

When does a clause become a question?

On the fine structure of the interrogative left periphery

Veneeta Dayal
Yale University

August 20, 2020

Overview

Section 1: Splitting up the interrogative left periphery

Section 2: The proposal in a nutshell

Section 3: Embedding SAP (Clausal Disjunction, Questions with quantifiers, Declarative Qs)

Section 4: Further Implications

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

1.1. The profile of matrix vs. embedded questions

ENGLISH:

Matrix Q: ↑matrix intonation, subject-aux inversion, wh fronting.

Embedded Q: no discernible Q intonation, no inversion, dedicated wh C for polar questions,
wh fronting

1a. Will Mary leave?

b. John knows whether/if Mary will leave.

2a. Who will Sue see?

b. John knows who Sue will see.

↑matrix intonation is being used as a cover term for whatever is the appropriate prosodic contour for the particular form (wh, polar, or alternative question, for example) and the particular illocutionary act (speech act of asking information-seeking questions, quiz-master questions, biased questions for example, or for a distinct speech act like requesting or ordering) in a particular language. Here I am focusing on information-seeking questions.

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

HINDI-URDU:

- Matrix Q: ↑matrix intonation, Optional polar question particle (PQP) *kyaa*,
Wh in situ/preverbal-focus movement, monoclausal polar Q.
- Embedded Q: no discernible Q intonation, Optional neutral C glossed as SUB
(following Szabolcsi's term for the Hungarian complementizer with similar
properties), no monoclausal polar Q, wh in situ/preverbal-focus movement

3a. (kyaa) anu jaaegii?

PQP Anu will-go

“Will Anu go?”

b. * ravi jaantaa hai ki (kyaa) anu jaaegii

Ravi knows SUB PQP Anu will-go

Intended: “Ravi knows whether Anu will go.”

c. ravi jaantaa hai ki anu jaaegii yaa nahiiN

Ravi knows SUB Anu will-go or not

“Ravi knows whether Anu will go or not.”

4a. anu kis-se milegii

Anu who-with will-meet

“Who will Anu meet?”

b. ravi jaantaa hai (ki) anu kis-se milegii

Ravi knows SUB Anu who-with will meet

“Ravi knows who Anu will meet.”

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

JAPANESE:

Matrix Q: ↑matrix intonation, optional Q-Particle *ka/no*, wh in situ.

Embedded Q: no discernible Q intonation, obligatory Q-Particle *ka/no*, wh in situ

5a. Mary-wa hon-o kai-masi-ta (ka)?

M-TOP book- ACC buy-POL-PAST Q

“Did Mary buy a book?”

b. Tanaka-kun-wa [Mary-ga hon-o kat-ta ka] sit-tei-mas-u.

T- TOP M- NOM book- ACC buy- PAST Q know-PROG- POL- PR

“Tanaka knows whether Mary bought a book.”

6a. Mary-wa nani-o kai-masi-ta (ka)?

M- TOP what- ACC buy-POL-PAST Q

“What did Mary buy?”

b. Tanaka-kun-wa [Mary-ga nani-o kat-ta ka] sit-tei-mas-u.

T- TOP M- NOM what- ACC buy- PAST Q know- PROG-POL-PR

“Tanaka knows what Mary bought.”

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

7. Matrix vs. Embedded Interrogative Profiles

	Matrix Questions	Embedded Questions
English	↑ _{MATRIX}	
	Subj-Aux Inversion	
	Wh Fronting	Wh Fronting
		Wh-Complementizer
Hindi-Urdu	↑ _{MATRIX}	
	Optional PQP	
	Monoclausal Y/N Question	
	Possible Wh Focus Movement	Possible Wh Focus Movement
		Optional <i>ki</i> Subordinator
Japanese	↑ _{MATRIX}	
	Optional Q-particle	Obligatory Q-particle
	Wh in-situ	Wh in-situ

Matrix Q = [SAP/ForceP [CP [TP]]]

Embedded Q = [...V [CP [TP]]]

The table in (7) suggests a mapping to a left periphery with two distinct interrogative projections, CP for embedded questions, Speech Act Phrase (Speas and Tenny 2003)/ForceP+Q (Rizzi 1997) (often used interchangeably), for the matrix.

But this picture is incomplete – cross-linguistically, there is evidence of interrogative clauses with mixed properties. I therefore split up the interrogative left periphery into three: CP, ForceP, SAP.

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

1.2: A three-way distinction among rogative predicates

EMBEDDED INVERSION

McCloskey (1992, 2006) & Henry (1995) discuss embedded inversion in Irish English.

The possibility holds across dialects, or at least the contrast between (8)-(9) is generally accepted. The embedding predicates in (8) are rogative, those in (9) responsive

8a. I wondered [was he illiterate ↑].

b. I asked him [from what source could the reprisals come↑].

9a. * I knew [was he illiterate ↑].

b. * I told him [from what source could the reprisals come↑].

These cases of embedded inversion have the characteristic ↑_{MATRIX} and a slight pause before the embedded Q, but they are not quotations (10b is slightly modified to make it gender neutral):

10a. Everybody wants to know [did I_{SP} succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred↑].

b. Every physicist wonders [will they_{AGENT} be awarded the Nobel prize↑].

McCloskey 2006

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

THE FIRST CUT AMONG ROGATIVE PREDICATES

The generalization so far: rogatives accept embedded inversion, responsivenesses don't.

But there are rogative predicates that do and there are rogative predicates that do not allow embedded inversion

DO -- *The question is, wonder, ask, want to know*

DO NOT -- *Depend on/be up to/investigate*

11a. The question is [whether Mary will leave]/[who Mary will see].

b. The question is, [will Mary leave↑]/ [who will Mary see ↑]

12a. [Whether Mary will leave]/[Who Mary will see] depends on/is up to Sue.

b. * [Will Mary leave ↑]/*[Who will Mary see↑] depends on/is up to Sue.

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

THE SECOND CUT AMONG ROGATIVE PREDICATES

Even the predicates that allow embedded inversion (*the question is, wonder*) do not accept all questions -- (biased) declarative questions are ruled out (Gunlogson (2003, 2008, McCloskey 2006):

- 13a. *Is it raining outside*↑ inversion + ↑ *neutral: felicitous with/without evidence of p*
b. *It's raining outside* ↑ no inversion + ↑ *biased: felicitous only with evidence of p*

- 14a. The question is, [*is it raining* ↑]
b. She wondered, [*did he have a haircut* ↑]

- 15a. * The question is, [*it's raining* ↑]
b. * She wondered, [*he had a haircut* ↑]

Ask, can select for interrogative quotations (Grimshaw 2012) not declarative quotations. That it accepts declarative questions, attests to the status of *declarative questions* as *questions*.

