How to license embedded instances of *no-da* and the politeness marker *mas* in Japanese:
CP recursion or Speech Act Phrase

Dokkyo University (myasui@dokkyo.ac.jp)

1. Outline of this study

➢ The *no-da/des* construction (Noda 1997, Kuno 1973, Kitagawa & Ross 1982 i.a.) and the politeness marking by *mas* (Miyagawa 2017) involve <u>the speaker's attitude</u>. They are possible only with complement clauses with <u>the quotative marker *to*</u>.

(1)　　**[A student reports the reason for her absence to her teacher]**
　　　　Kaze-o　hiki-**mas**-ita.　　　Ame-ni nure-ta　　　**no-desu**.　　(Kuno 1973:144)
　　　　cold-ACC catch-POL-PAST　　rain-by get.wet-PAST NO DA.POL
　　　　'I caught a cold. (It is because) I got wet in the rain.'

(2) a.　Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga　ki-ta **no-da**]　　**to** <u>hookokus</u>-ita.　　(nonfactive)
　　　　Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM come-PAST NO-DA TO report-PAST

　　b.　*Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga　ki-ta **no-da**]　　**koto**-wo　<u>hookokus</u>-ita.　　(factive)
　　　　Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM come-PAST-NO-DA KOTO-ACC report-PAST
　　　　'Taro reported that Hanako came.'

(3) a.　Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga　ki-**mas**-ita]　　**to** <u>hookokus</u>-tia.　　(nonfactive)
　　　　Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM come-MAS-PAST C　report-PAST

　　b.　*Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga　ki-**mas**-ita]　**koto**-wo　<u>hookokus</u>-ita.　(factive)
　　　　Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM come-MAS-PAST KOTO -ACC report-PAST
　　　　'Taro reported that Hanako came.'　　　　　　　　(Miyagawa 2012:93)

➢ **Section 2 →** Hopper & Thompson (1973, H&T) attempt to identify the range of <u>non-root declarative clauses</u> that allow the root transformations (RTs) listed by Emonds (1970, 2004); they have been characterized as 'assertive,' 'nonfactive' or 'novel' complements (Cattell 1978, Hegarty 1992).

➢ **Section 3 →** H&T analyze RTs as <u>emphatic</u>. The *no-da* construction is also emphatic. If RTs and *no-da* are embedded, it has to be clarified which is the emphasizer: the speaker or the matrix subject.

➢ **Section 4 →** Three pieces of evidence will be discussed to support the <u>CP recursion</u> analysis of embedded <u>main clause phenomena</u> (MCP)

　Section 4.1 → The subject-auxiliary inversion (SAI) in <u>non-root interrogative clauses</u> of Irish English analyzed by McCloskey (1992, 2006).

　Section 4.2 → *Que* + *wh*-interrogatives in Spanish analyzed by Lahiri (1991, 2002) based on Rivero (1980) among others.

　Section 4.3 → The Japanese quotative marker *to* in interrogative complements discussed by Nishigauchi (1999) among others.

➢ **Section 5** attempts to offer a unified analysis of embedded MCP under the CP recursion approach.

2. The parallel distributions of *no-da* and of English RTs

(4) a.　The scout <u>reported</u> that [beyond the next hill stood a large fortress]　(speaking V)

　　b.　I <u>suppose</u> that [most embarrassing of all was falling off the stage]　　(mental process V)

　　c.　Sally plans for Gary to marry her, and he <u>recognizes</u> that, [whether he likes it or not, marry her he will]　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(semifactive V)

(5) a. *He was <u>surprised</u> that [never in my life had I seen a hippopotamus]   (factive)

   b. *It was <u>impossible</u> that [each part he had examined carefully]   (probability/likelihood)

➢ Acceptable RTs (4a-c) in English →

(6) a. Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga   yat-ta   **no-da**] to/*koto-wo <u>hookokus</u>-ita.   (speaking V)

      Taro-TOP   Hanako-NOM do-PAST NO-DA TO/KOTO-ACC <u>report</u>-PAST

      'Taro exclaimed that it was OK with that.'

