

The Tenses of the Verbs in Temporal *Since*-clauses Compared with Those in the Main Clauses

Kiyoko KOBAYASHI

[Abstract]

This paper is to discuss common and uncommon usage of the tenses in both the main clause and the temporal *since*-clause in the works of contemporary writers. It is generally believed that the tense of the verb in the main clause is the perfect, or the simple tense in the construction *It + BE + time expression*, and that in the *since*-clause the preterit. But in reality we find a wide variety of tenses used in both the main and the *since*-clauses. Ninety-two examples collected from contemporary writers have been classified into sixteen kinds of combinations of tenses, and are to be discussed with special reference to such a rare case as having two successive preterits in both clauses.

Key words: *since*, simple present, perfect, preterit, pluperfect

INTRODUCTION

Grammatically *since* is used as one of the three parts of speech: as an adverb, a preposition, or a conjunction. When *since* is used as a conjunction, it leads two kinds of adverbial clauses: a temporal clause and a causative clause. Many discussions have been conducted over the tense of the verb in an adverbial clause of time introduced by *since*. On the other hand, there seems to be no problem at all whatever tenses may be used in both an adverbial clause of cause or reason and the main clause. It is generally said that the tense of the verb in the main clause should be the perfect and that in the temporal clause it should be the preterit. It is also said that a simple tense is used in the main clause of such a sentence as “It’s three months *since* you were here last” before a temporal clause introduced by *since*. But once we begin to read widely, we realize that a wide variety of tenses are used both in

the main and subordinate clauses.

Then the question arises. What kinds of tenses are possible in both the main clause and *the since*-clause? Therefore, the purpose of this paper is primarily to study the uses of *since*-clauses in the light of traditional grammar, and examine the examples quoted by the grammarians and those quoted by me from contemporary writers, and try to find some patterns among them if possible.

Firstly, the grammar books I mainly referred to are: *A Grammar of Late Modern English* (H. Poutsma), *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* (Otto Jespersen), and *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (Randolph Quirk et al.). They were published during the period of 1914-29, 1909-49, and in 1985, respectively.

Secondly, I gathered examples of temporal clauses from contemporary writers, especially from the twentieth century in order to compare them with the examples gathered by Poutsma or Jespersen, considering that the two grammarians mainly gathered their examples from authors who had lived in the period from Shakespeare to the beginning of the twentieth century. Thus, I have tried to discover consistency of use of the tense of the verbs in the main clause and *since*-clause, if there exists any. Twelve works by eleven different authors have been examined. They are: *The Return of the Native* (Thomas Hardy 1878), *The Apple Tree* (John Galsworthy 1900), *The Rainbow* (D. H. Lawrence 1915), *The Great Gatsby* (F. Scott Fitzgerald 1925), *Rebecca* (Daphne du Maurier 1938), *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (Ernest Hemingway 1941), *East of Eden* (John Steinbeck 1952), *Rabbit, Run* (John Updike 1960), *The Millstone* (Margaret Drabble 1965), *The Wheel of Love and Other Stories* (Joyce Carol Oates 1965), *The Daughters of Cain* (Colin Dexter 1994), and *Death is Now My Neighbour* (Dexter 1996).

Ninety-two examples, which have adverbial clauses of time introduced by *since*, have been collected from the above twelve works by eleven authors. They have been divided into four major groups, focused on the tenses in the main clauses: 1) group [1], 2) group [2] (*It* + BE + a time expression), 3) group [3] (the pluperfect), and 4) group [4] (the preterit). The result of my analysis is shown in Table 1 at the end of this paper, where the frequency of occurrences of the combinations of tenses in main clauses and those in *since*-clauses of time is given.

1. GROUP [1] (groups [1-1] - [1-5] in Table 1)

(The number in the brackets such as [1-1] represents an example of each group in Table 1 collected from eleven contemporary writers.)

