

## **Arbeitsgruppe 7/Working Group 7**

Organizers: Katrin Axel-Tober (Tübingen), Lutz Gunkel (IDS-Mannheim),  
Jutta M. Hartmann (Bielefeld), Anke Holler (Göttingen)

### **On the nouniness of propositional arguments**

Wednesday, February 24, 2021

- 13:45 -14:45 Katalin É. Kiss, Invited Speaker (Budapest)  
*The evolving of nouny subordination in Hungarian: From parataxis or from correlatives?*
- 14:45-15:15 Paul Poirier (Toronto)  
*Japanese nominalizations and the copula*
- 15:15-15:45 Elizabeth Bogal-Allbritten, Keir Moulton & Junko Shimoyama (Göteborg, Toronto, Montreal)  
*Nouny propositions and their individual correlates: The view from Japanese*
- 16:30-17:30 Carlos de Cuba, Invited Speaker (New York)  
*Relatively nouny?*
- 17:30-18:00 Ellen Brandner (Stuttgart)  
*CP-complementation and selection*

Thursday, February 25, 2021

- 9:00-10:00 Éva Dékány & Ekaterina Georgieva (Budapest)  
*Where propositional arguments and participial relative clauses meet*
- 10:00-10:30 Kalle Müller (Tübingen)  
*That relatives! and the relativization of dass-clauses in German*
- 11:15-11:45 Andreas Blümel & Nobu Goto (Göttingen, Tokio)  
*Reconsidering the syntax of correlates and propositional arguments*
- 11:45-12:15 Nikos Angelopoulos (Leuven)  
*Nouny clauses: The clausal prolepsis strategy*
- 12:15-12:45 Alassane Kiemtoré (Stuttgart)  
*A syntactic account of clausal complementation in Jula*
- 13:45-14:15 Imke Driemel & Maria Kouneli (Leipzig)  
*Verb-y and noun-y complementation in Kipsigis*
- 14:15-14:45 Vesela Simeonova (Tübingen)  
*Definitely factive*

Friday, February 26, 2021

- 11:30-12:00 Richard Faure (Nizza)  
*From D to N, CPs as nominals in Greek*
- 12:00-12:30 Jürgen Pafel (Stuttgart)  
*Argument clauses and definite descriptions*
- 12:30-13:00 Frank Sode (Frankfurt/M.)  
*On the nouniness of V2-clauses under preference predicates*
- 13:00-14:00 Patrick D. Elliott, Invited Speaker (Cambridge, MA)  
*Objects of attitude ascriptions*

Alternates:

Patrick Brandt (IDS-Mannheim)

*The transfer of nominal (ordinary individual) to propositional (phenomenal individual) properties in German particle verb constructions*

Jan Wiślicki (Warszawa)

*S-selection and presupposition in quotational complementation*

# Nouny propositions and their individual correlates: The view from Japanese

Elizabeth Bogal-Allbritten, Keir Moulton & Junko Shimoyama  
Göteborgs universitet, University of Toronto, McGill University

Elizabeth.bogal-allbritten@gu.se, keir.moulton@utoronto.ca, junko.shimoyama@mcgill.ca

In this paper, we examine languages with morphosyntactically nominal propositional arguments (NomProps). Based on evidence from Korean and Japanese, we propose that NomProps can denote either individual assertion events (Krifka 2014, Bogal-Allbritten and Moulton 2017) or ordinary individuals with propositional content (Kratzer 2006, Moulton 2015).

In Japanese, finite clauses can be nominalized by the element *-no*.

These can complement attitude verbs like *shinji-* 'believe' (1).

- (1) Watashi-wa [**Johnny-ga shukudai-o zembu shi-ta no**]-o  
I-TOP J-NOM homework-ACC all do-PST no-acc shinji-  
teir-u.  
believe-ASP-NONPAST

'I believe that Johnny finished his homework.'

As with Korean (Bogal-Allbritten and Moulton 2017), these Japanese NomProps require a discourse-familiar assertion. (1) can follow a discourse such as "*Johnny finished his homework. Can he play?*" but not one where the proposition is not asserted, e.g. "*Did Johnny finish his homework?*". We argue this shows NomProps at least sometimes denote assertion events.

We then show via an ambiguity in memory-reports that Japanese NomProps can also simply describe contentful individuals. Like English, the verb *obo-* 'remember', can describe a direct/vivid memory (*I remember him winning*) or an indirect memory (*I remember that he won*) (Stephenson 2010). In Japanese, however, a plain NomProp cannot express the indirect version; instead the element *toyuu*, which contains a grammaticalized verb of saying, is required.

- (2) [1703-nen-ni Kuranosuke-ga nakunat-ta \*(to-yuu) no]-o oboeteiru  
1703-year-in K.nom passed-PST TO-YUU NO-ACC remember 'I  
remember that K. passed away in 1703.'

We analyze the difference between bare NomProps in (1) and those in (2) with *toyuu* in terms of how the propositional meaning arises: in (1), the NomProp describes a familiar assertion event whereas in (2) it describes an abstract individual with propositional content, building on analyses of *toyuu* by H. Saito (2018). We then show that the meaning differences independently follow from selectional properties of the embedding verbs.

**References.** Bogal-Allbritten, E. & K. Moulton. 2017. Nominalized clauses and referent to propositional content. SuB 21. • Kratzer, A. 2006. Decomposing attitude verbs. UMass. Krifka, M. 2014. Embedding illocutionary acts. Recursion: Complexity in cognition. • Saito, H. 2018. (De)categorizing speech. UConn. Stepehnsn, T. 2010. Vivid attitudes. SALT 20.

# Nouny clauses: The clausal prolepsis strategy

Nikos Angelopoulos

KU Leuven

n.angelopoulos1@gmail.com

**1. Introduction.** This abstract proposes a new analysis of object clausal prolepsis in Dutch (cf. 1) inspired by the BigDP configuration that has been proposed for clitic doubling in Romance (cf. Uriagereka 1995 i.a.).

(1) Jan betreurt het [dat Marie onstlagen is].  
Jan regrets it that Marie fired is

**2. The analysis.** Under the proposed analysis, (2), *het* 'it', the proleptic form used in clausal prolepsis, is a D head that selects a silent pronoun (as complement) and in prolepsis, a CP (as specifier).