- 16a. She asked, "*Is it raining*↑" *quoted interrogative question*
b. *She asked, "*It's raining*↓" *quoted declarative*
c. She asked, "*It's raining* ↑" *quoted declarative question*

3 Subgroups of Rogatives

- (i) rogatives (*depend on, investigate*): Only Qs with embedded profile
(ii) rogatives (*ask, wonder, the question is*): Qs with embedded profile & a subset of Qs with matrix profile
(iii) rogatives: (*ask*): Qs with embedded profile & all Qs with matrix profile

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

INTERROGATIVE PARTICLES (Q-PARTICLES, POLAR Q-PARTICLES, META Q-PARTICLES)

Japanese Q-particle *ka*: required for all embedded questions - clause typing. There are other Q-particles, which could be used as well. But the point is that having *ka* in the embedded clause is sufficient to achieve an embedded Q interpretation.

- 5b.** Tanaka-kun-wa [Mary-ga hon-o kat-ta koto/ka] sit-tei-mas-u.
T- TOP M- NOM book- ACC buy- PAST C Q know-PROG- POL- PR
“Tanaka knows whether Mary bought a book.” *With ka*
“Tanaka knows that Mary bought a book.” *With koto*

Thanks to Toshi Ogihara for correcting the non-ka version

Hindi-Urdu Polar Question Particle *kyaa*, & Mandarin *ma*, are not Q-particles of the Japanese kind, crucially because they cannot type a clause as +WH (Bhatt & Dayal 2020, contra Cheng 1991):

- 3b.** ravi jaantaa hai ki anu jaaegii
Ravi knows SUB Anu will-go
“Ravi knows that Anu will go.”

Without kyaa

- b’.** *ravi jaantaa hai ki kyaa anu jaaegii
Ravi knows SUB PQP Anu will-go
Intended: “Ravi knows whether Anu will go.”

*With kyaa ⇒ unacceptable
crucial not to add ↑matrix on matrix/
embedded Q*

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

Kyaa, furthermore, only occurs with polar questions;
its distribution closely tracks that of English embedded inversion & the same holds for
Mandarin *-ma* (Bhatt and Dayal 2020); on *-ma* see also Song 2018).

kyaa is acceptable with *know* (3b'), with *ask* (17a), *the question is* (17b), but not with *depend on* (17c):

- 17a.** Tiichar-ne anu-se puuchaa **ki kyaa vo caai piyegii**↑
Teacher-ERG anu-INSTR asked SUB PQP she tea will-drink
“The teacher asked Anu if she will drink tea.”
- b.** savaal yeh hai **ki kyaa nayii vyavasthaa kaagar saabit hogii** ↑
question this is SUB PQP new arrangement effective prove will-be
“The question is whether the new arrangement will prove effective.”
- c.** * **(kyaa) vo jaayegii yaa nahii** uske mood par nirbhar kartaa hai
PQP she will-go or not her mood on depend does
“Whether she will go or not depends on her mood.”

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

Meta Question Particles (MQP): interrogative particles that can only appear in matrix questions or quotations: *English quick* (Dayal 2016), *Japanese kke* (Sauerland and Yatsushiro 2017), *Mandarin nandao* (Xu 2017), *Bangla naki* (Bhadra 2017, 2020). Maybe also English *again* (but see next page).

- 18a.** *Quick/quickly*, where did you hide the matza↑ Dayal (2016)
b. What is your name, *again*↑ Sauerland and Yatsushiro (2017)

- 19a.** Mary asked Sue **quick/quickly* where she hid the matza
where did she hide the matza↑
b. ? Mary asked Sue [what was her name, *again*↑]

quick & *quickly* in matrix questions (18a) is an instruction to the addressee to answer the question without delay. *Quick* is ungrammatical in embedded position (19a); *quickly* can only modify the manner of asking, not the speed with which Mary wanted Sue to answer.

What about *again*? In (18a) it has what Sauerland and Yatsushiro call a *remind-me* presupposition. It seems somewhat resistant to embedding but it may not be a MQP.

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

Mats Rooth (Salt 30) pointed out the acceptability of (i)-(ii):

- i. She apologetically asked what again his name was.
- ii. She wondered to herself what again his name was.

I agree and furthermore note that it holds with or without embedded inversion, ie that we have to allow *again* inside CP (on the proposal presented here) & with the intended remind-me reading.

It would seem that *again* is like German *weider* that Sauerland & Yatsushiro describe as embedding under rogative predicates. The case for MQP, then, has to be made on the basis of English *quick* and Japanese *-kke*. But it still begs the question of how an expression inside CP can function as a modifier at the speech act level. Let us assume structures like the following:

- iii. [_{CP} what_i [again] [_{C'} [his name was t_i]]]
- iv. [_{SAP} [_{CP} what is your name] [again] [_{SA'} t_i]]

If it is indeed harder to embed clause-final *again* than wh-medial-again, it could be because of the difference in CP (iii) vs. SAP embedding (iv).

We could perhaps tie the possibility of interpreting *again* higher than its surface position to the fact that it is a parenthetical.

But (i) and (ii) definitely need to be looked at further.

Similar considerations, we will see, apply to other speaker oriented adverbs inside CP (see pg. 33).

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

Japanese MQP: *kke*

Kke is ungrammatical in embedded clauses.

20a. *namae-wa nan da-kke-(ka)*

name-Top what Cop-kke-Q

“What is your name, again?”

Sauerland and Yatsushiro (2017: 658)

b. * *doko-ni simatta-kke siri-tai desu*
where-Loc put.away-kke know-want COP

Intended: [I] want to know – where did [I] put [the keys], again?

Sauerland and Yatsushiro (2017: 658)

c. * *Boku-wa [(kimi-no) namae-ga nan-da-kke (ka)] siri-ta-i.*

I-top you-gen name-nom what-COP-kke Q know-want-PRES

Intended: [I used to know but I’ve forgotten], so I want to know your name, please remind me.

Takeo Kurafuji, Satoshi Tomioka, Yoshiki Fujiwara (p.c)

I: THE INTERROGATIVE LEFT PERIPHERY

There are 3 points in the left periphery for a clause to become a question:

22a.

[*SAP* *SA_{ASK}* [*ForceP* *Force_{+CTR}* [*CP* *C⁰_{+WH}* [*TP...*]]]]

MQP, Declarative Q *inversion, PQP, ↑_{MATRIX}* *Q-particles/whether, wh fronting* *nucleus*

These distinctions explain a potential puzzle (Donka Farkas, p.c.): how can we refer to declarative questions as “questions” but block them from being embedded under a rogative predicate ?