   b. Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga   tuini   kuru **no-da**] to/*koto-wo <u>soozoos</u>-ita. (mental process V)

      Taro-TOP   Hanako-NOM finally come NO-DA TO/KOTO-ACC <u>imagine</u>-PAST

      'Taro imagined that Hanako would finally come.'

   c. Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga   yat-ta   **no-da**] to/*koto-ni   kizui-ta.   (semifactive V)

      Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM do-PAST   NO-DA TO/KOTO-DAT <u>discover</u>-PAST

      'Taro discovered that Hanako did it.'

➢ Unacceptable RTs (5a,b) in English →

(7) a. *Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga   kaba-wo   katteiru **no-da**] koto/no-ni   <u>odoro</u>-ita. (factive)

      Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM hippopotamus keep   NO-DA KOTO/NO -DAT <u>be.surprized</u>-PAST

      'Taro was surprised that Hanako kept a hippopotamus.'

   b. *[Taro-ga   zenbu-no buhin-wo teineini kensas-ita   **no-da**] koto/no-wa <u>arienai</u>.

       Taro-NOM all-GEN   part-ACC   carefully examine-PAST NO-DA KOTO/NO-TOP <u>impossible</u>

        'It is impossible that Taro examined every part carefully.'   (probability/likelihood)

➢ H&T regard RTs as <u>emphatic</u>, arguing correctly that "it is not appropriate to emphasize elements of a sentence whose proposition is already known, whose truth is presupposed, and whose content is relegated to the background." RTs are disallowed in <u>factive</u> complements.

3. Stephenson's (2007) Assessor Sensitivity/Immediateness Requirement

➢ Pearson (to appear) adopts the lexical entry for *believe* in (8) and extends this format to *say* and *want*, analyzing all of them as <u>attitude verbs</u>.   (See also Heim&Kratzer 1998: chapter 12)

(8) [[believe]] $^{g, w}$ = $\lambda p \in D_{<s,t>}$. $\lambda x \in D_e$.$Dox_{x,w} \subseteq p$, where <u>$Dox_{x,w}$ = {w': it is compatible with what x believes in w for w to be w'}</u>.

➢ Stephenson (2005, 2007): If epistemic modals and predicates expressing personal taste (PPT) are embedded by more than one attitude verbs, it is <u>the subject of the clause immediately containing</u> the epistemic modals and PPT whose knowledge state or taste is relevant.

(9) a. Mary$_i$ thinks that John$_j$ thinks it **must/might** be raining, but

       (i) I know it isn't / (ii) she$_i$ knows it isn't / (iii) #he$_j$ knows it isn't.

   b. Mary$_i$ thinks that John$_j$ thinks the dip **tastes good**, but

       (i) I find it disgusting / (ii) she$_i$ finds it disgusting / (iii) #he$_j$ finds it disgusting.

(10) **RTs in English**

   a.   Sally plans for Gary$_i$ to marry her, and he$_i$ recognizes that, *whether he$_i$ likes it or not*,

        [VP **marry her**] he$_i$ will.   (=(4c))

   b.   (i) I don't think he$_i$ will / (ii) #he$_i$ doesn't think he$_i$ will.

(11) **the *no-da* construction**
    a. Taro-wa *konomu to konom-aza-ru*   *ni kakawara-zu* Hanako-to   kekkon-suru koto ni
       Taro-TOP like   or like-not-NONPAST on depend-not Hanako-with marry   KOTO to
       naru   **no-da** to   ninsikisitei-ru.
       become NO-DA TO recognize-NONPAST
       'Taro recognizes that, whether he likes it or not, he will marry Hanako.'
    b. Demo (i) watasi-wa soo nar-anai   to omou / (ii) #kare-wa soo nar-anai   to omottei-ru.
       but   I-TOP   so become-not TO think   kare-TOP so become-not TO think-NONPAST
       'But (i) I think it won't happen / (ii) #he thinks that it won't happen.'

