

BARBARA KRYK

*Adam Mickiewicz University,
Poznań*

IS FACTIVITY A FACT? SOME SYNTACTIC EVIDENCE FROM ENGLISH AND POLISH*

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to examine the status of factivity in the linguistic description of predicates. The precise idea of factivity was stated by the Kiparskys (1971) as a feature of predicates pertaining to the logical notion of presupposition. Thus, verbs like **regret**, **resent**, **surprise** and adjectives **sad**, **strange**, **odd** were said to presuppose the truth of that-complements following them or, to be more precise, it was the speaker who, while uttering a sentence with one of these predicates, was committed to the truth of their complements¹.

The concept of factivity ascribed to the predicates in question (henceforth labelled *factive*) determined, according to the Kiparskys their presupposition-carrying nature not only in affirmative, but also in interrogative and negative sentences. Thus, a question 1. presupposes a corresponding statement 2.:

1. Who is aware that Ram eats meat?
2. Someone is aware that Ram eats meat Likewise, 3. presupposes, exactly as its positive counterpart, that the door is closed:
3. John does not regret that the door is closed Though the authors realized the possibility of negating presupposition, they claimed that it must be done explicitly, i.e. by means of external negation or contrastive stress, e.g.:²
4. Abe did not regret that he had forgotten; he had remembered (1971 : 351)

Thus, the Kiparskys ended up with a *factive/non-factive* classification of predicates, the latter lacking the above mentioned features. For example, a speaker uttering 5. does not presuppose that it is raining but expresses only a supposition that it might be the case:

5. I suppose that it is raining (1971 : 348)

The Kiparskys' observations were developed by Karttunen in his series of articles (1970; 1971a; 1971b; 1973). His contention was that besides negations and questions there are other environments having hardly any impact upon the truth value of *factive* complements. A limited number of verbs, which he labelled *full factives*, preserve the truth of their presuppositions even in conditional and modal contexts. Thus, only 6a. and 7a. express the speaker's positive commitment to the truth of the complement.

even though **regret** is embedded under a conditional and a modal **possible**, respectively. It is not, however, the case with **realize** and **discover**, also originally considered factive (1971b: 5):³

- 6a regret
- b. If I realize that I have not told the truth,
- c. discover I will confess it to everyone
- 7a. regret
- b. It is possible that I will realize later that I have
discover not told the truth

The discrepancies between the properties of factive predicates called for further subdivision. Consequently, Karttunen (1970; 1971b) distinguished between semi-factives (**realize**, **discover**, **find out**), whose presuppositions stay intact only in questions and negations, as opposed to full factives which extend this property also to modal and conditional contexts⁴. Further divergence in the behaviour of factives and semi-factives was later elaborated on by Givon (1972); Rosenberg (1975); Ross (1975), and others.

The semantic factive/non-factive distinction adopted by the Kiparskys was followed by a claim that the semantics of complement types is directly reflected in their syntax. Thus, factives undergo some transformations blocked for other predicates, while they are resistant to T-rules applicable to non-factives. To account for these syntactic differences the Kiparskys viewed factive complements as preceded by head noun **the fact** (obligatory in their underlying structure and optional on the surface), so that they are subject to the Complex NP Constraint (in the sense of Ross 1967). Consequently, any transformation moving an element out of a complex NP is blocked, hence the inapplicability of Raising, Neg-Raising, etc. (1971: 355–356).

The attempt to justify the semantic factive/non-factive distinction on syntactic grounds was questioned by R. Lakoff (1973). According to her the Kiparskys' analysis amounted to mere description of facts but did not offer any insightful explanation to the problem. Lakoff observed that the Complex NP Constraint could support the factive/non-factive division if the syntactic behaviour of the two types of predicates were clearly distinct and not subject to any exceptions. But this is not the case which she proved by supplying counterexamples to the Kiparskys' hypothesis. It turned out that apparent factives do sometimes undergo Raising, Neg-Raising and other movement rules (1973: 691).

Simultaneously, Lakoff rejected Karttunen's analysis based on the concept of pragmatic presupposition, so that some more subclasses of predicates (like semi-factives, implicatives, **if- and only-if-verbs**) were included into the division. This obscured the issue to a large extent and according to Lakoff such an expansion of the class of predicates taking **that-complements**, if adopted by the Kiparskys, would deprive their hypothesis of any explanatory power/since some factive characteristics are shared by the verbs in other categories they would be affected by parts of the Complex NP Constraint – but this is nonsense. Lakoff concluded that there is no reconciliation of the Kiparskys and Karttunen theories which will give syntactic explanation of the facts (1973: 693).

expresses a proposition contrary to the speaker's expectations, sequence of tenses becomes obligatory:

22. John claimed that the Earth was (* is) flat. Consequently, the rule was claimed to be optional for factives but obligatory for non-factives, cf. the Kiparskys 1971 : 359-60; Ross 1975 : 452-453.

