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I. Splitting up the Interrogative Left Periphery

BACKGROUND

“Complementizers express the fact that a sentence is a question, a declarative, an exclamative, a relative…and can be selected as such by a higher selector. This information is sometimes called the clausal Type (Cheng 1991), or the specification of Force (Chomsky 1995)”

Rizzi 1997: 283

CLAIM

• Question meaning is built up at 3 points in the left periphery:

  [Speech Act Phrase [Force Phrase [Complementizer Phrase [TP…]]]]

• Syntax, Prosody, Pragmatics spread out systematically along the interrogative left periphery.
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Arguments for the three-way distinction come from:

- **Interrogative Selecting Predicates**
  - Those which only take CP
  - Those which take CP or ForceP
  - Those which (only) ‘take’ SAP

- **Predicates that show shiftiness in their ability to select ForceP**

- **Alternative Questions and Embeddability**
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1.1. Matrix vs. Embedded Questions: often have distinct grammatical profiles.

*English*

1a. Will Mary leave?
   b. Who will Sue see?

2a. John knows whether/if Mary will leave.
   b. John knows who Sue will see.

- Matrix questions have subj-aux inversion and QUES intonation but no complementizer
- Embedded questions have a designated +WH complementizer but not subj-aux inversion or QUES intonation.
- Both have wh fronting.
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**Hindi-Urdu:** Matrix vs. Embedded Questions

3a. (kyaa) anu jaaegii?
   PQP Anu will-go “Will Anu go?”

b. anu kis-se milegii?
   Anu who-with will-meet “Who will Anu meet?”

4. ravi jaantaa hai
   Ravi knows
   a. ... ki (*kyaa) anu jaaegii.
      SUB PQP Anu will-go “Ravi knows that Anu will go.”
      NOT “Ravi knows whether Anu will go.”

b. ... ki anu kis-se milegii
   SUB anu who-with will-meet “Ravi knows who Anu will meet.”

o Direct questions allow monoclausal Y/N questions with optional Polar Question Particles (Bhatt & Dayal 2014, 2019) and QUES intonation but without the complementizer.

o Embedded questions optionally have a neutral complementizer (glossed as SUB, following Szabolcsi 2016) but not QUES intonation.

o Monoclausal Y/N questions, with or without PQPs (Polar Question Particles) are not possible in embedded position--“or not” is required.

o Both (possibly) allow wh-movement to preverbal position.
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_Japanese:_ Matrix vs Embedded Questions

5a. Mary-ga hon-o kat-ta ka?
   M-NOM book-ACC bought Q
   “Did Mary buy a book?”

b. Mary-ga nani-o kat-ta ka?
   M-NOM what-ACC bought Q
   “What did Mary buy?”

6a. Tanaka-kun-wa [mary-ga hon-o kat-ta ka] sitte imasu
   T-TOP M-NOM book-ACC bought Q knows
   “Tanaka knows whether Mary bought a book.”

b. Tanaka-kun-wa [mary-ga nani-o kat-ta ka] sitte imasu
   T-TOP M-NOM what-ACC bought Q knows
   “Tanaka knows what Mary bought.”

- Japanese embedded questions do not have QUES intonation (I’m guessing).
- Japanese matrix questions have QUES intonation.
- Japanese matrix and embedded questions have Q-particles and wh in-situ.
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### Matrix Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAP</th>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td><strong>A</strong>&lt;sub&gt;ASK&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong>&lt;sub&gt;+WH&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td><strong>T</strong>&lt;sub&gt;P&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Embedded Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong>&lt;sub&gt;&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td><strong>C</strong>&lt;sub&gt;+WH&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong>&lt;sub&gt;P&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>↑&lt;sub&gt;MATRIX&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subj-Aux Inversion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wh Fronting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wh Fronting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wh Fronting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wh-Complementizer</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindi-Urdu</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>↑&lt;sub&gt;MATRIX&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional PQP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monoclausal Y/N Question</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible Wh Focus Movement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possible Wh Focus Movement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible Wh Focus Movement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Optional <em>ki</em> Complementizer</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>↑&lt;sub&gt;MATRIX&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q-particle</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q-particle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wh in-situ</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wh in-situ</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.2. Making another Partition in the Periphery

- English rogative predicates, those that necessarily select question complements, differ in the types of interrogative profiles they allow.
- Some predicates allow inversion and ↑MATRIX, some do not.

