

# Hypotheses

YK and JT

October 25, 2023

?

- (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.

### 1.2.1 Projection of verbal and adjectival emotives

The emotive predicates labelled “passive” in the MV data set are not passivised verbal predicates, but adjectival predicates. Visualisation of the six emotive predicates which occur both as verbal and adjectival predicates in the MV data set suggests that the difference in mean projection ratings between verbal and adjectival emotives may not be significant. Visualisation of mean projection ratings of 402 verbal predicates shows that whilst many of the remaining 27 emotives are amongst those predicates with the highest mean projection ratings, this overall pattern is less pronounced than the investigation based on all 544 predicates suggested.

## 2 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?
- Does the strength of the veridicality inference predict the strength of projection? Yatsu Sudo dissertation
- We observe that the CC of emotive predicates projects more than that of other types of predicates. However, most of the emotives are adjectives, whereas all of the other predicates are verbal. The worry is that perhaps this is not about emotive vs. other predicate, but about adjectival vs. verbal.
- Does it matter whether the predicate is stative or eventive?
- 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.