We have by no means exhausted the inventory of transformations whose distribution among complement-taking predicates inclined linguists to subdivide them into factives, semifactives and non-factives. The environments intolerant of factives include root transformations, discussed by Hooper and Thompson (1973), as well as gapping, sinking of subjunctive into the clauses of subjunctivized matrix predicates, embeddings under modals **may** and **possible** and **if...** any configuration (cf. Ross 1975).

These will be disregarded in our analysis due to the limited scope of this paper dealing with some selected characteristics of factives, such as those enumerated in a.-f. above. Moreover, the discussion of subjunctive sinking as well as modal and **if...any** environments will go much beyond syntactic problems which are our concern here. All these involve the question of speaker's presupposition and the possibility of its suspension, hence they will be omitted for the reasons of brevity. Likewise, the logico-semantic issue of presupposition suspension will be left aside as related to complex sentences (conjunctions, disjunctions, conditionals, etc.)⁶.

Finally, **for-to** complementation will not be dealt with here, since it is emotivity that determines its distribution (there are non-emotive factives that do not take it, e.g. **know**). Besides, the present paper aims at showing that factivity is an exclusively semantic concept not only in English but also in Polish. Consequently two bodies of data will be presented below to show that factivity should be dispensed with in the syntactic description of the two languages. This brief analysis may constitute a starting point for more insightful cross-linguistic studies testing the universality of the claim that semantic categories like factivity should not be included into the syntactic apparatus. As this is a contrastive approach to the problem, only structures present in both languages are worth considering and **for-to** complementation is not relevant to Polish. It is normally rendered by a subordinate sentence with a conjunction **zeby** (cf. Fisiak, Lipińska, Zabrocki 1978 : 155 for further comments).

2. The problem

As has already been noted, the analysis to be carried out below aims at challenging the syntactic classification of predicates into factives, semi-factives and non-factives. Each of the rules enumerated in a.-f. above will be tested for the relevant classes of verbs in order to show that many of the syntactic characteristics of factives are subject to exception. As the examples will show, often „exclusively factive” transformations work with non-factives and vice versa. Hence, ascribing factivity to a limited group of predicates does not predict all the idiosyncracies of their behaviour. Consequently, it is my contention that factivity should be considered an exclusively semantic concept since it loses its explanatory value and becomes void in the syntactic analysis of predicates.

As far as technicalities go, the acceptability of sentences that constitute the English corpus was tested with a group of American students at SUNY, Stony Brook. The

judgements resulting from a questionnaire distributed there will be a basis for my hypothesis. Whenever there was a substantial disagreement among my informants, the evidence will be indicated as being uncertain.

Since the present analysis provides both English and Polish data showing how relevant the concept of factivity is to the linguistic description of predicates, the Polish equivalents will be given immediately below the English sentences. Judgements on the Polish examples are basically my own backed up by helpful comments of other native speakers of Polish.

3. The analysis

3.1 the fact + S configuration

It was claimed by the Kiparskys (1971 : 347) that only factives⁷ allow their complements to be preceded by head noun **the fact**. But consider the following examples with Karttunen's semi-factives, cf. 1970; 1971b, which were not included into the Kiparskys' classification. Note that **find out**, **learn** and **know** must be followed by a preposition **about**, which is not the case with **discover**:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. I found out about the fact | a. that Joe has joined the army |
| | b. of Joe having joined the army |
| 1'. Dowiedziałam się o fakcie | a. że Joe wstąpił do wojska |
| | b. wstąpienia przez Joe do wojska |
| 2. During his last chemistry lesson John discovered the fact | |
| | a. that salt dissolves in water |
| | b. of salt's dissolving in water |
| 2'. Podczas ostatniej lekcji chemii Janek odkrył fakt | |
| | a. że sól rozpuszcza się w wodzie |
| | b. rozpuszczania się (rozpuszczalności) soli w wodzie |
| 3. Listening to the news report I learned about the fact | |
| | a. that the Russians have launched a new spacecraft |
| | b. of the Russians' having launched a new spacecraft |
| 3'. Słuchając wiadomości dowiedziałam się o fakcie | |
| | a. że Rosjanie wypuścili nowy statek kosmiczny |
| | b. wypuszczenia nowego statku kosmicznego przez Rosjan |
| 4. Unfortunately, your wife knows about the fact | |
| | a. that you have lost 100 bucks |
| | b. of your having lost 100 bucks |
| 4'. Niestety, twoja żona wie o fakcie | a. że zgubiłeś 100 dolarów |
| | b. zgubienia przez ciebie 100 dolarów |

It follows from 1–4 that the alleged semi-factives can occur in this typically factive configuration, provided that they are accompanied by a preposition **about**, whenever necessary. Moreover, 1–4b illustrate another typically factive construction (Poss-ing form), which is possible with the verbs discussed beside head noun **the fact** following their complements.

