

Manner of Speaking Verbs and Their Clausal Complements in English*

Tetsuya Kogusuri

1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with clausal complements that manner of speaking verbs take:

- (1) a. Mary screamed that it was a mistake.
 b. John whispered that we should turn down the stereo.

In the examples in (1), the verbs *scream* and *whisper*, describing specific manners of speaking, take *that*-clauses as their complements. Such verbs are called manner of speaking verbs, which are defined as verbs referring to “intended acts of communication by speech” and describing “physical characteristics of the speech act” (Zwicky (1971:223)). Typical members of the class are listed below:

- (2) shout, scream, yell, mutter, whine, whisper, chuckle, sigh, shriek, growl, mumble, murmur ...

These verbs seem to express the same verbal utterance as verbs of saying such as *say* and *tell* do. However, their clausal complements are known to behave rather differently from that of *say*; in particular, they do not allow *that*-omission and *wh*-extraction, as in (3-4):

- (3) a. Mary murmured *(that) it was a mistake.
 b. She said (that) they were very impressed.
 (4) a. * What_i did Martin shriek that there were t_i in the caviar?
 b. What_i did John say that there were t_i in the caviar?

As seen in (3-4), *that*-clauses following manner of speaking verbs sharply contrast with those of verbs of saying with respect to these phenomena. Syntacticians have attempted to reduce the above contrasts to the structural difference between manner of speaking complements and complements of *say*, i.e. adjuncts versus arguments.

The purpose of this paper is to argue that a variety of behaviors of manner of speaking complements, including *that*-omission and *wh*-extraction, are motivated by the lexical status of the verbs themselves, not by the syntactic status of manner of

* This is a modified version of my paper “Eigo ni Okeru Doshi no Goi to Hobun no Soukan Kankei (The Correlation between Verbal Meanings and Clausal Complements in English),” read at the 3rd Linguistic Colloquium, held at University of Tsukuba, on June 26th, 2008. I would like to express my thanks to the following people for their invaluable comments on earlier versions of this article: Nobuhiro Kaga, Yukio Hirose, Naoaki Wada, Toshiaki Oya, Saburo Aoki, and Yoshiki Mori. I am also grateful to Ken-ichi Kitahara, Mai Osawa, Shun Kudo, and Kazuho Suzuki for helpful comments and discussions with me. My special thanks go to Debbie Fleury and Victoria Hourtris for insightful comments on the data presented here. Any remaining errors and shortcomings are mine.

speaking complements. This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 surveys adjunct analyses of manner of speaking complements, and several problems are pointed out. Section 3 suggests the lexical semantic analysis of manner of speaking verbs and proves the validity of the analysis by illustrating the interaction between verbal semantics and behaviors of clausal complements. In section 4, we give further support for our analysis in terms of the phenomenon of extraposition from subject NPs. Section 5 concludes this article briefly.

2. Previous Studies

In this section, let us survey syntactic approaches to manner of speaking complements and examine the validity of the argument.

2.1. *Adjunct Analyses*

In syntactic researches (Stowell (1981a, 1981b), Baltin (1982), and Kuwabara and Matsuyama (2001)), clausal complements of manner of speaking verbs have been claimed to be syntactically adjuncts, not obligatory elements. One piece of evidence, for example, is that *wh*-extractions out of temporal adverbial clauses, typically cited as an example of an adjunct, are unacceptable, as shown in (5):

- (5) * Who_i did Mary cry after John hit *t_i*? (Huang (1982:503))

The ungrammaticality of this example indicates that *wh*-extraction from an adjunct clause cannot be allowed. Similarly, manner of speaking complements do not undergo *wh*-extraction, either. Consider example (4a) again, repeated here as (6):

- (6) * What_i did Martin shriek that there were *t_i* in the caviar?

Therefore, given the fact about *wh*-extraction, manner of speaking complements have the status of adjuncts.

In addition to the similarity with temporal adverbial clauses, it is also known that manner of speaking complements are syntactically optional, as in (7):

- (7) a. Mary {murmured/screamed/whispered}.
b. * She said.

Example (7a) shows that manner of speaking verbs can be used intransitively. Moreover, it also shows that clausal complements are not obligatory constituents for manner of speaking verbs. In light of the general view that syntactically optional elements are adjuncts, it can be argued that manner of speaking complements are not the syntactic objects. The verb *say*, however, requires the object, as in (7b), so that its clausal complement is identified as the verbal argument.

