

## Types of *that*-clauses

Carlos de Cuba

Kingsborough Community College (CUNY)

[carlos.decuba@kbcc.cuny.edu](mailto:carlos.decuba@kbcc.cuny.edu)

Rutgers Workshop on Clausal Complementation

Rutgers University, April 6, 2018

### 1. Introduction

**Puzzle:** An elusive property of *that*-clauses which follow manner-of-speaking verbs (*whisper*, *mutter*, *groan*, etc.) is that they do not behave like complements to other non-factive verbs (*say*, *think*, *believe*, etc.) when it comes to the availability of *wh*-extraction, main clause phenomena and complementizer drop. Non-factive *that*-clauses (1) allow *wh*-extraction, main clause phenomena and complementizer drop while manner-of-speaking *that*-clauses (MoSCCs) (2) resist them. Instead, MoSCCs pattern with noun complement clauses (NCCs) (3), and it + *that*-clause constructions (ICCs) (4), which also resist *wh*-extraction, main clause phenomena and complementizer drop.

#### Non-factive:

- (1) a. Who did Barney say that Wilma was dating *t*?
- b. Barney said that this man Wilma was dating *t*.
- c. Barney said (that) Wilma was dating Fred.

#### Manner-of-speaking:

- (2) a. \*Who did Barney whisper that Wilma was dating *t*?
- b. \*Barney whispered that this man Wilma was dating *t*.
- c. Barney whispered \*(that) Wilma was dating Fred.

#### Noun complement clause:

- (3) a. \*Who did Barney repeat the claim that the government lied to *t*?
- b. \*Barney repeated the claim that this man Wilma was dating *t*.
- c. the claim \*(that) the government lied to the press

#### It + *that*-clause:

- (4) a. \*Who did Barney resent it that the government lied to *t*?
- b. \*Barney resented it that this man Wilma was dating *t*.
- c. Wilma resents it \*(that) the government lied.

**Claim:** The *referential* status of *that*-clauses, along with their *adjunct/argument* status can account for patterns of MCP, C-drop and *wh*-extraction in different types of *that*-clauses. Specifically, I claim that MoSCCs, NCCs and ICCs are referential adjuncts, factive *that*-clauses are (often) referential complements (they sometimes can be non-referential) and non-factive *that*-clauses are non-referential complements. I argue that these different classifications correlate with different the syntactic behavior associated with each type of *that*-clause;

specifically, the availability of Main Clause Phenomena (MCP), Extraction and Complementizer-drop (C-drop).

**Goal:** to provide clearer typology of *that*-clauses (that appear with factive verbs, non-factive verbs, manner-of-speaking verbs, nouns, and the pronoun *it*) based on their referential/non-referential and adjunct/argument status.

- Organization:**
- Section 2: Presenting the data patterns
  - Section 3: Focus on factive & non-factive clauses
  - Section 4: Focus on noun complement clauses
  - Section 5: Focus on manner-of-speaking clauses
  - Section 6: Focus on *it* clauses
  - Section 7: Addressing some arguments against apposition
  - Section 8: Some discussion of factives vs. semifactives
  - Section 9: Conclusion

## 2. Data Patterns in more detail

- (5) **Non-factive VCC: No Island effects**
  - a. Who does Mary think that she saw *t*?
  - b. When did Mary think that John saw Phil *t*?
- (6) **Non-factive VCC: MCP allowed**
  - a. John thinks that this book Mary read *t*.
  - b. Mary claimed that this book, John read *t*.
- (7) **Non-factive VCC: C-drop allowed**
  - a. John thinks (that) Mary read this book.
  - b. Mary claimed (that) John read this book.
- (8) **Factive VCC: Weak Island**
  - a. Who does Mary regret that she saw *t*?
  - b. \*When did Mary regret that John saw Phil *t*?
- (9) **Factive VCC: Resists MCP**
  - a. (Haegeman 2012:257, citing Maki et al. 1999:3)  
\*John regrets that this book Mary read *t*.
  - b. (Haegeman 2012:257 citing Hegarty 1992:52, note 19)  
\*Mary realizes that this book, John read *t*.
- (10) **Factive VCC: Resists C-drop**
  - a. John regrets \*(that) Mary read this book.
  - b. Mary loves \*(that) John read this book.
- (11) **NCC: Strong Island**
  - a. \*Which man did John believe rumors that Mary kissed *t*?
  - b. \*When did Mary believe the claim that John saw Phil *t*?