This accords with our intuitions, since we not only regret or resent facts, but we can also find out or learn something about them, discover them or know about their occurrence. Native speakers of Polish also find 1'–4' acceptable, though pronominali-

zation of the head noun **fakt** might be preferred in a. examples (with **że** + S complement). Note, however, that only sentences with verbs taking the preposition **o** (about) undergo this process, hence the oddity of 2'':

- 1''. Dowiedziałam się o tym, że Joe wstąpił do wojska
- 2''. ?Podczas ostatniej lekcji chemii Janek odkrył to, że sól rozpuszcza się w wodzie⁸
- 3''. Słuchając wiadomości dowiedziałam się o tym, że Rosjanie wypuścili nowy statek kosmiczny
- 4''. Niestety, twoja żona wie o tym, że zgubiłeś 100 dolarów

As far as b. examples go, Poss-ing construction is best rendered in Polish by deverbal nominals ending in **-nie**, **-cie**, requiring agent postposing, so that the latter is automatically preceded by a preposition **przez** (by), cf. 5.3. below for a more detailed discussion. Note, that this does not apply to 2'', where the noun **sól** (salt) is not an agent but a patient, hence it lacks the preposition **przez** and the deverbal nominal can occur in two parallel forms, i.e. one ending in **-nie** (denoting a process) and the other in **-ość** (standing for an attribute).

The above observations indicate that the alleged semifactives both in English and in Polish display some factive characteristics to the effect that whenever they are followed by a preposition **about** (Polish **o**), they can freely occur in **the fact** + S (Polish **fakt** + S) configuration. **Discover** (Polish **odkryć**) is an exception, since it does not require preposition insertion. Moreover, further supportive evidence is gained from Polish where the factivity marker is even stronger (both **fakt** and **to** head nouns are possible). Lastly, still more factive readings are obtained through nominalization of the complement in both languages – a typically factive operation, of. 1–4b examples.

3.12 „Non-factives”

Let us consider some sentences with verbs traditionally considered non-factive:

5. I like the fact that your kids have finally stopped smoking
- 5'. Podoba mi się fakt, że twoje dzieci w końcu przestały palić
6. I agree with the fact that Long Island has a lousy transportation system
- 6'. Zgadzam się z faktem, że Long Island ma parszywy system komunikacji
7. The teacher informs Tom about the fact that he has failed his exams
- 7'. Nauczyciel informuje Tomka o fakcie, że oblał egzaminy

Likewise, in this case my informants were of the opinion that 5–7 are by no means out-of-place in American English, so that the label “non-factive” does not exclude the possibility of these verbs being followed by complements of the structure **the fact** + S. However, as it was the case with “semi-factives”, **the fact** insertion automatically triggers here a preposition insertion whenever such is required if the verb takes a nominal object. Thus, **agree** is followed by **with** and **inform** by **about**, cf. the ungrammaticality of 6a. and 7a., where the prepositions are missing:

6. * I agree the fact that Long Island has a lousy transportation system
- 7a. * The teacher informs Tom the fact that he has failed his exams

The above examples support my claim that head noun **the fact** has much wider distribution than has generally been assumed. This observation might be a basis for some important generalization, since each of the verbs discussed represents a distinct group of predicates. **Like** is an emotive; **agree** a non-emotive performative that can be

used parenthetically⁹ and **inform** is a non-parenthetical performative classified together with **say**, **tell**, etc.

Similarly, the Polish verbs **podobć się**, **zgadzać się** and **informować** render grammatical sentences with head noun **fakt**, provided the latter two take appropriate prepositions (**z** and **o**, respectively). This immediately triggers a change of the case the noun is in, i.e. **z** requires Instrumental, whereas **o** Locative.

It follows from the above analysis that the distribution of the **fact + S** configuration (Polish **fakt + S**) has little explanatory value for the subclassification of predicates taking **that**-complements. Both in English and in Polish the head noun in question can be used not only with "factives", but also "semi-factives" and "non-factives". Consequently, it cannot serve as a criterion for distinguishing these subgroups, though this does not mean that all verbs taking **that**-complements can be followed by the **fact + S**. On the other hand, neither should the above examples be treated as mere exceptions to the rule that factivity determines the syntactic behaviour of predicates. The universality of this claim is undermined by this analysis and analogous conclusions will be reached below.

3.2 Extraposition

As was noted in 1b., the extraposition transformation is claimed to be optional for factives but obligatory for non-factives. Since extraposition is obligatory for most English predicates taking **that**-complements as their subjects, e.g. **seem**, **appear**, **turn out**, this generalization might seem right at the moment. However, there is at least one exception to the rule, i.e. an adjective **likely** which can occur in non-extraposed sentences:¹⁰

8. That Prof. Brown is a homosexual is very likely

8. a.? *Że Prof. Brown jest homoseksualistą jest bardzo prawdopodobne*

b. *To, że Prof. Brown jest homoseksualistą jest bardzo prawdopodobne*

Sentence 8, being an evident counterexample to the claim that extraposition is obligatory with non-factives, supplies some more evidence to support my hypothesis that "typically factive" syntactic behaviour is often shared by other predicates.