(12) **the politeness marking with *mas***
    a. Otooto-wa   ki-**mas**-u.   (the speaker uses *mas* for the hearer)
       younger.brother-TOP come-MAS-NONPAST   'My younger brother will come.'
    b. Taroo-wa [otooto-ga   ki-**mas**-u]   to Yamada kyoozyu-ni it-ta.
       Taro- TOP   younger.brother-NOM come-MAS-NONPAST TO Yamada professor-to say-PAST
       'Taro_i told Prof. Yamada that his_i younger brother would come.'
       (Taro uses *mas* for Prof. Yamada.   The speaker uses the nonpolite form for the hearer)
    c. Hanako-ga   ki-**mas**-u   kara   uti-ni   ite-**kudasai**/***kure**.
       Hanako-NOM come-MAS-NONPAST because home-at stay-IMP.POLITE/IMP.NONPOLITE
       'Since Hanako will come, please stay home.'   (adapted from Miyagawa 2017:96)
       (The speaker uses *mas/kudasai* for the hearer.)

➢ *Mas* in (12b) is not licensed by the Speech Act Phrase assumed in Miyagawa (2017), which encodes the speaker/hearer. *Mas*, the *no-da* construction and RTs in general obey the Immediateness Requirement on attitude predicates.

4. Evidence on CP recursion for MCP in interrogative complements

4.1 Subject-auxiliary inversion (SAI) in Irish English (McCloskey 1992, 2006)

(13) ***Ask*-type (question) predicates**
    a. I wonder [was he illiterate]
    b. She asked the stewards [was any member of the committee in the hall]
    c. I wonder [what is he like at all]
    d. I asked him [from what source could the reprisal come]

(14) ***Know*-type (resolutive) predicates**
    a. *It was amazing who did they invite.   (McCloskey 2006:17)
    b. *How much had he grown really astonished me.

Declarative complements with *know*-type/*ask*-type
(15) a. It was amazing that they invited John (, #but they didn't invite him).
    b. That he had grown five inches taller astonished me (, #but he had grown only two inches).
(16)   *They wondered/asked that Susan had been nominated.   (McCloskey 2006:29)

Immediateness Requirement on Semifactive predicates
(17) a. *I found out how did they get into the building.   (McCloskey 2006:3)
    b. *The police discovered who had they beaten up.

c. *I usually <u>know</u> who might they hire.

d. *I <mark>remember clearly</mark> how many people did they arrest.

(18) a. <mark>?Do you remember</mark> who did they hire?   (McCloskey 2006:18)

b. I don't <u>know</u> what is it at all?

c. I've never <u>found out</u> if I'd asked him would he really have come with me.

➢ Following Rizzi and Roberts (1989), McCloskey argues that SAI cannot apply to finite interrogative complements in Standard English since moving an auxiliary into C results in a violation of the matrix verb's selectional property. If this is correct, it follows that embedded SAI in Irish English can some-how circumvent a selectional violation.

➢ Drawing on Iatridou & Kroch's (1992) analysis of embedded verb second (V2) among others (see also Haegeman 2006, de Cuba & Ürögdi 2010), McCloskey adopts the CP recursion structure, where the higher C does not s-select the lower CP.

(19) But the simple analysis which suggests [_{CP} **that** because American investment takes place here [_{CP} **that** we should be a lapdog for their efforts in the war]] is one that I think is quite objectionable and quite offensive.   (McCloskey 2006:23)

4.2 *Que* + *wh*-phrase in Spanish (Lahiri 1991, Rivero 1978, 1980, Suñer, 1989, Plann 1982, i.a.)

