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**Chapter 7:**

**Clauses in Functions other than as Predicates of Attitudinal Objects**

**1. Factive clauses**

Mental states described by factive verbs do not have satisfaction conditions:

(1) a. ??? John’s regret that he was late was true / correct / satisfied.

 b. ??? The realization that it project was manageable was true / correct / fulfilled.

Semantic arguments for facts as arguments of attitude verbs:

1. *Partly* :

relates to the fact being described by picking out partial content:

(2) a. John partly realized that the students failed the exam.

 b. John partly regrets that that it rained on those days.

(3) a. That the collection was sold was partly predictable

 b. That John solved the problem is partly surprising.

 (4) John is partly happy that Mary sold her art collection.

(5) a. ??? John partly thinks that the students failed the exam.

 b. ??? John partly claims that it rained on those days.

 c. John partly ate the cake.

2. Nominals describe qualities of facts

(6) a. John’s happiness that Mary sold her art collection

 b. the predictability that John would pass the exam

3. Specificational sentences

(7) a. \* John’s happiness is that he passed the exam.

 b. \* The unexpectedness was that John passed the exam.

But:

(7) c. John’s only regret was that he did not try harder.

Facts as modal objects

(8) a. For a sentence S true in a world w, there is exactly one (non-normative) modal object d

 such that pos(d) = pos(S) ∩ {s | s < w} and neg(d) = ∅.

 b. [*the fact that* S]w = ιd[pos(d) = pos(S) ∩ {s | s < w} & neg(d) = ∅}]

Factive clauses as nominal clauses

An account within Simplified Syntax: FACT as a light noun.

(9) a. That Joe lost the election is interesting.

 b. [That [FP FACT] Joe lost the election] is interesting.

(10) a. John regrets that Joe lost the election.

 b. John regret [CP that [FACT] Joe lost the election].

(11) The Interpretation of Factive Clauses

 a. [*The fact that* [+fact] S] = ιd[pos(d) = pos(S) ∩ {s | s < w0} & neg(d) = ∅]

 b. [+fact]([S]]) = ιd[pos(d) = pos(S) ∩ {s | s < w0} & neg(d) = ∅]

 (12) happy(John, [that [[*fact*]([S])])

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**2. States of affairs as modal objects**

(13) That it will rain is likely / certain /desirable.

Semantic tests for states of affairs being arguments of predicates

Nominals describe tropes of states of affairs, not objects with satisfaction conditions:

(16) ??? The likelihood / certainty / desirability that it will rain is true / satisfied / correct.

Nominals describe tropes of states of affairs:

(17) \* The likelihood / certainty / desirability is that it will rain.

Reading of *partly*:

(18) That the students will fail the exam is *partly* certain (since several of them are

 completely unprepared).

States of affairs modal objects

(19) a. [*the state of affairs in which* S] = ιd [sit([S])] = ιd[pos(d) = pos(S) & neg(d) = ∅}]

 b. For a sentence S, sit([S]) = ιd[pos(d) = pos(S) & neg(d) = ∅}]

SIT as a light noun for states of affairs: [That SIT S]

Verbs taking facts and states of affairs as arguments:

(20) a. That Mary met Bill in Munich implies that Bill was in Munich.

 b. That Mary is nervous indicates that she is unprepared.

(21) [That FACT Mary is nervous] indicates [that SIT she is unprepared]

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**3. Thin assertions and predicates of truth**

*Correct* as a predicate of assertions

(22) a. That John is the director is correct.

 b. ??? The proposition that John is the director is correct.

 c. The claim / suggestion that John is the director is correct.

(23) That John is in charge is partly correct.

No predicates of concreteness applicable to *that*-clauses standing for assertions (Moulton 2020)

(24) a. ??? That John will lose his job was overheard by many.

 b. The remark that John will lose his job was overheard by many.

(25) a. ??? That Joe won the election, which caused a commotion, is correct.

 b. The claim that Joe won the election, which caused a commotion, is true.

Thin assertion

an assertion, but without properties of concreteness

carries norm of truth, word/mind-to-world direction of fit
Agent-dependent thin assertions

Generic thin assertions

*That*-clauses with predicates like *correct*: light noun ASSERT in SPEC(FP)

The Unique Determination Property

(26) a. That Mary got elected is nice.

 b. The fact that Mary got elected is nice .

 c. The situation which Mary gets elected is nice.

(27) a. That John might get elected is excluded.

 b. The possibility that John might get elected is excluded.

 c. The fact / The claim that John got elected is excluded (from the discussion).

(28) a. John recognized / appreciates that Mary is talented.

 b. John recognized / appreciates the fact that Mary is talented.

 c. John recognized / appreciates the assertion that Mary is talented.

(29) The Unique Determination Property (of the interpretation of clauses)

 With a given predicate an embedded clause has a single interpretation, describing a

 unique type of entity.