Another piece of evidence for the adjuncthood of manner of speaking complements is the acceptability of the passivization. Observe the examples below:

- (8) a. * It was shouted by Morris that night was falling. (Zwicky (1971:232))
 b. It is said that Bill is honest. (Tanaka (1991:71))

In (8a), the *that*-clause complement occupies the extraposed position in the passive sentence, while the expletive *it* is placed in the subject position. In this case, the passivization is barred with respect to the manner of speaking complement. This is sharply contrastive with the case of *say* in (8b). Given the pervasive assumption that passivization applies to verbal arguments, the illicit passivization of the *that*-clause in (8a) can be ascribed to its syntactic status: unlike the clausal complement of *say*, manner of speaking complements are not the syntactic objects of the verbs. Thus, the passivizability syntactically differentiates manner of speaking complements from complements of verbs of saying, which lends support to the adjuncthood of the former.

The same situation as passivization holds for topicalization as follows:

- (9) a. * [That he was sick of not getting fed]_i, I think that Ben sighed *t_i*.
 (Stowell (1981b:399))
 b. [That Mary was honest]_i, John says *t_i*. (Tanaka (1991:71))

In (9a), the manner of speaking complement cannot appear in the topic position. In (9b), on the other hand, the clausal complement can be topicalized to the sentence-initial position. As with the case of passivization, we can draw the similar distinction between manner of speaking verbs and verbs of saying in terms of the acceptability of topicalization.

Note here that object NPs can undergo topicalization, as in (10):

- (10) a. John_i, Mary kissed *t_i*.
 b. The carrot_i, he didn't eat *t_i*.

In light of the observation that syntactic objects can be topicalized, the unacceptability in (9a) is accounted for by the claim that manner of speaking complements are not the objects, but adjuncts (cf. Baltin (1982)).

Further evidence which argues for the adjuncthood comes from *wh*-extraction out of a goal PP. Sentences with manner of speaking verbs can undergo *wh*-movement of the goal (or recipient) NP with the preposition *to* left behind:

- (11) a. Who_i did Francine whisper to *t_i* that we should turn down the stereo?
 (Stowell (1981b:400))
 b. Who_i did you yell to *t_i* that Bill was here? (Cinque (1990:167))

From the examples above, Cinque (1990) suggests that the clausal complements do not appear in the immediate postverbal position (i.e. the object position), because there arises no crossing of paths which results from *wh*-extraction of the goal phrase and extraposition of the clausal complement. If the complement is indeed extraposed from the postverbal position, their *wh*-extraction would be prohibited, as in (12):

- (12) a. * Who_i did John say t_k to t_i [that Sally was sure to be late]_k?
 b. * Who_i did John remark t_k to t_i [that Sally was sure to be late]_k?
 (Safir (1985:89))

Accordingly, the grammaticality of (11) argues for the assumption that sentential complements of manner of speaking verbs do not originate in the object position.

Thus, the above pieces of evidence demonstrate that manner of speaking complements are adjuncts rather than arguments.

2.2. Problems

From the discussion so far, the preceding analyses for manner of speaking complements seem to be reasonable. A closer look, however, reveals that there are three empirical problems for the adjuncthood of the complements. Firstly, despite the fact that they can be used intransitively, as in (6), there are examples where they also take object NPs. Consider the examples in (13):

- (13) a. Hoffman will probably mutter {a foul oath/two or three words/
 something unintelligible}. (Zwicky (1971:224))
 b. Mr. Davis screamed it clearly: "Your messiah was never mine!"

Mutter in (13a) co-occurs with the direct object NP, and *scream* in (13b) is followed by the pronoun *it*. Given these examples, the intransitive use of manner of speaking verbs does not serve as strong evidence for the argument that the postverbal finite clause is an adjunct, not the object, since the verbs have a transitive use as well.¹

Secondly, contrary to the previous analyses, manner of speaking complements can be passivized. Compare the examples in (14) and (15):

- (14) a. It is whispered that he intended to resign ... (COBUILD³)
 b. ... it was shouted that they were bringing Kule in.
 (Margaret Mead, *The Mountain Arapesh*)

- (15) * It was shouted by Morris that night was falling. (= (8a))

In contrast with (15), (14) illustrates that manner of speaking complements can be passivized. Therefore, (14) gives strong counterevidence against the argument in the literature that manner of speaking complements cannot undergo passivization.

¹ Object NPs following manner of speaking verbs can undergo passivization. Consider the italicized portions:

- (i) a. We have all heard of the party game where *a message is whispered* from one person to the next... (BNC B33)
 b. *This was shouted* so loudly that passers-by reacted and Bernie put his hand out to her. (BNC ATE)

From these examples, it is clear that manner of speaking verbs can take true object NPs: they can be used transitively.

