

Embedded root phenomena, assertion, presupposition, and main point of utterance

Kristine Bentzen
University of Tromsø

Root Phenomena
ZAS Berlin, September 2-4, 2009

Main claims of this talk:

1. The assertion/presupposition distinction is not crucial for the availability of embedded root phenomena.
2. The potential independent communicative contribution of the clause is relevant for whether syntactic root phenomena are available or not.
3. (Embedded) syntactic root phenomena in themselves do not have, are driven by, or lead to any particular illocutionary force of the clause they occur in.

1 Introduction

- Since Hooper and Thompson (1973) (H&T) it has been well-known that root phenomena are allowed in certain embedded (non-root) contexts.
- H&T looked at root phenomena in complements of 5 types of predicates:
 - (i) Class A: Strongly assertive predicates: *say, report, exclaim*
 - (ii) Class B: Weakly assertive predicates: *suppose, believe, expect*
 - (iii) Class C: Non-assertive predicates: *doubt, deny, be (im)possible*
 - (iv) Class D: Factive predicates: *regret, be sorry, bother*
 - (v) Class E: Semi-factive predicates: *realize, find out, discover*

... and found that complements of class A, B and E predicates allow root phenomena (e.g. VP-preposing), while complements of class C and D predicates don't, (1) (from H&T: 474-480):

- (1)
 - a. Sally plans for Gary to marry her, and he **vows** that marry her he will.
 - b. I **expect** that speaking at today's luncheon will be our congressman.
 - c. *Sally plans for Gary to marry her and **it's possible** that marry her he will.
 - d. *Sally plans for Gary to marry her, and it **bothers** me that marry her he will.
 - e. Sally plans for Gary to marry her, and he **recognizes** that, whether he likes it or not, marry her he will.

- H&T proposed a link between assertion and (embedded) root phenomena, formulated as ‘The Assertion Hypothesis’ in Wiklund et al. (to appear):

The Assertion Hypothesis:

The more asserted (the less presupposed) the complements is, the more compatible it is with V2 (and other root phenomena).

- This proposed link has been discussed, assumed or argued for by several subsequent authors. (cf. Andersson 1975, Green 1976, Wechsler 1991, Holmberg and Platzack 1995, Meinunger 2004; 2006, Julien 2007; 2009, among many others; see also Heycock 2006 for an overview).

⇒ BUT, there’s a problem here:

Complements of class E predicates – the semi-factive class – are presupposed but still allow root phenomena.

- **My claim:** The assertion/presupposition distinction is not the decisive factor for the availability of embedded root phenomena. Rather,

↔ The potential independent communicative contribution of the clause determines whether it allows embedded root phenomena or not (cf. Wiklund et al. to appear).

↔ Root phenomena in themselves do not have, are driven by, or lead to any specific illocutionary force of the clause they are contained in.

- Outline:

Section 2: On the notions *assertion* and *presupposition*.

Section 3: Embedded V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses.

Section 4: Root phenomena in other embedded clauses in Norwegian and English.

Section 5: Some consequences and open questions.

2 Preliminary notes on *assertion* and *presupposition*

- Traditional view:

↔ Presupposed clauses contain ‘old information.’

↔ Asserted clauses contain ‘new information.’

- However, this issue is not that straightforward!

↔ Presuppositions don’t always consist of old information.

↔ Assertions don’t always provide new information.

2.1 What does it mean to be presupposed?

- The notion presupposition may either be rooted in pragmatics or semantics (or both).
- Stalnaker (1978:321): “Presuppositions are what is taken by the speaker to be the COMMON GROUND of the participants in the conversation, what is treated as their COMMON KNOWLEDGE or MUTUAL KNOWLEDGE.”

- Simons (2006:16): “(...) a presupposition may be either old or new information; but if it is new information, then (...) it should be uncontroversial” (cf. also e.g. Simons 2007, von Stechow 2008, Roberts et al. 2009).

↔ Accommodation: The hearer recognizes that the speaker has presupposed something as if it was common ground, and adjusts *his* common ground accordingly (cf. among many others Stalnaker 2002; 2008 on this).

↔ Simons (2003): If the hearer finds the speaker reliable, he may add the speaker’s proposition (with its presuppositions) to his own set of beliefs, and to what he takes to be common ground, (2) (from Simons 2003:258):

(2) *Ann to Bud:*

I have to take my Rottweiler to the vet.

Ann presupposes that she has a Rottweiler.

- Abbott (2008): But how are presuppositions different from assertions then...?
- Hooper and Thompson (1973:487): “(...) in a clear case of presupposition, the truth of the presupposed clause *is* a necessary condition for the truth or falsity of the whole sentence.”
- Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970): The truth value of a presupposed complement survives if the matrix predicate is negated.
- Hooper (1975:117): Presupposed complements are “implied by the entire sentence, and their truth remains constant under negation in the main clause.”
- von Stechow (2008:138): “(...) there is a presuppositional component of meaning hardwired in the semantics of particular expressions.”
- **Here:** Employ both the ‘common ground’ and the ‘grammatical’ definition of presuppositions.

⇒ Two tests probing for presuppositions:

◇ Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970): The ‘Entailment preservation under negation’ test:

↔ If the matrix predicate presupposes the existence of the event in the embedded clause, the entailment relation should not be altered by the presence of sentential negation in the matrix clause.

↔ If both (3a) and (3b) entail (3c), *be sorry* embeds a presupposed complement.

- (3)
- a. Bill is sorry that it is raining.
 - b. Bill isn’t sorry that it is raining.
 - c. It is raining.

◇ von Stechow (2004): The ‘Hey, wait a minute’ test for identifying presuppositions:

↔ The hearer may complain or express surprise if the speaker has uttered something containing a fact – a presupposition – that was not already established before the speaker’s utterance.

↔ Such complaints or expressions of surprise cannot be made about assertions, (4).

- ↔ (5): Modified test, making it even clearer that the complaint/surprise concerns a presupposition.
- (4) A: The mathematician who proved Goldbach's Conjecture was a woman.
B: Hey, wait a minute. I had no idea that someone proved Goldbach's Conjecture.
B': #Hey, wait a minute. I had no idea that that was a woman.
- (5) A: The mathematician who proved Goldbach's Conjecture was a woman.
B: Hey, wait a minute. It seems like you are taking it for granted that someone proved Goldbach's Conjecture.
B': #Hey, wait a minute. It seems like you are taking it for granted that that was a woman.

2.2 What does it mean to be asserted?

- Stalnaker (1978:323): "(...) the essential effect of an assertion is to change the presuppositions of the participants in the conversation by adding the content of what is asserted to what is presupposed."
- Abbott (2008): But assertions don't always provide new information, see (6) (from Abbott 2008:533):

(6) a. Linguistics is a science – I need hardly remind this group of that!
b. You have a dentist appointment next Tuesday.
c. We all know that Bill will never come clean on this.
- Julien (2007; 2009): A clause may be both asserted and presupposed at the same time.
 - ↔ If the speaker presents a proposition as new information or as a reminder, the speaker can assert this proposition, even if the proposition is presupposed by its matrix predicate.
 - ↔ Although the proposition is presupposed to the speaker, it may be presented to the hearer as an assertion – new information.
 - ↔ Accommodation on the part of the hearer is required to include this piece of information in the common ground.
- Similarly in Hooper (1975:117): "I must say that either presupposition needs to be re-defined to exclude this weaker type of presupposition, or we must admit that weakly presupposed propositions may also be asserted."
- So, how do we distinguish 'asserted old information' from so-called 'informative presuppositions' (presupposing new information)... ?
- Hooper and Thompson (1973:473) has a two-folded definition of assertion:
 - ↔ "The assertion of a sentence is its core meaning or main proposition."
 - ↔ "The assertion of a sentence may be identified as that part which can be negated or questioned (...)."