(2) [<sub>DP</sub> CP [<sub>D</sub> het<sub>D</sub> pro ]]

**3. No accidental homophony.** A first advantage of the proposed analysis is that it can capture the different meanings we will *het* 'it' can have in Dutch without postulating different accidentally homophonous lexical entries. In this analysis, *het* is a D head that (c-/s) selects an NP complement in DPs like *het boek* 'the book' or, a *pro* which can be individual or propositional denoting.

**4. The internal structure of the proleptic proform.** The analysis in (2) can also explain why in contrast to *het*, other DPs e.g. *dat* 'that', cannot double an embedded clause in Standard Dutch:

(3) Jan betreurt (het/\*dat) [dat Marie onstlagenis].  
Jan regrets (it/ \*that) that Marie fired.

Concretely, it is well known that demonstratives, e.g. *dat*, occupy the Spec DP (cf. Leu 2007 i.a.). This makes them incompatible with a doubled CP in the same position thus, blocking prolepsis.

**5. The distribution of clausal prolepsis.** (2) can account for a hitherto unobserved generalization:

(4) *The Prop-Prolepsis Generalization:* Clausal prolepsis can occur in all and only those contexts that allow for propositional *het*.

Under (2), (4) is accounted for: a proleptic clause is simply a propDP with a specifier. Clausal prolepsis is available, if propDP is selected by a verb.

**6. Clause type restrictions on clausal prolepsis.** Lastly, (2) can capture the fact that in clausal prolepsis, *het* in prolepsis imposes stricter restrictions on the kind of clause that it doubles, e.g. it cannot double a *wh*-question, (5):

(5) \*Jan vroeg het wie mijn lievelingsdichter was. Jan  
asked it who my favorite pet was

This restriction follows from the fact that the CP is selected in (2) by *het* and that this element only selects for familiar clauses.

**References.** Uriagereka, J. (1995). Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic inquiry*, 26(1), 79-123.

# Reconsidering the syntax of correlates and propositional arguments

Andreas Blümel & Nobu Goto  
*University of Göttingen & Toyo University*

ablueme@gwdg.de & ngoto@toyo.jp

This talk reconsiders well-known instances of nominal correlates and their associated propositional arguments primarily in German and English, and suggests a novel descriptive generalization with respect to their syntax: The association of a correlate with a sentential argument to the matrix predicate requires a category label on that sentential argument.

It is well-known that in numerous cases, German and English exhibit asymmetries between subordinate clausal arguments and root clauses fulfilling the same function. In German, such contrasts are manifested by V-final clauses introduced by complementizers and V2-clauses. In English, such contrasts are manifested e.g. by clauses headed by  $C^\circ = \textit{that}$  and such clauses headed by what is commonly analyzed as a null-C-head,  $C^\circ = \emptyset$ . One such said asymmetry is that *that/dass*-clauses can function as complements to nouns, while null-C-headed clauses and V2 cannot.

We seek to derive these patterns as follows: Drawing on the labeling algorithm LA suggested by Chomsky (2013, 2015), Blümel & Goto (2020) propose that root clauses are syntactically characterized by the obligatory absence of a category label. Assuming that a category label is syntactically required for the ongoing (Set Merge) computation, a label becomes superfluous when the derivation comes to an end – which is the case at the root node.

Given this much, we propose that unlabeled syntactic objects cannot associate syntactically with nominal elements, such as correlates and nominals that can take clausal arguments. For the sake of this talk, we stipulate (1):

(1) An unlabeled syntactic object must not be co-indexed with a nominal.

We show how (1) derives the attested empirical patterns. As to the question how English meet the requirement to leave root-clauses unlabeled. We suggest the following: Based on Chomsky's (2015) idea that the phase head  $*v$  is a "syntactic affix" which is invisible to the LA, Obata (2018) proposed that his C-deletion analysis can be recast:  $C^\circ$  and  $T^\circ$  form a complex head amalgam in which  $C^\circ$ 's phasehood is cancelled out (cf. also EKS 2016, Sugimoto 2016). Her proposal opens up the possibility that English root clauses are analyzed as  $C^\circ = \emptyset$  which can undergo Set Merge with TP, yielding  $\{C^\circ = \emptyset, TP\}$ . Assuming with Obata that the C-head is invisible to the LA,  $\{C^\circ = \emptyset, TP\}$  is the structure of English root clauses – an exocentric structure, as desired. Based on this, we show how the attested asymmetries between null-C-headed clauses and *that*-CPs derive.

**Selected References.** Blümel, A. & N. Goto (2020) Head Hiding. *Proceedings of NELS 50*. • Obata, M. (2018) Eliminating C-deletion in the syntax: structure-building by Merge. *Koganei Journal of the Humanities* 14:21–34.

# CP-complementation and selection

Ellen Brandner

University of Stuttgart

eleonore.brandner@ling.uni-stuttgart.de

In this talk, I will provide further evidence for the idea that clausal complements should be analyzed as modifiers of a (possibly null) pronominal argument of the verb instead of being selected as such, Kratzer (2006). I will approach the issue by considering cross-clausal dependencies, i.e. 'long extraction' in languages where the type of the complementizer changes, i.e. as it is the case in Celtic languages and in Alemannic, see Brandner & Bucheli-Berger (2018):

- (1) a. des isch des buech [**wo** de Peter\_ glese hät] RC  
this is the book RC the Peter read has  
b. %wer hesch gseet [**wo** d'Marie moant [ **wo** \*(er) en Unfall gha hät]]  
who have.2sg said RC the Maria thinks RC an accident had had  
c. wer hesch gseet [**dass** d'Marie moant [ **dass** \*(er) en Unfall gha hät]]  
who have (you) said that the Maria thinks that an accident had had  
b. and c. 'Who did you say that M. thinks that had an accident.'