The contrast between (14) and (15) suggests that the agent phrase, which normally realized as a *by*-phrase, must be suppressed, when manner of speaking complements are passivized. The restriction that *by*-phrases cannot appear with passivized clausal complements holds for the case of *say* as well:

- (16) It was said (*by Sam) that John was tall. (Onuma (1973:24))

Example (16) illustrates that the *by*-phrase cannot occur in the passive sentence with *say* when the *that*-clause is passivized. The data in (14-16) demonstrate that *by*-phrases cannot appear with passivized clausal complements taken by not only manner of speaking verbs but also verbs of saying. After all, the passivization of manner of speaking complements is acceptable if the agent *by*-phrase is suppressed.² Thus, the phenomenon does not provide empirical support for the adjunct analyses.

Finally, there are a few manner of speaking complements that are subject to *that*-omission, as in (17), and to *wh*-extraction, as in (18):

- (17) a. She screamed she had to have both. (Bolinger (1972:33))

- b. ... I shouted I would clear it. (BNC CBF)

- (18) a. What_i did John just whisper to you that he ate *t_i*?

- b. Who_i did Bill mutter that he doesn't like *t_i*?

(Stowell (1981b:406))

These are in sharp contrast with the judgments in the literature discussed above, repeated here as (19):

- (19) a. Mary murmured *(that) it was a mistake. (= (3a))

- b. * What_i did Martin shriek that there were *t_i* in the caviar? (= (6))

If the data in (17-18) are taken into account, not considered as exceptions, one who advocates the adjunct analysis has to offer some explanation to the examples.

Now, it is evident that the adjunct analyses of manner of speaking complements are not sufficient in that they fail to deal with three kinds of counterevidence we

² According to Postal (1986), the verb *say* in the passive form [it be V-ed that S] denotes a generic event, though he does not explain it in detail. If his claim is on the right track, the ungrammaticality in (16) can be accounted for by the generic/specific interpretation: in *It is said that Bill is honest*, the suppressed agent plays a role in interpreting the event as unspecific, not eventive; if there were a *by*-phrase expressing a particular agent like *Sam*, the event would be naturally construed as specific; hence, the presence of the *by*-phrase is infelicitous in (16).

The same reasoning seems to hold for the following example:

- (i) It was said (*to me) that you kicked my mother. (Postal (1986:245))

In this case, the presence of the specific interlocutor *me* is not possible with the passive of *say*. This fact is explained by assuming that the NP imposes the specific event interpretation on the sentence: due to the manifestation of the single interlocutor, the event described can be naturally interpreted as performed only once, i.e. eventive. Thus, specific (single) participants cannot be allowed when clausal complements of *say* are passivized, since they are responsible for specific readings.

The account under the generic interpretation would also be applicable to the ungrammatical passive form of manner of speaking verbs shown in (15), though the deep consideration is needed.

discussed here. Particularly, their analyses cannot capture the contradictory distributions of the complements, i.e. the contrast between examples in (19), on the one hand, and those in (17-18), on the other. To explain the distributional characteristics, we will propose to identify what regulates various behaviors of the complements with respect to verbal semantics in the next section.

3. Correlation between Verbal Semantics and Behaviors of Clausal Complements

In this section, we provide an alternative analysis of manner of speaking complements in order to account for the distributional features. Our discussion here concerns the semantico-syntactic correlation between manner of speaking verbs and behaviors of their clausal complements. First of all, we develop a “componential” analysis of manner of speaking verbs, positing two components of the verbs’ meaning: manner and saying components. Based on the analysis, we hypothesize that various behaviors of a clausal complement are restricted by the manner component, that is, specific lexical status of manner of speaking verbs. The validity of the hypothesis is attested by empirical evidence concerning (i) the contextual information about manner meanings and (ii) effects of manner adverbials on clausal complements of *say*.

3.1. Verbal Semantics: Manner and Saying

According to the characterization presented by Zwicky (1971), we can suppose that meanings of manner of speaking verbs are composed of two parts: one which refers to communication acts by speech, and one which describes the physical characteristics of the speech act. Similar characterizations can be found in the following dictionary definitions of manner of speaking verbs. They refer to physical characteristics of the speech as well as acts of saying something. For the sake of clarity, the relevant parts of descriptions for physical characteristics are underlined:

- (20) a. *shout*
to say something very loudly
- b. *whisper*
to speak or say something very quietly, using your breath rather than your voice
- c. *yell*
to shout or say something very loudly, especially because you are frightened, angry, or excited

(LDOCE⁴)

In these definitions, the physical characteristics of the verbs are depicted by manner

adverbs like *loudly* and *quietly*, while the communication acts are described by the expression *say something*. Therefore, it is clear that meanings of manner of speaking verbs can be commonly characterized by the combination of a manner meaning peculiar to the verb and the meaning of saying something.

