

On *With*-deletion

Akira Hiroe

Kyushu University

0. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to show that what makes *with*-deletion possible is a licensing condition on participial constructions. Some researchers have so far shed light on the syntactic and semantic aspects of adverbial *with*-phrases (e.g., Ishihara (1982), McCawley (1983), Quirk *et al.* (1985), Inada (1988)). But we cannot find any attempt in the literature to systematically tackle the correlation of the *with*-phrases with participial constructions. The correlation is naturally accounted for by the analysis presented below.

1. Facts and Problems

Let us begin with certain basic, if not very familiar, facts. There are three types of *with*-phrases, the restrictives, the non-restrictives, and the adverbials:

- (1) a. The faucet *with the water running* is useless.
- b. Perot, *with his supporters aiding in his campaigns*, rounded up votes.
- c. An old man was walking along *with his dog following*.

The structure of the *with*-phrases in (1) is (2) ([+P] is a prepositional feature) (details omitted):

- (2) [_{CP} [_C with [+P]] [_{IP} [_I -ing] [_{VP} . .]]]

It has been assumed in the literature that *with* is a 'pseudo (or prepositional)-complementizer.' But it differs from other complementizers in that it possesses a prepositional feature. (Ishihara (1982), Quirk *et al.* (1985), Inada (1988)). In (1a) and (1b), *with* stands in a tight relation with the nouns that it modifies, whereas in (1c) it does not. Thus, the adverbial *with*-phrase in (1c) is supposed to have weakened the relation since it denotes some different event from the matrix one. In this paper we will deal only with the adverbial type in (1c).

Now let us turn our attention to the following facts. In (3) we can observe that *with*-deletion is irrelevant for the grammaticality.

- (3) a. (With) the sun shining, John went for a walk.
- b. (With) there being so many tourists in the city, the tourist business is booming.
- c. (With) the audience applauding, Cary Grant stepped up to the microphone.

(Ishihara (1982): 2.158)

However, not all *with*-deletions are possible (asterisks indicate unacceptability).

- (4) a. *(With) Mary so easy to please, we are looking forward to her visit here.
- b. *(With) Dole as president, more cutbacks are sure to come.
- c. *(With) Jack at home, our house is burglar-proof.

The contrast in (3) and (4) poses an interesting problem for the notion "economy" in a minimalist framework. Under a strict application of economy-driven approach the "cheapest" among derivations with identical LF interpretation blocks other competing derivations. (Chomsky (1995)). Given the assumption, the free alternation between *with*- and *with*-less phrases should be impossible because the derivation involving a deletion process might be expected to be blocked in favor of the derivation which lacks this step. A ready account for the problem would be that *with*-phrases differ in

numeration from *with*-less ones. It follows, then, that the two derivations are completely different from each other.

In addition, it also poses a problem of economy of representation. *With* violates a principle of Full Interpretation, provided that it makes no semantic contribution. *With*-phrases denote a semantic entity "Proposition." The canonical structural realization of Proposition can be IP or CP. In terms of a derivational economy, it is predicted that it should require exclusive selection of IP over CP. There are, in fact, two pieces of evidence that support its IP flavor; First, *with*, as not with other complementizers, allows itself to have some readings in sentences like:

- (5) a. With himself acting on the stage, John understands how the actors feel.
- b. When he acts on the stage, John understands how the actors feel.
- (6) a. With him passing away, his time ended.
- b. Because he passed away, his time ended.

This seems to show that *with* does not play a role in determining the semantics of the whole sentence. Moreover, even if it is not available, *with*-less phrases can equally yield the same interpretations. Compare (5) and (6) with:

- (7) a. Acting on the stage, John understands how the actors feel.
- b. When he acts on the stage, John understands how the actors feel.
- (8) a. Passing away, his time ended.
- b. Because he passed away, his time ended.

Second, the historical fact is reported that in the sixteenth century *with* in *with*-phrases disappeared. (Nakajima (1965)). Given the motivation for its IP flavor, there is a good reason to assume that in a *with*-phrase the operation of deletion does exist.