Whereas a propositional complement is (usually) realized with a complementizer of the d-pronoun series (*dass*), this may change when extraction has taken place. In this case, the relative clause (RC) particle, exemplified in (1a), shows up as in (1b) – although the *dass*-complementation is a possibility as well, (1c). Note that (1b) does not allow a resumptive pronoun whereas this is nearly obligatory in the *dass*-case. The crucial point is that the length of both constructions is identical, i.e. the insertion of the resumptive cannot be due to complexity/parsing problems. The first question arising is how the matrix verb can tolerate a relative clause as its complement, since a relative clause can hardly be taken as being c-selected by a verb. If we do not want to give up the widely established analyses of RCs as being modifiers of nominal expressions, the answer can only be that the CCs in these cases are introduced into the structure as an RC (with an inherent gap) and not as a (selected) complement of the verb in form of an embedded clause with successive cyclic movement. The next question is whether this analysis can be transferred to the cases in (1c) with the 'usual' complementizer. Following the analyses by Kayne (2014) and Axel-Tober (2017), it will be argued that this type of clausal complements are indeed 'explicative relative clauses' that occur without a gap, cf. (1c). It will be argued that the long distance dependency in this case is established via a proleptic construction, see Salzmann (2006). This analysis is transferred to clausal embedding in general with a (possibly null) nominal correlate in the matrix clause. If it were true that verbs directly select for their clausal complements, the differences in shape of the complementizer nor the varying distribution of resumptives could not be captured.

**References.** Axel-Tober, K. (2017). The development of the declarative complementizer in German. *Language*, 93(2), 29-65. • Brandner, E. & C. Bucheli (2018). Über lange W-Extraktion im Alemannischen. In: *Sardis aus Saarbrücker Sicht 2* (ZDL Beihefte, 170). • Kayne, R. S. (2014). Why isn't this a complementizer. *Functional structure from top to toe*, 188–231. • Salzmann, M. (2006). *Resumptive Prolepsis: A study in Indirect A'-dependencies*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.

# The transfer of nominal (ordinary individual) to propositional (phenomenal individual) properties in German particle verb constructions

Patrick Brandt

*Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache*

brandt@ids-mannheim.de

We argue that properties that are presumably nominal in origin get transferred regularly in certain German Particle Verb constructions to properties that are propositional insofar as they concern the internal structuring of eventualities as understood to be described, by and large, by propositional (=truth-assessable) representations.

According to our analysis, the oft-noted perfectivizing function of certain verbal particles like *ein-* in *einfahren* (cf. e.g. Kühnhold 1972) is the effect of redressing a conflict at the syntax-semantics interface: On the one hand, constructions like *in* [*die Grube*]<sub>AKK</sub> *einfahren* exhibit transitive syntax (Gehrke 2008), requiring that the syntactic arguments are mapped onto well-distinguished or DIFFERENT referents in the semantics. On the other hand, *in/ein* codes a spatiotemporal inclusion relation between its relata, contradicting the requirement imposed by the transitive syntax.

We follow Brandt (2019) in assuming that the interface executes a maneuver that delays the interpretation of part of the contradiction-inducing DIFFERENCE feature. It is not locally interpreted (semantically represented) *in toto* but in part passed on to the next syntactic-semantic computational cycle. Here, the passed-on meaning is interpreted in the locally custom terms: there are times where the state of affairs that defines the Givonian post-state of the depicted eventuality does not hold. No hidden element codes the superficially surprising meaning, nor ambiguity. Instead, part of an actually coded but locally unrealizable semantics in terms of ordinary individuals spills over to the phenomenal domain (using Husserl's term) and yields the interpretive effect observed.

**References.** Brandt, Patrick (2019): *Discomposition Redressed. Hidden Change, Modality, and Comparison in German*. Tübingen: Narr. Gehrke, Berit (2008): *Ps in motion: on the semantics and syntax of P elements and motion events*. PhD thesis, Utrecht: LOT. Givón, Talmy (1972): Forward implications, backward presuppositions and time axis verbs. In Kimball, John P., editor, *Syntax and Semantics*. New York: Seminar Press, pages 29–50. Husserl, Edmund (1928): *Phänomenologie des inneren Zeitbewusstseins*. In Heidegger, Martin, editor, Edmund Husserls Vorlesungen zur Phänomenologie des Inneren Zeitbewusstseins. Jahrbuch für Philosophie und Phänomenologische Forschung. Halle: Niemeyer. Kühnhold, Ingeburg (1972): Präfixverben. In Moser, Hugo, editor, *Deutsche Wortbildung*. Erster Hauptteil: Das Verb. Düsseldorf: Schwann, pages 141–363.

# Relatively nouny?

Carlos de Cuba

*Kingsborough Community College, City University of New York*

carlos.decuba@kbcc.cuny.edu

In an effort to reconcile Kayne's (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom with Chomsky's (1995) Bare Phrase Structure, Kayne (2008), following Guimarães (2000), proposed that a head  $x$  can merge with itself, yielding the singleton set  $\{x\}$ . This solved a projection problem that occurs when merging two heads that would otherwise be in a symmetrical c-command relationship, causing a linearization problem (with mutual c-command it would be unclear which head should project). An upshot of the proposed analysis in the paper is the claim that nouns do not project, meaning that they do not take complements. Given that nouns have traditionally been analyzed as taking a number of different types of complements, the onus was then on Kayne to show that what we have been calling complements of nouns are not in fact complements. Kayne's solution was to propose that instead of complements, we were dealing with relative clause structures, which are adjuncts (see Arsenijević 2009 for a related proposal). This relative clause analysis has gained a lot of traction over the years, enough so to be featured prominently in the call for papers for this workshop. However, in this talk I will attempt to throw some cold water on the relative clause analysis. I will present a number of problematic issues that arise with the proposal that all complement clauses can be analyzed as RCs. I will show that the evidence that has been put forth in favor of the RC analysis in the literature is weak, and that cross-linguistic evidence points strongly away from a uniform treatment of complement clauses as RCs.

- References.** Arsenijević, Boban. (2009). Clausal complementation as relativization. *Lingua* 119(1). 39–50. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.08.003>
- Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Guimaraes, M. (2000). In Defense of Vacuous Projections in Bare Phrase Structure. In M. Guimaraes, L. Meroni, C. Rodrigues & I. San Martin (Eds), *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics*, 9, 90–115.
- Kayne, Richard. (2008). Antisymmetry and the lexicon. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 8. 1–31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/livy.8.01kay>
- Kayne, Richard. (2010). Why isn't *this* a complementizer? In Richard Kayne 2010. *Comparisons and contrasts*, 190–227. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



# Where propositional arguments and participial relative clauses meet

Éva Dékány & Ekaterina Georgieva

*Research Institute for Linguistics, Budapest*

dekany.eva@nytud.hu, ekaterina.georgieva@nytud.hu

**Claims:** In this talk we look at non-finite propositional arguments which have nominal properties and involve the same suffix as participial relative clauses (pRCs). This is observed in the Uralic, Altaic, Quechua and Tibeto-Burman languages (Koptjevskaya-Tamm 1993; Serdobolskaya & Paperno 2006; Shagal 2018). We investigate this phenomenon in Udmurt and Khanty (Uralic) as well as Kazakh, Modern Standard Turkish, Uyghur and Korean (Altaic). We argue that in the relevant cases non-finite propositional arguments with nominal properties structurally contain the projection of pRCs; however, the polysemy arises from different underlying structures. Languages exhibiting the polysemy fall into 3 types, parametrically differing in the structure of pRCs and propositional arguments.