(20) *Ask*-type

a. Te   <u>preguntan</u> [_{CP} **que** [_{CP} para qué   quieres el   péstamo]]
    you <u>ask</u>.3p   that   for what want.2s the loan
    'They ask you what you want the loan for.'

b. <mark>Pensó</mark>   [_{CP} **que** [_{CP} cuáles   seían   adecuados]]
    <mark><u>thought</u></mark>.3s that   which.ones would.be appropriate
    'He <mark>wondered</mark> which ones would be appropriate.'   (Rivero 1980:381-382)

(21) *Know*-type

a. El detective <u>sabe</u>   [_{CP} **(*que)** [_{CP} quidn la   mató]]
    the detective <u>know</u>.3s   (*that)   who   her killed.3s
    'The detective knows who killed her.'

b. Elena <u>se enteró de</u> [_{CP} **(*que)** [_{CP} por qué   no la habían invitado a   la fiesta]]
    Elena <u>found.out</u>.3s   (*that)   for what not her had.3p invited   to the party
    'Elena found out why they had not invited her to the party.'   (Lahiri 1991:77)

4.3 *Ka to* in Japanese interrogative complements (Nishigauchi 1999)

(22) A*sk*-type

[Dare-ga   kuru **ka-to**] <mark>omot</mark>-ta/ tazune-ta/ibukat-ta/ kangae-ta/soozoos-ita.
who-NOM come   <mark>wondered</mark>/asked/ wondered/pondered/ imagined
'I wonder/asked/wondered/pondered/imagine who would come.'

(23) **Know-type**

[Dare-ga   kuru **ka (*-to)**] sit-ta/osie-ta/wasure-ta/oboe-te-iru/wakat-ta
who-NOM come   knew/told/ forgot/   remember/ found.out
'I know/told/forgot/remember/found out who would come.'

(24) **Know-type taking a declarative with *koto***

    a. [Taro-ga   ki-ta]   **koto**-wo sitte-iru/osie-ta/wasurete-ita/oboete-iru.

        Taro-NOM come-PAST KOTO-ACC know/told/have forget/remember

        'I know/told (someone)/have forgotten/remember that Taro came.'

    b. [Taro-ga   ki-ta]   **koto**-ga wakar-ta.

        Taro-NOM come-PAST KOTO-NOM find.out-PAST

        'I found out that Taro had come.'

(25) a. [Dare-ga kuru] **ka** *omow-ta/^{OK}tazune-ta/^{OK}ibukar-ta/^{OK}kangae-ta/^{OK}soozoos-ita.

      who-NOM come **Q** *think/ ^{OK}asked / ^{OK}wondered/^{OK}pondered/^{OK} imagined

    b. [Taro-ga   kuru] **to** ^{OK}omow-ta/*tazune-ta/*ibukar-ta/ ^{OK}kangae-ta/^{OK}soozoos-ita.

      Taro-NOM come **nonQ** ^{OK}thought/*asked/   *wondered/ ^{OK}pondered/^{OK}imagined

5. MCP, selection and CP recursion

(26) a. Aitat! **to** itta   b. Tokyo-kara/hayaku **to** itta

      ouch   said   Tokyo-from/quickly   said

(27) **Assumptions**

  (i)   Natural languages have a complementizer (to be expressed as **C^{us}**) that is <u>unselective</u> for its clausal complement.   <u>Only attitude verbs can select C^{us}</u>. *To* in Japanese, *che* in Spanish and *that* in Standard and Irish varieties of English are examples of C^{us}.   Irish English has a nonovert C^{us}.

  (ii) C^{us} lacks semantic content and <u>can be transparent for the s-selectional relation</u> between its complement and an attitude verb selecting C^{us}.

  (iii) Natural languages have an interrogative feature (to be expressed as [Q]) that constitutes an interrogative clause.   It is bundled into lexical items like *ka* in Japanese, *if*, nonovert C or finite tenses in (Irish) English, and nonovert C^{us} in Irish English. (see Yasui 2014)

➢ Below, ⌐▭⌐ indicates the presence of some selectional relation, ⌐//⌐ its absence, and ⌐*⌐ a violation of selection.