- **Here:** It is the definition of assertion that needs to be re(de)finéd!

- ↔ The proposition which can be questioned or denied must be distinguished from the ‘core meaning/main proposition.’
- ↔ Only the former corresponds to ‘assertions.’
- ↔ The latter is a different notion independent of assertion/presupposition, concerning the proposition’s *illocutionary force*.

⇒ Two tests probing for assertions (in the strict sense assumed here):
(modified versions of tests used in Wiklund et al. to appear, inspired by H&T)

- ◇ Can the clause be denied (by the speaker or the hearer)? If yes, then it is asserted (and not presupposed):

- ↔ Denied by the speaker, (7).
- ↔ Denied by the hearer, (8).

(7) They said that he read the blog every day, but he didn’t.

(8) A₁: They said that the boys read the blog every day.
B: But that isn’t true! (i) They didn’t say that. (ii) They didn’t read the blog every day.
A₂: I know.

- ◇ Can the clause be questioned? If yes, then it is asserted (and not presupposed):

- ↔ Potentially ambiguous question response, (9).

(9) A₁: They said that the boys read the blog every day.
B: Did they? (i) Did they say that? (ii) Did they read the blog every day?
A₂: I don’t know.

2.3 The main point of the utterance

- The main point of an utterance (‘main assertion’) is not necessarily an assertion.
- Hooper (1975:97): “I have been using the term ASSERTION to mean a declarative proposition or a claim to truth that, on at least one reading, may be taken as the semantically dominant proposition in the discourse.”
- Abbott (2000:1431): “(...) what is asserted is what is presented as the main point of the utterance - what the speaker is going on record as contributing to the discourse.”
- Simons (2007): Assertion vs. main point of the utterance (MPU):
 - ↔ “The main point of an utterance U of a declarative sentence S is the proposition *p*, communicated by U, which renders U relevant” (p. 1035).
 - ↔ “I deny that this main point content is asserted” (p. 1041).

- Question/response sequences as a diagnostic for main point content, (10) (Simons 2007:1041):

- ↔ The MPU in B's reply is the embedded clause.
- ↔ Response Ca rejects this MPU as an explanation, but doesn't reject B's utterance as a whole.
- ↔ Response Cb is a denial of B's claim about what Henry thinks.
- ↔ Simons: "So, even though B's main point is that Louise (might) have left town, her utterance commits her to the proposition that Henry thinks this. This is the kind of commitment which accompanies assertion. Thus, what is asserted is different from the main point content."

- (10) A: Why isn't Louise coming to our meeting these days?
B: Henry thinks that she's left town.
C: a. But she hasn't. I saw her yesterday in the supermarket.
b. No he doesn't. He told me he saw her yesterday in the supermarket.

◇ The MPU test:

- ↔ Can the intended answer to a question be contained in the embedded clause?
- ↔ If yes, then the embedded clause may constitute the Main Point of the Utterance (MPU).

3 Embedded V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses

*** Most of this section is based on joint work, cf. Wiklund et al. (to appear) ***

- Following H&T's 5 predicate classes, Wiklund et al. (to appear) investigated the availability of V2 in *that*-clauses in Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish.
 - ↔ Non-subject topicalization with subject-verb inversion.
 - ↔ The word order V-Neg (in Norwegian and Swedish).
- Our results correspond to what H&T found for English:
 - ↔ Class A, B, and E predicates allow complements with embedded V2.
 - ↔ Class C and D predicates disallow complements with embedded V2.

(11) Class A: Strongly asserted complement:

- a. Han sa at **denne sangen** kunne han synge i bryllupet. (Norwegian)
he said that this song-the could he sing in wedding-the
'He said that this song, he couldn't sing in the wedding.'
- b. Han sa at han **kunne ikke** synge i bryllupet.
he said that he could not sing in wedding-the
'He said that he couldn't sing this song in the wedding.'

(12) Class B: Weakly asserted complement:

- a. Han trodde at **denne filmen** hadde vi ikke sett.
he believed that this film-the had we not seen
'He believed that this film, we hadn't seen.'

- b. Han trodde at vi **hadde ikke** sett denne filmen.
he believed that we had not seen this film-the
'He believed that we hadn't seen this film.'
- (13) Class C: Non-asserted complements:
- a. *Han tvilte på at **denne mannen** hadde hun ikke møtt.
he doubted on that this man-the had she not met
'*He doubted that this man, she had not met.'
- b. *Han tvilte på at hun **hadde ikke** møtt denne mannen.
he doubted on that she had not met this man-the
'He doubted that she hadn't met this man.'
- (14) Class D: Factive complements:
- a. *Han angret på at **denne sangen** hadde han ikke sunget.
he regretted on that this song-the had he not sung
'*He regretted that this song, he hadn't sung in the wedding.'
- b. *Han angret på at han **hadde ikke** sunget.
he regretted on that he had not sung
'He regretted that he hadn't sung.'
- (15) Class E: Semi-factive complements:
- a. Jeg oppdaget at **denne boka** hadde jeg ikke lest.
I discovered that this book-the had I not read
'I discovered that this book, I hadn't read.'
- b. Jeg oppdaget at jeg **hadde ikke** lest den.
I discovered that I had not read it
'I discovered that I hadn't read this book.'
- (11)-(14) are in line with The Assertion Hypothesis, but (15) is problematic:
Semi-factive complements are presupposed, and should disallow root phenomena.

3.1 Attempted explanation 1: Semi-factives are not presupposed

⇒ Semi-factive complements displaying root phenomena are not actually factive/presupposed.

- Karttunen (1971): Semi-factives may lose their factivity in certain contexts (in questions, under modals, embedded in the antecedent of a conditional), e.g. (16) (from Karttunen 1971:64).
- (16) a. If I regret later that I have not told the truth, I will confess it to everyone.
b. If I realize later that I have not told the truth, I will confess it to everyone.

- BUT, (15) does not correspond to any of these contexts.

- Let's apply the two presupposition tests...

◇ Entailment preservation under negation:

↔ A presupposed complement should still be entailed when the matrix predicate is negated.

