



FACHLITERATUR
EDITION ROMIOSINI
ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗ



ICGL12 | 12th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON GREEK LINGUISTICS
16 – 19 SEPTEMBER 2015
FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN, CEMOG

Proceedings of the ICGL12

vol. 2

The International Conference on Greek Linguistics is a biennial meeting on the study and analysis of Greek (Ancient, Medieval and Modern), placing particular emphasis on the later stages of the language.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ICGL12
ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ ICGL12

**Thanasis Georgakopoulos, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, Miltos Pechlivanos,
Artemis Alexiadou, Jannis Androutsopoulos, Alexis Kalokairinos,
Stavros Skopeteas, Katerina Stathi (Eds.)**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE 12TH INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE ON GREEK LINGUISTICS**

**ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ 12^{ΟΥ} ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ
ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ**

VOL. 2

© 2017 Edition Romiosini/CeMoG, Freie Universität Berlin. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.
Vertrieb und Gesamtherstellung: Epubli (www.epubli.de)
Satz und Layout: Rea Papamichail / Center für Digitale Systeme, Freie Universität Berlin
Gesetzt aus Minion Pro
Umschlaggestaltung: Thanasis Georgiou, Yorgos Konstantinou
Umschlagillustration: Yorgos Konstantinou

ISBN 978-3-946142-35-5
Printed in Germany

Online-Bibliothek der Edition Romiosini:
www.edition-romiosini.de

ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ

Σημείωμα εκδοτών	7
Περιεχόμενα.....	9
Peter Mackridge:	
<i>Some literary representations of spoken Greek before nationalism(1750-1801)</i>	17
Μαρία Σηφιανού:	
<i>Η έννοια της ευγένειας στα Ελληνικά.....</i>	45
Σπυριδούλα Βαρλοκώστα:	
<i>Syntactic comprehension in aphasia and its relationship to working memory deficits</i>	75
Ευαγγελία Αχλάδη, Αγγελική Δούρη, Ευγενία Μαλικούτη & Χρυσάνθη Παρασχάκη-Μπαράν:	
<i>Γλωσσικά λάθη τουρκόφωνων μαθητών της Ελληνικής ως ξένης/δεύτερης γλώσσας: Ανάλυση και διδακτική αξιοποίηση</i>	109
Κατερίνα Αλεξανδρή:	
<i>Η μορφή και η σημασία της διαβάθμισης στα επίθετα που δηλώνουν χρώμα.....</i>	125
Eva Anastasi, Ageliki Logotheti, Stavri Panayiotou, Marilena Serafim & Charalambos Themistocleous:	
<i>A Study of Standard Modern Greek and Cypriot Greek Stop Consonants: Preliminary Findings</i>	141
Anna Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, Elisavet Kiourti & Maria Mitsiaki:	
<i>Inflectional Morphology at the service of Lexicography: ΚΟΜΟΛεξ, A Cypriot Morphological Dictionary</i>	157

Γεωργία Ανδρέου & Ματίνα Τασιούδη: <i>Η ανάπτυξη του λεξιλογίου σε παιδιά με Σύνδρομο Απνοιών στον Ύπνο.....</i>	175
Ανθούλα- Ελευθερία Ανδρεσάκη: <i>Ιατρικές μεταφορές στον δημοσιογραφικό λόγο της κρίσης: Η οπτική γωνία των Γερμανών</i>	187
Μαρία Ανδριά: <i>Προσεγγίζοντας θέματα Διαγλωσσικής Επίδρασης μέσα από το πλαίσιο της Γνωσιακής Γλωσσολογίας: ένα παράδειγμα από την κατάκτηση της Ελληνικής ως Γ2</i>	199
Spyros Armostis & Kakia Petinou: <i>Mastering word-initial syllable onsets by Cypriot Greek toddlers with and without early language delay.....</i>	215
Julia Bacskai-Atkari: <i>Ambiguity and the Internal Structure of Comparative Complements in Greek.....</i>	231
Costas Canakis: <i>Talking about same-sex parenthood in contemporary Greece: Dynamic categorization and indexicality.....</i>	243
Michael Chiou: <i>The pragmatics of future tense in Greek.....</i>	257
Maria Chondrogianni:. <i>The Pragmatics of the Modern Greek Segmental Markers</i>	269
Katerina Christopoulou, George J. Xydopoulos & Anastasios Tsangalidis: <i>Grammatical gender and offensiveness in Modern Greek slang vocabulary</i>	291
Aggeliki Fotopoulou, Vasiliki Foufi, Tita Kyriacopoulou & Claude Martineau: <i>Extraction of complex text segments in Modern Greek.....</i>	307
Αγγελική Φωτοπούλου & Βούλα Γιούλη: <i>Από την «Έκφραση» στο «Πολύτροπο»: σχεδιασμός και οργάνωση ενός εννοιολογικού λεξικού.....</i>	327
Marianthi Georgalidou, Sofia Lampropoulou, Maria Gasouka, Apostolos Kostas & Xanthippi Foulidi: <i>“Learn grammar”: Sexist language and ideology in a corpus of Greek Public Documents</i>	341
Maria Giagkou, Giorgos Fragkakis, Dimitris Pappas & Harris Papageorgiou: <i>Feature extraction and analysis in Greek L2 texts in view of automatic labeling for proficiency levels</i>	357