(12) **NCC: Resists MCP**

- a. (Haegeman 2012:258, citing Hooper & Thompson 1973:479)  
\*I resent the fact that each part he had to examine *t* carefully.
- b. (Haegeman 2012:258, citing Emonds 2004:77, note 3)  
\*A promise that defective sets the company will fix *t* has been made by John.

(13) **NCC: Resists C-drop**

- a. I resent the fact \*(that) he had to examine each part carefully.
- b. A promise \*(that) the company will fix defective sets has been made by John.

(14) **MoSCC: Strong Island**

- a. \*Who did Mary whisper that John met *t*?
- b. (Cinque 1990)  
??How<sub>i</sub> did you murmur that John kissed Mary *t<sub>i</sub>*?

(15) **MoSCC: Resists MCP**

- a. \*John whispered that this book Mary read *t*.
- b. \*I groaned that the pizza, John ate *t*.

(16) **MoSCC: Resists C-drop**

- a. John whispered \*(that) you didn't come to the party.
- b. Martin groaned \*(that) the TV was broken.

(17) **ICC: Strong Island**

- a. \*Who did Mary regret it that John met *t*?
- b. \*Why did Mary resent it that John kissed Mary *t*?

(18) **ICC: Resists MCP**

- a. \*John resents it that this book Mary read *t*.
- b. \*Maria loves it that the big prize John won *t*.

(19) **ICC: Resists C-drop**

- a. John resents it \*(that) you didn't come to the party.
- b. Maria believes it \*(that) the company will fix defective sets.

**Table 1: Data Summary**

	Non-factive VCC	Factive VCC	NCC	MoSCC	ICC
<b>Island</b>	No	Weak	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Strong</b>
<b>Resist MCP</b>	No	Yes	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Resist C-drop</b>	No	Yes	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>

### 3. Factive/Non-factive VCCs

- de Cuba & Ürögdi (2009): *Referentiality* replaces *factivity* as the relevant notion. CPs are referential by default and non-referentiality is signaled by the merger of additional structure. Referential complement clauses are truncated structures as opposed to non-referential complement clauses:

(20)	a.	Referential CP:	V	[CP]
	b.	Non-referential cP:	V	[cP [CP]]

- MCP and extraction blocked in referential VCCs due to this truncation.
  - de Cuba (2017): Definitions for referential/non-referential CPs.
    - (c.f. de Cuba & Ürögdi 2009, Haegeman & Ürögdi 2010, as well as “main point of the utterance” proposed in Wiklund et al. 2009, following Simons 2007).
- (21) a. **Referential CP:** an accepted (or pre-established) proposition in the existing discourse which has no illocutionary force.
- b. **Non-referential cP:** a speech act which introduces a proposition (or an open question) which is not yet accepted (or pre-established) in the existing discourse.
- de Cuba (2017): Claim: Referential-CCs as a class resist C-drop.
    - Grimshaw (2009) reminds us that C-drop is complex:  
*“A jigsaw puzzle is a tiling puzzle that requires the assembly of numerous small, often oddly shaped, interlocking and tessellating pieces. Each piece usually has a small part of a picture on it; when complete, a jigsaw puzzle produces a complete picture.”* (Grimshaw 2009:11, citing Wikipedia ☺)

#### Summary:

- Truncated referential CPs block MCP and extraction.
- Referential CPs resist C-Drop.
- Extra structure in Non-referential cPs facilitates MCP & extraction.
- Non-referential cPs allow C-drop.