23a. Speaker A: Oh, **he passed the exam**↑
Speaker B: That’s a silly **question**.

b. The question is, **did he pass the exam** ↑ / * **he passed the exam** ↑

There are three interrogative structures, with distinct grammatical properties.

Different rogative predicates select for different interrogative structures.

All three structures can all be referred to by the English language term “question”

(apropos discussion following Bernard Schwarz’s talk at SALT).

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

2.1. What Happens Where

What Happens Where: CP_{+WH}

Clause-typing happens at CP: $\llbracket \text{CP}_{+WH} \rrbracket \neq \llbracket \text{CP}_{-WH} \rrbracket$

24a. $\llbracket \llbracket \text{CP}_{+WH} \text{ Whether Sue will leave} \rrbracket \llbracket \text{VP depends on Mary} \rrbracket \rrbracket$

- b. $\llbracket \text{C}_{+WH} \rrbracket = \lambda q \lambda p [p = q]$ *or whatever operation distinguishes*
 $\llbracket \llbracket \text{TP Sue will leave} \rrbracket \rrbracket = \wedge \text{sue will leave}$ *interrogative & declarative meanings*
 $\llbracket \llbracket \text{CP whether Sue will leave} \rrbracket \rrbracket = \{ \wedge \text{sue will leave}, \wedge \neg \text{sue will leave} \}$
via some special OP/coercion
- $\llbracket \llbracket \llbracket \text{TP } \llbracket \text{CP whether sue will leave} \rrbracket \text{ depends on Mary} \rrbracket \rrbracket =$
 $\wedge \text{depend-on (m) (Ans(\{ \wedge \text{sue will leave}, \wedge \neg \text{sue will leave} \}))}$

Clause-typing happens at the lowest of the three projections.

Putting clause-typing lower in the structure explains

- (i) the selectional difference between *believe* and *depend on*.
- (ii) the obligatoriness of Q-morphemes (Japanese *ka/no*) in all embedded Qs.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

What Happens Where: FORCE_{+CTR}

Force has a feature +CTR (Perspectival Center) which:

is prosodically interpreted as \uparrow matrix (rising for info-seeking polar questions etc.);

syntactically triggers inversion;

does not make an at-issue contribution

but:

(i) it introduces an argument whose perspective wrt Q is relevant (the judge)

(ii) it introduces a not-at-issue proposition: Q is potentially ACTIVE for the judge/center.

(this not-at-issue proposition enters CG without negotiation: Murray 2014)

25a. [_{ForceP} PRO [_{Force'} FORCE_{+CTR} [_{CP} will Sue leave]]]]

b. [[FORCE_{+CTR}] = $\lambda Q \lambda x$: Q is P-ACTIVE for x. Q

c. $\forall x \forall Q$ [P-ACTIVE-for(Q, x) \leftrightarrow $\diamond \neg$ Know(x, Ans(Q))] *for information seeking Q*

The term ForceP is from Rizzi (1997) but used differently here:

ForceP is not associated with illocutionary force (which is located at SAP)

ForceP is not associated with clause-typing (which is located at CP)

ForceP makes an interrogative a centered question.

Centering is a complex issue (cf. Dilip Ninan's talk, SALT 30) but we will stick with the claim here that taps into the anaphoric aspect of centering (perhaps closest in spirit to Saebo 2009). It is, of course, possible that on closer examination more areas of overlap between centering with interrogatives and centering with declaratives may be uncovered.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

What Happens Where: FORCE+CTR

In embedded contexts the center is the matrix subject.

Because of the NAI condition of possible ignorance on the part of the perspectival center only rogative predicates can embed ForceP+CTR .

26a. [_{SAP} SA_{ASSERT} [_{CP} Mary_i asked/*knew
[_{ForceP} [_{PRO_i} [_{Force+CTR} [_{CP+WH} will Sue leave]]]]]]

b. [[**ForceP**] = P-ACTIVE({[^]sue will leave, [^]¬sue will leave}, x_i).
{[^]sue will leave, [^]¬sue will leave}

c. [[Mary **asked** will Sue leave]] =

The question *Will Sue leave?* is potentially ACTIVE for Mary;
Speaker_C makes public their commitment to the proposition:

Mary wants to know the answer to the question *will sue leave?*

Consistent

d. [[Mary **knew** will Sue leave]] =

The question *Will Sue leave?* is potentially ACTIVE for Mary;
Speaker_C makes public their commitment to the proposition:

Mary knows the answer to the question *will Sue leave?*

Contradictory

The acceptability/unacceptability of (26a) rests on whether the NAI condition

◇¬know(Ans(will sue leave?)) is consistent with Mary being in the *ask/know* relation to the embedded Q.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

What Happens Where: SAP_{ASK}

Co-ordinates for speaker and addressee (Speas and Tenny 2003) and a semantics for SAP in terms of discourse moves by discourse participants (Szabolcsi 1982, Krifka 2014 a.o.). The binding of PRO by the speaker co-ordinate of SAP delivers consistency between the NAI condition of possible ignorance and the speech act of asking:

27a.

$[SAP \text{ Speaker}_{c-i} [SA' \text{ Addressee}_c [SA' SA_{ASK}$
 $[ForceP \text{ PRO}_i [Force_{+CTR} [CP C^0_{+WH} [TP]]]]]]]$

b. $[[SA_{ASK}]] = \lambda Q_{\langle\langle s,t \rangle, t \rangle} \lambda x \lambda y. y \text{ puts } x \text{ under obligation to ASSERT (Ans(Q))}$

Meta Q-Particles modify the speech act.

For example, *quick* modifies the illocutionary force:

$y \text{ puts } x \text{ under obligation to } \underline{\text{quickly}}(\text{ASSERT}) (\text{Ans(Q)})$

The restriction of MQPs to matrix questions/quotations is predicted if SAPs do not embed, except as quotations.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

2.2. Subordination & Shifty Responsives

The hybrid character of quasi-subordination: Pronouns in English

- 28a.** [_{SAP} Speaker_C Addressee_C ASSERT] **Subordination**
[_{CP} Mary [_{VP} asked
[_{CP+WH} who she should talk to]
I
you = Mary; Jane
= Speaker_C
= Addressee_C
- b.** [_{SAP} Speaker_C Addressee_C ASSERT] **Quasi-subordination**
[_{CP} Mary [_{VP} asked
[_{ForceP+CTR} who should she talk to ↑]
I
you = Mary/Jane
= Speaker_C
= Addressee_C
- b.** [_{SAP} Speaker_C Addressee_C ASSERT] **Non-subordination**
[_{CP} Mary [_{VP} asked
[_{SAP} “who should she talk to ↑”]
I **Quotation**
you ≠ Mary; = Jane
≠ Speaker_C; = Mary
≠ Addressee_C; = ?

