

On Adjunct Predicates in English

Katsuo Ichinohe

This study is concerned with the kinds of adjunct predicates in English which are exemplified in the following examples:

- (1) a. Bill_i is very witty drunk_i.
- b. I can't drink coffee_i hot_i.
- (2) a. Mary_i left the room angry_i.
- b. John ate the meat_i raw_i.

Following [2], we refer to adjunct predicates like (1) as conditional/causal predicates, and ones like (2) as temporal predicates. Furthermore, each type of predicates divides into two subtypes: subject-oriented predicates and object-oriented ones. Thus, we have four types adjunct predicates: Subject-oriented Conditional/Causal Predicates like *drunk* in (1a) (SCPs), Object-oriented Conditional/Causal Predicates like *hot* in (1b) (OCPs), Subject-oriented Temporal Predicates like *angry* in (2a) (STPs), and Object-oriented Temporal Predicates like *raw* in (2b) (OTPs). The major topic in this study is to discuss the two issues concerning these adjunct predicates: in what structural positions they occur, and in what way they are associated with their antecedents.

Much attention has been paid for the structural positions of STPs and OTPs, and many linguists have been argued that STPs and OTPs are adjoined to VP and V', respectively. Their arguments are mainly based on the behavior of STPs and OTPs with regard to so-called VP-constituency tests such as VP-preposing: both of STPs and OTPs have to be moved with constituents of VP, such as verbs and objects, through the VP-constituency tests. Furthermore, when an STP and an OTP cooccur, the latter must precede the former, which means that the latter is closer to V.

Closer scrutiny, however, reveals the precise positions in which they occur. Adopting the Predication Phrase (PrP) Hypothesis by [1], I assume that STPs and OTPs are adjoined to Pr' and V'. This assumption is schematically represented in (3):

- (3) [_{PrP} Subject [_{Pr}[_{Pr} Pr [_{VP} Object [_{V'}[_{V'} V Complement] OTP]] STP]]]

Our assumption has consequences for several linguistic facts concerning STPs and OTPs, including their distributional properties with regard to so-called VP adverbs and two kinds of nominal expressions, namely derived nominals and nominal gerunds.

In contrast to much controversy over STPs and OTPs, not many researches have been made into the structural position that SCPs and OCPs occupy. [2] and [4] argue that these types of predicates seem to be adjoined to I' or IP, in view of the fact that

SCPs and OCPs, in contrast to STPs and OTPs, may stand outside the scope of negation, which means that these types of predicates occupy the structural positions above the ones where negative elements occur. Consider:

- (4) a. Bill_i isn't witty sober_i. (SCP)
 = When Bill is sober, he isn't witty.
 b. Bill doesn't drink coffee_i black_i. (OCP)
 = If coffee is hot, Bill doesn't drink it.

If this analysis of the structural position of OCPs is correct, however, it poses a serious problem on the approaches by [3] and [5], in which predicates in general is associated with their antecedents (or subjects) in terms of the purely syntactic notion of c-command (predication-theoretic approaches): an OCP is associated with an object NP which cannot c-command it.

Besides the structural position of OCPs, there do exist some examples which cast doubt on the predication-theoretic approach. Consider:

- (5) a. Mary is watched [_{pp} by Bill_i] angry_i. (STP)
 b. John stared [_{pp} at Mary_i] nude_i. (OTP)
 c. You can depend [_{pp} on Tom_i] sober_i. (OCP)

In each of the examples above, the antecedent is embedded within PP, which means that it cannot c-command its predicate under the standard assumption. These facts given in (4) and (5) force us to seek for some alternative.

We propose that the adjunct predicates involve the small-clause-like structures with PRO subjects, in which the adjunct predicates are predicated of the PRO subjects which are in turn controlled by the antecedents. That is, we attribute the relation holding between an adjunct predicate and its antecedent to control. This line of approach is defended by [4], and so on. Furthermore, in view of the facts given in (5) and the structural position of OTPs, I claim that some device which is not based on a purely syntactic notion, like c-command or m-command, have to be required to define the relation between an adjunct predicate and its antecedent.

References: [1] Bowers, J. (1993) "The Syntax of Predication," *LJ* 24/ [2] Iwasawa, K. (1985) "Three Levels of Complement APs and the Notion of Time," *TES* 3/ [3] Rothstein, S. (1983) *The Syntactic Forms of Predication*, PhD. diss., MIT./ [4] Stowell, T. (1981) *The Origin of Phrase Structure*, PhD. diss., MIT./ [5] Williams, E. (1980) "Predication," *LJ* 11.