

進行形の意味を持つ補文標識について

An Observation of a Complementizer
with Progressive Meaning

by Sanae Tsuda

Introduction

In the past few years there have been proposals that complementizers are not semantically empty and should be introduced in the deep structure in opposition to the works such as Rosenbaum's or Kajita's which are based on the Aspects model. Joan Bresnan, for instance, studied the structure of English complements quite extensively and claimed that complementizers should be introduced in the base.

In this paper, 's-ing complementizer is studied. Especially 's-ing complementizer with progressive meaning is examined, taking into consideration the remarks made by traditional grammarians and generative transformationalists. And it is pointed out that there are some constructions in ing forms that cannot be dealt with in the Aspects model.

Chapter I Progressive or Gerund?

In the traditional grammar, the ing form is divided into the progressive aspect of the verb and the gerundive form of the verb. And it is sometimes difficult to separate these two forms.

Curme sets up semantic and syntactic criteria for the gerund and the participle. Semantically he considers an ing form to be "a present participle when it has a descriptive force, representing something as continuing or as being repeated."¹ From syntactic viewpoint, Curme says:

The gerund performs the function of a noun; the present participle performs the function of an adjective.... In spite of the strong verbal force of the gerund and its assumption of tense and voice forms, it remains a noun. It can still stand in the sentence only where a noun can stand and it still always performs the function of a noun.²

R. W. Zandvoort defines the gerund and the participle in the similar way as Curme:

1) George O. Curme., *Syntax*, (New York, 1935), p.490.

2) *ibid.*, p.491.

In the first place, such words may be used as VERBAL NOUNS, i. e. as nouns with a verbal MEANING... Nouns in *ing* with verbal meaning, or verbal meaning and function combined, are called GERUND... In the second place, such words may be used as VERBAL ADJECTIVES, either attributively, as in *a burning house*... or predicatively, as in *the house was burning*... In this case they are called PRESENT (or IMPERFECT) PARTICIPLES.¹

Jespersen also considers the gerund and the participle as two syntactically distinct items in spite of their formal identity. What characterizes his definitions of the gerund and the participle is the analysis of the nexus constructions, which characterizes Jespersen's grammar as a whole. He calls the grammatical construction with subject and predicate nexus, and divides it into the independent nexus and the dependent nexus. In the discussion of the gerund and the participle, the dependent nexus plays an important role.

Jespersen's description of the gerund and the participle is shown in the following statement and examples.

- 1) a gerund, parallel to, though syntactically different form, other nexus-substantives, but like them *denoting* a nexus, —symbol G—, and
- 2) a (first) participle, which does not denote but *implies* a nexus and is therefore on a par with agent-substantive, —symbol Y²

He gives the following examples for 1) and 2):

- 1) We praised her graceful dancing.
We praised her for dancing gracefully.
- 2) a dancing girl
a girl dancing gracefully appeared;
cf. (graceful) dancer³

He comments on the difference in meanings:

Dancing in 1) means "the fact that (she) dances" or "the way in which (she) dances"; in (2) "who dances".³

Jespersen's description of the gerund and the participle are quite different

1) R. W. Zandvoort, *A Handbook of English Grammar*, (Groningen, 1966), p. 24.
2) Otto Jespersen, *Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, Part V, (London, 1940), p. 143.
3) *ibid.*, *idem*.

Jespersen does not use the term noun. However, we may safely say that the substantive and the noun are equivalent in this discussion.

from Curme and Zandvoort in that he employs the discussion of nexus constructions in defining them. It is interesting that his explanation that "a participle *implies* a nexus" is, in a sense, parallel to an underlying or deep structure in the transformational grammar, and the part in his statements that he considers gerunds as substantives is common to Curme or Zandvoort in that they function as nouns.

Chapter II Complementizer with Progressive Meaning

In generative transformational frameworks, *ing* forms as participles are introduced as a part of auxiliary *be-ing* by phrase structure rules and those as gerunds are transformationally supplied as a part of a complementizer *s'-ing* in the Aspect model.

Rosenbaum points out that there is a complement in *ing* form which is not dominated by a noun phrase node which he calls the verb phrase complement. Compare each pair of sentences in (1) and (2):

- (1-a) I felt the rope slip.
- (1-b) I felt the rope slipping.¹
- (2-a) I began to cry.
- (2-b) I began crying.

While the sentences in (2) are considered to be synonymous, those in (1) are different in that (1-b) has progressive meaning where (1-a) does not. Rosenbaum claims that the *ing* in (1-b) must be described as "progressive" as Fillmore proposed in his paper.²

Fillmore clearly distinguishes the *ing* represented in (1-b) from the *ing* in "genitive ING nominalizations" and calls the former "telescoped progressive". By the term "telescoped" he means "the mutation involving the deletion Tense+BE from the verb phrase". In other words, the *ing* in telescoped progressives" derives from the auxiliary *be-ing* but functions also as a complementizer.

Rosenbaum and Fillmore seemingly succeeded in explaining such *ing* forms as (1-a), but this *ing* form cannot be explained in the Aspect model since the complementizers are considered semantically empty and transformationally introduced in the framework.

Among traditional grammarians, Jerspersen analyzed such structures as follows:

The construction in *I see (hear) John coming* may be analyzed SVO (12), if *coming* is taken to be a simple adjunct to John, or SVO (S₂P), if *John*

-
- 1) Peter S. Rosenbaum, *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1967) p.28.
 - 2) Charles J. Fillmore, "The position of Embedding Transformations in a Grammar," *Word*, XIX (August 1963), 216-218.

coming is taken as a nexus-object.... But *coming* may also be a gerund and then we have SVO (S₂G)¹.

