

When Did the Consequential Free Adjunct Appear?: A Diachronic Study

Naoki Kawaguchi

Daiichi Institute of Technology Common Education Center (1-10-2 Kokubu-chuo, Kirishima, Kagoshima, Japan)

Abstract: This article diachronically delves into participial constructions containing a consequential free adjunct, as in *The siren sounded, indicating that the air raid was over*. The consequential free adjuncts exhibit intriguing predilections: (A) that the consequential free adjunct *indicating that the air raid was over* refers back to, unlike the *usual* free adjunct, its whole matrix clause *The siren sounded*, (B) that its acceptability is subject to idiolectal preference, and (C) that its nearest paraphrase is claimed to be the sentential relative clause (i.e., *which indicated that...*). Accepting characteristics (A), (B), and (C), we can regard the consequential free adjunct as a marked, peripheral phenomenon, which merits research. This article, therefore, deals with the first date when the consequential free adjunct appeared in the English language, employing *Early English Books Online Corpus*. The findings are that the dates of the first consequential free adjuncts containing target predicates center mostly in 1500-1600 (i.e., from Late Middle English to Modern English), and that those of their corresponding sentential relative clauses, which are the nearest paraphrase of them, lag behind the advent of them. This article thereby provides empirical scaffolds for future theoretical research into the relationship between the free adjunct under consideration and the sentential relative clause.

Key words: diachronic syntax, participle, relative clause, markedness

1. Introduction and Problems to Consider

The participial construction (PC) consists of a finite main clause (MC) and a non-finite free adjunct (FA) containing a verb in the form of a present participle. As a rule, these two clauses are separated by an intonational break or a comma. To illustrate the PC, the following example should suffice:

- (1) He was washing the dishes [MC], loudly singing an opera aria [FA].

Here, the implicit subject of the FA tallies with the MC's subject *he*. Visser (1966) labeled such an FA

as a “related free adjunct”. There are, unlike usual FAs illustrated above, PCs which seriously violate the above-mentioned fundamental principle. Witness the following instance:

- (2) The siren sounded, indicating that the air raid was over.
(2') . . . which indicated that . . .
(Quirk et al. (1985: 1122), cf. Uchida (2002: 4))

It is quite intriguing to note two characteristics in (2). First (characteristic A), the subject or antecedent of the FA tallies with the entire preceding MC rather

than with *the siren*; thus it can be readily paraphrased with what Quirk et al. (1985) call a “sentential finite relative clause” (= 2’)), whose antecedent is the entire preceding sentence.¹ Second (characteristic B), as pointed out by Uchida (2002), the FA expresses a consequence of the event expressed by the MC. Thus, in accordance with Uchida (2002), we will call an FA bearing the two characteristics (= (A), (B)) a “consequential free adjunct” (CFA), in addition to which we are entitled to regarding such an FA as a marked, peripheral phenomenon in the English language in that it seriously deviates from the usual or “related” FA like 1)) where the coreference of the PC to its MC subject is retained.

This idiosyncratic behavior of the CFA has attracted the attention of various scholars (e.g., Frank (1972), Quirk et al. (1985), Hayase (2002), and Uchida (2002)).² It has been argued in some of these previous studies (Quirk et al. (1985), Hayase (2002), and Uchida (2002)) that, as mentioned above, the nearest paraphrase of the CFA is the sentential finite relative clause. In addition to this, Hayase (2002) observes that the content expressed by the MC is rephrased by introducing the CFA, both clauses conveying the same content from a different point of view. Frank (1972), on the other hand, makes the intriguing statement that the use of CFAs can be eschewed by some people in that they make no coreference to their MC subject—in other words, the acceptability of CFAs varies in accordance with idiolectal preference.³

Despite the CFA’s intriguing nature, no attention has been paid to the issue of when they first appeared in the language. Even examples of FAs from Old (449~1100), Middle (1100-1500), and Modern (1500~) English exhaustively collected by Visser (1966) contain no vestiges of CFAs. However, it can be presumed that the CFA began to exhibit itself after at least the Late Middle English period.

Yonekura (1985), extensively investigating PCs appearing in the Wycliffite Bible (c. 1380), and Higuchi (1996), painstakingly delving into PCs appearing in Chaucer’s *The Canterbury Tales*, include no fragments of CFAs in their findings.

Hence, we would like to ascertain when the CFA appears in the history of the English language using Davies’s (2017) *Early English Books Online Corpus* (EEBO), which contains examples covering the 1470s–1690s. This short paper will also scrutinize those corresponding sentential finite relative clauses occurring during that period that are the nearest paraphrase of the CFA. In doing so, the aim will be to discover a potential chronological overlap between the two grammatical phenomena.