5.1 *Omow* ('think') s-selects declarative with *to*

(28) a. [**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru (come)]   → matrix question with the rising intonation

    b. [[**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka[Q]**]   → *dare-ga* is licensed by *ka*

                                         matrix question w/wo the rising intonation

    c. [[[[**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka[Q]**   ] **to**] omotta (thought)]

                                             → embedded question

(29) (28a) →

    b. ?[[[**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru (come)] **to**] omotta (thought)]   → *dare-ga* is not licensed

                                          by *to* but possible as a direct quote?

(30) a. [Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)]   → matrix declarative or

                                          interrogative with the rising intonation

    b. [[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka**]   → matrix question with the rising intonation

                                or matrix declarative with *ka* as a S-final particle (SFP)

    c. [[[[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka**(SFP)] **to**] omotta (thought)] → embedded

                                             declarative

    d. [[[[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka doo-ka** (whether or not)] **to**] omotta (thought)]

                                             → embedded question

(31) (30a) → (30b) →

   c. *[[[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka**]   omotta (thought)]

                             └──*──┘   → *omow* does not select interrogative

(32) (30a) →

   b. [[[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)] **to**   ] omotta (thought)]   → embedded declarative

5.2 *Tazune* ('ask') s-selects interrogative

(33) a. [**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru (come)]

   b. [[**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka**[Q]]

   c. [[[**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru] **ka**[Q]   ] tazuneta (asked)]   → s-selection of *tazune* is
                                          satisfied by *ka*

(34) (33a) → (33b) →

   c. [[[**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru] **ka**[Q]] **to**] tazuneta (asked)]   → s-selection of *tazune* is
                                          not satisfied by *to*

                        ← Assumption (27-ii): *to* is transparent
                            for s-selection

(35) (33a) →

   b. ?[[[**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru (come)] **to**] tazuneta (asked)]   → s-selection of *tazune* is
                                      not satisfied by *to* but possible as a direct quote?
                         ← Assumption (27-ii)

(36) a. [Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)]

   b. [[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka**]   → matrix question with the rising intonation
                         or matrix declarative with *ka* as a S-final particle (SFP)

   c. [[[[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka**[Q]   ] **to**   ] tazuneta (asked)]   → embedded
                                         alternate question
                          ← Assumption (27-ii)

(37) (36a) →

   b. ?[[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)]   **to**]] tazuneta (asked)]   → s-selection of *tazune* is not
                                    satisfied by *to* but possible as a direct quote?
                         ← Assumption (27-ii)

5.3 *Soozoos* ('imagine') s-selects declarative and interrogative

(38) [**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka**[Q]] **to**]] [v soozoosita (imagined)]]
                                     → embedded question
                          soozoos s-selects declarative or interrogative?

(39) [**dare-ga** (who-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka**[Q]] [v soozoosita (imagined)]]   → embedded question
                          soozoos s-selects interrogative

(40) [[[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)] **ka**[Q]] soozoosita (imagined)]
                    → embedded alternate question. *soozoos* s-selects interrogative

(41) [[[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kuru (come)] **to**] soozoosita (imagined)]   → embedded declarative
                             soozoos s-selects declarative

5.4 The *no-da* construction

➢ The Japanese copula distinguishes the conclusive (CONCL) and noun-modifying (NMOD) forms: *da* and *na*, respectively. *Da* of the *no-da* construction lacks the noun-modifying form. *Koto/no* are Ns.

   (42)   [[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kita (came)-NMOD] [N **koto/no**]-wo (ACC) hookokusita (reported)]

(43) *[[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kita (came) **no-da-**CONCL] [N **koto/no**]-wo (ACC) hookokusita (reported)]

(44) [[Taro-ga (Taro-NOM) kita (came) **no-da-**CONCL] **to**] hookokusita (reported)]

5.5 Questions in Standard English

➤ (27-iii) on page 5: Natural languages have an interrogative feature [Q], which is bundled into lexical items like *ka* in Japanese, *if*, nonovert C or <u>finite tenses</u> in (Irish) English, and nonovert C^{us} in Irish English.

➤ I argued in Yasui (2014) that a finite verb with [Q] can internally merge with the clause containing it, which should be an option under the current minimalist idea of free Merge.