With this characterization in mind, it is not unreasonable to assume that meanings of manner of speaking verbs are represented by two components: manner and saying components.³ The latter component is equivalent to the meaning of utterance shared with verbs of saying, i.e. saying something. The former component, on the other hand, is the lexical element unique to manner of speaking verbs, i.e. physical characteristics of utterance specified in each of manner of speaking verbs. With respect to verbs of saying, no manner component in question is involved in their semantics, since they do not designate specific physical characteristics. In this regard, we can say that they are semantically more simple or basic than manner of speaking verbs; conversely, manner of speaking verbs are semantically more complicated than verbs of saying. This is supported by the following pair:

- (21) a. To mumble is to say.
 b. * To say is to mumble.

(Erteschik-Shir (1973:20))

The example in (21a) shows that the action described by *mumble* can be identified as the action of saying. However, the inverse is not possible, as in (21b). This minimal pair illustrates that the manner of speaking verb *mumble* is semantically more complex than *say*. Thus, in contrast to manner of speaking verbs, verbs of saying do not involve specific manner components in their lexical representations.

On the basis of the above assumption, let us now posit two semantic components in the lexical representation of manner of speaking verbs: a shared component SAY which represents the meaning of saying something, and a manner component peculiar to each of the verbs. The lexical representation exemplified by *shout* can be described as in (22). (The representation in (22) is inspired by that of Rappaport and Levin (1998), but other notations are possible.)⁴

- (22) *shout*: [x SAY <SHOUT> y]

In this representation, the two variables x and y indicate the two participants associated with the action of shouting: a shouter and a (propositional) content which x shouts. The latter variable may not be realized formally as discussed in section 2, which is

³ The assumption here is based on the predicate decomposition approach elaborated in the work of Jackendoff (1976, 1983, 1990). See also Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005) and the references therein for the detail.

⁴ See Kageyama (2006) for a similar lexical representation of manner of speaking verbs.

indicated by underlining it. The capital predicate of SAY is the primitive predicate shared by the set of verbs denoting the event of utterance. The angle-bracketed component <SHOUT> represents the particular manner of the verb's meaning: the loud voice named as "shout," which is uttered in the speech act. In lexical semantic studies, it is called a "root" or "constant," which may serve as a modifier of primitive predicates in the lexical semantic structure (recall the dictionary definitions of manner of speaking verbs, where manner meanings are expressed by manner adverbs modifying the act of saying something) (see Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998) for the detailed discussion).

Roots of verbs are known to be syntactically salient in that, among members which express the same event structure, they may differentiate one verb from another. For example, in the set of verbs describing externally caused changes of state or location, some members such as *break* or *slide* show the causative alternation, while others like *murder* or *remove* do not (cf. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995)). Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998) argue that the nature of nonalternating verbs' roots prevents the causative alternation; in other words, the lexical statuses of the individual verbs specify the compatibility with certain argument structures. Similarly, whereas manner of speaking verbs denote the same event of utterance as verbs of saying do, both types of the clausal complements are syntactically differentiated from each other.

Now, let us reconsider contrastive behaviors of the clausal complements taken by manner of speaking verbs and the verb of *say*, as the following:

- (23) a. Mary murmured *(that) it was a mistake. (= (3a))
 b. * What_i did Martin shriek that there were t_i in the caviar? (= (6))
- (24) a. She said (that) they were very impressed. (= (3b))
 b. What_i did John say that there were t_i in the caviar? (= (4b))

Given that verbal roots are syntactically salient and prevent certain syntactic phenomena, we can hypothesize about this contrast in grammaticality as follows:

- (25) Various behaviors of manner of speaking complements are restricted by manner components of the verbs.

This hypothesis accounts for the contrastive behaviors in (23-24) by resting on the existence of a manner component in the verbal semantics: in (23), the manner components of the verbs prevent the syntactic phenomena because of the syntactic saliency; by contrast, as verbs of saying do not have the corresponding manner component, their clausal complements in (24) are compatible with such grammatical behaviors.

If the hypothesis in (25) is on the right track, it is predicted that, in the following sentences where the syntactic phenomena in question are licensed, the roots of the

verbs are much less salient than usual, and that the speakers of the sentences judge the manner of speaking complements as identical to those of *say*.

- (26) a. She screamed she had to have both.
 b. ... I shouted I would clear it.
- (= (17))

- (27) a. What_i did John just whisper to you that he ate *t_i*?
 b. Who_i did Bill mutter that he doesn't like *t_i*?
- (= (18))

In what follows, this prediction will be verified in terms of observations about contextual supports, which in turn bears out our hypothesis in (25).