Before proceeding to Section 2, where the methods of our investigation are explicated, the author cannot resist making one point: scrutinizing the issue under consideration might constitute a significant contribution. One might be wondering *why* the CFA is possible despite its being subject to idiolectal preference, as reported by Frank (1972). To answer this question, however, it is essential that we obtain a sound empirical scaffolding, which this paper will provide. Suppose that it is revealed that the CFA and the sentential finite relative clause, the latter being the nearest paraphrase of the former, occurred contemporaneously in either the Middle or Modern English periods. We might then be able to establish a new avenue for theoretically analyzing the apparently idiosyncratic CFAs by hypothesizing that their idiosyncrasies might be imputed to the sentential finite relative clause. That is, there might be room for us to avoid regarding the relationship or mutual paraphrasability of the two grammatical phenomena as sheer or mere coincidence (although taking on this task would deviate from the main topic of this paper).

2. Methods

For convenience, the targeted predicates (or verbs except for their objects or prepositional phrases etc.) were confined to *causing*, *resulting*, and *suggesting*, and equivocal examples in the sense that it is uncertain whether a given participial clause refers back to the entire preceding MC or only back to the noun immediately preceding it are, together with overt gerund examples, excluded.⁴ Note that since, according to Stump (1985: 323), the CFA can be introduced by such adverbs as *thus* and *thereby*, the above-mentioned predicates accompanied by these adverbs were also considered.⁵

For comparison, the author also considered such collocations as *which(e) (thereby/thus) caused*, *which(e) (thereby/thus) resulted*, and *which(e) (thereby/thus) suggested* (or *suggests*), all being regarded as sentential finite relatives in accordance with Quirk et al. (1985) and the nearest paraphrases of CFAs. Collocations regarded as post-nominally modifying their preceding noun-phrases were not considered. (In distinguishing a CFA from a sentential relative clause, the author did not regard the presence or absence of a comma as a reliable criterion since such commas, where present, would have been subsequently inserted by editors.)

3. Findings

The author would like to enumerate the first attested examples of the use of each CFA and corresponding sentential finite relative clauses for comparison. The number in bold type preceding each example is the date of attestation. (Underscores are the author's.)

3.1 Cause

3.1.1 (*Thereby/thus*) *causing*

- (3) **1494**: he waxe frowarde of his condicion and was first grounde of ydolatrie and fynder vp of false religion causynge people to haue an opinion . . .

- (4) **1580**: in the beginning of the next Sommer which was y: viij: yere of his charge, agricola seding his flet before him, which often put a land and spoyled the Countreys, thereby causing a great and vncertaine feare . . .
- (5) **1615**: here our minister haith practised his profession of corrupting two wayes, first in translating noua editio symboli, the making of a new crede, whereas it should be the new edition of the crede thus causing the newnes to consist in the newnes of our beleefe or crede, . . .

3.1.2 *Which(e) (thereby/thus) caused*

- (6) **1494**: he might him silf nat fede which caused him of necessite to considre and cleerly for to see that . . .⁶

Note that no examples containing *which(e) thereby/thus caused* were attested. Nevertheless, the author cannot resist mentioning the following example, in which a participial verb is inserted into the sentential relative clause (that is, the example can be said to contain a sentential *non-finite* relative clause):

- (7) **1571**: and in this, the place shoulde naturally be hote, through which causing the engendering of heares . . .

Nakagawa (2011, 2014) observes that participial verbs accompanied by a relative pronoun thrived during the period 1570–1640 (for a similar example, see Visser (1966: 1156)).

3.2 Result

3.2.1 (*Thereby/thus*) *resulting*

- (8) **1664**: wherefore seeing the Auncients do call back nature, and every of its operations, to the account of elements, qualities and

complexions, resulting in mixture . . .⁷

It should be noted that no examples containing *thereby* and *thus* were attested.

3.2.2 *Which(e) (thereby/thus) resulted*

- (9) **1857:** To prevent a collision between Mormons and the exasperated travellers, which must result fatally to the latter.

It should be noted that no examples containing *which(e)* accompanied by *thereby* or *thus* were attested.⁸

3.3 *Suggest*

3.3.1 *(Thereby/thus) suggesting*

- (10) **1593:** it happened that a parson bringing his action in court ecclesiasticall vpon that constitution; was hindered and staied by prohibition, suggesting that . . .
- (11) **1655:** this is certified by mr: Bayly: mr: ash being then present, without the knowledge or consent of divers members of that committee, thereby suggesting that i had not appeared either before the said committee, or any other committee of parliament . . .
- (12) **1631:** he addeth: vwhere the worme dyeth not, and the fire neuer goeth out; thus suggesting to vs twice in one sentence the eternity of this fire . . .