Dionysis Goutsos, Georgia Fragaki, Irene Florou, Vasiliki Kakousi & Paraskevi Savvidou: <i>The Diachronic Corpus of Greek of the 20th century: Design and compilation</i>	369
Kleanthes K. Grohmann & Maria Kambanaros: <i>Bilectalism, Comparative Bilingualism, and the Gradience of Multilingualism: A View from Cyprus</i>	383
Günther S. Henrich: „Γεωγραφία νεωτερική“ στο Λίβιστρος και Ροδάμνη: μετατόπιση ονομάτων βαλτικών χωρών προς την Ανατολή;	397
Noriyo Hoozawa-Arkenau & Christos Karvounis: <i>Vergleichende Diglossie - Aspekte im Japanischen und Neugriechischen: Veriäten - Interferenz</i>	405
Μαρία Ιακώβου, Ηριάννα Βασιλειάδη-Λιναρδάκη, Φλώρα Βλάχου, Όλγα Δήμα, Μαρία Καββαδία, Τατιάνα Κατσίνα, Μαρίνα Κουτσομπού, Σοφία-Νεφέλη Κύτρου, Χριστίνα Κωστάκου, Φρόσω Παππά & Σταυριαλένα Περγέα: <i>ΣΕΠΙAME2: Μια καινούρια πηγή αναφοράς για την Ελληνική ως Γ2</i>	419
Μαρία Ιακώβου & Θωμαΐς Ρουσουλιώτη: <i>Βασικές αρχές σχεδιασμού και ανάπτυξης του νέου μοντέλου αναλυτικών προγραμμάτων για τη διδασκαλία της Ελληνικής ως δεύτερης/ξένης γλώσσας</i>	433
Μαρία Καμηλάκη: «Μαζί μου ασχολείσαι, πόσο μαλάκας είσαι!»: Λέξεις-ταμπού και κοινωνιογλωσσικές ταυτότητες στο σύγχρονο ελληνόφωνο τραγούδι.....	449
Μαρία Καμηλάκη, Γεωργία Κατσούδα & Μαρία Βραχιονίδου: <i>Η εννοιολογική μεταφορά σε λέξεις-ταμπού της NEK και των νεοελληνικών διαλέκτων</i>	465
Eleni Karantzola, Georgios Mikros & Anastassios Papaioannou: <i>Lexico-grammatical variation and stylometric profile of autograph texts in Early Modern Greek</i>	479
Sviatlana Karpava, Maria Kambanaros & Kleanthes K. Grohmann: <i>Narrative Abilities: MAINing Russian–Greek Bilingual Children in Cyprus</i>	493
Χρήστος Καρβούνης: <i>Γλωσσικός εξαρχαϊσμός και «ιδεολογική» νόρμα: Ζητήματα γλωσσικής διαχείρισης στη νέα ελληνική</i>	507

Demetra Katis & Kiki Nikiforidou: <i>Spatial prepositions in early child Greek: Implications for acquisition, polysemy and historical change</i>	525
Γεωργία Κατσούδα: <i>Το επίθημα -ούνα στη ΝΕΚ και στις νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους και ιδιώματα</i>	539
George Kotzoglou: <i>Sub-extraction from subjects in Greek: Its existence, its locus and an open issue</i>	555
Veranna Kyrioti: <i>Narrative, identity and age: the case of the bilingual in Greek and Turkish Muslim community of Rhodes, Greece</i>	571
Χριστίνα Λύκου: <i>Η Ελλάδα στην Ευρώπη της κρίσης: Αναπαραστάσεις στον ελληνικό δημοσιογραφικό λόγο</i>	583
Nikos Liosis: <i>Systems in disruption: Propontis Tsakonian</i>	599
Katerina Magdou, Sam Featherston: <i>Resumptive Pronouns can be more acceptable than gaps: Experimental evidence from Greek</i>	613
Maria Margarita Makri: <i>Opos identity comparatives in Greek: an experimental investigation</i>	629
2ος Τόμος	
Περιεχόμενα.....	651
Vasiliki Makri: <i>Gender assignment to Romance loans in Katoitaliótika: a case study of contact morphology</i>	659
Evgenia Malikouti: <i>Usage Labels of Turkish Loanwords in three Modern Greek Dictionaries</i>	675
Persephone Mamoukari & Penelope Kambakis-Vougiouklis: <i>Frequency and Effectiveness of Strategy Use in SILL questionnaire using an Innovative Electronic Application</i>	693

Georgia Maniati, Voula Gotsoulia & Stella Markantonatou: <i>Contrasting the Conceptual Lexicon of ILSP (CL-ILSP) with major lexicographic examples</i>	709
Γεώργιος Μαρκόπουλος & Αθανάσιος Καρασίμος: <i>Πολυεπίπεδη επισημείωση του Ελληνικού Σώματος Κειμένων Αφασικού Λόγου</i>	725
Πωλίνα Μεσηνιώτη, Κατερίνα Πούλιου & Χριστόφορος Σουγανίδης: <i>Μορφοσυντακτικά λάθη μαθητών Τάξεων Υποδοχής που διδάσκονται την Ελληνική ως Γ2</i>	741
Stamatia Michalopoulou: <i>Third Language Acquisition. The Pro-Drop-Parameter in the Interlanguage of Greek students of German</i>	759
Vicky Nanousi & Arhonto Terzi: <i>Non-canonical sentences in agrammatism: the case of Greek passives</i>	773
Καλομοίρα Νικολού, Μαρία Ξεφτέρη & Νίτσα Παραχεράκη: <i>Το φαινόμενο της σύνθεσης λέξεων στην κυκλαδοκρητική διαλεκτική ομάδα</i>	789
Ελένη Παπαδάμου & Δώρας Κ. Κυριαζής: <i>Μορφές διαβαθμιστικής αναδίπλωσης στην ελληνική και στις άλλες βαλκανικές γλώσσες</i>	807
Γεράσιμος Σοφοκλής Παπαδόπουλος: <i>Το δίπολο «Εμείς και οι Άλλοι» σε σχόλια αναγνωστών της Lifo σχετικά με τη Χρυσή Αυγή</i>	823
Ελένη Παπαδοπούλου: <i>Η συνδυαστικότητα υποκοριστικών επιθημάτων με β' συνθετικό το επίθημα -άκι στον διαλεκτικό λόγο</i>	839
Στέλιος Πιπερίδης, Πένυ Λαμπροπούλου & Μαρία Γαβριηλίδου: <i>clarin:el. Υποδομή τεκμηρίωσης, διαμοιρασμού και επεξεργασίας γλωσσικών δεδομένων</i>	851
Maria Pontiki: <i>Opinion Mining and Target Extraction in Greek Review Texts</i>	871
Anna Roussou: <i>The duality of mipos</i>	885