7a. Whether Mary will leave/Who will leave depends on Sue.
   c. *[Will Mary leave ↑]/*[Will who leave↑] depends on Sue.

8a. The question is whether Mary will leave/who Mary will see.
   b. The question is, [will Mary leave↑]/ [who will Mary see ↑]

   o depends on/it matters/investigate take complements with embedded question profile.
   o the question is/ask/wonder can take complements with embedded or matrix question profile.
   o This motivates the existence of two distinct syntactic structures in complement position.
   o CP_{+WH} for the first set; CP_{+WH} and an XP with more structure for the second set.
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- Hindi-Urdu rogative predicates, those that necessarily select question complements, also differ in the types of interrogative profiles they allow.
- Some predicates allow optional Polar Questsion Particles and monoclausal Y/N questions, some do not (Bhatt and Dayal 2014, 2019).

9a. *[anu (kyaa) jaayegii ↑] uskii maaN par nirbhar kartaa hai
   Anu PQP will-go her mother on depends

b. (*kyaa) anu jaaegii yaa nahiiN uskii maaN par nirbhar kartaa hai
   PQP Anu will-go or not her mother on depends
   “Whether Anu will go depends on her mother”

10. savaal yeh hai [ki (kyaa) aapke paas is baat kaa koii sabuut hai ↑]
    Question this is SUB PQP you-near this matter GEN any proof is
    “The question is, [do you have any proof of this?]”

- As in English, we assume a CP+WH structure for one class of predicates (the H-U equivalents of the same ones that stop at CP in English: depend on/it matters) and the possibility of a larger structure for the rest of the class of rogative predicates (the H-U equivalents of the question is, ask, wonder).
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English interrogative predicates that allow larger structures, with inversion and ↑MATIX, do not allow at least one type of question: rising declaratives.

11a. It’s raining ↑
   b. She burst out, “It’s raining ↑”

12a. * The question is, [it’s raining ↑] 
   b. * She wondered, [he had a haircut ↑]  

Gunlogson 2003 & McCloskey 2006

13a. The question is, [is it raining ↑] 
   b. She wondered, [did he have a haircut ↑]

   o If predicates like wonder/the question is can embed ForceP with +Q feature but cannot embed rising declaratives, rising declaratives must involve structures distinct from ForceP.
   o Some predicates embed CP+WH, some CP+WH & Force-P+Q.

Cf.* [will he have a haircut ↑] depends on Mary.

Interim Summary
   o CP+WH is always embeddable under any interrogative selecting predicate;
   o Force-P+Q is embeddable in principle under some of them;
   o Since rising declaratives are not embeddable in positions allowing ForcePs, so they must instantiate yet larger structures: SAPs.
   o SAPs can only ever be embedded as quotations.
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\[^{\text{MATRiX}}\] could also extend to non-canonical matrix question intonation, such as rhetorical, quiz master and echo questions, which may/may not embed.

14a. For an extra 2 points, [is Mt. Everest in Nepal ↑]
   b. They asked the contestant, [is Mt. Everest in Nepal ↑]

15a. So you are asking [is the Pope Catholic ↑]
   b. to aap puuch rahe haiN [ki (kyaa) dhartii gol hai ↑] then you are-asking SUB PQP earth round is “So you are asking [is the earth round ↑]”

- The status of embedded non-canonical questions is a bit unclear.
  - English quiz master questions with embedded inversion are OK;
  - English rising declaratives cannot be embedded;
  - English rhetorical questions appear to be embeddable, but it is unclear if they really have embedded interpretation.
II. What Happens Where?

2.1. What Happens At CP?

- \( C_{+WH} \) and \( C_{-WH} \) are defined to yield a set of propositions and a proposition respectively.
- A CP can embed under a predicate that selects for the specific value of WH on C.