3.3.2 *Which(e) (thereby/thus) suggested (or suggests)*⁹

- (13) **1616:** . . . for if before her Comlinesse and Beautie had withdrawne power from an incontinent libertie, now her Greatnesse and maiestie rather inflamed, then enamored; which suggested emulation against montanus, . . .

It should be noted that no examples containing *which(e) suggested* (or *suggests*) accompanied by *thereby* or *thus* were attested.

4. Chronologies

The dates of the first attested examples of the use of CFAs can be tabulated as follows:

Table 1. Chronology of the First Attested Examples of the Use of *Cause*

Form	Date Attested
<i>causing</i>	1494
<i>thereby causing</i>	1580
<i>thus causing</i>	1615
<i>which caused</i>	1494
<i>which causing</i>	1571

Table 2. Chronology of the First Attested Examples of the Use of *Result*

Form	Date Attested
<i>resulting</i>	1664
<i>which must result</i>	1857

Table 3. Chronology of the First Attested Examples of the use of *Suggest*

Form	Date Attested
<i>suggesting</i>	1593
<i>thereby suggesting</i>	1655
<i>thus suggesting</i>	1631
<i>which suggested</i>	1616

5. Conclusion and Possible Future Research

It can be concluded from this preliminary study that the advent of CFAs centers mostly in the 1500s–1600s, which implies the fact that the advent of the CFAs is significantly after that of the usual FAs which, as is evident from the examples compiled by Visser (1966), had already ensconced themselves in

the language since the Old English period. In this respect, this short paper contributes in a small way to supplementing Visser (1966) by providing the first attested dates of CFAs, and has verified CFAs' marked, peripheral nature in the sense that marked, peripheral grammatical items tend to exhibit themselves in some later stage of the history of the English language (cf. Yagi (1984)). However, the issue remains as to why the advent of the CFAs' corresponding *finite* sentential relative clauses, which are their nearest paraphrases in present-day English, arises after that of the CFAs themselves, except in the cases of *causing* and *which caused*.

The present study implies that CFAs, on the basis of the dates they and their corresponding sentential non-finite relative clauses were first attested, are in some way or other connected with the sentential *non-finite* relative clause rather than with their corresponding sentential *finite* relative clauses. (This situation does not apply to present-day English since the sentential *non-finite* relative clause has fallen into disuse.) With this observation and the CFA's markedness referred to in Section 1 in mind, the author has two hopes: that this paper will provide theoretical scholars with some empirical scaffolding for incorporating the idiosyncrasies of the CFA into "possible grammar" of human language; and that a future study, by resorting to some theory susceptible to markedness and longitudinal aspects, will reveal the relationship between the CFA and the sentential finite relative clause, thereby justifying the presence in present-day English of idiosyncratic, marked CFAs that are subject to idiolectal preference.

In order to incorporate the CFA into "possible grammar" and to avoid regarding the three grammatical phenomena as mere coincidence, the author exhorts scholars to conduct research into two areas: (A) the diachronic change from the sentential *non-finite* relative clause to the sentential *finite* relative clause and (B) diachronic/synchronic

stipulation and explanation of (or justification of) the CFA.

Endnotes

¹ Although Quirk et al. (1985) use the terminology "sentential relative clause" without adding "finite," this paper adds it to distinguish finiteness from non-finiteness since there appear in the paper "sentential *non-finite* relative clauses," which are now obsolete.

² Of the cited previous studies, Uchida (2002) devotes his entire book to analyzing CFAs. Thus, the interested reader is advised to refer to Uchida's work.

³ Being subject to idiolectal preference or varying acceptability is further evidence for arguing that the CFA is a linguistically marked, peripheral phenomenon (cf. Yagi (1984)) and hence merits scrutiny.

⁴ There are two reasons for why the present paper confines its investigation to these three predicates. One reason is that according to Uchida (2002: 51, 59), these predicates often exhibit themselves in CFAs. In addition, exhaustively investigating various predicates, which in itself merits a full article, goes beyond the scope of this paper. Thus, the author would like to limit the investigation to these three predicates, begging for the reader's indulgence.

⁵ One might be tempted to put forward the following two questions. The first concerns the function of *thereby* and *thus*. The author, at this moment, lacks a judicious answer to this question. However, it can at least be said that Stump (1985: 322–323) enumerates various sorts of adverbs accompanying FAs under the entry "connective adverbs," explaining that their function is to make clear the propositional connection expressed by the MC and its FA.

The second question concerns how to interpret the CFA or what function it has. As has been pointed out in Section 1, the CFA, according to Hayase

(2002), rephrases the content expressed by the MC from a different point of view. In addition, unlike such usual PCs implying attendant circumstances as *She was walking, listening to music*, PCs including a CFA can introduce not only active but also *stative* content into their MC. The reader is urged to pay attention to *are doing* in (i) and *have* in (ii).