**Analysis:** We argue that the shared suffix of pRCs and propositional arguments with nominal properties expones an aspectual head in the extended VP (Collins 2005; Baker 2011; *pace* Doron & Reintges 2005). Variation is observed in the structure of pRCs and nominalizations. We propose that:

1) pRCs fall into two types: they are either bare AspPs or they are nominalized before they are merged with the head noun. The nominalized status of the pRC is reflected in the obligatory possessive agreement of the clause and the genitive marking of the subject.

2) Nominalizations comprise the Asp of pRCs and an additional (covert) element that gives the external nominal distribution to the phrase. The additional element may be: (i) a nominal functional head, e.g., *n* or *D*, that takes AspP as its complement (mixed extended projections, cf. Borer 1997; Borsley & Kornfilt 2000; Alexiadou 2001); or (ii) a covert *N* with the meaning of 'event' or 'fact' taking the AspP as an RC modifier/complement. Empirically, the latter type is manifested by the alternation of overt and covert nouns or the presence of overt light *N*s.

**Cross-linguistic variation:** The languages under consideration fall into the following types: (i) Udmurt and Kazakh have bare pRCs and mixed extended projections as propositional arguments; (ii) Modern Standard Turkish employs mixed extended projections in both RCs and propositional arguments; (iii) propositional arguments in Korean, Uyghur and Kazym Khanty involve covert/overt light *N*s.

**Selected References.** Asarina & Hartman. 2011 Uyghur Genitive Subjects and the Phase Impenetrability Condition. Proceedings of WAFL7 • Kim 2009. E-type anaphora and three types of *kes*-construction in Korean. NLLT. • Kornfilt 2000. Some Syntactic and Morphological Properties of Relative Clauses in Turkish.

The Syntax of Relative Clauses • Shagal 2018. Participial systems in Uralic languages: an overview. ESUKA–JEFUL.

# Verb-y and noun-y complementation in Kipsigis

Imke Driemel & Maria Kouneli

Universität Leipzig

imke.driemel@uni-leipzig.de, maria.kouneli@uni-leipzig.de

In this talk, we present novel data from Kipsigis (Nilotic, Kenya) that reveal two types of CP complements. The starting point of our investigation is what has been described as upwards-oriented complementizer agreement with a matrix subject (Diercks & Rao 2019, Diercks et al. 2020): the complementizer consists of the root of the verb *le* 'say' and an agreement prefix. We argue that what has been described as an agreeing 'say'-based complementizer in Kipsigis is in fact the lexical verb 'say'. We offer the following arguments in favor of this position:

i) *le* 'say' can be used as a matrix verb, ii) *le* is inflected in the indicative in matrix uses, but in the subjunctive in complementation uses, and iii) applicative and reflexive morphology – usually associated with verbs – is possible on *le*, even when used in complementation contexts. However, we also find a non-agreeing form that contrasts with the agreeing forms in creating noun-y clausal complements. For example, complements headed by the non-agreeing form, unlike those headed by the agreeing forms, can appear in a pre-verbal position that is generally restricted to noun phrases in the language. Based on these (and other) observations, we analyze the agreeing forms of *le* as heads of <v,t> type complements and the non-agreeing form as heads of <e,t> type complements. Our analysis thus supports the claim that the semantic type of CPs varies cross-linguistically: CP complements are not propositional, but rather constitute properties of individuals or properties of eventualities depending on the language (Kratzer 2013, Özyıldız et al. 2018, Moulton 2019, Demirok et al. 2020 a.o.). Kipsigis is also added to a list of languages whose 'say'-based complementizers are analyzed as verbs (Koopman 1984, Koopman & Sportiche 1989 a.o.). Different 'say'-based complementizers with verb-y and noun-y properties have also been described for Zulu (Halpert 2018). It is an open question at this point whether both types are attested in all languages with 'say'-based complementation.

**Selected References.** Demirok, O., Özyıldız, D., and Öztürk, B. 2020. Complementizers with attitude. In Baird, M. and Pesetsky, J., (eds.), *Proceedings of the NELS 49*. GLSA, Amherst. Diercks, M., van Koppen, M., and Putnam, M. 2020. Agree Probes Down: Anaphoric Feature Valuation and Phase Reference. In Smith, P.W. et al., (eds.), *Agree to Agree: Agreement in the Minimalist Programme*, p. 347-389. Language Science Press, Berlin. Diercks, M., and Rao, M. 2020. Upward-oriented complementizer agreement with subjects and objects in Kipsigis. In Clem, E. et al., (eds.), *Theory and description in African Linguistics: Selected papers from the ACAL*, p. 369-393. Language Science Press, Berlin. Koopman, H., and D. Sportiche. 1989. Pronouns, logical variables, and logophoricity in Abe. *Linguistic Inquiry*, p. 555-588. Kratzer, A. 2013. Modality for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In Stephen R. Anderson, J.M. and Rebol, F., (eds.), *L'interface Langage-Cognition/ The Language-Cognition Interface: Actes du 19e Congrès International des Linguistes Genève*, p. 179-199. Librairie Droz.

# Objects of attitude ascriptions

Patrick D. Elliott

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

pdell@mit.edu

An embedded declarative of the form “that  $p$ ”, and a content nominal of the form “the proposition that  $p$ ” are not intersubstitutable *salva veritate* - this is a special case of Prior’s (1971) *substitution problem* (see also Moltmann 2003 on the “objectivization effect”). It’s tempting to conclude that *syntactic category* is responsible for failure of substitution (see, e.g., Forbes 2018). In previous work (Elliott 2017), I argued that this position is untenable, on the basis of evidence from Moltmann’s “special quantifiers”. Rather, there is reason to believe that embedded declaratives and content nominals play distinct compositional roles in attitude ascriptions - embedded declaratives are eventuality modifiers, whereas content nominals are *bona fide* arguments, a distinction which I argued cross-cuts the complement/adjunct distinction. In this talk, I reassess the empirical landscape, paying specific attention to cases where declarative clauses appear to take on certain characteristics of nominals, such as clausal subjects, and the relationship between “nouniness” and factivity.