As to the Polish equivalents of 8, the oddity of 8a. can be noticed, since we do not normally start Polish sentences with *że* which is typical for subordinate clauses. Consequently, what is required here is the retention of head noun in its pronominalized form, i.e. *to* (it). This accords with the opinion of Fisiak, Lipińska and Zabrocki (1978) on extraposition in Polish:

"There are sentences in Polish which have the structure very similar to 104:

104. That she did not read the book is very interesting surprised us very much

105. *To, że ona nie przeczytała tej książki jest bardzo ciekawe bardzo nas zdziwiło*

(1978:160).

To recapitulate, the above examples have shown that the occurrence of non-extraposed complements is not restricted to factives only. This observation constitutes another piece of evidence supporting my contention that the division of predicates into

factives, semi-factives and non-factives cannot be justified on syntactic grounds.

3.3 Poss-ing construction

3.31 "Semi-factives"

Let us examine some examples with "semi-factives" taking Poss-ing complementation which was traditionally considered a typically factive construction:

9. While reading a paper I learned about Carter's leaving the USA.

9'. Czytając gazetę dowiedziałam się o a.*Cartera opuszczenia USA
b. opuszczeniu USA przez Cartera

10. I know about your spilling a bottle of ink on the carpet.

10'. Wiemo a. ?twoim wylaniu butelki atramentu na dywan.
b. wylaniu przez ciebie

11. I have found everything about Ray's tormenting his unicorn.

11'. Wykryłam wszystko o a. ?Ray'a torturowaniu jego jednoróżca.
b. torturowaniu przez Ray'a

On the basis of these sentences one can conclude that, contrary to the Kiparskys' claims, the Poss-ing construction occurs also with verbs like **learn**, **know** and **find out**. However, being followed by nominals, they require the insertion of a preposition **about**.

Similarly, Polish equivalents of English sentences with semi-factives sound acceptable, if the following reservations are considered:

a) the English Poss-ing configuration sounds odd if translated directly into Polish as: NP_{Gen} + Nom, cf. 9a-11a.

b) best Polish equivalents I can think of are 9b-11b where the order of elements has been reversed in accordance with an observation by Fisiak, Lipińska, Zabrocki (1978:199) who claim that in Polish agent postposing is obligatory with -nie, -cie deverbial nominals if the nominalized form of the verb is followed by a genitive object NP. Here the nominalized forms, equivalents of English gerundive nominals, are followed by genitive objects, so that the agent is postposed and requires a preposition **przez**.

Having shown that gerundial constructions are not only "typically factive", but also occur with "semi-factives", we will now focus our attention on the so-called nonfactives.

3.32 "Non-factives"

12. The Catholics believe in God's having created the Universe

12'. Katolicy wierzą w stworzenie Wszechświata przez Boga

13. John liked my appearing on the stage

13'. Janowi podobało się pojawienie się na scenie przeze mnie¹¹

We agreed to Frank's redecorating his room

14'. Zgodziliśmy się na odnowienie pokoju przez Franka

Intuitively, 12-14 make good English sentences since one can imagine situations when he believes in facts, likes them or agrees to them. Moreover, the Poss-ing construction does pertain to facts whose truth is hard to suspend, whereas other forms of complements do not commit us to their truth to such an extent¹²

Also, Polish equivalents of 12-14 pose no problems under the condition that agent postposing and **przez** insertion have been applied, cf. 12'-14'. For reasons of brevity,

the dubious Polish versions of 12–14, i.e. those which have not undergone these two rules, have been omitted here (however, cf. ft. 11).

To conclude, the analysis of Poss-ing construction shows that its distribution can serve as counterevidence to the claim that certain transformations apply to factives only. What follows now is a reverse argument trying to prove that other T-rules, which are said to be prohibited for factives, are fairly limited in their application. Hence it is hard to capture any generalizations governing the distribution of these transformations and employing such observations as criteria for the subclassification of predicates is highly unjustified.

3.4 Raising

Raising has always been considered one of the rules factives and semi-factives are immune to. However, Postal (1974) included a semi-factive **discover** among verbs undergoing B-Raising. Moreover, Ross (1975: 456–457) observed that **discover** seems to be a weak exception to this rule, cf.:

- a. * learned
- 15. Mel b. * found out there to be no soup
- c. ? discovered

As might be expected, **know** as a semantically factive but syntactically non-factive verb is not resistant to raising and it, indeed, undergoes B-Raising, whereas full factives never do:

- a. * regret
 - 16. I b. * resent him to be a fool
 - c. know
- 16'. Żałuję,
Czuję urazę o to, że jest głupcem
Wiem,

The distribution of raising turns out to be extremely irregular, since the rule does not apply to “full factives”, nor is it allowed with “semi-factives” (**discover**, undergoing B-Raising, is the only exception). **Know**, another B-Raising verb, is a separate case, since its status is largely undetermined. The Kiparskys (1971) viewed it as a semantically factive but syntactically non-factive verb, whereas Karttunen (1970; 1971b) and Givon (1972) classified **know** as a semi-factive.

