

# Some Notes on the Deletion of *THAT*

## —Speaking Verbs—\*

---

Daisuke Hirai

---

### 1. Introduction

Traditionally, it has been assumed that the complementizer *that* in English (henceforth, COMP-*that*) which introduces a noun clause as a direct object of speaking verbs is basically optional and therefore, it can be deleted freely as in (1).

(1) a . We said that George Strait was awesome.

b . We said George Strait was awesome.

Specifically, Quirk *et al.* (1985: 1049) claims that COMP-*that* is often omitted in speech or informal situations, and that it is generally deleted when complements are not (linearly) long.

However, as Fowler (1965) points out, the omission of COMP-*that* seems to be subject to some requirements as shown in (2).

(2) a . \*The Italian Olympic Committee announced all officials, regardless of nationality, will wear the same uniform. (Fowler (1965: 633))

b . He said (that) he liked it. (Bolinger (1972: 18))

The sentence in (2a) is ungrammatical since COMP-*that* is deleted while (2b) is well-formed even when COMP-*that* is dropped. As this fact shows, it is well known that the (im)possibility of deleting COMP-*that* is dependent on verbs. If so, some questions arise immediately. One of them is what the rule is.

To answer this question, some analyses have been provided. One of them is proposed in terms of frequency. Another is proposed based on a meaning of a matrix verb and presupposition. This is similar to analyses for thinking verbs such as *forget*, *realize*, *suppose*, or *think*.<sup>1</sup> This analysis argues that the presence of COMP-*that* is required when a matrix verb involves response act which is to the complement presupposed.

The main purpose of this paper is to examine the distribution of COMP-*that* for speaking verbs in English and to show primarily on the basis of data collected from judgments by native speakers that the previous analyses do not match the empirical data,

and thus another approach is necessary.<sup>2</sup>

The organization of this paper is as follows. In the following section, two previous studies that we have just seen above will be briefly reviewed. First, an analysis based on frequency is discussed, and it will be pointed out that some problems exist with it. Then, I consider an analysis based on a relation between a matrix verb and its complement, and claim that this analysis requires more supporting evidence. In Section 3, in order to see how the latter works, I will examine the distribution of COMP-that of speaking verbs on the basis of the judgment by native speakers. The verbs used for this research are selected from Quirk *et al.* (1985) by referring to information on the frequency of words in Collins CUBUILD English Dictionary (COBUILD). In Section 4, the result obtained from the questionnaires will be presented. In Section 5, I will discuss the distribution of COMP-that, and claim that the analysis isn't well-supported. Section 6 is for concluding remarks and further problems.

## 2. Previous Analyses and their Problems

For the deletion of COMP-that following speaking verbs, some analyses have been presented. In this section, I will review some previous studies and consider some problems with them. First, I will consider an analysis by Bolinger (1972) and point out some problems with it. Then, another analysis based on meaning of verbs will be discussed in Section 2.2.

### 2.1 Frequency

One of the most outstanding studies of the omission of COMP-that is by Bolinger (1972). Bolinger attempts to explain the (im)possibility of the deletion of COMP-that in terms of frequency of words. Consider the examples in (3) and (4).

- (3) a. He said he like it.  
 b. He shouted he was ready.  
 c. He claimed it was no good.  
 d. He declared it was too hard to understand.  
 e. I added it was necessary. (Bolinger (1972: 18))
- (4) a. \*She gushed she simply loved it.  
 b. \*He sounded off he was better than anybody.  
 c. \*He sniggered it was easy.  
 d. \*They chortled it was only a joke.

- e . \*He objected it was already six o'clock and too late to leave.  
 f . \*I tossed in it was necessary.  
 g . \*I represented it was true.  
 h . ?He snorted he would have nothing to do with it.