2. Ishihara's (1982) analysis

With regard to *with*-deletion, she proposes that it is probably best described as a stylistic rule of PF component. She gives a piece of evidence to support her proposal. Consider the following example:

- (9) a. Mary would like (for) us to help her.
- b. Sam said (that) he would run the race.

(Ishihara (1982): 2.155)

She cites the example in which other complementizers like *for* or *that* can be deleted. For the sake of generality, however, her proposal is not adequate since complementizer deletion cannot always take place (% indicates variation):

- (10) a. We all would prefer for the Mariners to win.
- b. %We all would prefer the Mariners to win.
- (11) a. Tom yelled that the Mariners had won.
- b. *Tom yelled the Mariners had won.

In general, a mood is responsible for complementizer deletion. (See Hiroe (to appear) for a relevant discussion on complementizer deletion.)

3. A Licensing Condition

With-deletion works fine for (3) but not for (4). A quick look at (3) and (4) shows that *with*-less phrases is eventually equivalent to the so-called *participial construction* (or *nominative absolute*

construction). The observation is borne out by:

(12) a. The sun shining, John went for a walk.

b. Because the sun was shining, John went for a walk.

(13) a. There being so many tourists in the city, the tourist business is booming.

b. Because there are so many tourists in the city, the tourist business is booming.

(14) a. The audience applauding, Cary Grant stepped up to the microphone.

b. When the audience was applauding, Cary Grant stepped up to the microphone.

It follows, then, that whether *with*-deletion is allowed or not depends on a licensing condition on participial constructions. Based crucially on Chomsky (1986), the licensing condition that I will propose is:

(15) A Licensing Condition

A subject base-generated in Spec of IP must be theta-marked by I' taking the subject as specifier.

The subject that appears in a *with*-less phrase is base-generated in Spec of IP. (Hiroe (1996)). In (4) the subjects cannot be theta-marked by I' because there is no I head, i.e. *-ing*, which should support I'. A comment on the condition in (15) is in order. Note that it is one of the conditions that the theta-marking must meet, provided that it is correct that *with*-less phrases are base-generated in the surface position; otherwise, it would be an *ad hoc* stipulation. Thus, it is independently motivated.

Consequently, the hypothesis gives a natural account for the following facts. Consider the examples below:

(16) a. The work (being) done, I have nothing else to do.

b. She gets a monthly pay of 30,000 yen, taxes (being) included.

In (16) *being* is optional. Since these participial constructions are passive, *the work* and *taxes* already have been theta-marked by the verbs in the complement position before Spell-Out. They do not require themselves to be theta-marked by I' in the surface position. Therefore, under our analysis presented here, we can provide the optionality with a natural explanation.

4. Concluding Remarks

We have argued that a licensing condition on participial constructions is crucially responsible for *with*-deletion. From an economy-driven point of view, it is of much interest that *with*-deletion does coincide with the historical fact that *with* in *with*-phrases disappeared. It might be expected, then, that as far as the same meaning can be expressed, we prefer a given economical form to the less economical one. Extending our suggestion to other cases, however, it is not so clear whether it also holds for the contrast below:

(17) a. John said that the teacher was lying.

b. John said the teacher was lying.

I will leave this problem for further research.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, Noam (1986) *Barriers*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

- 稲田俊明 (1988) 『英語の前置詞 of とその擬似補部について』, 九州大学文学部文学研究
第86輯.
- Hiroe, Akira (1996) *On Participial Phrases*. MA Thesis, Kyushu University.
- Hiroe, Akira (to appear) "Mood and Complementizer Deletion."
- Ishihara, Roberta Lynn (1982) *A study of absolute phrases in English within the government binding
framework*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Diego.
- McCawley, James D (1983) "What's with *with*?" *Language*, vol. 59, 2. 271-287.
- 中島文雄 (1965) 『英語発達史』, 岩波書店.
- Quirk *et al.* (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- van Riemsdijk, H (1978) *A Case Study in Syntactic Markedness*. The Peter de Ridder Press, Lisse,
The Netherlands.
- Ruwet, N. (1976) 'Une Construction absolue en francais,' unpublished manuscript, Universite de
Paris VIII.