**References.** Elliott, Patrick D. 2017. *Elements of Clausal Embedding*. Ph.D. thesis, University College London.  
Forbes, Graeme. 2018. Content and theme in attitude ascriptions. In A. Grzankowski and M. Montague (Eds.), *Non-Propositional Intentionality*, pp. 114–133. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
Moltmann, Friedrike. 2003. Propositional attitudes without propositions. *Synthese* 135(1), 77–118.  
Moltmann, Friedrike. 2013. *Abstract Objects and the Semantics of Natural Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
Prior, Arthur N. 1971. *Objects of Thought*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

# From D to N, CPs as nominals in Greek

Richard Faure

Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS, BCL, France

richard.faure@univ-cotedazur.fr

The talk aims to account for the distribution of Classical Greek (CG) *hóti*-finite complement clauses (CC), provide fresh arguments in favor of the CP-as-nominal hypothesis (e.g., Baunaz&Lander 2017), arguing that the C is a D itself (but not a probe, as in Angelopoulos 2019), and explain the change from D to N of these clauses between CG and Modern Greek (MG).

*Hóti*-clauses have syntactic properties supposedly mutually exclusive, thus offering a contradictory picture in two respects. First, they seem to both (A) be low within VP (binding in and A-movement out of them are possible) and (B) extrapose (they always are rightmost in their clause, contrary to argumental DPs); second, like DPs, (C) they can be coordinated with DPs, but unlike DPs, (D) they cannot occupy focus (preverbal, Dik 1995) and subject (Spec,TP) positions.

I first show that CCs are actually *in situ* by means of coordination data and partial topicalization. I then address the question of the satisfaction of the selection of their embedding verbs, which otherwise select for DP. The complementary distribution of the C with articles, the association with demonstratives, and their agreement properties (showing that they carry  $\phi$ -features) indicates that *hóti*-clauses are DPs. However, restriction (D) is still to be clarified. It points towards an inability for *hóti*-clauses to be case-marked (see Stowell 1981). Although they are DPs of type e and carry  $\phi$ -features, which makes them suitable for  $\theta$ -marking *in situ*, they are not allowed to be A-moved to a case-position (Spec, TP or Spec, vP, Chomsky 2001, the latter being both an A and  $\bar{A}$  position in CG). Note that a dem. or a DP extracted out of them does not undergo such restrictions and goes to such a position, an operation that involves  $\theta$ -marked *hóti*-clauses in a chain headed by a case-marked DP, as required in  $\Theta$  Theory. Elsewhere, a silent expletive is present. Typologically, languages like English that do not have such proxies resort to other repair means like movement (which is moreover needed if they are not DPs, Moulton 2015).

Finally, the status of *hóti*-clauses changed with time: from CG to MG, (*h*)*óti* gained the ability to be nominalized with an article, which made it more N-like than D-like. At the same time, (*h*)*óti*-clauses spread to believe verbs. A feature impoverishment made possible this extension.

**References.** Angelopoulos N., 2019, Complementizers and Prepositions as Probes: In-sights from Greek, Phd diss. UCLA. Baunaz L.&E. Lander, 2017, "Syncretisms with the nominal complementizer", *SLinguistica* 72, p.537-570. Chomsky N., 2001, "Derivation by phase", in M. Kenstowicz, Ken Hale : A life in language, MIT Press, p.1-52. Dik H., 1995, *Word order in ancient Greek*, Gieben. Moulton, K. 2015. CPs: Copies and compositionality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 46.305-42. Stowell T., 1981, *Origins of Phrase Structure*, PhD diss. MIT.

# A syntactic account of clausal complementation in Jula

Alassane Kiemtoré

*University of Stuttgart*

akiemtor04@yahoo.fr

This paper attempts a unified syntactic derivation for complement clauses constructions in the West African Language Jula (Manding-Niger-Congo, SOV), using two mechanisms: predication (cf. Bowers 1993, Den Dikken 2006, Citko 2011) and Case assignment à la Koopman (1992). Two types of constructions are considered: (i) the complement clauses associated with correlate, (ii) the complement clauses without correlate. Despite their difference in the surface, I propose to derive the two constructions from the same underlying structure. In practice, the relation between correlate and complement clause (CP) is analyzed as an instance of predication. In this respect, they are both base-generated within a predication phrase to the right of the hosting matrix clause. The position of the correlate within the matrix clause results from a SpecX to SpecX movement triggered by Case assignment, in accord with the SOV word-order of the language. The absence of correlate is due to a principle active in Jula grammar according to which the specifier position of covert case assigning head must remain covert. Overall, the proposed analysis has at least two theoretical implications. First, it supports the observation that complement clauses can be base-generated in a non-argument position (Postal and Pullum 1988, Haider 1995, Moulton 2009 Frey 2016, i.a.). Therefore, their position does not result from movement out of the matrix clause, aka extraposition (Culicover and Rochemont 1990, Schwabe 2013, i.a.). Second, by treating the relation between correlate and complement clause as a case of predication, the analysis, in some way, goes against approaches that view complement clauses as complements to nominal heads or treat them on a par with relative clauses (cf. Aboh 2005, Arsenijevic 2009, Kayne 2014, i.a.). As the analysis predicts, complement clauses in Jula are not involved in such a relation.

**References.** Aboh, Enoch (2005). "Deriving relative and factive clauses". In: Brugè, Laura et al. (eds.), *Contributions to the thirtieth Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, Venezia: Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina, 2005, pp. 265-285. Venezia, Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina. • Arsenijevic, Boban (2009). "Clausal complementation as relativization". In: *Lingua* 119.1, pp. 39–50. • Bowers, John (1993). "The syntax of predication". In: *Linguistic inquiry* 24.4, pp. 591–656. • Citko, Barbara (2011). "Small clauses". In: *Language and Linguistics Compass* 5.10, pp. 748–763. • Culicover, Peter W and Michael S Rochemont (1990). "Extraposition and the complement principle". In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 21.1, pp. 23–47. • Den Dikken, Marcel (2006). *Relators and linkers: The syntax of predication, predicate inversion, and copulas*. Vol. 47. MIT press. • Frey, Werner (2016). "On properties differentiating constructions with inner-sentential pro-forms for clauses". In: *Inner-sentential propositional proforms: Syntactic properties and interpretative effects*, pp. 1–21. • Haider, Hubert (1995). "Downright down to the right". In: *On extraction and extraposition in German* 245–271.

