

Adjunct Clauses, Presupposition and Root Transformations

Hopper and Thompson (1973: hereafter H&T) observe that "Root Transformations" (RTs) in English are possible in, and only in, adjunct clauses whose content is not presupposed. Thus Left Dislocation is allowed in *because*-clauses (1a), whose content is typically not presupposed. By contrast, Left Dislocation is blocked in *when*-, *before*-, and *after*- clauses (1b), whose content typically is presupposed (Heinämäki 1978). (1c) shows that when presupposition is forced upon a *because*-clause by association with negation, Left Dislocation is blocked. Other RTs like Negative Constituent Preposing, Directional Adverb Preposing, Tag Question Formation, and Topicalization pattern similarly. The correlation that H&T observe raises a simple, but puzzling question: how could a semantic/pragmatic phenomenon like presupposition constrain syntactic operations like RTs?

We suggest a solution to this puzzle based on an important semantic difference between *because*- adjuncts vs *when*-/*before*-/*after*-adjuncts. According to Johnston (1994), *because* takes a closed event sentence as its complement, and expresses a relation between closed event sentences (2a,b). By contrast *when*, *before*, and *after* take an open event sentence as complement, yielding an open event sentence that typically functions as a restriction on an adverb of quantification (3a,b). This analysis explains the difference in presuppositional behavior under Diesing's (1992) observation that quantifier restrictions are presupposed. Given that *when*-, *before*-, and *after*-adjuncts function as Q-restrictions, whereas *because*-adjuncts do not, the former will be presupposed whereas the latter (typically) will not.

We further propose that the extra semantic element in the analysis of *because* complements - the event quantifier - corresponds to an additional layer of syntactic structure XP (4a,b), and that the latter explains the availability of RTs. In brief, the complement of *because* is a larger syntactic domain than that of *when*-, *before*-, and *after*-, and this extra layer of structure is the domain of RTs, like Left Dislocation (4c). We cite a variety of cross-linguistic data supporting the view that *because*-complements are syntactically larger/richer than *when*-, *before*-, and *after*-complements. Languages include: (a) Haitian Creole, which allows tense, mood, aspect and sentential negation in verb-doubled *because*-clauses, but not in *when*-clauses (5a,b); (b) Sakha, which exhibits subject - verb agreement in *because*-clauses, but not in *when*-clauses (6a,b); (c) Swedish, which shows main clause word order and root transforms in *because*-clauses, but not in *when*-clauses (7a,b); Japanese, which permits topic and modal phrases in *because*-clauses, but not in *when*-clauses (8a,b). We also discuss the identity of the categories XP and YP in (4).

H&T's correlation thus becomes an artifact of a deeper asymmetry between *because*- vs. *when*-/*before*-/*after*-adjuncts. The former take a richer complement which permits certain syntactic operations, but blocks use as a quantifier restriction. The latter take a poorer complement, which blocks RTs, but permits use as a quantifier restriction, yielding a presuppositional effect. as a by-product. We close with a discussion of nontemporal *since*-clauses, which allow RTs but don't seem to presuppose their content. We also offer brief contrasts between our approach and recent work by Haegeman on a similar range of data.

Examples

- (1) a. Mildred drives a Mercedes because **her son, he** owns stock in Xerox. (= H&T's (241))
b. *Mildred bought a Mercedes when/before/after **her son, he** purchased stock in Xerox.
c. *Sam is going out for dinner, not because **his wife, she** can't cook, but because he wants to discuss Q-magic with Stella. (= H&T's (245))
- (2) a. John left because Bill arrived.
b. BECAUSE ([e **arrive(e,b) & PAST(e)**]) ([e [leave(e,j) & PAST(e)]])
- (3) a. John (always) left when Bill arrived.
b. ALWAYS (**arrive(e,b) & PAST(e)**) ([leave(e,j) & PAST(e)])
- (4) a. because [XP [X' [e [YP ...]]]] b. when/before/after [YP ...]
c. because [XP her son [X' [e [YP he owns stock in Xerox]]]]
- (5) a. Achte Jan **pa te** achte flé yo, Mari fache.
buy John NEG PST buy flower Det, Mary angry
'Since John didn't buy the flowers, Mary is angry.'
b. *Di m **pa** di l sa, li ale.
tell I NEG tell him that, he go
'As soon as/When I didn't tell him that, he left..' (Lefebvre and Ritter 93)
- (6) a. Marty belesipie-ti-n atylaa-bat-a toqo dieri amerika-qa baar-a.
Marty bike-3-acc sell-NEGPST-3 because America-dat exist-3
'Marty didn't sell his bike because he was in America.'
b. *Marty belesipie-ti-n atylaa-bat-a amerika-qa baar-a kemiger.
Marty bike-3-acc sell-NEGPST-3 America-dat exist-3 time-dat-3
'Marty didn't sell his bike when he was in America.' (Nadya Vinokurova, p.c)
- (7) a. USA har startat ett nytt krig därför att **Nixon, han** är ju inte klok.
USA has started a new war because Nixon, he is (as is obvious) not sane.
'The USA has started a new war because Nixon, he is crazy.'
b. *Vi kom till Stockholm när **Henry, han** var på väg till Kairo.
we came to Stochholm when Henry, he was on way/road to Cairo
'We came to Stockholm when henry, he was on the way to Cairo.' (Anderssen 75:83)
- (8) a. **Taro-wa** raishuu kuru-**daroo**-kara, soba-o motte kite moraou.
Taro-top next week come(NPST)-may-because, noodle-acc bring come Ben(NPST-lets)
'(Lit.)Because Taro may come here next week, (I) will ask him to bring soba-noodles.'
b. Taro- ***wa**/-ga raishuu kuru-(**daroo**)-toki, soba-o motte kite moraou.
Taro-TOP/NOM next week come(NPST)-may-when, noodle-acc bring come Ben(NPST-lets)
'When Taro may come, (I) will ask him to bring soba-noodles.'

References

- Andersson, L. (1975) *Form and Function of Subordinate Clauses*. Doctoral Thesis. Göteborg Univ.
Diesing, M. 1992. *Indefinites*. MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Heinämäki, O. (1978) *Semantics of English Temporal Connectives*. Univ. of Indiana:IULC.
Hooper, J. B. and Thompson, S.A. (1973) "On the Applicability of Root Transformations," *LI* 4: 465-497.
Johnston, M. (1994) *The Syntax and Semantics of Adverbial Adjuncts*. Doctoral Thesis. UCSC.
Lefebvre, C. and Ritter, E. (1993) "Two Types of Predicated Doubling Adverbs in Haitian Creole," In Byrne, F and Winford, D (eds.) *Focus and Grammatical Relations in Creole Languages*. (pp. 65-91) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.