16. \([C_{+WH}] = \lambda q \lambda p [p = q]\)

17a. \([CP \text{ Sue will leave}] = \{^\text{sue will leave}\}\)

b. \([[[CP \text{ whether sue will leave} \text{ depends on Mary}]]] = ^\text{depend-on}(\text{Ans}({^\text{sue will leave}, ^\neg\text{sue will leave}}))(m)\)

- An interrogative CP is an appropriate argument for an Answerhood Operator of the kind proposed in Dayal (1996).
- I assume some kind of coercion for converting a singleton set into a 2-membered set or tweaking the Ans operator to respond to singleton sets.
- I will assume for now that a wh-complementizer or wh movement licenses \( C_{+WH} \) in English, triggering the shift to a set of propositions.
II. What Happens Where?

2.2. What Happens At Force-P?  *Semi-formal presentation (to be formalized, possibly based on Kratzer 2006, Moulton 2015, Szabolcsi 2016).*

- **Force-P \( + Q \)** converts a +WH CP into a “centered question”, adding a (not at-issue) requirement that the question be active for someone: it introduces a POTENTIAL-SEEKER (building on Dayal and Grimshaw 2009) for information-seeking questions.

18. \([\text{Force}^0 + Q] = \lambda Q [\text{POTENTIAL-SEEKER}(x, \text{Ans}(Q)) \bullet Q]

  \[\text{not at-issue} \quad \text{at-issue}\]

- The prosodic interpretation of Force\(^0 + Q\) is \( \uparrow \text{MATRIX} \).
- The syntactic reflex of Force\(^0 + Q\) is inversion in English, something that is blocked by the presence of a wh-complementizer (*cf. subordinators in H-U do not inhibit \( \uparrow \text{MATRIX} \), which we take to indicate Force\(^0 + Q\)):  
  
  \[
  * \quad [\text{Force-P} \uparrow \text{[CP if/whether \[TP \ldots V\ldots\]]}]
  \]

- The POTENTIAL-SEEKER is identified with the closest c-commanding argument: the subject of the predicate that embeds Force-P or the speaker argument of the SAP if Force-P is not embedded.
II. What Happens Where?

19. \[
[\text{[Mary asked [Force-P will Sue leave \uparrow]]]} = \text{POTENTIAL-SEEKER}(\text{mary, Ans(\{}\text{^sue will leave, ^¬sue will leave}\}) \bullet \text{^ask}(\text{mary, \{}\text{^sue will leave, ^¬sue will leave}\})
\]

- To generalize to other types of questions, we might need to loosen the condition from \text{POTENTIAL-SEEKER}(x, \text{Ans}(Q)) to something neutral like: \text{ACTIVE}(x, Q)

- \textbf{What does it mean for a question to be active for someone?}
  An information-seeking question is \textit{active} for an individual \( x \), iff \( x \) satisfies minimal felicity conditions for being a \text{POTENTIAL-SEEKER}:
  \text{know}(x, \text{ANS}(Q)) \notin \text{Common Ground}, \text{which is compatible with} \text{¬know}(x, \text{Ans}(Q)) \text{and with } \Diamond \text{¬know}(x, \text{Ans}(Q))

For quiz master questions, for example, \text{know}(\text{speaker, Ans(Q)}) \in \text{CG}. If the phenomenon of embedded inversion applies to such questions, then \text{ACTIVE}(x,Q) has to be cued to addressee.
II. What Happens Where?

↑_MATRIX_ is being used as a cover term for the intonation patterns associated with various types of canonical information-seeking matrix questions: Y/N, Alt-Q, Wh.
II. What Happens Where?

2.3. What Happens at At SAP

- SAP\_ASK relates the P-SEEKER of the information to the speaker of the context.

20. \([\left[SAP \text{ will Sue leave } \uparrow \right]] = \text{P-SEEKER}(\text{speaker}_C, \text{Ans}(\{^\text{sue will leave,} \\neg^\text{sue will leave}\}) \text{ and speaker}_C \text{ puts hearer}_C \text{ under obligation to answer the Q: } \{^\text{sue will leave,} \\neg^\text{sue will leave}\}.