[1-1] I've been *awfully* fond of him - ever since I was a child. (Lawrence)

[1-4a] Ever since a man down from them on Jackson Road lost his job as an undertaker's assistant

and became a bartender, Rabbit thinks of the two professions as related; ... (Updike)
 [1-4b] Since I have taken to the reddle trade I travel a good deal, as you know. (Hardy)

Poutsma describes the tenses in the main clause and the temporal *since*-clause: “In the case of the length of time with a definite starting-point being designated by an adverbial clause introduced by the conjunction *since*, the perfect, which is the normal tense, is rather frequently replaced by the present. . . . In the temporal clause the tense is mostly either the preterite or the perfect, the present being, rare.” He classifies into five groups (as shown in the group [1] of Table 1) all the possible combinations of tenses used in the main and the temporal *since*-clauses.

Twenty-eight out of the total seventy-three examples (excluding the structure *It* + BE + time expression) gathered from twelve works by eleven contemporary writers fall into these five groups as shown in Table 1. Twenty-three represented as [1-1] out of twenty-eight instances belong to the group [1-1] (a perfect in the main clause; a preterit in the temporal clause). Does this result (twenty-three out of seventy-three instances if the group [2] is excluded) agree with what is generally believed, i.e. the tense is perfect in the main clause and the preterit in the *since*-clause?

Jespersen says that “when the conjunction *since* has a purely temporal sense, it means ‘from the time when . . . till now’; hence the natural thing is for the main verb to be in the perfect, and for the dependent clause to be in the preterit.” It seems the most important concern for this usage on *since* is the reference to a period up to the present, so it sounds natural that the perfect is used in the main clause as a basic rule.

Two and three examples have been found respectively as the group [1-4a] (a present in the main clause; a preterit in the temporal clause) and [1-4b] (a present in the main clause; a perfect in the temporal clause). One of each group is shown as above [1-4a] and [1-4b].

Jespersen mentions nothing on these cases.

Poutsma cites only two instances on the group [1-4a]: “It is dull in our town since my playmates left”; “The ouse [house] ain’t worth livin’ in since you left it.” Quirk et al. argue that “modal auxiliaries, particularly *can* and *could*, or semi-auxiliaries occur in the matrix clause in nonperfective forms” and that “*ever* is usual here.” They give examples: “(Ever) since my teeth were pulled out I can’t eat anything solid”; “I have to use crutches (ever) since I had a car accident”; “They won’t smoke (ever) since they saw a film on lung cancer.” Further, they describe that “*since* marks the beginning of the period during which the situation in the matrix clause applies,” and cite an instance: “He feels much more relaxed *since* he left school.” The most common structure within this pattern is, indeed, *It* + BE + a time expression, but this will be discussed later as in a different section in this thesis.

As for the group [1-4b], Poutsma cites two instances of this case: “Georgy’s house is not a very lively one since uncle Jos’s annuity has been withdrawn”; “Are you afraid of walking by yourself since you have been frightened by the conjuror?”⁽¹⁰⁾ Quirk et al. suggest that the main clause “has habitual reference” when the simple present or the present progressive is used, and give examples: “(Ever) since we bought that car we *go* camping every weekend”; “I’m *doing* well since I invested in the money market.”⁽¹¹⁾ Seeing the example [1-4b], I find their argument compelling.

No instance has been found in twelve works by eleven contemporary writers, concerning the group [1-2] (a perfect in both the main and the temporal clauses), the group [1-3] (a perfect in the main clause; a present in the temporal clause) and the group [1-5] (a present in both the main and the temporal clauses).