As shown above, Jerspersen shows the three possible grammatical analyses for the sentence, and proposes that it is nearly immaterial to the meaning whether an *ing* after a noun (or a pronoun) is taken to be a gerund or a participle.² From his statement, Jerspersen does not distinguish the gerund from the participle in such constructions. In other words, there are constructions which cannot be explained by these two classifications the gerund and the participle. From generative transformational point of view, the classification is difficult when the semantic interpretation of the *ing* form is that of progressive while syntactic function of the *ing* is a complementizer.

As mentioned above, Rosenbaum naturally classifies progressive complement in verb phrase complementation: such verbs as *apperceive*, *behold*, *catch*, *detect*, *discern*, *feel*, *find*, *glimpse*, *keep*, *notice*, *observe*, *overhear*, *pass*, *perceive*, *see*, *show*, *watch* and *witness* take progressive complement according to his classification. However, he does not pursue the consequence of the marginal nature of the complement further.

It is interesting to note that the verbs which take this kind of complement are mostly the so-called perceptive verbs except *keep* and *pass*. Let us compare *keep* with a perceptive verb *hear*,

(3-a) I heard her sing.

(3-b) I heard her singing.

(4-a) *He kept me (to) wait.³

(4-b) He kept me waiting.

In the case of perceptive verbs, both the *for-to* and progressive complement occur, but *keep* only allows the *ing* form.

To show (4-b) is a progressive complement and not an ordinary 's-*ing* complement, the following sentence is given.

(5) *The father kept his daughter owing the old car.

According to Rosenbaum's analysis, *keep* takes only progressive complement but the verb *own* cannot be a progressive like *cost* or *have*. Therefore, such verbs as *cost*, *own*, *resemble*, and *have* cannot occur as complements in the progressive forms with verbs such as *keep* which always require progressive complements.

1) Jerspersen, p. 146.

The symbols stand for: S—Subject, V—Verb (finite), O—Object, P—Predicate, 1—primary, 2—Secondary ()—Particulars serving to explain the item immediately preceding.

2) Ibid., p. 136.

3) *shows the sentence is ungrammatical

4) Curme (1935), p. 373.

We shall now turn back to see how traditional grammarians such as Curme and Zandvoort deal with this construction, especially with non-perceptive verbs such as *keep* and *continue*.

Curme, for instance, refers to it in a section called "Durative Aspect":

To express different shades of the idea of continuance also other forms are often used, especially *remain*, *keep*, *keep on*, *go on*, *continue* with a present participle as predicate after an intransitive, and an infinitive or gerund as object after a transitive.¹

Again Curme implies in the above statement that he considers that the gerund functions as "a noun", since the gerund always follows transitive verbs. According to his analysis, the ing form after the verbs such as *keep*, *continue*, etc. may be a participle or a gerund depending on the interpretation of the ing form as "predicate" or "object" respectively. He gives the following examples:

- (6) He kept working (participle) until he was tired out.
- (7) He continued to work (object of transitive *continued*) or *working* (predicate participle or gerund object depending on whether "continued" is felt as intransitive or transitive), until he was tired out.¹

Curme's analysis here seems to depend only on intuition without making any formal distinction between participle and gerund, and therefore it is difficult to apply the criterion to other sentences.

Zandvoort tries to base his criteria of the distinction on the syntactic functions of the two ing forms, but stops applying them beyond certain points attributing these difficulties to the formal identity of the gerund and the participle. He says:

Again there is little to choose between such combinations as *He went on laughing*, *He continued laughing*. In the latter two the form in *ing* may be analyzed as a gerund because it functions to some extent as an object to the transitive verb *keep* (on) and *continue*. *To go on*, on the other hand, as an intransitive cannot take an object.... Some of the difficulties dealt with above are caused by the fact that.... their formal identity favoured the development of certain uses that do not easily fit into either. These uses are not sharply differentiated from either the present participle or the gerund, but pass into them by almost imperceptible gradations.²

He considers that the nature of the language makes the distinction of the two forms difficult. He does not, however, consider the criteria of the distinctions or the dichotomy of the gerund and the participle are insufficient.

1) Curme (1935), p. 373.

2) Zandvoort (1966), p. 47.

Conclusion

As it is pointed out at the end of the last chapter, Zandvoort may be correct in saying the “uses are not sharply differentiated from either the present participle or the gerund, but pass into them by almost imperceptible gradations.” In any analyses of grammatical structures, some marginal items that cannot be classified into a single category are present, which may cause a theoretical problem.

If we recognize ing form which has a progressive meaning and is a complement, we will have to admit that this complementizer should also be introduced in the base if we take the position that transformations do not change the meaning of the sentence.

References

- Bresnan, Joan: *Theory of complementation in English Syntax*, Ph.D. Thesis, MIT (1972)
- Curme, George O.: *Syntax*, New York (1935).
- Fillmore, Charles J.: “The Position of Embedding Transformation in a Grammar”, *Word*, XIX (1963), 208-231.
- Jersperen, Otto: *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, Part V, London (1940).
- Kajita, Masaru: *A Generative Transformational Study of Semi-Auxiliary in Present-Day American English*, Tokyo (1968).
- Rosenbaum, Peter S.: *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*, Cambridge, Mass. (1967).
- Ross, John Robert, “Nouniness”, *Three Dimensions of Linguistic Theory*, O. Fujimura Ed. Tokyo (1973).
- Zandvoort, R.W.: *A Handbook of English Grammar*, Groningen (1966).