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

The hybrid character of quasi-subordination: Bound variables in English

The hybrid character of quasi-subordination is reflected in the interpretation of pronouns (cf: 28) and bound variables (29):

- 29a.** Everyone wants to know [did **I** succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred]. 1st person = S_{pC}
b. Every physicist wonders [will **they** be awarded the Nobel prize]. 3rd person = \forall Physicist

Quasi-subordination, a term borrowed from Grimshaw and Dayal (2009), is meant to apply to English structures with embedded inversion, as well as Hindi structures that allow PQP and monoclausal polar questions in embedded position. This does not mean that Hindi wh questions cannot be quasi-subordinated, just that we don't have syntactic cues for distinguishing between quasi-subordinated and subordinated wh questions in Hindi.

Whether quasi-subordination should be reserved for structures that also allow shiftiness of the kind to be discussed below, I leave open for now.

On the connection between quasi-subordination and discourse, see pg. 49.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

QUASI-SUBORDINATION AND SHIFTY RESPONSIVES

Recall the rogative/responsive difference wrt to embedded inversion in English and PQP in Hindi-Urdu, which was explained by the condition on possible ignorance. Core examples repeated below:

30a. Everybody wants to know [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred↑].

b. * Everybody knows [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred ↑].

31a anu jaannaa caahtii hai [ki (kyaa) tum cai piyoge ↑]

Anu to-know wants SUB PQP you tea will-drink

“Anu wants to know whether you’ll drink tea.”

b. * anu jaantii hai [ki (kyaa) tum cai piyoge (↑)]

Anu knows SUB PQP you tea will-drink

Intended: “Anu knows whether you’ll drink tea.”

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

QUASI-SUBORDINATION AND SHIFTY RESPONSIVES

But the ban on responsive predicates is not absolute; when the matrix is negated or questioned the unacceptability goes away, and this seems to hold of quasi-subordination X-linguistically:

32a. * I remember [was Henry a communist ↑]

b. ? I don't remember [was Henry a communist ↑]

c. Do you remember ↑ [was Henry a communist ↑]

McCloskey 2006: 112

33a. koi naahiiN jaantaa [ki kyaa Tito stalin-se mile the ↑]

Someone not knows SUB PQP Tito Stalin-with met

“Nobody knows whether Tito had met with Stalin.”

Corpus search: COSH
*intonation added by
Bhatt & Dayal*

b. kisii-ko bhii maalum hai ↑ [ki (kyaa) Tito stalin-se mile the ↑]

someone-ACC at all know SUB PQP Tito Stalin-with met

Bhatt & Dayal 2020

McCloskey entertains the possibility of a structural distinction in embedding (SAP/ForceP for rogatives, CP for responsives), but gives it up because of paradigms like (32): “the necessary discriminatory work is done by ultimately pragmatic conditions...we do not want to hardwire into the lexical entry of a resolutive [responsive] predicate a constraint which forbids it to combine with a complement of the higher type.” (McCloskey 2006: 116).

The proposal here is an attempt to nail down these pragmatic conditions.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

QUASI-SUBORDINATION AND SHIFTY RESPONSIVES

The proposed NAI condition on Q being potentially ACTIVE, in composition with the AI contribution derives the shiftiness of responsives.

- 34a.** * [Sue remembers [was Henry a communist ↑]] *remember + inversion*
◇¬know(Sue, Ans(Q)); remember(Sue, Ans(Q)) \Rightarrow contradiction
- b.** [Sue doesn't remember [was Henry a communist ↑]] \neg remember + inversion
◇¬know(Sue, Ans(Q)); ¬remember(Sue, Ans(Q)) \neq contradiction
- c.** [Does Sue remember ↑ [was Henry a communist ↑]] ? remember + inversion
◇¬know(Sue, Ans(Q)); $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{remember(Sue, Ans(Q))} \\ \neg \text{remember(Sue, Ans(Q))} \end{array} \right]$ \neq contradiction

The last case justifies the choice of potentially ACTIVE, rather than ACTIVE simpliciter, in the NAI condition.

Note that the presupposition of *remember*, namely *PAST know(Sue, (Ans(Q)))*, is not at odds with the NAI, which is about knowledge at the time of evaluation.

So this is the proposal in a nutshell – the rest is just kicking the tires!

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

2.3. Issues related to prosody

THE FINAL FALL OF ALT-QUESTIONS

The proposal so far has the following shape:

35a. [SAP SA_{ASK} [ForceP Force_{+CTR} [CP C⁰_{+WH} [TP...]]]]
Illocutionary Force Matrix Intonation Clause-Typing

To be revised

The prosodic profile of alternative questions includes: pitch accent on the alternatives, prosodic break between alternatives, a final fall (Bartels 1997, a.o)

These three features are in evidence in direct as well as in embedded alternative questions, including those embedded under predicates like *depend on*, argued here to select CPs.

36a. Do they want [coffee]_F, or do they want [tea]_F ↓?

b. John wants to know/The question is,

[ForceP do they want [coffee]_F, or do they want [tea]_F ↓]

c. [CP Whether they will want [coffee]_F, or whether they will want [tea]_F ↓]

will depend on when they get here.

potential counterexample

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

THE FINAL FALL OF ALT-QUESTIONS

While pitch accents and the prosodic break are determined within the nucleus proposition inside TP, the final fall has to come higher in the structure (according to the current proposal).

Does that make the final fall in (36c), with the CP-selecting matrix predicate *depend on*, a potential counterexample? If matrix intonation, ↓ in the case of Alt-Q, enters at ForceP how can this be?

But not all alternative questions have a final fall (Roelofsen and van Gool 2010, Roelofsen and Farkas 2015, Hoeks 2020). Open disjunctive questions as Alt-Qs show sensitivity in embeddability:

- 37a.** Do they want [coffee]_F, or do they want [tea]_F ↑? *Matrix question*
- b.** John wants to know/The question is,
[ForceP do they want [coffee]_F, or do they want [tea]_F ↑] *quasi-subordination*
- 38a.** * [CP Whether they will want [coffee]_F, or whether they will want [tea]_F ↑] *subordination*
will depend on when they get here. *under depend-on*
- b.** ? John wants to know/The question is, *subordination*
[CP whether they want [coffee]_F, or whether they want [tea]_F ↑] *under want to know*

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

THE FINAL FALL OF ALT-QUESTIONS

Interrogative CPs in embedded position, if they are subordinated, do not have the final rise, regardless of the embedding predicate. That is, embedded questions that are CPs cannot be open disjunctive questions.

Only matrix and quasi-subordinated questions can be open disjunctive questions, consistent with the view that final rise enters at ForceP.