Be that as it may, raising sheds little light upon the criteria of predicate subdivision. Not only does it not delimit the scope of factive/non-factive distinction, but its application is confined to a strictly determined group of predicates and many so-called non-factives do not take it, either:¹³

- 17. We decided Laura to be a good student – B-Raising
- 17'. Zdecydowaliśmy, że Laura jest dobrą studentką
- 18. John occurred to me to have been drunk – A-Raising
- 18'. Przyszło mi do głowy, że Jan jest pijany

This criterion is not relevant to Polish, since there is an opinion that raising does not belong to the inventory of Polish transformations¹⁴. Therefore, neither 16' nor 17'–18' are congruent (in the sense of Marton 1968; Krzewsowski 1971) with their English

equivalents. B-Raising is rendered in Polish as a complex sentence of the structure S_1 - $\text{-}\dot{z}\text{e}$ - S_2 and A-Raising is best realized as an impersonal construction with the matrix verb ending in -no ; -to ; -to , etc., followed by S_2 ($\dot{z}\text{e}$ conjunction being retained).

3.5 Negative Raising

Negative Raising does not offer too much insight into the division of predicates taking that- complements due to its limited scope. Beside factives, semi-factives and know, traditionally claimed to be resistant to this rule, many other verbs are also immune to this transformation. G. Lakoff (1970:30-31) observed that Negative Raising, called by him Not-Transportation, is a minor rule since it operates only on a few verbs like think, believe, want, etc. and it does not operate on most verbs that take object complements, e.g. hope, like, require, etc. Similar conclusions were reached by Horn (1971; 1975); Menzel (1975:102) and Bonney (1976:116-120). Consequently, Negative Raising will be disregarded here since it has hardly any impact upon the overall picture of the issue at hand.

3.6. Sequence of tenses (SOT)

Contrary to the claim that factives are optionally subject to this process¹⁵ my contention is that, like all other verbs, they depend in this respect on the type and tense of the complement, cf.:

a) when the complement refers to the past, the so-called factives indeed do not have to be subject to SOT, the process being optional (which also holds true for "semi-" and "non-factives"):

discovered
regretted that I lost a bunch of keys yesterday at A and S
believed

b) the complement being a general truth expressed by Simple Present, SOT is optional regardless of the class the verb represents:

resented

20. I found out that porcupines do not live on bananas
understood

c) the same general truth sounds much worse if the complement is in Present Continuous:

ignored it

21.? I learned that the US is selling more missiles to Egypt
assumed

d) with Present Continuous non-general statement SOT is obligatory even in case of "factives" and "semi-factives":

regretted

22. * I knew that the children are watching an X-rated movie
claimed

e) also, when the complement is in the future, the obligatoriness of SOT increases:
deplored it

23.* I realized that someone will take care of my seven cats
fancied

No Polish equivalents have been given here since sequence of tenses is not observed in this language. However, in English the application of this rule has much bearing upon the semantic readings of sentences. It has been shown that it is not so much the type of the matrix verb that has impact upon this process, as it is due to the complement tense and generality of the proposition expressed by this complement. The more general the statement (hence occurring usually in Simple Present or Past), the more optional the application of SOT. The rule becomes gradually more obligatory as we move toward future and iterative statement. Consequently, the original distinction of "factives", "semi-factives" and "non-factives" should not have been based on the distribution of the sequence of tenses rules which are governed by much more complex principles than it had been claimed¹⁶.

4. Conclusion

To recapitulate, the analysis of some syntactic characteristics of verbs taking **that**-complements provided enough evidence for a negative answer to the question asked in the title. It has been shown that the presence of the feature I + FACTIVE in the semantic structure of predicates has little explanatory and predictive value as to their syntactic behaviour.

The discussion has been confined to selected transformations whose distribution was originally believed to be fairly regular along the factive/non-factive distinction complemented later by a third intermediate group of semi-factive predicates. Thus, the **fact** + S configuration, gerundial constructions as well as the optionality of extraposition and sequence of tenses rules (SOT) were supposed to be characteristic of factives only. On the other hand, raising and Negative Raising were exclusively non-factive transformations. However, in the course of the present analysis it turned out that the application of the above-mentioned rules is by no means governed by the factivity factor.

Both the English and Polish bodies of data provided enough material to challenge the claim that there are "exclusively factive" or "non-factive" transformations. It is not factivity, but appropriate context, some insertion processes and idiolectal preferences that determine the array of rules a given predicate can be subject to.