(45) a. [he {be, PAST, 3SG, NOM} illiterate]   → matrix declarative
b. He was illiterate.
(46) a. [he {be, PAST, 3SG, NOM, **Q**} illiterate]   →Merge {be, PAST, 3SG, NOM, **Q**} with (46a)
b. [{be, PAST, 3SG, **Q**} [he {be, PAST, 3SG, Q} illiterate]]   → matrix question
c. Was he illiterate?
(47) a. [he {be, PAST, 3SG, NOM} illiterate]   → Merge *if* with (47a)
b. [**if**[Q] [he {be, PAST, 3SG, NOM} illiterate]]   → embedded alternate question
c. [wonder [CP **if**[Q] [he {be, PAST, 3SG, NOM} illiterate]]]

d. I wonder if he was illiterate.
(48) (46a) → (46b) → Merge *wonder* with (46b)
c. [wonder [{be, PAST, 3SG, **Q**} [he {be, PAST, 3SG, Q} illiterate]]
         *   → *wonder* cannot c-select V. Standard English lacks a nonovert C^{us}.
d. *I wonder was he illiterate.

5.6 SAI in Irish varieties of English.

(49) (46a) → (46b) → Merge C^{us} with (46b)
c. [**C^{us}** [{be, PAST, 3SG, **Q**} [he {be, PAST, 3SG, Q} illiterate]]]
         //
d. [wonder [**C^{us}** [{be, PAST, 3SG, **Q**} [he {be, PAST, 3SG, Q} illiterate]]]   → s-selection by
         //   *wonder* is not satisfied by C^{us}. It is satisfied by Q
                                         ← Assumption (27-ii)
e. I wonder was he illiterate.
(50) (46a) → (46b) → Merge *know* with (46b)
c. [know [{be, PAST, 3SG, **Q**}[he {be, PAST, 3SG, Q} illiterate]]]   → *know* does not select C^{us}.
         *   *know* cannot c-select V.
d. *I don't know was he illiterate/*I know was he illiterate.

5.7 RTs in English

➤ A clause to which some RT has applied is assumed to become a larger structure of a distinct category (=α). English has two kinds of *that*: selective and unselective.
(51) a. [a large fortress stood beyond the next hill]   → Locative inversion
b. [α beyond the next hill stood a large fortress]

    c.   [[**C^{us} that**] [α beyond the next hill stood a large fortress]]

              └—//—┘   → *report* as an attitude verb selects [C^{us} that]

    d.   [report   [[**C^{us} that**] [α beyond the next hill stood a large fortress]]

              └———┘   └—//—┘

    e.   The scout reported that [beyond the next hill stood a large fortress]   (=(4a))

(52) a.   [I had never seen a hippopotamus in my life]   → Negative inversion

    b.   [α Never in my life had I seen a hippopotamus in my life]

    c.   surprised [that [α never in my life had I seen a hippopotamus in my life]] → *surprise* does

             └———┘   └—*—┘   not select [C^{us} that]. Ordinary *that* cannot select α.

    d. *He was surprised that never in my life had I seen a hippopotamus.   (=(5a))

6. Concluding remarks and remaining issues

➢   Evidence on the existence of unselective complementizers (C^{us}) in natural languages.

    (53) a.   [**Taro-ga** ki-ta   **to**] omot-ta.   b. [[**Dare-ga** ki-ta   **ka**] **to**] omot-ta.

             Taro-NOM come-PAST TO think-PAST   Who-NOM come-PAST Q   TO think-PAST

             '(I) think Taro came.'   '(I) wonder who came.'

➢   Attitude predicates in Pearson's (to appear) sense, which are extended to *ask*-type interrogative predicates, are subject to the Immediateness Requirement. They are assumed to select C^{us}.

➢   Clauses with MCP are larger than and categorially distinct from those without MCP; the former are represented as α. α is allowed as a root clause since it is selected by nothing. Merger of C^{us} with α does not result in a selectional violation due to its unselective nature. If a C^{us} layer is absent, merger of α with a head causes a violation of the head's selectional property.