Kayne, Richard S (2014). "Why isn't this a complementizer". In: Functional structure from top to toe: A Festschrift for Tarald Taraldsen. • Koopman, Hilda (1992). "On the absence of case chains in Bambara". In: Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 10.4, pp. 555–594. • Moulton, Keir (2009). "Natural selection and the syntax of clausal complementation". • Postal, Paul M and Geoffrey K Pullum (1988). "Expletive noun phrases in subcategorized positions". In: Linguistic Inquiry 19.4, pp. 635–670. • Schwabe, Kerstin (2013). "Eine uniforme Analyse sententialer Proformen im Deutschen". In: Deutsche Sprache 41, pp. 142–164.

# The evolving of noun subordination in Hungarian: From parataxis or from correlatives?

Katalin É. Kiss  
*Research Institute for Linguistics*

e.kiss.katalin@nytud.hu

The talk will analyze the evolution of Hungarian complement clauses and their complementizer *hogy* 'that', which is form-identical with the *wh*-phrase meaning 'how; as'. The following developmental path will be documented: Proto-Hungarian, similarly to present-day Khanty and Mansi, its conservative sister languages, only used non-finite subordination, and, in the case of verbs of communication, parataxis. The first sentence type with properties of finite subordination emerging in Khanty is the correlative construction, involving an indefinite/interrogative pronoun in the initial clause and an overt or dropped definite pronoun in the second clause, such as *Who... he...; Where... there...; As... so*. The abundance of this construction in Old Hungarian suggests that correlatives represented the first type of subordination in Proto-Hungarian, as well. With the shift of word order from SOV to SVO, inverse correlative structures (*He... who...; ...there where...*) also started spreading. In *...so as...* constructions, *as*-clauses containing an indicative verb functioned as clauses of manner, and those containing a subjunctive verb functioned as clauses of purpose. Verbs of communication, followed by a direct quotation, also contained the adverb *so* (*He spoke so; He said so*).

The generalization of finite subordination resulted in the embedding of direct quotations. By analogy, the correlative [<sub>CP</sub> ...*so* [<sub>CP</sub> *as* ]] pattern came to be extended to constructions involving a verb of communication complemented by an indirect quotation, as well. *Hogy* 'as' eventually developed into a general complementizer. Later, the adverb *so* associated with indirect quotations came to be replaced by the pronoun *az-t* 'that-ACC', the strong version of the 3rd singular [-human] pronoun. Object clauses coindexed with an (overt or pro-dropped) pronoun trigger agreement on the verb, which is evidence of their nouniness – as object-verb agreement is only elicited by DPs (Bartos 2000).

In late Middle Hungarian, free relative complement clauses underwent a further change: their pronominal associate in the main clause came to be reanalyzed as part of the relative *wh*-pronoun, as a result of which relative *wh*-pronouns assumed an *a*-prefix, and the pronoun had to be spelled out again (i.e., *az-t, mi-t* 'that-ACC, what-ACC' > *azmi-t* > *ami-t* > *az-t, ami-t*). The developmental paths to be presented may be relevant for the controversy concerning the evolution of Germanic *that*-clauses (cf. Lenerz 1984; Hopper & Traugott 1993; Axel-Tober 2017; etc.).



# ***That* relatives! and the relativization of *dass*-clauses in German**

Kalle Müller

University of Tübingen

kalle.mueller@uni-tuebingen.de

This talk is concerned with the question whether *dass* can introduce relative structures in German. It has been argued recently that many instances of *that*-clauses involve relative structures rather than complement structures (e.g. Aboh 2005, Kayne 2008, Arsenijević 2009, Haegeman & Ürögdi 2010). This concerns especially cases like *the fact/claim that* what will be referred to by the neutral term 'noun related clauses' (= NRCs). However, this claim has been challenged by de Cuba (2017) who argues that crosslinguistically, languages which, unlike English, have separate forms for declarative complementisers and relative particles always employ the latter to introduce relative clauses. Distinguishing between internal and external issues of syntax, I argue that *dass*-clauses are compatible with operator movement but are replaced by different relativisers in the case of more accessible constituents. NRCs can be either complements or adjuncts of the noun, hence the form of non-complement NRCs (i.e. V-final vs. V2) cannot be selected syntactically. Evidence is drawn from various phenomena: Clefted temporal adverbials like *Es war zu dieser Zeit, dass ich müde wurde* 'It was at this time that I became tired' show how the lack of an adverbial relative pronoun *wann* 'when' in German sparks the competition between *als* and *dass* to relativise the time argument. Furthermore, I apply Fabricius-Hansen & von Stechow (1989) test for implicative vs. explicative constituents to show the NRC behaves like an adjunct for some nouns but like a complement for others. Finally, following Reis (1997), who has argued that embedded V2-clauses are not syntactically licensed as complements, the same is argued for NRCs in the form of V2-clauses: they can only be semantically licensed as adjuncts.

**References.** Aboh, E. 2005. Deriving relative and factive clauses. In Brugè et al. (eds.) Contributions to the Thirtieth Incontro di Grammatica Generativa. 265–285. Venezia: Cafoscarina. • Arsenijević, B. 2009. Clausal complementation as relativization. *Lingua* 119(1). 39–50. • de Cuba, C. 2017. Noun complement clauses as referential modifiers. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 2(1): 3. 1–46. • Fabricius-Hansen, C. & A. von Stechow. 1989. Explikative und implikative Normalerweiterungen im Deutschen. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 8. 173–205. • Haegeman, L. & B. Ürögdi. 2010. Referential CPs and DPs: An operator movement account. *Theoretical Linguistics* 36(2–3). 111–152. • Kayne, R. S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. MIT Press. • Kayne, R. 2008. Antisymmetry and the lexicon. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 8. 1–31. • Reis, M. 1997. Zum syntaktischen Status unselbständiger Verbzweit-Sätze. In Dürscheid et al. (eds.) *Sprache im Fokus*. 121–144. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

# Argument clauses and definite descriptions

Jürgen Pafel

Universität Stuttgart

juergen.pafel@ling.uni-stuttgart.de

Argument clauses aren't noun phrases, nevertheless they have several interesting similarities with noun phrases. Long time ago, Herling called the complementizer *daß* a sentential article (›Satzartikel‹) in his *Syntax der deutschen Sprache* (1832). Depending on one's syntactic framework, argument clauses and noun phrases are similar to a certain extent. The most startling affinity, however, can be detected looking at the semantics. Argument clauses and several types of noun phrases can be analyzed as definite descriptions. It seems that we can distinguish four types of definite descriptions which are instantiated by noun phrases as well as argument clauses. These four types will be introduced in my talk.