Thus, the **fact** + S configuration has a wide distribution both among English and Polish verbs, provided an appropriate context is created and the verb is followed by a proposition it would normally take when accompanied by an object NP. Moreover, in both languages sentences retaining head noun **the fact** on the surface differ as to their acceptability in distinct dialects or even idiolects. There is, however, general agreement that many of them sound more formal in spoken language, thus being much more common in a written form.

Similarly, the optionality of extraposition is not governed by factivity, since there is at least one exception to the rule, i.e. a non-factive predicate **likely**. No evidence from Polish was obtained since non-extraposed complements do not occur in this language, unless preceded by head nouns.

Poss-**ing** complementation also has wider distribution than might be expected. Again, it freely applies to predicates if they take appropriate prepositions required whenever a given predicate is followed by an NP. Not only can some semi-factives but



also can many so-called non-factives occur with gerundial complements in English. However, in Polish they are rendered by deverbal nominals automatically undergoing agent postposing. Nonetheless, in English factivity cannot serve as a criterion for the distribution of this type of complement.

The two allegedly non-factive transformations of raising and Negative Raising turn out to be extremely irregular in their distribution, i.e. two "semi-factives", **discover** and **know** undergo B-Raising, whereas many "non-factives", are intolerant of this rule. Besides, both A- and B-Raising as well as Negative Raising apply to a limited number of predicates, thus there are other semantic and syntactic factors determining the scope of the application of these rules.

Finally, the optionality of sequence of tenses is governed not so much by factivity as by generality and time reference of the proposition expressed by the complement.

The three above-mentioned rules are not to be found among the transformations operating in Polish. Nevertheless, the evidence presented above still casts serious doubt upon the relevance of the semantic notion of factivity to the syntactic description of predicates both in English and in Polish. At this point arises a question concerning an alternative subclassification of predicates. The issue might be a topic of another paper but I would suggest that one of the possible solutions is a scalar division of predicates along the lines of Rosenberg (1975). Such a classification would not only reflect the type of relationholding between the predicate and its complement, but it would also predict the syntactic idiosyncrasies of each of the predicates analysed.

NOTES

Paper read at the 16th International Conference on Polish-English Contrastive Linguistics – Boszkowo, December 14–16, 1978.

1. The Kiparsky's account of presupposition oscillates between a pragmatic vs. logical approach; for the discussion of the distinction, cf. Keenan 1971. On the one hand, they adhere to the former employing speaker's presupposition. On the other hand, the interpretation of the scope of negation in the negation test advocated by the Kiparskys is a reflection of the classical definition of presupposition derived from logic.

2. This procedure was criticized by Kempson (1975:67–69) as it attaches no significance to the distinction between speaker's presupposition vs. sentence presupposition.

3. Further subdivision of verbs taking *that*-complements into implicatives, *if*-verbs and *only-if*-verbs is disregarded here due to the limited scope of this paper. For a more detailed discussion of the problem, cf. Karttunen (1970; 1971a, b).

4. Karttunen's criteria of subdivision of factives were questioned by Oh 1974.

5. Whenever the matrix verb takes an object complement, A-Raising results in, what is sometimes called, „personal passive”. The structural change triggered in such cases comprises raising of a complement subject to a matrix subject position, passivization of the matrix verb, infinitivalization of the complement verb followed by its object, e.g.:

John was considered to be an FBI agent

Givon (1972) uses this term and confirms the Kiperskys' observations concerning the impossibility of rendering this structure with verbs like factives.

6. The problems at hand are given much attention in R. Lakoff (1971); Karttunen (1971 b, c; 1973); Kempson (1975); Wilson (1975).

7. The Kiparskys realized the existence of idiolectal variations in the distribution of head noun *the fact* in front of verbal complements, cf. 1971: 348, ft. a. Also Kempson (1975: 127) noticed that *discover* can be followed by *the fact* + S configuration which, however, triggers a slight difference in meaning.

8. Though the pronominalization of head noun **fakt** sounds weird in affirmative sentences with **odkryć** 'discover', it is perfectly acceptable in questions and negations which automatically get an emphatic reading:

Czy podczas ostatniej lekcji chemii Janek odkrył to, że sól rozpuszcza się w wodzie?

Podczas ostatniej lekcji chemii Janek nie odkrył tego, że sól rozpuszcza się w wodzie

9. The parenthetical nature of **agree** allows for its occurrence either as a main verb followed by its complement, where it plays the role of a full-flledged matrix verb contributing to the semantic reading of the sentence (cf. a. below), or it can be used parenthetically at the end of the sentence. In such cases, the initial position of the complement gives primary importance to this proposition, whereas the verb, cut off the main assertion, only signals speaker's attitude toward the proposition (for a more insightful treatment of the issue, cf. Urmson 1963):

a. I agree that roses smell nicer than lilacs

b. Roses smell nicer than lilacs, I agree

10. I am grateful to Paul Neubauer for pointing this out to me.

11. Note that with **podobać się** 'like', the Poss-ing complementation occurs in Polish not only as a result of agent postposing and preposition insertion, as it is in 13, but it also allows a possessive pronoun to precede the nominal (a structure much closer to its English equivalent):

Janowi podobało się moje pojawienie się na scenie

12. Cf. Rosenberg's comment (1975: 84-90) on different readings of questions with semi-factives which range from presuppositional to non-presuppositional, depending on the form of the verbal complement.

