Main Clause Phenomena at the Syntax-Semantics Interface

Suwon Yoon
ZefiS/Bergische Universität Wuppertal

Goal. In this talk, I will show: first, that Main Clause Phenomena (MCP) may be prompted by a variety of *illocutionary forces* in addition to the well-known assertive force in both Korean and German; and second, *other types of potential Functional CP heads* (Cinque 1999; Tenny & Speas 2003) that have been typically treated as mere semantic-o-pragmatic components, are actively engaging in the syntactic process promoting MCP. This include elements such as expressive/emotional attitude (Yoon 2011a), evidentials, (anti)honorification (see Miyagawa 2012 for Japanese honorification and MCP), and mood choice (Whitman 1989, Yoon 2011a). This analysis, if correct, has important implication regarding the big question of to what extent the conceptual and intentional components of linguistic system are interactive or independent.

Parallelism and my earlier findings. In Yoon (2011b), I offer a comparative study between Korean and German to examine what kind of universals and parameters exist. I propose that *assertive force* is indeed relevant, but it is *not*, in fact, the only source for triggering MCP. Both MCP in Korean and V2 in German exhibit *a striking parallel* in assertion-driven MCP (shaded cells in [1-3] Table1), according to the results of diagnostics (I-VIII in Table2).

I. Assertive and Evaluative Force: I show that there is another kind of MCP that is triggered by illocutionary force other than assertive force – *evaluative force* which reflects the evaluative attitude of a judge toward the content of complement (e.g. 'fear' or 'hope' in Korean and Japanese, as shown in the case of evaluative negation in Yoon 2011a; 'hope' in German which Meinunger 2006 classifies as a problematic case within the assertion theory in [5] in Table1). ***II. Non-presupposition:*** I furthermore show that MCP is limited to complements encoding *non-presupposition*. Complementizer in Korean is the locus of the *presupposition* meaning for the content of complements. Table 2 shows that complementizer selection between non-presuppositional *ko* 'that' and presuppositional *nunkesul* 'the fact that' is available only for MCP-inducing predicates, and *ko* passes all the tests for MCP in I-VIII.

III. Structural Ambiguity: I show that even in complements allowing for MCP, *structural ambiguity* is observed between root-like and subordination-like complements in Korean, which could be understood along the lines of the optionality of V2 or non-V2 in German for similar matrix predicates.

Proposal: the extension of Functional CP Heads as MCP-activator. Given the above findings, I expand the scope of investigations and show that MCP is sensitive to (i) *other types of illocutionary force* summarized in Table 3 for Korean, paralleled to German equivalents, and (ii) *other potential CP Heads* in the sense of Cinque in (1) such as expressive/emotional attitude, evidentials, (anti)honorification, and mood choice. These findings support Miyagawa's (2012) analysis of Japanese MCP with assertive force or honorification building on Ross's Performative Analysis (1970) and Speas & Tenny's (2003) structure, and I go further to suggest a unified account that Speas & Tenny's view—sentence mood and point of view are encoded in syntax as a layered speech act phrase and a layered sentience phrase, is directly applicable to MCP at least for abovementioned cases.

Implications. The current analysis has important implications: First, this analysis shows that the type of illocutionary force that prompts root property must be extended so as to comprise various types of MCP – with ForceP$_{[ASSERT]}$ and ForceP$_{[VOL/DIR/HOR/INT...]}$, as observed in Korean and German. Second, the structural ambiguity for MCP constructions in Korean allows the generalization that MCP must be operative on syntax. This supports the necessity of the split CP structures (Rizzi 1997; Beninca & Poletto 2004; Haegeman 2006), and in particular of ForceP for MCP. Furthermore, the expanded scope of relevant Functional Heads empirically supports the previous insights that paratactic configurations typically involve the case where a subject has *'attitude toward the veridicality'* of embedded proposition (Higginbotham 1988; Hinzen 2003; Uriagereka 2008; Dayal & Grimshaw 2009). Finally, the current analysis opens the possibility of suggesting a principled account incorporating prior

research on individual factor like Evaluative attitude (Yoon 2011a,b in Korean, Japanese), Evidentiality (Wiklund 2010 in Swedish), or Irrealis (de Cuba 2007) as MCP-activating heads in other languages.

Table 1. V2 licensing in German (Meinunger 2006): shaded cells for Korean MCP

verbs/constructions that allow for V2	that do not
[1] verbs of saying	[6] factive verbs (emotive, truly factive predicates)
[2] evidential predicates	[7] semantically complex, negative verbs
[3] verbs of thinking	[8] causative, implicative
[4] semi-factive verbs (Korean: no MCP)	[9] under negation
[5] volitional predicates	[10] discourse-old

Table 2. Diagnostics for MCP in Korean (cf. de Haan 2001; Haegeman 2006; Bentzen 2009)

Diagnostics	[A] MCP predicates ([1],[2],[3],[5] in Table 1)	[B] Non-MCP predicates ([4],[6]-[10])
I. postposing	✓ *ko / ??nunkesul*	?? *nunkesul*
II. prosodic independence	✓ *ko / ??nunkesul*	*??nunkesul*
III. speaker-oriented interjections	✓ *ko / * nunkesul*	* *nunkesul*
IV. occurrence as root clauses	✓ *ko / * nunkesul*	* *nunkesul*
V. case-resistance	✓ *ko / * nunkesul*	* *nunkesul*
VI. no extraction	✓ *ko / * nunkesul*	* *nunkesul*
VII. no binding	✓ *ko / * nunkesul*	* *nunkesul*
VIII. complementizer-drop	✓ *ko / * nunkesul*	* *nunkesul*

Table 3. Results of diagnostics applied in complements with five illocutionary forces

Diagnostics for root properties	*kka(poa)/ki*: anti-/volitional	*la*: directive	*ca*: hortative	*ci*: interrogative
I. postposing	✓	✓	✓	✓
II. prosodic independence	✓	✓	✓	✓
III.speaker-oriented interjections	✓	✓	✓	✓
IV. occurrence as root clauses	✓	✓	✓	✓
V. complementizer-drop	*	✓ (*ko*)	✓	*
VI. non-subj topicalization	✓	✓	✓	✓
VII. epistemic modality	✓	✓	✓	✓
VIII. utterance modifiers	✓	✓	✓	✓
IX. Acc-case resistance	✓/*	✓	✓	✓/*
Diagnostics for subordinating properties	*kka(poa)/ki*: anti-/volitional	*la*: directive	*ca*: hortative	*ci*: interrogative
X. extraction	✓	✓	✓	✓
XI. dual embedding	✓	✓	✓	✓
XII. no binding	✓	✓	✓	✓

(1) Cinque (1999)'s four highest projections as MCP-triggering heads
[Speech Act Mood [Evaluative Mood [Evidential Mood [Epistemological Mode]]]]