- (17) Entailment preservation under negation with a factive predicate:
- De var overrasket over at han leste den bloggen hver dag.
they were surprised over that he read that blog-the every day
'They were surprised that he read that blog every day.'
 - De var faktisk **ikke** overrasket over at han leste den bloggen hver dag.
they were actually not surprised over that he read that blog-the every day
'They were actually not surprised that he read that blog every day.'
 - Han leste den bloggen hver dag.
he read that blog-the every day
'He read that blog every day.'
→ Both a. and b. entail c.
- (18) Entailment preservation under negation with a semi-factive predicate (topicalization):
- Vi innså at **den bloggen** leste han hver dag.
we realized that that blog-the read he every day
'We realized that that blog, he read every day.'
 - Vi innså faktisk **ikke** at **den bloggen** leste han hver dag.
we realized actually not that that blog-the read he every day
'We actually didn't realized that that blog, he read every day.'
 - Den bloggen leste han hver dag.
that blog-the read he every day
'That blog he read every day.'
→ Both a. and b. entail c.
- (19) Entailment preservation under negation with a semi-factive predicate (V–Neg vs. Neg–V):
- Vi innså faktisk **ikke** at han **ikke leste** den bloggen hver dag.
we realized actually not that he not read that blog-the every day
 - Vi innså faktisk **ikke** at han **leste ikke** den bloggen hver dag.
we realized actually not that he read not that blog-the every day
'We actually didn't realized that he didn't read that blog every day.'
 - Han leste ikke den bloggen hver dag.
he read not that blog-the every day
'He didn't read that blog every day.'
→ Both a. and b. entail c.
- (20) No entailment preservation with an assertive predicate:
- Vi sa at **den bloggen** leste han hver dag.
we said that that blog-the read he every day
'We said that that blog, he read every day.'
 - Vi sa faktisk **ikke** at **den bloggen** leste han hver dag.
we said actually not that that blog-the read he every day
'We actually didn't say that that blog, he read every day.'
 - Den bloggen leste han hver dag.
that blog-the read he every day
'That blog, he read every day.'
→ Neither a. nor b. entail c.
- (21) No entailment preservation with a non-assertive predicate:
- Vi tvilte på at han leste den bloggen hver dag.
we doubted on that he read that blog-the every day
'We doubted that he read that blog every day.'

- b. Vi tvilte faktisk **ikke** på at han leste den bloggen hver dag.
we doubted actually not on that he read that blog-the every day
'We actually didn't doubt that he read that blog every day.'
- c. Den bloggen leste han hver dag.
that blog-the read he every day
'That blog, he read every day.'
→ Neither a. nor b. entail c.

♣ Semi-factive complements are entailed (and thus presupposed) even in contexts where they (potentially) display V2.

◇ 'Hey, wait a minute':

↔ This hearer response is only appropriate when a presupposition has been made.

(22) Factive complement:

- A: Det er interessant at han er på Facebook.
it is interesting that he is on Facebook
'It is interesting that he is on Facebook.'
- B: Hei, vent nå litt. Det virker som du tar for gitt at han er på Facebook.
hey wait now little it seems like you take for given that he is on Facebook
'Hey, wait a minute. It seems that you are taking it for granted that he is on Facebook.'

(23) Semi-factive complement:

- A: De oppdaget at han var på Facebook.
they discovered that he was on Facebook
'They discovered that he was on Facebook.'
 - B: Hei, vent nå litt. Det virker som du tar for gitt at han er på Facebook.
hey wait now little it seems like you take for given that he is on Facebook
'Hey, wait a minute. It seems that you are taking it for granted that he is on Facebook.'
- OR:
- A: De oppdaget at han **var ikke** på Facebook.
they discovered that he was not on Facebook
'They discovered that he wasn't on Facebook.'
 - B: Hei, vent nå litt. Det virker som du tar for gitt at han ikke er på Facebook.
hey wait now little it seems like you take for given that he not is on Facebook
'Hey, wait a minute. It seems that you are taking it for granted that he isn't on Facebook.'

(24) Asserted complement:

- A: De påstod at han var på Facebook.
they claimed that he was on Facebook
'They claimed that he was on Facebook.'
 - B: #Hei, vent nå litt. Det virker som du tar for gitt at han er på Facebook.
hey wait now little it seems like you take for given that he is on Facebook
'Hey, wait a minute. It seems that you are taking it for granted that he is on Facebook.'
- OR:
- A: De påstod at han **var ikke** på Facebook.
they claimed that he was not on Facebook
'They claimed that he wasn't on Facebook.'
 - B: #Hei, vent nå litt. Det virker som du tar for gitt at han ikke er på Facebook.
hey wait now little it seems like you take for given that he not is on Facebook
'Hey, wait a minute. It seems that you are taking it for granted that he isn't on Facebook.'

(25) Non-asserted complement:

A: Det er mulig at han var på Facebook.

it is possible that he was on Facebook

‘It is possible that he was on Facebook.’

B: #Hei, vent nå litt. Det virker som du tar for gitt at han er på Facebook.

hey wait now little it seems like you take for given that he is on Facebook

#‘Hey, wait a minute. It seems that you are taking it for granted that he is on Facebook.’

- ♣ The hearer may oppose to a semi-factive complement in the same way as he may oppose to a factive complement – both are uttered as presuppositions the hearer did not share.

⇒ Semi-factive complements are entailed and presupposed in the relevant contexts.

⇒ The availability of root phenomena in semi-factive (class E) complements is not due to a lack of entailment or presupposition in these complements.

3.2 Attempted explanation 2: Semi-factives are asserted

⇒ Semi-factive complements may somehow be both presupposed and asserted simultaneously.

- Hooper and Thompson (1973:481): “(...) semifactive verbs (...) have at least one reading on which they are in fact assertions” (cf. also Julien 2007; 2009).

(... but this is what they call *main assertion*... we’ll return to this)

- Let’s apply the two assertion tests...

◇ An assertion may be denied.

↔ If the content in the complement clause can be denied, then the clause is asserted.

(26) a. **Asserted complement:**

De sa at han leste bloggen hver dag, men det gjorde han ikke.

they said that he read blog-the every day but that did he not

‘They said that he read the blog every day, but he didn’t.’

b. **Non-asserted complement:**

Det er (u)mulig at han leste bloggen hver dag, # men det gjorde han ikke.

it is (im)possible that he read blog-the every day but that did he not

‘It is (im)possible that he read the blog every day, # but he didn’t.’

c. **Factive complement:**

Det var overraskende at han leste bloggen hver dag, # men det gjorde han ikke.

it was surprising that he read blog-the every day but that did he not

‘It was surprising that he read the blog every day, # but he didn’t.’

d. **Semi-factive complement:**

De innså at han leste bloggen hver dag, # men det gjorde han ikke.

they realized that he read blog-the every day but that did he not

‘They realized that he read the blog every day, # but he didn’t.’

- The speaker may deny the content uttered in the asserted complement, (26a), but not that uttered in the semi-factive complement, (26d).

↔ The semi-factive complement patterns with the non-asserted and the factive complements in (26b)-(26c).

- This holds true regardless of whether the embedded clause displays V2 or not:
 - ↔ Asserted complements can be denied also when they are non-V2, (27a).
 - ↔ Semi-factive complements cannot be denied even when they are V2, (27b).

(27) a. **Asserted complement without V2:**

De sa at han **ikke leste** den bloggen hver dag, men det gjorde han.
they said that he not read that blog-the every day but that did he
'They said that he didn't read that blog every day, but he did.'

b. **Semi-factive complement with V2:**

De innså at **den bloggen** leste han hver dag, # men det gjorde han ikke.
they realized that that blog-the read he every day but that did he not
'They realized that that blog, he read every day, # but he didn't.'

- Julien (2007; 2009): It is infelicitous for the speaker to deny a (direct) assertion that he himself has just uttered.
- So, let's have someone else deny it...
 - ↔ In (28), speaker B may be denying the truth of either the matrix clause ('They didn't say that') or the embedded clause ('The boys didn't read the blog').
 - ↔ In (29)-(31), B can only be denying the truth of the matrix clause.
 - ↔ Support: A's response in A₂ is only felicitous if B has denied the truth of the embedded clause, unless A's intention is to immediately admit to B that all of A₁ was a blunt lie!

(28) **Asserted complement:**

A₁: De sa at guttene leste bloggen hver dag.
they said that boys-the read blog-the every day
'They said that the boys read the blog every day.'

B: Men det er jo ikke sant!
but that is indeed not true
'But that isn't true!' (i) They didn't say that. (ii) They didn't read it.