– Type I denotes a maximal plurality

Examples:

- (1) (Joe knows) the politician(s) representing his county.
- (2) (Joe knows) that Mary is a gifted politician.
- (3) (Joe knows) whether Mary is a gifted politician.

– Type II denotes a minimal plurality

Examples:

- (4) The speakers of all factions (met in parliament yesterday).  
[scope: all>the speakers]
- (5) (We know) which politicians met in parliament yesterday.
- (6) (We know) which politicians each of them met in parliament. [each>which]

– Type III denotes a kind

Examples:

- (6) Dinosaurs (are not mammals).
- (7) (We wonder) which politicians met yesterday in parliament.
- (8) (We know) where to meet a democrat. [mention-some reading]

– Type IV denotes a smallest kind

Examples:

- (9) Politicians from all factions (agreed on a declaration). [all>politicians]
- (10) (We wonder) which politicians each of them met in parliament yesterday.  
[each>which]

# Japanese nominalizations and the copula

Paul Poirier

University of Toronto

paul.poirier@mail.utoronto.ca

There is a vast literature focused on nominalizations embedding different major clausal projections, such as TP and CP (e.g. Kornfilt and Whitman 2011). Increasing research argues the need for a more fine-grained approach to clausal structure, such as the articulated C-domain espoused by Rizzi (1997). I will make the case here that such an approach is also required for Japanese nominalizations headed by *koto* and *no*, providing evidence from the copular paradigm. While adjectival and nominal predicates surface with non-past copula *da* in matrix contexts, the special adnominal form *na* appears in the nominalizations, patterning with other complex NPs:

- (1) a. Sarah-wa shinsetsu da/\*na  
Sarah-Top kind Cop/NA  
'Sarah is kind.'
- b. [John-ga shinsetsu \*da/na koto/no]-ni odoroi-ta  
John-Nom kind Cop/NA koto/no-Dat surprise-pst  
'It surprised me that John is kind.'

Following Rizzi's [Force>Topic\*>Focus>Topic\*>Fin] C-domain hierarchy, I propose that these nominalizations embed only the lowermost head of the C-domain—Fin. I will argue that non-past *da* is best analyzed as being dependent on the Focus head, as its presence in matrix clauses forces an exhaustive reading for the subject, which has been tied to raising to Spec/FocP (Watanabe 2003). This suggests that *da* should also find its locus on the Focus head. Meanwhile, the FinP analysis of *koto/no* clauses entails the absence of Focus from their structure, and explains why *da* cannot surface. Other analytic and past-tense copular forms do not show the same sensitivity to C-domain structure, and surface uniformly across clause types.

Since the different forms of the copula depend on different heads in the clausal spine, we can extend the use of the copular distribution to determine how much functional structure is present in other embedded contexts, including interrogatives and conditionals. Moreover, the distribution of the copular forms in *koto* and *no* clauses present further evidence to support the need for an articulated C-domain. This would suggest that nominalizing heads are sensitive to this more fine-grained clausal structure, and consequently, that CP-nominalizations across languages do not constitute a uniform class.

**References.** Kornfilt, Jacklin, and John Whitman. 2011. Afterword: Nominalizations in syn-tactic theory. *Lingua* 121:1297-1313.  
Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*, ed. Liliane Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.  
Watanabe, Akira. 2003. Wh and operator constructions in Japanese. *Lingua* 113:519-558.

# Definitely factive

Vesela Simeonova  
University of Tübingen

vesela-simeonova@uni-tuebingen.de

The relation between factivity and definiteness has been the subject of copious works, starting with 'Fact' by Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970). The tradition senses a parallel between the clausal and nominal domains and often implements it as factive clauses headed by a covert nominal layer and a determiner. The present paper sympathizes with the intuition that nominals and factive clauses share the property of definiteness, but models this theoretically without a mediating nominal layer or treating factive clauses as noun-modifying clauses (*pace* Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1970). I show that noun modifying clauses cannot be the solution of the puzzle of 'nouny' factive vs less so non-factive clauses because noun modifying clauses exhibit **the same puzzle** (cf. 1-a-ii vs 1-b-ii)—an observation that has escaped the literature so far. The parallel and the theoretical solution proposed here are summarized below. The proposal: non-factive verbs and nouns select for CONTENT CLAUSES ( $cP_{cont}$ ) (in the sense of Moulton, 2009, label de Cuba, 2017 extended here to factive clauses as well), while factive verbs and nouns select for DEFINITE CLAUSES ( $cP_i$ ) (building on ideas by Melvold, 1991).

(1) a. **factive domain:**

- (i) Factive verbs: He regrets/resents/is happy [ $cP_i$  OP<sub>i</sub> [ $cP$  that Edna is a thief]]
- (ii) Fact(ive) nouns: the fact/realization/regret [ $cP_i$  OP<sub>i</sub> [ $cP$  that Edna is a thief]]

b. **non-factive domain:**

- (i) Content verbs: He believes/said [ $cP_{cont}$  OP<sub>cont</sub> [ $cP$  that Edna is a thief]]
- (ii) Content nouns: the idea/rumor/belief [ $cP_{cont}$  OP<sub>cont</sub> [ $cP$  that Edna is a thief]]

The  $cP$  layer allows differentiating C- and  $c$ -complementizers. This captures cross-linguistic facts: Greek uses *oti* for content clauses and *pou* for factive ones, while languages like English have an all-purpose complementizer. I propose that Greek-type are  $c$ -complementizers and English *that* is a C-complementizer. In both types of languages, the *cont/i* distinction is in the  $c$  head, not in C.