(Bolinger (1972: 17-18))

Notice that the matrix verbs in (3) and (4) are verbs which I call speaking-verbs in this paper. Bolinger (1972) argues that COMP-that following high-frequency verbs is deletable. This means that COMP-that is optional when a matrix verb is one which is popular or used often in usual conversation, while it is obligatory when a matrix verb is one which is low in their frequency. Furthermore, Bolinger also observes that COMP-that is obligatory when a matrix verb is a speaking verb which incorporates a manner adverb.<sup>3</sup>

However, some problems are easily found with this argument. One of them is that the analysis is based on frequency. As Figure 1 shows, it is doubtful that *sound* and *object* in (4b, e), respectively, after which COMP-that cannot be deleted, are much less popular than the matrix verbs in (3) where COMP-that is dropped. Specifically, it seems that there is not much difference between the frequency of *object* and that of *declare* to determine the omission of COMP-that. Moreover, *represent* is quite familiar, but its COMP-that is obligatory. Besides, although *snort* is the lowest, the omission of COMP-that is a bit more permissible than after *represent*. See (4h). This shows that the analysis based on the frequency of verbs in question is not satisfactory enough, and the deletion of COMP-that is not crucially related to the frequency.

In addition, if we pay close attention to the verbs in (3), we will see that the analyses which rely on whether verbs incorporate a manner adverb are also lack of generality. As Bolinger (1972) implies, the matrix verb *shout* in (3b) seems to incorporate a kind of manner adverb as in (5a). The same argument can also be applied to another verb in

Figure 1<sup>4</sup>

Verb(s)	Frequency	Omission of <i>that</i>
shout	2897	YES
declare	3610	YES
object	3176	NO
sound	13077	NO
represent	5507	NO
snort	282	?

(3). In fact, those verbs are defined as in (5).

(5) a. If you shout, you say something loudly.

b. If you declare that something is true. You say that it is true in a firm, deliberate way. (COBUILD)

Under the analyses by Bolinger (and Erteschik), deleting COMP-that following those verbs should not be possible. Nevertheless, the given facts show that COMP-that is deletable. This means that this argument is not adequate enough, either.

In the following section, I will consider an alternative analysis based on meaning of matrix verbs.

## 2.2 Meaning of Verbs

Another interesting analysis is suggested by Nakamura (1998), Hiroe (1999) and among others.<sup>5</sup> Nakamura claims that although speaking verbs are assumed to be non-factive verbs, there are some types of verbs that show the same behavior/properties as factive verbs. In particular, like factive verbs, there are some verbs that include a sort of response to the content of the complement which is presupposed in the discourse, namely, response verbs. COMP-that following those kinds of verbs is non-deletable.

In the case of the factive verb, as Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970) argues, its complement expresses a true proposition which is presupposed, and the factive verb in a matrix clause conveys comments or opinions to it. In this case, COMP-that is not deletable (see Melvold (1991) for discussion). Consider (6).

(6) a. I suppose (that) Lions lost the first game.

b. I regret \*(that) Lions lost the first game.

In (6b) where the occurrence of COMP-that is obligatory, the speaker/subject presupposes that the content of the complement is true and gives his opinion or comment to it. On the other hand, in (6a) where the presence of COMP-that is optional, the speaker/subject only thinks or supposes that Lions lost the first game. That is, COMP-that is difficult to delete when the matrix verb implies the speaker/subject's opinion or thought with the content of the complement presupposed.

According to Nakamura, even for non-factive (speaking) verbs, some verbs, behaving just like factive verbs, select as their complement the content that is not necessarily presupposed, but is believed to be true in the discourse. The verbs to do this job are response stance verbs, which include response to a complement whose content is somewhat presupposed as shown in (7).

(7) *accept, agree, confirm, deny, ...*

- a. Bill claimed that Sue was guilty, and then in response, Bill denied it.  
 b. \*Bill denied that Sue was guilty and then, in response, Harry claimed it.

(Cattell (1978: 68))

As shown in (7), there is a temporal sequence in (7a), which does not exist in (7b). Thus, those types of verbs seem to involve a sort of response to the content of the complement which is believed to be true in the discourse (or presupposed in a sense). Those verbs do not allow the deletion of COMP-that as in (8).

(8) a. They accept \*(that) loneliness causes cancer.

b. They agree ??(that) she is guilty. (Nakamura (1998))

c. Bill admitted \*(that) he was guilty. (Hiroe (1999: 67))

As seen in (8), COMP-that following these types of verbs is not deletable, just like factive verbs.