### 4. NCCs as Referential Modifiers

- de Cuba (2017) following Hawkins (1978), Mikkelsen (2014): NCC constructions are “referent-establishing” and involve *close apposition*.
- Hawkins (1978), Mikkelsen (2014): close nominal apposition structures (22) have an intuitive similarity to NCCs (23).

(22) the physicist Melissa Franklin

(23) the claim/fact that the government lied to the press

- Mikkelsen (2014): direct structure NCCs (23) are like close nominal apposition structures (22) in that a CP like *that the government lied to the press* provides the primary semantic content of the noun *claim* (cf. Moulton 2015), just like the proper name *Melissa Franklin* provides the primary semantic content for the noun *physicist*.
- Note that in these cases content nouns like *claim*, *fact* and *physicist* have the unusual property that they can be felicitously uttered with a definite article at first-mention (24). However, the modifier is obligatory (25). (data from Hawkins 1978:147; see also Keizer 2007)

(24) a. I don't like the color red. b. I can't stand the name Algernon.

(25) a. #I don't like the color. b. #I can't stand the name.

- The same holds for NCCs like content nouns like *fact* and *conclusion* in NCCs (26), (27).

(26) a. Bill is amazed by the fact that there is so much life on earth.

b. The man came to the conclusion that language did not exist.

(27) a. #Bill is amazed by the fact.

b. #The man came to the conclusion.

- Hawkins argues that in (24) and (25) the modifier “*takes over the role of previous discourse, and enables the hearer to identify some set of objects within which he is to locate the referent.*” (Hawkins 1978:148).
- Keizer (2005) also discusses the discourse functions of close appositions, such as the “descriptively identifying use” in which “*...the descriptive element provides information which allows the hearer to relate the referent of the construction as a whole to her ‘knowledge base’, or, more specifically to anchor the referent in the discourse situation*” (Keizer 2005: 449).
- In regards to close apposition in general, Keizer (2007) concludes that, “*...the whole point in using an apposition consists in the fact that through the combination of a proper noun and a descriptive element one can produce a referring expression which is felicitous in a given context*” (Keizer 2007: 60).

- de Cuba (2017) takes this as evidence in favor of the idea that the “modifying” CP in NCC constructions line (26) is referential, and thus should share syntactic behavior with other referential clauses.
- de Cuba (2017): NCCs always have an antecedent in the discourse. In other words, the content noun (*claim*, *fact*, etc.) and its associated CP refer to the same entity. The claim is that all NCCs are referential as they are co-referential with their content noun (28).

(28) the [<sub>N</sub> claim/fact]<sub>i</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> that the government lied to the press]<sub>i</sub>

- Following the definitions in (21), NCCs are referential. For the propositions in (29), it is clear that they do not have illocutionary force.<sup>1</sup>

(29) a. the claim that John came  
 b. the belief that the earth is flat

- Typically, an assertion is defined as a speech act in which the speaker puts forth a proposition as being true (i.e. to be included in the common ground). Krifka (1999; 2014) takes the view that in an assertion, the speaker takes on the social commitment that the content of the assertion is true. By this definition, the NCCs in (29) are not asserted (since they can be uttered felicitously by a speaker without any commitment to the truth of the proposition).
- Krifka (1999; 2014) claims that there are *sentence radicals*, which denote propositions, as opposed *speech acts*, which are formed when illocutionary operators are applied to sentence radicals. He notes that sentence radicals have more syntactic restrictions, citing examples of MCP being restricted to contexts following predicates which typically allow associated clauses with illocutionary force operators.
- As noted above in (8-13) repeated here with “factive” changed to “referential”, NCCs show similar syntactic behavior to referential VCCs when it comes to resisting MCP (9, 12) and C-drop (10, 13). However, they differ when it comes to island status: Referential VCCs are weak islands (8) and NCCs are strong islands (11).