A₂: Jeg vet det.
I know it
'I know.'

(29) **Non-asserted complement:**

A₁: Det er mulig at guttene leste bloggen hver dag.
it is possible that boys-the read blog-the every day
'It is possible that the boys read the blog every day.'

B: Men det er jo ikke sant!
but that is indeed not true
'But that isn't true!' (i) It isn't possible. (ii) #They didn't read it.

A₂: #Jeg vet det.
I know it
'I know.'

(30) **Factive complement:**

A₁: De virket overrasket over at guttene leste bloggen hver dag.
they seemed surprised over that boys-the read blog-the every day
'They seemed surprised that the boys read the blog every day.'

B: Men det er jo ikke sant!
but that is indeed not true
'But that isn't true!' (i) They didn't seem surprised. (ii) #They didn't read it.

A₂: #Jeg vet det.
I know it
#'I know.'

(31) **Semi-factive complement:**

A₁: De innså at guttene leste bloggen hver dag.
they realized that boys-the read blog-the every day
'They realized that the boys read the blog every day.'

B: Men det er jo ikke sant!
but that is indeed not true
'But that isn't true!' (i) They didn't realize that. (ii) #They didn't read it.

A₂: #Jeg vet det.
I know it
#'I know.'

- This holds true regardless of whether the embedded clause displays V2 or not:
 - ↔ Asserted complements can be denied also when they are non-V2, (32).
 - ↔ Semi-factive complements cannot be denied even when they are V2, (33).

(32) **Asserted complement without V2:**

A₁: De sa at guttene **ikke leste** bloggen hver dag.
they said that boys-the not read blog-the every day
'They said that the boys didn't read the blog every day.'

B: Men det er jo ikke sant!
but that is indeed not true
'But that isn't true!' (i) They didn't say that. (ii) They read it.

A₂: Jeg vet det.
I know it
'I know.'

(33) **Semi-factive complement with V2:**

A₁: De innså at **den bloggen** leste guttene hver dag.
they realized that that blog-the read boys-the every day
'They realized that that blog, the boys read every day.'

B: Men det er jo ikke sant!
but that is indeed not true
'But that isn't true!' (i) They didn't realize that. (ii) #They didn't read it.

A₂: #Jeg vet det.
I know it
#'I know.'

- ♣ Semi-factive complements, like non-asserted and factive complements, may not be denied (neither by the speaker himself nor by the hearer).

◇ An assertion may be questioned.¹

- ↪ If the content in the complement clause can be questioned, then the clause is asserted.
- ↪ In (34), speaker B may be questioning the truth of either the matrix clause ('Did they say that?') or the embedded clause ('Did the boys read the blog'), but in (35)-(37), B can only be denying the truth of the matrix clause.
- ↪ Support: Again, A's response in A₂ is only felicitous if B has denied the truth of the embedded clause, otherwise this is a completely absurd response; A would be unsure about whether he said what he just said.

(34) **Asserted complement:**

- A₁: De sa at jentene spilte Xbox hele dagen.
they said that girls-the played Xbox whole day-the
'They said that the girls played Xbox all day.'
- B: Gjorde de det?
did they that
'Did they?' (i) Did they say that? (ii) Did they play all day?
- A₂: Jeg vet ikke.
I know not
'I don't know.'

(35) **Non-asserted complement:**

- A₁: De tvilte på at jentene spilte Xbox hele dagen.
they doubted on that girls-the played Xbox whole day-the
'They doubted that the girls played Xbox all day.'
- B: Gjorde de det?
did they that
'Did they?' (i) Did they doubt it? (ii) # Did they play all day?
- A₂: #Jeg vet ikke.
I know not
'#I don't know.'

(36) **Factive complement:**

- A₁: De virket overrasket over at jentene spilte Xbox hele dagen.
they seemed surprised over that girls-the played Xbox whole day-the
'They seemed surprised that the girls played Xbox all day.'
- B: Gjorde de det?
did they that
'Did they?' (i) Did they seem surprised? (ii) # Did they play all day?
- A₂: #Jeg vet ikke.
I know not
'#I don't know.'

(37) **Semi-factive complement:**

- A₁: De innså at jentene spilte Xbox hele dagen.
they realized that girls-the played Xbox whole day-the
'They realized that the girls played Xbox all day.'
- B: Gjorde de det?
did they that
'Did they?' (i) Did they realize that? (ii) # Did they play all day?

¹Thanks to Madeleine Halmø for her judgments on these and similar dialogues.

A₂: #Jeg vet ikke.
I know not
#‘I don’t know.’

- Complements of class A (and B), which are assertions, may be questioned or denied.
- Semi-factive complements of class E pattern with complements of class C and D in that they cannot be questioned or denied.
- Again, the pattern holds regardless of whether the embedded clause displays V2 or not:
 - ↪ Asserted complements can be denied also when they are non-V2, (38).
 - ↪ Semi-factive complements cannot be denied even when they are V2, (39).

(38) **Asserted complement without V2:**

A₁: De sa ikke at jentene **ikke spilte** Xbox hele dagen.
they said not that girls-the not played Xbox whole day-the
‘They didn’t say that the girls didn’t play Xbox all day.’

B: Gjorde de ikke det?
did they not that
‘Did they?’

(i) Didn’t they say that? (ii) Didn’t they play all day?

A₂: Jeg vet ikke.
I know not
‘I don’t know.’

(39) **Semi-factive complement with V2:**

A₁: De innså at **Xbox** spilte jentene hele dagen.
they realized that Xbox played girls-the whole day-the
‘They realized that Xbox, the girls played all day.’

B: Gjorde de det?
did they that
‘Did they?’

(i) Did they realize that? (ii) # Did they play all day?

A₂: #Jeg vet ikke.
I know not
#‘I don’t know.’

- ♣ Semi-factive complements, like non-asserted and factive complements, may not be questioned.

⇒ Semi-factive complements are *not* assertions in the sense of being a proposition that can be questioned or denied.

⇒ The availability of root phenomena in semi-factive complements is not due to these complements being simultaneously presupposed and asserted.

3.3 Attempted explanation 3: Semi-factives may constitute the MPU

⇒ The availability of root phenomena is linked to the notion of ‘Main Point of the Utterance.’

- Simons (2007): The intended answer to a question – the MPU – may in certain contexts be contained in an embedded clause.

- Which predicate classes allow their complements to behave this way?
- Let's apply the two MPU tests...

◇ Probing the MPU through question/answer sequences (adapted from Simons 2007):

↔ If the answer to the questions in (40)-(43) can be the content in the embedded complement, this complement may constitute the whole clause's main communicative contribution to the discourse.

↔ Class A, B, and E complements have this property; Class C and D complements don't, cf. (40), (43) vs. (41)-(42).