This analysis seems most promising so far because it shares some properties with analyses already presented for factive verbs. However, it seems to be still premature since enough evidence is not presented. In order to see whether this argument is correct, we need further evidence to support this analysis. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the distribution of COMP-that more closely. In the following section, I investigate the distribution of COMP-that by collecting data from native-speakers' judgments, and show that the data doesn't provide enough evidence for this analysis.

### 3. Data Collected from the Questionnaires

To examine further the distribution of COMP-that, I have conducted research by questioning 12 native speakers. In order to select verbs to examine, I have picked up 25 high-frequent verbs out of 53 verbs listed in Quirk *et al.* (1985: 1181) as speaking verbs that take indirect speech. The choice of these verbs is based on COBUILD, which shows by using five frequency bands how frequent the verbs in question are in terms of corpus data. Using high-frequent verbs is meaningful for informants' check in order to obtain more adequate results. All the verbs listed in Quirk *et al.* (1985: 1181) are given below. The figure beside each verb shows the frequency shown in COBUILD, and the bold-typed verbs are used for the research. (The most frequent words have five points, and the less frequent ones have lower point(s).)

For the verbs given in Figure 2, I examine the distribution of COMP-that and see what kind of verb blocks the omission of COMP-that by using a questionnaire to native

speakers. Sentences in the questionnaire are given as written English. The subjects are supposed to answer with their linguistic intuition how necessary COMP-that is, and to mark the scale: 1. Totally, 2. Very, 3. Not very, 4. Unnecessary. The subjects are shown in Figure 3. All the subjects are teaching English at a high school or university.

Figure 2<sup>6</sup>

Verb	Point	Verb	Point	Verb	Point	Verb	Point
add	5	explain	4	predict	3	testify	2
agree	5	guarantee	4	remark	3	vow	2
announce	5	insist	4	affirm	2	certify	1
answer	5	maintain	4	allege	2	confide	1
claim	5	mention	4	assert	2	exclaim	1
report	5	object	4	boast	2	foretell	0
state	5	promise	4	confess	2	prophecy	0
suggest	5	repeat	4	contend	2		
admit	4	reply	4	convey	2		
argue	4	warn	4	disclose	2		
comment	4	acknowledge	3	proclaim	2		
complain	4	bet	3	pronounce	2		
confirm	4	concede	3	retort	2		
declare	4	forecast	3	submit	2		
deny	4	hint	3	swear	2		

Figure 3

Subject	Nationality	Sex	Age
A	U.S.A.	Male	23
B	U.S.A.	Female	23
C	U.S.A.	Male	65
D	U.S.A.	Male	51
E	U.S.A.	Male	43
F	New Zealand	Male	35
G	British	Male	35
H	British	Male	47
I	Irish	Male	36
J	New Zealand	Female	36
K	New Zealand	Male	24
L	Australia	Female	30
Average Age			37.3

For the questionnaire, see Appendix 1.

#### 4. Results

The result obtained from the questionnaires to 12 informants is shown in Figure 4. The figure in it shows that the lower point(s) each verb gets, the more necessary COMP-that is for its complement. The verbs in Figure 4 are arranged in order of difficulty of the deletion. The average point is listed beside each verb. The alphabets in the top line in Figure 4 correlate to those in Figure 3.

Taking a look at the results above, we can see that the obligatoriness of COMP-that differs, depending on verbs. Specifically, as Figure 4 shows, the presence of COMP-that should be required for *add*, *answer*, *argue*, *comment*, *object*, *explain*, *reply*, and *warn*, given that each average point does not go over 2 points.<sup>7</sup> In other words, COMP-that is totally necessary or at least very necessary for these verbs.