- Embedding predicates do not select for this much structure.
II. What Happens Where?

• SAPs never embed (contra Krifka 2015 a.o) – (21a) & (22a) from Dayal (2016), (21b) from Sauerland 2009, Sauerland & Yatsushiro 2014.

• *Quickly* in (22a) is ungrammatical if construed with the complement, it can only modify the matrix verb.

• *Again*, seems acceptable in (22b) but perhaps only if the complement is a quotation.

**21a.** Quickly, what’s your name? = give me the answer quickly.

b. What’s your name, again? = remind me, what’s your name?

**22a.** Mary is asking [quickly what’s your name ↑]  complement ≠ (21a)

b. Mary is asking [what’s your name again ↑]  complement ≠ (21b)

• SAPs can embed under predicates that select for quotation: *ask* but not *the question is.*
II. What Happens Where?

2.4. Discourse-Active Questions

- Cases of embedded inversion under discussion are distinct from quotation and involve genuine subordination (McCloskey 2006).

23a. Everyone_j wanted to know [did I_{SPEAKER-C} buy chocolate for Winifred ↑]
   b. Everyone_j wanted to know [should they_j buy chocolate for Winifred ↑]

- Such cases were termed *quasi-subordination* in Dayal and Grimshaw (2009); left open was the correlation between quasi-subordination and discourse-active status of a complement.

- CP_{WH} complements can be discourse-active. (24a) is a declarative but requires an answer, not affirmation/denial -- it functions like a question.

*Department administrator & New Faculty member:*

24a. The chair wants to know if you can teach Semantics 2 next year.
   b. Sure, I can.
   c. #How interesting (that she should want to know my teaching preferences)!


II. What Happens Where?

- Force-$P + Q$ complements can be discourse-active (25a).

25a. The chair wants to know [can you teach Semantics 2 next year ↑]
   b. Sure, I can.
   c. #How interesting (that she should want to know my teaching preferences)!

- They don’t have to be: (26) is not discourse-active. Ans-$D(Q) \in CG$ but it satisfies “centering” -- the matrix subject provides the $p$-SEEKER argument.

26. Everyone wants to know [did I buy chocolate for Winifred ↑]

McCloskey 2006

- (26) is noted by McCloskey as a naturally occurring example. He adds that the licensing of embedded inversion “depends on the epistemic state of the individuals denoted by the experiencer argument of $know$; that state is in turn evaluated with respect to the parameters defined in the matrix clause (realistic and finite, therefore at the present time in the actual world).”
III. Shifty Responsives

3.1. Embedded Inversion and $\uparrow_{\text{MATRIX}}$.
- *Know* is a responsive predicate that rejects embedded inversion and $\uparrow_{\text{MATRIX}}$ but accepts them when it is itself under the predicate *want*.

27a. * Everybody *knows* [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred ↑].
   b. Everybody *wants to know* [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred↑]  

McCloskey 2006: 115

- Responsive predicates also improve wrt embedded inversion and $\uparrow_{\text{MATRIX}}$ under negation and a matrix Y/N interpretation.

28a. * 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

- McCloskey entertains the idea that responsive predicates c-select CPs (as opposed to Force-P/SAP) but rejects it because of this shiftiness: “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).
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3.2. What are these pragmatic conditions?

- Felicity conditions of a canonical direct information seeking question:
  (i) \( \text{SPEAKER}_C \) does not know \( \text{Ans-}D(Q) \), ie \( \text{Ans-}D(Q) \notin \text{CG} \)
  (ii) \( \text{SPEAKER}_C \) wants to know \( \text{Ans-}D(Q) \)
  (iii) \( \text{SPEAKER}_C \) believes \( \text{HEARER}_C \) knows \( \text{Ans-}D(Q) \)

- If Force-P introduces the condition \( \text{POTENTIAL-SEEKER} (x, \text{Ans}(Q)) \) for some individual \( x \), there are two types of contexts that can support it:
  \( x \) doesn’t know \( \text{Ans}(Q) \); \( x \) may or may not know \( \text{Ans}(Q) \);

A matrix predicate like \( \text{know}/\text{remember} \Rightarrow \text{contradiction} \)