---

<sup>1</sup> While it is clear that NCCs do not have illocutionary force, one might still question how NCCs (as well as MoSCCs and ICCs to be discussed below) are “accepted” or “established” in the discourse when they can be uttered out-of-the-blue, and thus not be in the previous discourse. However, I follow the idea that these constructions are referent-establishing (see Mikkelsen 2014:10 and Hankamer & Mikkelsen 2012, who follow in the spirit of Hawkins 1978:130-149), so they qualify as established in the discourse.

- (8)      **Referential VCC: Weak Island**
- a. Who does Mary regret that she saw *t*?
  - b. \*When did Mary regret that John saw Phil *t*?
- (9)      **Referential VCC: Resists MCP**
- a. \*John regrets that this book Mary read.  
(Haegeman 2012: 257, citing Maki et al. 1999: 3)
  - b. \*Mary realizes that this book, John read.  
(Haegeman 2012: 257 citing Hegarty 1992: 52, note 19)
- (10)     **Referential VCC: Resists C-drop**
- a. \*John regrets \*(that) Mary read this book.
  - b. \*Mary realizes \*(that) John read this book.
- (11)     **NCC: Strong Island**
- a. \*Who does Mary believe the claim that John saw *t*?
  - b. \*When did Mary believe the claim that John saw Phil *t*?
- (12)     **NCC: Resists MCP**
- a. \*I resent the fact that each part he had to examine carefully.  
(Haegeman 2012: 258, citing Hooper & Thompson 1973: 479)
  - b. \*A promise that defective sets the company will fix has been made by John. (Haegeman 2012: 258, citing Emonds 2004: 77, note 3)
- (13)     **NCC: Resists C-drop**
- a. \*I resent the fact \*(that) he had to examine each part carefully.
  - b. \*A promise \*(that) the company will fix defective sets has been made by John.

- I have argued above that referential CPs are truncated structures, lacking the structure needed for MCP. Since both referential CPs and NCCs are referential, the lack of MCP is expected (9), (12).
- I have also claimed that Referential CPs as a class resist C-drop in referential CPs and NCCs (10), (13).
- What about the difference in extraction?

### Adjunction Blocks Extraction

- de Cuba (2017): close apposition involves adjunction, providing an explanation for the strong island status of NCCs (10): adjuncts are strong islands for extraction (see Stowell 1981, Snyder 1992).
- Note that factive *that*-clauses are weak islands (8). The contrast is accounted for if NCCs are adjuncts while factive/non-factive *that*-clauses are arguments.

**Summary:**

- NCCs are referential CPs
- NCCs block MCP in referential CPs (no cP position for MCP movement)
- NCCs block C-drop because referential CPs as a class block C-drop
- NCCs are strong islands because they are CP adjuncts (adjunct islands)

**5. MoSCCs as Referential Modifiers**

- Like referential CPs and NCCs, MoSCCs (14-16 repeated here) resist MCP (15) and C-drop (16). Like NCCs they are also strong islands (14).
  - (for discussion of MoSCCs see Zwicky 1971; Erteschik-Shir 1973, 2006; Stowell 1981; Snyder 1992, Ambridge & Goldberg 2008; Stoica 2016; a/o)

(14) **MoSCC: Strong Island**

- a. \*Who did Mary whisper that John met *t*?
- b. (Cinque 1990)  
??How<sub>i</sub> did you murmur that John kissed Mary t<sub>i</sub>?

(15) **MoSCC: Resists MCP**

- a. \*John whispered that this book Mary read *t*.
- b. \*I groaned that the pizza, John ate *t*.

(16) **MoSCC: Resists C-drop**

- a. John whispered \*(that) you didn't come to the party.
- b. Martin groaned \*(that) the TV was broken.