Stathis Selimis & Demetra Katis: <i>Reference to static space in Greek: A cross-linguistic and developmental perspective of poster descriptions</i>	897
Evi Sifaki & George Tsoulas: <i>XP-V orders in Greek</i>	911
Konstantinos Sipitanos: <i>On desiderative constructions in Naousa dialect</i>	923
Eleni Staraki: <i>Future in Greek: A Degree Expression</i>	935
Χριστίνα Τακούδα & Ευανθία Παπαευθυμίου: <i>Συγκριτικές διδακτικές πρακτικές στη διδασκαλία της ελληνικής ως Γ2: από την κριτική παρατήρηση στην αναπλαισίωση</i>	945
Alexandros Tantos, Giorgos Chatziioannidis, Katerina Lykou, Meropi Papatheohari, Antonia Samara & Kostas Vlachos: <i>Corpus C58 and the interface between intra- and inter-sentential linguistic information</i>	961
Arhonto Terzi & Vina Tsakali: <i>The contribution of Greek SE in the development of locatives</i>	977
Paraskevi Thomou: <i>Conceptual and lexical aspects influencing metaphor realization in Modern Greek</i>	993
Nina Topintzi & Stuart Davis: <i>Features and Asymmetries of Edge Gemimates</i>	1007
Liana Tronci: <i>At the lexicon-syntax interface Ancient Greek constructions with ἔχειν and psychological nouns</i>	1021
Βίλλυ Τσάκωνα: <i>«Δημοκρατία είναι 4 λύκοι και 1 πρόβατο να ψηφίζουν για φαγητό»:Αναλύοντας τα ανέκδοτα για τους/τις πολιτικούς στην οικονομική κρίση</i>	1035
Ειρήνη Τσαμαδού- Jacobberger & Μαρία Ζέρβα: <i>Εκμάθηση ελληνικών στο Πανεπιστήμιο Στρασβούργου: κίνητρα και αναπαραστάσεις</i> ...	1051
Stavroula Tsiplakou & Spyros Armostis: <i>Do dialect variants (mis)behave? Evidence from the Cypriot Greek koine</i>	1065
Αγγελική Τσόκογλου & Σύλα Κλειδή: <i>Συζητώντας τις δομές σε -οντας</i>	1077

Αλεξιάννα Τσότσου:	
<i>Η μεθοδολογική προσέγγιση της εικόνας της Γερμανίας στις ελληνικές εφημερίδες</i>	1095
Anastasia Tzilinis:	
<i>Begründendes Handeln im neugriechischen Wissenschaftlichen Artikel: Die Situierung des eigenen Beitrags im Forschungszusammenhang.....</i>	1109
Κυριακούλα Τζωρτζάτου, Αργύρης Αρχάκης, Άννα Ιορδανίδου & Γιώργος Ι. Ευδόπουλος:	
<i>Στάσεις απέναντι στην ορθογραφία της Κοινής Νέας Ελληνικής: Ζητήματα ερευνητικού σχεδιασμού</i>	1123
Nicole Vassalou, Dimitris Papazachariou & Mark Janse:	
<i>The Vowel System of Mišótika Cappadocian</i>	1139
Marina Vassiliou, Angelos Georganas, Prokopis Prokopidis & Haris Papageorgiou:	
<i>Co-referring or not co-referring? Answer the question!.....</i>	1155
Jeroen Vis:	
<i>The acquisition of Ancient Greek vocabulary.....</i>	1171
Christos Vlachos:	
<i>Mod(aliti)es of lifting wh-questions.....</i>	1187
Ευαγγελία Βλάχου & Κατερίνα Φραντζή:	
<i>Μελέτη της χρήσης των ποσοδεικτών λίγο-λιγάκι σε κείμενα πολιτικού λόγου</i>	1201
Madeleine Voga:	
<i>Τι μας διδάσκουν τα ρήματα της ΝΕ σχετικά με την επεξεργασία της μορφολογίας.....</i>	1213
Werner Voigt:	
<i>«Σεληνάκι μου λαμπρό, φέγγε μου να περπατώ ...» oder: warum es in dem bekannten Lied nicht so, sondern eben φεγγαράκι heißt und ngr. φεγγάρι</i>	1227
Μαρία Βραχιονίδου:	
<i>Υποκοριστικά επιρρήματα σε νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους και ιδιώματα</i>	1241
Jeroen van de Weijer & Marina Tzakosta:	
<i>The Status of *Complex in Greek.....</i>	1259
Theodoros Xioufis:	
<i>The pattern of the metaphor within metonymy in the figurative language of romantic love in modern Greek.....</i>	1275

MOD(ALITI)ES OF LIFTING *WH*-QUESTIONS*

Christos Vlachos

Queen Mary University of London

c.vlachos@qmul.ac.uk

Περίληψη

Η δομή ανήψωσης ερωτηματικής πρότασης μερικής αγνοίας, εκτός από την ερωτηματική τροπικότητα, φέρει και στοιχεία αυτοοπτικότητας αντίστοιχα με αυτά που παρατηρούνται στις παρενθετικές προτάσεις. Αντίθετα με μία πρόσφατη μελέτη που προτείνει ότι η αυτοοπτικότητα αντιστοιχεί σε μία ανεξάρτητη λειτουργική κεφαλή και οδηγεί σε παρατακτική σύνταξη, το παρόν άρθρο προτείνει ότι η αυτοοπτικότητα είναι ιδιότητα του ρήματος που επιλέγει την ερωτηματική πρόταση μερικής αγνοίας και οδηγεί σε υποτακτική σύνταξη.