On the other hand, the result also shows that verbs allowing COMP-that to be deleted are *declare*, *promise*, *insist*, *admit*, *deny*, *suggest*, *guarantee*, and *agree*. The average points for those verbs are over 3 points, which means that COMP-that is not very

Figure 4

Verb	Point	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	Ave.
add	5	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1.33
answer	5	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	1.41
argue	4	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1.41
comment	4	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	1.58
object	4	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	1.58
explain	4	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	3	2	2	3	1.83
reply	4	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	1.83
warn	4	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1.83
repeat	4	2	1	2	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
announce	5	1	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	2.08
complain	4	1	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2.25
state	5	1	1	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2.33
confirm	4	1	1	2	1	1	3	4	4	4	3	2	2	2.33
maintain	4	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2.41
mention	4	4	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	1	2.5
report	5	4	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	4	3	3	3	2.83
claim	5	4	4	2	2	1	2	4	3	3	3	3	4	2.91
agree	5	4	3	4	3	3	2	4	2	3	3	3	1	2.91
guarantee	4	4	4	4	3	1	3	4	3	3	2	3	1	2.91
suggest	5	4	3	3	4	1	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.25
deny	4	2	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	2	3	3	3.25
insist	4	4	4	4	2	2	3	4	4	4	3	3	2	3.25
admit	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.33
promise	4	4	4	4	3	1	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.33
declare	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	1	3.33
Ave.	2.31	2.12	2.42	2.42	1.96	2.23	2.81	2	3	2.42	2.36	2.35	2.08	2.37

necessary. That is, COMP-that following those verbs is more deletable than *add*, *answer*, *argue*, *comment*, *object*, *explain*, *reply*, and *warn*.

In the following section, I show that the result above does not meet the prediction made by the analysis in Section 2.2, and argue that the analysis is not well supported.



## 5. Discussion

As seen above, the result of the questionnaires shows that there are some verbs after which COMP-that is difficult to delete, and there are other verbs that allow deleting COMP-that. I argue that this result shows that the analysis we have seen above is not supported and thus, is not adequate enough.

Looking closely at the tested verbs after which COMP-that is shown to be most necessary (namely, verbs whose average points are below 1.5), it is easily found that the verbs in the upper positions in Figure 4 do not necessarily include a sense of response which is addressed to the clause type we are discussing. Consider, for example, *answer*, *argue*, *comment*, and *object*. COBUILD gives definition for each verb as follows.<sup>8</sup>

- (9) a. When you answer someone who has asked you something, you say something back to them.  
 b. If you argue that something is true, you state it and give the reasons why you think it is true.  
 c. If you comment on something, you give your opinion about it or you give an explanation for it.  
 d. If you object to something, you express your dislike or disapproval of it.

(COBUILD)

Considering the definition of those verbs, we see that the verbs in the upper positions in Figure 4 don't necessarily convey a sense of response to the presupposed complement. It is true that it is impossible to *comment* or *object* if the content of the complement is not believed to be somewhat true in the discourse. Thus, no serious problems won't be raised with the previous analysis. However, verbs such as *answer* or *argue* which are also in the upper level in the figure seem to bear different properties. It is not necessarily impossible to *answer* or *argue*, even if the complement clause is not presupposed or believed to be true in the discourse. If the previous analysis is correct, we predict that for most of speakers COMP-that after this kind should be deletable, but we have seen that the empirical data cannot support this prediction. That is, the deletion of COMP-that after those verbs is not possible for most native speakers.

Next, let us pay our attention to verbs which allow omitting COMP-that, namely, verbs whose average points are above 3.<sup>9</sup> According to the analysis based on response act verbs, verbs in the lower positions in Figure 4 should not be response act verbs. However, the result above shows that this is not well-supported. That is, we see that a clausal complement without COMP-that which follows a response-stance verb is still

possible for a lot of native speakers. See Figure 4.

Let us consider, for example, *admit*, and *deny* which are taken to be instances of response act verbs. Recall that according to the previous analysis, COMP-that after those verbs should be non-deletable. Nevertheless, most native speakers admit, against the expectation, the omission of COMP-that after *admit*, and *deny*. Consider (10).

(10) a. Bill claimed that Sue was guilty, and then in response, Bill denied it.

b. \*Bill denied that Sue was guilty and then, in response, Harry claimed it.