I draw the conclusion from this that interrogative CPs in embedded position do not have final fall in regular alternative questions like (36c) either -- the *absence* of a final fall may not be detectable as distinct from a final fall.

A clarification prompted by a question from Dan Goodhue:

The contrast between (37) and (38) is intended to apply to alternative questions. Of the three markers of their status as alternative questions, pitch accents on the alternatives and the pause between the alternatives, are determined TP-internally and are therefore available in all subordinated clauses. The final fall/rise, however, can only come at the ForceP level so only with quasi-subordination – detectable in English by the possibility of embedded inversion.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

But what about embedded polar questions like (i) and its subordinated variants?

thanks to Dan Goodhue, Beste Kamali and Kyle Rawlins for raising the issue of polar questions

Dan Goodhue pointed out that the contrast between (37) and (38) holds even on a polar question interpretation of the embedded Q, namely one with a final rise on the embedded Q.

Kyle Rawlins raised the question about quasi-subordinated vs. subordinated versions of a polar question embedded under a polar question:

- (i) [Does Sue remember ↑ [was Henry a communist ↑]]
- (ii) [Does Sue remember ↑ [whether Henry was a communist]]
- (iii) * [Does Sue remember ↑ [whether Henry was a communist ↑]]

While I am relatively confident that there are two distinct boundary tones in (i), it does not seem to me that (ii) has a final contour that is specifically associated with the embedded CP of the kind shown in (iii). The prediction, at least, is that (iii) will be ungrammatical. But, of course, paradigms such as this should be further explored and intuitions experimentally verified.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

BIAS, CLAUSE-TYPING, RISE/FALL

How do intonation and illocutionary force interact? There are two puzzles that are relevant.

Puzzle 1: Why do declarative syntax+rising intonation lead to bias in English but not in Hindi-Urdu?

39a. Is it raining?	interrogative + ↑	neutral Q	<i>English</i>
b. It is raining?	declarative + ↑	biased Q	<i>English</i>
c. paanii paR rahaa hai? water is falling “Is it raining?”	declarative + ↑	neutral Q	<i>Hindi-Urdu</i>

Dayal (2016: 268-9, 278-9)

Puzzle 2: Why do Hindi monoclausal polar questions only occur as matrix or quasi-subordinated Qs?

40a. (kyaa) anu jaaegii ↑ PQP Anu will-go “Will Anu go?”	b. ravi jaannaa caahtaa hai [ki (kyaa) anu jaaegii↑] Ravi knows wants SUB PQP Anu will-go “Ravi wants to know [will Anu go?].”	c. ravi jaantaa hai [ki anu jaaegii yaa nahiiN] Ravi knows SUB Anu will-go or not Intended: “Ravi knows whether Anu will go.” “Ravi knows whether Anu will go or not.”
---	---	---

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

BIAS, CLAUSE-TYPING, RISE/FALL

35b. [SAP SA_{ASK} [ForceP Force_{+CTR} [CP C⁰_{+WH} [TP...]]]]
 Illocutionary Force Matrix Intonation Clause-Typing
 Matrix Intonation *Revised final version*

Intonation is encoded at both SAP and ForceP. The intonation at ForceP must be compatible with SAP and CP. That is, it should have an intonation contour that is represented at SAP, and it should have a contour that is consistent with the clause-type of CP (↑ for +WH, ↓ for –WH).

Puzzle 1: English

- 41a.** Is it raining? [SAP ASK (↑) [ForceP Force_{+CTRQ} (↑) [CP C_{+WH} it is raining]]]
b. It is raining? [SAP ASSERT (↓)• ASK(↑) [ForceP Force_{-CTR} (↓) [CP C_{-WH} it is raining]]]
c. * It is raining? *[SAP ASK(↑) [ForceP Force_{-CTR} (↑) [CP C_{-WH} it is raining]]]

Natural language has combined speech acts, specifically bias involves both an assertion and a question (Reese & Asher 2010, Asher & Lascarides 2001).

English declarative Qs are acceptable as biased questions: ASSERT licenses a fall and ASK licenses a rise at SAP. The structure is licit because the fall at ForceP matches one of the tones in SAP (namely, ASSERT) and is compatible with [CP_{-WH}]. (41b)

English declarative questions cannot be neutral questions: neutral questions have the simple speech act ASK at SAP which licenses a rise. A rise at ForceP is incompatible with [CP_{-WH}] (41c).

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

BIAS, CLAUSE-TYPING, RISE/FALL

Puzzle 1: Hindi-Urdu paanii paR rahaa hai?
Rain falling

42a. It is raining? [SAP ASK(↑) [ForceP Force-CTR (↑) [CP C_αWH it is raining]]]

b. It is raining? [SAP ASSERT (↓)• ASK(↑) [ForceP Force-CTR (↓) [CP C_αWH it is raining]]]

The neutral Q interpretation is available here: Hindi-Urdu does not have a +WH Y/N complementizer. A rise (42a) at ForceP is compatible with [CP C_αWH]. (42a).

It is also possible to have a biased question interpretation (albeit with a slightly different prosody, Dayal 2016: 279) – derived in the same way as English declarative questions (42b).

Puzzle 1 is also investigated by Bhadra (2020) for Bangla. The interaction of declarative syntax, rising intonation and bias given here, though different in several respects, overlaps with the account in Bhadra (2020), which in turn draws on Davis (2009).

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

BIAS, CLAUSE-TYPING, RISE/FALL: The solution to puzzle 1 points to the solution for puzzle 2.

Puzzle 2: Hindi-Urdu

Hindi-Urdu does not have a Y/N +WH complementizer: $\llbracket [_{CP} C_{\alpha WH}] \rrbracket \neq \lambda p \lambda q [q = p]$

The shift to a set of propositions for a mono-clausal CP comes via coercion by $[_{ForceP} F_{CTR}]$, as in (43a); or the set of propositions must come from TP-internal alternatives, *p or not p*, as in (43b):

43a. $\llbracket [_{CP} C_{\alpha WH} [_{TP} paanii paR rahaa hai]] \rrbracket = \wedge it \text{ is raining}$

$\llbracket [_{ForceP} F_{+CTR} \uparrow [_{CP} C_{\alpha WH} [paanii paR rahaa hai]]] \rrbracket = \{ \wedge it \text{ is raining, } \wedge \neg it \text{ is raining} \}$

43b. $\llbracket [_{TP} paanii paR rahaa hai ya nahiiN] \rrbracket = \{ \wedge it \text{ is raining, } \wedge \neg it \text{ is raining} \}$

$\llbracket [_{CP} C_{\alpha WH} [_{TP} paanii paR rahaa hai \underline{ya nahiiN}]] \rrbracket = \{ \wedge it \text{ is raining, } \wedge \neg it \text{ is raining} \}$
or not

A mono-clausal polar question complement is possible in matrix questions.

