MISSING SUBJECTS IN ADVERBIAL CLAUSES*

KEN-ICHI TAKAMI

Shizuoka University

In this note I would like to point out that both Reuland's 1983 analysis of missing subjects in adverbial clauses and the command constraint on them put forward by Langacker 1969 or Jackendoff 1972 run into serious counterexamples, and furthermore to make clear that the phenomena of missing subjects in adverbial clauses present various types of distributional differences according to what conjunction or which type of predicates (*-ing*, *-ed*, or verbless clauses) is used.

1. REULAND'S ANALYSIS. Reuland (1983: 129) states that examples such as 1a-c seem to violate condition 2 (=his 34).

- (1) a. John fell asleep while PRO reading.
- b. You should bring your sister when PRO visiting me next time.
- c. Mary went to bed at once after PRO drinking whisky.

(2) *-ing* is participial only if its domain is governed by NP or VP. However, he argues that only *temporal* subordinating conjunctions are accepted in this position and that "since Infl as such is primarily associated with tense, it is not surprising that it can only be bound by temporal conjunctions". Hence 1a-c realize [+tense, -AG] as an expansion of Infl.

A closer examination of the data, however, will show that this is not necessarily the case. Some *non-temporal* conjunctions can appear in this position, as shown in 3a-e.

- (3) a. Mary has never felt homesick, *although* PRO living by herself, far away from home.
- b. He told his parents about his fiancée's career, *as if* PRO

* I would like to thank Richard Maynard, who carefully read the manuscript and gave me a lot of insightful comments and suggestions. My thanks are also due to Sadao Ando and Harumi Sawada, from whose comments I have greatly benefited.

knowing everything about her.

(Imai & Nakajima 1978: 443)

- c. *Though* PRO understanding no Spanish, she was able to communicate with the other students.
(Quirk et al. 1985: 1005)
- d. *Unless* PRO wearing his school uniform, John doesn't look as old as he actually is.
- e. *While* PRO not actually encouraging it, the school allows students to park their cars up the main drive.

2. THE COMMAND ANALYSIS. It has generally been assumed that the phenomenon of a missing subject obeys the condition that the missing subject be *commanded* by its antecedent (Langacker 1969: 182 and Jackendoff 1972: 180). Let us now consider whether this condition is indeed workable or not, applying the well-motivated V^4 system of adverbial clauses proposed by Nakajima 1982, which is shown in 4.

Now observe the following examples.

- (5) a. *Michael has to start early in the morning, *for* having a long way to go. (V^4)
- b. John seldom reads English books, even *though* majoring in English. (V^3)
- c. She's been quite different *since* coming back from America. (V^2) (Swan 1980: 457)
- d. Mary behaved *as if* wanting to change her present job.

The ungrammatical 5a and grammatical 5b-d can be accounted for by the command constraint on missing subjects: in 5a the missing subject is not commanded by its antecedent *Michael*, since the adverbial clause containing the missing subject is attached to V^4 (above S (V^3) node), whereas in each of 5b-d the missing subject *is* commanded by its

antecedent, since the adverbial clause is attached to or below S (V³) node.

Moreover, the command constraint can cope with 6a-d, in which clauses with *-ed* participle are used, and with 7a-d, in which verbless clauses are used.

- (6) a. *John made a speech in Russian, *for* asked by his mother. (V⁴)
- b. You should appear in court, *if* required. (V³)
- c. Ideas thrive *when* faced with opposition and counter-attack. (V²)
- d. John behaved *as if* threatened by someone. (V¹)
- (7) a. *John felt no fear, *for* a brave man. (V⁴)
- b. *Though* young, John worked hard to support his family. (V³)
- c. John wrote many letters to his wife *while* in prison. (V²)
- d. He behaved *as if* unaware that I was present at the party. (V¹)

In 6a and 7a the missing subject is not commanded by its antecedent, while in 6b-d and 7b-d it is commanded by its antecedent.¹

The command constraint, however, will face some counterexamples, such as 8-10.

- (8) a. *John passed the entrance exam *because* studying so hard.
- b. *Mary will leave home early *so that* being in time for school.
- c. *John speaks Cockney, *since* coming from London.
- (9) a. *John has been very happy *after* invited to the party.
- b. *Mary has been very sad *since* left alone.
- c. *Mary handed \$500 to John *because* blackmailed by him.
- (10) a. **Because* a man of ingenuity, John invented a lot of wonderful things.
- b. *John has been in poor health *since* young.
- c. *John has been feeling quite gloomy *after* sick.