Keywords: *wh*-slifting, evidentiality, parentheticals, complementation, clausal pied-piping

* This paper is part of an ongoing project on clausal complement selection in the context of *wh*-slifting, *wh*-scope marking, and clausal pied-piping. Pieces of this project have been presented at the conference “Generative Syntax in the Twenty-first Century: The Road Ahead” (Athens, May 2015), the “12th International Conference on Greek Linguistics” (Berlin, September 2015), the workshop “On *Wh*-doubling” (Konstanz, October 2015), the lunch talk of the Linguistics Department of Queen Mary University of London (London, March 2016), and the University of Reading (Reading, June 2016). For insightful comments, challenging debates, and ongoing support, I am indebted to David Adger and Hagit Borer. Also, I cordially thank the audiences of the above events, and more in particular: Mark Baker, Sjef Barbiers, Josef Bayers, Ellen Brandner, Ian Cummings, Alex Drummond, David Hall, Daniel Harbour, Sylva Kleidi, George Kotzoglou, Diego Gabriel Krivochen, Elliot Lash, Julie Anne Legate, Rita Manzini, Anna Maria Margariti, Theodoros Marinis, Luisa Marti, Gereon Müller, Nicola Munaro, Fryni Panayidou, Josep Quer, Anna Roussou, Douglas Saddy, Ourania Sinopoulou, Linnaea Stockall, Peter Svenonius, Aggeliki Tsokoglou, George Tsoulas, and Coppe van Urk. This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 656044. This project reflects only my view and the REA is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains. All remaining errors are mine.

2. Introduction

A rarely-documented phenomenon, with important implications about the grammar of clausal complement selection, is *wh*-slifting, exemplified in English as in (1) (due to space limitation, English will be the language of exemplification throughout the present paper).

- (1) Who did Mary meet, do you think?

(1) shows that a *wh*-interrogative clause with root-properties, hereafter CP₂, surfaces at the left of a typical yes/no question, henceforth CP₁. A non-trivial question, then, arises as to how CP₂ is linked to CP₁, on the observation that the verb *think* in CP₁ does not typically select questions, but propositions, as the ungrammaticality of **I think who Mary met* suggests.

Haddican et al. (2014), which is the first detailed attempt to account for the properties of *wh*-slifting, propose the parse in (2) (which repeats only the part of their parse in (96) that is most relevant for present purposes, a general strategy employed hereafter).

- (2) [_{FOCP} [_{CP₂} How old is she]_i] [_{FOC} [_{MOODEVIDP} [_{CP₁} Op_i did she say t_{Op}] [_{MOODEVID} [t_{CP₂}]]]]]?

Glossing over unnecessary technical details, we see in (2) that an evidential head mediates between the two CPs, taking CP₂ as its complement, and CP₁ as its specifier. A null Op(erator) moves from the argument position of the verb in CP₁ to [Spec,CP₁], and is co-indexed with CP₂, which moves to a F(ocus) P(hrase), past CP₁, yielding the observed linear arrangement. In short, for Haddican et al., *wh*-slifting features evidential properties which arise from an independent functional head that flanks the two CPs under consideration, in a paratactic fashion.

In the present paper, I will follow Haddican et al. (2014) in assuming that *wh*-slifting bears evidential properties. However, unlike Haddican et al., I will argue that these properties arise from the modal requirements imposed on the verb in CP₁ (section 2). This conclusion, in turn, supports a hypotactic treatment of *wh*-slifting, as the one panned out in Vlachos (in progress), which argues that the complement of the verb in CP₁ is a nominal element that heads CP₂, and triggers (typical) *wh*-movement coupled with clausal pied-piping; hence, the corresponding arrangement (section 3).

2. Describing evidentiality

Haddican et al. (2014) were the first to observe that the set of verbs that support *wh*-slifting is a proper subset of the proposition-selecting verbs discussed in Hooper (1975). Specifically, the verbs supporting *wh*-slifting seem to be limited to the set in (3) (repeated from Haddican et al. 2014: 95, (58); judgments are theirs).

- (3) How old is she,
- a. do you think/suppose/believe/expect/guess/imagine/figure/predict/reckon?
 - b. did you say/*insist/*declare/*maintain/*promise/*mutter/*shout?
 - c. * do you hope?
 - d. ? does it seem/appear?
 - e. * do you realize/regret/admit/don't you deny/have you discovered?

As we may observe, (3) includes verbs of belief (cf., (3)a), but excludes verbs of communication (e.g., manner of speaking verbs as in (3)b)—apart from *say*—verbs of longing (cf., (3)c), raising verbs (cf., (3)d), as well as factives (cf., (3)e).

Let us put Haddican et al.'s (2014) observations into perspective, by considering them in the context of Hooper's (1975) early classification of proposition-selecting predicates, a representative sample of which is given in (4) (repeated from Hooper 1975: 92, Table 1).