Predicates syntactically select CPs with light verbs FACT, SIT, or ASSERT in SPEC(FP)

The Substitution Problem

(30) a. John saw / realized that it was raining.

 b. John saw / realized something.

 c. ??? John saw / realized the fact that it was raining.

(31) a. John regrets that it is raining.

 b. John regrets something.

 c. John regrets the fact that that it is raining.

Factive verbs like *see* syntactically select only light DP, not ordinary DPs.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**4. Clauses as predicates of truthmakers?**

(32) a. It has never *occurred* that John was late.

 b. It has twice *happened* that John was late.

 c. Could it *be* that John is late?

 d. That John is nervous is often / not the case.

 e. That *is* so.

(33) a. tm([*that John was late*])= λs[s ∈ pos(S)]

 b. ¬∃e[occur(e) & tm([*that John was late*])(e)]

(34) a. \* the occurrence that John was late

 b. \* an event that John won the race

 c. \* a being that John was late

Russian nouns of occurrence with *cto*-clauses (Bondarenko 2021)

(35) Mne to. prišla v in golovu mysl’ [cto ˇ COMP belki s”eli vse orexi].

 ‘I had a thought that squirrels ate all the nuts.’

(36) a. Na on prošloj nedele byl was slucaj ˇ [cto ˇ COMP belki s”eli vse orexi].

 ‘Last week there was an event of squirrels eating all the nuts.’

 b. Vcera ˇ proizošla /slucilas’ ˇ /situacija [CP cto ˇ COMP moj zakaz zaderžali].

 ‘Yesterday a situation that my order was delayed happened /occurred.’

Russian verbs of occurrence *byvat’* ‘happen’, *sluˇcatsja* ‘occur’, and *proisxodit’* ‘take place’ take *cto*-clauses

 Clausal modifiers of nouns of occurrence.

English *that*-clauses:

(37) That it is raining is likely.

Only *in which*-clauses can denote properties of situations or kinds of situations that are truthmakers of the clause

(38) a. The cases in which a student passed the exam are rare.

 b. \* The case that a student passed the exam is rare.

 c. \* The case that a student passed the exam is rare.

German clausal modifiers of nouns of occurrence:

(39) a. der Fall, dass sein Student das Examen besteht

 the case that a student passes the exam

 ‘the case in which a student passes the exam’

 b. \* ein Fall, dass ein Student das Examen besteht

 a case that a student passes the exam.

(40) a. That a student failed the exam never occurred.

 b. ¬∃e(occur(e, [*that* SIT *a student failed the exam*]))

 c. ¬∃e(occur(e, sit([*a student failed the exam*]))

 d. For an event e and a state of affairs d, occur(e, d) iff e ╟ d.

(41) ∃e(see(John, e) & tm([*Mary leave*])(e))

Verbs of appearance

(42) a. It appears that it is raining.

 b. It seems that it is raining.

*That*-clauses as predicates of appearances / seemings – objects that come with accurateness conditions

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**5. Topic-related locutionary verbs**

Topic-related locutionary verbs:

Verbs that describe a locutionary act that is about a particular issue, a fact, or topic under discussion in the context of the utterance

1.  *explain, criticize* and *praise* on one of their two readings,

2. *complain*, *boast*, *comment* and *remark*: verbs that are known not to take any DPs, not even special quantifiers, as complements

Two readings of *that*-clauses with *explain* and *complain*:

(43) a. John explained that there was no water.

 b. John explained the fact that there was no water.

 c. How did John explain that there was no water?

(44) a. Looking at the well, John criticized that there was not enough water

 b. John criticized that there was no water, by saying that without water the project cannot

 be done.

 c. John criticized the water shortage / the fact that there was not enough water.

In specificational sentences only content-related reading is available:

(45) a. John’s explanation was that there was no water.

 b. John’s criticism was that there was no water.

(46) That there was not enough water was not explained / criticized.

(47) John complained / commented / remarked that there was no water (??? by saying that

 without water the project could not be done).

Special quantifiers

1. No special quantifiers in place of that-clauses :

(48) a. John complained that it rained.

 b. \* John complained something.

(49) a. John commented that the idea was good.

 b. \* John commented something.

(50) a. Mary remarked that she would come.

 b. \* Mary remarked something.

2. *Explain* and *criticize*

special quantifier can replace clausal complement only on the topic-related reading:

(51) a. John explained something, that there is no water.

 b. What did John explain?

(52) a. John criticized something.

 b. What did John criticize?

(53) John [[remarked] [DP e]][that S]

(54) a. John [V’explained [DP e]] [that there is no water]

 b. John [V’explained [that there is no water]]

An account of the impossibility of special quantifiers in Simplified Syntax:

Topic argument syntactically present, occupies direct object position; *that*-clause in indirect object position, a replacing special quantifiers could not be assigned case.

The complex predicate analysis

(55) a. ∃d(give(John, d) & [explain(ation)](d, tc) & [*that there is no water*](d))

 b. ∃d(give(John, d) & explain(ation)(d, fact([*that there is no water*])))