➢   There should be syntactic/semantic basis to define what attitude predicates are.

    (8) ⟦believe⟧$^{g, w}$ = λp ∈ D$_{<s,t>}$. λx ∈ D$_e$.Dox$_{x,w}$ ⊆ p, where Dox$_{x,w}$ = {w': it is compatible with what x believes in w for w to be w'}.

➢   It has to be explained what logical relation, if any, holds between the format of lexical entries for attitude verbs such as (8) and an unselective C in syntactic structure.

Selected References

Aelbrecht, L., L. Haegeman & R. Nye, eds. *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons*. John Benjamins.

de Cuba, Carlos. 2007. *On (non)factivity, clausal complementation and the CP-field*. PhD Diss. Stony Brook U.

de Cuba, C. & B. Ürögdi. 2010. Clearing up the 'facts' on complementation. In *UPenn. Working Papers in Linguistics* 16 (1), 41-50.

Emonds, Joseph. 1970. *Root and structure-preserving transformations*. Doctoral diss., MIT.

_____. 2004. Unspecified categories as the key to root constructions. In D. Adger, C. De Cat & G. Tsoulas (eds.) *Peripheries: syntactic edges and their effects*, pp.75-120. Kluwer.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2006b. Conditionals, factives and the left periphery. *Lingua* 116:1651-1669.

Hooper, J. and S. Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4:465-497.

Iatridou, Sabine and Anthony Kroch. 1992. The licensing of CP-recursion and its relevance to the Germanic verb second phenomenon. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 50:1-24.

Lahiri, U. 1991. Embedded interrogatives and predicates that embed them. PhD diss., MIT.

McCloskey, J. 2006. Questions and questioning in a local English. In Zanuttini, E. et al. eds., *Crosslinguistic research in syntax and semantics: Negation, tense, and clausal architecture*, pp.87-126. Georgetown University Press.

Miyagawa, S. 2012. Agreements that occur mainly in the main clause. In L. Aelbrecht et el. eds., pp.79-112.

Nishigauchi, T. 1999. Quantification and Wh-movement. In Tsujimura, N. ed., *The Handbook of Japanese linguistics*, Blackwell, pp.269-296.

Pearson, H. (to appear). Attitude Verbs. In Matthewson, L. et al. eds., *Companion to semantics*. Wiley.

Plann, S. 1982. Indirect questions in Spanish. *Linguistic inquiry* 13:297–312.

Rivero, M.-L. 1980. On left-dislocation and topicalization in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 11:363–393.

Rizzi, L. & I. Roberts. 1989. Complex inversion in French. *Probus* 1:1–30.

Stephenson, T. 2007. *Towards a theory of subjective meaning.* PhD diss., MIT.

Yasui, M. 2014. Innocuousness of {XP, YP} as a root clause in Japanese and English. *MITWPL 73 (FAJL 7)*: 277-288.

Extra data

Pseudo-clefts in English

What John bought is this.   This is what John bought.

[A student reports the reason for her absence to her teacher]

(1)   Kaze-o   hiki-**mas**-ita.   Ame-ni nure-ta   **no-desu**.   (Kuno 1973:144)

     cold-ACC catch-POL-PAST   rain-by get.wet-PAST NO DA.POL

     'I caught a cold. (It is because) I got wet in the rain.'

(2) [Noticing some sound outside]

    Ame-ga futteiru no-desu

    rain-NOM faling NO DA.POL   'It is raining.'

Empty topic

(1) → Sore-wa ame-ni nure-ta   no-desu.

       It-TOP   rain-by get.wet-PAST NO DA.POL   'It was (because) I got wet in the rain.'

(2) → Are-wa   ame-ga   futteiru no-desu   'That (sound) is the falling of rain.'

     that-TOP rain-NOM faling   NO DA.POL

The *no-da* construction falls under **the topic construction** (Maki et al. 1999)