A mono-clausal polar question complement is possible in quasi-subordination (detectible through a slight pause, rising intonation and optional PQP *kyaa*).

A mono-clausal polar question complement is not possible in a subordinated structure, regardless of whether the embedding predicate is a rogative or a responsive.

Wh questions in Hindi-Urdu activate C_{+WH} ($\llbracket [_{CP} C_{+WH}] \rrbracket = \lambda p \lambda q [q = p]$) and can be subordinated.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

Manfred Krifka's question (SALT 30) had two parts.

One, relates to whether combined speech acts like ASSERT.ASK are needed to model the bias of declarative questions. The answer is, not necessarily. Take the view that biased questions involve a tentative commitment on the part of the speaker towards the nucleus, with the final confirmation resting on the addressee (Krifka 2014). One could connect the falling contour that is compatible with the –WH CP to the tentative commitment, and the phonetically realized rise to the discourse move that places the obligation on the addressee. We would then get the same results for the contrast between English and Hindi-Urdu. The two key features of the explanation for both puzzle 1 and puzzle 2 are independent of the particular representation of bias: (i) the specification of CP as -WH in English and its underspecification in Hindi-Urdu (ii) the source of bias being a “declarative” based commitment, combining with an “interrogative” based uncertainty.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

Two, what is the status of evidentials which may appear inside CP but lead to bias similar to the one observed in declarative questions: *Could it perhaps be raining outside?* Obviously, such speaker-oriented expressions, though inside TP, cannot be interpreted as part of the nucleus. Such expressions have to be interpreted in relation to Speaker_C. One possibility is to move such expressions at LF to the SAP domain. Note that the claim in section 1 is not that every SAP modifier is a MQP that will resist embedding, but a weaker claim that there are MQP that are generated at SAP that resist subordination as well as quasi-subordination (cf: discussion of *again* on pp. 11-12).

I'm not sure how these expressions behave under embedding – with rogatives and responsiveness:

- (i) Mary wants to know [could it perhaps be raining outside ↑]
- (ii) [Does Mary know ↑ [could it perhaps be raining outside ↑]]

In (i) the “bias” seems to be Mary’s but I’m not sure about (ii). If it is grammatical, it seems to me to be skewed towards the Speaker_C. These questions would be important to settle, going forward.

II: THE PROPOSAL IN A NUTSHELL

Todor Koev's question (SALT 30): why is it the rise that is phonetically interpreted in a biased question? Where does the bias come from?

I assume the primary speech act in ASSERT.ASK is ASK (ie a biased question is a question), which is associated with ↑.

Quasi-subordination involves [_{ForceP} Force-CTR ↓ [_{CP} C-WH it is raining]], which is an assertion.

*[_{ForceP} Force-CTR ↑ [_{CP} C-WH it is raining]],

which could be a question but is ruled out as misaligning intonation and wh specification.

If we have a combined speech act, there has to be justification for both speech acts. The speaker has to have some evidence in order to make a tentative commitment to the prejacent proposition (the part that ASSERT is associated with) but not enough to be sure, so confirmation from the addressee is needed (the part that ASK is associated with).

III: EMBEDDING SAP

CLAUSAL DISJUNCTION: CANCELATION VS. CHOICE

Hirsh 2017, drawing on Groenendijk & Stokhov (1989), Krifka (2001), Szabolcsi (1997), Ciardelli et al (2015) and Szabolcsi (2016), distinguishes between two types of disjunction of clausal questions.

- 44a.** What is your name? **Or (rather)**, what is your SSN?
b. What is your name **or** what is your SSN?

(44a): Cancellation type. The speaker, in effect, cancels the first question and moves to a more specific question or a question better suited to the current conversational goals. In effect, the first speech act is retracted and is replaced by a second one.

(44b): Choice type. The two questions are equally efficient ways of serving the current conversational goals and the speaker leaves it up to the addressee to answer whichever question they want to answer.

III: EMBEDDING SAP

CLAUSAL DISJUNCTION: CANCELATION VS. CHOICE

- 45a.** Mary is asking what is your name or what is your SSN? *Choice (also cancelation?)*
b. Mary is asking what is your name or rather what is your SSN? *Cancelation*

(45a): Mary gives the addressee the choice of providing their name or their SSN (either will do).

(45b): it isn't Mary who cancels the first question and replaces it with a better question; it is the speaker who retracts the first speech act, maybe because they realize mid-stream that they misremembered.

(45b) has to be analyzed as (46a), not (46b), i.e. its base form is (46c), a disjunction of two assertions, with the first assertion canceled in favor of the second – not of two questions (possibly even clearer with shifty responsives: *does M know what is your name or rather what is your SSN?*):

- 46a.** [_{SAP} ~~Mary wants to know what is your name~~] or rather
[_{SAP} Mary wants to know what is your SSN]

- b.*** [Mary wants to know[[_{SAP} ~~what is your name~~] or rather
[_{SAP} what is your SSN]]]

- c.** Mary wants to know what is your name, or rather, she wants to know what is your SSN.

Cancellation Type disjunction occurs at SAP and cannot be (quasi-)subordinated.

III: EMBEDDING SAP

CLAUSAL DISJUNCTION: CANCELATION VS. CHOICE

What about Choice Type disjunction? Where does that fit into the proposed view of the interrogative left periphery and how does it relate to the embedding verb?

Can one derive the choice reading of (47a) from the permissible structures in (47a') or (47a'') and with what type of an Ans operator? For completeness I add the subordinated structure in (48). This is the challenge from Schwarz's talk (SALT 2020) and I leave for the future:

47a. Mary is asking what is your name or what is your SSN?

47a'. Mary is asking [_{ForceP} [_{ForceP+CTR} what is your name] or
[_{ForceP+CTR} what is your SSN]]

47a''. [[_{SAP} Mary is asking [_{ForceP+CTR} what is your name]] or
~~[_{SAP} Mary is asking~~ [_{ForceP+CTR} what is your SSN]]]

48a. Mary is asking what your name is or what your SSN is.

a'. Mary is asking [_{CP} [_{CP} what your name is] or
[_{CP} what your SSN is]]

a''. [[_{SAP} Mary is asking [_{CP} what your name is]] or
~~[_{SAP} Mary is asking~~ [_{CP} what your SSN is]]]

III: EMBEDDING SAP

QUESTIONS WITH QUANTIFIERS

Quantifying into Question Speech Acts

Questions with quantifiers on their pair-list readings are possible in direct and embedded positions, with responsive and with rogative predicates:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 49a. Which book did every student read? | <i>matrix</i> |
| b. Mary wondered [which book every student read] | <i>rogative-subordinate</i> |
| c. Mary wondered [which book did every student read] | <i>rogative-quasi-subordinate</i> |
| d. Mary knew [which book every student read] | <i>responsive-subordinate</i> |
| e. [Which book every student will read] depends on the teacher. | <i>rogative-subordinate</i> |

This raises doubts about an analysis that involves questioning into speech acts (Krifka 2003).