3.2. Contextual Information about Manner Meanings

This subsection investigates how contextual information about verbal meanings affects behaviors of manner of speaking complements, and gives supporting evidence for our hypothesis of the correlation between manner components and behaviors of *that*-clauses. As we predicted earlier, manner of speaking complements come to behave like those of *say*, if the preceding information about manners is provided. First, participle clauses, which further specify the verbal meaning, ameliorate the acceptability for *that*-omission and *wh*-extraction:

- (28) a. Using a very serious whisper, John whispered to me Clark was Superman.
 b. Using a very serious whisper, what_i did John whisper to you that Clark was *t_i*?
- (29) a. Using a very loud shout that I had never heard, John shouted to me Clark was Superman.
 b. Using a very loud shout that you had never heard, what_i did John shout to you that Clark was *t_i*?

For instance, *using a very serious whisper* in (28) gives more specific information on the subsequent verb *whisper*, allowing the omission of *that* in (28a) and the *wh*-extraction in (28b). The same holds true for the examples in (29). These facts can be accounted for by our analysis: since the contextual information presupposes the manner components modifying the subsequent verbs, the status of the manner meanings are rendered much less salient pragmatically; hence, the otherwise illicit syntactic behaviors are licensed in the discourse (cf. Erteschik-Shir (1973:131fn1)). Thus, it is manner components that distinguish manner of speaking complements from those of verbs of saying in terms of *that*-omission and *wh*-extraction.

Second, in contexts where manner meanings in question are presupposed,

clausal complements can be focused on in terms of question and negation. For example, they cannot normally function as the direct reply to the preceding question:

- (30) a. Why was Laura so happy? (Goldberg (2006:132))
 b. # John shouted that she was dating someone new.
 c. John said she was dating someone new.

((b-c) from Goldberg (2006:134))

The clausal complement in (30b) does not answer the question in (30a); the clausal complement of *say* in (30c), on the other hand, can function as the direct reply to the question. Moreover, manner of speaking complements cannot be within the scope of negation, as in (31):

- (31) a. He didn't say they went to the market.
 b. I didn't grumble that they sent the letter.

(Goldberg (2006:143-144))

As Goldberg (2006) notes, the sentential negation can be used to imply a negation of the proposition expressed by the clausal complement of *say* in (31a), whereas it cannot negate the propositional content of the *that*-clause in (31b). More precisely, while (31a) will be true if he said they didn't go to the market, (31b) will not even if the speaker grumbled that they didn't send the letter. Rather, the example in (31b) only implies the negation of the physical characteristics denoted by the matrix verb (e.g. an implication that the speaker didn't grumble, but whined) (see Goldberg (2006:144)).

By contrast, in special contexts where manner meanings are construed to be given, the scope of question and negation can range over manner of speaking complements. For example, if the presupposition that the referent of the subject always repeats the action of mumbling is given in the discourse, the manner of speaking complement can function as the answer to the preceding question. Consider example (32):

- (32) (Mike is very shy and always mumbles.)

A: What are good vegetables for rabbits?

B: Mike mumbled to me that fresh and small vegetables are good for them.

Here, the clausal complement in the utterance of B functions as the adequate direct reply to the previous question of A. Likewise, in a game of whisper-down-the-alley, where people in a row pass a message down from one to another by whispering, sentential negation comes to range over manner of speaking complements (Ambridge and Goldberg (2008)). Consider the following example:

- (33) (In a game of whisper-down-the-alley)
 I didn't whisper that the horse was green.

= That the horse was green is not what I whispered.

(Ambridge and Goldberg (2008:358-359))

This example illustrates that the contextual information about whispering makes it possible for the clausal complement to be inside the scope of the negation in the matrix clause. Thus, if manner components of the verbs are contextually presupposed, the scope of question and negation can extend to manner of speaking complements. Consequently, what distinguishes manner of speaking verbs from the verb *say* for behaviors of the complements is the very nature of manner components lexicalized in the former.

Third, contextual information may mitigate the obligatoriness of the sequence of tenses in manner of speaking complements. As is well known, a speaker reporting a past utterance can often choose between the past tense and the present tense in the complement clause:

(34) a. John said that his wife {was/is} pregnant.

b. The doctor told me that my blood group {was/is} B.

(Declerck and Tanaka (1996:290))

As for manner of speaking complements, however, Costa (1972) observes that the sequence of tenses is obligatory. Now consider the following example:

(35) Bill {quipped/snorted/whispered} that the new President of Chorea
{was/*is} really a Chai CIA agent. (Costa (1972:46))

The example in (35) shows that after manner of speaking verbs it is impossible to use the present tense form which is distinct from the one in the matrix.