As for the group [1-2], both Poutsma and Jespersen give several instances. For example, Poutsma cites an instance from Congreve: “I cannot say that he has once broken my rest since we have been married.”⁽¹²⁾ Jespersen quotes from Dickens: “I have known this, night and day, since I have known you in your home.”⁽¹³⁾ He mentions the perfect tense in the *since*-clause: “this use of *since* = ‘from the beginning of . . .’ is combined with the perfect tense . . . = ‘inclusive’ present.”⁽¹⁴⁾ Quirk et al. refer to the verb in the *since*-clause as: “When the whole construction refers to a stretch of time up to (and potentially including) the present, the general rule for the temporal *since*-clause is that...the present perfective is used when the clause refers to a period of time lasting to the present.”⁽¹⁵⁾ Some of the examples they give are: “Max has been tense since he’s *been taking* drugs”; “I’ve gone to concerts ever since I’ve *lived* in Edinburgh.”⁽¹⁶⁾

As for the group [1-3], instances with the present in the *since*-clause and the perfect in the main clause are limited to the structure having a phrase, *can remember* in the *since*-clause. It is clear to see instances cited by Jespersen, Poutsma or Quirk et al. Quirk et al. argue that “the nonperfective forms *can remember* and *could remember* are used in *since*-clauses to indicate the span over which personal memory extends,” and give an example: “My parents have spent their summer vacations in France ever since I *can remember*.”⁽¹⁷⁾ Jespersen explains that “*since I can remember*” is equal to “since the beginning of the time I can remember,” and gives instances: “I have had these impulses since I can remember”; “it makes her look, for the first time in her life, since I remember her, like a decent woman”; “I have played a great deal ever since I can remember.”⁽¹⁸⁾

As for the group [1-5] (a present in both the main clause and the temporal clause), Poutsma cites only one instance from Burney: “How often do I wish since I am absent from you that I was under the protection of Mrs. Mirvan.”⁽¹⁹⁾ Neither Jespersen nor Quirk et al. give an example of such case. There is no wonder no instance has been found in my examination.

2. GROUP [2] (*It* + BE + a time expression)

2.1. Groups [2-1] - [2-5]

[2-1] It is eight hours since you and Miranda walked out of here, but not together, rushing out of each other's lives and out of my life, or so you said - eight hours since Miranda jumped up on this window sill (which is about to rot off, did you notice?), threatening to throw herself out the window. Eight hours since you abandoned ship. (Oates)

[2-2] It's years since I've kissed a bullfighter, even an unsuccessful one like thee. (Hemingway)

[2-3] 'Has it seemed long since you last saw me?' she asked. (Hardy)

[2-4] It was months since I had even heard his name, . . . (Drabble)

[2-5a] It has been too long since we have destroyed any. (Hemingway)

[2-5b] It had been four hours since the observation plane had flown over them. (*ibid.*)

As for the structure *It* + BE + time expression, the result of my analysis is shown in groups [2-1] - [2-6] of Table 1. Six instances have been found for the group [2-4] (a preterit in the main clause; a pluperfect in the temporal clause) while four for the group [2-1] (a present in the main clause; a preterit in the temporal clause), out of total fifteen (excluding the group [2-6]). The group [2-1] is believed to be the most common case for this particular structure. If so, the question is whether four out of fifteen examples can be the most typical case in terms of the combinations of the tenses.

Poutsma illustrates that “the word(-group) denoting the length of time during which the action or state has continued, is sometimes, for emphasis, placed in a phrase opening with *It is*.”⁽²⁰⁾ According to him, the tense in the main clause is usually the present, and the tense in the *since*-clause is “mostly the preterite, sometimes the perfect.”⁽²¹⁾ Jespersen expresses the same opinion on this structure as Poutsma, adding the explanation “to indicate the distance in time from now.”⁽²²⁾ Quirk et al. also describe that “nonperfective forms are normal.”⁽²³⁾ So far Poutsma, Jespersen and Quirk et al. all agree that the tense of the main verb in the sentence *It* + BE + time expression is usually the present, or at least nonperfective.