\((29a)\) [I remember [was Henry a communist ↑]]

\( \Diamond \neg \text{know}(\text{speaker}_C, \text{Ans}(Q)) \bullet \text{remember}(\text{speaker}_C, \text{Ans}(Q)) \)

A matrix predicate like \( \neg \text{know}/\neg \text{remember} \not\Rightarrow \text{contradiction} \)

\((29b)\) [I don’t remember [was Henry a communist ↑]]

\( \Diamond \neg \text{know}(\text{speaker}_C, \text{Ans}(Q)) \bullet \neg \text{remember}(\text{speaker}_C, \text{Ans}(Q)) \)

A matrix predicate like \( \text{know}^?/\text{remember}^? \not\Rightarrow \text{contradiction} \)

\((29c)\) [Do you remember ↑ [was Henry a communist ↑]]

\( \Diamond \neg \text{know}(\text{hearer}_C, \text{Ans}(Q)) \bullet \left[ \neg \text{remember}(\text{hearer}_C, \text{Ans}(Q)) \lor \text{remember}(\text{hearer}_C, \text{Ans}(Q)) \right] \)
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3.3. Hindi-Urdu Polar Question Particles and $\uparrow_{\text{MATRIX}}$. 

- Hindi-Urdu shows pretty much the same shiftiness as in English.
- The explanation lies in the pragmatics of centered questions, as in English.

30a. * anu jaantii hai [ki (kyaa) tum cai piyoge ($\uparrow$)]
  Anu knows SUB PQP you tea will-drink

b. anu jaantii hai [ki tum cai piyoge yaa/ki nahiiN]
  Anu knows SUB you tea will-drink or not
  Intended: “Anu knows whether you will drink tea.”

31a. anu jaannaa caahtii hai [ki (kyaa) tum cai piyoge $\uparrow$]
  Anu know want SUB PQP you tea will-drink
  “Anu wants to know whether you’ll drink tea.

b. koi nahiiN jaantaa [ki kyaa Tito stalin-se mile the $\uparrow$]
  Someone not knows SUB PQP Tito Stalin-with met
  “Nobody knows whether Tito had met with Stalin.”

c. kisii-ko bhii maalum hai $\uparrow$ [ki (kyaa) Tito stalin-se mile the $\uparrow$]
  someone-ACC at all know SUB PQP Tito Stalin-with met

*(31b) from COSH corpus (Bhatt & Dayal 2016) – obviously $\uparrow$ is ours; (31b) is also acceptable without the PQP.*
III. Shifty Responsives

3.4. Some Further Effects in Shiftiness

- Carolyn Anderson (p.c.): the judgements of (32a)-(32b) can get flipped with a change in quantifiers.

32a. Everybody wants to know [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred↑]  
 McCloskey 2006: 115
b. * Everybody knows [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred ↑].

33a. * Nobody wants to know [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred↑]  
 McCloskey 2006: 115
b. Nobody knows [did I succeed in buying chocolate for Winifred ↑]
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- The lexical semantics of the embedding verb can be an influencing factor as is first person subject and present-tense in the matrix – factors leading to a de facto direct question interpretation.

34a. I forget, [did Ann get As in her 1st year courses ↑]
   b. I have forgotten, [did Ann get As in her 1st year courses ↑]

- (34) cannot be used to answer a question about Ann’s grades.

35. Speaker A: Do you remember [did Ann get As in her 1st year courses ↑]

   Speaker B: I used to know but now I've forgotten
   whether Ann got As in her 1st year courses.

   Speaker B: *I used to know but now I've forgotten,
   [did Ann get As in her 1st year courses ↑]
IV. Alternative Questions

4.1. Cancelation vs. Choice


36a. What is your name? **Or (rather)**, what is your SSN?
   b. What is your name **or** what is your SSN?

- (36a): **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.

- (36b): **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.
IV. Alternative Questions

- Embedded inversion indicates Force-P, but we can ask if it allows both types of disjunction.

37a. Mary is asking what is your name or what is your SSN?
   b. Mary is asking what is your name or rather what is your SSN?