- (40) A: Hvorfor kom han ikke på festen?
why came he not on party-the
'Why didn't he come to the party?'
- B₁: Han hadde ikke tid.
he had not time
'He didn't have time.'
- B₂: Hun sa at **han hadde ikke tid.**
she said that he had not time
'She said that he didn't have time.'
- (41) A: Hvorfor må han i fengsel?
why must he in jail
'Why did he have to go to jail?'
- B₁: Han hadde ikke betalt skatt.
he had not paid taxes
'He hadn't paid taxes.'
- B₂: #Han benektet at **han ikke hadde betalt skatt.**
he denied that he not had paid taxes
'He denied that he hadn't paid taxes.'
- (42) A: Hvorfor kjøpte du ikke noe på salget?
why bought you not anything on sale-the
'Why didn't you buy anything on the sale?'
- B₁: Jeg hadde brukt opp alle pengene før jul.
I had used up all money-the before Christmas
'I had spent all my money before Christmas.'
- B₂: #Jeg angret på at **jeg hadde brukt opp alle pengene før jul.**
I regretted on that I had used up all money-the before Christmas
'I regretted that I had spent all my money before Christmas.'
- (43) A: Hvorfor kom han ikke på møtet igår?
why came he not on meeting-the yesterday
'Why didn't he come to the meeting yesterday?'
- B₁: Han hadde ikke fått på vinterdekkene ennå.
he had not got on winter.tires-the yet
'He hadn't changed to winter tires yet.'
- B₂: Vi oppdaget at **han hadde ikke fått på vinterdekkene ennå.**
we discovered that he had not got on winter.tires-the yet
'We discovered that he hadn't changed to winter tires yet.'

- The pattern holds regardless of whether the embedded clause displays V2 or not:

↔ Asserted complements without V2 may be MPU, (44).

↔ Semi-factive complements without V2 may be MPU, (45).

(44) **Asserted complement without V2 as MPU:**

A: Hvorfor kom han ikke på festen?
why came he not on party-the

B₁: Han hadde ikke tid.
he had not time

B₂: Hun sa at **han ikke hadde tid.**
she said that he not had time

(45) **Semi-factive complement without V2 as MPU:**

A: Hvorfor kom han ikke på møtet igår?
why didn't he come on meeting-the yesterday

B₁: Han hadde ikke fått på vinterdekkene ennå.
he had not got on winter.tires-the yet

B₂: Vi oppdaget at **han ikke hadde fått på vinterdekkene ennå.**
we discovered that he not had got on winter.tires-the yet

- ♣ Semi-factive complements with or without V2 word order may constitute the MPU, just like asserted complements may.

⇒ Clauses that may constitute MPU correspond to clauses that may display root phenomena, namely complements of Class A, B, and E predicates.

Summing up on root phenomena in *that*-clauses:

- Both asserted and semi-factive complements may show embedded root phenomena.
- Semi-factive complements are presupposed and not asserted, also when displaying root phenomena.
- Assertion vs. Presupposition is not crucial for the distribution of root phenomena in *that*-clauses.
- The availability of an MPU reading appears to be relevant for the availability of syntactic root phenomena.

4 Root phenomena in other embedded clauses

- Haegeman (2006a) (and much previous/subsequent work):² Central vs. peripheral adverbial clauses.

↔ Central adverbial clauses:

Are closely integrated in the matrix clause they occur in.

Don't allow argument fronting or epistemic modality expressions, (46).

²See e.g. Haegeman 2006b; 2007; 2009; to appear.

↔ Peripheral adverbial clauses:

Express propositions that may be processed as part of the discourse.

Allow argument fronting and epistemic modality expressions, (47).

(From Haegeman 2006a:30,33)

- (46) a. *While **this book** Mary was writing this time last year, her children were staying with her mother.
b. ??John works best while his children are **probably/might** be asleep.
- (47) a. His face not many admired, while **his character** still fewer felt they could praise.
b. The ferry will be fairly cheap, while the plane **may/will probably** be too expensive.

• **Here:** Various root phenomena tested in various Norwegian and English adverbial clauses:³

(i) Non-subject topicalization (arguments/adjuncts), in Norwegian with S-V inversion.

(ii) The word order V-Neg.

(iii) Epistemic expressions.

(iv) Evidential markers.

• Norwegian and English adverbial clauses disallowing root phenomena:

↔ Central temporal adverbial clauses: *(i)mens* ‘while,’ (48).

↔ Central cause clauses: *fordi* ‘because,’ (49).

↔ Purpose clauses: *sånn/for at* ‘so that,’ (50).

↔ Concessive clauses: *selv om/enda* ‘although,’ (51a)-(51b); also adversative concessive clauses are bad in English, (51c).

↔ *Just as*-clauses: *samtidig som* ‘just as,’ (52).

↔ *Until*-clauses: *(inn)til* ‘until,’ (53).

↔ Conditional clauses: *hvis* ‘if,’ (54); peripheral conditional clauses are only degraded in English, (55).

- (48) a. *Foreldrene jobber best (i)mens **i stua** sover barna deres.
parents-the work best while in living.room-the sleep children-the their
b. ??The parents work best while **in the living-room** their children are sleeping.
- (49) a. *Han syklet ikke fordi han **nok** hadde kræsjet bilen, men fordi han ville ha
he biked not because he EVID had crashed car-the but because he wanted have
litt morsjon.
some exercise
b. ??He didn’t bike because he had **apparently** crashed his car, but because he wanted some exercise.
- (50) a. *Han gjemte boka mi sånn at jeg **skulle ikke** få gjort leksene mine.
he hid book-the my so that I should not get done homework-the my
b. *He hid my book so that **my home work** I wouldn’t be able to do.

³Thanks to Peter Svenonius and Gillian Ramchand for suggestions and judgments regarding the English examples.

- (51) a. *Hun bestod eksamen selv om hun **hadde ikke** lest pensum.
she passed exam-the even though she had not read syllabus
 b. *She passed the exam even though **the syllabus** she hadn't read.
 c. *She passed the exam, though **top marks** she didn't get.
- (52) a. *Jeg forlot klubben samtidig som **noen av fansen** inviterte Nick Cave inn i bussen.
I left club-the simultaneously as some of fans-the invited Nick Cave in in bus-the
 b. *I left the club just as **some of the fans** Nick Cave invited onto the bus.
- (53) a. *Han stabled opp fatene til **vasken** dekket de helt.
he piled up plates-the until sink-the covered they completely
 b. *He piled up the plates until **the sink** they covered up completely.
- (54) a. *Søstra mi blir veldig lettet hvis Siv Jensen **vinner ikke** valget i høst.
sister-the my becomes very relieved if Siv Jensen wins not election-the in fall
 b. *My sister gets very disappointed if **this fall's election** Siv Jensen wins.
- (55) a. *Hvorfor kjøper du blåbær hvis **jordbær** liker alle bedre?
why buy you blueberries if strawberries likes everyone better
 b. ?Why are you buying blueberries if **strawberries** everybody likes better?

• Norwegian and English adverbial clauses allowing root phenomena:

- ↪ Peripheral temporal adverbial clauses: *mens* 'while,' (56), (57).
 ↪ Peripheral cause clauses: *fordi* 'because,' (58).
 ↪ Consequence clauses: *sånn at* 'so,' (59).
 ↪ Adversative concessive clauses in Norwegian: *skjønt* 'although,' (60).

- (56) a. Foreldrene jobber, mens **i stua** sover barna deres.
parents-the work while in living.room-the sleep children-the their
 b. The parents are working, while **in the living-room** their children are sleeping.
- (57) a. Foreldrene jobber, mens barna deres **sannsynligvis** sover i stua.
parents-the work while children-the their probably sleep in living.room-the
 b. The parents are working, while their children are **probably** sleeping in the living-room.
- (58) a. Han syklet ikke, fordi han **nok** heller ville kjøre den nye bilen sin.
he biked not because he EVID rather would drive the new car-the REFL
 b. He didn't bike, because he **evidently** would rather drive his new car.
- (59) a. Han gjemte boka mi, sånn at jeg **kunne ikke** gjøre alle leksene mine.
he hid book-the my so that I could not do all homework-the my
 'He hid my book, so I couldn't do all my homework.'
 b. He hid my book so **some of my homework** I haven't been able to do.
- (60) a. Hun bestod eksamen, **skjønt noen toppkarakterer** fikk hun ikke akkurat.
she passed exam-the though any top.marks got she not really
 'She passed the exam though she didn't exactly get top marks.'
 b. Han kom på festen, **skjønt han snakket ikke** med noen.
he came on party-the though he talked not with anyone
 'He came to the party though he didn't talk to anyone.'