Six instances, by far the largest number for this structure, have been found, as shown in the group [2-4] (a preterite in the main clause; a pluperfect in the temporal clause) of Table 1. These six instances exactly match with what Poutsma calls “strict grammar.” He explains that “when the time-sphere of such a sentence as *It is* . . . is shifted back to the past, the tense in the subordinate clause ought, in strict grammar, to be the pluperfect.”⁽²⁴⁾ On the contrary, the fact is, according to him, the preterit is used in place of pluperfect, and that “the principle, however, appears to be rather frequently

disregarded.”⁽²⁵⁾ The fact that six instances as represented by [2-4] have been found seems to prove that contemporary writers do not disregard the principle, and follow what Poutsma calls “strict grammar.” Jespersen also briefly explains the pluperfect in such a way as “If this is shifted to the past, we have of course the pluperfect.” He cites an instance from Thackeray: “What years ago it seemed since he had first entered that room!”⁽²⁶⁾ He never discusses other tenses than the present and the preterit as main verbs for *It + be* a time expression.

Poutsma asserts that instances of the perfect tense in main clauses are “distinctly uncommon.”⁽²⁷⁾ Quirk et al., however, argue that “perfective forms may also be used here too, eg: *It’s been ten years since they were last here; It had been ages since they last paid their bills on time; Next Tuesday it will have been six years since I became an American citizen.*”⁽²⁸⁾ According to my analysis of the examples collected from eleven contemporary writers, only three out of fifteen take the perfect tense in the main clause. This wholly agrees with what Poutsma asserts, and also proves what Quirk et al. argue.

Neither Poutsma nor Jespersen gives us fairly full explanation over the tenses in the structure with *It + BE + a time expression*. Quirk et al., as the principle, regard this particular structure as exceptions of common adverbial clauses of time because it is possible to have the tenses such as the present, preterit or will-future as the main verb in this structure.⁽²⁹⁾

[2-3] is one of the instances which belong to the group [2-3] (a perfect in the main clause; a preterit in the temporal clause), and completely agrees with what Quirk et al. explain: “Other verbs, particularly seem, also fit into this pattern.”⁽³⁰⁾ Poutsma quotes one example from Swift and another from Scott: “It has been a long time since the custom began”; “You understand women well, though it may have been long since you were conversant amongst them.”⁽³¹⁾ Again, Jespersen remains silent.

As for the group [2-5] (a perfect or a pluperfect in both the main and the temporal clauses), both Poutsma and Jespersen do not refer to this case. Nevertheless, I have uncovered an example of each case ([2-5a] and [2-5b]) through my examination. Quirk et al. give the very simple explanation for these two cases: “The present perfective may also be used in the pattern *It + BE + time expression*, when there is no explicit indication of point of time, such as *last: It’s been a long time since I’ve seen Gerald.*”⁽³²⁾

Thus, it is comprehensible to have the case with the perfect in both the head-sentence and the temporal *since*-clause, although it is “distinctly uncommon.”⁽³³⁾ Then, what about the example to have the pluperfect? Even Quirk et al. explain nothing of this case. So, there seems no other way to explain it than that we might have the pluperfect in both clauses if the whole time (like the case having the perfects in both clauses) is shifted back to the past.

2.2. Group [2-6]

[2-6a] ‘Yes, three years that he is dead - yes.’ (Lawrence)

[2-6b] ‘It’s a year and a half he’s been with her now.’ (*ibid.*)

In [2-6a], there can be little doubt that *it is* is obviously understood, and that *is dead* means *has been dead*. The question is whether it is grammatically correct to use *that*, instead of *since* in [2-6a]. Further, is *since* or *that* understood as in [2-6b]?

As to the first question, both Jespersen and Quirk et al. do not mention anything at all. Of course we should take into consideration the fact that [2-6a] is spoken by the Polish lady, whose first language is clearly not English, although I am not sure whether this has any bearing in her use of *that* here. Only Poutsma refers to the first point. He quotes Thackeray’s example such as “*It is ten hours ⁽³⁴⁾ since (or that) I had (or have had) anything to eat*” when he explains the tenses in this structure *It + BE + time expression*. I want to pay particular attention as to why Poutsma adds *or that* to Thackeray’s example. Some of other instances Poutsma cites are: “It was not three months ago since, wild with joyful expectation, she had there run backwards and forwards some ten times a-day”; “Let’s see, it was fifteen days ago, that we first met⁽³⁵⁾”; “It is now four years that I have meditated this work.”⁽³⁶⁾ From these quotations we can surmise that *since* can be replaced with *that* because Poutsma inserts the above comments. But Poutsma himself does not give any explanation as to why such usage is possible.