(Cattell (1978: 68))

c. Harry claimed that Sue was guilty, and then in response, Bill admitted it.

d. ?Bill admitted that Sue was guilty, and then in response, Harry claimed it.

The examples in (10) show that those verbs can be used to report responses. If so, the previous analysis predicts that the occurrence of COMP-that is obligatory. However, the result from the informants' judgments shows that this prediction is not borne out. As we have seen in Figure 4, the COMP-that deletion is still possible for most of speakers. This means that the previous analysis in the literature is not well-supported.

Furthermore, we see that other empirical data are also against the previous analysis. The verbs whose average points of the deletion of COMP-that range from 1.6 to 3 include those taken to be response act verbs such as *agree*, and *confirm*. Note that although *confirm* is not listed in Cattell (1978), it seems to be an instance of response act verbs.

(11) a. Bill claimed that Sue was guilty, and then in response, Bill agreed/confirmed it.

b. ?Bill agreed/confirmed that Sue was guilty, and then in response, Harry claimed it.

If the previous analysis in the literature is correct, those verbs should not allow the deletion of COMP-that at all. The data given in Figure 4, thus, can provide another evidence against the previous analysis.

In this section, we have seen that the analysis based on meaning of verbs is not on the right track, either, because the predictions made by the analysis do not meet the data collected from the informants' judgments. This means that other syntactic and/or semantic requirements should be involved in deleting COMP-that after speaking verbs. Thus, in order to capture the distributional properties of COMP-that more correctly, another analysis must be suggested, which unfortunately we cannot present here.<sup>10</sup>

## 6. Conclusion and Further Problems

Traditionally, a lot of analyses of the deletion of COMP-that have been presented. I have pointed out, however, that closely examined empirical data cannot support those proposals adequately, and that there is no such strict restriction or condition on the deletion of COMP-that like the previous analyses.

In fact, the obtained data given in Section 4 have showed that the speaking verbs which are supposed in the analysis based on meaning of verbs to admit the deletion of COMP-that do not necessarily allow COMP-that to be omitted while the verbs supposed to admit the omitted COMP-that sometimes prefer COMP-that to be overtly realized. This empirical fact does not match the prediction made by the literature. Thus, I have pointed out that other syntactic and/or semantic requirements may be involved in the (im)possibility of deleting COMP-that. An alternative explanation is required to account for the fact of the COMP-that deletion shown in Section 4. So far, this is unclear to me. I would like to leave this task for further research.

### Notes

\* I would like to thank Hiroyuki Nawata for making a lot of helpful and invaluable comments. Thanks also go to anonymous *IVY* reviewers for their invaluable comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this paper. I am also grateful to my informants, who cannot all be listed here. Needless to say, all remaining errors are my own.

<sup>1</sup> The classification I adopt for thinking and speaking verbs is basically based on Quirk *et al.* (1985). For thinking verbs, it has been assumed that the presence of COMP-that is obligatory for factive-verb type (Melvold (1991)). For speaking verbs, we need more discussion. For other more detailed classifications, see Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970) and Hooper and Thompson (1973).

<sup>2</sup> As a general policy, I restrict my attention to complements directly following speaking verbs, and ignore sentences such as *I said to myself that I was right*, because COMP-that is always required when some elements intervene between the matrix verb and its complement.

<sup>3</sup> This analysis is similar to Erteschik's (1973) analysis. Erteschik explains the deletion of COMP-that in terms of dominance, and argues that only when complements are dominant, COMP-that can be deleted. Under this analysis, when a matrix verb involves a manner adverb, it makes its complement non-dominant. Consequently, the omission of COMP-that and extraction out of the complements are not allowed.

(i) \*What did he mumble that John did?

I leave this matter open in this paper. For details, see Erteschik (1972) and references cited there.

<sup>4</sup> The data is collected from the COBUILD *Direct*.

<sup>5</sup> See also Kurata (1998), and among others. Kurata (1998) observes, building on Bolinger's observation, that COMP-that can be deleted when a matrix verb implies thought or opinion that is taken to be given at the moment of speech.