As with the cases discussed above, if the manner meaning is presupposed in the discourse, the present tense is impeccable even in a clausal complement:

(36) A: What did Ann whisper to Bill just now?

B: She whispered that she {loved/loves} him.

(Declerck and Tanaka (1996:294))

In this example, *whisper* used in the question is duplicated in the following answer, which makes presupposed the manner component of the verb. Notice again that the result in (36) parallels with the case of verbs of saying in (34). Thus, the phenomenon of the sequence of tenses illustrates that, with information about manner components presupposed, manner of speaking complements become identical with those of complements of *say* with regard to the behavioral pattern, which in turn proves the unique nature of manner components.

From the discussion so far, we have revealed that if contextual information about manners of speaking is given in the discourse, various phenomena, including *that*-omission and *wh*-extraction, become possible for manner of speaking

complements. The point here is that contextual supports make it possible that manner of speaking complements syntactically approximate to complements of verbs of saying. The observation can be ascribed to the grammatical saliency of manner roots: contextual information pragmatically renders manner of speaking verbs less salient, then approximates its lexical status to that of *say*, and consequently improves various phenomena of the clausal complements. Thus, the discussion of contextual supports here bears out our hypothesis in (25) that various behaviors of manner of speaking complements are restricted by manner components of the verbs.

In the next subsection, we will see that our hypothesis is further supported by independent evidence: if there occur adverbs describing manners of speaking, the complements of verbs of saying come to behave in the same fashion as manner of speaking complements.

3.3. *Manner Adverbials and Their Effects on Clausal Complements*

Supposing that manner components of verbs determine various behaviors of clausal complements, it may be predicted that the same situation holds for sentences with manner adverbials which modify verbs of saying. This prediction is confirmed in the following discussion. Consider the data below:

(37) a. * John said very loudly Mary is a genius.

b. ?*What_i did he say loudly that John would buy t_i? (Starke (2001:32 fn5))

The sentences in (37) include the manner adverbial *loudly* and the verb *say*. Interestingly enough, the clausal complements are incompatible with *that*-omission shown in (37a), and with *wh*-extraction in (37b). The unacceptability is quite comparable to what holds for manner of speaking verbs as discussed earlier, repeated below for illustration:

(38) a. Mary murmured *(that) it was a mistake.

b. * What_i did Martin shriek that there were t_i in the caviar?

(= (23))

Incidentally, as for temporal adverbials and goal PPs, *that*-omission and *wh*-extraction are still possible, as in (39-40):

(39) a. They said last year the economy would be better by now.

b. I said to Mary (that) he was in error.

(Doherty (2000:25))

(40) a. What_i did John say last year that Bill Clinton would do t_i?

b. Who_i did Mary say to you that John loved t_i?

In these cases, unlike *loudly* in (37), the temporal adverbial *last year* and the goal phrases *to Mary* and *to you* do not prevent either of the operations. Therefore, the

ungrammatical sentences in (37) lead us to argue that the manner of speaking, whether it is incorporated into a verb or independently realized as an adverbial, governs the behaviors of clausal complements.

Next, manner adverbials also affect the possibility of using the present tense even within a clausal complement of *say* (Declerck and Tanaka (1996:295)):

- (41) a. John said softly that he {couldn't/?can't} help me.
 b. John said that his wife {was/is} pregnant. (= (34a))

As shown in the contrast between (41a) and (41b), using the manner adverb *softly* makes less acceptable the present tense form *can't* in the clausal complement. Recall that this consequence is identical to the pattern of the manner meaning expressed by manner of speaking verbs, repeated here as (42):

- (42) Bill {quipped/snorted/whispered} that the new President of Chorea
 {was/*is} really a Chai CIA agent. (= (35))

To sum up, as with manner of speaking verbs, verbs of saying modified by manner adverbials are restricted in terms of the behaviors of their clausal complements. This leads us to the conclusion that manner meanings, whether they are incorporated into verbs or independently realized as adverbials, are salient for the behaviors of clausal complements, which independently bears out our hypothesis in (25). In the next section, we will see that our analysis of manner of speaking verbs can extend to another phenomenon, i.e. extraposition from subject NPs, and give further support for our hypothesis.

4. Extraposition from Subject NPs

In this section, we deal with the phenomenon of the so-called “extraposition from NP,” as illustrated in (43a-b):

- (43) a. A man with blond hair appeared.
 b. A man appeared with blond hair.

(Kuno and Takami (2004:169))

It has been assumed in the literature that sentence (43b) is derived from (43a) by extraposing the PP *with blond hair*, a part of the subject NP *a man with blond hair* in (43a), to the sentence-final position.