All these examples are ungrammatical, despite the fact that the adverbial clauses are dominated either by V² or by V³ node and therefore the missing subjects are commanded by their antecedents.

¹ The proposed adverbial clause in 7b is considered, as Nakajima (1982: 369-71) argues, as dominated by the V³ node. It is interesting to note here that Reinhart 1976, 1981, 1983 argues that all proposed adverbial clauses should be attached to $\bar{S}$ (E). If so, however, Reinhart's claim cannot account for examples such as 7b, since the antecedents fail to command the missing subjects.

3. DISTRIBUTIONS. It may be suggested from the examples in the preceding sections that conjunctions should be classified into several distinct groups according to whether or not they can take *-ing*, *-ed* or verbless clauses. Logically speaking, there should be eight different groups, since there are three variables, each of them being either permitted or not ($2 \times 2 \times 2 = 8$). But examination of the data will reveal that conjunctions are in fact divided into the following five types.²

(11)

	type conjunction	-ing	-ed	verbless
A	<i>when(ever)</i>	○	○	○
	<i>(al)though</i>	○	○	○
	<i>as if (though)</i>	○	○	○
	<i>while (duration)</i>	○	○	○
	<i>while (concession)</i>	○	○	○
	<i>unless</i>	○	○	○
	<i>(even) if³</i>	○	○	○
	<i>once</i>	○	○	○
	<i>as (reason)</i>	○	○	○
	<i>until (till)</i>	○	○	○
	<i>whether ... or</i>	○	○	○
B	<i>before</i>	○	*	*
	<i>after</i>	○	*	*
	<i>since (duration)</i>	○	*	*
	<i>whereas</i>	○	*	*
C	<i>as soon as</i>	*	○	○
	<i>as (manner)</i>	*	○	○
	<i>where(ver)</i>	*	○	○

² I owe this classification to Imai and Nakajima 1978, Quirk et al. 1985 and Richard Maynard (personal communication).

³ Some conjunctions cannot take missing subjects when used nonrestrictively, that is, used as modifying the performative clause. Observe the following, for instance.

*If remembering correctly, I watched the movie five times.

D	<i>as far as</i>	*	○	*
	<i>as long as</i>	*	○	*
E	<i>because</i> ⁴	*	*	*
	<i>since</i> (reason) ⁴	*	*	*
	<i>for</i>	*	*	*
	<i>so that</i> (purpose)	*	*	*
	<i>so that</i> (result)	*	*	*

The question we are thus faced with is: What sort of well-motivated principles of grammar can capture such rich distributional differences as described above? Although we would have to take semantic and contextual as well as syntactic information into account, it is not immediately clear to me at present.

REFERENCES

- IMAI, KUNHIKO, and HEIZO NAKAJIMA. 1978. *Gendai no eibunpoo 5: Bun II*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- JACKENDOFF, RAY. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- LANGACKER, RONALD. 1969. On pronominalization and the chain of command. Modern studies in English, ed. by David Reidel and Sanford Schane, 160-86. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- NAKAJIMA, HEIZO. 1982. The V⁴ system and bounding category. LA 9.341-78.
- QUIRK, RANDOLPH, SIDNEY GREENBAUM, GEOFFREY LEECH, and JAN SVARTVIK. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- REINHART, TANYA. 1976. *The syntactic domain of anaphora*. MIT dissertation.
- _____. 1981. Definite NP anaphora and c-command domains. LI 12.605-35.
- _____. 1983. *Anaphora and semantic interpretation*. London: Croom Helm.
- REULAND, ERIC. 1983. Governing *-ing*. LI 14.101-36.
- RHYNE, ORESTES. 1910. Conjunction + participle group in English. *Studies in Philology* 4.3-29.
- SWAN, MICHAEL. 1980. *Practical English usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁴ We have to hasten to add that *because* and *since* (reason) can take adjective clauses, as shown in the contrast below, though this point would need further consideration and we do not go into any further here.

(i) The man, *because/since drunk* and unruly, was thrown out the door. (cf. Rhyme 1910: 28)

(ii) ??The man, *because/since inebriated* and considered dangerous, was thrown out the door.