**PROPOSAL:**

- de Cuba (2018): MoSCCs are referential in the same way as NCCs.
  - MoSCCs modify a (usually null) content noun object as in (30).
- (30) Barney whispered [a whisper]<sub>i</sub> [that Wilma was dating Fred]<sub>i</sub>
- The fact that the content noun is usually null fits well with Hale & Keyser's (2002) analysis of cognate objects with unergatives like "dance", where the null object is licensed by the semantic content of the verb "dance" (see Hale & Keyser 2002: Chapter 3). The same analysis can apply to the verb "whispered" licensing the null N "whisper" in (30).
  - de Cuba (2017): close apposition involves adjunction, providing an explanation for the strong island status of NCCs (adjuncts are strong islands for extraction).

- MoSCCs are also strong islands, which is expected if they are adjuncts.
  - (There is some disagreement in the literature regarding the strong island status of MoSCCs - see Ambridge & Goldberg 2008; Szabolcsi 2006; Erteschik-Shir 1973; Stowell, 1981. In addition, Dor 2005 claims that complementizer drop is possible with some MoSCCs. See Stoica 2016 for discussion.)
- MoSCCs resist MCP because they are referential.
- MoSCCs resist C-drop because they are referential

**Previous analyses:** The present analysis of MoSCCs has predecessors in the literature. Zwicky (1971) proposed that MoS verbs have a cognate object, and Snyder (1992) analyzed MoSCCs as adjuncts (see also Stowell 1980; Moltmann 1989). For Snyder, *grunt* has a syntactic representation like (31). If *grunt* has a corresponding CP, Snyder claims it is in apposition to *grunt*, not a complement.

- (31) [v (make)] [<sub>NP</sub> (a) [<sub>N</sub> *grunt*]] (Snyder 1992:3)

- Snyder also noted the similarities between both nominal apposition and NCCs blocking extraction (32).
- (32) a. \*Whom did John make a bold suggestion [that Mary likes *t*?]  
       b. \*What did John say that Fred was [<sub>NP</sub> Frederick the Great], [<sub>NP</sub> King of *t*] (Snyder 1992:2-3)
- Finally, Snyder reaches similar conclusions to those proposed here on the differences between the argument status of referential and non-referential VCCs vs. the adjunct/appositive status of NCCs and MoSCCs (33).
- (33) A verb takes a CP argument if and only if the verb attributes, to its subject or to the speaker, a propositional attitude towards the content of the CP. (Snyder 1992:4)

### Summary:

- MoSCCs are referential CPs
- MoSCCs resist MCP because they are referential CPs (no cP position for MCP movement).
- MoSCCs block C-drop because referential CPs as a class block C-drop
- MoSCCs are strong islands because they are CP adjuncts (adjunct islands)

## 6. *It + that-clause (ICC)*

**Claim:** ICCs (a.k.a. “object extraposition” or “anticipatory it” constructions) represent another case of close apposition, given the familiar resistance to extraction (17), MCP (18) and C-drop (19). (17-19) repeated from above.

(17) **ICC: Strong Island**

- a. \*Who did Mary regret it that John met *t*?
- b. \*Why did Mary resent it that John kissed Mary *t*?

(18) **ICC: Resists MCP**

- a. \*John resents it that this book Mary read *t*.
- b. \*Maria loves it that the big prize John won *t*.

(19) **ICC: Resists C-drop**

- a. John resents it \*(that) you didn’t come to the party.
- b. Maria believes it \*(that) the company will fix defective sets.

## PROPOSAL:

- de Cuba (2018): Instead of a content noun, in ICCs the referential CP is in apposition to the pronoun *it*.
  - Support: Kaltenböck (2003): the *it* in extraposition constructions retains, “*at least some of the referential force of a referring it, which allows it to establish a referential link with some clausal constituent in the context*” (Kaltenböck 2003:253; see also Bolinger 1973, 1977; Pesetsky 1995).
  - Gentens (2016) characterizes the anticipatory *it* and the *that*-clause that follows it as being *co-referential* (as I’ve claimed for content nouns and their associated *that*-clauses in NCC and MoSCC constructions).
  - Also note the extraction difference between the strong island ICC (34a) and weak island referential VCC in (34b). The difference lies in the argument vs. adjunct status of the CC.
- (34) a. \*Who did Mary regret it that John met *t*?  
       b. Who did Mary regret that John met *t*?