• Is there a link between any notion of assertion and the distribution of root phenomena in adverbial clauses?

4.1 Asserted? Presupposed?

- Following the Assertion Hypothesis we would expect:
 - ↔ **Asserted clauses:** Peripheral *while*-clauses, consequence *so*-clauses, peripheral *because*-clauses, and adversative *although*-clauses.
 - ↔ **Non-asserted clauses:** Central *while*-clauses, purpose *so that*-clauses, central *because*-clauses, concessive *although*-clauses, *before*-clauses, and *until*-clauses.
- Let's apply the tests again...

4.1.1 Adverbial clauses that allow root phenomena and are asserted

- Most adverbial clauses that allow root phenomena are indeed asserted:

Peripheral *while*:

◇ Entailment preservation under negation: *

- (61) a. John cooks on Mondays, while Jack cooks on Tuesdays.
b. John **doesn't** cook on Mondays, while Jack cooks on Tuesdays.
c. Jack cooks on Tuesdays.
Neither a. nor b. seem to entail c.

◇ Hey, wait a minute: *

- (62) A: John cooks on Mondays, while Jack cooks on Tuesdays.
B: #Hey, wait a minute. It seems like you take it for granted that Jack cooks on Tuesdays.

◇ Denying: ✓

- (63) A: John cooks on Mondays, while Jack cooks on Tuesdays.
B: But that isn't true! (i) John doesn't cook on Mondays, (while Jack cooks on Tuesdays).
(ii) Jack doesn't cook on Tuesdays.

◇ Questioning: ✓

- (64) A: John cooks on Mondays, while Jack cooks on Tuesdays.
B: Does he? (i) Does John cook on Mondays? (ii) Does Jack cook on Tuesdays?

♣ Peripheral *while* adverbial clauses are asserted, and not presupposed/entailed.

Consequence *sånn at* 'so':

◇ Entailment preservation under negation: *

- (65) a. Hun drakk whisky igår kveld sånn at hun sovnet først kl. ett.
she drank whisky yesterday evening so that she fell.asleep first clock one
'She drank whisky last night so she fell asleep as late as one in the morning.'
b. Hun drakk **ikke** whisky igår kveld sånn at hun sovnet først kl. ett.
she drank not whisky yesterday evening so that she fell.asleep first clock one
'She didn't drink whisky last night so she fell asleep as late as one in the morning.'

- c. Hun sovnet først kl. ett.
she fell.asleep first clock one
'She fell asleep as late as one in the morning.'
Neither a. nor b. seem to entail c.

◇ Hey, wait a minute: *

- (66) A: Hun drakk whisky igår kveld sånn at hun sovnet først kl. ett.
she drank whisky yesterday evening so that she fell.asleep first clock one
'She drank whisky last night so she fell asleep as late as one in the morning.'
B: #Hei, vent nå litt. Det virker som du tar for gitt at hun sovnet først kl. ett.
hey wait now little it seems like you take for given that she fell.asleep first clock one
#'Hey, wait a minute. It seems like you take it for granted that she fell asleep as late as one in the morning.'

◇ Denying: ✓

- (67) A: Hun drakk whisky igår kveld sånn at hun ikke sovnet før kl. ett.
she drank whisky yesterday evening so that she not fell.asleep before clock one
'She drank whisky last night so she fell asleep as late as one in the morning.'
B: Men det er jo ikke sant!
but that is indeed not true
'But that isn't true!' (i) She didn't drink whisky so she fell asleep as late as one.
(ii) She didn't fall asleep as late as one.

◇ Questioning: ✓

- (68) A: Hun drakk whisky igår kveld sånn at hun sovnet først kl. ett.
she drank whisky yesterday evening so that she fell.asleep first clock one
'She drank whisky last night so she fell asleep as late as one in the morning.'
B: Gjorde hun det?
did she that
'Did she?' (i) Did she drink whisky so she fell asleep as late as one?
(ii) Did she fall asleep as late as one o'clock?

♣ Consequence *so (that)* adverbial clauses are asserted, and not presupposed/entailed.

4.1.2 Adverbial clauses that disallow root phenomena and are non-asserted

- Furthermore, most adverbial clauses that don't allow root phenomena are indeed not asserted (and often also not presupposed):

Central *while*:

◇ Entailment preservation under negation: *

- (69) a. The parents work best while their children are asleep.
b. The parents **don't** work best while their children are asleep.
c. Their children are asleep.
Neither a. nor b. seem to entail c.

◇ Hey, wait a minute: *

- (70) A: The parents work best while their children are asleep.
B: #Hey, wait a minute. It seems like you take it for granted that their children are asleep.

◇ Denying: *

- (71) A: The parents work best while their children are asleep.
B: But that isn't true! (i) The parents don't work best then. (ii) #Their children are not asleep.

◇ Questioning: *

- (72) A: The parents are always working hard while their children are sleeping.
B: Are they? (i) Are the parents always working hard then? (ii) #Are their children sleeping?

♣ Central *while* adverbial clauses seem to be neither presupposed/entailed nor asserted.

Central *because*:

◇ Entailment preservation under negation: *

- (73) a. Han sykler idag fordi han har kræsjet bilen, ikke fordi han trenger morsjon.
he bikes today because he has crashed car-the not because he needs exercise
'He's biking today because he has crashed his car, not because he needs the exercise.'
b. Han sykler **ikke** idag fordi han har kræsjet bilen, men fordi han trenger morsjon.
he bikes not today because he has crashed car-the but because he needs exercise
'He isn't biking today because he has crashed his car, but because he needs the exercise.'
c. Han har kræsjet bilen.
he has crashed car-the
'He has crashed his car.'
Neither a. nor b. seem to entail c.

◇ Hey, wait a minute: *

- (74) A: Han sykler fordi han har kræsjet bilen, ikke fordi han trenger morsjon.
he bikes because he has crashed car-the not because he needs exercise
'He is biking because he has crashed his car, not because he needs the exercise.'
B: #Hei, vent nå litt. Det virker som du tar det for gitt at han har kræsjet bilen.
hey wait now little it seems like you take it for given that he has crashed car-the
#'Hey, wait a minute. It seems like you take it for granted that he has crashed his car.'

◇ Denying: *

- (75) A: Han sykler fordi han har kræsjet bilen, ikke fordi han trenger morsjon.
he bikes because he has crashed car-the not because he needs exercise
'He is biking because he has crashed his car, not because he needs the exercise.'
B: Men det er jo ikke sant!
but that is indeed not true
'But that isn't true!' (i) That's not why he is biking. (ii) #He hasn't crashed his car.

◇ Questioning: *

- (76) A: Han sykler fordi han har kræsjet bilen, ikke fordi han trenger morsjon.
he bikes because he has crashed car-the not because he needs exercise
'He is biking because he has crashed his car, not because he needs the exercise.'

- B: Gjør han det?
does he that
'Does he?' (i) Did he bike (for that reason)?
- B': #Har han det?
has he that
'Has he?' (ii) #Has he crashed his car?

♣ Central *because* adverbial clauses seem to be neither presupposed/entailed nor asserted.