Can we use *that*, instead of *since*, in the sentence *It + BE + time expression*? One possible explanation may be found in the *OED*. They suggest that *since* was “used in place of ‘that’.” Instances in the *OED* are: “It is . . . five months now, since these honor’d personages have suffer’d . . . indignities in these Dungeons” (W. Browne 1647); “Though it is now four-score years since he has plagued all those who have any dependence on him, yet he is so well in health [etc.]” (Goldsm. 1774); “It is near four months since Ella has been away” (Charlotte Smith 1804).⁽³⁷⁾

However, no example of a *that*-clause after the phrase *It + BE + time expression* has been found so far in the *OED*. Again the *OED* may shed some light on this question: “= From the time that; since. ⁽³⁸⁾Obs. rare.” Now, perhaps we can accept that *that* has been rarely used in the sense of *since*, and that *that*, in the sense of *since*, is no longer in use.

As to the second question, neither Jespersen nor Quirk et al. refer to anything at all. Only Poutsma cites from Galsworthy an instance of the structure *It + BE + time expression* where *since* or *that* is understood after the expression: “It was many years he had been to the mountains.”⁽³⁹⁾ Thus in Poutsma, we have only one instance for this structure without *since* or *that* as a conjunction, though he

cites this instance as an explanation of the tense as a whole, not of this particular structure.

We have far more cases with *since* as a temporal clause introducer than *that*, but we have cases with *that* for this structure *It + BE + time expression* as shown in Poutsma's examples. My conclusion is that *that* could be understood when *that* is used as a temporal clause introducer with this particular structure as shown in cases in Galsworthy. Therefore, in [2-6a], *that* is used in the sense of *since* as the temporal clause introducer, and is understood in [2-6b].

3. GROUP [3] (The Pluperfect)

[3-1] . . . but since he had grown older faiths were shaken. (Hardy)

[3-2] - it was the first word she had uttered since I came into the room. (Fitzgerald)

[3-3] It was true, since she had come, the composition books had grown more and more untidy, disorderly, filthy. (Lawrence)

The group [3] in Table 1 shows that thirty-eight out of seventy-three examples (excluding *the group* [2] *It + BE + a time expression*) have the pluperfect in either the main clauses or *since*-clauses or even in both clauses. This fact is again at odds with what is generally said; the tense of the verb in the main clause should be the perfect and that in the temporal clause it should be the preterit. It is noticeable that twenty-four out of the total thirty-eight examples fall into the group [3-3] (a pluperfect in both the main and the temporal clauses) as represented in the above [3-3].

Jespersen argues that "it is natural to have the pluperfect of both verbs." Also, according to him, when the whole sentence is shifted back to the past, then we have either the preterit or the pluperfect in the main clauses with the pluperfect in the adverbial clauses of time. He cites instances from G. Eliot and N. Worth: "Stephen's society seemed to have become much more interesting since Maggie had been there"; "the children had lived with their aunt since the father had been gone." He also quotes such an example from Thompson as "two and a half years had elapsed since he had made any money, Spencer returned to London." He adds that this sentence would be "two and a half years have elapsed since he made any money" if shifted forth to the present time.

Greenbaum and Quirk tell the pluperfect in adverbial clauses in such a simple way as "when the whole period is set in past time, the past perfect or the simple past is used in both clauses." They give an instance: "Since he *had known* (*knew*) her, she had been (was) a journalist." So, they are a little different from Jespersen.