- In (37a) Mary is said to give the addressee the choice of providing their name or their SSN (either will do) – embedded Choice Type disjunction.
- In (37b) it is not Mary who cancels the first question and replaces it with a better question; it is the speaker who does the cancellation.
- There is no embedded Cancellation Type disjunction because there’s no embedded SAP.

38a. Mary wants to know what is your name, or rather, she wants to know what is your SSN.

   b. [SAP Mary wants to know what is your name] or rather
      [SAP Mary wants to know what is your SSN]

   c. * [Mary wants to know[ [Force-P what is your name] or rather
      [Force-P what is your SSN] ]]

25
IV. Alternative Questions

4.2. The Prosody of Alt-Qs

- 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 questions as well as in embedded alternative questions, including those identified as embedding CPs.

39a. Do they want \([\text{coffee}]_F\), or do they want \([\text{tea}]_F \downarrow\)?
  b. John wants to know/The question is,
     do they want \([\text{coffee}]_F\), or do they want \([\text{tea}]_F \downarrow\)
  c. Whether they will want \([\text{coffee}]_F\) or whether they will want \([\text{tea}]_F (\downarrow)\) will depend on when they get here.

- While pitch accents and the prosodic break is determined within the nucleus proposition, the final fall comes at ForceP. This makes the final fall in (39c) a potential counterexample.
IV. Alternative Questions

- Not all alternative questions have a final fall (Roelofsen and van Gool 2010, Roelofsen and Farkas 2015).
- Open disjunctive questions show sensitivity in embeddability

40a. Do they want [coffee]_F, or do they want [tea]_F↑?
   b. John wants to know/The question is,
      do they want [coffee]_F, or do they want [tea]_F↑

41a. * Whether they will want [coffee]_F or whether they will want [tea]_F↑ will depend on when they get here.
   b. * John wants to know/The question is,
      whether they want [coffee]_F, or whether they want [tea]_F↑

- Final fall/rise enters at ForceP.
- Interrogative CPs in embedded position do not have final fall/rise, though the absence of a final prosodic feature may not be detectable as distinct from a final fall.
V. Monoclausal Y/N Qs

5.1. Embedding in English vs. Hindi-Urdu.
   - English allows monoclausal Y/N questions in all embedded positions but it does not allow it in unconditionals.
   - Hindi-Urdu seems quite fussy, but the fussiness may be systematic.

42a. Mary knows/Mary wonders \([_{CP+WH} \text{whether Sue left}].

\(b. \ [_{CP+WH} \text{Whether Sue leaves}] \text{ will depend on Mary.} \quad \text{Bolinger 1978}
\)

\(c. \text{Whether Sue leaves *(or not), Mary will.} \quad \text{Biezma & Rawlins 2012}
\)

43. \(\text{anu jaantii hai} \quad [_{CP-\alpha WH} \text{ki Uma calii gayii}]_{s\rightarrow t}
\)
\(\text{knows} \quad \text{SUB Uma left}
\)
\(\text{“Anu knows that Uma left.”}
\)
\(\text{NOT: “Anu knows whether Uma left.”}
\)

- The English complementizer system specifies +/- WH (whether/if vs. that).
- The Hindi-Urdu clausal complementizer is neutral in this regard (ki ‘that’).
- \(\text{Whether/if triggers the shift from propositional type <s,t> to question type <<s,t>, t> (except, of course, (42c)) but ki does not.}
\)
V. Monoclausal Y/N Qs

- Hindi-Urdu CPs can have +WH specification (and be embeddable under *nirbhar-karna* ‘depend-on’) if there is a wh expression or a disjunction with alt-Q prosody in the nucleus proposition, *yaa nahiiN* ‘or not’ as well as *yaa X* ‘or X’.

44a. [CP anu jaaegii yaa nahii/uma] uski maaN par nirbhar kartaa hai
   Anu will-go or not Uma her mother on depends
   “Whether Anu will go or not/or Uma, depends on her mother.”

44b. [CP kaun jaaegii] uski maaN par nirbhar kartaa hai
   who will-go her mother on depends
   “Who will go depends on her mother.”