13. The subclassification of verbs undergoing raising into two groups: A-verbs and B-verbs was given by Postal (1974).

14. There are, however, sentences in Polish which might be considered instances of raising (I owe this observation to Paul Neubauer and Liz Riddle):

Uważam go za kulturalnego człowieka

On raising in Polish, cf. also Lewandowska (1976) and Boniewicz (1978). Although the former noticed only one raiser **wydawać się** 'seem', the latter showed that there are other verbs allowing raising in Polish, e.g. **zdawać się**, **wydawać się**, **wyglądać na**, **czuć**, **odzuwać**, **pozwalać**, etc.

15. See, for example, the Kiparskys (1971: 359); Ross (1975).

16. A detailed account of sequence of tenses rules was given in Riddle (1978) where the author advocated a pragmatic approach to the problem.

REFERENCES

- Boniewicz, a. „Properties of raised constructions in English and Polish”. Unpublished paper.
- Bonney, W. L. 1976. „Problems in the grammar and logic of English complementation”. **Indiana University Linguistics Club**.
- Caton, Ch. E. (ed.). 1963 **Philosophy and ordinary language**. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Fillmore, Ch. and Langendoen, D. T. (eds.). 1971. **Studies in linguistic semantics**. New York: Holt.
- Fisiak, J. (ed.). 1968. **Studia Anglica Posnaniensia 1**. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. A. Mickiewicza.
- Fisiak, J. (ed.). 1976. **Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics 4**. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. A. Mickiewicza.
- Fisiak, J., Lipińska, M., Zabrocki, T. 1978. **An introductory English Polish contrastive grammar**. Warszawa: PWN.
- Givon, T. 1972. „Forward implications, backward presuppositions, and the time axis of verbs”. In Kimball, J. (ed.). 1972. 29-50.
- Hooper, J. B., Thompson, S. A. 1973. „On the applicability of root transformations”. **LI 4, 4**, 465-97.
- Horn, L. 1971. „Negative transportation: unsafe at any speed?”. **CLS 7**, 120-33.
- Horn, L. 1975. „Neg-Raising predicates: toward an explanation”. **CLS 11**, 279-94.
- Karttunen, L. 1970. „On the semantics of complement sentences”. **CLS 6**, 328-39.
- Karttunen, L. 1971 a. „Implicative verbs”. **LG 47, 2**, 340-58.
- Karttunen, L. 1971 b. „The logic of English predicate complement constructions”. **Indiana University Linguistics Club**.
- Karttunen, L. 1971 c. „Counterfactual conditionals”. **LI 2, 4**, 566-9.
- Karttunen, L. 1973. „Presuppositions of compound sentence”. **LI 4, 2**, 169-93.

- Keenan, E. L. 1971. „Two kinds of presuppositions in natural language” In Fillmore, Ch. and Langendoen, D. T. (eds.). 1971. 45–54.
- Keenan, E. L. (ed.). 1975. *Formal semantics of natural language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kempson, R. M. 1975. *Presupposition and the delimitation of semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kimball, J. (ed.). 1972. *Syntax and semantics 1*. New York: Seminar Press.
- Kiparsky, P., Kiparsky, C. 1971. „Fact”. In Steinberg, D. D. and Jakobovits, L. A. (eds.). 1971. 345–69.
- Krzyszowski, T. P. 1971. „Equivalence, congruence and deep structure”. In Nickel, G. (ed.). 1971. 37–48.
- Lakoff, G. 1979. *Irregularity in syntax*. New York: Holt.
- Lakoff, R. 1971. „If's and's and but's about conjunction”. In Fillmore, Ch. and Langendoen, D. T. (eds.). 1971. 114–49.
- Lakoff, R. 1973. Review of Bierwisch, M. and Heidolph, K. E. (eds.). 1970. *Progress in linguistics*. *Lg* 49, 4. 685–97.
- Lewandowska, B. 1976. „Derivation of infinitives in English and Polish”. In Fisiak, J. (ed.). 1976. 303–17.
- Marton, W. 1968. „Equivalence and congruence in transformational contrastive studies”. In Fisiak, J. (ed.). 1968. 53–62.
- Menzel, P. 1975. *Semantics and syntax of complementation*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Nickel, G. (ed.). 1971. *Papers in contrastive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oh, Ch. K. 1974. „More on the degree of factivity”. *CLS* 10. 317–27.
- Postal, P. M. 1974. *On raising*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Riddle, E. 1978. „Sequence of tenses in English”. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Rosenberg, M. 1975. „Counterfactuals: a pragmatic analysis of presupposition”. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Ross, J. R. 1967. „Constraints on variables in syntax”. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. MIT.
- Ross, J. R. 1975. „Clausemateness”. In Keenan, E. L. (ed.). 1975. 422–75.
- Steinberg, D. D. and Jakobovits, L. A. (eds.). 1971. *Semantics. An interdisciplinary reader*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Urmson, J. O. 1963. „Parenthetical verbs”. In Caton, Ch. E. (ed.). 1963. 220–40.
- Wilson, D. 1975. *Presuppositions and non-truth conditional semantics*. New York: Academic Press.