Poutsma explains the pluperfect in the main clause: "*She has lived here since her husband died* becomes *I was told that she had lived here since her husband died.*" Poutsma continues that "when the

length of time during which the action or state has continued, is indicated by a temporal clause with *since*, the tense of the predicate in the latter [the *since*-clause] is not affected by the change of the time-sphere.⁽⁴³⁾ [3-2] is the exact instance which proves Poutsma's explanation. When phrases like *It was*, *She told*, *I wondered* or *I felt* are added to instances as in [3-2], then the tenses as a whole are shifted back to the past as a result. The tense in the *since*-clause, however, remains unchanged, i.e. preterit.

Quirk et al. explain very simply that "the past perfective may be replaced by the simple past," and give an example: "Since the country had achieved independence, it *had revised* its constitution twice" could be "Since the country achieved independence, it *revised* its constitution twice."⁽⁴⁴⁾ Here it seems to be a little difference in interpretation regarding the tense in the *since*-clause for this case among Jespersen, Poutsma and Quirk et al.

But why do we have so many examples (twenty-four in total) with the pluperfects in both the main and the subordinate clauses? They are definitely not considered to be the most common instances. But, in fact, we have a great many instances in long novels such as "*For Whom the Bell Tolls*," and "*Rebecca*." Yet on the contrary, we have only one instance as in "*The Apple Tree*," "*Wheel of Love and Other Stories*," "*The Rainbow*," etc., or nothing at all in "*Rabbit, Run*." The first, "*The Apple Tree*" is a short story recalling a brief period of the hero's youth, and the last, "*Rabbit, Run*" recounts a short period in the life of a baby boomer. The common point among these works by Oates, Galsworthy and Updike is that the stories happened over a short period of time. This fact might be one of the reasons whether or not the pluperfect is used in both the main and the *since*-clauses.

4. Group [4] (The preterit in both the main clause and the temporal clause)

[4-a] She was used to his nakedness, and to her mother's nakedness, ever since she was born.

(Lawrence)

[4-b] And since she was nearly forty years old, she began to come awake from her sleep of motherhood, her energy moved more outwards. (*ibid.*)

[4-c] And ever since he made a success he was very generous with me. (Fitzgerald)

[4-d] ... where she used to speak every morning of her life to me, ever since she first came to Manderley? (du Maurier)

[4-e] So much seemed to have happened since I spoke to him on the telephone, ... (*ibid.*)

[4-f] That was what made her panicky ever since she was little this thing of nobody knowing how you felt and whether nobody could know or nobody cared she had no idea. (Updike)

[4-g] Robert Kennedy was murdered since I became this man's mistress, ... (Oates)

Jespersen asserts that in Early Modern English the distinction between the preterit and the perfect was not so strict as in Late Modern English. He cites two examples from Shakespeare: “I was not [now: I have not been] angry since I came to France, Vntill this instant”; “Since death of my deer’s⁽⁴⁵⁾ mother It did not speake [= now: has not spoken] before.” But having collected seven instances from the contemporary writers’ works discussed above, we cannot say that nowadays the distinction between the preterit and the perfect is not so strict as Jespersen mentions Early Modern English in comparison with Late Modern English. So, Jespersen’s explanation does not necessarily provide a satisfactory explanation for the fact that we have instances with the preterit in both the main and the *since*-clauses in contemporary English. How are we to interpret cases having the preterit in both clauses?

Poutsma says that when the preterit is used, “the time denoted by the adverbial adjunct or clause ... is felt to be separated from the moment of speaking by a longer or shorter space of time.”⁽⁴⁶⁾ He never mentions the preterit as the main verb with the temporal *since*-clause except the particular structure *It + BE + time expression*. So far, it seems, no in-depth discussions have been taken place for this case. This is perhaps because of the nature of the conjunction *since*. As Jespersen says, the conjunction *since* “means ‘from the time when ... till now’” when it has “a purely temporal sense.”⁽⁴⁷⁾ So, it is incomprehensible to have two successive preterits in both clauses.