(i) Active:

In hospitals and other public spaces, people are doing their best to disinfect, making it difficult to study how microbes behave in the wild.

(*Wired*, “How Long Does the Coronavirus Last on Surfaces?”)

(ii) Stative:

a. Future versions of Dagaz will have an added multiplayer mode, making it possible to create a worldwide neural network that . . .

(*iWeb Corpus*)

b. Furthermore, direct correction and coaching have very little effect, showing the important role of the child’s own efforts.

(*The Oxford Companion to the English Language*, p. 211)

It seems to follow that the CFA is not affected by whether the content of its MC is active or stative. It should be noted that the fact that the CFA allows the MC to be stative resonates with Uchida’s (2002) conclusion that the CFA has lower transitivity than the usual FA does. (For an examination of the degree of transitivity, see Hopper and Thompson (1980).) It seems safe to say that PCs including a CFA convey some proposition rather than events.

⁶ The source of this example is the same as that of example (3). The author suspects that the use of *causing* and *which caused* might be attributable to the writer’s preference.

⁷ One might wonder why *resulting* appears much later than *causing*. To explain this, the author must

begin by pointing out that according to the EEBO, the first attested example of *causing* is found in *Here begynnethe the boke calledde Iohn bochas descriuinge the falle of princis princessis [and] other nobles tra[n]slated i[n]to englissh by Iohn ludgate mo[n]ke of the monastery of seint edmu[n]des Bury*, which was translated from the Latin original *De Casibus Illustrium Virorum*. Kawaguchi (2024) reveals that PCs are a result of Latin calquing. Thus, it is at least conceivable that the appearance of *causing* earlier than *resulting* might be ascribed to Latin calquing. The first example of *resulting* is, on the other hand, contained in *Van Helmont’s works containing his most excellent philosophy, physick, chirurgery, anatomy: wherein the philosophy of the schools is examined, their errors refuted, and the whole body of physick reformed and rectified: being a new rise and progresse of philosophy and medicine, for the cure of diseases, and lengthening of life*, a work indigenous to the English language.

⁸ It is interesting to note an example where a participial verb is accompanied by *which*:

(i) **1678:** . . . and practise so many arts, from all which resulting to his advantage, his greatness and exaltation did as it were miraculously succeed.

This example, however, in clearly having a nominal antecedent, cannot be regarded as exemplifying a sentential relative. Accordingly, the author will exclude it.

⁹ Readers might wonder why not just the past tense form *suggested* but also the present tense form *suggests* are taken into account. The reason for this move is that the CFA can play a role showing comments on its MC, which is fulfilled mainly by *suggesting*, whose paraphrase *may* be *which suggests*.

References

- Davies, Mike (2017) *Early English Books Online Corpus*. Available online at <https://www.english-corpora.org/eebo/>
- Davies, Mike (2018–) *The iWeb Corpus*. Available online at <https://www.english-corpora.org/iweb/>
- Frank, Marcella (1972) *Modern English: A Practical Reference Guide*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Hayase, Naoko (2002) *Eigo Koubun no Kategorii Keisei: Ninchi Gengogaku no Shiten kara* [The Formation of Categories of English Constructions: From Perspectives of Cognitive Linguistics], Keiso Shobo, Tokyo.
- Higuchi, Masayuki (1996) *Studies in Chaucer's English*, Eichosha, Tokyo.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson (1980) “Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse,” *Language* 56 (2), 251–299.
- Kawaguchi, Naoki (2024) “Unearthing the Multiple Roots of Participial Constructions,” *Kindai Eigo Kenkyu* [Studies in Modern English] 40, 1–33.
- Nakagawa, Satoshi (2011) “Synchronic and Diachronic Aspects of Nominative and Accusative Absolutes in English,” *Gengo Kenkyu* 139, 85–109.
- Nakagawa, Satoshi (2014) “Kankeidaimeishi o Tomonau Bunshi Koubun no Suitai ni Tsuite” [On the Declining of Participial Constructions with Relative Pronouns], *Bulletin of Toyota National College of Technology* 47, 115–124.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London.
- Stump, Gregory T. (1985) *The Semantic Variability of Absolute Constructions*, D. Reidel, Boston.
- Uchida, Mitsumi (2002) *Causal Relations and Clause Linkage: Consequential Participle and Their Use*, Osaka University Press, Suita.
- Visser, Frederik T. (1966) *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, Part II, *Syntactical Units with One Verb (Continued)*, E. J. Brill, Leiden.
- Yagi, Takao (1984) “Tougoron no Yuhyousei Riron” [Marked Theories for Syntax], *Gekkan Gengo* 13 (1), 238–248.
- Yonekura, Hiroshi (1985) *The Language of the Wycliffite Bible: The Syntactic Differences between the Two Versions*, Aratake Shuppan, Tokyo.