But it is also possible that quantifying into speech acts is reserved for matrix questions, and an alternative analysis accounts for embedded cases of pair-list readings of questions with quantifiers.

Some support for this comes from the fact that pair-list readings of questions with quantifiers in matrix and embedded contexts have been argued to have different properties (Moltmann and Szabolcsi 1994, Szabolcsi 1997).

III: EMBEDDING SAP

DECLARATIVE QUESTIONS AGAIN

If SAPs are disallowed from any embedded position other than quotation, it would rule out one potential derivation that we have not considered for the ungrammatical sentence in (50a):

50a. * The question is, it's raining?

b. *_{SAP} ASSERT _{CP} The question is

[_{SAP} ASSERT ↓ • ASK ↑ [_{ForceP} Force-CTR ↓ [_{CP} C-_{WH} it is raining]]]

If (50b) were acceptable, we would get declarative questions in quasi-subordination. Recall, this was one of the initial arguments for a three way split in the interrogative left periphery but it is worth recalling it at this point to close the loop.

IV: FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

X-linguistic Variation (thanks to Beste Kamali for bringing this up)

The claim that interrogative meaning is built up at three points has been made on the basis of evidence from English, Hindi-Urdu and Japanese (though we only saw clear evidence of a 3-way split in English). What do we predict cross-linguistically? There are two versions of the claim:

(i) every language builds up interrogative meaning in the same order, but not every language has to have all three projections – as far as I can tell, every language has to have SAP (on current conceptions of how syntax and pragmatics interface) since every language has direct questions. Every language has to have CP+WH since every language (well, almost every language) has questions embedded under rogative/responsive predicates. So the only candidate for exclusion is ForceP_{+CTR}. The wide range of languages that display quasi-subordination type effects makes me doubt that languages differ in excluding this option but it is perhaps possible.

(ii) every language has the same options for the interrogative left periphery, though they may or may not be easy to detect. For example, not every particle that allows restricted options for embedding may show the same restrictions across languages. Some may be quasi-subordinated under rogatives but not under shifty responsives. That may be due to further semantic-pragmatic contributions of individual particles. What exactly would be the nature of these restrictions that would allow embedding under rogatives but not under shifty responsives remains to be worked out.

I am essentially treating ForceP as the locus for what is now known as Main Clause Phenomena (aka root phenomena) which have been discovered in a wide range of languages for declaratives, but there is also a growing body of work on Questions.

IV: FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

Beyond Information-Seeking

Quasi-subordination may be possible with other Ques types, such as Quiz-master Questions.

51a. For \$500, who was the first woman to win the Nobel Prize?

Speaker_C knows the answer, Speaker_C wants to find out if Addressee_C knows the answer.

know(Speaker_C, Ans(Q))

◇¬know(Addressee_C, Ans(Q))

b. [[ForceP_{+CTR}] = first pass ⇒

[x knows(Ans(Q)) ∧ x wants to know {(y knows Ans(Q)), ¬(y knows Ans(Q))}]

c. The quiz master asked of the contestant, who was the first woman to win the nobel prize.

At SAP: *x* and *y* would be identified by Speaker_C and Addressee_C respectively.

At ForceP: Perhaps we would want *y* to be existentially closed or represented syntactically as the indirect object (51c). A version of (51c) with *wonder* is predicted to be unacceptable: it is a self-directed query: the same *x* cannot know the answer and want to confirm it of themselves.

We might also want to look to see how quiz master questions embed under shifty responsives:

52a. * The quiz-master remembers/has forgotten, who was the first woman to win the Nobel Prize?

d. * Does/Has the quiz-master remember/forgotten, who was the first woman to win the N Prize?

These paradigms would need to be carefully considered in order to determine if (51b) is on the right track.

IV: FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

Beyond Information-Seeking

Quasi-subordination may be possible with other Speech Act types, such as Imperatives.

52a. John said (*that) call Mary.

Context: John said, “Call Mary”

b. John said call his mom.

Context: John said, “Call my mom”

Crnič ad Trinh 2008

There are several factors that distinguish imperatives and interrogatives which would require careful consideration but there are some obvious connections as well. Like quiz-master questions, embedded imperatives seem to be compatible with only a subset of predicates that might be considered possible candidates. Embedded imperatives occur with verbs of saying (*say*, not *want*).

53. $[[\text{ForceP}_{+\text{CTR}}]] = \text{first pass} \Rightarrow [x \text{ imposes on } y \text{ the obligation to make } p \text{ true}]$

Matrix clauses: x and y are bound by Speaker_C and Addressee_C

Embedded clauses: x bound by subject, y by possibly implicit indirect object of the matrix clause.

54a. My girlfriend said don't call her.

b. “Don't call her!”

c. My girlfriend said not to call her.

Crnič ad Trinh (2008) argue that embedded imperatives (54a) are closely related to matrix imperatives (54b), not to subordinated imperatives (54c). They analyze embedded imperatives in terms of centering (Laserson 2005, Stephenson 2007): *call Mary* is true in w iff the addressee calls Mary in each centered world compatible with the speaker commands in w , and (52a) is true in w iff the addressee calls Mary in each centered world compatible with what John commands in w .

IV: FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

S-selection

Two notions of 'selection'

- It is a lexically marked feature of predicates what complement type they can and cannot combine with.
This suggests that a predicate P and a closely related predicate P' (in terms of lexical meaning) may select different types of complements.
- It is a matter of composition whether a particular predicate can combine with a particular complement type.
This suggests that a predicate P and closely related predicate P' (in terms of lexical meaning) are likely to select similar types of complements.

Grimshaw (1979) argues for a two-dimensional selection system: c-selection (for category selection) and s-selection (for semantic selection), but do we need a theory of s-selection?

Grimshaw (1979) herself holds that s-selection should be derivable from the lexical semantics of the embedding predicate and the semantics of the complement clause.

IV: FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

S-selection

Grimshaw: rogative predicates require uncertainty and are therefore incompatible with exclamatives, which are factive.

- 55a. John knows how very tall she is!
b. *John wonders how very tall she is!

Shiftiness in –WH selecting predicates

Even the basic +/- WH selection seems subject to shiftiness (Elliott 1974, Grimshaw 1979, Huddleston 1993):

- 56a. *I can believe who is going out with who.
b. I can't believe who is going out with who.
c. Can you believe who is going out with who?