Hooper, building on Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1971) and Karttunen (1971), categorizes the predicates that select propositions into 4 classes, on the basis of two factors that intersect with each other: "assertiveness" and "factivity". As the distinction between assertives and factives is tangential to the present discussion, it suffices to say that, according to Hooper, the major difference between the two classes of predicates is this: while assertive predicates assert the truth of their complement proposition, factive predicates presuppose the truth of their complement proposition (see also Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1971). Assertive nonfactive predicates are further distinguished into "weak" and "strong", because they differ as to the degree of certainty the speaker has towards the truth of the complement proposition: unlike strong assertives, weak assertives imply that the speaker has no absolute knowledge that the proposition is true.

The validity of Hooper's classification has not remained unchallenged (see, for example, Palmer 2001, and Simons 2007, for some recent criticism), but this issue is orthogonal to our present concerns. What makes Hooper's classification quite handy

(4)

NONFACTIVE		
ASSERTIVE		
WEAK ASSERTIVE	STRONG ASSERTIVE	NONASSERTIVE
<i>think</i> <i>believe</i> <i>suppose</i> <i>expect</i> <i>imagine</i> <i>guess</i> <i>seem</i> <i>appear</i> <i>figure</i>	<i>acknowledge</i> <i>admit</i> <i>affirm</i> <i>allege</i> <i>answer</i> <i>argue</i> <i>assert</i> <i>certify</i> <i>claim</i> <i>predict</i> <i>say</i>	<u>Non-negative:</u> <i>be likely</i> <i>be possible</i> <i>be probable</i> <u>Negative:</u> <i>be unlikely</i> <i>be impossible</i> <i>doubt</i> <i>deny</i>
FACTIVE		
ASSERTIVE (SEMIFACTIVE)		NONASSERTIVE (TRUE FACTIVE)
<i>find out</i> <i>discover</i> <i>know</i> <i>learn</i> <i>note</i> <i>remember</i> <i>see</i>		<i>regret</i> <i>resent</i> <i>forget</i> <i>amuse</i> <i>make sure</i> <i>be odd</i> <i>be relevant</i>

for our present purposes is the fact that it offers a heuristic method to narrow down the class of the proposition-selecting predicates that support *wh*-slifting. More precisely, if we look at Haddican’s et al. judgements in (3), under the light of the table in (4), we see that only weak assertive predicates support *wh*-slifting, along with the strong assertive *say*, while all nonassertives—that is, factives or otherwise—are excluded.²

² In passing, notice that, although the raising predicates, *seem* and *appear*, belong to the weak assertive class, they sound marginal (or, downright ungrammatical) in *wh*-slifting. This marginality seems to turn on Case-marking (as suggested to me by David Adger), and raises a number of implications that revolve around selection and clausal movement (of the kind, perhaps, addressed in Alrenga 2005). As a comprehensive discussion of the relevant issues would lead us too far afield, I will take it up on a future occasion.

Hooper argues that the primary syntactic difference between assertive (weak and strong) and nonassertive predicates is that assertives permit the preposing of their complement proposition, while nonassertives do not. For example, witness (5) (fashioned over Hooper's 1975: 94, (1), (3), (9), and (12)).

- (5) a. I think the wizard will deny your request.
- b. The wizard will deny your request, I think.
- c. The guide explained that the winters are very cold here.
- d. The winters are very cold here, the guide explained.
- e. It's probable that factivity is important in other constructions as well.
- f. * Factivity is important in other constructions as well, it's probable.

(5) shows that both the weak assertive *think* (cf., (5)a), and the strong assertive *explain* (cf., (5)b), allow proposition-preposing, as in (5)b and (5)d respectively. However, the nonassertive *it's probable* (cf., (5)e) does not allow such preposing, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (5)f.

At least as early as Urmson (1952), the property of certain predicates, as opposed to others, to permit the preposing of their complement proposition has been taken as an indication of the "parenthetical" use of such verbs. So, Hooper's claim is that, unlike nonassertive predicates, both weak and strong assertives have a parenthetical status when their complement proposition is preposed, as in (5)b and (5)d respectively.

Several authors, among them Bresnan (1968), Jackendoff (1972), Ross (1973), Hooper (1975), Emonds (1976, 1979), McCawley (1982), Reinhart (1983), and more recently, Rooryck (2001), have shown that the constructions that weak assertive predicates (among others) support, in their parenthetical use, exhibit certain syntactic and semantic properties (see also Simons 2007 for a pragmatically-oriented treatment). In what follows, I will show that some of these properties figure in *wh*-slifting, as well. A remark is in order before I embark on the aforementioned task: for expository purposes, I will maintain the term "complement (proposition)" when referring to the declarative *that*-clause that may be construed with weak assertive parentheticals. However, by doing so, I take no stand on what the correct structural representation of the relevant configurations may (turn out to) be. In section 3, I take Rooryck's (2001) complementation analysis of parentheticals at face value, but it should be noted at the outset that parentheticals have lend themselves to adjunct-like treatments, as well (see,

for example, Jackendoff 1972 for an early discussion; yet, it seems possible to make the complementation approach compatible with the adjunct view, as in Rooryck 2001).

With the previous as much, witness (6), which is modelled on Rooryck (2001: 128, (12) & (13)).

- (6) a. Jules is back, they (*really) say.
- b. Jules is back, I (*firmly) believe.