4.1.3 But wait! Some adverbial clauses that disallow root phenomena are asserted...

- Two of the adverbial clauses that disallow root phenomena appear to be asserted:

***Just as*-clauses:**

◇ Entailment preservation under negation: *

- (77) a. I left the club just as Nick Cave invited some of the fans onto his bus.
b. I **didn't** leave the club just as Nick Cave invited some of the fans onto his bus.
c. Nick Cave invited some of the fans onto the bus.
Neither a. nor b. seem to entail c.

◇ Hey, wait a minute: *

- (78) A: I left the club just as Nick Cave invited some of the fans onto his bus.
B: #Hey, wait a minute. It seems like you take it for granted that Nick Cave invited some of the fans onto his bus.

◇ Denying: ✓

- (79) A: I left the club just as Nick Cave invited some of the fans onto his bus.
B: But that isn't true! (i) You didn't leave the club then. (ii) Nick Cave didn't invite fans onto his bus.

◇ Questioning: ✓

- (80) A: I left the club just as Nick Cave invited some of the fans onto his bus.
B: Did you? (i) Did you leave the club then?
B': Did he? (ii) Did he invite fans onto his bus?

♣ *Just as* adverbial clauses seem to be asserted, and not presupposed/entailed.

***Until*-clauses:**

◇ Entailment preservation under negation: *

- (81) a. Han stabet opp fatene til de dekket vasken helt.
he piled up plates-the until they covered sink-the completely
'He piled up the plates until the covered the sink completely.'
b. Han stabet **ikke** opp fatene til de dekket vasken helt.
he piled not up plates-the until they covered sink-the completely
'He didn't pile up the plates until the covered the sink completely.'

- c. De dekket vasken helt.
they covered sink-the completely
'They covered the sink completely.'
Neither a. nor b. seem to entail c.

◇ Hey, wait a minute: *

- (82) A: Han stablet opp fatene til de dekket vasken helt.
he piled up plates-the until they covered sink-the completely
'He piled up the plates until the covered the sink completely.'
- B: #Hei, vent nå litt. Det virker som du tar det for gitt at de dekket vasken helt.
hey wait now little it seems like you take it for given that they covered sink-the completely
#'Hey, wait a minute. It seems like you take it for granted that they covered the sink completely.'

◇ Denying: ✓

- (83) A: Han stablet opp fatene til de dekket vasken helt.
he piled up plates-the until they covered sink-the completely
'He piled up the plates until the covered the sink completely.'
- B: Men det er jo ikke sant!
but that is indeed not true
'But that isn't true!' (i) He didn't pile up the plates. (ii) They didn't cover the sink completely.

◇ Questioning: ✓

- (84) A: Han stablet opp fatene til de dekket vasken helt.
he piled up plates-the until they covered sink-the completely
'He piled up the plates until the covered the sink completely.'
- B: Gjorde han?
did he
'Did he?' (i) Did he pile up the plates?
- B': Gjorde de?
did they
'Did they?' (ii) Did they cover up the sink completely?

♣ *Until* adverbial clauses seem to be asserted, and not presupposed/entailed.

⇒ Adverbial clauses provide a different challenge to the Assertion Hypothesis:
Assertions don't necessarily allow root phenomena.

4.2 Root phenomena in adverbial clauses and MPU

- Is there a link between the availability of root phenomena and the availability of MPU readings in adverbial clauses?
- An MPU reading is not available in the non-asserted adverbial clauses disallowing root phenomena:

- ↔ The answer that “The children are asleep” is not available as the intended response from B₂ in (85).
↔ The answer that “She got a bad mark” is not available as the intended response from B₂ in (86).

Central *while*:

- (85) A: Why is it always so quiet at your place on Sunday mornings?
B₁: The children are asleep.
B₂: #Jon works best while **the children are asleep**.

Concessive *although*:

- (86) A: Hvorfor var foreldrene så skuffet?
why were parents-the so disappointed
‘Why were her parents so disappointed?’
B₁: Hun fikk en dårlig karakter.
she got a bad mark
‘She got a bad mark.’
B₂: #Hun bestod eksamen selv om **hun fikk en dårlig karakter**.
she passed exam-the although she got a bad mark
#‘She passed the exam although **she got a bad mark**.’

- Asserted adverbial clauses allowing root phenomena may constitute the MPU of the clause they are contained in:
 - ↔ The answer that “The children took care of the cooking” is available as the intended response from B₂ in (87).
 - ↔ The answer that “They didn’t manage to reveal his identity” is available as the intended response from B₂ in (88).

Peripheral *while*:

- (87) A: Hvorfor er det så rotete på kjøkkenet?
why is it so messy on kitchen-the
‘Why is the kitchen such a mess?’
B₁: Ungene tok seg av matlaginga.
children-the took REFL of cooking-the
‘The children took care of the cooking.’
B₂: John ryddet i stua, mens **ungene tok seg av matlaginga**.
John tidied in living.room-the while children-the took REFL of cooking-the
‘John tidied up the living room, while **the children took care of the cooking**.’

Consequence *so (that)*:

- (88) A: How did Jack win the game?
B₁: They didn’t manage to reveal his identity.
B₂: He was very careful so **they didn’t manage to reveal his identity**.

- This pattern holds true regardless of whether the *while*-clause displays V2 or not:

- (89) A: Hvorfor er det så rotete på kjøkkenet?
why is it so messy on kitchen-the
‘Why is the kitchen such a mess?’

B₁: Ungene ryddet ikke opp etter matlaginga.

children-the cleaned not up after cooking-the

‘The children didn’t clean up after the cooking.’

B₂: John ryddet opp etter seg i stua, mens **ungene ikke ryddet opp etter**

John tidied up after REFL in living.room-the while children-the not cleaned up after

matlaginga.

cooking-the

B₂': John ryddet opp etter seg i stua, mens **ungene ryddet ikke opp etter**

John tidied up after REFL in living.room-the while children-the cleaned not up after

matlaginga.

cooking-the

‘John tidied up after himself in the living room, while **the children didn’t clean up after the cooking.**’

- **But**, asserted adverbial clauses not allowing root phenomena may **not** constitute the MPU of the clause they are contained in:

↔ The answer that “He couldn’t see them any longer” is **not** available as the intended response from B₂ in (90).

↔ The answer that “Nick Cave invited some of the fans onto his bus” is **not** available as the intended response from B₂ in (91).

Until-clauses:

(90) A: Hvorfor vinket han ikke tilbake?

why waved he not back

‘Why didn’t he wave back?’

B₁: Han kunne ikke se dem lengre.

he could not see them any.longer

‘He couldn’t see them any longer.’

B₂ #Han gikk til **han ikke kunne se dem lengre.**

he walked until he not could see them any.longer

#‘He walked until **he couldn’t see them any longer.**’

Just as-clauses:

(91) A: Why didn’t John come home after the concert last night?

B₁: Nick Cave invited some of the fans onto his bus.

B₂: #I left the club just as **Nick Cave invited some of the fans onto his bus.**

⇒ Clauses that may constitute MPU correspond to clauses that may display root phenomena.

Summing up on root phenomena in adverbial clauses:

- All adverbial clauses allowing syntactic root phenomena are assertions.
- But not all asserted adverbial clauses allow syntactic root phenomena.
- It is not clear that the Assertion vs. Presupposition contrast is crucial for the distribution of root phenomena in adverbial clauses.
- The availability of an MPU reading appears relevant for the availability of syntactic root phenomena in adverbial clauses.