One may argue whether the complements in (56b)-(56c) are interrogatives or exclamatives, but that is orthogonal to the issue of how the selectional properties of *believe* should be characterized – selection applies equally to interrogatives as to exclamatives.

Certainly, the shiftiness of responsive predicates wrt to embedded inversion and \uparrow_{MATRIX} suggests that compositional semantics/pragmatics may be the locus of selectional restrictions (though sadly *investigate* doesn't fit the picture: it could provide a center/judge but it doesn't allow inversion)

IV: FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

S-selection

There is a small but significant literature on deriving s-selection from compositional semantics/pragmatics – early efforts in this direction include: D’Avis 2002, Abels 2007, Guerzoni 2007 (a.o). Much work in this direction has been done more recently.

While the idea that s-selection is derivable is only just beginning to move out of the programmatic level, the empirical imperative for it is clear.

“Current research makes it seem unlikely that s-selection is lexically specified once and for all for predicates. While we may continue to talk about a predicate selecting a particular type of complement, we need to be cautious about investing too much theoretical capital in this distinction. An adequate elaboration of the combinatorial possibilities, taking into account all aspects of meaning and conversational dynamics, may ultimately make a theory of s-selection redundant. Interestingly, Grimshaw herself anticipates this in her arguments for s-selection.” *Dayal 2016:147*

IV: FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

Further Effects in Shiftiness

There is a basic difference between rogative and responsive predicates wrt embedding $\text{ForceP}_{+\text{CTR}}$

Modifying responsives with negation and questioning shifts the unacceptability.

There may be more to take into account.

The judgements for (57a)-(57b) can get flipped with a change in quantifiers (Carolyn Anderson p.c.):

57a. Everybody wants to know [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred↑]

b. * Everybody knows [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred ↑].

58a. * Nobody wants to know [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred↑]

b. Nobody knows [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred ↑]

IV: FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

Answering with embedded inversion

The lexical semantics of the embedding verb can also be an influencing factor, as is first person subject and present-tense in the matrix – factors leading to a de facto direct question interpretation.

59. I forget/have forgotten, [did Ann get As in her 1st year courses ↑]

Presupposition of *forget*: I used to know Ans(Q)

Contribution of ForceP_{CTR}: I don't know Ans(Q) now.

Consistent

Can (59) be used to answer a question? It appears that it cannot be used in this way but why?

60. Speaker A: Did Ann get As in her 1st year courses?

Speaker B: I used to know but now I've forgotten [whether she did/got As in her 1st year courses]

* [did she get As in her 1st year courses ↑]

When there are alternative ways of eliciting the same information, there seem to be additional pragmatic conditions on the use of non-canonical forms.

IV: FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

What about Free Indirect Discourse and Wh Slifting?

61. She wondered if she he was still asleep. How did she even fall asleep and on top of him?!
Was he ... shirtless? Oh ... he was... cited by Maier 2012

62. How old is she, did you say? Haddican et al 2014

There are several parallels between quasi subordination and such structures but there are also significant differences. Most notably, neither FID nor Wh Slifting readily allows negation in the “matrix” question, whereas quasi-subordination seems to allow it. But there is no reason to expect that all of these structures should be same/similar semantically. They are all different syntactically and in terms of discourse structures. For example, wh slifting clearly has a parenthetical phrase but it is not obvious that the matrix is a parenthetical in quasi-subordination. FID typically is a monologue in which Addressee_C, even if formally represented, is identical to Speaker_C.

The only thing one can conclude at this point is that any departure from “normal” complementation comes with additional pragmatic conditions.

On FID: Sharvit 2008, Maier 2012, Eckhardt 2014, a.o.

On Wh Slifting: Ross 1973, Haddican et al 2014, a.o.

IV: FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

Quasi-subordination & Discourse-active Complements

63a. Everyone wants to know did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred.

b. Dept Secy: [The Chair wants to know [ForceP+CTR can you teach Semantics 1 next semester?]]
[CP if you can teach Semantics 1 next semester.]]

Faculty Member: Yes, I can. _____ ↑
#Great that she cares

Embedded inversion:

Is not a necessary condition for an interrogative complement to be discourse-active (63b).

Is not a sufficient condition for an interrogative complement to be discourse-active (64).

64. Everyone wants to know [ForceP+CTR did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred?]

The context in which (64) was uttered makes it clear that the answer to the embedded question was known to Speaker_C and Addressee_C, ie it was not discourse-active.

Centering tracks a middle path – by requiring the question to be *potentially* discourse-active for *someone*.

On discourse-active complements: Simons 2007, Dayal and Grimshaw 2009

CONCLUSION

[SAP	SA _{ASK}	[ForceP	Force _{+CTR}	[CP	C ⁰ _{+WH}	[TP...]]]]
	Illocutionary Force Matrix Intonation		Matrix Intonation		Clause-Typing		

This view of the interrogative left periphery has been empirically motivated but it is worth highlighting that the evidence actually points to the order in which interrogative meaning is built up, it does not actually argue for the three steps to correlate with distinct projections in the syntax. However, it is compatible with the correlation given above, which is in keeping with current practice in syntax and semantics.

Though very much inspired by Rizzi (1997), like much of the current on discourse sensitive phenomena, it presents a rather different picture from the one found in the cartographic literature.

CONCLUSION

Rizzi & Cinque 2016: 144-145

“the C zone is delimited by the two heads labeled Force (expressing illocutionary force and clausal type) and Finiteness (Fin, agreeing in finiteness with the adjacent clause)... the left periphery is populated by functional heads, such as Q, Top, and Foc, which have a double function. First, in the syntax, they act as probes attracting a phrase bearing matching features; for instance, Q attracts a *wh*-element bearing the +Q feature, and Top attracts an element bearing the +Top feature. Second, at the interfaces with sound and meaning, criterial heads guide interpretation by triggering the appropriate routines: At the interface with sound, special intonational contours are associated with scope–discourse configurations, and at the interface with meaning and discourse, the dependents of the criterial head are interpreted in terms of the appropriate notions.”

Some further elaboration of how the current view relates to the cartographic view is called for, but for now, the proposal in this talk has been made on empirical evidence related specifically to how the syntax, prosody and interpretation of interrogatives are manifested within and across languages.

THANK YOU!

For helpful comments and suggestions,
Rajesh Bhatt, Simon Charlow, Gennaro Chierchia, Jane Grimshaw
students in Semantics 3 (Rutgers Fall 2017)
audiences at UMass Amherst, NYU,
Inquisitive BnB 3 (University of Amsterdam)
3rd Referential Semantics Colloquium (UFSCar, Brazil)
And now
SALT 30 (Cornell University)