It is a long-standing observation that parenthetical verbs have impoverished meaning or, as Urmson (1952: 482) puts it, “parenthetical verbs are not psychological descriptions”. For example, the parenthetical *they say* (cf., (6)a) does not necessarily describe the information obtained by someone actually “saying” something, but the information obtained just by reading the tabloids (as Rooryck 2001: 128 says). In this sense, the meaning of parenthetical verbs is semantically bleached, or “di-intensified”, in Bresnan’s (1968) terminology. This semantic reduction is further supported by the fact that a parenthetical cannot be modified by adverbs that require the original meaning of the verb, as the ungrammaticality of *really* and *firmly* demonstrates in (6)a and (6)b respectively. In a similar context, for (6)b, Rooryck (2001: 128) quotes Vet (1994), who notes that “...in the parenthetical *I think*, there is no conviction expressed, but a reservation limiting the assertion to the opinion of the speaker.” Or, as Hooper (1975: 101) argues, concentrating on weak assertive predicates of the type in (6)b, their semantic content makes no assertion, in and of itself, but describes the attitude of the speaker towards the truth of the asserted proposition, which lies in the complement clause. The contribution of the weak assertive verb, then, is to suspend the implication that the speaker *knows* the proposition expressed by the complement to be true.

According to Hooper (1975), maximal semantic reduction of the parenthetical verb is obtained with simple present, first-person singular subject, which represents the “optimal” parenthetical use of a weak assertive verb (cf., (6)b, for example). With future tense and third-person subject, for example, semantic content is added to the verb, to the extent that it becomes difficult to obtain a parenthetical reading. This is illustrated in (7), where the “#” notation marks the absence of a parenthetical reading, to be maintained throughout the current section ((7) is modelled on Hooper’s 1975: 102, (57)).

- (7) # We should take the bus, John will believe.

In line with Hooper, the parenthetical clause enriches the semantic content by attributing the assertion of the complement proposition to another person (here, *John*), in the future. This has the effect of cancelling the parenthetical reading of *believe*.

Turning to *wh*-slifting, we see that a similar situation obtains, in the sense that the semantic content of the verb in CP1 must be maximally reduced, as (8) demonstrates.

- (8) a. How long will the strike take, do you think?
- b. ? How long will the strike take, does John think?
- c. # How long will the strike take, do most demonstrators think?
- d. # How long will the strike take, does every demonstrator think?
- e. # How long will the strike take, does some demonstrator think?
- f. # How long will the strike take, do two demonstrators think?
- g. # How long will the strike take, does anyone think?

(8) shows that the “optimal” use of the CP1 verb is with simple present, second-person singular subject (cf., (8)a). Felicity degrades as semantic content is added: the subject may not be a proper name (cf., (8)b), an overtly realized referential NP (cf., (8)b), a quantifier (cf., (8)c), an indefinite, either strong (cf., (8)d) or weak (cf., (8)e), a numeral (cf., (8)f), or a NPI (cf., (8)g).³

Probing further, parenthetical verbs must have affirmative reading, as illustrated in (9), fashioned over Hooper’s (1975: 95, (16) and (17)) respectively (see also Ross 1973).

- (9) a. Many of the applicants are women, it does (* not) seem.
- b. He wants to hire a woman, he does (* not) say.

In the presence of sentential negation, both (9)a and (9)b become ungrammatical.

A similar situation holds for *wh*-slifting, as shown in (10).

- (10) * Who does John like, don’t you believe?

(10) is ungrammatical if negation is present.

(11)a and (11)b exemplify two further properties of parenthetical constructions (modelled on Hooper’s 1975, (40) & (64) respectively).

³ Many thanks to David Adger for this evidence. See also Haddican et al. (2014) for similar observations regarding the subject of the parenthetical, which they formulate as a “second-person” constraint.

- (11) a. Sally plans for Gary to marry her, and marry her he will, it seems.
b. This car needs a tune-up, I think, doesn't it?

(11)a is an instance of “VP preposing”, where the VP *marry her* linearly precedes the sentential subject *he* for reasons of emphasis. “VP preposing” belongs to a group of structural configurations that are named by Emonds (1970) as “Root Transformations”, because they are assumed to be restricted to root (main) clauses. Yet, Hooper (1975) shows that some of these arrangements may also figure in the complement proposition of weak assertive verbs, as (11)a demonstrates (see also Hooper & Thompson 1973 for an extensive commentary on Emonds’s 1970 evidence). (11)b additionally illustrates that the assertion that lies in the complement proposition of a weak assertive verb may be questioned by a tag.

Taken together, both properties in (11) can be seen to figure in a typical *wh*-slifting construction, as in (12).

- (12) Who did Mary meet, do you think?

(12) shows that the complement to the parenthetical *think* is a *wh*-question with root properties, as is evident by the T-to-C substitution.

A final piece of corroborating evidence to the hypothesis that *wh*-slifting is comparable to parenthetical constructions comes from binding-theoretic considerations. Consider (13) and (14) ((13) is repeated from Rooryck 2001: 128–129, (18)a & (23)b respectively, and (14) from (18)b and (24)b respectively).

- (13) *Subject-oriented, quotative*

- a. He_i would be late, Jules_i said.
b. That picture of herself_i was bad, Jules_i said.

- (14) *Speaker-oriented, inferential/hearsay*

- a. Jules_i will be late, he_i said.
b. * That picture of herself_i was bad, Jules_i said, although it wasn't.

Building on Reinhart (1983), Rooryck (2001) maintains her distinction between two types of parentheticals, which he then tailors to interpretation, and more precisely to the distinction between two evidential categories: *subject-oriented* parentheticals are

“quotative” evidentials, in the sense that they facilitate readings akin to Free Indirect Speech. For example, in (13)a, the 3rd person *he* stands in for a 1st person *I*, giving rise to a reading that mimics direct speech by *Jules*, as in *I will be late*. On the other hand, *speaker-oriented* parentheticals involve “hearsay” or “inference”. For example, a parenthetical of the form *he said*, as in (14)a, favours a reading similar to *I think or probably* (as Rooryck 2001: 128 puts it). Notice that, as cited by Rooryck (2001: 129), according to Reinhart (1983: 182, fn: 6), the presence of the adverbial introduced by *although* ensures the speaker-oriented reading of the parenthetical.