CZY FAKTYWNOŚĆ JEST FAKTEM? DOWODY SYNTAKTYCZNE Z JEZYKA ANGIELSKIEGO I POLSKIEGO.

Streszczenie

Celem niniejszego artykułu jest wykazanie, iż faktywność winna być traktowana jedynie jako semantyczna cecha predykatów, ponieważ w sferze syntaktycznej pojęcie to traci swą siłę wyjaśnienia. Zaprezentowana analiza oparta jest na obserwacjach R. Lakoff zawartych w recenzji (*Language* 1973) artykułu Kiparskich „The fact” (1971).

Wg. tych ostatnich, pewne predykaty presuponują prawdę swoich zdań podrzędnych nie tylko w zdaniach twierdzących, lecz także w pytających i przeczących. Na tej podstawie wyróżniono czasowniki faktywne, charakteryzujące się w/w cechą oraz nefaktywne, których zdania podrzędne nie są presuponowane lecz jedynie są pod asercją. Kiparscy próbowali znaleźć uzasadnienie swej hipotezy także w sferze składni, tak więc zauważyli kilka cech charakterystycznych. Wg. nich, jedynie dla faktywów, np. rzeczownik *the fact* (*fakt*) mogący poprzedzać ich zdania podrzędne; komplementacja *Poss-ing*: opcja w stosowaniu tzw. *extraposition transformation* czy następstwa czasów. Jednocześnie miały faktywy nie poddawać się stosowaniu transformacji

przenoszących pewne elementy zdania (tzw. movement rules), jak np.: raising czy neg-raising.

Doprowadziło to do generalizacji, jakby faktywność determinowała nie tylko semantyczne ale i syntaktyczne zachowania predykatów. Twierdzenie powyższe zostało zakwestionowane przez R. Lakoff, wg. której część tzw. czasowników faktywnych pozwala na stosowanie reguł typu raising i odwrotnie, domniemane niefaktywne mogą być czasem poddawane transformacjom „typowo faktywnym”.

Niniejsza analiza dostarcza bardziej wyczerpujących dowodów na poparcie tezy, iż taki podział predykatów, wraz z trzecią pośrednią grupą sami-faktywów w żadnym stopniu nie określa syntaktycznych zachowań tych czasowników. Na podstawie materiału angielskiego i polskiego zostało wykazane, że powyższa klasyfikacja jest bezzasadna, co stanowi poparcie dla tezy autora, iż skomplikowane zagadnienia syntaktyczne nie znajdują wyjaśnienia poprzez pojęcia semantyczne, takie jak faktywność.

Analiza bada możliwość zastosowania pewnych „typowo faktywnych” reguł do tzw. semi- i niefaktywnych czasowników i odwrotnie. Przeprowadza się testy co do „odporności” faktywów na reguły typu raising. Okazuje się, iż zarówno w przypadku angielskich czasowników, jak i ich polskich odpowiedników, „faktywne” transformacje mają znacznie szerszą dystrybucję, niż sądzono pierwotnie. Ich zastosowanie jest uwarunkowane pewnymi procesami insercji lub preferencjami idiolektycznymi (w przypadku rzeczownika *the fact* czy komplementacji *Poss-ing* czy też doborem odpowiedniego predykatu (*likely*), gdy chodzi o extrapozycję.

Natomiast reguły typu raising są stosowane wg. na tyle skomplikowanych kryteriów, że dychotomia faktywny/niefaktywny ma zbyt małą siłę wyjaśnienia. Po pierwsze, dwa faktywy poddają się regule raising, po drugie grupa tzw. raisers (czasowników podatnych na tę transformację) jest niewielka w angielskim i jeszcze mniej liczna w polskim. Z kolei neg-raising ma tak ograniczoną dystrybucję, że nie ma ona wpływu na rozpatywany problem.

Następstwo czasów miało być dowolnie stosowane przy faktywnych i obligatoryjnie przy niefaktywnych. Analiza dowodzi, że reguła ta jest uzależniona raczej od typu zdania podrzędnego i czasu w jakim występuje, a nie od klasy danego predykatu w zdaniu głównym.

Reasumując, angielski i polski materiał wykazał, że żadnej transformacji nie można przypisać cechy „faktywna” „niefaktywna”. Nie faktywność, lecz kontekst, procesy insercji, preferencje idiolektyczne i inne skomplikowane czynniki decydują o regułach jakim może być poddany określony predykat.