern English Structure*, London (Edward Arnold), 1962, § 66.

8). *The Compounding and Hyphenation of English Words*, and *Compounding in the English Language*, New York (Funk & Wagnalls Company), 1951.

9). Cf. K. Ueno,

10). Bloomfield, *op. cit.*, § 14. 2.

11). *A Handbook of Present-day English*, Groningen (Noordhoff), 1932, Part II, § 1581.

12). Jespersen, *op. cit.*, § 8.11.

13). *Ibid.*, § 8.12.

14). *The Grammar of English Nominalizations*, The Hague (Mouton & Co.), 1963, p. 115.

15). Jespersen, *op. cit.*, Chs. VIII, IX.

NOTES

16). There are various complications in the subcategorization of the verb phrase. Roughly speaking, besides transitives and intransitives, there is another class called "middle verbs" which, though followed by objects, do not have passive transforms nor manner adverbials and include *have, cost, weigh, resemble, total, stand,* etc. The middle verbs do not transform into action nominals with *of,* as do other transitive verbs.

17). These new terms are said to be more descriptive and precise than the traditional ones, independent and dependent. The basic sentence, traditionally called an independent clause, is called a matrix sentence by many transformationalists. The sentence embedded into a matrix sentence, traditionally called a dependent clause, is called a constituent sentence.

18). Some nouns take no ending in the genitive singular: these include all the nouns of relationship ending in *-er* (fader, doghter, brother, etc.). Cf. M. Hussey, A. C. Searing, and J. Winny's *An Introduction to Chaucer,* England (Cambridge University Press), 1965, p.94.

19). *So* and *as,* originally one and the same word (OE. *swa* and the reinforced *eall swa*), retain a number of parallel uses in ME. Both are often used in asseverations: "as have I blisse" meaning "as surely as I hope to have bliss". For further details see T. F. Mustanoja's *A Middle English Syntax* Helsinki (Société Néophililogique), 1960, Part I, pp. 334-336.

20). we have a name (B.Sh.1479)   our name (HF.3.1696)

21). a webbe of a loppe (Astr.I.3)

22). the chambe of his paleys (A.Kn.2525) and some other expressions with the presition *of*:
the dores of the tour (B.MK.3615)
the gates of the toun (B.MK.3239)
the gate of the gardyn (RR.1279)

23). We can construct such a derivation as follows:
boures wal (A.Mil.3367)
the walles of the town (TC.5.1112)
chambre wal (TC.2.919)