

Hypotheses

YK and JT

November 20, 2023

Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970

- (1) here is a first example
- (2) here is another one
 - a. another
 - b. one
- (3) and a third one

1 H1: Emotive vs. doxastic vs. communicative vs. inferential

1.1 Classification of predicates

All the predicates occur in the past tense in the MV dataset, so we also used the past tense to code up the lexical meaning.

- Communicative: A predicate P is communicative if and only if “X Ped that m” requires X to have externalized that m is the case/on the table. The externalization may be have been verbal or nonverbal.
 - Pure: “say” (you can do this on your own)
 - Discourse participation: “deny, respond” (you can’t do this on your own, requires another interlocutor)
 - State changing: “demonstrate, prove, fake, conceal” (you can’t do this on your own, AH’s communicative act is combined with the intention to change somebody’s belief state)
- Private: A predicate P is private if and only if “X Ped that m” conveys that m stands in some relation to X’s mental representation of the world (which doesn’t require X to believe that m is true).
 - Emotive: “be amused, feel”, X has a feeling or emotion towards m
 - Cognitive: “think, know, discover”, conveys something about X’s relation to m
 - * Stative: “think, know, deluded”
 - * Telic: “discover, realize”
 - * Activity: “contemplate, reminisce”

- Evidential: A predicate P is evidential if and only if “X Ped that m” conveys the source of information by which X received the information about p.
 - “was bet”: private, evidential (reportative)
 - “was challenged”: REL(X,m)
 - “was chastized, was congratulated, was consulted (informed)”: private, evidential, reportative
 - “was deplored that”: only occurs with periphrastic “it”
 - “was forgiven that”: REL(X,m)
 - “was jaded that”: emotive
 - “listened that”: not categorized
- * Pure: “X saw that p, X heard that p, X reasoned/realized that p” (inferential may be conjectural/indirect evidence)
- * Passivized: “was told that, was (mis)informed that’, was contacted that’

1.2 Projection of different predicate types

Visualisation of mean projection ratings by predicate and predicate type (communicative, emotive, cognitive, evidential) shows higher mean projection ratings for emotives than for other predicate types. Visualisation of mean projection ratings by predicate type and voice shows higher mean projection ratings for active voice cognitives and evidentials compared to passive predicates of these types. It further shows higher mean projection ratings for “passive” emotives than for active ones. The emotive predicates labelled “passive” in the MV data set are not passivised verbal predicates, but adjectival predicates.

1.3 H1a: An emotive meaning component of a communicative affects the projection of its CC

Visualisation of mean projection ratings by predicate type and emotive component shows that the CC of those communicative predicates that have an emotive meaning component projects more than the CCs of those that do not. The mean projection rating of 0.279 for communicatives without an emotive component is relatively close to that of cognitive (0.246) and evidential (0.308) predicates, whilst the mean projection rating of 0.425 for communicatives with an emotive component is significantly higher.

2 H2: Dynamicity modulates projection

Visualisation shows that overall, stative predicates project more than dynamic ones. Amongst the other types of predicates, these differences are not large enough to indicate that the high projection ratings of the emotives, which are all stative predicates, are entirely the result of dynamicity affecting projection ratings.

3 H3: Positive correlation between veridicality and projection ratings

Visualisation shows that veridicality and projection ratings are positively correlated, i.e., the strength of the veridicality inference predicts the strength of projection.

4 Other hypotheses

- Does the valence and arousal of the emotive predicates predict the projection of the CC?

- Why does the CC of emotive predicates project more than that of other predicates?
- Among the communicatives, are there classes we can identify of predicates whose CC is highly projective vs. not projective?
- Among the private predicates, which distinctions might matter?
- Does the information that the predicate provides about the level of expertise of the AH matter? (*inform, confess*)
- gradability

References

Kiparsky, Paul and Carol Kiparsky. 1970. Fact. In M. Bierwisch and K. Heidolph, eds., *Progress in Linguistics*, pages 143–173. The Hague: Mouton.