However, it has also been recognized that not all sentences that involve extraposition from NPs are acceptable. For example, consider the following paradigm:

- (44) a. A man spoke yesterday with blond hair. (Takami (1999:30))
 b. * A man {whispered/grumbled/yelled} yesterday with blond hair. (ibid.)
 c. * A man screamed who wasn't wearing any clothes.

(Rochemont and Culicover (1990:65))

In (44a), the PP *with blond hair*, which originates in the subject NP *a man*, is legitimately placed in the sentence-final position. On the other hand, sentences (44b-c) are formed by extraposing the PP *with the blond hair* and the relative clause *who wasn't wearing any clothes*, respectively, but they are unacceptable.

It should be noticed here that the contrast in grammaticality between the verb of saying in (44a) and the manner of speaking verbs (44b) is quite parallel with the case of manner of speaking complements we have considered in the preceding sections. Based on the contrastive behaviors exemplified in (44), we can extend our analysis of manner of speaking verbs to this phenomenon: extraposition of subject NPs is incompatible with the syntactic saliency induced by manner roots of manner of speaking verbs. This is endorsed by two pieces of empirical evidence.

One of the evidence in favor of our prediction is the effect of contextual information regarding manners of speaking on the possibility of extraposition. As with the case of clausal complements, contextual supports can overcome the ill-formedness of extraposition over manner of speaking verbs like:⁵

- (45) a. ? A man {whispered/grumbled} in the middle of the meeting with blond hair. (Takami (1999:30))
 b. ? A man yelled in the stadium with blond hair. (ibid.)
 c. Suddenly there was the sound of lions growling. Several women screamed. Then a man screamed who was standing at the very edge of the crowd. (Rochemont and Culicover (1990:65))

In (45a-b), the locative PPs *in the middle of the meeting/in the stadium* set up situations in which the given manners can be regarded as nothing special (cf. Takami (1999:31)).⁶ In (45c), the same type of situation is established by the first sentence (i.e. presenting a situation that lions were growling); furthermore, the verb *scream* is repeatedly used in the second and third sentences; as a result, the contextual information contributes to the possible extraposition of the relative clause *who was*

⁵ Takami (1999:30-31) reports that the sentences (45a-b) “are distinctly better than [(44b)], if not perfect.”

⁶ In order to improve the acceptability of extraposition, the pragmatic strategy adopted here is slight different from what we have observed above: In examples (28-29), (32-33), and (36), the presuppositions about manner components are presented by using the same verbs in the previous contexts; the cases in (45a-b), however, are acceptable because the PPs set the scenes adequate for using the relevant manners of speaking (e.g. a scene where people whisper in the meeting).

It is noteworthy here that the object NPs of the scene-setting PPs are definite, generally regarded as given information. Therefore, these NPs might help the PPs invoke the accessibility to the previous discourse. Needless to say, to justify this conjecture, more consideration is required, which I would like to leave open to future research.

standing at the very edge of the crowd.

The fact that contextual supports improve the felicity of extraposition over manner of speaking verbs is also observed in the following data:

- (46) A: Who screamed the loudest?
 B: An old man did with a mustache and a long beard.
 (Kuno and Takami (2004:176))

- (47) A: Who screamed the loudest?
 B: An old man did who had a mustache and a long beard.
 (Kuno and Takami (2004:185))

The sentences in (46B) and (47B) undergo extrapositions of the PP and the relative clause, respectively. According to Kuno and Takami (2004), the majority of the speakers who do not usually accept extraposition over manner of speaking verbs consider these sentences acceptable. Notice that they function as the answers to the preceding questions which include the manner of speaking verb *scream*, and that the verb is substituted with an auxiliary verb in both cases. As the *do* substitution indicates, the verb *scream* is presupposed in the discourse; hence, the manner components become less salient: the verb's lexical status results in approximating to the status of verbs of saying, which in turn makes possible the extrapositions in (46-47).

Another piece of evidence which argues for our prediction concerns the combination of verbs of saying and manner adverbials. Manner adverbials prohibit not only behaviors of clausal complements of *say*, but also extraposition from subject NPs, as illustrated in (48):

- (48) a. A woman with blond hair spoke in a loud voice.
 b. * A woman spoke in a loud voice with blond hair.

In (48b), the adverbial *in a loud voice* clearly prevents the extraposition of *with blond hair*. Again, this ungrammaticality accords with the case of manner of speaking verbs in (44b-c), repeated here as (49) for ease of exposition:

- (49) a. * A man {whispered/grumbled/yelled} yesterday with blond hair.
 b. * A man screamed who wasn't wearing any clothes.

