

Definite CPs: revisiting the selectional restrictions of attitude predicates

A current question regarding the syntax-semantics interface pertains to the nature of clause-embedding attitude predicates [APs] (e.g. *say, believe, know, regret, doubt*). We present a novel analysis that connects a well-known—but less well-understood, semantic-pragmatic distinction between the cognitive (*realize, be aware*) and the emotive (*appreciate, be happy*) factives (cf. Karttunen 1971; Abusch 2002, 2010; Abrusán 2011; Jayez et al. 2015; Djärv et al. 2017a, with the observation that the two types of factives differ with respect to their selectional properties. In particular, it has been known since Hooper and Thompson 1973 that cognitive, but not emotive factives, license embedded Main Clause Phenomena [MCP] (e.g. VP-preposing, topicalization, V-to-C, etc.). The connection between the syntactic and the semantic-pragmatic properties of the two types of factives however, has proven elusive and difficult to substantiate (Wiklund et al. 2009; Julien 2009; Djärv et al. 2017b). Recent work from Haegeman and Ürögdi (2010); Haegeman (2014); and Kastner (2015) argue that the presence of a D-layer, obligatory with *all* factive APs, block the projection of an extended CP. This makes the incorrect prediction however, that cognitive factives should disallow MCP.

This paper builds on this idea, but argues that the \pm factive distinction is too coarse. Instead, the relevant distinction is between those APs that require, vs. those that do not require that their complement is DISCOURSE FAMILIAR—a property which is encoded in a definite D-head (§1). We further present data suggesting that this ‘clausal D-head’ show the same type of variation as definiteness in the nominal domain Schwarz (2009, 2013) (§2). Finally, we show that making this distinction between cognitive and emotive factives allows us to capture a previously overlooked contrast regarding (factive) islands (§3)

§1. Apart from the emotive factives, the response-stance APs (e.g. *deny, agree*) also disallow MCP (1b). As shown in (2d-e), the emotives further share with these APs the property of requiring that their complements are discourse familiar. This is unlike the APs that *do* allow MCP (1a)—namely the cognitives, and the volunteer-stance APs (e.g. *say, believe*) (2a-c).

- | | | |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|
| (1) | Mary plans for John to marry her, and ... | VP-preposing |
| | a. I { say, believe, know } that marry her he will. | ✓MCP |
| | b. *I { deny, resent } that marry her he will. | ✗MCP |
| (2) | [Uttered out of the blue:] <i>Guess what — / You know what —</i> | |
| | a. ✓They said on the radio that Trump resigned. | [Volunteer stance speech act] |
| | b. ✓I believe that Trump resigned. | [Volunteer stance cognitive state] |
| | c. ✓I just found out that Trump resigned. | [Factive cognitive state] |
| | d. #I appreciate that Trump resigned. | [Factive emotive state] |
| | e. #I { doubt, deny } that Trump resigned. | [Response stance state/speech act] |

We argue that both properties are due to an obligatory, but optionally silent, definite D-head in the complements of APs like *deny, regret*: [_{VP} V [_{DP} D [_{CP} C TP]]]. Further support comes from pronominal CP-anaphora (3), as well as data showing that MCP—unlike other CPs, do *not* pattern like DPs with respect to case and argument-licensing. (4) shows that an MCP-clause may not be the subject of an unaccusative predicate, unlike non-MCP clauses.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|
| (3) | a. J {said, thought, knew} [that M did it] _i , and I { said, thought, knew } [it/so] _i too. | |
| | b. J {regretted, denied} [that M did it] _i , and I { regretted, denied } [it/*so] _i too. | |
| (4) | Mary plans for John to marry her, but ... | VP-preposing |
| | a. [that he will marry her] is far from obvious. | ✓MCP |
| | b. *[that marry her he will] is far from obvious. | ✗MCP |

A Turkish MCP; finite *diye*-clauses (5) (see Özyildiz 2016), reveals the same asymmetry (5). [As for other MCP, Turkish *diye*-clauses are possible under the volunteer-stance APs and the cognitive factives, but not under the response-stance APs and the emotive factives. Nominalized clauses are the default, possible under all AP types. (Data omitted for space.)]

- (5) a. [Ali-'nin geldigi] belli.
 [Ali-GEN came.NMZ.NOM] obvious
 'That Ali came is obvious.' ✓MCP
- b. *[Ali geldi diye] belli.
 [Ali came DIYE] obvious
 'Intended: That Ali came is obvious.' ✗MCP

§2. Schwarz (2009, 2013) shows that there are two kinds of definiteness cross-linguistically; one which requires explicit discourse anaphora, and one which requires only that the referent is situationally unique. (7) shows that the same is true in the clausal domain, and moreover, that the emotives and the response-stance APs differ with respect to the kind of DP-complement that they select for.

- (6) Context: Uttered on a sunny day on the beach, with no previous mention of the weather:
 a. I'm {**surprised, happy**} that the weather turned out so well.
 b. #I **doubt** that it's going to rain.
- (7) Context: A discussion of whether or not it's going to rain.
 a. I **doubt** that it's going to rain.

§3. A further observation (data noted, but not discussed in Rooryck 1992), falls out from this account; namely that the cognitive and the emotive factives differ with regard to their 'factive island' status. With the former only can the weak factive-island effects disappear with focus on the WH-phrase (8)-(9).

- (8) a. *Who did you **resent** t likes this book?
 b. *WHO did you **resent** t likes this book?
- (9) a. ??/*Who did you **discover** t fixed your bike?
 b. WHO did you **discover** t fixed your bike?

This follows if 'factive islands' are due to an intervening nominal; optional with *know*, but obligatory with *regret* [we further discuss the effect of focus in the talk]. It also—correctly, predicts, that response-stance APs should also give rise to island-effects (10).

- (10) a. *Who did you **doubt/deny** t likes this book?
 b. ??/*WHO did you **doubt/deny** t likes this book?

We conclude the talk with a discussion about why the presence of a D-layer should rule out MCP: does the DP block the projection of an extended CP as per previous authors, or do verbs and nominals select different C-heads, which differ in whether they may carry discourse features like Topic, Focus, Force, Finiteness?

Selected References: Haegeman, L. (2014). Locality and the distribution of main clause phenomena. Haegeman, L. and B. Ürögdi (2010). Referential CPs and DPs: An operator movement account. Hooper, J. and S. Thompson (1973). On the applicability of root transformations. Karttunen, L. (1971). Some observations on factivity. Kastner, I. (2015). Factivity mirrors interpretation: The selectional requirements of presuppositional verbs. Schwarz, F. (2009). Two Types of Definites in Natural Language. Schwarz, F. (2014). Two kinds of definites cross-linguistically.