<sup>6</sup> I ignore *call out* for the reason given above. See note 2.

<sup>7</sup> Given the fact that COMP-that after *add* is difficult to delete, it can be another support for the argument that Bolinger's examples are not reliable. See (3).

<sup>8</sup> As for *add*, further study is required because some informants comment that COMP-that is necessary probably for other reasons such as stylistic requirement, which are still unclear. I left this open for further study.

<sup>9</sup> The analysis that we are discussing may properly capture the distribution of COMP-that for *declare* or *promise*, because they are quite close, in terms of their meanings, to *say* after which COMP-that is truly optional.

<sup>10</sup> As an alternative approach, it seems possible that the difference in the presence of COMP-that is related to an EPP property in C in terms of Pesetsky and Torrego (2001). Specifically, verbs that allow deleting COMP-that may select complements which lack the EPP property on an uninterpretable tense feature (uT) in its C. Pesetsky and Torrego (2001) argues, assuming that all instances of finite C bear uT with COMP-that (bearing a T feature) base-generated in the T-head, that COMP-that is not C itself, but an element moved overtly by both Agree in terms of the T feature and the EPP property on uT in C. In addition to this T-to-C movement, the alternative operation of nominative subject movement is also available since the subject is also assumed to bear uT, and the subject position and the TP are equi-distant from C. However, it is not made clear what determines which option. Moreover, no evidence is presented to support the movement of the embedded subject to the embedded Spec-CP except a nominative *wh*-phrase. Thus, it is doubtful that the embedded subject moves to Spec-CP. Therefore, I assume tentatively that the EPP property on the uT in the finite CP can be deleted only by movement of COMP-that. Notice that if the EPP property does not exist on the uT in the embedded C, no movement to this position is induced except cases involving movement induced by the uninterpretable *wh*-feature. (In this case, the uT in C is deleted only by agreement between the relevant elements.) Pesetsky and Torrego claim that this is true for some constructions such as indirect questions and some infinitival clauses. Adapting this idea to the problem under discussion, it follows that if the uT has the EPP property, COMP-that will be overt, but otherwise, it will be null. This means that the difference in the occurrence of COMP-that can be attributed to the existence of the EPP property on the uT in the embedded C. Verbs which admit deleting COMP-that may select CP without the EPP property on its uT. On the other hand, verbs after which COMP-that is relatively necessary may take CP with the EPP property on the uT. This means that if correct, the distributional property is closely related to the EPP property on the uT in the embedded C. However, one serious question still remains to be answered. What affects the existence of an EPP property on uT in C? So far, no crystal clear conclusions can be provided yet. I would like to put this matter for further study.

## References

- Bolinger, Dwight. 1972. *That's That*. *Janua Linguarum Series minor*, 155. The Hague: Mouton.
- Cattel, Ray. 1978. On the source of interrogative adverbs. *Language* 54, 61-77.
- Erteschik, Nomi. 1973. On the nature of island constraints. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Fowler, Henry W. 1965. *A dictionary of modern English usage*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hiroe, Akira. 1999. Mood and complementizer deletion. *English Linguistics* 16, 55-77.
- Hooper, Joan B. and Sandra Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 465-497.
- Kiparsky, Paul and Carol Kiparsky. 1970. Fact. In *Progress in Linguistics*, ed. by Manfred Bierwisch and Karl E. Heidolph, 143-173. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kurata, Makoto. 1996. Hobunhyoushiki that wo kangaeru (1). *SELL* 13, 59-70. Kyoto University of Foreign Studies.
- Melvold, Janis. 1991. Factivity and definiteness. In *More papers on WH-movement*, ed. by Lisa Cheng and Hamida Demirdash, 97-117. MIT Working Paper in Linguistics 15. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- Nakamura, Masaru. 1998. Hobun doshi-no imi kouzou. In *Gengo no naizai to gaizai*. ed. by Hideyuki Hirano and Masaru Nakamura, 119-159. Tohoku University.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sydney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Pesetsky, David and Torrego. 2001. T-to-C movement: causes and consequences. In *KEN HALE: A life in language*, 355-426. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

## Dictionaries

Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary for Advanced Learners. London and Glasgow: Collins. (COBUILD)

## Corpus

The COBUILD *Direct* Corpus

## Appendix 1

Questionnaire on “That”

This is a linguistic research. The conjunction *that* can be deleted for some verbs and cannot be deleted for other verbs. However, it seems difficult to know why this is. This questionnaire is intended to examine what the rule is.