Now, as we may observe, each type of parenthetical above yields radically different binding effects (see Reinhart 1983 for a first observation). More precisely, for both (13) a and (13)b to be grammatical, we must assume that, at some point in the derivation, *Jules* *c*-commands *he*, in (13)a, and *herself*, in (13)b. If so, then, it must be the case that the sentence containing the two bindees originate as complements to the parenthetical verbs. This contrasts sharply with both (14)a and (14)b: (14)a is grammatical only under the assumption that the proposition containing *Jules* is not the complement of the parenthetical verb, and the same assumption extends to the ungrammaticality of (14 b, where the reflexive remains unbound.⁴

Interestingly, *wh*-slifting yields the same contradictory binding requirements. Consider the two minimal pairs in (15) and (16).

- (15) a. What did he_i buy, did John_i say?
 b. Which picture of himself_i was downloaded most, does he_i think?

- (16) a. What did John_i buy, did he_i say?
 b. * Which picture of himself_i was downloaded most, did he_i think?

As we may observe, (15) patterns with the quotative reading of the parenthetical in (13), in respecting both conditions A (cf., (15)b) and C (cf., (15)a). On the other hand, (16) bleeds both conditions A (cf., (16)b) and C (cf., (16)a). So, (16) is akin to the inferential/hearsay interpretation of the parenthetical in (14).

4 As Rooryck (2001) correctly points out, the fact that the effects of binding theory vary in subject-oriented and speaker-oriented contexts should be no surprise on the observation that the status of a clause as direct, indirect or free indirect speech is well known to have implications about binding-theoretic relations (see, among others, Banfield 1973, 1981; Schlenker 2000).

To sum up, the set of predicates supporting *wh*-lifting is restricted to a class of proposition-selecting verbs, whose distribution is comparable to that of parentheticals. In the next section, I will capitalize on this conclusion.

3. Deriving evidentiality

As regards parenthetical constructions, Rooryck (2001) commences from the observation that parenthetical verbs express a large range of evidential meanings, a sample of which is given in (17) (his, (12), p. 126).

- (17) Jules is back
- a. I feel / I sense. (nonvisual sensorial)
 - b. I see. (sensory inferential, visual deduction)
 - c. I hear / they say. (sensory evidence, hearsay)
 - d. Sarah said. (quotative) e. I realize / I found out (memory / circumstantial inferential)
 - f. it seems / it appears (unspecified source, circumstantial)

 - g. I believe / think / guess / suppose / presume / suspect / assume / take it / gather. (speculative)
 - e. I'm afraid / I'm sorry to say. (surprisal: to attenuate hearer's surprise)

According to Rooryck, evidentials carry information about the source of a claim (e.g., inference, hearsay, visual, etc.), along with the speaker's attitude towards the truth of the relevant information (e.g., "feel", "think", "believe", etc.) (see Chafe & Nichols 1986 for an overview). So, for example, parentheticals like "feel" and "sense" facilitate a "nonvisual sensorial" reading, as in (17)a, and accordingly for the other verbs in (17).

Building on the close relation of parentheticals to evidentials, Rooryck derives the syntax and semantics of parenthetical constructions from evidentiality, through the use of Cinque's (1999) universal hierarchy of the placement of adverbs. More in particular, witness the two parses in (18), where, for convenience, I resort to the same notational device I have been using all along in order to distinguish between the two CPs (other than that, (18)a and (18)b correspond to Rooryck's (33)a and (33)b respectively).

- (18) a. [_{CP1} [_{MoodEvidP} [_{CP2} Jules is back] [_{MoodEvid}] [_{TP} I [_T] [_{VP} I think t_{CP2}]]]]
- b. [_{CP1} [_{MoodEvidP} [_{CP2} Jules is back] [_{MoodEvid} said] [_{TP} she [_T t_{said}] [_{VP} she t_{said} t_{CP2}]]]]

(18)a illustrates that CP2 originates as the complement of the parenthetical. The parenthetical moves (covertly, through the relevant functional heads) to the evidential modal projection (MoodEvid), which is an adverbial head that sits on top of the inflectional/tense domain of CP1. The sentential moves (overtly) to the specifier of this head. (18)b additionally shows that movement of the parenthetical to MoodEvid can be overt, triggering the corresponding T-to-C raising (i.e., quotative) inversion, for reasons of emphasis. In short, Rooryck's take on parentheticals is that CP2 is hypothetically linked to CP1, whose verb is "de-intensified" (semantically impoverished) due to the evidential mood to which the verb surfaces at.

Turning to *wh*-slifting, we have seen in section 2 that the verb in CP1 is indeed comparable to parenthetical verbs. However, the two sets of facts in (19) and (20), among others, suggest that *wh*-slifting is not a *prima facie* parenthetical construction ((20)a and (20)b are repeated from Haddican et al. 2014: 98–99, (81) and (82) respectively).

(19) Who did Mary meet,

- a. do you think / believe / suppose / expect / imagine / guess / figure.
(speculative)
- b. did she say? (quotative)
- c. ?? did you hear? (sensory evidence, hearsay)
- d. ? does it seem / does it appear? (unspecified source, circumstantial)

(20) a. The children (she said) will (she said) come back (she said) in two days (she said).

- b. When on earth (do you think) will (?? do you think) the children (?? do you think) come back (do you think)?