## 7. Arguments against Apposition

- Kogusuri (2009) provides a few arguments against apposition, two of which I take up here:

1. Since MoS verbs can take NP arguments (35), so they seem to dispense a theta-role, but not for CPs.
- (35) a. Hoffman will probably mutter a foul oath/two or three words/something unintelligible. (Zwicky 1971:224)
- b. John groaned a pained groan.
2. In some cases MoSCCs can be passivized, despite the adjunct status of the CP. If the CP (linked to the expletive) can be passivized in (36), it is not behaving like an adjunct.
- (36) a. It is whispered that he intended to resign.
- b. ...it was shouted that they were bringing Kule in. (Kogusuri 2009:190)

### Solutions:

- For (35), I have proposed that there is always an (usually unpronounced) argument following MoS verbs, so a theta-role is indeed dispensed.
- For (36), I can say that the argument content noun (in the form of *it*) is passivized, not the adjunct CP, so passivization should be possible.

## 8. A few comments on factives vs. semifactives

Hooper & Thompson's (1973) semifactives (class E) seem to pattern with their true factives (class D) in resisting complementizer drop:

- (37) a. He said (that) he would leave. (class A)
- b. I thought (that) he would leave. (class B)
- c. He denied \*(that) he had done it. (class C)
- d. He regretted \*(that) he had done it. (class D)
- e. He discovered \*(that) she had done it. (class E)

However, to my ear the facts are not so clear. While some semifactives do seem to resist complementizer drop, this is not always the case: for example the sentences in (38) seem fine to me with the complementizer omitted.

- (38) a. I notice (that) you are wearing your class ring today.
- b. You know (that) I always like to wake up early.
- c. I was in my bedroom when I discovered (that) my wallet was gone.

- The fact that semifactives are less resistant to complementizer drop than true factives mirrors difference in in the availability of MCP between the two classes. For example, Scandinavian languages are well known to allow V2 (a MCP) in the complements of semifactive verbs like *discover* (39), even with a factive interpretation ((39a) presupposes the truth of (39b)). (see also discussion in Dayal & Grimshaw 2009)

- (39) a. *Vi upptäckte att den bloggen läste han inte varje dag.*  
           we discovered that that blog-the read he not every day  
           “We discovered that this blog he didn’t read every day.”
- b. *Han läste inte den bloggen varje dag.*  
           he read not that blog-the every day  
           “He didn’t read this blog every day.”

- I have argued that referentiality is the relevant notion for different syntactic behavior between the classes of complement clause, not factivity, so a difference in behavior between true factives and semifactives is not unexpected.
- The prediction made by the present analysis is that MCP and C-drop would be allowed in non-referential semifactive contexts.
- The difference then between semifactives (class E predicates) and true factives (class D predicates) then is that while both are factive, semifactives can more easily introduce a new (non-referential) proposition into the discourse than true factives, which tend to make a comment on an existing (i.e. referential) proposition.

## 9. Conclusion & Open Questions

- I have argued that the type of a *that*-clause (referential vs. non-referential) together with the attachment of the *that*-clause (adjunct vs. argument) can explain the syntactic behavior of *that*-clauses (availability of MCP, Extraction & C-drop) which follow so-called “factive” and “non-factive” verbs, manner-of-speaking verbs, nouns and ‘anticipatory *it*’.
- Open Questions:
  - How does my definition of “*referentiality*” fit in with “*quasi-referential*” (Moltmann 2013) “*quasi-subordination*” (Dayal & Grimshaw 2009), or “*interpreted utterance forms*” (Matthews 2011)?
  - What is the true nature of C-drop beyond my stipulation that the availability C-drop is linked to non-referentiality?