(2) Greek: [ $cP$   $oti_{cont}/pou_i$  [ $cP$   $\emptyset$  [ ... ] ] ]

(3) English: [ $cP$   $\emptyset_{cont}/\emptyset_i$  [ $cP$  that [ ... ] ] ]

To summarize, this paper upgrades decompositional semantics with a unified account of factivity in the nominal and verbal domains, and addresses the thorny issue of the syntactic size of factive and non-factive clauses and the interpretation of complementizers.

**References.** de Cuba, Carlos. 2017. Noun complement clauses as referential modifiers. *Glossa* 2(1). doi:10.5334/gjgl.53.

Kiparsky, P. and C. Kiparsky. 1970. Fact. In *Progress in linguistics*, 143–173. Mouton, The Hague.

Melvold, J. 1991. Factivity and definiteness. In *MIT WPL*, vol. 15. 97–117.

Moulton, K. 2009. Natural selection and the syntax of clausal complementation. UMass Dissertation.

# On the nouniness of V2-clauses under preference predicates

Frank Sode

Goethe University Frankfurt

sode@em.uni-frankfurt.de

This talk addresses embedded V2-clauses under “preference predicates” that typically are marked by subjunctive mood, cf. Frank (1998); Meinunger (2007).

- (1) a. *Ich { wollte / wünschte }, ich wäre schon zu Hause.*  
I { want.SUBJ / wish } I be.SUBJ already at home  
b. *Maria wäre froh, sie wäre schon zu Hause.*  
Maria be.SUBJ glad she be.SUBJ already at home  
c. *Es wäre gut, ich wäre schon zu Hause.*  
It be.SUBJ good I be.SUBJ already at home

These embedded V2-clauses don't really fit into the standard picture of embedded V2-clauses since predicates like “wollen” (‘want’), “gut (sein)” (‘be good’) and “froh (sein)” (‘be glad’) are not assertive and don't license embedded root phenomena.

In a first step, I bring together syntactic evidence, Williams (1974); Pesetsky (1991), semantic evidence Heim (1992) and cross-linguistic evidence, Iatridou (2000); von Stechow & Iatridou (2017), that suggest that the predicates in (1) form a natural class across languages: At their core they are evaluative predicates that take conditional clauses as their arguments which share semantic and syntactic properties with nominal arguments. Second, I argue that embedded V2-clauses under preference predicates have the same distribution as “complement fulfilling conditionals” suggesting that they are argument-conditionals.

The overall consequence of this view is that embedded V2-clauses under preference predicates restrict a hidden conditional operator in the same way as “if”-clauses do. This solves the puzzle of V2-clauses under preference predicates since V2-clauses under preference predicates are not embedded root phenomena and don't pose any threat to the standard picture that relates embedded V2 to assertivity or at-issueness (Antomo (2012)).

**Selected References.** Frank, N. (1998). Präferenzprädikate und abhängige Verbzweitsätze. Magisterarbeit Universität Tübingen. Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340. Bericht Nr. 128. • Heim, I. (1992). Presupposition Projection and the Semantics of Attitude Verbs. *JoS*, 9.3:183–221. • Iatridou, S. (2000). The grammatical ingredients of counterfactuals. *LI*, 31.2:231–270. • Meinunger, A. (2007). In the mood of desire and hope. In *Tense, Mood and Aspect*, p. 155–176. Rodopi. • Pesetsky, D. (1991). *Zero syntax*. Vol. 2: Infinitives. Ms. • Williams, E. S. (1974). *Rule Ordering in Syntax*. PhD thesis, MIT.

# S-selection and presupposition in quotational complementation

Jan Wiślicki  
University of Warsaw

j.wislicki@uw.edu.pl

**1 Observations.** There are four observations underlying the present proposal.

**First**, though quotation does not involve TMA and phasal relations, allowing also gibberish as in (1), it is not blind for relations with root verbs, as in (2):

(1) He didn't say 'He is gwich'.

(2) #He asked 'He is smart'.

**Second**, relations with verbs are based on presupposition, rather than standard selection. Though (2) is clearly odd, it is not simply ungrammatical. Rather, it is at odds with the presupposition involved by the verb that quotation represents a question. This is supported by the fact that quotation passes the *hey-wait-a-minute* test, e.g. in the context of code-switching quotation:

(3) A: He asked 'Suzuki ga kita'. [*Suzuki ga kita* is a declarative in Japanese]

B: Hey, wait a minute, I didn't know that's a question!

**Third**, quotation enters a relation typical for complementation (with attitude verbs, e.g. *say*, *claim*) or adjunction (with irrealis verbs, e.g. *agree*, *decide*):

(4) He didn't agree 'He is smart'.

While in (1) the quoted speaker did not utter the quoted string, in (4) he expressed his disagreement by uttering the quoted string. **Fourth**, tenseless verbs (e.g. *avoid*, *finish*) treat direct quotation as purely phonological strings, without entering formal relations with their content:

(5) He finished 'Heis smart'. [i.e. finished writing, uttering, ...]

**2 Analysis.** These effects align with the hierarchy of verbs developed by Wurmbrand & Lohninger (2019). Most of attitude verbs allow quotations, treating them as complements. Irrealis verbs allow quotations less often and combine with them via adjunction. Finally, only some tenseless verbs allow quotation, treating them as strings of symbols. Still, the above effects require a more fine-grained semantic account, which is secured by Cooper's (2005) TTR framework. First, rather than simple types, like *e* or *et*, it provides dependent types, e.g.  $f(e)$ . Second, except single formulas like  $\lambda x.dog(x)$ , it allows various pieces of information encoded in separate fields within a bigger record of formulas. This goes in hand with the above observations. The root verb *ask* selects not an object of type QUEST, but *presup*(QUEST), presupposing that it is a question; hence the odd, but not ungrammatical, character of (2) and the effect in (3). Tenseless verbs take arguments of type STRING, as shown in (5). Finally, adjunction is interpreted as providing a separate field (not an argument of verb), so that negation in (4) scopes over the verb *agree*, but not quotation.

**References.** Wurmbrand S. & M. Lohninger. 2019. An implicational universal in complementation—Theoretical insights and empirical progress. Cooper R. 2005. Records and record types in semantic theory.