Quirk et al. argue that “nonperfective forms are commonly used in matrix clauses with *since*-clauses,” and that they are used in informal American English, and increasingly in informal British English as well.⁽⁴⁸⁾ They give an example in American English, though they regard it as an exception:⁽⁴⁹⁾ “Since I last saw you, my mother died.”

Is it reasonable that seven examples, as shown above, with the preterit in both clauses are regarded as exceptions? No example has been found in Hemingway, Steinbeck, Drabble or in Dexter, and clearly in Hardy. Hemingway never uses the preterit in both the main clause and the *since*-clause in spite of his using temporal *since*-clauses thirteen times. It is said that this case with the preterit in both clauses rarely occurs, but still the fact is that we have seven examples in both British and American English. They are still considered to be informal according to Quirk et al. even in contemporary English.⁽⁵⁰⁾ Can we say that ten percent of occurrences (excluding the structure *It + BE + time expression*) are exceptions?

According to Quirk et al., stative verbs like *be* and *seem* “may take nonperfective forms when the predication is durative.”⁽⁵¹⁾ Then, at least the verbs in [4-a], [4-c] and [4-e] are considered to be stative, but the problem is that not all of them are stative ones. This explanation, again, does not necessarily fully explain why as many as seven instances with the preterit in both the main and the *since*-clauses have been found in contemporary writers.

CONCLUSION

As shown in Table 1, it is quite obvious that a wide variety of tenses are used in both the main and temporal *since*-clauses. Sixteen kinds of combinations of the tenses have been found by my examination. We have only twenty-three instances, which are considered to be the most common combination of the tenses, with the perfect as the main verb and the preterit in the *since*-clause (group [1-1]). On the contrary, we have totally forty-five examples where the pluperfect is used in either the main clause or the *since*-clause, or in both clauses (groups [2-4], [2-5b] and [3-1]-[3-3]). This figure is almost half of the total occurrences (ninety-two) with the conjunction *since* as a temporal clause introducer. As for seven instances with preterits in both the main and the *since*-clauses (group [4]), further study is required to explore the usage of the conjunction *since* as a temporal clause introducer and that of the tenses in both the main and the *since*-clauses.

Table 1. Frequency of Occurrences of *Since*

	Main Clause	Temporal Clause	S-Tot	Har	Gal	Law	Fi	Mau	Hem	Ste	Up	Dra	Oat	De1	De2
1	Group 1														
1-1	Perfect	Preterit	23	2	0	2	0	6	3	4	3	1	1	1	0
1-2	Perfect	Perfect	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-3	Perfect	Present	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-4a	Present	Preterit	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
1-4b	Present	Perfect	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
1-5	Present	Present	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Sub-Total	28	3	0	2	0	6	3	5	5	1	2	1	0
2	Group 2 (<i>It</i> +BE+a time expression)														
2-1	Present	Preterit	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0
2-2	Present	Perfect	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2-3	Perfect	Preterit	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
2-4	Preterit	Pluperfect	6	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0
2-5a/b	Perfect/Pluperfect	Perfect/Pluperfect	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
2-6a/b	Others (<i>since</i> or <i>that</i>)		4	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		Sub-Total	19	1	0	5	0	2	4	0	1	4	1	0	1
3	Group 3 (Pluperfect)														
3-1	Preterit	Pluperfect	4	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
3-2	Pluperfect	Preterit	10	1	0	3	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0
3-3	Pluperfect	Pluperfect	24	3	1	1	1	4	5	2	0	3	1	2	1
		Sub-Total	38	5	1	6	2	4	6	6	1	3	1	2	1
4	Group 4 (Preterit)														
4a-4g	Preterit	Preterit	7	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
	TOTAL		92	9	1	15	3	14	13	11	8	8	5	3	2

Notes.

Har=Hardy/Gals=Galsworthy/Law=Lawrence/Fi=Fitzgerald/Mau=du Maurier/Hem=Hemingway/
Ste=Steinbeck/Up=Updike/Dra=Drabble/Oat=Oats/De1=Dexter 1994/De2=Dexter 1996.