**REFERENCES:**

- Ambridge, Ben & Adele E. Goldberg. 2008. The island status of clausal complements: Evidence in favour of an information structure explanation. *Cognitive Linguistics* 19(3): 349-381. <https://doi.org/10.1515/COGL.2008.014>
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1977. *Meaning and Form*. London: Longman.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1973. Ambient “it” is meaningful too. *Journal of Linguistics*, 9(2), 261–270. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002226700003789>
- Cinque, Guglielmo 1990. *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dayal, Veneeta and Jane Grimshaw. 2009. Subordination at the interface. Department of Linguistics, Rutgers University. At: <http://rulingistics101.org/page/grimshaw.html>
- de Cuba, Carlos. 2018. Manner-of-speaking *that*-clauses as close apposition structures. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, 3(1), 32:1-13. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v3i1.4320>.
- de Cuba, Carlos. 2017. Noun complement clauses as referential modifiers. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.53>
- de Cuba, Carlos and Jonathan MacDonald. 2013. Referentiality in Spanish CPs. In Victoria Camacho Taboada, Ángel Jiménez Fernández, Javier Martín González & Mariano Reyes Tejedor (eds.), *Information Structure, Agreement and CP*, 117-140. Linguistik Aktuell: 197, John Benjamins. [10.1075/la.197.04cub](https://doi.org/10.1075/la.197.04cub)
- de Cuba, Carlos & Barbara Ürögdi. 2009. Eliminating factivity from syntax: Sentential complements in Hungarian. In Marcel den Dikken & Robert Vago (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian* Vol. 11, 29-64. John Benjamins. [10.1075/atoh.11.03cub](https://doi.org/10.1075/atoh.11.03cub)
- Dor, Daniel. 2005. Toward a semantic account of *that*-deletion in English. *Linguistics* 43(2): 345-382. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2005.43.2.345>
- Emonds, Joseph. 2004. Unspecified categories as the key to root constructions. In: David Adger, Cécile De Cat & Georges Tsoulas (eds.), *Peripheries: syntactic edges and their effects*. 75-120. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 2006. Bridge Phenomena. In: Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell. 284-294.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1973. On the nature of island constraints. PhD dissertation, Cambridge, MIT.
- Gentens, Caroline. 2016. The discursive status of extraposed object clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 96. 15-31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.03.001>
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2012. *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and the Composition of the Left Periphery: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 8*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haegeman, Liliane & Barbara Ürögdi. 2010. Referential CPs and DPs: An operator movement account. *Theoretical linguistics* 36(2-3): 111-152. <https://doi.org/10.1515/thli.2010.008>
- Hale, Ken & Samuel Jay Keyser. 2002. *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*. Number 39 in Linguistic Inquiry Monograph, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Hankamer, Jorge & Line Mikkelsen. 2012. CP Complements to D. Ms. UC Santa Cruz and UC Berkeley. [http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~mikkelsen/papers/CP\\_complements.pdf](http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~mikkelsen/papers/CP_complements.pdf) (Accessed March 26, 2016)
- Hawkins, John A. 1978. *Definiteness and indefiniteness: a study in reference and grammatical prediction*. London: Croom Helm.
- Hegarty, Michael. 1992. Familiar complements and their complementizers: On some determinants of A'-locality. University of Pennsylvania: Unpublished manuscript.
- Hooper, Joan, and Sandra Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4. 465-497. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177789>

- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2003. On the syntactic and semantic status of anticipatory *it*. *English Language and Linguistics* 7.2: 235–255. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674303001096>
- Keizer, Evelien. 2007. Close appositions. In Evelien Keizer. 2007. *The English Noun phrase: The Nature of Linguistic Categorization* (Studies in English Language series), 22-60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keizer, Evelien. 2005. The discourse function of close appositions. *Neophilologus*, 89(3): 447-467. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11061-004-0963-9>
- Kiparsky, Paul & Carol Kiparsky. 1971. Fact. In Danny D. Steinberg and Leon A. Jakobovits (eds.), *Semantics: An interdisciplinary reader in philosophy, linguistics and psychology*, 345-369. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kogusuri, Tetsuya. 2009. Manner of Speaking Verbs and Their Clausal Complements in English. *Tsukuba English Studies* 27: 187-203.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2014. Embedding illocutionary acts. In Thomas Roeper & Margaret Speas (eds.), *Recursion: Complexity in cognition*, 59-87. Springer International Publishing. See also ‘Embedded Speech Acts.’ Ms., Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. [http://amor.cms.hu-berlin.de/~h2816i3x/Publications/Krifka\\_EMBEDDINGSpeechActs.pdf](http://amor.cms.hu-berlin.de/~h2816i3x/Publications/Krifka_EMBEDDINGSpeechActs.pdf) (Accessed March 26, 2016).
- Krifka, Manfred. 1999. Quantifying into question acts. In Tanya Matthews and Devon Strolovitch (eds.), *SALT IX: Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 181-198. Department of Linguistics, Cornell University: CLC Publications. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/salt.v9i0.2830>
- Maki, Hideki, Lizanne Kaiser & Masao Ochi. 1999. Embedded topicalization in English and Japanese. *Lingua* 109: 1–14. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841\(98\)00055-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(98)00055-2)
- Matthews, Robert J. 2011. Measurement-theoretic accounts of propositional attitudes. *Philosophy Compass* 6/11: 828–841.
- Moltmann, Friederike. 2013. *Abstract Objects and the Semantics of Natural Language*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Moltmann, Friederike. 1989. Nominal and Clausal Event Predicates. In *Proceedings of the Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society (CLS)* 25, Dept. of Linguistics, Chicago University: Chicago
- Mikkelsen, Line. 2014. Clausal complements to N in Danish. Paper presented at Workshop on the North Germanic Noun Phrase. Universitet i Tromsø. (Handout). [http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~mikkelsen/talks/Tromso\\_handout.pdf](http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~mikkelsen/talks/Tromso_handout.pdf) (Accessed Jan. 18, 2018).
- Moulton, Kier. 2015. CPs: copies and compositionality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46(2): 305-342. [https://doi.org/10.1162/LING\\_a\\_00183](https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00183)
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Simons, Mandy. 2007. Observations on embedding verbs, evidentiality, and presupposition. *Lingua* 117(6). 1034–1056. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2006.05.006>
- Snyder, William. 1992. *Wh-extraction and the lexical representation of verbs*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Ms. [http://web.uconn.edu/snyder/papers/Snyder\\_1992\\_Wh\\_V.pdf](http://web.uconn.edu/snyder/papers/Snyder_1992_Wh_V.pdf) (Accessed Jan. 18, 2018).
- Stoica, Irina. 2016. Island effects and complementizer omission: the view from manner of speaking verbs. In: Petronia Petrar & Amelia Precup (eds.), *Constructions of Identity (VIII): Discourses in the English-Speaking World*. Cluj-Napoca, România: Presa Universitară Clujeană. 191-200. <http://www.editura.ubbcluj.ro/bd/ebooks/pdf/2036.pdf>
- Stowell, Tim. 1981. Origins of phrase structure. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2006. Strong vs. weak islands. In: Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Vol. IV: 479-532. Blackwell.

- Szabolcsi, Anna & Frans Zwarts. 1993. Weak islands and an algebraic semantics for scope taking. *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 235-284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00263545>  
Reprinted In Anna Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking*, 217-262. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Kristine Bentzen, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson and Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2009. On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian *that*-clauses. *Lingua* 119. 1914-1938. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2009.03.006>
- Zwický, Arnold M. 1971. In a manner of speaking. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 2(2). 223-233.