5 Some consequences and open questions

⇒ **The Assertion Hypothesis is weakened:**

- ↔ Embedded clauses that are not asserted may still display root phenomena.
- ↔ Asserted embedded clauses don't always allow root phenomena.

- *Assertion* does not seem to be a sufficient/appropriate indicator for the availability of root phenomena.

⇒ **An alternative correlation proposed:**

- ↔ Overlap between clauses allowing root phenomena and clauses that may constitute the MPU.
- ↔ **Note!** “Main assertion” is a misnomer for MPU — the MPU does not have to be asserted.

- *The Main Point of the Utterance* does seem to be a good indicator for the availability of root phenomena.

⇒ **The link between V2 and illocutionary force appears to be weakened:**

- ↔ Illocutionary force \approx MPU
- ↔ MPU \rightarrow V2
V2 is not a prerequisite for being the MPU: Embedded V2 is optional in (92) even though the embedded clause is the MPU.
- ↔ V2 \rightarrow MPU
Being the MPU is not a prerequisite for having V2: Even though an embedded clause displays V2 it doesn't have to be the MPU.
- ↔ In (93), Jon's reason for not buying the book is either (i) his father's attitude to the matter or (ii) he can't afford it.

(92) **Non-V2 complement with MPU-reading:**

- A: Hvorfor kom han ikke på festen?
why came he not on party-the
- B: Hun sa at han {hadde} ikke {hadde} tid.
she said that he had not had time

(93) **Embedded topicalization without obligatory MPU reading:**

- A: Hvorfor kjøpte ikke Jon Norsk Referansegrammatikk?
why bought not Jon Norwegian Reference.grammar
'Why didn't Jon buy the Norwegian Reference Grammar?'
- B: Faren hans mente at sanner bøker hadde ikke Jon råd til.
father-the his thought that such books had not Jon means to
'His father thought that Jon didn't have the money to buy such books.'

- V2 and other root phenomena do not in themselves have or lead to, nor are they driven by illocutionary force.

⇒ **Still open question:**

How to explain the availability of embedded root phenomena structurally.

- Haegeman (2006a): Difference in structural size (cf. also Julien 2007, de Cuba and Ürögdi to appear):
 - ↔ Clauses allowing root phenomena (e.g. peripheral) have a full CP domain;
Clauses disallowing them (e.g. central) have a reduced CP domain.
 - ↔ A projection in the full CP domain encodes anchoring to the speaker.
 - ↔ **Here:** A projection in the extended CP domain encodes MPU potential.
 - ↔ A full CP domain makes syntactic operations in the higher CP projections possible.
 - ↔ **Questions:**
 - (i) Do the relevant embedded clauses *always* contain a full CP structure even when they neither constitute MPU nor display syntactic root phenomena?
 - (ii) If yes, why is V2 (V–Neg/‘V-to-C’) only optional in the presence of this full CP domain?
- Haegeman (2007; to appear): The operator movement analysis:
 - ↔ Central adverbial clauses are derived by operator movement.
 - ↔ This operator movement blocks e.g. fronting of arguments.
 - ↔ Factive and non-assertive complement clauses may also be derived by operator movement, thus blocking e.g. topicalization (of arguments) in Norwegian.
 - ↔ **Here:** Operator movement is responsible for both lacking syntactic root phenomena, and for missing MPU potential.
 - ↔ **Questions:**
 - (i) Why would operator movement also block adjunct fronting in Norwegian?
 - (ii) Why would operator movement block verb movement?
 - (iii) Why would operator movement block the MPU potential?

⇒ **These still open questions are left open...**

References

- Abbott, Barbara. 2000. Presuppositions as nonassertions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1419–1437.
- Abbott, Barbara. 2008. Presuppositions and common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31: 523–538.
- Andersson, Lars-Gunnar. 1975. *Form and function of subordinate clauses*. Ph.D. thesis, Gothenburg University.
- de Cuba, Carlos and Barbara Ürögdi. to appear. Eliminating factivity from syntax: Sentential complements in Hungarian. In *Approaches to Hungarian*, edited by Marcel den Dikken and Robert M. Vago. John Benjamins.
- von Stechow, Kai. 2004. Would you believe it? The king of France is back! Presuppositions and truth-value intuitions. In *Descriptions and Beyond*, edited by Marga Reimer and Anne Bezuidenhout, pp. 315–341. Oxford University Press.
- von Stechow, Kai. 2008. What is presupposition accommodation, again? *Philosophy of Language* 22: 137–170.
- Green, Georgia. 1976. Main clause phenomena in subordinate clauses. *Language* 52: 382–397.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2006a. Argument fronting in English, Romance CLLD and the Left Periphery. In *Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture: Cross-Linguistic Investigations*, edited by Raffaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger, and Paul Portner, pp. 27–52. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2006b. Conditionals, factives and the left periphery. *Lingua* 116: 1651–1669.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2007. Operator movement and topicalisation in adverbial clauses. *Folia Linguistica* 41 3-4: 279–325.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2009. The movement derivation of conditional clauses. Manuscript, University of Ghent.
- Haegeman, Liliane. to appear. The internal syntax of adverbial clauses. *Lingua*.
- Heycock, Caroline. 2006. Embedded root phenomena. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, edited by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, vol. II, pp. 174–209. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Holmberg, Anders and Christer Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Hooper, Joan and Sandra Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 465–497.
- Hooper, Joan B. 1975. On assertive predicates. In *Syntax and Semantics IV*, edited by John P. Kimball, pp. 91–124. Academic Press, New York.
- Julien, Marit. 2007. Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 80: 103–161.

- Julien, Marit. 2009. Embedded clauses with main clause word order in Mainland Scandinavian. Manuscript, Lund University.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1971. Some observations on factivity. *Papers in Linguistics* 4: 55–69.
- Kiparsky, Paul and Carol Kiparsky. 1970. Fact. In *Progress in Linguistics*, edited by Manfred Bierwisch and Karl Erich Heidolph, pp. 143–173. Mouton, The Hague.
- Meinunger, André. 2004. verb position, verbal mood and the anchoring (potential) of sentences. In *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*, edited by Horst Lohnstein and Susanne Trissler, pp. 313–341. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Meinunger, André. 2006. On the discourse impact of subordinate clauses. In *The Architecture of Focus*, edited by Valéria Molnár and Susanne Winkler. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, Craige, Mandy Simons, David Beaver, and Judith Tonhauser. 2009. Presupposition, conventional implicature, and beyond: A unified account of projection. Manuscript.
- Simons, Mandy. 2003. Presupposition and accommodation: Understanding the Stalnakerian picture. *Philosophical Studies* 112: 251–278.
- Simons, Mandy. 2006. Presupposition without common ground. Manuscript, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh. Available at <http://www.hss.cmu.edu/philosophy/faculty-simons.php>.
- Simons, Mandy. 2007. Observations on embedding verbs, evidentiality, and presupposition. *Lingua* 117 6: 1034–1056.
- Stalnaker, Robert C. 1978. Assertion. In *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 9: Pragmatics*, edited by Peter Cole, pp. 315–322. Academic Press, New York.
- Stalnaker, Robert C. 2002. Common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25: 701–721.
- Stalnaker, Robert C. 2008. A response to Abbott on presupposition and common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31: 539–544.
- Wechsler, Stephen. 1991. Verb second and illocutionary force. In *Views on phrase structure*, edited by Katherine Leffel and Denis Bouchard, pp. 177–191. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Kristine Bentzen, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, and Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. to appear. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. *Lingua*