Compared to (17), (19) shows that *wh*-slifting assumes a restricted set of evidential meanings, which ranges over only speculative (cf., (19)a) and quotative (cf., (19)b) interpretations, while hearsay (cf., (19)c) and circumstantial meanings that leave the information source unspecified are marginal (at best). In terms of word order, (20) shows that parenthetical sentences, like *she said* in (20)a, may surface freely in several positions in-between the sentential (here, *the children will come back*). Yet, *wh*-slifting

exhibits a more rigid word order: CP1 may either follow immediately after the initial *wh*-element, or surface at the end.

Drawing from several properties of *wh*-slifting, alongside these in (19) and (20), in Vlachos (in progress), I propose that a typical *wh*-slifting parse is best analyzed as in (21), which reconciles the evidential properties of the verb in CP1 with the lack of a parenthetical syntax.⁵

(21) [_{CP1} [_{DP} Who [_D [_{CP2} *t_{who}* did [_{C2} Mary meet *t_{who}*]]]] [_{C1} do [_{MOODEVIDP} [_{MOODEVID} *t_{do}* [_{TP1} you [_T *t_{do}* [_{VP1} think *t_{DP}*]]]]]]]]?]

(21) says that CP1 features an evidential head that sits on top of the relevant inflectional/tense domain, and as such, *think* picks up two modalities, via auxiliary *do*-support: an evidential reading, due to MoodEvid, and an interrogative interpretation from C1. Probing further, I argue that a functional D-layer mediates the association of the verb in CP1 with CP2. D, which is the argument of the verb in CP1, probes for a *wh*-element, and translates to an indefinite that takes a proposition as its complement, namely, CP2. CP2 is a typical *wh*-question, where *who* moves from its argument position to [Spec,CP2]. After agreement with D, and then with C1, *who* moves to [Spec,DP], and lands at [Spec,CP1], pied-piping CP2; hence, the corresponding word order. As I show extensively in Vlachos (in progress), the syntax of *wh*-slifting, as prefigured in (21), is comparable with that of *wh*-scope marking in German/Hindi and clausal pied-piping in Basque, raises important implications about clausal complementation, and provides a new solution to an old problem: the trigger for successive cyclic *wh*-movement.

4. Conclusion

Maintaining a recent assumption that *wh*-slifting, alongside interrogative modality, bears evidential meaning, this paper argued that evidentiality arises from a dedicated modal head that supports a hypotactic syntax: a propositional attitude verb picks up an

5 In fact, (21) represents only one of the three *wh*-slifting variants I propose in Vlachos (in progress), all of which handle, among others, the contradictory binding facts (cf., (15) and (16)), and the relevant restrictions regarding complementation (cf., (19)) and word order (cf., (20)), in a natural way.

interrogative and evidential modality, and embeds a functional D-layer, which sits on top of a *wh*-interrogative clause, and facilitates *wh*-movement accompanied by clausal pied-piping.

References

- Alrenga, Peter. 2005. "A Sentential Subject Asymmetry in English and its Implications for Complement Selection." *Syntax* 8:175–207.
- Bannfield, Ann. 1973. "Narrative Style and the Grammar of Direct and Indirect Speech." *Foundations of Language* 10:1–39.
- Bannfield, Ann. 1982. *Unspeakable Sentences. Narration and Representation in the Language of fiction*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1968. *Remarks on Adsententials*. Manuscript, MIT.
- Chafe, Wallace, and Johanna Nichols. 1986. *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emonds, Joseph E. 1970. "Root and Structure-preserving Transformations." PhD diss., MIT.
- Emonds, Joseph E. 1976. *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax*. New York: Academic Press.
- Emonds, Joseph E. 1979. "Appositive Clauses Have no Properties." *Linguistic Inquiry* 10:211–243.
- Haddican, Bill, Anders Holmberg, Hidekazu Tanaka, and George Tsoulas. 2014. "Interrogative Shifting in English." *Lingua* 138:86–106.
- Hooper, Joan B. 1975. "On Assertive predicates." In *Syntax and Semantics IV*, edited by John Kimball, 91–124. Academic Press, New York.
- Hooper, Joan B., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1973. "On the Applicability of Root Transformations." *Linguistic Inquiry* 4:465–497.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1971. "Some Observations on Factivity." *Papers in Linguistics* 4:55–69.
- Kiparsky, Paul, and Carol Kiparsky. 1971. "Fact." In *Progress in Linguistics*, edited by Manfred Bierwisch, and Karl Erich Heidolph, 143–173. The Hague: Moulton.

- McCawley, James D. 1982. "Parentheticals and Discontinuous Constituent Structure." *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:91–106.
- Palmer, Robert Frank. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1983. "Point of View in Language - The Use of Parentheticals." In *Essays on Deixis*, edited by Gisa Rauch, 169–194. Tübingen.
- Rooryck, Johan. 2001. "Evidentiality, Part I." *Glott International* 5:125–133.
- Ross, John Robert. 1973. "Slifting." *The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages*, edited by Maurice Gross, Morris Halle, and Marcel-Paul Schützenberger, 131–169. *Ianua linguarum/Series major* 62. The Hague: Moulton.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2000. "Propositional Attitudes and Indexicality: A Cross-Categorical Approach", PhD diss., MIT.
- Simons, Mandy. 2007. "Observations on Embedding Verbs, Evidentiality, and Presupposition." *Lingua* 117: 1034–1056.
- Urmson, James Opie. 1952. "Parenthetical Verbs." *Mind* 61:480–496.
- Vet, Co. 1994. "Savoir et Croire." In *Language Française. Les sources du savoir et leurs marques linguistiques*, edited by Patrick Dendale, and Liliane Tasmowski, 56–68.
- Vlachos, Christos. In progress. "Unselected Embedded *wh*-Questions." Queen Mary University of London.