The Tenses of the Verbs in Temporal *Since*-clauses
Compared with Those in the Main Clauses (Kiyoko KOBAYASHI)

- (1) *COBUILD English Usage* (Suffork: HarperCollins, 1992) s.v. *since*.
- (2) H. Poutsma, *A Grammar of Late Modern English*, 5 vols. (Groningen: Noorhoff, 1914,16,26,28²,29²) pt. II, sec. II, pp.274-5.
- (3) *Ibid.*, pt. II, sec. II, p.274.
- (4) *Ibid.*, pt. II, sec. II, pp.274-5.
- (5) Otto Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, 7 vols. 1909-49 (Northampton: John Dickens, 1965) pt. IV, p.76.
- (6) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt. II, sec. II, p.275. The 1st instance is cited from Browning, and the 2nd Shaw.
- (7) Randolph Quirk et al., *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, 1985 (London: Longman, 1995) p.1016.
- (8) *Ibid.*, p. 1084.
- (8) *Ibid.*, p. 1016.
- (10) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt. II, sec. II, p. 275. He cites the 1st instance from Thackeray, and the 2nd G. Eliot.
- (11) Quirk et al., *op. cit.*, p. 1017.
- (12) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt. II, sec. II, p. 275.
- (13) Jespersen, *op. cit.*, pt. IV, p. 78.
- (14) *Ibid.*
- (15) Quirk et al., *op. cit.*, p.1017.
- (16) *Ibid.*, p. 1018.
- (17) *Ibid.*
- (18) Jespersen, *op. cit.*, pt. IV, p. 79. The 1st instance is cited from C. Brontë, the 2nd Collins, and the 3rd Bentley.
- (19) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt. II, sec. II, p. 275.
- (20) *Ibid.*, pt. II, sec. II, p. 269.
- (21) *Ibid.*, pt. II, sec. II, p. 275.
- (22) Jespersen, *op. cit.*, pt. IV, p. 79.
- (23) Quirk et al., *op. cit.*, p. 1016. Here nonperfective means "the simple present or simple past, or the will-future," according to them.
- (24) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt. II, sec. II, p. 282.
- (25) *Ibid.*
- (26) Jespersen, *op. cit.*, pt. IV, p. 79.
- (27) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt. II, sec. II, p. 275.
- (28) Quirk et al., *op. cit.*, p. 1016.
- (29) *Ibid.*
- (30) *Ibid.*
- (31) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt. II, sec. II, pp. 275-6.
- (32) Quirk et al., *op. cit.*, p. 1018.
- (33) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt. II, sec. II, pp. 275-6.
- (34) *Ibid.*, pt. II, sec. II, p. 282. (my underlines)
- (35) *Ibid.* The 1st is cited from Austen, the 2nd Pemberton. (my underlines)
- (36) *Ibid.*, pt. II, sec. II, p. 269. This is quoted from Byron. (my underlines)
- (37) *OED*, 2nd ed., s. v. *since*.
- (38) *Ibid.*, s.v. *that*.
- (39) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt. II, sec. II, p. 284.

- (40) Jespersen, *op. cit.*, pt. IV, p. 78.
- (41) *Ibid.*, pt. IV, p. 83.
- (42) Sidney Greenbaum and Randolph Quirk, *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*, 1990 (London: Longman, 1991) p. 296.
- (43) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt II, sec. II, p. 277.
- (44) Quirk et al., *op. cit.*, p. 1017.
- (45) Jespersen, *op. cit.*, pt. IV, p. 77.
- (46) Poutsma, *op. cit.*, pt. II. sec. II, p. 257.
- (47) Jespersen, *op. cit.*, pt. IV, p. 76.
- (48) Quirk et al., *op. cit.*, pp. 1015-6.
- (49) *Ibid.*, p. 539.
- (50) *Ibid.*, pp.1015-6.
- (51) *Ibid.*, p. 1016.

(こばやし きよこ 文学研究科英米文学専攻博士後期課程)

1999年10月15日受理