- Hindi-Urdu monoclausal Y/N questions are also “licensed” by ↑MATRIX.

45. anu jaannaa caahtii hai [Force-ForceQ [CP-αWH ki uma jaaegii] ↑]_{st→t}
   Anu to-know wants
   SUB Uma will-go
   “Anu wants to know if/whether Uma will go.”

- These data (mostly/completely?) based on Bhatt and Dayal *in prep*.

Not sure if this issue has been discussed in the literature previously.
V. Monoclausal Y/N Qs

5.2. Declarative Form and Bias

- Hindi-Urdu declarative questions do not standardly have biased readings. (Dayal 2016, see Bhadra 2017 for an account of the same fact in Bangla).
- Since the Hindi complementizer is neutral wrt +/-WH specification, Force\textsuperscript{0}+Q (with its prosodic signifier ↑\textsc{matrix}), which is defined for questions, shifts the denotation of the CP to a set of propositions.
- The result is a neutral Y/N question, whether embedded or direct.

46a. [[CP-\(\alpha\) baahar paani paR rahaa hai]] = ^it is raining outside

b. [[ [Force-P Force\textsuperscript{+Q} CP baahar paani paR rahaa hai] ↑ ]] = P-\textsc{seeker}(x, \textsc{ans}({^it is raining outside, ^it is not raining outside})) • {^it is raining outside, ^it is not raining outside}

- Note that it is possible to get a biased Y/N question reading in Hindi-Urdu direct questions but with a distinct prosody (Dayal 2016: 279).
V. Monoclausal Y/N Qs

- The situation is very different in English. Bartels 1997, Gunlogson 2003, 2008 show that a declarative form in combination with ↑ results in bias.
- The declarative form requires (tentative) commitment of speaker\textsubscript{C}, the potential clash with ↑ is resolved by placing the obligation on the hearer\textsubscript{C} to affirm/deny the proposition.
- (47)-(48) show the importance of the speaker being a source for p.

(9) [Robin is sitting in a windowless computer room with no information about current weather conditions when another person enters from outdoors.] Robin to newcomer:
a. Is it raining?
b. #It’s raining?
c. #It’s raining.

(10) [Robin is sitting, as before, in a windowless computer room when another person enters. The newcomer is wearing a wet raincoat and boots.] Robin to newcomer:
a. Is it raining?
b. It’s raining?
c. (I see that/So/Oh) It’s raining.
V. Monoclausal Y/N Qs

Generalizations:

$\uparrow + \alpha WH CP \Rightarrow$ neutral Y/N question, embeddable. *Hindi-Urdu*

$\uparrow + -WH CP \Rightarrow$ biased Y/N question, not embeddable. *English*

- The fact that rising declaratives don’t embed under predicates that embed rising interrogatives suggests that $\text{Force}_{0+Q}$ cannot force a $-WH$ CP to shift to a set of propositions in the same way that it does to a $\alpha WH$ CP in Hindi.

- It also suggests that the discourse requirements imposed by conflicting values of $\uparrow$ and $-WH$ CP, requiring *discourse commitment slates*, must be under SAP, not Force-P. The same applies to other accounts of the higher left periphery (Krifka 2015, Condoravdi and Lauer xx).

- The bining of the POTENTIAL-SEEKER argument by an argument of the matrix clause is distinct from the binding by SAP arguments.
VI. What about 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?
VI. What about Selection?

- Grimshaw herself holds that s-selection should be derivable from the lexical semantics of the embedding predicate and the semantics of the complement clause.
- For example, according to her, rogative predicates require uncertainty and are therefore incompatible with exclamatives, which are factive.

49a. John knows how very tall she is!
   b. *John wonders how very tall she is!

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

50a. *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 (50b)-(50c) are interrogatives or exclamatives, but that is in a way orthogonal to the issue of how the selectional properties of believe should be characterized.
VI. What about Selection?

- Certainly, the shiftiness of responsive predicates wrt to embedded inversion and $\uparrow^{\text{MATRIX}}$ suggests that compositional semantics/pragmatics may be the locus of selectional restrictions.

- 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 more 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.
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