Please read the question below and each sentence carefully, and mark your answers by checking the number in ( ). You have 25 sentences to answer.

Daisuke Hirai  
Nagoya University

## Question

How essential/necessary do you think the underlined conjunction (complementizer) *that* is in the following sentences?

1. John White added that ICHIRO was great.  
( 1. Totally      2. Very      3. Not very      4. Unnecessary)
2. John White agreed that he would help them.  
( 1. Totally      2. Very      3. Not very      4. Unnecessary)
3. John White announced that he got the CMA.  
( 1. Totally      2. Very      3. Not very      4. Unnecessary)
4. John White answered that he was right.  
( 1. Totally      2. Very      3. Not very      4. Unnecessary)
5. John White claimed that he was right.  
( 1. Totally      2. Very      3. Not very      4. Unnecessary)
6. John White reported that it was raining.  
( 1. Totally      2. Very      3. Not very      4. Unnecessary)
7. John White stated that he would help them  
( 1. Totally      2. Very      3. Not very      4. Unnecessary)
8. John White suggested that we read the paper.  
( 1. Totally      2. Very      3. Not very      4. Unnecessary)
9. John White admitted that he loved Mary.  
( 1. Totally      2. Very      3. Not very      4. Unnecessary)
10. John White argued that attacking the country was the worst option.  
( 1. Totally      2. Very      3. Not very      4. Unnecessary)



## Synopsis

Some Notes on the Deletion of *THAT* —Speaking Verbs—

Daisuke Hirai

The main purpose of this paper is to examine the distribution of the complementizer *that* after speaking verbs, primarily on the basis of data collected from intuitive judgments by native speakers. Then, it is argued that previous analyses are not well supported by the result from the obtained data.

It has been assumed traditionally that the complementizer *that* in English following a matrix verb is freely deletable. Thus, both sentences in (1) are grammatical.

(1) a. We said that George Strait was awesome.

b. We said George Strait was awesome.

Specifically, it has often been said that the complementizer *that* after speaking verbs is not always necessary, although the deletion of the complementizer *that* after thinking verbs such as *forget*, *realize*, *regret*, *suppose*, or *think* is restricted to a certain circumstance.

However, it is also pointed out by many linguists that the deletion of the complementizer *that* after speaking verbs may be subject to some requirements as in (2).

(2) Italian Olympic Committee announced \*(that) all officials, regardless of nationality, will wear the same uniform. (Fowler (1965: 633))

To account for this fact, some analyses have been proposed in the literature. One analysis is, based on frequency of verbs, that the complementizer *that* is deletable if it is after high-frequency verbs. However, I argue that this is not adequate by showing that evidence collected from corpus data cannot provide supporting evidence for this analysis. Another analysis argues that some types of verbs do not allow deleting the complementizer *that* like factive verbs. As for this analysis, further examination seems to be necessary.

To see whether the latter analysis is correct, my informants are asked to fill out, with their linguistic intuition, a questionnaire on the possibility of the deletion of the complementizer *that*. The speaking verbs used for the test are selected from Quirk *et al.* (1985) by referring to information on the frequency of words. Then, considering the result obtained from the questionnaires, we will see that the analyses in the literature are not on the right track. In fact, the obtained result shows that verbs that are supposed in the literature to permit the deletion of the complementizer *that* do not necessarily admit deleting it while verbs that are supposed to require obligatorily the complementizer *that* admit omitting it. That is, the empirical evidence does not match the predications made by the previous analyses. Therefore, it can be concluded that a new analysis is necessary to account for the distribution of the complementizer *that*. If my discussion is correct, the preference of the occurrence of the



complementizer *that* will be due to another requirement different from the requirement suggested in the previous analyses.