The fact in (48) can be accounted for by the lexical semantic property of manner meanings for grammatical behaviors which we have discussed so far: the manner adverbial in (48b) is syntactically salient so that the extraposition from the subject NP is ruled out.

It is now clear that our analysis of manner of speaking verbs can extend to the phenomenon of extraposition from subject NPs. The evidence for the argument is provided by considerations of contextual information and the effect of manner

adverbials on the acceptability of extraposition. Also, this consequence indirectly endorses our hypothesis about manner of speaking complements.

5. Conclusion

We have been concerned with the class of manner of speaking verbs and the behavioral pattern of their clausal complements. We have claimed that various behaviors of manner of speaking complements are restricted by manner components of the verbs. This claim was confirmed by three pieces of empirical evidence: (i) contextual information on manner meanings, (ii) the effect of manner adverbials modifying verbs of saying, and (iii) extraposition from subject NPs. Our discussion results in signifying the importance of considering the correlation between verbal semantics and grammatical behaviors.

REFERENCES

- Ambridge, B. and A. E. Goldberg (2008) "The Island Status of Clausal Complements: Evidence in Favor of an Information Structure Explanation," *Cognitive Linguistics* 19-3, 349-381.
- Baltin, M. (1982) "A Landing Site for Movement Rules," *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 1-38.
- Bolinger, D. (1972) *That's That*, Mouton.
- British National Corpus, [BNC].
- Cinque, G. (1990) *Types of A' Dependencies*, MIT Press.
- Collins COBUILD English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*, 3rd edition, (2001), HarperCollins Publishers, [COBUILD³].
- Costa, R. (1972) "Sequence of Tenses in *That*-Clauses," P. Peranteau, J. Levi and G. Phares (eds.), *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 45-51.
- Declerck, R. and K. Tanaka (1996) "Constraints on Tense Choice in Reported Speech," *Studia Linguistica* 50-3, 283-301.
- Doherty, C. (2000) *Clauses without "That": The Case for Bare Clausal Complementation in English*, Garland.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (1973) *On the Nature of Island Constraints*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Goldberg, A. E. (2006) *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*, Oxford University Press.
- Huang, C. T. J. (1982) *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1976) "Toward an Explanatory Semantic Representation," *Linguistic Inquiry* 7, 639-671.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1983) *Semantics and Cognition*, MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1990) *Semantic Structures*, MIT Press.

- Kageyama, T. (2006) "Motional and Resultative Constructions with Verbs of Sound Emission," *Journal of the Society of English and American Literature* 50-2, 57-73, Kwansai Gakuin University.
- Kuno, S. and K. Takami (2004) *Functional Constraints on Grammar: On the Unergative-Unaccusative Distinction*, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kuwabara, K. and T. Matsuyama (2001) *Hobun-Kouzou (Structures of Clausal Complements)*, Kenkyusha.
- Leech, G. N. and J. Svartvik (1994) *A Communicative Grammar of English*, 2nd edition, Longman.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (1995) *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*, MIT Press.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (2005) *Argument Realization*, Cambridge University Press.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, 4th edition, (2003), Longman, [LDOCE⁴].
- Onuma, M. (1973) "Kotoba to Bunka (Language and Culture): Putting a Linguistic Cart before a Horse," *Eigo Kenkyu (English Studies)* 62-6, 22-24.
- Postal, P. M. (1986) *Studies of Passive Clauses*, State University of New York Press.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. and B. Levin (1998) "Building Verb Meanings," M. Butt and W. Geuder (eds.), *The Projection of Arguments*, 97-134, CSLI Publications.
- Rochemont, M. and P. Culicover (1990) *English Focus Construction and the Theory of Grammar*, Cambridge University Press.
- Safir, K. (1985) *Syntactic Chains*, Cambridge University Press.
- Starke, M. (2001) "Move Dissolves into Merge: a Theory of Locality," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.
- Stowell, T. (1981a) "Complementizers and the Empty Category Principle," *NELS* 11, 345-63.
- Stowell, T. (1981b) *Origins of Phrase Structure*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Takami, K. (1999) "A Functional Constraint on Extraposition from NP," A. Kamio and K. Takami (eds.) *Function and Structure: In Honor of Susumu Kuno*, 23-56, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tanaka, S. (1991) "On the Argumenthood of *That*-Clauses Which 'Communication Verbs' Take," *Tsukuba English Studies* 10, 69-82. University of Tsukuba.
- Zwicky, A. (1971) "In a Manner of Speaking," *Linguistic Inquiry* 11-2, 223-233.

Doctoral Program in Humanities and Social Sciences

University of Tsukuba

e-mail: ay_ust_et_gok@hotmail.com